

The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell

Volume IV

1829-1832

Edited by Hugh C. McPherson, M.A. and Frederick M. O'Connell

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF DANIEL O'CONNELL

Editor: Maurice R. O'Connell, Ph.D.

Assistant Editor: Gerard J. Lyne, M.A.

Editorial Assistants:

Hugh C. McFadden, M.A. *and* Elizabeth M. O'Connell

THE
CORRESPONDENCE
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume IV

1829-1832

Edited by
Maurice R. O'Connell
Professor of History
Fordham University

DUBLIN
STATIONERY OFFICE
FOR THE
IRISH MANUSCRIPTS COMMISSION

1977

© Government of Ireland, 1977

To be purchased direct from the
GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS SALE OFFICE,
G.P.O. ARCADE, DUBLIN 1
or through any bookseller

PRINTED IN THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND BY
CAHILL (1976) LIMITED, DUBLIN

Contents

The preface acknowledgments and list of manuscript and published sources for *The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell* are to be found in Volume I.

Abbreviations vi

Correspondence

1829 (letters 1505-1626) 1

1830 (1627-1744) 116

1831 (1745-1863) 249

1832 (1865-1945b) 395

Index of Persons 483

Abbreviations

BLG	<i>Burke's Landed Gentry</i>
BLGI	<i>Burke's Landed Gentry of Ireland</i>
BM	British Museum
Boase	Boase, Frederic, <i>Modern English Biography</i> . . .
Cath. Ency.	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i> (U.S.A.)
DEM	<i>Dublin Evening Mail</i>
DEP	<i>Dublin Evening Post</i>
DNB	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
Ency. Brit.	<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i>
FJ	<i>Freeman's Journal</i>
Gillow	Gillow, Joseph, <i>A Literary and Biographical History . . . of the English Catholics</i> . . .
MC	<i>Morning Chronicle</i>
MR	<i>Morning Register</i>
NLI	National Library of Ireland
PRO	Public Record Office
<i>Times</i>	The London <i>Times</i>
UCD	University College, Dublin

*Works cited
in abbreviated form*

Broderick, *Holy See and Repeal*

Broderick, John F., 'The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Act of Union with England, 1829-47', *Analecta Gregoriana* LV, (Rome, 1951).

Butler, *Great Reform Bill*

Butler, J. R. M., *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill*, (London, 1914).

Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*

Cloncurry, Lord, *Personal Recollections of the Life and Times, with Extracts from the Correspondence of Valentine, Lord Cloncurry*, (Dublin, 1849).

Fagan, *O'Connell*

Fagan, William, *The Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell*, (Cork, 1848), 2 vols.

FitzPatrick, *Cloncurry*

FitzPatrick, William J., *The Life, Times and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry*, (Dublin, 1855).

FitzPatrick, *Doyle*

FitzPatrick, William J., *The Life, Times and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin*, (Dublin, 1880), 2 vols.

Gwynn, *O'Gorman Mahon*

Gwynn, Denis, *The O'Gorman Mahon : Duellist, Adventurer and Politician*, (London, 1934).

Halevy, *Triumph of Reform*

Halevy, Elie, *The Triumph of Reform, 1830-1841* (London, 1927).

Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*

Inglis, Brian, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841*, (London, 1954).

Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*

Lecky, William E. H., *A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, (London, 1892), 5 vols.

McDowell, *Irish Administration*

McDowell, R. B., *The Irish Administration, 1801-1914*, (London, 1964).

McDowell, *Public Opinion*

McDowell, R. B., *Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846*, (London, 1952).

Macintyre, *The Liberator*

Macintyre, Angus, *The Liberator : Daniel O'Connell and the Irish Party 1830-1847*, (London, 1965).

O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*

O'Brien, R. B., *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881*, (London, 1883), 2 vols.

O'Keeffe, *O'Connell*

O'Keeffe, Christopher Manus, *Life and times of Daniel O'Connell with sketches of his contemporaries*, (Dublin, 1872), 2 vols.

Paget, *One-Leg*

Paget, George, Marquess of Anglesey, *One-Leg : The Life and Letters of Henry William Paget, First Marquess of Anglesey, 1788-1854*, (London, 1961).

Reynolds, *Emancipation Crisis*

Reynolds, James A., *The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland, 1823-29*, (Yale University Press, 1954).

Ward, *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*

Ward, Bernard N., *The Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, (London, 1911-12), 3 vols.

1505

To Richard Newton Bennett

Tuesday evening [probably January 1829]

My dear Bennett,

The moment you get to London procure for me and transmit all the practical details respecting the actual taking of a seat,¹ these little things which everybody goes through and few take the trouble to know beforehand. I must not be non-suited on a point of form. Learn everything, commit nobody, see B,² etc., etc. I trust much to your *discretion*. You *know me, etc.*

In haste,

Ever yours,

Daniel O'Connell

P.S. Time presses.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

1 See letter 1506, note 1.

2 Probably Henry Brougham.

1506

From Bishop Doyle (J.K.L.)

12 January 1829

[No salutation]

... I think I can judge without passion and I can find nothing in the conduct of our opponents respected. Who can respect ignorance or stupidity? Who can defer to bigotry or monopoly? All opposition is founded on ignorance, religious intolerance or self-interest. When you proceeded to combat this opposition in Clare, I saw to its fullest extent the difficulties and dangers, public and personal, to be encountered; but I thought they ought to be braved, and I cheered you upon your way. You were well fitted for that contest, but that which is now before you is of a different and more delicate character. Courage, perseverance and address were then necessary but in addition to these you now require parliamentary knowledge, great fortitude and that cool deliberation which cannot be

circumvented but know how to turn every occurrence to the best account.

The *suaviter in modo* and *fortiter in re*, so little suited to us *Irish*, would be always useful to you but in your approaching struggle will be indispensable. You will have to give 'honour to whom honour is due' whilst you enforce the rights you possess, knowing that they belong to you even as the crown belongs to a king. Were I not of a profession which prescribes to me other duties, I should attend you to the door of the House of Commons and share in your success, for success must attend you,¹ but at home I shall pray unceasingly to Him who holds in His hand the hearts of men that He may direct and prosper you in all your ways, that He may vouchsafe to give peace in our days, and not suffer his people to be tried beyond what they can bear.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Dr. Doyle*, II, 114-15

- I O'Connell intended going to London to take his seat for Clare on the first day of the coming session (*DEP*, 30 Dec. 1828). He contended that he was legally entitled to enter the Commons without having to subscribe to the oaths objectionable to Catholics. He argued that such oaths applied only to parliament as constituted before the Act of Union with Ireland so that Catholics could enter the United Kingdom parliament without subscribing to them (O'Connell to the Members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 2 February 1829, *DEP*, 7 Feb. 1829). However it was ultimately agreed that he should defer the attempt to take his seat until the fate of the proposed Catholic Emancipation bill should be decided (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 622).

1507

To his brother John, Grenagh, Killarney

Merrion Square, 13 January 1829

[Photostat]

My dear John,

Everybody is exclaiming against Kerry, afraid of a few paltry and malignant Brunswickers.¹ There is no Liberal club,² no meeting to address Lord Anglesey,³ no nomination for London,⁴ etc. Everybody too blames the 'John O'Connell' of the viewer of the lakes.

But seriously, my dear John, something ought to be done in Kerry. A strong county petition on the recall of Lord Anglesey, strong resolutions, an address to Lord Anglesey himself, a Liberal club. I cannot tell you what contempt I entertain for Lord Headley since I heard he was in principle a Brunswickeer.

Is there any chance of any Protestant coming up from Kerry to the meeting of the 20th?⁵ If Protestants do not come, Catholics certainly ought to be doubly numerous. If you put your shoulders to the wheel Kerry will not be any longer among the most backward counties in Ireland. The bigots are almost beating us in zeal⁶ and, if I was not an agitator of unconquerable activity, they would beat the Catholics all to nothing in exertion. No successor as yet appointed to Lord Anglesey. The cause of his recall is now known to be the most ridiculous and absurd in the world. Only think, because he visited Lord Cloncurry and did not deprive O'Gorman-Mahon and Steele of the commission of the peace at the instance of Molony, the sheriff of Clare.⁷

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 Members or supporters of the Orange Brunswick clubs (see letter 1483, note 1). At a Catholic meeting held in Kenmare, Co. Kerry, on 1 January 1829 a resolution was passed expressing satisfaction that Kerry was the only county in which Brunswick clubs had not as yet been established (*DEP*, 29 Jan. 1829).
- 2 See letter 1473, note 3.
- 3 Anglesey had recently been recalled because of his pro-Catholic sympathies (see below, note 7). No meeting to address him appears to have been held in Kerry despite O'Connell's appeal.
- 4 At the provincial meeting of the Munster Catholics on 25 and 26 August 1828, it had been resolved that 'feeling alive to the results of the late Election for the County of Clare, we strongly recommend to the people of the Province in every County, City and large Town, to request of two gentlemen . . . to attend in London at the period of Mr. O'Connell's taking his seat in order to give him their countenance, advice and assistance in every legal and constitutional manner' (*DEP*, 4 Sept. 1828). In the Catholic Association on 30 December 1828 O'Connell complained that this resolution had not been complied with and expressed his intention of proceeding alone to London if necessary (*DEP*, 1 Jan. 1829). When O'Connell did leave for London on 6 February 1829 he declared he wished to go 'unnoticed and unattended' (*MR*, 5 Feb. 1829). However, he found himself, according to the *Morning Register*, accompanied by several gentlemen on that day, and, 'Before a week most of the Irish

Catholic Gentry who are so situated that they can go, will, we are sure . . . be in London, aiding with their countenance and advice, the member for Ireland' (*MR*, 7 Feb. 1829).

- 5 A great meeting of the Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty was held at the Rotunda, Dublin, on 20 January 1829, under the chairmanship of the duke of Leinster. Among those present were Lords Cloncurry, Milltown, Forbes, Glengall, Clanmorris, Bective, Killeen, Riversdale, Rossmore and Dunally (*DEP*, 20, 22, 24 Jan. 1829). It was there resolved that a petition to the king in favour of Emancipation be presented by the duke of Leinster to be accompanied by a large number of noblemen and M.P.'s (*DEP*, 24 Jan. 1829).
- 6 A reference to the many local anti-Catholic Protestant meetings being held throughout Ireland at this time.
- 7 Anglesey had decided after careful consultation with the Irish lord chancellor not to remove from the magistracy O'Gorman Mahon and Tom Steele, two prominent members of the Catholic Association, although desired to do so by Wellington and Peel. In addition, Anglesey stayed at the house of Cloncurry who immediately afterwards attended a meeting of the Catholic Association. Not satisfied with Anglesey's explanation of his conduct on these points, Wellington brought the whole matter before the cabinet and obtained their consent to the viceroy's recall. Anglesey was notified of this decision on 30 December 1828 (see George Paget, marquess of Anglesey, *One-leg: The Life and Letters of Henry William Paget, First Marquess of Anglesey, 1768-1854* [London 1961], pp. 210-12). Although these incidents constituted the 'two sparks which lit the fuse' in the explosion leading to Anglesey's recall, his overall policy of conciliation towards the Catholics had set the ground for a rupture between him and the Wellington ministry (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Paget, Henry William, first Marquis of Anglesey').

1508

*From William Gossett,¹ Phoenix Park, Dublin,
14 January 1829*

Arranging appointment to receive an address² on 15 January.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast), T. 1068 Letter-Book 20, f. 162

- 1 William Gossett (died 1848), Round Wood, Cornwall. Private secretary to the lord-lieutenant; M.P. for Truro, 1820-26; under-secretary for Ireland, 1830-35. Knighted, 1831.
- 2 Probably to Lord Anglesey on his recall.

1509

*From Edmond McCarthy,¹ South Mall, Cork,
20 January 1829, to Merrion Square*

On private legal business. 'The Romans here are greatly pleased with your getting up a deputation to present our address.'²

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

¹ Attorney.

² Probably the address to Anglesey drawn up at a meeting of the Catholics of the county and city of Cork on 16 January 1829 (see *Southern Reporter*, 17 Jan. 1829). On 19 January a deputation from the Catholics of the county and city of Cork, headed by Alexander McCarthy, B.L., presented Anglesey with this address (*Southern Reporter*, 20 Jan. 1829).

1510

To William Joseph Battersby¹

Merrion Square, 22 January 1829

Sir,

I am perfectly satisfied that the charge I made from memory upon you as being the author of 'the rentpayer' was totally unfounded and that I was quite deceived.² I am ready to acquit you of it in the fullest manner you may desire.

I am, Your obedient servant,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE : Archbishop Marsh's Library, Dublin, Z 1.2.50 (6)

¹ A Catholic printer and bookseller, Winetavern Street, Dublin.

² A handbill entitled *A Rent-payer* had recently been circulated in Dublin, containing allegations that O'Connell had dishonestly appropriated part of the Catholic rent for private purposes. In the Association on 30 December 1828, O'Connell accused William J. Battersby of being the author of this accusation (*DEP*, 1 Jan. 1829). On 24 January Battersby's denial of authorship was published in the *Dublin Evening Post*. The finance committee of the Association had already on 1 January issued a report clearing O'Connell of the charges brought against him in the *Rent-payer* (*DEP*, 3 Jan. 1829).

1511

*To John Primrose, Jr., 26 January 1829,
from Merrion Square*

Instructing Primrose to thank John Murphy,¹ Valentia, Co. Kerry, for offering to accompany him (O'Connell) to London² but he would not allow Murphy to be at the trouble and expense of coming.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Unidentified.

2 See letter 1507, note 4.

1512

*From Thomas Steele, Hibernian Hotel (probably Dublin),
1 February 1829*

Seeks franks for two English people.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1513

To Bishop Doyle,¹ Old Derry, Carlow

[Dublin, 4 February 1829]

Private

[No salutation]

The reports about an Emancipation bill are true. I believe the Clare contest² has greatly contributed to this result. The blessing you bestowed on its infancy has prospered.³ My address in London will be Batts Hotel, Dover St. If I get into the House, Catholic education will have an unremitting and sincere advocate. You *will* then help, and if any advice strikes you as valuable *now* or *then*, you will let me have it, I know. I refer you to the *Register* of Saturday for my law argument.⁴

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

- 1 This is a circular letter to the bishops of Ireland signed by O'Connell on behalf of the committee of the Catholic Association. It calls for the co-operation or, at least, the approbation of each bishop in supporting the collection of the Catholic rent and in the preparation of petitions from all over Ireland. O'Connell then adds a note, marked private, to Dr. Doyle as above.

- 2 A reference to the famous Clare election.
- 3 Doyle had been an early supporter of the Catholic Association. According to Reynolds, he had been instrumental in winning for it the support of other members of the Catholic hierarchy (Reynolds, *Emancipation Crisis*, pp. 47-9).
- 4 A lengthy document addressed to 'the Members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland' dated 2 February 1829 upholding O'Connell's right to enter parliament without subscribing to the oaths objectionable to Catholics (*DEP*, 7 Feb. 1829; see also letter 1506, note 1).

1513a

*To the Knight of Kerry, Brookes's [Club],
St. James's Street, London*

Merrion Square, 6 February 1829

My dear Sir,

I have again paid the College fines and expenses amounting to £616.4.8 being about one pound more than the last. Your share is £113.3.5. These sums are late currency.¹ You therefore owe me in present currency £104.9.0. This we can settle when we meet as you please.

I leave Dublin today and as I travel with post horses I shall not reach London before Tuesday. As soon as I arrive I will send to Brookes's to enquire where I could see you. I trust by that day no person will doubt *my right* in point of law to sit and vote. The [Morning] *Register* of tomorrow and I hope the *Times* of Monday will contain my statement.² The Irish bar appear unanimously with me, and indeed the Law *is* so. But I am not to [? learn] thus. The Ministry can command a majority on any debatable point as a matter of Law must be. I will however make as hard a fight as I and my friends can make. I need not tell you that if I get in I will be a Whig but certainly one 'des plus prononcés' because my opinions upon reform are of the most strong description, but enough of this.

I am told Mr. Spring Rice has taken offence at something attributed to me. If you see him pray interfere for me with him. I am quite sure I did not intend to say any thing unkind of him and if [I] did say so I regret it.

This country *would* be in the most alarming state but for the favourable rumours which have not only consoled the people but already begun to mitigate the Brunswickers. It

really surprises me to perceive the change which so few days of the prospect of emancipation has made. Many of a very violent class are already giving in and of course are met with great cordiality. It really is the easiest thing in the world to tranquillize Ireland.

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 Irish currency was finally assimilated to British, in the ratio of 13 to 12, on January 6, 1826 by an act of 1825, 6 Geo. IV c. 79 (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 108-112).
- 2 See letters 1506, note 1 and 1513, note 4.

1514

*From John Miller,¹ Cove, Co. Cork, 7 February 1829,
to London*

Says he sent O'Connell a case for his opinion on 29th ult. and four newspapers relating to it and asks for a reply by return of post as he is due to leave for Jamaica on 20th inst.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Unidentified.

1515

To his wife, Merrion Square

Shrewsbury, 8 February 1829

My own darling love,

We are detained here tonight by the failure of the fore-wheels of the carriage Hutton¹ gave me. We had Mass this morning at Llangollen and came on very well thus far, but here we found it absolutely necessary to *refit* our fore-wheels and this keeps us here all night. We will, please God, start at four in the morning and so reach London tomorrow night. Of course, I have not heard as yet one single word respecting either myself or the cause except what appears in the newspapers. I am, I confess, in some doubt as to the line of conduct² which should be adopted at the present moment, but our arrival in London will give me further information, and I will not hesitate to take a decided and honest part. That, sweetest, *you* will readily allow. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 One of the firm of John Hutton and Sons, coach builders, 14 Summerhill, Dublin.

- 2 Either with regard to the dissolution of the Catholic Association (see letter 1516, note 3) or O'Connell's attempting to take his seat in parliament (see letter 1506, note 1).

1516

From his daughter Kate to Batt's Hotel, Dover St., London

Merrion Square, 8 February 1829

My own dearest Father,

We were delighted to hear last night from James Sugrue that you had such a quick and good passage and we hope very, very soon to hear from yourself that you are quite well and able to fight your country's battle and with the blessing of God to conquer for her. The dear little Mod is, thank God, getting quite stout. She intends coming down to the drawing-room this evening. . . .

They are all here much pleased with the King's Speech¹ and the debate² in the House of Commons. It is so very kind of his Majesty to remember *us* at all in his [? rich] heart! But well do we know to whom Ireland owes her being mentioned in that speech and whose labours have brought his country to her present situation. My dear father, we burn with impatience to hear of your entry into the House. . . . I offered up my Communion for you this morning. . . . Mr. L'Estrange was so kind to give Mama Mass today. He begged his best regards to you and that he hoped you would soon write to them to tell them what they ought to do at the Association. He says he fears the Orange Papists are too much with Sheil and that they are conspiring³ (he means Blake⁴ and Wolfe).⁵ . . . I hope you did not travel all the way outside or, at least, that you did not find it very cold. Many a cold and wet mile I travelled that way with my dearest father when I used to be obliged to ask if it was still raining, he kept his Catty so covered up from all the rain and wind. . . .

SOURCE : Kenneigh Papers

- 1 The king's speech on the opening of parliament on 5 February 1829. While it hinted at the forthcoming suppression of the Catholic Association, it recommended that parliament should take into consideration the whole condition of Ireland and should review the laws imposing civil disabilities on Catholics (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 5).

- 2 That which took place on 6 February 1829 on the king's speech. It consisted mainly of a discussion of Catholic Emancipation (*DEP*, 10 Feb. 1829).
- 3 In the Catholic Association on 3 February 1829, Sheil, urging a damping down of agitation in view of the disposition of the ministry to meet the Catholic claims, declared, 'Nothing can so well become us as mild behaviour and humility, when the least intimations of national pacification are held out' (*DEP*, 5 Feb. 1829). On 10 February Sheil delivered a 'long and most powerful speech' in which he declared he had the opinion of twenty-two Catholic bishops that the Association should be immediately dissolved. He thereupon moved a resolution to that effect and, despite letters to the association from O'Connell in favour of its remaining in existence until Emancipation should become law, and attempts of his son Maurice to postpone the resolution (*DEP*, 10, 12 Feb. 1829), Sheil carried his motion on 12 February 1829 (*DEP*, 14 Feb. 1829).
- 4 Anthony Richard Blake.
- 5 Probably Stephen Woulfe (1787-1840), son of Stephen Woulfe, Tiermaclane, Ennis, Co. Clare. Crown counsel for Munster, 1830; third serjeant, 1835-36; M.P. for Cashel, 1835-38; solicitor-general, 1836-37; attorney-general, 1837-38. Chief baron of the exchequer, 1838-40, the first Catholic so appointed. See *DNB*.

1517

To his wife

Batt's Hotel, Dover Street [London],
10 February 1829

My darling love,

. . . I am happy to tell you that prospects seem more favourable than we expected. I saw Sir Henry Parnell who kindly called on me the moment we arrived. His name is not to get into the newspapers but he tells me that there is to be no veto, nor any attack or interference with the discipline of the Catholic Church. This darling is important *if true*, as the Americans say. I have my hopes that it is so.

With respect to taking my seat I have not as yet determined upon the time of taking it. That must be determined tomorrow or the day after by my professional friends and the advice of the persons who in parliament shall be found honest enough to support me. I shall however write to you every day and give *you*, sweetest, full details. You will not state the names of the persons who may give me information because the newspapers

are so ready to catch up any and everything that it is not safe to mention names to anybody. . . .

Darling, whatever becomes of my claims or of those of my country, you are my consolation and my solace. Your state of health is my great and foremost source of anxiety.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X (1882), 717-18

1518

From Corn. MacLoghlin to London

Paris, 10 February 1829

Dear Sir,

I wrote you a few lines on Saturday. I now see as clear as the paper on which I write that you will take your seat in Parliament. If not immediately at no remote day. Let me know how things will go on as in the event of your taking your seat, I have a proposition to make that will tend to your future ease and comfort and enable you to devote your entire time to your country. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1519

From Edward Dwyer to Batt's Hotel, Dover St., London

Dublin, 11 February 1829

My dear Sir,

Since our commencement I never wished so much to have a letter from you. It is intended to give notice this day for a dissolution of the Association on this day week. All the bishops now here recommend it. Indeed they even go so far as to say that they will withdraw their names and countenance from it should we not comply. The opinions of our Protestant as well as Catholic friends here is that we should dissolve and not await the fiat of Parliament for putting us down.¹ Everything appears well, the prospect is cheering. God send there is no snake in the grass. It would be presumption in me to offer advice but were I to do so it would be in three words, caution, caution, caution.

I purpose having a notice given this day through Mr. Sheil for the appointment of a Committee of Accounts and that measures be taken to render the old fund² available for education purposes, building schools and discharging of debts due by the Association. On this subject in particular I shall claim your attention and hope to receive a communication from you previous to Tuesday's meeting.

. . . The inspector³ is just arrived from Kerry after getting up a regular system of rent collecting, etc.

[P.S.] I have just received your letter from Shrewsbury⁴ which will be read this day and of course will have due weight.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A bill (directed against the Catholic Association) 'for the suppression of dangerous Associations or Assemblies in Ireland' was ordered in the Commons on 10 February 1829. The bill was enacted on 5 March 1829 as 10 Geo. IV c. 1.
- 2 The fund of the old Catholic Association, which had been suppressed by the act of 1825. This fund, which remained vested in the hands of the treasurers of the old association, was stated in January 1829 to amount to £13,000 (*DEP*, 3 Jan. 1829).
- 3 In the association on 13 January 1829 O'Connell initiated a system of Catholic rent inspectors. According to this plan, a head inspector was to be dispatched by the association to each county where he was to appoint five local inspectors. The local inspectors were in turn to appoint parish churchwardens to collect the Catholic rent in the parish churches on the first Sunday of every month. Besides organizing the Catholic rent, the local inspectors had extensive duties ranging from reporting on the local franchise and conditions of local education to helping suppress agrarian secret societies (see *DEP*, 15 Jan. 1829).
- 4 O'Connell to Edward Dwyer, 8 February 1829 (public letter). This letter was read at the meeting of the association on 12 February 1829. It counselled the association to view with caution ministerial intentions with regard to Emancipation and urged that the association be maintained in being until the passage of that measure should be achieved. In addition, the letter urged that in the event of the proposed Emancipation bill containing any clause restricting the elective franchise, it should be met 'By a petition from every parish . . . to resist any bill of Emancipation no matter how extensive if accompanied by any such interference' (*DEP*, 12 Feb. 1829).

1520

From Joseph Childs

14 February 1829

Mr. Childs of Liskeard¹ in the County of Cornwall (for the present at the Tavistock Hotel, Covent Garden) takes leave to transmit to Mr. O'Connell the *West Briton* Newspaper of the 30th ult. containing the letter² of the Rev. Robert Walker,³ a Protestant clergyman of property and independence and one of the most respectable and respected magistrates in the County, enclosing also an extract from his letter to Mr. Childs under date of the 6th inst.⁴ . . . He has Mr. Walker's letter now in the press and will gladly distribute as many copies of it as may be calculated . . . to assist in convincing the misguided of the folly and injustice into which it has been attempted to betray them. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Joseph Childs (1776-1829), solicitor.

2 Unidentified.

3 Rev. Robert Walker (1765-1835), son of James Walker, Lanlivery, Cornwall.

4 Unidentified.

1521

*From Michael Scales,¹ 44 Aldgate, London, 19 February 1829,
to Batt's Hotel, Dover St., Piccadilly*

Offering O'Connell the use of his horse, chaise and harness while O'Connell will be in London. Payment is not mentioned.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Of the firm of William and Edward Scales, meat salesmen, 44 Aldgate Street, London.

1521a

To Robert White, 18 Fleet St., Dublin

London, Monday, 23 February 1829

My Dear Robert,

I wrote the enclosed on Saturday but it was forgotten to be sent to the office.

No further news but that the Duke of Clarence has been canvassing for us.

SOURCE : O'Connell School, Dublin

1522

*From his brother James, Dublin, 24 February 1827 or 1829,
to Merrion Square*

Concerning two bills of exchange for £1500 each for money due by the writer to Bindon Scott.¹

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Bindon Scott, Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare. Married 1810 Frances Percy. Their daughter Mary married 1832 O'Connell's son Maurice.

1523

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

19 Bury Street, St. James, London, 25 February 1829

My dear John,

. . . You may rely on the determination of the ministry to carry the measure. The Emancipation bill will be law before the first of May and the bill will in itself be satisfactory in all its details. The *securities*, if any, are to follow, not accompany the bill.¹ . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 The Emancipation Act was accompanied by two others, one of which was intended to suppress the Catholic Association and a second for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.

1524

From Jeremiah McCarthy

62 Dawson St., Dublin, 26 February 1829

My Dear Sir,

. . . The Duke of Clarence's speech¹ has made a great noise here. Your letter to Mr. Carroll² is highly praised. You stand higher than ever among your friends and well wishers.

. . . The Rev. Mr. Maguire³ dines with me today. He desires me give his most affectionate respects to you. Staunton got off very well with the Bishop of Tuam.⁴ I am told Sheil's

speech was splendid⁵ but I had not as yet time to read it. I have no further news for you but of this fact I am positive that the moment you take your seat the *National Subscription* will commence.⁶ Dillon McNamara⁷ asserted yesterday that you would not be the sitting member for Clare, he seems positive.⁸ . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 In the Lords on 23 February 1829. He pledged his support to the Catholic Emancipation bill and declared that such a measure ought long ago to have been carried. In addition he spoke in praise of the Irish character and declared that Wellington in passing Emancipation would be but paying off a debt of gratitude to those thousands of Irishmen serving in the English forces who, he claimed, had been mainly responsible for both Nelson's and Wellington's victories on land and sea (*DEP*, 26 Feb. 1829).
- 2 Charles Rivers Carroll, Charleston, South Carolina, dated 21 February 1829. It was written to thank Carroll for the sum of £200 sent by him through O'Connell for the Catholic Association. In the letter, published in the *Morning Register*, 26 February 1829, O'Connell informed Carroll of the recent dissolution of the association (see letter 1516, note 3) and, while stressing that O'Connell himself disagreed with this step, spoke in praise of its sponsors, Sheil and Jack Lawless. In addition the letter stressed the friendship felt by Irishmen for America and promised that the Irish would 'assist in preserving the meridian splendour of American independence'.
- 3 Probably Rev. Thomas Maguire.
- 4 The Protestant archbishop of Tuam, Power le Poer Trench, had prosecuted Michael Staunton for publishing in his newspaper, the *Weekly Register*, a speech of the Rev. Thomas Maguire which, according to the archbishop, contained a libel on himself and the Established church (*FJ*, 24 Feb. 1829). The speech, which appeared in the *Weekly Register* of 10 November 1827, was copied from the *Dublin Evening Post* of 3 November 1827. The *Freeman's Journal* of 12 November also published the speech, but only the *Register* was proceeded against. The case came for trial on 23 February 1829. Sheil appeared as counsel for Staunton who was acquitted (*FJ*, 24, 25 Feb. 1829).
- 5 Sheil's speech was couched in very sarcastic terms, designed to denigrate the character of the archbishop and his motives in bringing the action against Staunton (*FJ*, 24, 25 Feb. 1829).
- 6 See letter 1549, note 4.
- 7 Dillon McNamara (died 1838), attorney, Keilty, Co. Clare, and Birchfield, Co. Dublin. Son of Thady McNamara, Dublin.
- 8 See letter 1525, note 2.

1524a

To the Knight of Kerry

Bury St. [London], Wednesday [Spring, 1829]

My dear Sir,

Perhaps I could ask you to give me a call whenever you come *into town* tomorrow. If you do not come be so kind as to let me have a line by the penny post to say when I could see you for half an hour at your leisure. I have had most satisfactory information on the subject of my seat¹ but I shall want your assistance and I know how ready you are to give it to me.

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

1 See letters 1535 and 1563.

1525

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 3 March 1829

My darling Heart's Love,

. . . I fear there will be a freehold wing.¹ . . . I am obliged to attend the striking of my Committee² this day and so cannot send you the latest news of the day, because I shall be at the House when the post is about to close. Mr. Brougham was with me this morning for an hour. Let this fact not get into the papers. He spoke to me a great deal on the freehold wing. He wanted to get some countenance from me for the Whigs supporting that wing. I need not tell you that he totally failed. They *trapped* me before. They cannot possibly succeed in that way a second time. Besides, darling, I really am too much indebted to the 40s freeholders. You do not think I could ever turn my back on the poor fellows in Clare. I argued with Brougham in the strongest terms on the subject and showed him how useless it would be to call it a measure of concession, if they were at the same time to destroy the rights of the people at large. Brougham left me, perhaps dissatisfied but certainly without any encouragement from me, decidedly the reverse. Darling, everything else is favourable. The King is in the hands of the Ministry. The Duke of Cumberland³ was in the House last night quite muzzled. In forty-

eight hours or a little more we shall know our fate. What a critical moment. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 A bill to disfranchise the forty-shilling freeholders.
- 2 On 10 February 1829 the Commons accepted a petition from four freeholders of Co. Clare, namely, Thomas Mahon, Greenlawn, and William Finucane, Michael Finucane and James O'Gorman, all of Ennis, against O'Connell's return for the county in July 1828 (the famous Clare election) alleging in particular, intimidation by the Catholic clergy. On 3 March a committee was appointed to try the petition and on 6 March declared O'Connell duly elected (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 106-7).
- 3 Ernest Augustus (1771-1851), fifth son of George III. On the death of his brother William IV and the accession of his niece Victoria to the throne of England, he became king of Hanover.

1526

To Edward Dwyer

3 March 1829

My dear Friend,

I could not get a moment till now on my way down to the House of Commons, where the Committee¹ is to be selected, to give you a sketch of what passed between Brougham and me this day.

Brougham had about an hour's conversation with me; his object to convince me that we should accede to a freehold wing² if it shall be proposed. He put his arguments as strongly as possible upon the expediency of not throwing out the Relief Bill by opposing the freehold wing, if—mark, as yet it is *if*—that measure shall be proposed.

I need not tell you that I availed myself of that opportunity of urging every argument against any such measure. I declared my perpetual and unconquerable hostility to it; I showed that emancipation, accompanied by that wing, would rather irritate than assuage; I showed him that the people would get into worse hands than ours. In short, he left me convinced that it was the duty of the Whigs to take as decisive a part as possible in preventing the Ministry from bringing in such a wing. So stands the matter at present.

It was *curious* that Brougham should come to me the

very day—the morning of the day—on which my committee was and is to be formed.

Perhaps it was accident, but certainly it was just the day when it was most likely that I should wish to be in favour with the men who might form that committee. In haste.

[P.S.] The committee is just struck. I take it to be favourable. Lord William Russell³ is chairman. Almost all voted for the Catholics. An excellent committee: Lord W. Russell, James Brougham, Sir G. Robinson, Robert Clive, E. B. Clive, John Stuart, M. Liddle, T. P. Courtney, M. Lock, J. Easthope, M. Carew.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 49-50

1 See letter 1525, note 2.

2 See letter 1525, note 1.

3 Lord William Russell (1767-1840), third son of the marquis of Tavistock and brother of the fifth and sixth dukes of Bedford; murdered by his valet 6 May 1840.

1527

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 4 March 1829

My darling Love,

My Committee¹ sat all day and everything was as favourable as possible. They adjourned at three o'clock till tomorrow at eleven. I believe they will decide tomorrow and I anticipate an easy decision in my favour. I was treated with great courtesy by all the persons connected with the House. It is impossible to be sure of what *will come* but I have every reason to be satisfied. . . .

I cannot write politics this day because, my own darling, there is a tremulous anxiety about me for tomorrow. Tomorrow is the awful day, *big with the fate of Cato and of Rome*.² You see, love, how poetic I am grown. The fact is that as the crisis approaches on which we *must* know everything, one cannot bring one's mind to do otherwise than merely wish that the time of certainty were come. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 1525, note 2.

2 It was expected that a motion would be made in the Commons on

5 March 1829 in favour of resuming the adjourned debate on whether or not the House should go into committee on the Catholic claims. The motion was, however, adjourned to 6 March, when it was carried by 205 to 76 (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 106, 109).

1528

To his wife, Merriion Square

[London], 5 March 1829

[No salutation]

. . . I am writing in the committee room amidst a great crowd and while the counsel against me is speaking.¹ It is one o'clock and he will soon conclude. He has been speaking since eleven. One counsel is then to be heard on my behalf and then the Committee are to decide. Everybody tells me I must succeed. Indeed I myself perceive the Committee laughing at the arguing counsel. $\frac{1}{2}$ after one, the counsel at the other side have done. Mr. Pollock² is going on and is putting the case extremely well.

The news respecting the Emancipation bill is to *this* extent favourable. The Ministry were with the King yesterday and he has definitively [*sic*] agreed to the Emancipation. . . . The King was playing all manner of tricks and the Duke of Cumberland was as usual exceedingly virulent. But the Ministry have succeeded and the bill comes forward this evening. This, darling, you may depend on. I will write again, of course, tomorrow. What an awful interval for Ireland. I am greatly afraid of a freehold wing³ but it is, I confess, the only thing I am afraid of. Maurice is in perfect good health and spirits and goes to all the parties he is asked to. They are many. A lady told me he was the handsomest man of the deputation.⁴ I told her his mother was of the same opinion and I added that he was very like his mother. I was so proud to be able to say so. He will go with me into the City and indeed everywhere else where I am asked to dine. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 In the committee set up to try the petition against O'Connell's return for Clare (see letter 1525, note 2).
- 2 Jonathan Frederick Pollock (1783-1870), K.C.; M.P. for Huntingdon, 1831-47; knighted, 1834. Attorney-general, 1834-35, 1841-44; chief baron of the exchequer, 1844-66. Created baronet, 1866.

- 3 The bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.
 4 That which accompanied O'Connell to London for the purpose of assisting him in obtaining permission to take his seat (see letter 1507, note 4).

1529

To his wife

19 Bury St., St. James [London], 6 March 1829

My darling Love,

The bills are announced. Great and glorious triumph as far as the Emancipation bill goes—no Veto—no payment of the clergy—no ecclesiastical arrangements. So far the bill is excellent. If it passed alone it would be the greatest of triumphs. It is to be a single bill, that is, the Emancipation bill is to pass by itself. There are to be two other bills, one a bill to prevent *the extension* of the Jesuits and other monastic orders. I will drive a coach and six through it. Another clause is to prevent Catholic bishops from being called Lords¹—absurd and childish.

Next comes the mischief—bill to raise the freehold qualification to ten pounds. This is bad, very bad, and we must prevent it if we can. I will publish on Tuesday a letter on this subject² but everything else is admirable. Whoever thought we could get such a bill from Peel and Wellington. Catholics can be judges, mayors, sheriffs, aldermen, common counselmen, peers of parliament, members of parliament, everything, in short, everything. There is no doubt of the bill passing. The King is tied hand and foot by his own acts. Darling, may I say that I contributed to this. Everything well but the 40s freehold but in my opinion the £10 will really give more power to the Catholics. I must however support the freeholders.

Darling, I am in perfect health and spirits. I tread on air. Oh, if I could support the 40s freeholders! *That, that* is the only blot. Maurice is also perfectly well and merry. One of the Committee³ was here to tell me their determination though they are now pronouncing it. I do not as yet know whether I shall get costs or not. It is a great triumph either way.

We dine tomorrow at Mr. Lynch's,⁴ the son-in-law of Mr. Butler. On Sunday I dine at Bentham's, on Tuesday at a

public dinner.⁵ On Wednesday with, that is in company with, rich Jews in the City. Perhaps Maurice could pick up a £50,000 amongst them.⁶ On Thursday with a Mr. Fenton.⁷ The Duke of Norfolk has not asked us nor have any of the leading English Catholics. We have been invited only by the rich mercantile men [remainder of letter missing] . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 1530, notes 1 and 3. These provisions were incorporated as clauses in the Emancipation Act. O'Connell had perhaps not seen the printed bills yet since he would scarcely have confused bills with clauses. In 1821 and 1825 these provisions had formed separate bills so that one might expect a similar procedure in 1829.
- 2 See letter 1532, note 5.
- 3 That appointed to try the petition against O'Connell's return for Clare (see letter 1525, note 2).
- 4 Andrew Henry Lynch.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 That is, no doubt, a daughter with a dowry of £50,000.
- 7 Probably John Fenton (1790-1863), banker at Rochdale. First M.P. for Rochdale, 1832-34, 1837-41.

1530

To Bishop Doyle, Carlow

19 Bury St., St. James [London], 6 March 1829

Private

My dear and respected Lord,

I use another's frank that this may be as much private as *you* please.

Look (if you will do so at my request) at the wings¹ to the new bill. Give me advice and assistance on this subject. It is a critical moment. I desire to do right. I have already exerted myself against the freehold wing² here but I believe that the bills as proposed by the Minister will be carried. The monastic bill³ is an absurdity and I think I will easily *supercede* it but this [is] a moment of great value and advice and assistance are now absolutely essential.

I shall long to hear from you on *these* points. At all events let me know your opinion on the state of Ireland at this moment. Tell me anything you think may be useful.

I long to be *in* the House to uphold the honour and charac-

ter of our country and creed but for the present I only write for advice.

[The letter is franked by Robert Shapland Carew.]

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

- 1 This may refer to the bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders. It is more likely, however, that it refers to certain provisions contained in the Emancipation bill itself. Among these was the provision prohibiting Catholics from holding religious ceremonies or celebrations outside their churches or private houses, the provision prohibiting Catholic bishops from adopting the titles of sees belonging to the Established church and certain provisions directed against Jesuits and other religious orders. (For the text of these clauses and of the Emancipation bill, see *DEP*, 14 Mar. 1829; also Reynolds, *Emancipation Crisis*, p. 64. See also letter 1529, note 1.)
- 2 The bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.
- 3 A reference to the clause in the Emancipation bill designed 'to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition' of 'Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or societies, of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic or religious vows . . . resident within the United Kingdom'. It was provided in the bill that members of such orders were to be compelled to register; foreign members of such orders entering the United Kingdom in future were to be banished, and persons admitted, or instrumental in admitting novices to such orders, were to become liable to prosecution (see *DEP*, 14 Mar. 1829). Although these provisions were embodied in the bill as finally passed, they proved from the start a dead letter.

1531

To O'Connor Don, Belanagare

19 Bury Street, St. James [London], 6 March 1829

My dear friend,

I should have written sooner to you had I not been prevented by the pressure of constant business. Have the goodness to excuse me.

You will see by the papers that we have a most comprehensive Emancipation Bill. The only drawback is the freehold wing, the abolition of the 40s freeholders. I hope you will pour in petitions against that part of the arrangement. There is no time to be lost. My opinion is that the liberal clubs¹ ought not

to dissolve themselves. They do not come within the legitimate provisions of the new Algerine Act.²

You will be glad to hear that the Clare Election Committee³ decided unanimously in my favour.

There is not the least doubt that the Emancipation Bill will be carried. The intrigues with the King have totally failed and Emancipation is quite certain. The only drawback is the freehold wing. In every other respect the measure is frank, direct and complete. It is a comfort to have struggled for this glorious object and to have assisted in achieving a bloodless revolution. No gentleman had a more useful or honourable share in this contest than you had and that at times when we were abandoned by many of the highest names. When you were most wanted, you were always at your post.

SOURCE : Clonalis Papers

- 1 See letter 1473, note 3. Apparently the Liberal clubs did not dissolve but remained in being to become integral parts of the O'Connellite and liberal political machines of the 1830s (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, pp. 88-90).
- 2 10 Geo. IV c. 1. The act designed to suppress the Catholic Association (see letter 1519, note 1).
- 3 See letter 1525, note 2.

1532

To Edward Dwyer

19 Bury St., St. James's, London, 6 March 1829

Private

My dear Friend,

'And we will plant a laurel tree,
And we will call it liberty.'

Yes, there is much good. The Committee¹ have unanimously decided in my favour. Peel's bill for Emancipation is good, very good; frank, direct, complete; no veto, no control, no payment of the clergy.

I always said that when they came to emancipate they would not care a bulrush about those vetoistical arrangements which so many paltry Catholics from time to time pressed on me as being useful to Emancipation.

The second Bill is to prevent the extension of monastic institutions and to prevent the Catholic Bishops being called

lords.² I will stake my existence that I will run a coach-and-six three times told through this Act.

The third Bill³ is the freehold wing somewhat modified,⁴ that is, reduced to £10 qualification. This *must be opposed in every shape and form*. I will write and transmit tomorrow to Ireland an address⁵ on this subject.

There should be meetings everywhere to petition against it; if possible, the Protestants should be urged to join with the Catholics in opposing it. We met this day as usual at the Thatched House Tavern. The Whigs were in conclave at Sir Francis Burdett's. I moved a resolution calling on them to oppose the freehold wing at all hazards and had it transmitted to them by Mr. O'Gorman; I understand, however, that they have agreed to support it!!!

Every honest man should join in petitioning on this point without delay. Urge this in every manner you can. Let St. Audeon's⁶ rally. But let them confine their exertions to the freehold wing until the clergy pronounce on the other two clauses.⁷ Perhaps an application should be made on these clauses to the clergy; but I only fear the freehold wing.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 51-2

- 1 See letter 1525, note 2.
- 2 These provisions were incorporated as clauses in the Emancipation Act itself (10 Geo. IV c. 7).
- 3 The bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.
- 4 O'Connell was apparently remembering Goulburn's Relief Bill of 1825 which had contained a similar provision.
- 5 O'Connell's address was mainly devoted to extolling those parts of the Emancipation bill which removed Catholic disabilities and deploring those clauses in it directed against the Catholic prelates and against Catholic religious orders (see letter 1530). With regard to the bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders O'Connell declared, 'Let not our exultation at the first, [that is, the Emancipation] bill prevent our decided, determined, energetic, but constitutional opposition to this bill' (O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 7 Mar. 1829, *DEP*, 12 Mar. 1829).
- 6 St. Audoen's parish, Dublin, where, according to FitzPatrick, the Catholics were particularly well organized (FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 175, n3). O'Connell, however, was more probably thinking of the liberal Protestants of that parish who had agreed at a meeting the previous day to petition parliament in favour of the Catholic claims (*MR*, 6 Mar. 1829).
- 7 Those directed against the Catholic hierarchy and religious orders (see letter 1530, notes 1 and 3).

1533

To his wife, Merrion Square

[London] 7 March 1829

My own Love,

. . . We had a great meeting at the Thatched House tavern today. I found considerable opposition to the *prudence* of petitioning in favour of the 40s freeholders but I at length carried it unanimously.¹ Maurice spoke and spoke exceedingly well.² We had some curious trimming but no matter, I carried it by beating them all out most completely.

The Duke of Norfolk and Mr. Blount paid me another visit this day, a high honour of which I am *duly* sensible.

Give my tenderest love to my children. Tell every one of them how their father doats of them. I write no politics because the papers will tell you that we had the enormous majority of 188³ so that the ministers are quite certain of carrying the measure.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell proposed that a petition be presented to parliament which, while it expressed the gratitude of the Catholics for Emancipation, should pray 'that that part of the measure relating to the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders should not pass into law'. O'Connell's motion was opposed by Pierce Mahony, Lord Killeen, Nicholas P. O'Gorman and Eneas MacDonnell. It was supported by O'Gorman Mahon, Tom Steele and Jack Lawless. After a 'warm discussion, Mahony, the leader of the opposition, agreed that the petition should "go forth as the petition of the individual signatures attached to it and not to pledge . . . the meeting generally, to this proposition"' (MR, 11 Mar. 1829).
- 2 Maurice O'Connell's speech does not appear to have been published.
- 3 On 7 March 1829 a government motion in the Commons in favour of going into committee on the Catholic claims was carried by 348 to 160.

1534

To his wife, 9 March 1829, from London

'I have not and will not now abandon the Forty-Shilling Freeholders.'

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X (1882), 718

1535

To the Knight of Kerry

19 Bury Street [London], 10 March 1829

My dear Sir,

The words in the Statute of the 30th Ch. 2 Stat. 2, c. 1¹ (indeed the only C) are: 'Any person that now is or hereafter shall be a member of the House of Commons'. You see, therefore, that the precedent is in my favour, so adopting any other form of words must be for the sole purpose of excluding me.²

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 The Test Act of 1678 which had the effect of debarring Catholics from sitting in the English parliament.
- 2 The Emancipation Act was not retrospective and so did not apply to O'Connell's election for Clare in 1828.

1536

To Edward Dwyer

19 Bury Street, St. James's, London, 11 March 1829

Private

My dear Friend,

By the time that this reaches you, the Association Suppression Act—the Lying Act—the worse than Algerine Act,¹ will be the law of the land. How long it will continue so is another question. I shall not be in the House one fortnight when I will apply for its repeal.

How mistaken men are who suppose that the history of the world will be over as soon as we are emancipated! Oh! *that* will be the time *to commence* the struggle for popular rights.

But to the point: as the law stands, the Finance Committee of the Association can receive no more money; they can sit, however, for making payments and investigating accounts. As to the future, my advice is that the Catholic rooms should be kept up by a subscription of from five to ten shillings by each individual, to pay current expenses of newspapers, coals, candles, clerks, &c.

It will serve as a nucleus for talking over Catholic and Irish affairs. Call it the Catholic Reading-rooms. A few months

will enable us to do better, but in the meantime a rallying point of this kind is wanting and a reading-room is just the very best you can have.

Let me press the necessity of having such an establishment and put my name and my sons', Maurice, Morgan, John and Dan, as original subscribers. Let us attempt to keep it on foot for some months at least if we can get but ten subscribers. There is no danger of the Lying Act affecting us.

So much for details—now for politics. I am exceedingly sorry that the Irish forty-shilling freeholders are likely not to get any support² in this country. You know already that we sent a Resolution to the Whigs calling upon them to resist the Disfranchisement Bill at all hazards. It was I who drew it up, and Purcell O'Gorman took it to Sir Francis Burdett's when they were all assembled.³ Yet Brougham and all the party gave in. The Opposition, to a man, will vote for it; it almost drives me to despair on this subject.

I sent Lawless to stir Hunt to get up some English opposition. I begged of O'Gorman Mahon to call upon him this day, and I will also go myself, but I expect nothing. Lawless's expedition has failed—totally failed; Hunt has got *no following*. I was until now convinced that the Radicals were in some power—they are *not*; they are numerous but they have no leaders, no system, no confidence in either Henry Hunt or William Cobbett—not the least—not the least.

This is the case with the reformers generally; they are powerless by reason of the people who considered themselves leaders but who are despicable both from their characters and their vile jealousies and ill temper.

It is right that the friends of freedom in Ireland or, at least, those in Dublin, should know how little assistance they can expect to receive for the forty-shilling freeholders from any portion of the English Members of Parliament whatever—not the least.

You will have seen by the Duke of Wellington's speech last night in the Lords that he is determined to carry the Bill through both Houses rapidly.

The clause against the Catholic Bishops taking a denomination by diocese⁴ is confined to their own acts and does not prevent others from calling them by any denomination they please.

It is one of the most foolish and most abortive clauses ever invented. The clause against the monastic orders⁵ is equally

so; I would ride a troop of horse three times through it; and you will observe that no person belonging to these orders can be prosecuted before any magistrate or by any private person. The prosecution must be in the Court of Exchequer only and by the Attorney-General alone.

The Emancipation Bill is an excellent one in every respect—aye, in every respect; for although it seems to exclude me,⁶ yet in point of fact I wish it were passed in its present form.

The freehold wing⁷ is as little objectionable in its details as such a Bill can possibly be. It will make the right of voting clear and distinct; its only evil is the increase of the qualification.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 53-8

1 10 Geo. IV c. 1 (designed to suppress the Catholic Association).

2 That is, against the act (10 Geo. IV c. 8) for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.

3 This occurred at a meeting which took place on 6 March. See letter 1532.

4 See letter 1530, note 1.

5 See letter 1530, note 3.

6 See letter 1535, note 2.

7 The bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.

1537

To Edward Dwyer

London, 12 March 1829

My dear Friend,

The Irish forty-shilling freeholders have no friends amongst the English members; the Whigs and all are against them. Even Lord Grey declares he will not oppose the Disfranchisement Bill.¹ This is cruel—very cruel.

Hunt or Cobbett can do nothing. They have not one particle of *following*. Our petition will be presented this day² against the disfranchising wing; and we must have many petitions from Ireland. We must put on record our decided hostility to it in every shape and form so as to enable us hereafter, *and soon*, to do battle in favour of a restoration of this right.

I deem it my duty to give this information that the gentlemen, having early notice, may act accordingly.

I beg now, as a member of the Finance Committee of the Catholic Association, to make a motion.³ I hope that I shall be allowed to make *one*—it shall be the only one. I am quite serious.

I wish to move that a sum of one hundred guineas be transmitted to Mr. Secretary O'Gorman to defray his expenses in London. I implore you, my good friend, to canvass for me on this motion.

Mrs. O'Gorman is with him; and as he is not rich, we should certainly prevent his being at any expense on his own account. Before the Committee meet, show this letter to Rev. Wm. L'Estrange, &c. I feel deeply anxious to pay O'Gorman this mark of my personal attention; and if the Emancipation Bill pass, I trust the Government may be induced to pay the Catholic body the compliment of making a provision for him by giving him such an office as he is well suited to fill and as would increase his comforts.⁴

Do not show this letter to anyone but to those who will feel its confidential and delicate nature.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 58-60

- 1 A meeting of the Irish Catholics in London on 9 March had proposed that Earl Grey be requested to present a petition against this bill in the Lords (*Times*, 10 Mar. 1829).
- 2 No petition against the disfranchisement bill was presented in either house of parliament on 12 March. On 18 March, however, a petition against the bill from the Roman Catholics of Ireland was presented in the Commons (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 148).
- 3 No evidence has been found to show whether O'Connell's motion ever came before the committee.
- 4 O'Gorman was not appointed to any office at this time. In 1834 he was made assistant barrister (county court judge) for Westmeath.

1538

From Charles D. O. Jephson

House of Commons, Thursday [12 March 1829]

Dear Sir,

In presenting a Petition¹ this evening, I spoke of the hardship of your being excluded from the benefit of a Bill which purports to be a Bill of relief to *all* Catholics.

Mr. Robert Gordon² came to me subsequently and said he thought I was mistaken in my view of the provision of the Bill.

That you were in an intermediate state (like Mahomet's coffin I suppose) between the *old & new law* that you *could* not take the new Catholic oaths, yet were not required to take any oaths but those of abjuration, allegiance and supremacy—inasmuch as that immediately *on the passing of the Act* the declarations against transubstantiation were utterly repealed. He probably is quite right in his view of *the case*. He did not anticipate any difficulty from the Oath of Supremacy—as he said that Catholics were willing to take that oath—confirming their views of the spiritual authority of the Pope. As to the *Church* of this country—it is not for me to comment on this opinion—he requested me to give you his view of the case, which I have done.

SOURCE : Jephson, *An Anglo-Irish Miscellany*, pp. 188-9

- 1 A petition from Mallow in favour of the Catholic claims. In presenting it Jephson declared that had the proposed Emancipation bill admitted O'Connell to parliament (see letter 1535, note 2), it would have had an enhanced popularity in Ireland (*DEP*, 17 Mar. 1829).
- 2 Robert Gordon (1786-1864), only child of William Gordon, Auchendolly, Kircudbrightshire. M.P. for various constituencies, 1812-41. Commissioner of board of control, 1832-33; secretary of board of control, 1833-34, 1835-39. Secretary to treasury, 1839-41.

1539

To Charles D. O. Jephson

19 Bury St. [London], 13 March 1829

My dear Sir,

Mr. Gordon is totally mistaken in his views of the subject¹ because if it be necessary to take the Oath of Supremacy I would not take it in its present shape for the wealth of the world. I would not take it even if I were a Protestant as it stands now *worded*. It must therefore be considered that the Oath of Supremacy, if required, is an unsurmountable bar. With great gratitude to you for your kind exertions, and to Mr. Gordon for the trouble of considering the subject with so friendly a disposition.

I am

Your faithful and obliged

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE : Jephson, *An Anglo-Irish Miscellany*, p. 189

- 1 See letter 1538.

1540

From Henry Hunt

36 Stamford Street, 17 March 1829

My dear Sir,

I am much grieved to hear that such a slavish spirit of apathy and apostacy prevails amongst your friends and supporters at the late Clare Election, as that which you have described in your letter which I have this moment received; as I observed to you on Friday last at the meeting¹ at my house, the course of seclusion which you have been advised to adopt since you have arrived in London, together with your not having even attempted to take your seat in the House of Commons as you had promised,² and as the public had a right to expect that you would have done, these, as I then thought and still think, are the most powerful causes of the criminal apathy of which you so justly complain, and I am quite sure that the above alluded to want of action on your part, has been, and still is, the sole cause of the torpor and indifference of the London Reformers, of which I have had ample and chilling proof in the great difficulty I have experienced in obtaining names to the requisition now in the course of tardy signature in the City for a Common Hall.³ I am met by many whose love of liberty is proverbial and on most occasions overflowing, when I present them the requisition they say, 'what use is it for the people of England to interfere when we see the Irish, and even O'Connell himself, so totally indifferent on the subject?'

You may easily conceive that I am but a poor apologist to meet and answer these remarks, and from habit totally incapable of giving utterance to language and opinions that are not in unison with my own conviction. Therefore when I say anything I am of necessity compelled to admit the truth and justice of such observations.

I mean to go to Epsom on Saturday⁴ and if a Common Hall is to be obtained, I will attend and raise my voice against the infamous measure of disfranchisement,⁵ but I assure you to obtain a Common Hall is no very easy matter for the Radicals to accomplish. But your friends, the moderate Reformers or Whigs of the City such as Mr. Richard Taylor,⁶ the printer, that faction could do this without the slightest trouble or difficulty, but such as these, would have nothing

to do with it if they even fancied that you had made any overtures to the Radicals.

I write this in confidence and with unlimited sincerity and I trust that you will receive it as my undisguised and honest opinion.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Unidentified.

2 O'Connell made the promise in an address to the freeholders of Co. Clare, dated 28 January 1829 (*DEP*, 29 Jan. 1829; see also letter 1506, note 1).

3 Unidentified.

4 On Saturday, 21 March, Hunt caused a great sensation by appearing at a meeting of the freeholders of Surrey convened at Epsom to petition against further concessions to the Catholics. His speech ran counter to the purpose of the meeting and was mostly concerned with the need for proclaiming reform (*Times*, 23 Mar. 1829; *DEP*, 26 Mar. 1829).

5 The bill for the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders.

6 Richard Taylor (1781-1858), printer and naturalist: editor of many magazines of natural history, philosophy and antiquities. See *DNB*.

1541

To Rev. W. A. O'Meara, O.S.F.,¹ Franciscan Convent, Cork

19 Bury Street, St. James's [London], 18 March 1829

Confidential

Rev. and dear Sir,

I am standing counsel for the friars, so that you owe me no apology nor any thanks for attending to any affairs of yours. My fee is paid by one moment of recollection of me occasionally at the pure and Holy Sacrifice.

I have the happiness to tell you that the proposed law² is one which has been well described as a class by the celebrated jurist Bentham in one word, *unexecutable*—that is, that can never be executed. This is literally one of those laws. It is insolent enough in its pretensions. It will be, and must be, totally inefficient in practice, for these reasons:—

1st. There is no power at all given to magistrates to interfere in this subject nor any jurisdiction whatsoever given to magistrates in that respect.

2ndly. No private person can prosecute any friar or monk; nobody can do it but the Attorney-General, so that you are thus free from private malice.

3rdly. The person prosecuted—that is, if any friar or monk be prosecuted—is not bound to disclose anything or to say one word but simply to allow his Attorney to plead *nil debet* to the information.

Thus, you see, nobody will be obliged to accuse himself.

This will put the prosecutor on his proofs.

Now, 4thly. The prosecutor will have nobody to prove his case because, mark, there is a penalty on all persons assisting at the taking of the vows; therefore, if any of these persons be examined as witnesses, they can with perfect safety object to give evidence and totally refuse lest they should convict themselves.

Thus, you see, that it is *almost* impossible any prosecution should be instituted at all; and it is *quite* impossible that any prosecution should be successful.

Besides, the *existing* class of friars are all legalized. My advice, therefore, decidedly is that the friars should keep quiet. Let this Act take its course, recollecting also that you will have Catholic members in Parliament still further to mitigate these laws before the time comes to give these laws any effect, even in point of form. Go on with your building³ and prosper. Be so good as to put down my name for £50. I will give it to you when I arrive in Cork. Regretting I cannot afford to give more. . . .

SOURCE : Papers of Franciscan Fathers, Killiney, Co. Dublin

- 1 Rev. William Aloysius O'Meara, O.F.M. (died 14 March 1848), provincial, order of St. Francis, Little Cross Street, Cork.
- 2 A reference to the clauses in the Emancipation bill which were intended for the suppression of the Jesuits and monastic orders (see letter 1530, note 3).
- 3 The Franciscans of Cork were currently engaged in rebuilding and extending their church at Little Cross Street (William O'Connell, *Cork Franciscan Records, 1764-1831* [Cork 1942], p. 14).

1542

To John Primrose, Jr., care of Capt. O'Connell, Day Place,
Tralee

19 Bury Street, St. James, London, 21 March 1829

My dear John,

. . . Everything going on here as well as possible. The

duel of the Duke of Wellington with Lord Winchilsea¹ making a great rout. It will in its result be useful to the Catholics as the false courage displayed on the occasion will tend to menace the popularity of the Duke. Lord Winchilsea fired in the air, the Duke's ball passed through the coat and waistcoat of the other scoundrel.²

Since I wrote to you yesterday I have additional reason to believe that the bank notes must come out again.³

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 George William (Finch-Hatton), tenth earl of Winchilsea (1791-1858).
- 2 Winchilsea had published a letter in the press in connection with the proposed establishment of the King's College, London, in which he accused Wellington of 'breaking in upon the constitution of 1688' and spoke of 'his insidious designs for the infringement of our liberty and the introduction of Popery into every department of the State'. The consequence was a hostile encounter between the two at Battersea Fields on 21 March. Winchilsea subsequently published an apology to Wellington for his alleged offence (for a full account of this affair, see Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 630-41).
- 3 See letter 1546, note 8.

1543

From (Sir?) Richard Ford,¹ 33 Henrietta Street, Bath, Somerset, 25 March 1829, to Batt's Hotel, Dover Street, London

Congratulates O'Connell on the passing of Catholic Emancipation.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.

1544

To Pierce Mahony, Union Hotel, Cockspur St., London

Merrion Square, 28 [and 29] March 1829

Private

My dear Mahony,

I am delighted to be able to give you an account of the state of the public mind. I have seen most of the persons of influence and am able to pledge myself to these two things: *first*, that the proposed measures give the greatest satisfaction

to the Catholics without the slightest admixture of insolence or unworthy triumph; *secondly*, that almost all the Brunswickers are pleased and daily becoming *cordial*. You may vouch for these facts at the peril of your existence.

If the Government will follow up the bill in the same spirit, discountenance *all* partisans and employ only the efficient and useful, no matter what party they may have belonged to. If the Government will do this or even approach to it—for one must not expect miracles—Ireland will be both tranquil and productive, but while Gregory and Blacker¹ remain at the Castle, while that greatest of absurdities exists of a government paying a press to abuse its measures²—an anomaly that could exist only in Ireland—while these and similar things exist, for example, the neglect of such a man as Alderman McKenny—and the baronetcy of Kingston James³—while we see such things, who dares to hope for any continued commonsense?

The Duke of Northumberland⁴ gives much satisfaction. He is working hitherto well but the people are heart-sore for the loss⁵ of the brave and gay and good Anglesey. If the Duke of Wellington would but send him back so soon as he could do so without slighting the present Lord-Lieutenant! But these are day-dreams too brilliant to stay. One ounce of common sense would govern Ireland as if by a magic charm.

But, my dear Mahony, there *must* be a grant for public works. It will be repaid, every shilling of it, tenfold in revenue, in tranquillity and in permanent utility. Scotland was *quieted* by just laws of religious liberty and afterwards by lavish expenditure *in waste*. Ireland wants no *waste*, wants nothing *lavish* but should be nourished by one or two grants of money. The people will be taken out of *our* hands by Emancipation as we took them from Capt. Rock⁶ by *our* agitation. They may fall back into Rock's hands unless the Government have the common sense to take them into their own. This can easily be done by giving them present employment and taking the simple precaution of not making a hatred of the people one of the qualifications for office according to the hitherto approved practice.

I will be back in London for the 6th ready to make my experiment of taking my seat, should that course appear advisable.⁷ I have written to Clare⁸ and will be ready by the 6th. But you must in the meantime *ascertain* that the attempt will not impede the relief bill. If there be any danger of its im-

peding that measure, nay if it *be not certain* that it will not impede it, I will not take or attempt to take my seat. Next it must be ascertained that it will not *annoy* the Ministry. You will smile at my chivalrous delicacy towards the Administration when you recollect that in fact I do not care two pence three farthings about this or any other administration, but I have an insurmountable repugnance to give the Ministry any species of trouble *as connected with the Catholic question*. This may be an impeachment to my head but literally my heart overrules me. Thus the language of silly novels steals into politics. I will be sturdy enough on all other points but on this I have, I own it, a woman's weakness.

Sunday, 29 [March 1829]

Read Alderman Darley's speech last night at the Mansion House.⁹ The Duke of N. was very well—excellent—but Darley!!!—and is he to continue at the head of the police?

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 William Blacker, J.P. (1777-1835), son of Rev. Stewart Blacker, Carrick Blacker, Co. Armagh. High sheriff, 1811. Vice-treasurer of Ireland, 1817-29. Lieutenant-colonel, Armagh militia.
- 2 According to Brian Inglis, the Castle press was by 1829 in decline, and the proclamation fund out of which the government had hitherto subsidized newspapers had sharply dwindled (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, p. 183).
- 3 Sir John Kingston James (1784-1869), created baronet, 1823; son of Francis James, a Dublin merchant; lord mayor of Dublin, 1822 and 1841.
- 4 Hugh (Percy), third duke of Northumberland (1785-1847); lord-lieutenant of Ireland, 1829-30.
- 5 A reference to the recent recall of Anglesey, the late lord-lieutenant (see letter 1507, note 7).
- 6 A symbolic name for agrarian secret societies.
- 7 Mahony acted as intermediary between O'Connell and the ministry in connection with the latter's unsuccessful attempt to take his seat for Clare on 15 and 18 May 1829 (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 645).
- 8 This letter does not appear to have been published.
- 9 In the course of a dinner given by the lord mayor of Dublin in honour of the new viceroy, Northumberland (*DEP*, 31 Mar. 1829).

1545

To Pierce Mahony, Union Hotel, Cockspur St., London

Merrion Square, 30 March 1829

(private)

My dear Mahony,

. . . Would there be any use in having this fact known? In 1813, *before* the Battle of Leipsic and while the fate of Europe was in suspense, that is, at the moment when it was uncertain whether Napoleon and his generals would not fill all the thrones in Europe, Denys Scully, the barrister, who was a principal but underhand manager of Catholic affairs, sent a message to Mr. Peel offering in his—Scully's—name and *in mine* that if the Government would undertake to pass an Emancipation bill the Catholics would raise and give up to government free of expense, and *man by man* as they were raised, one hundred thousand serviceable men, the Emancipation bill not to be brought in until the entire were raised or unless raised within three months. The Catholics were not to have the nomination of one single officer or any species of interference with the men who were to be enlisted for unlimited service. There was to be no other boon or price given but Emancipation save that Scully wished to stipulate for a free pardon for a printer then in gaol for a libel which Scully had written.¹

This offer was made to Mr. Peel, who did not feel authorized to do other than to reject it. The person who made it was Mr. Darcy Mahon,² a most respectable man. He was, you may recollect, a Commissioner of Stamps or held some high situation in that office at the time that the great plunder and speculation was carried on by others and his, I believe, were the only correct accounts and, while many others were dismissed for misconduct, he was promoted. You know that there is not a more respectable gentleman in society. You will ask why I did not use this fact sooner. There is a sufficient reason because Mr. Darcy Mahon undertook the duty only on the terms that it should never transpire without his consent. I have seen him yesterday and he now for the first time thinks that the period is arrived when he ought to allow it to be published and he is ready to vouch it in any way that may be desired. He is ready to go to London at one moment's

warning to see Mr. Peel and remind him of all the details should the multiplicity of that gentleman's other business have rendered the recollection of it at all faded. This proves that we did not appeal to the people before we offered that people to the Government and shows that we are now quite consistent in assisting to throw that people into the hands of a *just* and paternal government.

Consult with Blake³ whether you should use this fact in any way. . . .

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1 The alleged libel in Scully's *Statement of the Penal Laws* which was published by Hugh FitzPatrick.

2 Commissioner of stamps for Ireland, 1824-27.

3 Anthony Richard Blake.

1546

To Pierce Mahony, Union Hotel, Cockspur Street, London

Downpatrick [Co. Down], 31 March 1829

(Confidential and for your eye *only*)

My dear Mahony,

I wrote you two long and *grand* epistles¹ from Dublin. I want to bring your entire attention for one moment to the plan of my again appealing to the Clare 40s freeholders. Let us be extremely cautious how we commit ourselves on that subject. Multitudes of them are disfranchised by a blunder² in the registry. It may not be easy to stir up the rest to a *last* effort when they know that their landlords have already lost the interest they had in keeping on foot small freehold tenures and may therefore *safely* wreak their vengeance on the poor creatures when each lease happens to expire. We should not, I think, make the experiment unless we had a reasonable prospect of success. I may almost add a certainty. A defeat after the bill shall have passed and that the 40s freeholders were struck out would be unimportant. Reflect on this and on what I wrote in my last—but why should I detain you on my private concerns!

Everything is looking exceedingly well in politics here. The conciliation is going on. The Orange and Ribbon³ system are both failing fast. There will not be an Orangeman in Ireland

or of course a Ribbonman either if Gregory⁴ and other firebrands be removed from working the government machine. I am to get a public dinner here⁵ from the friends of civil and religious liberty. There are amongst them several Protestants and Presbyterians. The North is becoming as peaceable and as *conciliated* as the South. This is delightful.

Is there any chance of a parliamentary grant for public works?⁶ Urge this subject on Lord L. Gower and Mr. Dawson.⁷ Also suggest to them that Ireland will be ruined unless the circulating medium be speedily increased. A cheaper medium of currency than gold is absolutely necessary and it is *insanity* not to see that it is so. It really is madness not to perceive that the total stagnation of trade and even in the funds is owing to the gold currency being almost the only one.⁸

Darley's speech at the Lord Mayor's dinner⁹ is not printed. When I wrote on Sunday I thought it would. But it was just such a speech as you would expect from that fiery partisan.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1 See letters 1544, 1545.

2 Unidentified.

3 The Ribbonmen were a form of agrarian secret society regarded as composed of Catholics.

4 William Gregory, under-secretary for Ireland.

5 That is in Downpatrick. O'Connell had been 'brought over special' from London to attend the Downpatrick assizes as counsel in a case which has not been identified (*DEP*, 28 Mar. 1829). On 30 March a meeting of the Catholics of the parish of Down, under the chairmanship of the Rev. Cornelius Denvir, voted an address of gratitude to O'Connell on having achieved Emancipation. A deputation consisting of Surgeon Daniel Murray and Messrs. Henry Maguire, Robert Denvir, Sr., Waring Curran, Henry Curran, William Starkey and Robert Denvir, Jr., presented this address to O'Connell. On 2 April he was present at a public dinner at Downpatrick in his honour attended by 'upwards of eighty gentlemen, of different religious persuasions' (*MR*, 18 April 1829: for an account of the dinner see *MR*, 25 April 1829). Rev. Cornelius Denvir later became bishop of Down and Connor, 1835-65.

6 No such grant appears to have been made at this time though on 18 May a bill was introduced for the continuation of 6 Geo. IV c. 101, to provide for the repair and maintenance of roads and bridges in Ireland. It was enacted on 19 June (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 311, 399).

7 Probably George Robert Dawson.

- 8 In 1819 in an effort to stabilize the currency, a parliamentary committee of inquiry recommended a return to payments on a gold basis in four stages between February 1820 and May 1823. The recommendation was implemented by acts of 1819 and 1821 (59 Geo. III c. 99; 1 & 2 Geo. IV c. 26) and, according to Woodward, there followed a sharp contraction of the note issue, a fall in prices, and increased unemployment (Edward L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform, 1815-1870* [Oxford 1938], pp. 56-7). O'Connell, however, probably had in mind a further act which the government had passed in 1826 (7 Geo. IV c. 26) prohibiting the Bank of England and local banks from issuing notes below the value of £5 after 5 April 1829.
- 9 See letter 1544, note 9.

1547

To Lord Anglesey

Merrion Square, 4 April 1829

My Lord,

I complied strictly with the commands¹ with which you were pleased to honour me. The Bishop, Dr. Kelly,² received your suggestions³ with due respect, and I hope that, if the Newry petition⁴ be transmitted a second time, it will be so framed as not to be calculated to do *more mischief than good*.

You will be pleased to know that the peace of Ireland is already almost complete. The Catholics are acting to the letter on the advice you gave, and never will the name and virtues of the nobleman who gave that advice be blotted from the recollection or gratitude of Ireland.

I leave Dublin tomorrow for London and shall have the honour of personally paying my respects in a few days.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast), DOD 619, Carton IV, f. 46

1 Unidentified.

2 Thomas Kelly (c. 1745-1835), a native of Armagh. Professor of dogmatic theology at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, 1825-26. Bishop of Dromore, 1826-32. Archbishop of Armagh, 1832-35.

3 O'Connell had stopped off at Bishop Kelly's residence 'for a short time' when passing through Newry on his way to Downpatrick (*DEP*, 31 Mar. 1829). What the suggestions were have not been identified.

4 Perhaps the petition for a bill for the improvement and extension of the canal linking Newry with the sea. This petition was reported to a committee of the Commons on 20 February 1829 (*Commons*

Journal, 1829, LXXXIV, 66-7). On 2 March the committee reported that certain of the Commons standing orders on such petitions had not been complied with (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 92). On 13 March leave was given for the improvement and extension of Newry navigation (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 130). This bill was enacted on 29 June, 1829 as 10 Geo. IV, Local, c. 126.

1548

*From Edward Dwyer, 12 Burgh Quay, Dublin, 7 April 1829,
to 19 Bury St., St. James, London*

Congratulations on the second reading of the Catholic Emancipation bill.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast), B 619, Carton IV, f. 46

1549

To his wife, Merrion Square

19 Bury St., St. James, London, 8 April 1829

My dearest Love,

I am just arrived. I slept last night at Oxford, comfortably enough. I posted in from Oxford and came here at one o'clock. I have since seen Lord Anglesey who is exceedingly anxious about my taking my seat. I believe I gave him some consolation. The bill will get the royal assent tomorrow week, and I will then arrange to make my experiment so as to compel *them* either to do me justice or to show themselves the greatest rascals in existence. That would be no great consolation. No matter. Everybody tells me that my journey to Ireland¹ has done me great good. I think myself I am the better for it. How indeed could it be otherwise when I had the happiness to be with you, sweetest love, and my darlings. . . . Darling, I left Maurice² in I think good spirits and disposed to make us all happy. It would crown *all* if he were to fix himself *now* well. There is not one particle of news. The bill is drifting its course to harbour. Wright,³ the banker, told Pierce Mahony that Lord Shrewsbury would subscribe £5,000 to my testimonial.⁴ Darling, let me have by post the little French papers regularly. You do not read them and they interest me. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 1546, note 5.

- 2 His son. See letters 1407, 1408, 1552.
- 3 John Wright, of Wright, Selby and Robinson, bankers, 5 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London.
- 4 A reference to the O'Connell testimonial (not to be confused with the annual O'Connell Tribute. See letter 1707). At a meeting at 12 Burgh Quay on 25 March 1829 under the chairmanship of Lord Gormanston, it was resolved that '... the distinguished and valuable services rendered by Daniel O'Connell ... to the cause of civil and religious freedom, have imposed on every Roman Catholic in particular, and on every friend of civil and religious liberty in general, a deep debt of obligation and gratitude which is incumbent on them to discharge.' A committee of some 270 named individuals, including Lords Fingal, Gormanston, Kenmare, Cloncurry, Killeen and Rossmore, was proposed to make arrangements for the collection (MR, 27 Mar. 1829). On 31 March seven individuals described by the *Dublin Evening Post* as 'of the very first mercantile rank' were elected treasurers of the proposed fund: Andrew Ennis, Arthur Guinness, John David Latouche, David Lynch, Cornelius MacLoghlin, William Murphy and John Power. Rev. Edward Groves, Nicholas P. O'Gorman and Edward Dwyer were made joint secretaries of the proposed fund, the collection of which immediately got under way (DEP, 2 April 1829).

1549a

From John Hanly to Dublin

Cincinnati, Ohio, 10 April 1829

Sir,

Within a few months back a society has been formed in this city for the purpose of promoting the cause of Civil and Religious Liberty in Ireland. It is composed of persons of every clime and creed, Protestants as well as Catholics, Jews as well as Gentiles. With this you will receive a remittance of two hundred dollars. In a short time we shall be able to make a further remittance of at least the like amount. This sum may appear small to you when compared with the Eastern remittances but when you recollect the new country in which we reside and in which money is of so much value, you must be assured it is not for want of a disposition to serve Ireland that our offering is so small. With respect to yourself I beg to assure you that your exertions are highly approved of by the friends of Ireland in this part of the World. Persevere in the course

which you have hitherto pursued with so much advantage to your Country and rely upon it, Ireland must be free.

In conclusion I beg to inform you that it is the wish of the subscribers to our Fund here to be admitted members of the Catholic Association in Dublin. Accept my best wishes for your welfare and be assured that I am

Your sincere friend and Countryman,

John Hanly

Secretary to Cincinnati Association

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 15473

1550

To his wife, Merrion Square

11 April 1829

My darling Love,

The bill *has* passed the Lords last night. It will receive the Royal assent on Monday and thus the ascendancy and proud superiority which your neighbours had over you will be at an end the day you receive this letter. And it was your husband contributed *most* to this measure. Was it not, sweetest?

. . . Send me on the brief.¹ I enclose a letter for Maurice from Primrose. I read it because I was anxious for Iveragh news. I am sure my dear Maurice will forgive me. How much better he is behaving than Morgan! I will write to the latter tomorrow to a certainty, please God. I will write to him as feelingly as I can and as firmly not, however, at all forgetting my tenderness for him. My arrangements about my seat are in progress. I want to ascertain whether or not the Ministry *as a body* will oppose me. If they do not make the opposition a ministerial measure I will easily carry it.² I however shall not know their determination for a day or two. Of course you will have the first intimation. I hope my darling girls were pleased with the drawing-room. . . . I should add that *I am determined* to spend this sessions in parliament. It would never *do* for the people to have me out of it. I will fight the battle of Ireland and of Catholicity there better than anywhere else save in a parliament in College Green. You may wish to

know *the minute* when the bill will receive the royal assent, *about 20 minutes* after four by the Dublin clocks.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Unidentified.

2 It was later claimed to have been ascertained by Pierce Mahony, apparently in an interview with the government during the Easter recess, that the government as a government (whatever individual members of it might do) did not intend to oppose O'Connell's proposed attempt to take his seat in parliament (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 645).

1550a

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 13 April 1829

My own darling love,

The day has at length arrived when the royal assent is to be given to the Catholic bill, that Emancipation for which I have so long struggled is at length achieved. I am going down to the House of Lords to be present at the giving of the royal assent. Of course it is given by commission. And as to myself, darling, I think I can promise you that I will take my seat in the House [of Commons] the day on which the act comes into operation. Now if the subscription¹ goes on well, darling, I will have you here, please God, early in May. There is a Mr. Fulton² here of whom I spoke to you. He is a Protestant yet he has put down his name for £200 to my subscription. Only think of that. Darling, I wish you could discover exactly Miss Redington's³ fortune. Dillon Bellew,⁴ if spoken to confidentially, would tell you, I am quite sure. Mr. L'Estrange⁵ ought to know it. In point of fortune I would much prefer Miss O'Brien⁶ but the choice must be with Maurice.⁷ Give him my tenderest love. . . .

The adjournment of the House will be, I understand, a full fortnight from tomorrow. That will bring us to the 28th of April on which day I really expect to be in the House. My own darling love, how I regret to be separated from you, my sweetest heart's treasure. I dined yesterday with Mr. Wright,⁸ a Catholic banker at a country house about two miles from town. Blount⁹ was there and congratulated me as 'he would the Duke of Wellington on the victory at Waterloo'.

Get Maurice to find out for me that state of Sir Anthony Hart's health and also whether he means to sit before term and, if so, on what day.

Darling love, how my heart is at ease about our sweet Danny. Give him my tender love and a sweet kiss for his *fado*. Tell my girls how sorry I am that I did not see them in their Court dresses. I wish I had been present when my Betsey was kissed by the Duke.¹⁰ She must have blushed pretty deeply as much [from] indignation as anything else.

SOURCE : Papers of B. M. Heron

- 1 The O'Connell testimonial (see letter 1549, note 4).
- 2 At a meeting in London on 12 June 1829 to promote a testimonial fund for O'Connell, a subscription of £200 is attributed to a Mr. John Fuller (*DEP*, 16 June 1829).
- 3 Probably a daughter of Thomas Redington, Rye Hill, Co. Galway.
- 4 Probably Michael Dillon Bellew (1796-1855), Mount Bellew, Co. Galway. Created baronet 1838.
- 5 Rev. William L'Estrange.
- 6 Christine O'Brien, 12 Fitzwilliam Square, Dublin. Married 1830 James Patrick O'Gorman Mahon.
- 7 His son.
- 8 John Wright.
- 9 Edward Blount, English Catholic secretary.
- 10 The lord lieutenant, the duke of Northumberland.

1551

To Edward Dwyer

The first day of freedom! 14 April 1829

My dear Friend,

I cannot allow this day to pass without expressing my congratulations to the honest men of Burgh Quay¹ on the subject of the Relief Bill.

It is one of the greatest triumphs recorded in history—a bloodless revolution more extensive in its operation than any other political change that could take place. I say *political* to contrast it with *social* changes which might break to pieces the framework of society.

This is a good beginning and now, if I can get Catholics and Protestants to join, something solid and substantial may be done for all.

It is clear that, without gross mismanagement, it will be impossible to allow misgovernment any longer in Ireland. It

will not be my fault if there be not a 'Society for the Improvement of Ireland', or something else of that description to watch over the rising liberties of Ireland.

I am busily making my arrangements respecting my own seat. As soon as they are complete you shall hear from me.

I reckon with confidence on being in the House on the 28th instant, the day to which the adjournment is to take place. I think my right now perfectly clear and beyond any reasonable doubt.

Wish all and every one of the 'Order of Liberators'² joy in my name. Let us not show any insolence of triumph but I confess to you, if I were in Dublin, I should like to laugh at the Corporators.³

I am writing a congratulatory address to the people.⁴ It will appear, I hope, on Easter Monday in Dublin.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 60-2

1 The meeting-place of the Catholic Association.

2 See letter 1325, note 3.

3 The members of Dublin corporation which was strongly opposed to Catholic Emancipation.

4 No such address has been traced.

1552

To his wife, Merrion Square

Bury Street [London], 15 April 1829

My darling Love,

I am sorry we differed about the illumination¹ but my great reason for being anxious about the prevention of that measure was least you or my girls should be insulted by an infuriate banditti. I should be glad and yet sorry that Maurice was at home. With these mixed feelings, which to a certain extent were applicable to many other families besides my own, I did strongly recommend them not to illuminate. It would be I thought the mere personal gratification of a triumph which might be considered insulting just at the moment when, having got a real and substantial advantage, we want no feathers but, darling, why do I *now* annoy about my opinions? If I were in Dublin I would probably have given up my opinion to yours. At all events, darling, we would not have quarrelled about it. I have this day nothing further to say to you about my seat² although I hope to be able to tell you tomorrow

something decisive. Lord Duncannon has been from me to Vesey Fitzgerald to learn whether the Ministry intend to oppose me. I have other irons in the fire. I am to be with Lord Anglesey at twelve tomorrow about it. He had a consultation at his house this day of several leading peers. In fact, it is impossible for any man to act with more kindness than Lord Anglesey is acting. My own opinion decidedly is that I will take my seat on the first day that the bill³ comes into operation. *That* cannot however be for a fortnight as the House adjourns this day until the twenty-eight[h]. How I wish I could slip over to Ireland in the interval or even to Paris. But I must not think of those things. Darling heart's love, how I wish to hear about Maurice and Miss Redington or Miss O'Brien! Speak to him yourself about Miss O'Shea. I really think it is to say the least of it *unkind* to bring her to his neighbourhood. Is it a trap?

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell had advised the Catholics to refrain from illuminating Dublin in celebration of Emancipation, lest such a demonstration of triumph should lead to disturbance in the city (*DEP*, 14 April 1829). On 14 April a public meeting in Dublin of the leading Catholics, under the chairmanship of Sir Thomas Esmonde, arranged to have circulars sent round and advertisements inserted in the press for the purpose of preventing any such demonstration. It was stated that Archbishop Murray and the Catholic clergy approved of this course (*MR*, 5 April 1829).
- 2 He had not yet attempted to take his seat in the Commons.
- 3 The Catholic Emancipation bill.

1553

To Lord Anglesey, 15 April 1829, from Bury St., London

Regretting cancellation of appointment made by Pierce Mahony. Asks for appointment tomorrow.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast), D 619, Carton VIII, f. 77

1554

To his wife, 18 April 1829, from Bury St., London

Is glad that Lent is over. He has not suffered from it but, on the contrary, has grown 'quite corpulent'.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X (1882), 718-19

1555

From Michael Staunton to 19 Bury St., London

Dublin, 18 April 1829

My Dear Sir,

Today and yesterday the *Register* has been upon your case. The paragraph of yesterday is said to be of the sort that is useful.¹ . . .

I was ordered today peremptorily to 'desist' from sending papers to churchwardens² on account of the Association and that when the supply for the week was nearly completed. There was no vote from a committee to warrant this but Mr. Dwyer said he was influenced by the 'talk' amongst the loungers in the rooms!³ . . . If we dismiss our churchwardens without even one minute's notice and while our funds await the final vote of an aggregate or general meeting, it is my opinion that we act not only ungraciously but ungratefully. . . . I have not acted on the peremptory order and . . . I have insisted upon a committee being specially summonsed to decide upon this question before the connection with the churchwardens be finally severed. . . .

The *Morning Register* is keeping up its sale wonderfully but there are no advertisements in any of the papers and it is utterly impossible to get the payment of a single farthing. I should suppose that half of the papers of the country must go down. I shall hold out as long as I can.⁴

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 On 17 April 1829 Staunton's paper, the *Morning Register*, in appealing for contributions to the O'Connell testimonial (see letter 1549, note 4) declared that this fund would be the means of enabling O'Connell to concentrate exclusively on his parliamentary duties with great resultant benefit to Ireland.

2 See letter 1519, note 3.

3 The Catholic reading rooms, Dublin. See letter 1536.

4 Heavy taxation and the difficulty of obtaining advertisements due to the country's declining commercial prosperity was having an adverse effect on newspaper circulation and profits about this time. In addition, the cessation of the agitation for Catholic Emancipation led to a marked falling off in the demand for newspapers (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, pp. 190-2).

1555a

From the Knight of Kerry

Sunday [19 April 1829]

My Dear O'Connell,

I called yesterday & today without finding Mr. Vesey FitzGerald, & have written to request he will fix a time to see me tomorrow.¹

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 This is a reply to letter 1474 the date of which was originally thought to be July 1828. The special reason why O'Connell felt that the Catholics should make atonement to Vesey FitzGerald is not clear. It is possibly a reference to the vigorously pro-Emancipation speech which FitzGerald made on 30 March on the third reading of the Emancipation bill (*Mirror of Parl.*, 1829, II, 923-5).

1555b

To Pierce Mahony

Easter Sunday [19 April 1829]

My dear Pierce,

I enclose you a note I got from the Knight.¹ I will be with you by nine in the morning. Tell your son to have Breakfast ready *while you are dressing*. I wrote the Knight a note² yesterday or I believe the day before, which it might be well that Vesey FitzGerald saw. Of this more in the morning. If you think nine too early tell the waiter to give me the newspapers until your *usual* hour.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 Letter 1555a.

- 2 Letter 1474.

1556

To N. Purcell O'Gorman

Bury Street [London], 24 April 1829

My dear Purcell,

The enclosed arrived for you yesterday. In sending it to

you I avail myself of the opportunity of giving you again my most solemn pledge that I will never lose sight of your claims on that situation and station to which the only accredited and most faithful officer of the Catholics of Ireland is entitled as of right. I will redeem this pledge faithfully and expeditiously.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 181-2

1557

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Bury Street [London], 25 April 1829

My dear John,

. . . Whatever money is collected in Kerry should be sent up and lodged in the Hibernian Bank to my credit as rapidly as possible. I think it is likely that the subscription¹ will be sufficient to get me quite out of debt and to pay my daughters' fortunes. If it does so much, I shall be quite content. In fact the thing would be splendid if there were persons capable of conducting it. Every parish should be collected by itself. It was the single shillings that swelled the Catholic Rent. But this is not for me to say and therefore you will of course use the strictest silence as to *my* saying so. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 To the O'Connell testimonial (see letter 1549, note 4). At a meeting held in Tralee on 23 April arrangements were made for the appointment of a central committee to collect funds throughout the county. It was stated that close on £1,500 had already been contributed in Kerry (*MR*, 29 April 1829).

1558

To James Sugrue

Bury St., St. James's, London, 29 April 1829

My dear James,

I have great pleasure in telling you that I have ascertained that there is to be no opposition to my taking my seat on the part of the Government unless they are compelled to it by the Speaker¹ and Mr. Wynne.² So that if the Whigs stand

by me, I am certain of being seated. This you may confidently communicate to —— as well as ——, and my real friend Barrett³ may announce that intelligence has come from London that the universal belief was that the Ministers would suffer Mr. O'Connell to take his seat for Clare at his own risk and without giving him any opposition. . . .

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 67-8

- 1 Charles Manners-Sutton.
- 2 Charles W. W. Wynn.
- 3 Richard Barrett (died Oct. 1854), editor and proprietor of the *Pilot* newspaper which he established in 1827 to support O'Connell. He was a brother of the author Eaton Stannard Barrett (born 1786 in Cork).

1559

To James Sugrue

19 Bury Street, London, 30 April 1829

My dear James,

I am making my arrangements for my seat. I suppose you will hear of me 'as of', in the phrase of the lawyers, this day week. If Mr. Wynne¹ and the tail of the Grenvilles² behave well to me I am sure to succeed.

Tomorrow I shall have digested my new letter.³ It will contain my view of the subject and my, I trust, convincing arguments in favour of my right to take my seat. If Lord Nugent helps me, as I hope he will, my success is not doubtful.

You will see the absolute necessity of not allowing these names or any communication from me to get into print. But the Irish people may be cheered by the prospect of my taking my seat and being thus enabled to work for them.

I heard that the Duke of Wellington is determined not to increase the currency but to resort to an income tax.⁴ This is the last *private* report and is believed by many. Income from the funds would, of course, come under such a tax. The Subletting Act⁵ will be materially changed this session. Of this I am assured, and I hope the assurance will be realized.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 182

- 1 Charles W. W. Wynn.

- 2 That section of the Whigs who had followed William Wyndham, baron Grenville, and had supported Catholic Emancipation.
- 3 See letter 1561, note 1.
- 4 In fact, income tax, which had been repealed in Britain in 1816 upon the cessation of the Napoleonic wars, was not revived until 1842.
- 5 See letter 1448, note 1.

1560

To James Sugrue

19 Bury Street [London], 1 May 1829

My dear James,

. . . I spent all day working at my case for the House of Commons. I have every hope that this day week will see me at my post in the House.

I intend to take an *immediate* active part in the proceedings. I need not say to you how impatient I am to be useful.

Every hour increases the favourable accounts (or at least *reports*) of the intention of the Ministry to allow me to take my seat quietly. And my present object is simply to make such a case in point as will render it impossible for Mr. Sugden¹ or anybody else to give me effectual opposition.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 182-3

- 1 Edward Burtenshaw Sugden (1781-1875); solicitor-general of England, 1829-30; lord chancellor of Ireland, December 1834-April 1835, 1841-46; lord chancellor of England, 27 February-20 December 1852. Created 1852 Baron St. Leonards. See *DNB*.

1561

To his wife, Merrion Square

Bury Street [London], 4 May 1829

My own darling Love,

I shall not have my letter to the members¹ out before Thursday. I suppose I will not go down to the House before this day week. But every moment fills me with greater hopes. The editor of the *Times*² told me half an hour ago that the Government intimated to that paper that they would not oppose me. I have also excellent news from Clare.³

. . . . Pay the ministers' money.⁴ Give the parish curates two guineas saying you believe that is what I give and begging of them to say whether I gave more. I do not think my ministers' money can be in arrears, but pay the man and be rid of him. James Sugrue will give you money. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell to the members of the House of Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, 9 May 1829. The letter is a long one and is mainly concerned with the legal technicalities in favour of O'Connell's taking his seat in the Commons without subscribing to the objectionable oaths (*MR*, 14 May 1829).
- 2 Thomas Barnes (1785-1841), editor of the *Times*, 1817-41. See *DNB*.
- 3 O'Connell was alleged to have received at this time 'letters from different respectable individuals, both Protestants and Catholics, of Clare' stating that, should he not be admitted to take his seat in parliament in right of his election for the county in July 1828, 'he would be received with redoubled enthusiasm by Clare [for re-election] and that if he had a double majority of the forty-shilling freeholders, he would have a three-fold one of the Ten-Pound' freeholders (*MR*, 9 May 1829, quoting *British Traveller*).
- 4 An obligatory payment for the upkeep of the ministry of the Established church, the urban equivalent of tithes.

1561a

*To William Duncan Godfrey*¹

Bury St. [London, 5 May 1829]

My dear Godfrey,

There will be a vacancy in the office of collector of the cess in the barony of Magonihy² by the resignation of Stephen Galway.³

Allow me to request that you will keep your vote as a grand juror disengaged until the assizes when a friend and near relation of mine, Mr. Maurice Brenan,⁴ will bring forward his claims for the consideration of the grand jury. He is, I assure you, perfectly qualified and can give the most abundant security. I believe my brother James would become security for him, and James is not a person likely to secure anybody of whom the slightest doubt could be entertained.

SOURCE : Papers of Sir William Godfrey, Bart.

- 1 William Duncan Godfrey (1797-1873), Kilcoleman, Milltown, Co.

Kerry; eldest son of Sir John Godfrey, second baronet; succeeded as third baronet, 1841. See Burke's *Peerage*.

- 2 One of the eight baronies into which Kerry was divided for the purpose of civil jurisdiction; includes the town and hinterland of Killarney.
- 3 *Recte* Gallwey; a member of the Killarney family who were land agents to the earl of Kenmare.
- 4 Maurice Brennan, New Street, Killarney; son of John Brennan, Reen House, Killarney, and Ellen, youngest daughter of Charles Sugrue, Fermoyle, Waterville, Co. Kerry, and thus a close relative of O'Connell.

1561b

To the Knight of Kerry

Bury Street [London], 5 May 1829

My dear Sir,

I received a letter from Maurice Brennan [*recte* Brennan] from Killarney stating that Stephen Galway [*recte* Gallwey] announced his intention of resigning the chief constableness for collection of barony cess in Magonihy and that he—Maurice Brennan—intends to offer himself for that situation¹ and has requested of me to ask you to hold yourself disengaged until the next assizes so as to be able to consider his claim without being bound by any previous promise. I believe you know enough of him to concur with me in the opinion that he is perfectly suited to the office and that if necessary he can get security to the amount of £50,000.

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 See letter 1561a.

1562

To James Sugrue

[c. 11 May 1829]

My dear James,

I have only to communicate these particulars. My letter¹ has done wonders. Tierney,² Agar Ellis,³ Alexander Baring,⁴ Charles Wynne, etc., have declared it conclusive.

Lord Duncannon has been with me, and Friday is fixed for the grand experiment.⁵ The post of Sunday will carry you the news.

In haste.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 76

- 1 See letter 1561, note 1.
- 2 George Tierney, M.P.
- 3 George James Welbore Agar-Ellis (1797-1833), only son of Henry Welbore (Agar-Ellis), second Viscount Clifden; M.P. for various constituencies, 1818-31; strongly supported Catholic Emancipation and other reforms; created 1831 Baron Dover. See *DNB*.
- 4 Alexander Baring (1774-1848), second son of Sir Francis Baring, first baronet. For eighteen years head of the firm of Baring Brothers, merchants, London; M.P., 1806-35; master of the mint and president of the board of trade, 1834-35; created 1835 Baron Ashburton; ambassador (special mission) to U.S.A., 1842. See *DNB*.
- 5 See letter 1569, note 1.

1563

To the Knight of Kerry

19 Bury Street, London, 12 May 1829

My dear Sir,

Will you be so good as to communicate with the Speaker¹ for me on the subject of my going down to take my seat? I write that he should know; I do not mean to take him by surprise. I will look for you this day at Brooks's.² Indeed, if I had not to do with a Manners Sutton, I should expect little difficulty. But I have too melancholy an experience of that family to expect anything of impartiality or discrimination of judgement from any of them. Lord Manners was a great practical enemy of mine, and he injured me too much not to hate me. However, I am a good deal indifferent on the matter. I know that I have demonstrated my right, and that it will be understood and felt in Ireland. Indeed, no rational man who will take the trouble to consider can doubt my right. I wish much to find you at leisure.

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 Charles Manners-Sutton.
- 2 Brooks's Club, 60 St. James' Street, London, a favourite meeting place of Whigs.

1564

To Edward Dwyer

Bury St., London, 12 May 1829

My dear friend,

I was unwilling to write to you while I remained in a state of uncertainty with respect to the course which it was right for me to take.

I certainly felt more than unwilling to raise any question personal to myself as long as it could be possible to consider my claim¹ hostile to the Ministry. This was but an act of *gratitude* on my part for the manly and excellent Emancipation Bill they carried through both Houses. I call that Bill excellent although there are parts of it, indeed, which deserve any other appellation, but the Bill has in itself the principle of *improvement*, and its defects will soon be effaced by the inevitable results of parliamentary and popular information. It was all the more desirous to pay this tribute to the Ministry because, if I should get into Parliament, I can *never* be a ministerial member.

I however ascertained that my bringing forward my claims would not and could not be considered by the Ministry in any hostile point of view. You will perceive that there is not any violent hostility in the Government papers to my right. This is, I take it, a decisive symptom of the absence of ministerial opposition.

You have of course read my letter which was published yesterday in the *Times*.² I have the pleasure to tell you that I am every moment receiving fresh proofs of the impression which that letter has made. In fact, the law is *quite* and clearly in my favour. They may do what they please with me, but this I consider that I have put beyond all possibility of doubt, namely, that by refusing to allow me to sit, they will do a palpable and a gross injustice. I confess that I do not expect anything so inconsistent with every sense of right. On the contrary, I have reason to be convinced that I shall meet with little if any opposition. Unfortunately, the Speaker³ is a nephew of Lord Chancellor Manners and on that account alone has some claim to my *apprehensions*. But I hope he is an honourable man and will listen to no other counsels than those of good sense and duty. In fact, it would be exceedingly

wrong of them to interfere unless expressly called on by the House or some member of the House. If then the Speaker does not go out of his way and, in fact, make himself the scapegoat of party, there can be no doubt of my admission. I *repeat* that I do not anticipate any personal objection on his part nor anything inconsistent with his high rank and station.

Upon the whole, then, my course is determined. I will, please God, make all my previous arrangements tomorrow and Thursday morning, and on Friday, *peremptorily*, I will go down and address the House. That day is fixed on for my taking my seat.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 70-3

- 1 That is, to take his seat in parliament for Clare without subscribing to the oaths objectionable to Catholics.
- 2 O'Connell's letter to the members of the House of Commons of Great Britain and Ireland (see letter 1561, note 1). The *Times* considered the letter presented an argument of 'great professional skill and force' and that 'many leading members of the house have (we understand) been convinced by it' (*Times*, 14 May 1829).
- 3 Charles Manners-Sutton.

1565

To James Sugrue

Bury Street [London], 13 May 1829

My dear James,

All appears well: my last letter¹ has had great success, simply because it is unanswerable. The law is with me in all its bearings, and as yet I have every reason to think that the opposition to me, if any, will be feeble. In forty-eight hours I shall know more.

I was this day at the King's Bench, at half-past nine, and took the new oath.² So far I have *progressed*, as the Americans say. I am now certain of getting *into* the House—that is, *as far as the table*. How much beyond that I know not. I will then call for the new oath, and if it be administered, then the contest is over. If they refuse to administer it, I will take my seat without it and put upon others to make any motion they may please.

Since I wrote the foregoing paragraph I have ascertained that the Government declare positively that they will not make

it a *Government* question nor give me any *Government* opposition.³

I think, therefore, that my prospects are the very fairest; but one must not be too sure of anything to come. . . .

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 183-4

- 1 See letter 1561, note 1.
- 2 Presumably the oath which the Emancipation Act required of Catholics 'who shall after the commencement of the Act be appointed to any office, or place of trust, or profit under his Majesty . . .' The oath was to be taken within three months of the passing of the act and might be taken in, among other places, any of the courts of king's bench. As a barrister O'Connell automatically held a place of trust under the crown.
- 3 See letter 1550, note 2. Whatever the source of O'Connell's information, it does not appear to have been made public. The *Times* on 15 May refers to the likelihood of the government's refraining from opposition to O'Connell's taking his seat but makes no mention of any explicit statement on the subject.

1565a

*From William James Macneven*¹

New York, 13 May 1829

Sir,

The letter of Mr. Hanly was received by me a few days after the news arrived here of the dissolution of the Catholic Association and the act of parliament against it, which confiscates to the King of Great Britain any more rent intended for its use.² Of this I immediately informed Mr. Hanly by letter and also sent him the public papers containing the intelligence from Europe, adding that I would make no use of his bill until I received from him new instructions.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 15473

- 1 This letter is written on the second leaf of letter 1549a. Macneven was president of the 'Friends of Ireland Society', 1828-9.
- 2 The act suppressing the Catholic Association (10 Geo. IV c. 1) contained a provision (section VIII) forfeiting all contributions to the association.

1566

To Edward Dwyer

Bury St., London, 14 May 1829

Private

My dear friend,

The hour of combat approaches! At half-past three tomorrow the question is to be tried.

I have the judgement and opinion of three-fourths of the House with me as I am fully convinced, but that will be entirely useless if the Government behave to me faithlessly and if the Speaker¹ take a strong part against me. However, that is not to be apprehended, and at all events everything appears at present to bear a favourable aspect. I have great declarations of support from various quarters. Brougham, Burdett, Lord Althorp, Baines² and many, very many other great names are active to assist me. I repeat that if the Government does not take a very decided part against me, I am quite safe. It is *admitted* at all hands that I have proved my right.

Have you heard of the conduct of the English Catholics towards me? They have a club here called the 'Cis-Alpine',³ a bad name, you will say. They had been much divided amongst themselves and were now about all to re-unite. I agreed to be proposed into it, when, behold! they met the day before yesterday and *black-beaned* me.⁴ However, I believe it has knocked up the club as Howard of Corby and several others at once declared that they would never again come near it. Mr. Blount has behaved exceedingly well on this occasion. No man could behave better. I believe there are many of them highly indignant at the conduct of the rest, and at all events, I heartily forgive them all. But it was a strange thing of them to do; it was a comical 'testimonial' of my services in emancipating them. It would be well, perhaps, if I could *un-emancipate* some of them.

There is a petition from the parish of Dungarvan for the old Association lustre.⁵ It could not be better bestowed. I beg of you to endeavour to get it for my friend, the Rev. Mr. Fogarty.⁶ There are also demands from Clare; and I hope *those* are particularly attended to. I think there ought to be £20—or £30—sent down to Clare to assist in the new registry of freeholders.⁷ Send for Richard Scott and consult him on the subject. . . .

I long to shake hands again with all the worthies at 12, *Burgh Quay*.⁸ How I hate *that* affectation! I hope that Staunton is allowed to continue his weekly papers to the churchwardens⁹ at my expense if not at that of the Finance Committee.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 74-6

- 1 Charles Manners-Sutton.
- 2 Edward Baines, Jr. (1800-90), journalist and economist, editor of *Leeds Mercury*, 1818-?. M.P. for Leeds, 1859-74. Knighted 1880. See *DNB*.
- 3 This club was originated as an anti-papal English Catholic institution of national church tendency on the dissolution of the English Catholic committee in 1792. Like the committee, it was an aristocratic and select organization (Bernard Ward, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, 2 vols. [London 1915], I, 194).
- 4 On 28 April 1829 O'Connell was proposed but rejected for membership of the club. According to Ward only two votes had been cast against him. Four prominent members of the club at once resigned in protest. A few months later the club was dissolved and reconstituted as the Emancipation Club, which, to all intents and purposes, was the same organization under a different name (Ward, *End of Catholic Emancipation*, III, 267-9).
- 5 Presumably some luminous ornament such as a candelabrum or chandelier.
- 6 Rev. Patrick Fogarty (c. 1789-29 July 1866), sometime curate in Lismore and Dungarvan; P.P.; vicar general, 1838. A strong supporter of O'Connell.
- 7 A new registry was held following the recent alteration of the voting qualification on the abolition of the forty-shilling franchise.
- 8 That is, with the officials and leading members of the Catholic Association, but since that body was now illegal (under 10 Geo. IV c.1) O'Connell was obliged to refer to them as of '12 *Burgh Quay*'.
- 9 See letters 1519 note 3, and 1555.

1567

From Edward Dwyer to Bury St., St. James, London

12 Burgh Quay, Dublin, 16 May 1829

My dear Sir,

I cannot describe to you my sensations on reading your esteemed favour of Thursday. You have heretofore given a picture of the English Catholics which their present conduct¹ proves was not too highly coloured, but enough of them. They

are not worthy of occupying your thoughts for a moment. I mistake much if you are not now the sitting member for Clare but should it not be the case, I have the opinion of Richard Scott, whom I conversed with yesterday, that the £10 freeholders will 'to a certainty' return you. I long much for tomorrow.

If you are treated badly by the English Catholics, the Irish are doing their duty. One of the parishes of Limerick, St. Michael's, met on Tuesday when £500 was subscribed on the spot. Of this sum O'Connell,² the brewer, and his son, gave £150. From Thurles I expect to receive about £300. . . . I observe what you say with respect to the *Evening Post* but in candour I must assist in placing the saddle on the right horse. Every article with respect to the 'Tribute' which appeared in that paper³ was concocted and published by Pat FitzPatrick⁴ with perhaps one or two exceptions. . . .

[P.S.] . . . I had a letter from Mr. McLoughlin⁵ [from Paris]

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letter 1566, note 4.
- 2 Of the firm Connell and Fitzgerald, brewers, Green Hill, Limerick.
- 3 Several editorials in support of the O'Connell testimonial or tribute were published in the *Dublin Evening Post* during April and May 1829.
- 4 Patrick Vincent FitzPatrick (1792-1865), educated St. Patrick's College, Maynooth; published some verse; friend and confidant of O'Connell for whom he collected the 'O'Connell Rent' from 1830; assistant registrar of deeds, 1847-65, through O'Connell's influence.
- 5 Cornelius MacLoughlin.

1568

To N. Purcell O'Gorman

Bury Street [London], 17 May 1829

My dear O'Gorman,

I got a jealous note from you conveying two letters which were duly forwarded. I had not time to reply sooner to your observations or, rather, accusations which, indeed, might have been done by pleading not guilty to it. You accuse me of having concealed from you my plan respecting the taking my seat. Indeed you wrong me. I told you my plan, and you at

that time distinctly condemned it. I was to give up the seat if the Ministry considered my assertion of the right a measure of hostility to themselves; and secondly, that I would give up the seat if the Ministry would oppose me as a Government measure. I endeavoured to persuade you that I was right in making these offers, but you thought that I should at all events have insisted on taking my seat. Perhaps you were right and I was wrong in my course, but surely everything I said must have convinced you of my intention of taking my seat if the Government gave me a favourable answer to each of the propositions which I thus made them. Since you left I got those answers and of course I then proceeded to assert my right to the seat. Thus I concealed nothing from you nor did I now *or at any time of my life* give you cause for real jealousy in any one scene of our political lives. My fate in the House is in the scale. I think I shall succeed. The Ministry are not against me; the greater part of the Orange members have declared in my favour. The only thing against me is the *ipse dixit* of that hopeful nephew of Lord Manners, the Speaker.¹ The debate will be resumed early tomorrow but you cannot possibly have an account of the result by the post of tomorrow nor perhaps by that of Tuesday. There is no doubt whatsoever but that I shall be heard on my own behalf either at the table or at the Bar—the question really is *at which*. After the House has heard me, some of my friends will move that I should be allowed to take the oath in the Relief Bill and the property qualification oath. On that the debate will arise, and the decision will *decide* my fate.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 186-7

1 Charles Manners-Sutton.

1569

To Charles Sugrue, Cork

Bury Street [London], 20 May 1829

My dear Charles,

I know your anxiety to hear *all* about me, and although the papers have communicated to you nearly as much as I know myself, yet I cannot but believe that you would not be displeased at my own account.

The Government behaved to me with the greatest duplicity.

They distinctly declared that they would not make it a Government question; and when a gentleman disposed to vote for me in the usual way wrote to the Treasury to ask to *tie* with a Government member, he got an official letter stating to him that it was not to be opposed by the Ministry. But this promise to me was most grossly violated, and the delay from Friday until Monday¹ was sought for by Peel for the mere purpose, I am persuaded, of making a personal canvass against me which was necessarily more tedious, as, to preserve the appearance of consistency and truth, they did not issue Treasury tickets² as they are called. The truth is the Administration is an exceedingly weak one and has all the vices of weakness, the principal of which are hypocrisy and falsehood. I should still have had a chance of success but for the conduct of Sir James Scarlett, who made a very strong and argumentative speech in my favour and concluded by declaring that he would vote against me. This, of course, was a decisive blow. But the Attorney-Generalship is vacant, and poor Sir James is a man. Alas for humanity! Thus between Tory falsehood and hypocrisy and Whiggish *uncertainty*, the question was lost. There was one man who has behaved to me in a manner which exceeds all praise: that is Mr. Brougham. His conduct has been kind, generous and persevering. He has given me the full benefit of his great talents and character. There is to be another discussion tomorrow night but I do not continue to hope for any favourable result. It will, however, expose the Ministry to the derision and contempt of the public by reason of their legislating heretofore out of a paltry and pitiful spitefulness against a single man. I intend at once to address the Electors of Clare. I am assured that I have a new election quite secure; nay, it is said that there will be no rival candidate. At all events it is quite certain that Vesey FitzGerald will not stand. It would be folly of him to do so, as, upon the death of his mother,³ who is very old and very infirm, he is to be a peer.⁴ Thus I will be likely to have a great triumph. Indeed, I have every reason to be satisfied with the result. Brougham told me today that there was but one opinion on the subject of my speech,⁵ and that is that my success in a Parliamentary career is quite certain. Lord Lansdowne conveyed to me, through Tom Moore, his opinion that from report he had conceived that, however suited to a popular assembly or mob, my eloquence would not answer for the *refinement* of Parliament, but that he was now decidedly convinced of the contrary. The Marquis

of Anglesey came to see me twice with a still more flattering judgement. I do not mention these things out of vanity but because I know they will give you pleasure. From *every quarter* communications of a similar description have reached me.

Give my most affectionate regards to the mother of your children and to the children themselves. Make up your mind to allow a couple of your boys to spend a month or six weeks at Derrynane this summer.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 187-9

- 1 On Friday, 15 May, O'Connell presented himself in the Commons for the purpose of taking his seat for Clare. On refusing to take the oath of supremacy tendered him by the speaker (which the Emancipation Act had rendered unnecessary for all members thereafter elected), he was directed to withdraw. Brougham then rose to defend O'Connell's right to take his seat. The debate which followed was terminated by Peel's motion in favour of adjourning the question to the following Monday, 18 May (*DEP*, 19 May 1829). On the eighteenth it was decided by 190 to 116 that O'Connell should not be allowed to take his seat without subscribing to the old oath of supremacy (*Commons Journal*, 1829, LXXXIV, 311). In fact the oath of supremacy had been abrogated in 1689 but the oath tendered to members of parliament continued to be *called* the oath of supremacy even though containing no declaration as to the sovereign's spiritual supremacy. This oath was objectionable to Catholics because it contained a condemnation of the doctrine of transubstantiation, the invocation of saints and the sacrifice of the Mass. For a full account of the evolution of parliamentary oaths, providing the background to this problem, see Michael MacDonagh, *Parliament: Its Romance, Its Comedy, Its Pathos* (Westminster 1902), pp. 179-96.
- 2 Unidentified, but obviously some form of circular sent by the prime minister to government supporters in parliament.
- 3 Catherine (Vesey), first Baroness FitzGerald and Vesey (c. 1759-1832). Married 1782 James FitzGerald, M.P. Created baroness, 1826.
- 4 O'Connell was mistaken. FitzGerald's mother's barony was of the kingdom of Ireland and therefore could not entitle FitzGerald, when he should succeed, to a seat in the House of Lords. It would not disqualify him from a seat in the Commons.
- 5 That delivered by O'Connell at the bar of the House of Commons on 18 May 1829 after the House had unanimously resolved that he be heard. His speech was a lengthy one concerned with the legal technicalities of his claim to take his seat without subscribing to the oaths objectionable to Catholics (*DEP*, 21 May 1829).

1570

To Lord Stafford,¹ 20 May 1829, from 19 Bury St., London

Regretting that he must decline his and Lady Stafford's very kind invitation for 30 May since he must return to Ireland because of the near certainty of a new election for Clare.²

SOURCE : Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 George William (Stafford-Jerningham), seventeenth Baron Stafford (1771-1851); succeeded his father, 1809, as seventh baronet. His claim to the barony of Stafford was acknowledged by the House of Lords 6 July 1825. Took the name of Stafford before that of Jerningham, 1826.
- 2 Following O'Connell's failure to gain admission to parliament without subscribing to the oath of supremacy.

1571

To Mr. Wright¹

London, 20 May 1829

My dear Sir,

Your letter arrived in a very busy time. Yesterday I attended the House of Commons to read the Oath² which, having done, I refused to take. So there will have to be a new election.

I thank you for your very warm-hearted letter. I know there are many members of the Society of Friends who feel as you do, their forefathers having suffered persecution themselves.

As an outcome of the Relief Bill I think the day is not far distant when the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland will be permanently united for the common good.

SOURCE : Belfast PRO, 869, p. 84

- 1 Perhaps William Wright, member of the Society of Friends, a native of Sheffield who resided in Leeds.
- 2 After the House had voted on 18 May against O'Connell's sitting without taking the oath of supremacy (see letter 1569, note 1), he was ordered to attend on the following day (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 312). Accordingly the speaker asked him whether he would have the oath of supremacy. 'Whereupon Mr. O'Connell requested to see the Oath, which being shown to him accordingly, Mr. O'Connell stated, that the said Oath contained one proposition which he knew to be false, and another proposition which he believed to be untrue and that he therefore refused to take the said Oath of Supremacy' (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 314-17). See also FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 184-5.

1572

To his wife, Merrion Square

21 May 1829

My own darling Love,

I can write but little this day. You would be consoled for my disappointment on Monday night if you knew the extent of impression I have made as a public speaker. I am going down to the House to listen to Spring Rice's motion.¹ I expect nothing to result from it. I have a borough ready for the rest of the sessions² and my address to Clare will appear in the *Morning Chronicle* of Friday and I will be in parliament for the borough on Wednesday or Thursday next. Darling, you of course know me too well to suppose that I would barter any one of my principles for the world's wealth. No, love, I go in for the borough, as I did for Clare, perfectly my own master. Of course you have not the least uneasiness on that head. It will give me a station and rank in addressing the people of Clare and give weight and importance to my exertions in that county. I want too to bring before the country my parliamentary capacities. I want to show of what use I could be to Catholic charities and other Catholic purposes. Do not therefore, my darling heart, be in the least degree mortified at my taking advantage of a free borough for the rest of this sessions. Depend upon it that it can serve only to make me more respected by the public. You will I repeat be greatly pleased with my address to the people of Clare. It would have amused you to have heard the paltry squaling [squealing?] of the voices of the other speakers after me in the House of Commons. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 On 19 May Thomas Spring Rice declared his intention of moving 'that the oath (of supremacy) be so altered, or dispensed with, that Mr. O'Connell can take his seat without a new election' (*DEP*, 21 May 1829.) On 21 May Rice moved for leave to bring in a bill to amend the Emancipation Act for this purpose (*DEP*, 23 May 1829). He was prevailed on, however, to withdraw his motion (*DEP*, 23 May 1829; *Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 325).
- 2 Obviously a 'pocket' borough but it has not been identified. It is known that O'Connell had offered 3,000 guineas to Sir Edward Denny for the borough of Tralee, but the negotiations came to nothing (O'Keeffe, *O'Connell*, II, 503).

1573

To James Sugrue

London, 21 May 1829

My dear James,

You cannot form the least idea of my first appearance on the parliamentary stage. My speech¹ was a dry argument but it is said to have been in manner and tact beyond what could have been conceived, and all that it should be. Lord Grey, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Anglesey, etc., are among the warmest admirers of it.

If I be put out for Clare this night, which is very probable, I have had a kind of an offer of a *free* seat for the rest of the session for a borough,² and to address Clare at once. Let not this matter get into the newspapers. . . .

I must conclude, as I am going down to the House. I expect little from Spring Rice's motion.³

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 77-8

1 See letter 1569, note 5.

2 See letter 1572, note 2.

3 See letter 1572, note 1.

1574

*From Emanuel Hutchinson Orpen,¹ to Merrion Square,
redirected to 19 Bury St., St. James', London*

Dublin, 21 May 1829

My Dear Sir,

. . . At such a time as the present I cannot write to you without expressing my unfeigned surprise at the late vote of the Commons² which I think was a plain violation of the Relief Bill so recently passed and, whatever my sentiments may have been on the general advantages or disadvantages of that enactment, I must consider it unjust treatment that the individual by whose exertions that measure was mainly obtained should be the only person not permitted to benefit by the enactment. Though you are put to the inconvenience of another election I should scarcely think Mr. Vesey FitzGerald could have the indecency to make it a contested one, and after you shall, as I expect, be again returned, I

trust your future conduct in Parliament will be such as to convince persons of a different persuasion that their apprehension of being at all disturbed in the conscientious exercise of their faith was without foundation . . . and that you may [? be assured] that many of the opponents of the cause you had most at heart acted solely from conscientious convictions and not a wish to countenance any mere party monopoly. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Attorney, 50 Exchequer Street, Dublin.

2 See letter 1569, note 1.

1575

To William Roche, Limerick

Bury St., London, 22 May 1829

My dear Sir,

Many, many thanks not in words but from my heart. I am determined to contest Clare which I would now do even if I was undetermined before I got your *kindest* note.¹ My accounts thence are most favourable. What care I for any political event, when I am sure of the cordial friendship of such men as you? Desiring my best regards to your brother,² as well as to his fine family, believe me with affectionate regard,

Yours, etc.,

Daniel O'Connell

P.S. The more letters you are kind enough to write the better.

SOURCE : Roche, *Essays*, II, 119-20

1 Unidentified.

2 James Roche, Cork.

1576

To Michael Scales

19 Bury St. [London], 22 May 1829

Copy

My dear Sir,

I need not tell you that the letter¹ written to you in my name is an impudent and silly forgery. The creature guilty of

so much meanness is beneath contempt. He however gives me the opportunity to assure you that I entertain for you sentiments directly the reverse of those contained in that letter.

I also return you the letter of Mr. Cobbett of the 11th inst.² which you gave me two days ago. I assure you that no man can be more sensible than I am of the value of Mr. Cobbett's talents—his history of the Protestant Reformation³ and his paper on the currency⁴ are amongst the most powerful exhibitions of human research, accuracy, discrimination and intellect—the world is his debtor for these immortal publications. . . . But I cannot retract the words⁵ which he attributes to me. I never spoke those words, neither did I ever cause them to be printed or published. If they were attributed to me by the newspapers it was without any participation of mine and by the mistake of persons who distorted (perhaps without design) the words which I did use in consequence of a horrible attack made by Mr. Cobbett on the mangled remains of one of the purest and most high-minded beings that ever lived.⁶

. . . I *simply* think that Mr. Cobbett injures the effect of his own writings by attacking a man so firmly, so disinterestedly, so unremittingly devoted to the cause of rational liberty as I am. But if he thinks otherwise let him continue his attacks upon me.⁷ They will afford me sometimes a cause for a smile, sometimes a provocation to pity the abuse of great talents.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Unidentified.

2 See note 5 below.

3 William Cobbett, *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland, showing how that event has impoverished the main body of the people in those countries* . . . 2 vols. (London 1829).

4 *Cobbett's Paper against Gold: Containing the History and Mystery of the Bank of England* . . . (W. Molineux, printer, London 1817).

5 According to Cobbett O'Connell had 'said in the most public manner and caused to be printed that I [Cobbett] was "*a tyrant to the inmates of my home*"'. Cobbett declared he would continue his attacks on O'Connell 'until he has atoned for his offence by a retraction as public and as explicit as the false and infamous charge' (Cobbett to Michael Scales, 11 May 1829, copy in Fitz-Simon Papers).

6 Unidentified.

7 O'Connell and Cobbett appear to have first quarrelled in 1825 (see letter 1248, note 1). They were reconciled at a dinner to Burdett on 25 May 1829 (*Times*, 26 May 1829).

1577

To Edward Dwyer or James Sugrue

22 May 1829

[No salutation]

. . . You will see *I am out*, and out for the session of course.¹ We must be stirring. Work the press for me. I am myself preparing my address to the Clare men. It will, I hope, appear tomorrow.² I do not mince the matter in it.

Consider of forming a Dublin Committee³ at once to conduct the Clare election. It cannot, however, come on till the month of July at soonest. Vesey Fitzgerald will not attempt the county again. That much is *certain*.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 78

1 See letter 1572, note 1.

2 O'Connell's famous 'Address of the Hundred Promises' (published on 28 May). In this he pledged himself to secure a wide variety of reforms, including the abolition of oppressive county taxes, the repeal of the Sub-letting Act, the provision of a system of poor laws free from the abuses of those in England, the restoration of the forty-shilling franchise, grand jury reform and the abolition of the Vestry Act. He also promised to secure measures for the restoration to Ireland of a resident gentry and increased representation in parliament (O'Connell to the Electors of the County of Clare, 25 May 1829, *DEP*, 28 May 1829).

3 Appointed at a public meeting (Rev. William L'Estrange in the chair) in Dublin on 25 May (*DEP*, 26 May 1829).

1577a

To John Howard Payne

London, 22 May 1829

My dear Payne,

I contribute with pleasure my mite to the *curiosities* of your album. I wish I could call to recollection, in order to furnish you with something *original*, the speech I made on giving the memory of Washington at our dinner on the lake of Killarney.¹ I only recollect that the conclusion of it was much cheered. Did it not convey this idea? 'He found his native

land a pitiful province of England. He left her—Oh Glorious destiny!—an independent and mighty nation.'

SOURCE : Harvard University Library

1 See letter 492.

1578

From John Barclay Sheil

34 St. James's Street [London], Friday Evening, 23 May 1829¹

My dear Sir,

I beg leave to request that my name may be entered on the list here as subscriber of ten guineas to the O'Connell National Fund.²

Before you leave town I wish your friends could arrange some committee or secretary for subscriptions here. I think that the English Catholics may yet do their duty.³ I see a charity dinner of the English Catholics announced at the Freemasons Tavern on the 15th June which I will attend.⁴ Lord Stourton is to be in the chair. If an opportunity occurs I shall tell them what I think they all owe to *one Irishman*.

I have had a letter from Barn Elms Farm.⁵ If you are not plighted in honour to attend at Sir F. Burdett's dinner on Monday⁶ I wish that you would consider how far it might be a proof of your good taste to avoid meeting with the *Messrs.* Cobbett⁷ and Hunt? Besides I do think that *Burdett* gave you but a very cool support last Monday⁸ and *he* ought to have remembered that but for *your* influence he never would have been chosen (instead of Sir Henry Parnell) to present the petition for the Catholics of Ireland.⁹

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Friday was 22, not 23, May.

2 See letter 1549, note 4.

3 On 28 May a preparatory meeting under the chairmanship of George Bourke Kelly of Acton was held for the purpose of securing English subscriptions to the O'Connell testimonial. Among prominent English Catholics subscribing were the duke of Norfolk, Lord Stafford, Rev. Dr. Weld, Hon. Hugh Clifford, Charles Langdale, Sir Edward M. Vavasour and Marmaduke Maxwell (*DEP*, 30 May 1829; see also Ward, *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, pp. 268-9). However, at a further meeting held in London for the same purpose on 12 June 1829, the absence of the British Catholic nobility was strongly complained of (*DEP*, 16 June 1829).

- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 Near Barnes, Surrey. A small farm which Cobbett ran, 1827-31.
- 6 A dinner held on 25 May at the Crown and Anchor Tavern to celebrate the twenty-second anniversary of the return of Burdett for Westminster. The dinner was marked by wrangles occasioned by attempts of Cobbett and Hunt to address the assembly. According to the *Times*, O'Connell delivered a speech of 'great power and eloquence' (*Times*, 26 May 1829).
- 7 See letter 1576, note 5.
- 8 There is no record of Burdett's having taken any part in the debate in the Commons on 18 May on the subject of O'Connell's admission to parliament (see letter 1569, note 1), nor does his name appear in the list of those voting in favour of O'Connell's admission (see *Hansard*, N.S., 1829, XX, 1038, 1458-9). It is probable that Burdett was at this time already suffering from the illness which he claimed prevented him from attending the dinner in his honour on 25 May (see above, note 6; see also the *Times*, 26 May 1829; also letter from Burdett, *DEP*, 28 May 1829).
- 9 Presented by Burdett in the Commons on 13 March 1829 (*Hansard*, N.S., XX, 1061).

1579

From Edward Dwyer to Holyhead

Sunday [31 May 1829]

My dear Sir,

In addition to the annexed resolutions¹ one was passed requesting Mr. O'Sullivan² to await your arrival at the Head to signify to you the intention of the Committee to have a steamboat in readiness to meet you off Howth to convey you to Kingstown. . . .³

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 The annexed resolutions were: a meeting of Mr. O'Connell's friends on 30 May 1829, Rev. F. J. L'Estrange in the chair, resolving to meet him at Kingstown on his arrival; and a meeting of the committee of Mr. O'Connell's friends resolving on the time for assembly at Kingstown. 'It is the particular request of the Committee that no banners or emblems of any description shall be used on the occasion. The road from Kingstown to Dublin will be watered.'
- 2 Roger O'Sullivan.
- 3 On his arrival at Howth from London on 2 June 1829, O'Connell was met by a large party of his friends on board a steam packet which conveyed him to Kingstown (modern Dun Laoghaire) where a crowd of many thousands greeted him (*DEP*, 4 June 1829).

1580

*From Emily Sibthorpe, 28 Hardwicke St., Dublin,
3 June 1829*

A begging letter from a widow describing herself as a Protestant.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1581

To Pierce Mahony, Union Hotel, Cockspur St., London

Merrion Square, 4 June 1829

My dear Mahony,

. . . I receive your advice with the most sincere gratitude but what have I to do with English parties! The Marquis of Anglesey has indeed conferred on me a kindness of attention for which I can never be sufficiently grateful. I am desirous of preserving his good opinion and I would preserve it by a sacrifice of everything save what I deem 'principle'. As to Lord Holland, what have I to do with him or his opinions? I owe him no gratitude nor is there now any community of feeling between us that I know of save so far as he may be 'a Whig'. He was an advocate for settling the Catholic question and I give him full credit for his sincerity but we did that business for ourselves. I know we did and therefore I have very little of the mawkish sentiment of whipped syllabub [i.e., frothy, lacking in substance] gratitude to him or to anybody else who did not assist our actual struggles. There was not one of our parliamentary friends that did not vilify us who took the vanguard of agitation—of that agitation without which we should never have been emancipated. Oh, thank Heaven, we are emancipated from the patronage of our friends. When therefore you cite to me the opinion of Lord Anglesey you certainly influence my judgement, but as to Lord Holland, really I know not what claims he can have to sway my own deliberate opinion.

Having no object of personal advantage to look for I turn my thoughts exclusively to what I deem useful to Ireland and I am most thoroughly convinced that nothing but 'the Repeal of the Union' can permanently serve her interests.

The English parliament does not suit my taste at all, and my return for Clare is perhaps more suited to retard than to advance my exertions for the repeal of that most atrocious measure. These are my honest sentiments upon which I *must* act.

. . . I am told there is to be no opposition to my election for Clare. At present there is no appearance of any. I go down on Sunday to Limerick and make my entry the next day into Ennis. I mean to canvass all the gentry. I wish you *could* see the O'Briens, Lucius¹ and his brother,² and solicit from them a declaration in my favour on this vacancy. I assure you that they may live to regret a refusal. Lucius volunteered *his services* to sustain me³ as his colleague yet he quitted the House [of Commons] and left me to my fate. If you have any delicacy about going *there*, do not think of it. I only suggest it in consequence of his former communication to you.⁴

If I succeed in Clare, especially after a contest, it will rouse a fresh spirit in all the counties in Ireland. The only danger is that there shall not be a contest⁵ for in that case the usual torpidity will follow, recent exertions there being no adequate stimulant to keep up excitement. But a contest in Clare would rouse all the dormant passions and give an energy to opposition which would not be easily appeased.

[P.S.] You perceive that I have not and of course will not touch anything private, basely as I have been treated. The old system of government is in full force here—not the least change in the government—all as bitterly Orange as ever.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 Lucius O'Brien (1800-72), son of Sir Edward O'Brien, fourth baronet. M.P. (Tory) for Co. Clare, 1826-30, 1847-52. Succeeded to the baronetcy, 1837; succeeded (1855) to the barony of Inchiquin and was confirmed by the House of Lords, 1862.
- 2 William Smith O'Brien (1803-64), Cahirmoyle, Co. Limerick. Second son of Sir Edward O'Brien, fourth baronet, Dromoland, Co. Clare. M.P. for Ennis, 1828-31; Co. Limerick, 1835-49. See *DNB*.
- 3 That is, support of O'Connell's right to take his seat in parliament.
- 4 See letters 1593, 1599.
- 5 O'Connell was returned for Clare on 30 July 1829 without any contest.

1582

To Colonel O'Donnell,¹ Limerick

Ennis [Co. Clare], 9 June 1829

Sir,

I feel that I owe to you in point of respect to solicit the high honour of your support at the now ensuing election. . . .

Should you be pleased to favour me with your vote and interest I will endeavour to deserve it by using my best exertions to promote the peace, harmony and prosperity of our countrymen, to increase every disposition to obedience to the laws and subordination to the constituted authorities combined with the spirit of constitutional freedom and the desire of amelioration in the political system. Such amelioration as would render revolutionary violence impossible and give increased security to private life and additional value to private property. . . .

SOURCE : National Museum of Ireland

- 1 Col. Henry Anderson O'Donnell, C.B. (1758-1840), son of John O'Donnell of Limerick and Trough and Mount O'Donnell, both Co. Clare. Colonel in East India Company. Married firstly Domina Jan, a Persian princess; secondly, Maria, daughter of John Brownrigg.

1583

From David Mahony¹

29 Merrion Square, North, 12 June 1829

[Copy]

Private and Confidential

My dear O'Connell,

I this day received a *private* letter from Pierce, dated London 10th inst., authorizing me to communicate with you and Mr. Sheil in the *strictest professional and personal confidence*. . . .

You are aware of the retirement of Mr. Stuart from the representation of Waterford.² This event was expected but had not taken place at the date of Pierce's letter. On the morning of that day, Pierce had a communication with Lord Beresford³ and Sir Geo. Hill and he was authorized to endeavour to

secure your valuable services professionally for Lord George Beresford at the ensuing election for Waterford,⁴ assuming Mr. Stuart to retire as he has since announced.

The anxiety on their part to retain you on behalf of Lord George Beresford is the strongest mark of his Lordship's desire to bury in oblivion and for ever the political differences which formerly existed between you and his Lordship, and that he wishes to become the representative of the County of Waterford and not of any particular party in it. His object will be, during his canvass as well as during the election, to give an example of forbearance and forgetfulness of all past differences, and thus to assist in restoring friendly feeling among all parties. Pierce adds his own hope and expectation that you will readily embrace this opportunity of proving your willingness in an equal degree to contribute to the same result, in which hope I myself concur and trust your reply will justify us. . . .

I may add that I believe (in addition to the fact that *all* the Beresford party, 9 in number, with the exception of the Primate,⁵ supported the late measures for the regeneration of Ireland and the advancement of her best interests)—if the whole truth was known—it would be found that the Catholics had not in this family the bitter enemies they supposed but circumstances prevented their showing how they felt or were acting. However, there is no longer 'a Catholic question'. It is no longer a struggle whether a supporter of Emancipation is to be returned or not! . . .

Mr. Sheil has accepted the retainer, and allow me to say that you will do the same. The arrangements you may safely confide to your friend by whose desire I now address you. Of course your compensation must be ample.

How goes on the Clare registry? And when do you return?

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 David Mahony (1795-1844), attorney, Grangecon, Co. Wicklow, and Upper Mount Street, Dublin; partner with his brother Pierce in P. and D. Mahony, a leading firm of solicitors in Dublin.
- 2 Villiers Stuart, to O'Connell's great annoyance, decided, apparently because of financial difficulties, to give up the representation of Waterford (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 687).
- 3 William Carr (Beresford), Viscount Beresford (1768-1854).
- 4 Sheil accepted the offer but O'Connell, after consultation with his Dublin friends, refused. He was accused by the *Times*, and it was stated by his enemies, that he had been willing to accept Beresford's offer but had withdrawn when the latter would not pay him the

- fee which he had stipulated. For a full discussion of this episode, see Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 687-94; see also letters 1584 and 1588.
- 5 Rev. Lord John George de la Poer Beresford (1773-1862), second son of first marquess of Waterford. Bishop of Cork, Cloyne and Ross, 1806-07; Raphoe, 1807-19; Clogher, 1819-20; archbishop of Dublin, 1820-22; Armagh, 1822-62. See *DNB*.

1584

To David Mahony, Atty at Law, Dublin, at Messrs P. and D. Mahony's

Kilrush [Co. Clare], 14 June 1829

(private)

My dear Mahony,

You may rely on it that the communication to me shall be strictly confidential.

I am exceedingly delighted at the offer made me as it proves that the memory of former dissensions is to be buried in oblivion. No man living more heartily deserves that consummation than I do.

Before I accept the retainer I wish to have it distinctly understood that if I do accept it, there is to be no expectation that I will do anything beyond my professional duty; that is, there is to be *no sale* by me nor any purchase by them of my political exertions. I made this stipulation with Villiers Stuart and although I went beyond that duty for him it was only because the political sentiments I then advocated were more mine than they were his. This is a point which must be distinctly understood before I even consider whether I shall or not accept the retainer. If the offer of it under those circumstances shall be repeated—a matter of which I entertain some doubt as out of term I made Villiers Stuart pay me £600—my professional remuneration I will leave to you and your brother, should the offer be repeated and should I be able to accept of it.

I need not tell you that there could not be a greater inducement held out to me than the fact that you and your brother are the law agents of the Beresford family on this occasion. I have always been exceedingly well treated by that family when they employed me as a professional man.

I will certainly be in Dublin on Thursday night at the latest.

I have this county [Clare] hollow. Half the county is not yet gone through and my majority is already certain. It is impossible that there should be a serious contest. You know I would not deceive you but I can now beat even Vesey Fitzgerald three to one. No other person could stand one hour. The popular excitement and enthusiasm are greater than ever. How wise in Master Peel & Co. to send me back. . . .

[P.S.] The number registered up to Friday evening was 309. Of these 280 are pledged to me. Of the rest at least one half will probably vote for me.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1585

To O'Gorman Mahon, Batt's Hotel, Dover St., London

Kilrush [Co. Clare], 14 June 1829

My dear O'G. M.,

. . . We do not at present want you, nor shall we until some rival candidate starts or at all events until the registry is at an end and the election approaches. In either event your powerful energies will be essentially necessary. If there is to be *battle*, we cannot go to *battle* without you and if there is to be a storm, why you must once again '*ride on the whirlwind and direct the storm*'.

For the present everything is going on most smoothly. Our registries, as they stand, secure to us the election. We have between Ennis and Ennistymon a sufficient majority to defeat the Tories and we have full one half of the county still to register. I think the enthusiasm of the people is still greater than it was at the last election whilst the altered tone of the Brunswickers shows a sense of defeat and the weakness resulting from the want of hope.

I do not entertain the least doubt that two independent men can be returned for this county at the general election. You have *now* the means of doing it. I speak to you as I would to my son. Attend to what I say to you and I will see you representing this county—and that soon. The game is on the cards. Play it well and the perfect popular representation of Clare will be *one* of your rewards.¹ Present my kindest regards to my dear and most cherished friend (Steele).

Again I repeat my advice, my entreaty. Look to yourself and become *master of circumstances*.

SOURCE : O'Gorman Mahon Papers, University of Chicago Library, Chicago, Illinois

1 O'Gorman Mahon was elected for Clare in 1830.

1586

To Michael Furnell,¹ 14 June 1829, from Kilrush

Seeks his vote in the coming Co. Clare election because Vesey FitzGerald is not standing and because of his (Furnell's) friendship with O'Connell's son Maurice and because of 'our poor departed friend John Bric'.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, XI (1883), 53-4

1 Michael Furnell (born 17 April 1795), Cahirelly, Co. Limerick. Eldest son of Michael Furnell (died 1816) and Mary Stackpoole; educated Trinity College, Dublin; called to the bar, 1825; a magistrate and alderman of Limerick city. High sheriff of Co. Limerick, 1842.

1587

From his brother James, Lakeview, Killarney, 15 June 1829, to Dublin

Concerning bills of exchange, borrowings and family affairs.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1588

To David Mahony, Merrion Square

Merrion Square, 21 June 1829

My dear Mahony,

The letter¹ of your brother² is quite satisfactory in all its professional details. I entirely acquiesce in all he says of professional duty and emolument.

I am also proud of the selection made of me by Lord Waterford,³ as a professional man; the certainty that he and his family concur with all the real friends of Ireland in burying in oblivion all former feuds is both satisfactory and con-

solatory. For my humble part, I am impressed with the strongest conviction that the distinctions between Protestant and Catholic, in politics, should be for ever forgotten.

I would not, therefore, have it conceived for one moment that my declining to accept the retainer has any other source than this: that having now ascertained the certainty of my return for Clare, I do not feel at liberty to be of counsel to any candidate pending the Parliament; as a member of the House I consider myself precluded from being so, because if there were a disputed return, I would be liable to be one of the judges of that return, so that it would be impossible for me to pre-engage my mind by my advice as counsel. If there shall be no new election until the general election, I will then be too occupied for myself to be able to assist any other person. Of course you will distinctly understand that I do not consider myself any longer at liberty to be professionally engaged against the interest of Lord Waterford. My present prospects in Clare thus excluding me from accepting any such retainer, I again beg leave to express my great gratification at the matter and manner of the communication to me.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 193-4

1 See letter 1583.

2 Pierce Mahony.

3 Henry (de la Poer Beresford), third marquess of Waterford (1811-59). Succeeded, 1826.

1589

From Rev. Matthias Kelly¹ to Merrion Square

Chapel House, Monday, 2 July 1829

My Dear Sir,

As the building² and the collection have now commenced and as all our exertion will be required in order to meet the expectation of the builders as the work advances, will you be so kind to say when it may be convenient that Rev. Mr. Ennis³ and I shall call upon you to have your liberal donation as an excitement to others at the head of the subscription list?

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Administrator of St. Andrew's parish (Townsend Street chapel), Dublin, 1826-31. He was curate in Liffey Street-Marlborough Street until 1826. P.P. of St. James's, 1831-32; resigned, 1832.

- 2 Enlargements and improvements to Townsend Street chapel (St. Andrew's parish church).
- 3 Rev. John Ennis (1792-1862), a native of Dublin; ordained at Maynooth, 1816; educated Paris, 1816-18; C.C. of St. Andrew's, 1818-39; P.P. of Booterstown, 1839-62; active in the erection of national schools in Dublin and prominent in Fr. Mathew's temperance movement.

1590

From his son Morgan to Merrion Square, redirected to Ennis

[Jaszbereny] 7 July 1829

My dearest Father,

. . . The General¹ wrote to me on the 27th of May as his letter is so dated and I only got it yesterday. It contains bills on Rothschild in Vienna for £100 . . . according to your directions. The rest he will send me as soon as I acknowledge the receipt of his present letter. Be assured, my dear father, that this is the last time I will make any such extravagant demand. . . . I will however endeavour to prove to you by my future conduct of the change operated in me and of my firm unalterable resolution not again to involve myself in such a predicament. These are not empty words. Time will prove the truth of them. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

1 Count O'Connell.

1591

To Sir Richard Willcocks, Kt.¹

Merrion Square, 12 July 1829

My dear Sir,

[O'Connell asks Willcocks to co-operate with him for the purpose of obviating expensive litigation in the Chancery case of *Cody v. White* which concerns the disposition of the property of James O'Donnell, deceased, of Sackville Street, Dublin. O'Connell obviously has confidence in Willcocks as a man of integrity, and ends the letter: 'I trust to your kind-

ness which I have often experienced to excuse the long letter.']

SOURCE : Property of Miss Eileen R. Harty, 46 Newtownpark Avenue, Blackrock, Co. Dublin

- 1 Sir Richard Willcocks, Palmerstown, Co. Dublin. Knighted, 1827. Inspector of police in Munster (ret.).

1592

*From Sir William Homan*¹

15 July 1829

[No salutation]

. . . Having a message from Mr. Stuart² to Mr. O'Connell would wish . . . to speak a few words to him.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sir William Jackson Homan (1771-1852), second son of the Rev. Philip Homan; Dunlum, Co. Westmeath; created baronet, 1801. See *Boase*.
2 Probably Henry Villiers Stuart.

1593

To Pierce Mahony

Ennis [Co. Clare], 29 July 1829

My dear Mahony,

I return you at once Mr. Donough O'Brien's¹ letter. It is just such an unwise composition as I should naturally have expected.

With respect to the threat it contains of personal hostility—that is a matter which from 'the house of Dromoland' I rather covet than deprecate. It is to me a matter of the greatest indifference, with just a leaning of preference to 'the hostility'. One may be injured by the friendship of some persons whilst there are those in the world whose enmity is perfectly innocuous.

. . . I have no copy of the report of the speech² you allude to before me but, as I recollect it, it contained one inaccuracy which arose from my misconception of what you told me. I said 'that Mr. Lucius O'Brien had communicated to you *that although HE had opposed me at the late election, yet,*

etc.' I find from you that what he really said and what you reported to me was *that although his family had opposed me he had not taken any part at the late election*. I am therefore quite ready to have the truth in this particular—which by the by is very immaterial—accurately stated. The important point and that on which I grounded my charge of political duplicity was, as I recollect, accurately stated in the newspapers at least in substance but of the report I cannot be certain. Of the communication itself I have no doubt, namely, that he authorized you to inform me 'that he *then*' (at the time he spoke to you) 'recognized me as his colleague *and would support me as such*.' This you know you recognized as his communication when we spoke on this subject in his chamber near the Exchequer where you showed me the former paper³ of Mr. D. O'Brien's. Indeed his going to you at all would have been foolish if he had not made *that* promise.⁴ Certainly you communicated that promise to me and it is upon that promise that I grounded my charge against him as a public man. I repeat that I do not recollect the words of the newspaper report but the above contains what I really said and what is literally true. I therefore cannot either qualify or retract it without deviating from truth.

It is quite plain that there never yet was a promise more distinctly violated than that of Mr. Lucius O'Brien.

Mr. Donough O'Brien accuses me of 'selfish purposes'. I submit readily to *his* making that charge. I do not complain of it or retaliate it. My principles are well known. There is blood—human blood—on my hand and nothing can tempt me to commit that crime again.⁵ May God forgive me. The knowledge of my resolution on this subject has made many men exceedingly valiant to me who are as shrinking from others as it is possible to be.⁶ I gladly submit to this inconvenience in my own case.

. . . I cannot retract my assertion 'that Mr. Lucius O'Brien has done nothing for the County of Clare.' I know that he voted for the Catholic question and was one of its zealous but I must say useless advocates. I am also ready to admit that he was sincere in his advocacy but still 'he *did* nothing for Clare' because it was not '*our friends*' in parliament carried the bill. It was the Catholics themselves who forced the measure on *our enemies* and they carried it through. Perhaps it may be said that this is an ungracious view of the subject. I however think it the truth.

If you send me down the report of my speech and that I find any other inaccuracy in it, save that of Mr. Lucius O'Brien having opposed me at the last election, I will readily correct it.

As Mr. D. O'Brien requested that you would send me his very uncivil letter, I beg of you to send him this which certainly is not intended to convey any kind of incivility but simply to assert my own independence of the O'Brien family and my attachment to the facts, with my constant readiness to atone for any error I may chance to fall into in point of fact. But, at the same time, my total disregard of the animosity of those who may be displeased with me for speaking the truth of public men on public subjects.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 Donough Acheson O'Brien (1780-1847), fourth son of Sir Lucius O'Brien, third baronet, Dromoland, Co. Clare.
- 2 Delivered at an election meeting in Ennistymon, Co. Clare, on 9 June 1829 (*DEP*, 13 June 1829). A synopsis of O'Connell's speech as reported in the press is best given at this point. In comparing his own record of public service with that of Lucius O'Brien, he demanded, 'What has Mr. O'Brien done for you?' and declared that the electorate should return Maj. William N. MacNamara in his place. He added that after his own return for Clare, Sir Lucius O'Brien, 'Believing that the House of Dromoland [that is, the O'Brien family] might yet want a prop', approached O'Connell's agent, Pierce Mahony, expressed the hope that 'he had not created any unpleasant feeling in my mind by his conduct at the late election' and promised Mahony (and later O'Connell in person) that he would support O'Connell's admission to parliament for Clare. According to O'Connell, however, when he attempted to take his seat, O'Brien and his brother (William Smith O'Brien) walked out of the House, 'leaving Daniel O'Connell and the Freeholders of Clare to shift for themselves'. O'Connell concluded his speech by threatening to make it difficult for William Smith O'Brien to obtain election for Ennis again (*DEP*, 13 June 1829).
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 That is to support O'Connell in his attempt to take his seat.
- 5 A reference to his fatal duel with D'Esterre in 1815.
- 6 O'Connell suffered allegations of cowardice from his enemies because he refused to fight duels with persons whom he insulted in his public speeches.

1594

To Pierce Mahony, Merrion Square

[postmarked Ennis, 31 July 1829]

Private

My dear Pierce,

I send you back a packet. You will oblige me *very, very* much by getting both letters copied and keeping the copies for me. Mr. Donogh O'Brien's letter¹ is very uncivil and would have deserved a harsh reply on his own account but I forgive him.

No opposition here—the county perfectly quiet. . . .

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1 See letter 1593.

1595

From Pierce Mahony

Merrion Square, Dublin, 1 August 1829

[Draft]

My dear O'Connell,

I send you with this an extract from the *Dublin Evening Post* of the 13th June, being the parts of your speech¹ at Newmarket-on-Fergus complained of by Mr. O'Brien. I also send you a copy of Mr. D. O'Brien's letter to me and a copy of your reply to that letter written also to me but amended by the omission of some observations which I did not think necessary. My opinion is against your sending that letter even in its present shape and, accordingly, I shall wait for your answer before I deliver it.

As far as I am concerned the facts are according to the best of my recollection as follows: Mr. Lucius O'Brien called on me at Merrion Square about Christmas—I cannot state the exact period—on business of his father's.² I was in the act of preparing your case³ when he came into my drawing-room. After the matter of business was disposed of we spoke of the state of this country, the Catholic question and the last Clare Election, and he took occasion to explain to me that he had no hostility to you, that without at all stating that he would *not* (if in Ireland during the contest) have taken the same

part against you his family did at that time, yet the fact was he took no part at all; but as you had been elected by his constituents he considered you as then standing in a very different position as regarded him to that in which you stood as candidate; that you were then his colleague and as such he felt you entitled to any support or assistance (I cannot state which word was used) he could fairly give you. I do not say he undertook in terms to *vote* for you.

. . . He stated his desire that I should inform you of his sentiments and I did so accordingly on the same day.

My advice is that you should write me a different letter from the one I received yesterday commenting on the extract of the speech⁴ I send you now and substituting what I state now for what has been attributed to you, and I will communicate the contents of your answer as you may direct.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1 See letter 1593, note 2.

2 Sir Edward O'Brien, fourth baronet.

3 The case for O'Connell's taking his seat in parliament without subscribing to the oaths objectionable to Catholics.

4 See letter 1593.

1596

From Lord Duncannon

Bessborough, 4 August [1829]

Private

Dear Sir,

The very dangerous illness of Lady Duncannon after her confinement has made it impossible for me to attend to any business for the last week which must be my apology to you for not sooner having written. I hope she is now going on well. I assure you there is no one who is more sincerely rejoiced than I am at your triumph.¹ I have indeed never had a doubt on the subject, as any other result to the measure of the last session of Parliament would have disgraced this country, who must ever look to you as having mainly contributed to the great measure of Catholic Emancipation.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 O'Connell was re-elected unopposed for Clare on 30 July 1829 (*DEP*, 1 Aug. 1829).

1597

To Bishop Doyle, Old Derry, Carlow

Limerick, 6 August 1829

My Lord,

Since my return for Clare I have begun to write a species of circular to the Catholic prelates tendering my parliamentary services. I am unaffectedly anxious to be useful but I want information and assistance. From you in particular I expect both. Parnell and Rice are certainly friends but I have long been of opinion that Catholic interests would never be effectually served in parliament until they were represented by a Catholic man of business, sincere at least in his religious professions.

The present state of the Catholic Church in Ireland demands, I humbly conceive, great attention. Things cannot possibly remain as they are. I do not foresee anything of a retrograde nature, and therefore I look solely to her advance. Whilst the Catholic religion was persecuted it crept along as well as it was able. It was afterwards in Ireland in the species of neutral state called toleration and then it has worked itself into its present state of half-starved existence. It is now liberated and to a certain extent free. It seems to me that the time has arrived to commence a plan for its 'dotation'. Its endowment would not be difficult if the Irish people were rich, and although they are '*made to be poor*', yet I think that by the aid of persevering courage such arrangements may be made as to afford a prospect of having glebes and glebe houses for the Catholic clergy in every parish in Ireland.¹ This is a favourite plan of mine and, if I get the aid of the Catholic prelates I am determined to effectuate it—God willing—before many years pass away. Should I get the assistance of your powerful mind I would expect to overcome many difficulties and to smooth the way to that success which I perhaps fondly but very distinctly anticipate. If the Catholic clergy had glebes and houses their other revenues would enable them to promote education, the building of schools and churches, etc. They could then make up a 'seminary rent' so that there may be a seminary in each diocese sufficient for its wants whilst a visit to Maynooth for one or two years might close the course. Again, Ireland seems to me to be the most proper

nursery for missionary priests. Irish priests are *in demand* all over the Christian world and in my day-dreams I revise the brighter period of Irish history when Erin was the hotbed of saints and Science.

With your rigid and philosophic mind chastened by the higher order of your contemplations you will smile perhaps mournfully at my enthusiasm and look upon it as but a source of barren speculation but recollect that enthusiasm is the *only* parent of great success.

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

1 This plan was never realized.

1598

To Pierce Mahony, Merrion Square

Limerick, 10 August 1829

My dear Pierce,

. . . I have for the present only to add the expression of my surprise that you still contrive to think that there is something which I ought to respect in the Duke of Wellington's administration. How can you, my excellent friend, think so? You, who have so clear, so fair an intellect, how can you disguise from yourself that the present administration is doing the *dirty work* of the Cumberland party so that 'the Cumberlanders' have all the advantage of being in power without any of the discredit of the measures pursued. Mark—Lefroy¹ is sent to the North as judge—Sacred Heaven! At this moment the furious partisan Lefroy is sent to the North as an indifferent and impartial judge between Catholics and Orangemen. Then young Saurin—the son of the other advocate of rebellion in case the Catholic question should be carried, gets an offer of £1,700 per annum.² Again, Ellis of Newry is still a yeoman officer³—but at the other side what have they done in the spirit of Emancipation? What one friend to liberality have they encouraged? Why, for example, did they not give you the office Saurin has got—why? Because you were of the class of most prominent liberal Protestants and were as opposed to Orangeism as I was. No, my dear Mahony, do not deceive yourself. The Duke of Wellington is a narrow-minded, *single idead* [*sic*] man, fit to be a great general with the aid of exceedingly brave troops but he is not a statesman nor a liberal nor an enlightened man. He has not one single trait of a really

great mind. Besides they are driving the country to actual insurrection by their stupid perseverance in the currency measure.⁴ Thus on the one hand, grinding all the nation to powder by the burden of taxation in a highly valuable currency and, on the other hand, promoting, rewarding, fostering every Orange enemy of theirs and of the country. What poor, what pitiful policy!

It is in vain for you to flatter yourself with the hope that this administration will ever do any good. They must be turned out neck and heels. Who are to succeed them? Why, of course, 'the Cumberlanders'! What a set! Let them take the reins. That would be better much. They would do something for the country just to show that they were not as bad as they were supposed to be, precisely as the present Administration patronize the Orangemen just to show that they are not as liberal as they are accused of being. . . .

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 Sergeant Thomas Langlois Lefroy left Dublin on 3 August to act as judge on the north-east circuit in place of Baron James McClelland who was indisposed.
- 2 Mark Saurin, son of William Saurin, had just been appointed solicitor to the excise in Ireland (*DEM*, 5 Aug. 1829).
- 3 John Ellis, lieutenant in yeomanry, had been engaged in a fracas on 12 July in Newry. The yeomanry were indicted for participating in an Orange procession. The case came before the Newry petit sessions on 18 July where the decision was made to bring informations against Mr. Ellis at the next assizes.
- 4 See letter 1546, note 8.

1599

To Pierce Mahony, Merrion Square

Limerick, 10 August 1829 [The second letter of this date. It is dated 11 August by O'Connell on the outside.]

My dear Mahony,

. . . The letter you sent me of Mr. Donogh O'Brien is an exceedingly uncivil one.¹ He accuses me of 'selfish purposes'. I submit to his accusation cheerfully and without retorting on the writer, simply because I do not feel its truth.

With respect to any hostility of mine to the 'House of Dromoland',² the writer ought to have known that I entertained none, but as to their hostility to me, I neither seek it nor deprecate it.

I did not assail their political conduct until, on my arrival in Clare, I found their law agent, Mr. Charles Studdert,³ had been employed to oppose the registry of the freeholders.⁴ I thus found that they had taken their hostile and, I think, very foolish position against me and it became my right as well as my duty to oppose them. A popular representative carrying the Disfranchisement Act into vigorous execution is to me an object of great distaste.

Such was the origin of my attack. I however am not a duellist, and nothing upon earth would induce me to entertain the crime of 'the point of honour'. I do not care how I may be vilified, aye and despised, for this determination. It is fixed. But I am only the more ready on that account to give the most ample satisfaction to any person whom I may have *untruly* assailed. I am most anxious to retract any error I may have fallen into.

Accordingly I retract so much of the report as made me say that Mr. Lucius O'Brien had opposed me at the former election.⁵ I fell into this mistake because of the violent opposition given to me at that election by the rest of his family. This mistake is partly mine and, in some slight degree, that of the reporter. There is another error. It is this. I did not state his declaration of neutrality made to you with respect to that election. The one was an error of commission, the other an error of omission. They were both perfectly unintentional. I am ready to disavow them in any manner he chooses.

There remain two other things in that report⁶ which I cannot retract or disavow simply because they are true.

The first is—I asserted by way of interrogatory '*that Mr. Lucius O'Brien had done nothing for Clare*'. I must on all proper occasions repeat that assertion until somebody points out to me or until I can otherwise discover its untruth. What has he done for Clare? Oh, Mr. Donogh O'Brien says he supported the Catholic claims. I admit it. I admit his sincerity and his zeal. I never directly or indirectly denied them but my assertion was one respecting acts, not intentions. I know he intended to do something for Clare in that respect. But did *he* do it? Certainly not. It was not *our friends* in

parliament that *did the thing*. It was the Catholics themselves that *forced* the measure on our enemies. I therefore still deny that Mr. Lucius O'Brien *did* anything for the County of Clare.

What jobbing did he expose? What grievance did he abolish? What tax did he oppose? What local or general advantage did he promote? If I could give a favourable answer to any of these questions I would do so readily.

The second accusation I made against him was the violation of his pledge to support me as his colleague.⁷

I cannot possibly retract this charge because it is perfectly true.

He spoke to you, my agent. After making a declaration of his neutrality at the late election (which by the by puts his offer of support in a stronger point of view than I had put it), he went on to say that 'I was then his colleague and that he felt me entitled to all the support or assistance he could fairly give.'

There never was a more distinct pledge. It could have but one meaning, and he understood it so for, first, he asked me to give him notice when I was to go down to endeavour to take my seat.

Secondly, he got such notice, and thanked me in the House itself during the debate for having given it.

Thirdly, he so thanked me *after* he had in his possession for some days my printed statement of my case and claim.

And lastly, he walked away afterwards without voting and gave me no support or assistance whatsoever.

There never was a pledge more distinctly violated.

As to the 'youthful temperament' of which Mr. Donogh O'Brien speaks, it is an odd thing enough. I felt little from its attacks whilst I was myself a duellist. I am glad that I am punished by many an assault of it since I ceased to commit or approach that crime. Indeed since that period many men are extremely violent in their language to me who are tameness and submission personified towards others.

I beg you will communicate this my reply as you have transmitted his uncivil letter. . . . I cannot retract the truth or express any regret for having opposed those who support the present administration and would diminish the miserable remnant of the elective franchise.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

1 See letter 1593.

- 2 The seat of Sir Edward O'Brien, father of Lucius O'Brien, M.P., and of William Smith O'Brien, M.P., the future leader of the Young Irelanders.
- 3 Attorney, a native of Co. Clare; Camden Street, Dublin.
- 4 A new registry of freeholders was held following the recent raising of the franchise qualification on the abolition of the forty-shilling franchise. The claims of persons seeking to register as electors were judged by an assistant barrister presiding over the registry court. It was usual for political groups to hire legal counsel to contest the registering of political opponents. From O'Connell's letter it appears that the O'Briens had taken steps to have the qualifications of the claimants closely scrutinized.
- 5 See letter 1593, note 2.
- 6 See letter 1593, note 2.
- 7 That is, to support O'Connell's attempt to take his seat.

1600

From Rev. John Spratt, O.C.C.,¹ Guardian, Carmelite Fathers, 57 Aungier Street, Dublin, 10 August 1829, to care of John Hacket Esq., Main Street, Clonmel, to be forwarded immediately

Reminding O'Connell of his promise to himself and Rev. Mr. W. L'Estrange to preside at a public dinner in aid of St. Peter's Orphan Society.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Spratt (1796-1871), born in Cork Street, Dublin; entered Calced Carmelite order, 1816; educated for priesthood in Spain; ordained, 1820; prior of Whitefriar Street, Dublin, 1823-29; provincial, Irish Carmelites, 1863. Active in establishing many charitable institutions. See *Boase*.

1601

To Pierce Mahony, Merrion Square

Limerick, 11 August 1829

My dear Pierce,

You have my reply to Mr. Donogh O'Brien under two other covers. Keep a copy of it for me and get back the original after he has read it.

I will write tomorrow to James Sugrue to hand you the amount of Devereux's protest for the Provincial Bank. But you

must get them instantly to sue Devereux for the amount without its being known that I take any interest in that action. Devereux, if arrested, would, I presume, pay and it is a kind of swindling to enable others to raise money on acceptances which they have no notion of taking up.¹ As to poor Lawless, there is not the least use in suing him.² But I rely on you to get the money levied from Devereux if it be possible but, of all things, not to have it supposed that I am the person to sue him.

You have got a most unfortunate jury for the Paget cause.³ Kift⁴ was quite incompetent to assist you—simply because he has a respect for *partisans* tinged with his own principles. The worst jurymen on the list is William Coppinger who is brother to John's wife. He is of that scoundrel race called Orange Papists.

Find out for me whether the Solicitor-General⁵ goes to Clonmel.⁶ Let me have one line to say so, if the fact be so.

O'Gorman Mahon is going on with a most foolish canvass in the County of Clare but he gets no kind of countenance from the Catholic clergy.⁷ It is strange that a man in his circumstances should dream of such a thing but he is so eaten up with inordinate vanity! I am sincerely sorry for him. I hope your native air and regular hours agree with you. Present my very sincere regards to Mrs. M.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 This matter has not been identified.
- 2 Nothing is known of John (Jack) Lawless in this context.
- 3 See letter 1602, note 3.
- 4 Probably John Thomas Kift, attorney, 40 Marlborough Street, Dublin.
- 5 John Doherty.
- 6 The solicitor-general attended the Clonmel assizes in connection with the trial of a number of policemen for having fired on crowds at Borrisokane on 26 and 28 June allegedly without sufficient cause, killing six persons (*DEP*, 30 June 1829). All the individuals charged were acquitted (see *DEP*, 22, 25, 27 Aug. 1829; Abraham Brewster, *A Report of Seven Trials at the Clonmel Summer Assizes of 1829, including those which arose out of the occurrences at Borrisokane ... [on] 26th and 28th of June 1829, Dublin 1830*).
- 7 O'Gorman Mahon was returned for Clare in the general election of 1830.

1602

To his wife, Derrynane

Cork, Friday [28 August 1829]

Darling Love,

. . . This day I am *afflicted*, *afflicted* at getting a letter from my sweet, sweet Kate¹ simply because you were too ill to write yourself. My own, own Mary does not at all understand how I love her. . . .

You will be surprised to hear that the assizes are over, actually over. Lady Byng's² case was *botched*.³ The Solicitor-General came down specially and a special bad hand he made of the case, allowed the opposite counsel to humbug him and then gave up the case upon a most miserable apology, after first admitting the absolute innocence of the *defendant*. I never was more indignant in my life but this comes of employing great geese. Darling, if your husband had the conducting of the cause it would have been otherwise. However, one thing is perfectly clear, that Gerald Callaghan⁴ has had a decided triumph. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 His daughter.
- 2 Lady Agnes Byng (née Paget; died 1845), fifth daughter of first marquess of Anglesey; married March 1829 George Stevens Byng, later second earl of Strafford.
- 3 The case of Capt. Byng and Lady Agnes Byng, otherwise *Paget v. Gerald Callaghan, M.P.* According to the *Dublin Evening Mail* the case aroused unusual interest both in Ireland and England (*DEM*, 31 Aug. 1829). O'Connell and John Doherty, solicitor-general, were engaged as counsel on behalf of Lady Byng. In the court Doherty agreed at the request of counsel for the defendant, Callaghan, to settle the case without proceeding further. O'Connell expressed his strong disapproval of Doherty's decision, declaring that in his opinion there was 'a great deal of humbug' in his procedure, and that '... we [the plaintiffs] are getting permission to make an apology for having brought the action' (*DEM*, 29, 31 Aug. 1829).
- 4 Gerard Callaghan (died 1833), Lotabeg, Cork, third son of Daniel Callaghan of Cork and brother of Daniel Callaghan (M.P. for Cork city, 1830-49). M.P. for Dundalk, 1818-20; Cork city, July 1829-March 1830.

1603

To his wife, Derrynane, 29 August 1829, from Cork

Only part of letter remaining. O'Connell expects to arrive at Derrynane on Thursday evening.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1604

To Isaac Lyon Goldsmid¹

Derrynane, 11 September 1829

My dear Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your kind congratulations on the event of the Clare Election.² I also gladly avail myself of this opportunity to offer you my very sincere thanks for the great kindness which my son and I received from you and your amiable family while we were in London. I assure you I should be most happy, if any event should induce you to visit 'the Green Isle', to show you my sense of your kindness in the best manner in my power. Ireland has claims on your ancient race as it is the only Christian community that I know of unsullied by any one act of persecution of the Jews.

I entirely agree with you on the principle of freedom of conscience, and no man can admit that sacred principle without extending it equally to the Jew as to the Christian. To my mind it is an eternal and universal truth that we are responsible to God alone for our religious belief and that human laws are impious when they attempt to control the exercise of those acts of individual or general devotion which such belief requires. I think not lightly of the awful responsibility of rejecting *true belief*, but that responsibility is entirely between man and his creator and any fellow being who usurps dominion over belief is to my mind a blasphemer against the deity as he certainly is a tyrant over his fellow creatures. With these sentiments you will find me the constant and active friend to every measure which tends to give the Jews an equality of civil rights with all other the King's subjects, a perfect unconditional equality. I think every day a day of injustice until that civil equality is attained by the Jews. Command my most

unequivocal and energetic exertions in parliament to do away with the legal forms and the laws which now ensnare or impede the conscientious Jew in seeking for those stations to which other subjects are entitled. I have not ability to offer you but I have zeal and activity.

Allow me at once to commence my office of your advocate and to begin by giving you advice. It is: not to postpone your claim of right beyond the second day of the ensuing session.³ Do not listen to those over cautious persons who may recommend postponement. Believe an agitator of some experience that nothing was ever obtained by delay—at least in politics—you must to a certain extent force your claims on the parliament. You cannot be worse, recollect, even by a failure and you ought to be better by the experiment. As far as you and your friends may entrust the measure to me, I will bring it forward in twenty different shapes if necessary to advance its success. Of course I wish your cause committed to more able and to infinitely more influential hands than mine. I only speak of myself to indicate the mode in which I think you ought to be served. Confided or not confided in, my course will be the same, that is, I will on every *practical* occasion struggle to extend the full effort and operation of the principle of freedom of conscience to all your people. In me they shall have a perfectly disinterested as well as a constant friend because I deem their present exclusion an injustice in which every legislator participates unless he actively resents its continuance.

You must I repeat *force* your question on the Parliament. You ought not to confide in English liberality. It is a plant not genial to the British soil. It must be *forced*. It requires a *hot-bed*. The English were always persecutors. Before the so styled reformation the English tortured the Jews and strung up in scores the Lollards. After that reformation they still roasted the Jews and hung the Papists. In Mary's days the English with their usual cruelty retaliated the tortures on the Protestants. After her short reign there were near two centuries of the most barbarous and unrelenting cruelty exercised towards the Catholics, a cruelty the more emaciating because it was sought to be justified by imputing to them tenets and opinions which they always rejected and abhorred. The Jews too suffered in the same way. I once more repeat. Do not confide in any liberality but that which you will yourself rouse into action and *compel* into operation.

After all you are the best judges of your own affairs and if

you deem my advice unwise, you will not the less receive every assistance from me in my poor power.

SOURCE : Goldsmid MSS

- 1 Isaac Lyon Goldsmid (1778-1859), a wealthy financier and philanthropist, and the political leader of British Jews at this time; active in the foundation of University College London; created baronet, 1841.
- 2 O'Connell had been returned unopposed for Clare on 30 July 1829.
- 3 Goldsmid was the inspirer of the bills of 1830 and 1833 in favour of Emancipation for Jews (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Goldsmid, Isaac Lyon'; also Lionel Abrahams, 'Sir I. L. Goldsmid and the Admission of the Jews of England to Parliament', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, IV [1903], 116-76, which has a reference to O'Connell's above letter).

1605

To the Knight of Kerry

Derrynane, 12 September 1829

My dear Knight,

I will certainly give you the *toties quoties* tenure you require of the lot we spoke of at Renard.¹ But I am quite ignorant of its value or of its boundaries. I will be at Cahirciveen on Wednesday next where if it be your perfect convenience to meet me we can conclude the matter. If you should not be able to come there send a messenger with a line to remind me of speaking to Mr. Primrose on the subject and I will send you by that messenger a regular contract executed by my son and by me.

I fear your estimate of the Duke of Wellington's power and intentions is likely to be entirely falsified. I confess it is not possible to entertain a worse opinion of any administration than I do of the present. They seem to me to be the mere tools of that most execrable of human beings—*quaere human*—the Duke of Cumberland.

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 See letter 1608.

1606

To Nicholas Maher, Thurles

Derrynane, 13 September 1829

My dear Maher,

I got your letter so late that I fear my reply will not reach you before the dinner¹ to Mr. Otway Cave² has been actually given. I regret extremely that the shortness of the notice prevents me from being able to pay him that compliment which I am quite certain he merits. I think I know him well, and I am convinced the House of Commons does not contain a man of more pure, honourable and patriotic mind. He is one of the most unaffectedly honest public men in the British dominions; and I trust that I shall live to see him, and that shortly, fill the station of representative of your county,³ a county which has been so long misrepresented by scions of a very worthless aristocracy. Indeed, my indignation against the great men of your county is at this moment at its height because I learn from the newspapers that they are so totally regardless of constitutional feeling and common humanity as to seek to have the infamous measure of the Insurrection Act introduced.⁴ But their vile speculation will, I trust, be disappointed by the firmness of the Government and the better sense of Parliament.⁵ The people, too, should be thoroughly aware that the way to defeat their enemies is to observe the law, to avoid all riots and outrages and not strengthen the hands of their enemies by committing crimes. Crimes must and will be punished. The crimes against the people are for the present less likely to meet punishment.

But the scenes that are gone by will never be repeated, and the people will themselves learn that the way to triumph over their malignant enemies is to abstain from secret societies, illegal oaths and Whiteboy⁶ outrages. If Mr. Otway Cave were the representative of your county he would cause the magistracy to be purged or he would at least expose the delinquencies which the improper part of them may commit. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell, *Bianconi*, pp. 223-4

1 Held at Boyton's Hotel, Clonmel on 15 September 1829 (*DEP*, 22 Sept. 1829).

2 Robert Otway Cave (c. 1791-1844), Castle Otway, Co. Tipperary, and Stanford Hall, Leicestershire; eldest son of Henry Otway and Sarah

(Otway-Cave), Baroness Braye; M.P. for Leicester borough, 1826-30; Co. Tipperary, 1835-44. Married 1833 Sophia, elder daughter of Sir Francis Burdett, fifth baronet.

- 3 Tipperary.
- 4 At a meeting of the Tipperary magistrates in Thurles on 7 September, 1829 it was resolved to petition the government to renew the Insurrection Act in view of the extraordinarily disturbed state of that county. According to the *Dublin Evening Post*, about one third of the magistracy of the county, including several Catholics, were present at this meeting (*DEP*, 12 Sept. 1829). There were many dissentients from its resolutions (*DEP*, 15 Sept. 1829).
- 5 No renewal of the Insurrection Act appears to have taken place in 1829 or 1830.
- 6 A form of agrarian secret society.

1606a

From William James Macneven

New York, 19 September 1829

Sir,

The dignity of the right Rev. Bishop Dubois¹ as well as your own renders it fit that he should not pass through Ireland without your becoming known to each other. He in one capacity is the friend and benefactor of your countrymen in the extensive diocese of New York while you are labouring with so much success to ameliorate their condition in their native homes.

I also beg leave on this occasion to acquaint you that it became my official and pleasing duty to transmit to you last Spring an address from the friends of Ireland here which we hope you have received, and in like manner a petition from the people of Canada² to the British parliament in favour of Catholic emancipation, fortified by an immense number of the most respectable signatures. Those documents were received in Liverpool.

I heartily congratulate you on your triumph in Clare,³ and rejoice, in common with every friend of Ireland and liberty on this continent, that you propose to take up the great question, the only great question for Ireland, the one that lies at the root of all her prosperity, the repeal of the Union: supposing of course a corresponding organization of the new Irish parliament on the basis of population, an extensive suffrage and

voting by ballot. *Nil desperandum*. Your ceaseless efforts, your prudence, time and opportunity will effect it all, and I trust our good Bishop will pray for your success.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 15473.

- 1 John Dubois (1764-1842), a refugee from the French Revolution; bishop of New York from 1826. He visited Rome and Paris in 1829 to raise funds for the establishment of a seminary. See *Cath. Encycl.*
- 2 This petition was not presented, probably because it arrived too late.
- 3 His unopposed return for Clare on 30 July 1829.

1607

To Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, P.P., Carhen, Cahirciveen

Derrynane [Date uncertain.¹ Perhaps 21 September 1829.]

Copy

My respected friend,

I am anxious to see you for two or three reasons which would require your presence here. First, I want to come to a definite arrangement with Mr. Teahan to give up the portion of the parish² beyond the mountain. I wish you to be the person to close that arrangement. Indeed I cannot well do it without your assistance.

In the second place, my youngest son³ is now in the habit of going of himself every week to Confession and I would be glad he made his first Communion. . . . I should be glad you conversed with him for half an hour before I allowed him to make his first Communion.

And thirdly, I should like to give you a document signed by me and my son⁴ to secure that you should be repaid all your expenditures at Carhen as it is my intention to demand no part of that farm until I realize my favourite object of establishing the grand part of the town there. If you could come and spend a couple of days with me for these purposes you would very much oblige me.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 The copy is attested as genuine by M. I. Fitzgerald, Cahirciveen, who describes the recipient as 'my uncle, Father Ned'. The date on the copy is 21 February 1829, but O'Connell was in London then. Daniel, Jr., would probably have made his first Communion about 1829.

- 2 Parish of Kilcrohane (Cahirdaniel). The part 'beyond the mountain' is obviously Loher, the part north of Coomakista Pass. Loher is still of Kilcrohane parish.
- 3 Daniel, Jr.
- 4 Maurice.

1608

To the Knight of Kerry

Derrynane, 24 September 1829

My dear Sir,

If you have as I very sincerely desire such an account of your family in London as would enable you to attend to trifles [*sic*] you will very much oblige me by ascertaining for me how I am to get my parliamentary papers. I am anxious to be reading them whilst I have a little leisure.

Mr. Primrose and the Rev. Mr. Day¹ will see the lot at Reenard² you desire to have and will put a value on it which if you deem it reasonable will secure your tenants a *toties quoties* tenure. I make no doubt indeed that the rent will be what you yourself would say it ought to be.

I wish you could give me any *evidence of the ministers'* intentions to do good in Ireland. All I want from the Government is to give the Emancipation Act its natural effect.

You are aware that the decided countenance given to the Orange faction prevents Emancipation from coming into play. There is more of unjust and unnatural virulence towards the Catholics in the present administration than existed even before the passing of the Emancipation Bill.

Before that event the Irish Government was shamed by a sense of the decency which is required from public hostility. The Relief Bill has just enabled them to act with distrust—immediate and personal rancour on the one hand, and with open and unblushing favouritism on the other. The three next Judges are to be Joy, Leslie Foster and Sergeant Lefroy unless the Solicitor-General has earned a preference by his candour at Clonmel.³ What a prospect for another generation of the Irish people!

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

- 1 Possibly Rev. John Godfrey Day (1801-1879), a cousin of the Knight of Kerry. See *Boase*.

² See letter 1480.

³ At the trial of the Borrisokane policemen (see letter 1601, note 6), the solicitor-general, John Doherty, made it clear in his opening speech to the jury that his sympathies in the case lay with the police (*DEP*, 22 Aug. 1829).

1609

*From Robert Vicars*¹

Coolbanagher Glebe, Emo [Queen's Co.], 25 September 1829

Dear Sir,

. . . Though every liberal person in the Empire must admire the principle which induced you to confer a lasting obligation on the Presbyterians,² and though the immense majority of Irishmen regard you with affection as the man who has raised them from the dust, yet I believe you are aware you are in no favour with that class of men, some of whom occupy seats in Parliament, who are often called in contempt 'the Saints' but who call themselves Evangelicals. Perhaps, with some few honourable exceptions, they may be called with as much propriety, bigots and hypocrites. . . . Nothing would mortify these men so much as that you should succeed in procuring for the Jews the rights of citizens. . . . No doubt the Saints will expect that the interests of this afflicted race should be left in their hands exclusively because, for twenty years, they have laboured hard for its conversion to Christianity; but it never occurred to their narrow minds that their flatteries and bribes and tracts were all received by the Jews as insults, and that their proselytizing societies were actually impeding the work of conversion. . . .

You may now see the principal objects of this letter, which are to suggest to you that no time should be lost after the meeting of Parliament in taking the Jews out of the hands of the Saints, and to submit to you that it would be wise for you to commence your exertions in Parliament by introducing a bill in favour of the Jews.³ For obvious reasons I avoid any public discussion on these subjects.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

¹ Rev. Robert Vicars (c. 1759-1829), rector of Coolbanagher.

² A reference to O'Connell's support for the abolition of the Test Act in 1828.

- 3 O'Connell supported the bill for removing Jewish disabilities introduced by Robert Grant on 5 April 1830. The bill was lost on the second reading by 228 to 165 (*Annual Register*, 1830, pp. 109-15).

1610

From Thomas Spring Rice

Mount Trenchard [Co. Limerick], 28 September 1829

My dear O'Connell,

. . . Direct Mitchell (of the Vote Office) to send you also the Lords Report on the China Trade.¹ It was communicated to the Commons some years back. I am delighted to think you are directing your great powers to that subject. Important as it is in general principles few matters are more likely to advance Irish interests than an opening of markets which will give an extension of demand for manufactures and an increased supply of colonial and tropical luxuries. What a happy dispensation of nature it is that no Saxon loom can ply at Manchester without tending to promote Irish industry. Their very horses must feed on our *trans-substantiated* oats.

Be assured of one thing that the gentle [?] enemy the D[uke] of W[ellingto]n has in his Royal Highness of Cumberland. He will leave no stone unturned to compass his undoing but I believe that King Arthur and King George are now on good terms.

SOURCE : Monteagle Papers, NLI 549

- 1 *Report by the Lords Select Committee appointed to inquire into the means of extending and securing the Foreign Trade of the Country . . .*, H.C., 1821 (476) VII, 1; *Second Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider of the means of maintaining and improving the Foreign Trade of the Country*, H.C., 1821 (535), VI, 187; *Third Report . . .*, H.C., 1821 (746), VI, 191.

1611

To his wife, Derrynane

Cork, 30 September [and 1 October] 1829

My own darling Love,

You will be glad to hear that I had a great day's hunt

yesterday. I never saw better hunting in my life. Lyne¹ and I reached Kenmare a good deal fatigued but I got a warm and good bed and slept till six this morning when James and I started for Glenflesk. . . .

1st October

. . . I rise this early, just after six to write to my sweetest darling love. Never, dearest Mary, was any woman so loved as you are. Indeed, my own heart's darling, you deserve it, for there never yet was so sweet a little woman. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Con Lyne, B.L.

1612

To his wife, Derrynane

New Ross, 2 October 1829

My darling Love,

I take my chance of this letter reaching you sooner than one from Dublin, and as there is half an hour's delay here I readily employ the time in the manner most agreeable to me, that is, in writing to you, my own sweetest love. The dinner to Lord Duncannon went off very well.¹ There was a large party and we had great speaking. O'Gorman was there twice as large as ever. He is really becoming a perfect show.² . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The dinner took place in Carrick-on-Suir on 1 October 1829, Thomas Edward Lawlor Gregg presiding (*FJ*, 5 Oct. 1829; *DEP*, 10 Oct. 1829).
- 2 Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman, who spoke mainly on the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders (*FJ*, 5 Oct., *DEP*, 10 Oct. 1829).

1613

To his wife, Derrynane, 3 October 1829, from Wicklow

Short letter describing his Fitz-Simon grandchildren.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1614

To James Sugrue

Derrynane, 13 October 1829

My dear James,

. . . You may be quite sure that I will be in Dublin as soon as I possibly can. But my brother James is laid up with a sad accident. We were coming from his house to Cahirciveen in the mail cart when, as we were going along the Drung Hill road, one horse stumbled and broke the pole, and then both horses started off at full speed along the precipice. There is no sufficient guard wall, and we might have gone down several hundred feet in a few minutes. The driver roared to us to jump out, which we foolishly did as the car was going at full speed. I fell on my shoulders and back of my head but came off with some sound bruises and the stunning of a few seconds. As to James, he came on his right arm and broke it between the shoulder and elbow. I sent off for surgeons in two directions, cut up a shirt into bandages and had splints made before Dr. Barry¹ arrived. He at once set the bone. This is the fourth day and, thank God, James is going on as well as possible.

You may rely, however, on my being in Dublin as speedily as possible.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 79-80

1 Dr. James Barry, Cahirciveen.

1615

*From Richard Harold,¹ Limerick, 14 October 1829, to
Merrion Square*

Asks O'Connell to assist Thomas Spring Rice, M.P. to present a petition to parliament concerning the wrongs he has suffered from the Limerick Navigation Company.²

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Of Russell Place, Limerick.

2 The petition does not appear to have been presented.

1616

From Con Lyne

Mardike [Cork], 26 October 1829

My dear Dan,

. . . I did not receive your letter till today and not doing so gave me some alarm lest you had not escaped from the accident you had met with.¹ . . . Yesterday the special Commission proceeded with the trial of four unfortunate men and a capital conviction was the verdict.² . . .

Doherty's speech (three hours) was admirably arranged and much liked by the country gentlemen. The four informers³ were formidable villains and required the master hand of the bold *Dan* to demolish them.⁴ They were an overmatch for F. McCarthy⁵ and Pigott⁶ and the men are to be executed on Monday week. . . .

One thing is certain as to a *Release*. None had been or could be given so I agree with you entirely as to the short and pithy argument in your letter. . . .

I shall read part of your letter tomorrow on the way to Lord Kingston.⁷ Lord Mountcashel had much the best of it with the bishops.⁸ . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 1614.

2 This letter concerns the famous 'Doneraile Conspiracy'. It was charged that the peasantry around Doneraile, Co. Cork, were involved in a conspiracy against the landlords of the district. It was stated by four persons that they had witnessed a meeting of a committee of the conspirators at the fair of Rathclare in the course of which a paper was signed decreeing that three local landlords, George Bond Low, Michael Creagh and Henry Evans, should be shot. On 23 October four alleged members of this committee, John Leary, James Roche, James Magrath and William Shine, were in consequence sentenced to death in Cork (for an account of their trial see *DEP*, 27 Oct. 1829).

3 David Sheehan, William Nowlan, Patrick Daily and Owen Daily who were the chief witnesses for the prosecution.

4 On 26 October four others of the alleged Doneraile conspirators, Edmond Connors, Patrick Lynch, Michael Wallis and Timothy Barrett, were brought to trial. O'Connell had meanwhile been called by special express from Derrynane, and having travelled all night, arrived dramatically in the court just as proceedings were

getting under way. His cross examination of the witnesses for the prosecution revealed so clearly the contradictory nature of their evidence that the jury failed to reach a verdict in the case and had to be discharged (*DEP*, 29 Oct. 1829). Fifteen other prisoners who were tried on the same charge on 28 and 29 October were defended by O'Connell and acquitted (*DEP*, 31 Oct. 1829). A romanticized account of the episode is to be found in Canon Patrick A. Sheehan, *Glenanaar: A Story of Irish Life* (Dublin 1905).

5 Francis McCarthy.

6 David Richard Pigot (1797-1873), son of Dr. John Pigot, a physician at Kilworth, Co. Cork. Educated at Fermoy and Trinity College, Dublin. Called to the bar, 1826; K.C., 1835. Solicitor-general, 1839-40; attorney-general, 1840-41; chief baron of the exchequer, 1846-73. M.P. for Clonmel, 1839-46.

7 George (King), third earl of Kingston (1771-1839). Created 1821 Baron Kingston (U.K.).

8 A reference to what proved to be only the beginning of a very long controversy conducted in the public press between Lord Mountcashell and Thomas Elrington, Protestant bishop of Ferns and Leighlin. Mountcashell had presided at a meeting in Cork on 17 September 1829 of several influential Protestants, including the sheriff of the city, in the course of which he called for the reform of a wide variety of abuses which he claimed to exist in the Established churches of England and Ireland (*DEP*, 22, 29 Sept. 1829). The meeting appears to have created considerable stir in England as well as Ireland (*DEP*, 22, 29 Sept., 1 Oct. 1829) and led to Elrington's joining issue with Mountcashell in a series of letters to the press in which he sought to defend the Established church from the charges levelled at the Cork meeting. (For full details of this controversy, see *A Review of the Correspondence between the Earl of Mountcashell and the Bishop of Ferns, together with the Letters and the Report of Lord Mountcashell's Speech at the Meeting Held in Cork* . . . [Dublin 1830].)

1617

From George Ensor to O'Connell and Richard Barrett

Address [Loughall, Co. Armagh], 10 November 1829

Gentlemen,

I this morning received the circular headed 'Irish Volunteers' relative to a proposed dinner¹ to celebrate their achievement of national independence in 1782. Perhaps at this distance of time it is idle to lament that the Volunteers did not use their power to the full extent of the wants of Ireland. Yet,

considering what we were by what we are, to repine that all was not done by them that the occasion required would be ungrateful and might be misconstrued into indifference or indisposition! . . . The Union must be ended if Ireland is to be relieved. The projects of the day for serving the country are the fopperies of uneasy benevolence or mere dotage. . .

Should I be in Dublin I shall certainly attend the proposed dinner and, if I could be of any service here or elsewhere to end the Union, I shall be present.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

1 Unidentified.

1618

From Walter Berwick,¹ 9 Lr. Fitzwilliam St., Dublin, 15 November 1829

Enthusiastically accepting invitation to the Irish Volunteers anniversary dinner.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Walter Berwick (c. 1801-68), 9 Lower Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin; son of Rev. Edward Berwick, rector of Esker, Lucan, Co. Dublin. Assistant barrister, Co. Waterford, 1835-47; Co. Cork, 1847-59. Justice of bankruptcy court, 1859-68. See *Boase*.

1619

From Hon. Pierce Butler to O'Connell and Richard Barrett

Ballyconra, 15 November 1829

Gentlemen,

The melancholy task of answering all communications addressed to my brother, Lord Kilkenny,¹ having devolved on me for many years past, I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt this day of your intimation to him.

. . . I cannot comprehend the object of holding a public dinner to celebrate the virtues of the Irish Volunteers of 1782.

Should, however, a crisis arise anything similar to what occasioned the embodying of the Volunteers of 1782 . . . I should be one of the first on parade.

Alas, the Act of Union and the disfranchisement of her nobility and her people have left Ireland only one integral

part of the constitution to defend, namely, the Throne of our gracious and beloved sovereign. . . .

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Edmund (Butler), twelfth Viscount Mountgarret (1771-1846), Ballyconra, Ballyragget, Co. Kilkenny. Created 1793 earl of Kilkenny; insane since 1799. The earldom became extinct in 1846.

1620

From Edward Berwick,¹ c. 16 November 1829

Acknowledges communication and says he will co-operate with every effort to honour the Volunteers of 1782.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Edward Berwick (died 7 March 1877); called to the bar, 1832; president of Queen's College, Galway, 1845-77. See *Boase*.

1621

*From William Cole Faulkner,¹ 47 Lr. Gardiner Street,
Dublin, 29 November 1829, to Merrion Square*

Seeks loan of £200 from O'Connell or the Catholic Association because, as a Catholic, he is being persecuted by his Presbyterian relatives.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Perhaps William Cole Faulkner (born 1774), a native of Co. Tyrone. Entered Trinity College, Dublin, 1793.

1622

*From Rev. Charles Stuart,¹ Chapel House, John St.,
15 December 1829*

Invites O'Connell to become president of the committee of St. Patrick's asylum.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Prior, Augustinian fathers, John Street, Dublin. St. Patrick's was a home for old men in Rainsford Street, Dublin.

considering what we were by what we are, to repine that all was not done by them that the occasion required would be ungrateful and might be misconstrued into indifference or indisposition! . . . The Union must be ended if Ireland is to be relieved. The projects of the day for serving the country are the fopperies of uneasy benevolence or mere dotage. . . .

Should I be in Dublin I shall certainly attend the proposed dinner and, if I could be of any service here or elsewhere to end the Union, I shall be present.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

1 Unidentified.

1618

From Walter Berwick,¹ 9 Lr. Fitzwilliam St., Dublin, 15 November 1829

Enthusiastically accepting invitation to the Irish Volunteers anniversary dinner.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Walter Berwick (c. 1801-68), 9 Lower Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin; son of Rev. Edward Berwick, rector of Esker, Lucan, Co. Dublin. Assistant barrister, Co. Waterford, 1835-47; Co. Cork, 1847-59. Justice of bankruptcy court, 1859-68. See *Boase*.

1619

From Hon. Pierce Butler to O'Connell and Richard Barrett
Ballyconra, 15 November 1829

Gentlemen,

The melancholy task of answering all communications addressed to my brother, Lord Kilkenny,¹ having devolved on me for many years past, I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt this day of your intimation to him.

. . . I cannot comprehend the object of holding a public dinner to celebrate the virtues of the Irish Volunteers of 1782.

Should, however, a crisis arise anything similar to what occasioned the embodying of the Volunteers of 1782 . . . I should be one of the first on parade.

Alas, the Act of Union and the disfranchisement of her nobility and her people have left Ireland only one integral

part of the constitution to defend, namely, the Throne of our gracious and beloved sovereign. . . .

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Edmund (Butler), twelfth Viscount Mountgarret (1771-1846), Ballyconra, Ballyragget, Co. Kilkenny. Created 1793 earl of Kilkenny; insane since 1799. The earldom became extinct in 1846.

1620

From Edward Berwick,¹ c. 16 November 1829

Acknowledges communication and says he will co-operate with every effort to honour the Volunteers of 1782.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5241

- 1 Edward Berwick (died 7 March 1877); called to the bar, 1832; president of Queen's College, Galway, 1845-77. See *Boase*.

1621

From William Cole Faulkner,¹ 47 Lr. Gardiner Street, Dublin, 29 November 1829, to Merrion Square

Seeks loan of £200 from O'Connell or the Catholic Association because, as a Catholic, he is being persecuted by his Presbyterian relatives.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Perhaps William Cole Faulkner (born 1774), a native of Co. Tyrone. Entered Trinity College, Dublin, 1793.

1622

From Rev. Charles Stuart,¹ Chapel House, John St., 15 December 1829

Invites O'Connell to become president of the committee of St. Patrick's asylum.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Prior, Augustinian fathers, John Street, Dublin. St. Patrick's was a home for old men in Rainsford Street, Dublin.

1623

From Rev. John Sheehan to Dublin

Waterford, 20 December 1829

My Dear Friend,

I am sorry to be obliged to inform you that P. G. Barron¹ has bolted out of the election course.² The influence of his Biblical wife has proved too strong for the combined efforts of all the independents in this County. Never was man by his own act more degraded than he is now. He of himself declared that if called upon by the County he would be the candidate and this offer on his part gave birth to the requisition.³ His wife and Biblical party which he entertained on the day after my Corporators⁴ and myself succeeded in calling him forth, put an extinguished [*sic*] on all our plans with him. But perhaps it is all for the better. Hag-ridden as he is, we should be exposed at every step to what he may be pleased to consider a violation of the conditions upon which he came forward and we would thus constrained never be able to evoke that spirit which always achieves the liberty of nations. . . . We have another Barron who will stand if supported. His name is John.⁵ He is an officer in the 17th Lancers now stationed in Dublin, and although the brother of Henry,⁶ no man can be found more vehement in his condemnation of the proposed union with the Beresfords.⁷ A meeting takes place today at Duckspool.⁸ John Barron attends on the occasion and I trust that no obstacle will be thrown in the way of the young man who now comes forward to vindicate the independence of his native County.⁹ I enclose you a letter from our Bishop-Elect¹⁰ on the business which I request you will transmit to me at the earliest possible period. I enclose it for the purpose of showing you how the head of our Church feels on this business. Some of our own body have expressed an intention of crushing the political influence of the priests, but we, who know that without morality and religion there cannot be any liberty long in any country, are determined to exercise our just and legitimate influence with the people. . . . I see it is intended to reestablish the ascendancy of the old families upon your destruction. But I say to you that the country is at your back and let your motto be '*Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito.*' Yet a little while and those miserable wretches who fawn upon you in public

but strive to stab you in private will be held up to public execration. What is Sheil about? I am told that he has succeeded in getting a Chief Constableness for N. Whyte,¹¹ and that a brother¹² of said Whyte's who lives in this county is forthwith to be promoted to a barrack mastership in England. You see how those Beresfords for their own flagitious purposes quarter their minions not upon their own estates but upon the hard earnings of the people. If Sheil come here for the Beresfords, I trust in God that our election will take place before that of Louth,¹³ and then I think you will see an address from the priests of Waterford to the priests of Louth to reject the claims of a man who roused the 40s. freeholders against the landlords, and who when Emancipation is gained by their insurrection, joins those Beresfords whilst visiting the dupes of his fallacious promises with their direst vengeance. I warrant you I have something in store for Master Richard. Until the new candidate is announced it would not be right to say anything of P. George Barron. Wm. Winston Barron¹⁴ was present when the conversation¹⁵ referred to by Mr. McDermott¹⁶ took place. I met him this day and he assured me that Mr. Blount gave him full liberty to make Mahony's communication¹⁷ as public as possible. Yet what has Mahony written? Is Prospero really a conjurer? The thing is most extraordinary and I shall be looking with the greatest possible anxiety to the denouement of the business.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Pierse George Barron (1793-1864), J.P., D.L., Carig Barron, Co. Waterford; son of John Barron, Ballydurne, Co. Waterford. Succeeded his father, 1797. Defeated candidate at the Dungarvan election, 1834. Married Katherine Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Cornelius Bolton, M.P., Faithlegge House, Co. Waterford. See *Boase*.
- 2 There is no evidence to show when Pierse George Barron agreed or was selected to stand for Co. Waterford, shortly to be vacant on the retirement of Stuart (see letter 1583 note 2). A meeting in Dungarvan on 7 October 1829, attended by O'Connell, had issued a request to Henry Winston Barron to stand (*DEP*, 13 Oct. 1829). Though Barron accepted the invitation (*DEP*, 17 Oct. 1829), he subsequently withdrew. It must have been after this that Pierse George Barron was asked to stand. A few days after receiving the above letter from Sheehan, O'Connell published an appeal to the gentry and people of Co. Waterford to select a candidate (*DEP*, 29 Dec. 1829).
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 Unidentified.

- 5 John Barron (born c. 1797), third son of Pierse Barron, Ballyneale, Co. Waterford, Lieutenant, 17th Dragoons, 1826.
- 6 Henry Winston Barron (1795-1872), eldest son of Pierse Barron, Ballyneale, Co. Waterford; M.P. for Waterford city, 1832-47, 1848-52, county court judge), 1841-91. See *Boase*.
- 7 See letter 1583.
- 8 Home of John Mathew Galwey at Dungarvan, Co. Waterford.
- 9 John Barron was apparently selected at this meeting. However, in the Co. Waterford election which took place on 2 March 1830, he was defeated by Lord George Thomas Beresford by 461 votes to 319 (*DEP*, 4 Mar. 1830).
- 10 William Abraham (1792-1837), bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 1830-37.
- 11 Unidentified.
- 12 Unidentified.
- 13 That is, in the next general election.
- 14 William Winston Newell Barron, B.L. (1805-91), fourth son of Pierse Barron, Ballyneale House, Co. Waterford; assistant-barrister (later county court judge), 1841-91. See *Boase*.
- 15 See letter 1626.
- 16 William McDermott, 10 Southampton Street, Bloomsbury, London. He was probably William C. McDermott.
- 17 See letter 1626.

1624

To N. Purcell O'Gorman

Merrion Square, 24 December 1829

Confidential

My dear O'Gorman,

I have just written to Waterford about you. I was desirous to see you when I heard that Pierse George¹ would not stand. I have strongly urged them to call upon *you* and to do so in a manner that would assure you that not one sixpence expense on your part should be required. Before my letter reaches Waterford perhaps some other candidate may be selected, but if not, I think you will hear from him. I intended to give £50 for any candidate. I will give £100 if you are the man. You know my frankness, therefore you will believe me when I say I will support you with as much zeal as you have done me. Do not hesitate for one instant if the committee in Waterford call on you. They cannot propose to you to stand without completely discharging you of all ex-

penses whatever. That must be a *sine qua non*, and I have said so to them. As soon as we get through the records I will go down to join you in your canvass.

I will buy a £20 rent charge so as to qualify myself to speak as a freeholder and to vote hereafter. I have written down to get it to buy. We will go to every parish in the county and address the people from all the chapels or at least as many of them as may be requisite. How I long to see your bold fist on a frank! The greatest blow the aristocracy ever got, the greatest triumph the Association ever attained, would be by beating the Beresfords with the worthy secretary.²

If the thing take the turn I wish surely O'Gorman Mahon will come forward; what he saved from Clare he should give now. I am full of spirits at the prospect of your return.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 197-8

1 See letter 1623.

2 Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman.

1625

*From M. G. S. Crumpe,¹ 165 Regent St., London,
24 December 1829*

Asks O'Connell to help to have her history, *Geraldine of Desmond*, distributed more widely in Ireland.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Miss M. G. S. Crumpe, daughter of a well known Limerick doctor and writer, Samuel Crumpe. She wrote several novels, 1830-52.

1626

From William McDermott to Merrion Square

10 Southampton Street, Bloomsbury, London,
28 December 1829

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I would have written to you ere this on the subject of the 'Mysterious Letter',¹ for so it may be well denominated, but was waiting to see Blount in order to prevail on him to give me a copy of it. This he will not do. He has strongly urged Mahony, he says, to publish it but that gentleman also declines giving this precious *morceau* to the public. This really is most

extraordinary. First Mr. Blount says he has received a communication from Mr. Mahony. Mahony wishes him to keep it a secret but Blount *indignantly refuses this*, and says he wishes to give it every publicity, and when asked to do so, he says he cannot.

When your letter appeared in the *Herald* Blount wrote to me saying he did not couple your name with the report or, in other words, he *denied* the chief part of our conversation. I enclose you his letter and my answer to it and you will see how I met the denial. Fortunately Wm. Barron, the brother of Winston Barron,² the candidate for Waterford, was present during *every part of my conversation with Blount* and if necessary, he will bear me out in saying that Blount did *expressly state* what my letter to you contained, of *this I am certain as I am of my existence*. And if Mahony's letter does not contain those charges against you why not let it meet the light? That a base and dastardly conspiracy was hatched against you any unbiassed mind must admit, but I entirely exculpate Blount from any share in it. However I think his conduct in keeping back the letters after his former declarations of his anxiety to give it publicity is to say the least of it very inconsistent. Lord Killeen could not be the person designated the 'Leader', because his lordship's name was (though I forgot to mention this in my former letters) introduced by Blount in the course of the conversation but in this way, 'that Mahony in his letter stated that the report as circulated in Ireland of the junction of the English and Irish Catholics against the present administration had materially injured Lord Killeen's election for Meath.'³ That you were the 'Leader' mentioned by Blount *expressly* and not by way of *implication* is as certain as that I am now writing this letter. At foot I send you copies of the correspondence between Blount and me since your letter appeared. I beg you *will not publish either this letter or the correspondence*, but if you think it at all necessary I will write a letter to the *Pilot* and state every circumstance connected with the transaction from the beginning. The 'Pious Eneas' is arrived and he is to ruin you in the eyes of the world.⁴ What will he not bring forward in the House of Commons against you?

[P.S.] This is the whole correspondence that has passed between us. I did not wish to say any more on the subject, expecting that Blount would have written a letter to some of

the public papers. And if he did I certainly would have answered it jointly with Barron who is now in Ireland and to whom I have written on the subject. *So positive am I that Blount mentioned your name in the way I wrote to you that the day after the conversation took place when I went to Chambers in the morning, Barron asked me if I had written to you acquainting you with the circumstances and when I told him I had not, he urged me strongly to write to you the next day which I did.*

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 O'Connell published in an evening newspaper (probably the *Herald*) of 18 December 1829, a letter he had received from William McDermott, dated 11 December 1829, in which McDermott claimed to have recently met Edward Blount, late secretary to the (English) Catholic Association, in London. According to McDermott's letter, Blount told him that he had received a letter from Pierce Mahony, stating that a party of which O'Connell was the leader had been got up in Ireland against the administration, and that the British Catholic peers had joined it. Blount, according to McDermott's letter, declared his intention of publishing this (Mahony's) letter (*DEP*, 19 Dec. 1829). In a letter to the press dated 19 December 1829, Mahony denied the existence of any such letter, declaring, 'no letter of mine to Mr. Blount, during the last nine months, contains either expressly, or by implication, in words or in substance, anything whatsoever relating to Mr. O'Connell' (*DEP*, 22 Dec. 1829). Mahony suggested that McDermott had misunderstood Blount.
- 2 John Winston Barron was the candidate for Co. Waterford.
- 3 Killeen advertised his intention to stand for Meath on the vacancy created by the retirement of Lord Bective (*DEP*, 1 Dec. 1829). He was returned for Meath on 22 February 1830.
- 4 Eneas MacDonnell had acted as London general agent to the Catholics of Ireland, 1824-29. In June 1829 he demanded a certain additional payment for his services. His claim was discussed at three public meetings of the finance committee of the Catholic Association (*FJ*, 27, 29 June, 4 July 1829). O'Connell vigorously opposed his claim and it was rejected. In later years MacDonnell was a Tory as shown by his defence of the political activities of the House of Lords in a series of public letters in 1836 (*The Letters of Eneas MacDonnell to the Editor of the 'Times'* [London 1837]).

1627

From Cuyler Staats, Albany, N.Y., U.S.A., 1 January 1830

Writer complains that he did not receive an acknowledgement of a copy of his book, *Tribute to DeWitt Clinton, Governor of New York*.¹ It was sent to O'Connell 'among other distinguished Europeans'.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Cuyler Staats, *Tribute to the Memory of DeWitt Clinton* . . . (Albany 1828).

1628

*From Jennings Patrick MacCabe,¹ 76 Rue Chaillott, Paris,
12 January 1830, to Merrion Square*

Begs O'Connell to undertake his petition² to the House of Lords or induce O'Loughlen to do it.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Called to the Irish bar, 1814.
2 A petition on a private family matter against two decrees of the Irish court of chancery. It was presented on 17 February 1830. Its prayer was partly complied with.

1628a

From C. Sinclair Cullen¹

1 Derby Street, Parliament Street.
12 January [1830]

My dear Sir,

I send you a paper, the *Brighton Guardian*, with a letter of mine. I run the same road with you though far behind you. I look to a session of glorious agitation, especially of law reform, through your means, and with the assistance of our noble friend Bentham.

I am glad you have done with your personal conflicts though I think you come on the whole, fairly out of them. I like much your two last letters, the one to the Protestants² and the one instituting a parliamentary office in Dublin.³

Vesey Fitzgerald will never be an agitator or opponent of agitation more. He has had an apoplectic attack. The Duke

of Wellington frequently of late said to him that he lived too well and took too little exercise. This must lead to some little change of the *Dramatis Personae* but none in the action of the Drama.

It is not worth while to communicate to you by letter any view of the state of parties here but I shall be glad to see you as soon as you arrive for there are some things worth your knowing, although your course is a plain and great one, quite independent of persons.

[P.S.] I write this chiefly to let you know what you may chance not otherwise to have heard of Vesey Fitzgerald.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Died 9 November 1830. A very close friend of Jeremy Bentham.
- 2 A letter from O'Connell to the Protestants of Ireland, 1 January 1830, asking them to join with the Catholics in working for Ireland and condemning the government for continuing its illiberal policies despite the act of Catholic Emancipation (*DEP*, 5 Jan. 1830).
- 3 In a letter to the People of Ireland, dated 3 January 1830, O'Connell announced the establishment at 26 Stephen Street, Dublin of a parliamentary agency of which Edward Dwyer would be manager. Its function would be 'to facilitate the preparation and forwarding of petitions, and the transacting all other parliamentary business in Ireland'. Part of the premises would be used for 'public meetings assembling to petition parliament', and for meetings of charitable societies (*FJ*, 7 Jan. 1830).

1629

From Rev. John Sheehan to Dublin

Waterford, 13 January 1830

My dear Friend,

Being firmly convinced that your presence here will not only be useful, but that it is now become *absolutely necessary*,¹ I do command to be here in the evening of Wednesday the 20th inst. We shall then dine in Dungarvan on Thursday. The prodigal scattering of money on the part of the Beresfords has surpassed anything that has yet occurred in electioneering. In fact they are sure that if they succeed now, no opposition will ever again be offered to their pretensions and on the other hand they are equally satisfied that a victory on the part of the people this time will paralyse them for ever. Hence the efforts they are making on the present occasion. They have even

succeeded in keeping the public feeling of this city asleep. Some quondam brawling patriots have touched the cash and although they durst not openly avow themselves the supporters of Curraghmore² they are privately doing their business, by throwing cold water on the efforts of the Independents. Your presence here will confound their plans for they give out that if you felt any interest in the return of John Barron, you would come to his assistance. The Provincial Bank here is the treasury of the Beresfords.

I think I have laid the proper train for the *affair you suggested*.³ We have a dinner today at Kilmacthomas, where there will be a great gathering.⁴ This is the *point d'appui*; we really commence the work today. Several will go there from Waterford.

The explanation given you by Mahony about the Freeholders⁵ is all a tissue of falsehood. I intend answering Sheil's vindictory letter⁶ in a few days. If I show him that the Beresfords have not relaxed in their hatred to the people, I think that according to his own showing, the motives for becoming counsel to them no longer exists. Indeed if he had been true to the people, he never would suppose that they existed at all. . . . I shall also put you in possession of a fact⁷ which you must bring out in a speech or a letter and which will make the stones mutiny against the Beresfords.

O'G Mahon, I perceive, is about to meet the fate he merits. I thank the priests of Clare for the part they are about to act.⁸ I had Father Duggan⁹ with me here a few days ago, and he assured me the Gag¹⁰ would not get a single vote in the County. If Dr. Foran¹¹ had received canonical institution¹² he would instantly have the plan of Clare¹³ carried into effect. Once more let me say that *we must have you here*. I hope you don't forget Lord Duncannon. He can *command the Duke*,¹⁴ and Lord Fitzwilliam has two votes in the County for which he should also interest himself. The voters' names are Coates.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 In view of the impending election for Co. Waterford (see letter 1623). O'Connell came to Waterford shortly afterwards to canvass for John Barron (*DEP*, 26 Jan. 1830; see also letter 1630).
- 2 Seat of the Beresford family.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 The dinner was attended by Co. Waterford freeholders and other supporters of the candidate, John Barron. (*Waterford Mirror*, 18 Jan. 1830).

- 5 Perhaps in connection with the allegation, made in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 4 February 1830, of what appears to have been a pre-election compact between Lord George Thomas Beresford and the freeholders of Dungarvan. According to this report, Beresford seems to have undertaken to give each freeholder, on application, an acre of land for cultivation at a moderate rent.
- 6 Sheil had recently published a long defence of his conduct in accepting the retainer of the Beresfords as agent for the forthcoming Co. Waterford election (see letter 1583). Sheil argued that by acting for the Beresfords he was helping bury sectarian animosities which he claimed had been rendered anachronistic as a result of Emancipation, and declared 'I shall not be deterred, by the fear of popular censure, from the performance of what I believe to be my duty' (*DEP*, 8 Dec. 1829).
- 7 Unidentified. In his next public letter to the people of Co. Waterford, (*DEP*, 30 Jan. 1830), O'Connell levels many damning accusations against the Beresfords but none which appears to fit the description of the 'fact' alluded to by Sheehan.
- 8 A reference to O'Gorman Mahon's recently attempted canvass of Co. Clare in preparation for offering himself as a candidate at the next election (see letter 1601).
- 9 Rev. Malachy Duggan, P.P. Kilballyone, near Kilkee, Co. Clare, 1839-44; P.P. Carrigaholt, Co. Clare, 1844-50.
- 10 O'Gorman Mahon.
- 11 Nicholas Foran (born Waterford, died 1855); ordained 1808; President, St. John's College, Waterford, 1814-18; P.P. Lismore, 1824-29, Dungarvan, 1829-37; Bishop of Waterford and Lismore from 1837.
- 12 A reference to the candidature of Nicholas Foran for the vacant bishopric of Waterford and Lismore (see letter 1631). The bishopric, however, went to William Abraham, who was consecrated on 31 March 1830. On Abraham's death in 1837, Foran succeeded him.
- 13 A reference to the support given O'Connell by the clergy in the famous Clare election.
- 14 The duke of Devonshire.

1630

From Rev. John Sheehan to Dublin

Waterford, 17 January 1830

My dear Friend,

. . . William O'Donnell¹ will be prepared to receive you at breakfast and I have written to him to have his neighbours there so that you may speak to them of the increasing misery of the country and the consequent necessity of destroying the

influence of those families, who have brought it to its present condition and who will sacrifice it altogether if the people do not put that influence entirely *hors de combat*. . . . Lord George [Thomas] Beresford and Barron² are hunting each other in their canvass in the west. Your appearance will have electric effect in that quarter. . . .

I wonder the [Dublin *Morning*] *Register* and those other papers who live by the support of the middling classes do not give the people any support now in return. I find that they have been asking what is to be done for Ireland, and I wonder no one answers that nothing will be done for her if Lord George [Thomas] Beresford or the like of him be her representatives. I assure you that among the readers of the [Dublin] *Weekly Register* a strong feeling is growing up against that paper in consequence of the manner it has treated the great interests of democracy since the passing of the Relief Bill. Barrett's³ *Pilot* is the universal favorite and I think that much time will not elapse before with the *democratic* portion of the community it will altogether supersede the *Old Post*.⁴ . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Retired merchant, The Cottage, Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary.

2 John Barron.

3 Richard Barrett (died October 1854), the Protestant proprietor and editor of the *Pilot* newspaper which he established in 1827 to support O'Connell. Brother of Eaton Stannard Barrett, author (see *DNB*).

4 The *Dublin Evening Post*.

1631

*From Dominick Ronayne*¹

Dungarvan, 17 January 1830

My dear O'Connell,

Dismiss from your mind all doubt of my joining you heart and hand in keeping out the Beresfords or (if you *prefer the phrase*) *cordially co-operating* with the Barrons. I had a long conversation here yesterday with Winston Barron² on the present state of the political interests. He says he is confident that his brother³ will poll 400. If he does so, his election is secure as I think it will be impossible to poll double that number. I am rejoiced at the prospect of meeting you here on Thursday. Dr. Foran, our Bishop-Elect, with whom I have

been speaking just now, seems to be in good spirits on the subject and thinks your presence here will give great impulse to the popular excitement. He says the priests are quite hostile to the Beresfords. I entirely concur with you in thinking it would be glorious *now* to beat them. . . . If you can spare time let me have a line on receipt of this; as the candidate and his brother are to be with me on Wednesday it would be gratifying to us to know your movements. I have been in battle here yesterday with O'Gorman who was counsel for the Duke⁴ on some toll cases before the magistrates. The result has been that the Duke has abandoned all claims to tolls here, in Tallow and in Bandon. This is some evidence of the value of *agitation*.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Dominick Ronayne (died 15 January 1836), Ardsallagh, near Youghal, Co. Waterford, only son of Tobias Ronayne of Ringville, near Youghal; M.P. for Clonmel 1832-36; author of several political lampoons; kinsman and close friend of O'Connell.
- 2 Henry Winston Barron.
- 3 John Barron, candidate for Co. Waterford.
- 4 The duke of Devonshire.

1632

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Merrion Square, 18 January 1830

My dear John,

. . . [1st Concerning Primrose's management of O'Connell's property]

2nd I must say that this is not the first occasion on which I have found you gave a decided preference to others when they clashed with my convenience. It happened more than once between me and my brother James. He indeed seems to have a complete control over you. I know that you have trouble for me to ten times the value of any remuneration and yet these things give me a jealousy.

3rd I am also much dissatisfied that the new building of Derrynane is so very backward. You promised me to compel Donoghue to proceed with it so as to have the walls up before Christmas. . . .

4th Donoghue complains that he has been superseded in the building of the Chapel. It is my decided wish that he

should not. I implore of you to look to this and not to allow any jealousies which other tradesmen may entertain to interfere with this.

. . . [5th, 6th, 7th and 8th dealing with bills of exchange, rents, loans]

9th I will send down a Cobbett stove for the new small parlour. The black marble chimney in the back room can I believe be replaced by a wooden one. I allude to the bedroom under the state bedroom. The state bedroom itself will require to be [? studded]. . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1633

*To his wife, Merrion Square, 1 February 1830,
from Shrewsbury.*

Describing his journey in the snow from Holyhead.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1634

*From Charles McCarthy, Droumbeg, Listowel, Co. Kerry,
3 February 1830, to Merrion Square, redirected to Maddox
Street, Regent Street, London.*

Asks O'Connell to present a petition to parliament to afford debtors the same relief on Christmas Day as on Sundays.¹

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 No such petition was presented.

1635

*From Edward Dwyer to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street,
London*

26 Stephen Street, Dublin, 4 February 1830

My dear Sir,

. . . I refer you to the *Pilot* of last evening for a list of the Committee.¹ I think it would be well if you would write a few lines to Staunton Cahill² requesting him to act³ for you

in the Co. Clare. I am sure he will be proud to be your appointee, also to select someone to act for Maurice in the Co. Kerry.⁴ Mr. Fitz-Simon will take Co. Wicklow; Mr. Quin⁵ Co. Tipperary. We shall soon have several at work. . . .

[P.S.] I have forwarded the Law Petition⁶ with about 10,000 signatures. It will reach you on Saturday.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Probably Charles Staunton Cahill, otherwise unidentified.
- 3 As election agent.
- 4 Presumably as an election agent. Maurice O'Connell did not, however, stand for Kerry in 1830, but for Drogheda.
- 5 Probably Michael J. Quin (1796-1843), born in Thurles; son of a brewer. Editor of *The Monthly Review* 1825-32; the *Catholic Journal* from March 1828-March 1829; first editor of the *Dublin Review* for its first two numbers (May and July 1836). Barrister. Died at Boulogne sur Mer.
- 6 Presented by O'Connell in the Commons on 11 February 1830. It complained of the existing statute and common law, and prayed that the House might invite all persons so disposed to send in, each of them, a plan for a new and comprehensive legal code. The petition was ordered to lie on the table (*Hansard*, N.S. XXII, 328-32).

1636

From Rev. Maurice Sheehan¹ to House of Commons

Youghal [Co. Cork], 4 February 1830

Dear Sir,

I send by this post a petition from a union of this parish called Cloynepriest, praying a repeal of the Subletting act. It is the wish of the parishioners that you would take the trouble to present it to the House.² You will also receive by tomorrow's post another petition against the vestry bill³ from the same place, which you will also do us the kindness to present at your convenience. I shall have *your own* petitions on the above grievances from Youghal⁴ forwarded in a day or two. You were present when it was resolved that you should be requested to present these also. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Rev. Maurice Sheehan (died 1856), P.P. of Killeagh from before 1836-39, P.P. Youghal 1839-56.

- 2 This petition was presented in the Commons on 9 February 1830.
- 3 That is, 7 Geo. IV c. 72. This petition was presented on 9 February 1830.
- 4 The Youghal petition against the Vestry and Subletting Acts was presented on 12 February 1830.

1637

To James Sugrue, Royal Hotel, Dublin

5 Maddox Street [London], 9 February 1830

My dear James,

I write to you this day in much haste and for the purpose of begging of you at once to go to my house and get my court dresses packed up and sent by *the first* mail coach here. . . . I am to dine with the Speaker¹ on Sunday and it seems one dines with him in court dress. I did not know this till last night. The dinner is to 'the Opposition' and is quite customary. I am asked as a matter of course. I am fast learning the tone and temper of the House and in a week or so you will find me a constant speaker. I will soon be struggling to bring forward Irish business. I am exceedingly amused by the exhibitions of the human mind that surround me. Such a finished blockhead as the great Baring is I never witnessed. Indeed, there is more folly and nonsense *in* the House than anywhere out of it. There is a low and subservient line of thinking, there is a submission to authority which is to the last degree debasing.

SOURCE : Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

- 1 Charles Manners-Sutton.

1638

From John Sheehan to London

Londonderry, 9 February 1830

Sir,

Having been, as I believe you are already aware, editor of an independent and liberal paper in this City, *The Londonderry Chronicle*, I considered it my duty . . . to find out every species of local abuse in this part of the country. I have consequently become acquainted with many of the misdeeds of the Derry Corporation. . . . The Corporation of this city,

as a mass of ignorance, intolerance and corruption, surpasses anything you could have imagined. . . . I have therefore forwarded a petition on the subject to Mr. Hume¹ which, he has assured me, he will present.² . . .

My petition charges the Corporation with many serious offences: the principal one is that a wooden bridge which was and is their property having been carried away by icebergs during the year 1814, it was of course deemed necessary to rebuild it: the Corporation although in the receipt of a large revenue declared that their coffers were empty, and through the influence of Sir George Hill, borrowed for the purpose the sum of £15,000 from Government. . . . [This] has not been refunded nor any part of it to Government. It is useless for Sir George Hill, who may be said to be Lord and Master of the Corporation, as the body is composed of 36 individuals, the greater part of which are either Sir George's relations or needy dependants, to attempt to palliate its misdeeds . . . they have made no improvements in the city of Derry with the exception that about five years ago they built a couple of small markets which might cost about £3,000 merely to give them a claim to levy exorbitant customs. . . . About two years ago the Orangemen erected here a pillar (Walker's Testimonial) to perpetuate the achievements of the good King William. When the Corporation were asked for their contribution, did this bankrupt body (who are now borrowing money at 6%) excuse themselves on the ground of poverty? Not at all. Although unable to improve the harbour or make a dry dock, although too poor to repay the Government the sum which they borrowed, yet they were not ashamed to give £50 to the *Testimonial*. Within the last four years this needy body . . . was able to expend £10,000 ! ! ! in erecting a banqueting hall for its members. . . . I trust that when Mr. Hume brings the matter before the House, . . . you will in your place support the prayer of the petition, and read the Corporation of Derry a lecture which, while it will increase your own fame and endear you to the citizens of Derry both Protestant and Catholic, will have a tendency to abolish such bodies, by exposing their profligacy and incapacity to conduct public affairs. . . . Let him [Sir George Hill] . . . declare to an impoverished country why the Derry Corporation should not be compelled to publish a statement of their accounts. . . . I send you a number of my paper, *The Derry Chronicle*, in which there is an article on the subject, a

single sentence of which the Corporation hacks, *the Derry Journal*, and *the Derry Sentinel*, never dared to contradict. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Joseph Hume (1777-1855), a Radical. M.P. 1812 and almost continually from 1818 to 1855; M.P. for Kilkenny City, 1837-41. See *DNB*.
- 2 On 23 March 1830, a petition of John Sheehan was presented and read in the Commons by Joseph Hume, complaining of the conduct of the corporation of Londonderry, and praying the House to compel that corporation to furnish a statement of its finances, specifying the amount of its revenue, and from what sources it was derived, to what uses it had been applied for the past fifteen years, and also the amount of money which it had borrowed. Hume stressed that he did not know whether the accusation brought against the corporation by the petitioner had any foundation. Sir George Hill denied the accusations and declared Sheehan's petition had received no support from the citizens of Londonderry, and that Sheehan was not even a citizen of that city. The House agreed, on the motion of Hume, seconded by Hill, to order an inquiry into the amount of money borrowed by the corporation (*DEP*, 27 March 1830). It is not recorded that O'Connell took any part in this debate.

1639

To Archbishop Murray

5 Maddox Street [London], 10 February [*recte* March] 1830
My Lord,

I have had a half-written letter to your Grace on my table for nearly a week, apologising for being silent on the presentation of the Irish Prelates' petition.¹ The fact simply is that I did not receive your Lordship's letter with a copy of the petition until *the day after* it was presented. I was therefore in ignorance of its contents when Lord [Francis Leveson-] Gower was stating its leading object, and I was afraid of injuring by my interference some object which the Prelates had not deemed it at all necessary to communicate to me. . . .

I was prevented by the pressure of constantly recurring public business from finishing that letter, and a subject of overwhelming importance now requires that I should abandon everything else and most earnestly solicit your Lordship's attention to another measure which appears to me to be awfully important to the morality of the Irish people.

Lord F. L. Gower has just brought in a Bill to provide for the maintenance of illegitimate children in Ireland.² This bill is on the face of it one of apparent justice but it is calculated to effect the most deplorable and frightful mischief.

It is the introduction into Ireland of the first and worst part of the system of poor laws, the law of bastardy.

The effect of the English bastardy law has been totally, I say totally, to demoralize the females of the poorer classes. The reason I make this sweeping assertion is this, that it is in evidence before the testimony of clergymen of the established church that in very many of the English counties not one woman in twenty is married amongst the working classes otherwise than in an advanced or at least very visible state of pregnancy. The fact is that the moment a woman is pregnant she has a choice of husbands. She can swear the child to any man she pleases and unless that man be capable of paying or securing a sum of about £40 he must either marry her or go to gaol.

The consequences need not be described. A young woman is quite *safe* in a worldly sense to submit to illicit intercourse with unmarried men. If she be not rendered pregnant she is not the worse in public estimation, that is she is not found out. If she becomes pregnant the more men she has a *colour* of attributing the child to the better prospect she has of a husband to her choice. She may pick out the best workman or weaver or shoemaker amongst her *acquaintance*.

One of the great temporal guardians of female chastity, the fear of being so degraded as to lose all chance of matrimony, is thus done away, and a deluge of immorality opened upon the people. I need not add, what you experience in the chair of confessor has but too often and too painfully apprized you of, that if females be unchaste there is but, alas, little prospect of restraining the passions of the male part of the community.

These ideas will probably have struck your own judgment but I know you will pardon my anxiety in consideration of its motive. I will send to you and to all the Catholic Bishops copies of the bill tomorrow or the day after, and will trespass again on your patience on this subject. With the blessing of God we will defeat this bill. I have much more to say upon it but I trespass already too long.

SOURCE : Dublin Diocesan Archives

1 A petition from the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland presented in

the Commons by Lord Francis Leveson-Gower on 26 February 1830, complaining that the parliamentary grants for Irish education continued to be diverted to the maintenance of schools objectionable to Catholics, and stressing the antagonism of the Catholic hierarchy to 'a system of Education prescribing the reading of the Sacred Scriptures without note or comment, by children in schools. . . .' The bishops believed that the mode in which the parliamentary grants for education were allocated was responsible for the sectarian strife and animosity prevailing in Ireland. They declared they wished to see 'a well-ordered system of education extended to all classes of the Irish people without religious distinction. . . .' (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 104; *Hansard*, N.S., XXII, 1006).

- 2 Lord Francis Leveson-Gower and John Doherty were ordered on 1 March 1830 to bring in a bill to make provision for deserted and illegitimate children in Ireland. At the second reading of the bill on 26 April, O'Connell declared that 'great difficulties would arise in the details. Children might be transferred from one part of the country to another and a species of parochial questions would arise as to whether they had been properly abandoned or no'. He declared, however, that he would *not* oppose its second reading (*Hansard*, N.S., XXIV, 56). On the bill being reported back from committee on 11 May, O'Connell attempted to have the House adjourn. His motion was opposed by John Doherty, who accused him of attempting to delay the bill (*DEP*, 13 May 1830). The bill lapsed at the end of the session. Since the bill was introduced on 5 March the correct date of this letter must be March not February.

1640

To Thomas Attwood,¹ Birmingham

5 Maddox Street [London], 16 February 1830

My dear Sir,

I have at length been able to look into all the English Statutes which may be considered to bear upon the Birmingham Union,² and I have great pleasure in being able to pledge myself, as a professional man, that your Society or Union is perfectly legal. I venture to ask you to act with confidence in this opinion as I have had no small reason to turn my attention to subjects of this description. I will tomorrow find means to transmit my subscription to you; that subscription will be a small one but it shall be continued until the attainment of a thorough reform in the House of Commons. I am quite convinced that the British and Irish nations cannot retain

their stations amidst the powers of the world; neither can their people be restored to plenty and prosperity without a radical reform of the law and of the present corrupt state of representation. To these great objects I devote all my faculties, and I beg, with the view to the attainment of these great objects, to have my humble name enrolled on the Birmingham Reform Union.

There are two principal means of attaining our constitutional objects which will never be lost sight of. The first is the perpetual determination to avoid anything like physical force or violence and by keeping in all respects within the letter as well as the spirit of the law, to continue peaceable, rational, but energetic measures so as to combine the wise and the good of all classes, stations and persuasions in one determination to abolish abuse and renovate the tone and strength of the representative system. The other is to obtain funds by the extension of a plan of collection which shall *accept* from no man more than he can with the utmost facility spare even in these times of universal distress. The multiplication of small sums, of very small sums, should be the proper as it would be the efficacious popular treasury. Its guardian should be the publication of every item of receipt and expenditure. I offer my experience to assist in arranging a plan for this purpose. The people should incessantly call for reform until their cry is heard and *felt* within the walls of Westminster.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 199-200

- 1 Thomas Attwood (1783-1856), a Birmingham banker and political reformer. M.P. for Birmingham, 1832-40. See *DNB*.
- 2 The Birmingham Political Union for Protection of Public Rights founded by Thomas Attwood 25 January 1830.

1641

To C. Sinclair Cullen

5 Maddox Street [London], 16 February 1830

My dear Cullen,

You may assure your friend, Stanhope,¹ that he mistakes me much if he thinks me at all *doubtful* on 'the fee-gathering system', or that I fall short of the full measure of relief which Bentham contemplates. Indeed, if it were possible to go further than Bentham does, and at the same time to be

right, I would do so; because I know *practically* that the mischiefs of the present system exceed, not fall short of, any notions which may be entertained by those who are not practically engaged in its workings.

I adopt the 'spirit of the petition for justice.' That petition is my legal creed. I do not believe it to be infallible but I really and seriously think it as nearly infallible as any purely human project can be.

The fee-gathering system has been attacked in Ireland thus far—the fees are all now paid to the government. The pecuniary emoluments of the judges are fixed and are not affected by the amount of the fees, directly or indirectly. Even the officers, whom the judges appoint, are now paid by fixed salaries. We are therefore suffering from the odious effects of 'fee-gathering' in former times although that source of increase of mischief is slackened. In attacking the fee-gathering system I must not forget that this is the existing state of facts but I dislike the system itself. I am and ever will be its enemy, its implacable enemy.

In fine, there never lived a more complete, entire, unchangeable enemy to law abuses as they exist—a more determined advocate for the *domestic* instead of the *factitious*—the *summary* in contradistinction to the *technical* form of procedure than yours, very sincerely, etc.

SOURCE : John Bowring, *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, (Edinburgh and London, 1843), XI, 34-35.

- 1 Hon. Leicester FitzGerald Charles Stanhope (1784-1862), succeeded his brother in 1851 as fifth earl of Harrington. Born in Dublin, of radical political sympathies, he was a disciple of Bentham. Director of the National Bank of Ireland from 1837 or earlier.

1642

From his wife to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street, London

Merrion Square, Monday morning, [1 March 1830]

My dearest Love,

. . . If you think that lodgings will answer, why not take them? Perhaps those you have might answer with some additional rooms. Of all things let the rooms be large and airy. They must consist of three best sleeping rooms with one for James¹ and his wife and a servant man's apartment. Richard² is very anxious I should send him and the horses by the

steamer from this to London. We must have him and the horses at expense in Ireland and be obliged to have job horses and coachmen in London which, from what I can learn, will [be] dreadfully expensive. . . .

As you are well, darling, I care little for your *increasing* size, the more particularly as you always exaggerate your size. *It* can't at all events be unwholesome. It does not proceed from inactive or sedentary habits. You are neither an epicure nor a hard drinker. Indeed if you were like O'Gorman,³ who is [one word illegible] large and a gormandizer, I should then be unhappy about you. You have the best of constitutions and may God continue it to you is my constant prayer. . . .

O'Gorman Mahon is still single but continually with Miss O'Brien.⁴ If he had a hundred thousand pounds to contest Clare with you, the general opinion is he would not stand two days, he is so fallen in the estimation of the people and of the aristocracy of that county. I think, darling, you may feel quite secure on the subject. You have at this moment more claims on your country than at any former period of your life. The enclosed printed paper was directed to me. I hope you got the copy of the Vestry Bill speech.⁵ I can't say why two letters from me to you arrived by the same post. The letters are always sent in time every day to the office as well as the newspapers.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13650

1 O'Connell's manservant.

2 Coachman.

3 Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman.

4 Christine O'Brien, 12 Fitzwilliam Square, Dublin who married O'Gorman Mahon in 1830.

5 Unidentified. During February 1830 O'Connell presented three Irish petitions against the vestry act. On 27 April he moved that the act be amended. His motion was defeated by 177 to 47 (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 338; *Hansard*, N.S. XXIV, 83-104). See letter 1669, note 2.

1643

From M. S. Forristall to House of Commons

1 Black Friars Road 1 March 1830

Sir,

I have to apologise for the liberty I have taken in writing

to you, to request that you will be pleased to inform me if Catholic marriages are legalised by the late Emancipation Bill. . . . Dr. Phillimore,¹ an Honourable Member of the House, endeavoured (previous to the passing of the late Bill) to obtain a Bill to legalise Catholic marriages—not having done so since the passing of the Bill, it is supposed by many that it is unnecessary.² . . . I do expect . . . to see you by your extraordinary perseverance and patience, together with your inflexible integrity and honesty, emancipate this country from its most grievous and overburdened taxes and thus save the country from an approaching revolution. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Joseph Phillimore (1775-1855), eldest son of Joseph Phillimore, vicar of Orton-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire; Regius Professor of Civil Law, Oxford, 1809-55; M.P. St. Mawes, 1817-26; Yarmouth (Isle of Wight) 1826-30. See *DNB*.
- 2 On 4 May 1830 O'Connell and Charles D. O. Jephson obtained leave to bring in a bill 'to amend the Laws respecting Marriages celebrated by Roman Catholic Priests'. O'Connell objected to the existing laws which, he alleged, prohibited Catholic clergymen from officiating at marriages of persons other than Catholics. O'Connell stated he wished to confine the bill for the amendment of these laws to Ireland (*DEP*, 8 May 1830). The bill, in fact, was not introduced.

1644

From his wife to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street, London

Merrion Square, 2 March [1830]

My dearest Dan,

I have to give you a message I got last week from Mr. Edward Pennefather and which I totally forgot until yesterday evening. . . . Will you be or *can* you be in Ireland the Saturday before Palm Sunday? The cause of Blackwood and Blackwood¹ is again to be tried at *this* assizes brought forward in a new shape. Without your cooperation with Mr. Pennefather he fears with his clients and yours the trial will go against them. . . . I hear the great cause² in Galway that you could not attend this assizes is to be put off for you until the summer assizes. How will it be possible for you, darling, to do everything? From the papers you appear to be as great a man in England as you are in Ireland. At this rate I expect one of these days to be the wife of the Prime Minister of

England, Daniel O'Connell. Really, love, it is what you may look forward to without sacrificing one inch of your principles. They will see they cannot do without you and you will have everything your own way. . . .

Fitz-Simon here thinks with me it will be more economical to take our horses and coachman to London for this reason. We should have to support them here and to pay high in London. . . . Perhaps if James³ would be on the look out he may be able to get a small house on reasonable terms with coachhouse and stable for the time we may be in London. All this I leave to your consideration. You know London better than I can possibly judge of it but my wish is to be as saving as possible both here and elsewhere but I am anxious to make a good appearance in London for the sake of our girls. It might be of great advantage to them.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13651

- 1 An action brought down from the court of exchequer concerning the validity of a lease given by John O'Reilly Blackwood of lands at Ballymenoch, Hollywood, Co. Down. The case was tried at Downpatrick on 31 March and 1 and 2 April. O'Connell seems to have appeared in court only on the third day. The jury decided in favour of his and Pennefather's clients. (*DEP*, 6 Apr. 1830).

2 Unidentified.

3 Manservant.

1645

To Charles D. O. Jephson

5 Maddox Street [London], Friday [—March 1830]

My dear Sir,

This will be handed to you by Dr. Wakely¹ of the *Lancet*. He is very anxious for your attendance on the Committee on the St. Giles Vestry Bill² this day. I would not solicit you to do so but I am convinced that Bill is a gross job, promoted to maintain the powers of a close vestry, few in number, who have usurped the rights and mismanaged the property of the Parish. If it does not incommode you I feel so much interest in this contest, I have already seen so much of the tricks of the close party that I would entreat you to judge for yourself by taking the trouble to attend and know the facts.

SOURCE : Jephson, *An Anglo-Irish Miscellany*, 189-90

- 1 Thomas Wakley, M.R.C.S., (1795-1862). Founder and editor of *The Lancet*, 1823-62. M. P. Finsbury, 1835-52. See *DNB*.

- 2 A bill introduced on 24 February 1830, for the better regulation of the affairs of the joint parishes of St. Giles-in-the-Fields and St. George, Bloomsbury, in Middlesex. Despite a number of hostile petitions, it was enacted on 8 April 1830 as 11 Geo. IV c. 10.

1645a

From Michael J. Quin

2 South Square, Gray's Inn [London], 8 March 1830

My dear Sir,

I received this morning a letter from Dr. McSweeney,¹ the president of the Irish College in Paris, in which he informs me that he has had some correspondence with you upon the subject of the claims which were presented by the Rev. Paul Long² to the Commissioners who were appointed to carry into execution the several conventions with France for the settlement of the claims of British subjects on the Government of that country.³

Dr. McSweeney has requested my legal assistance in the further prosecution of the claims which were made by Mr. Long. I should therefore much wish to be allowed to confer with you upon the course which I am about to take, as it is more than probable that we may stand in need of your powerful protection in the House of Commons. For this purpose I shall be ready to wait upon you at any hour on any day that may be most convenient to you.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, XXI, (1893), 137-8

- 1 Rev. Patrick McSweeney, D.D. (c. 1790-1865), a native of Co. Cork; educated at Maynooth College; superior (rector) and administrator, Irish College, Paris, 1828-50; chevalier, Legion of Honour, 1847.
- 2 Rev. Dr. Paul (Canon) Long (died 1 July 1837); a native of Dublin; Rector, Irish College, Paris 1814-18; administrator-general of the Irish foundations in France and Irish College, Paris, 1815-19; returned to Ireland, 1819; parish priest of St. James' and St. Catherine's, Dublin, 1829-37.
- 3 These commissioners were established by an act of 1819 (59 Geo. III c. 31).

1646

*From John Small, Guisborough, Yorkshire, 11 March 1830,
to London*

Small says he is the modest owner of cottages and that people of his class are injured by the bill¹ on the poor laws introduced

by Mr. Harvey Slaney² which comes up for discussion on the following Monday. The prevailing distress means that tenants can't pay their rents so that owners cannot pay rates which the last clause in the proposed bill would compel them to do. He asks O'Connell's intervention.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 This bill contained a clause for compelling owners of houses under £10 a year rent to pay the poor rate in place of their tenants (*DEP*, 29 Apr. 1830). It was later divided into two bills both of which received their second reading on 7 May but were not proceeded with. Debates on the bills were scantily reported and it is not known whether O'Connell opposed them.
- 2 Robert Aglionby Slaney, known as Harvey, (1792-1862); M.P. for Shrewsbury, 1826-35, 1837-41 and 1847-62. See *DNB*.

1647

From John Fowler, 10 Alfred Street, Liverpool, 11 March
1830

As a radical reformer he praises O'Connell's address on Monday last on the occasion of forming a political union in London.¹

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The Metropolitan Political Union, modelled on the celebrated one in Birmingham, was founded at a meeting in London on 8 March 1830. Its purpose was 'To obtain by every just, legal, . . . constitutional, and peaceful means a radical reform in the Commons House of Parliament.' O'Connell was voted chairman of the meeting on the motion of Henry Hunt. In thanking the meeting for this honour O'Connell declared that he 'differed (from them) somewhat in accent—his language had a touch of the Irish mountains, and therefore, perhaps, he might not be all they could wish. . . .' He spoke in favour of parliamentary reform, universal suffrage, shorter parliaments, the ballot, and law reform. He based these demands on Magna Carta, which he declared had been betrayed by the nobility. (*DEP*, 13 Mar. 1830).

1648

From Rev. John Archbold¹ to House of Commons

13 Nelson Street, Dublin, 14 March 1830

Honourable and Dear Sir,

There is a very material change to be made in the prison

acts² this session of parliament, and you would confer an everlasting benefit on the clergymen of every religion who attend them if you would call on the Irish [chief] Secretary and make some alteration in that part which refers to them. You perceive how absurd it is at the present that if they increased to ten more there is no remuneration for the additional duties of the chaplains.³

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Rev. John Archbold (died 5 May 1833), Catholic chaplain of Newgate Prison, 1827-33; curate in St. Michan's parish.
- 2 No legislation affecting prisons was passed in 1830.
- 3 A sheet attached to this letter explains that in the reign of George III a salary of £100 a year was granted by act of parliament to each of the chaplains of Newgate—Protestant, Dissenter and Catholic. Since then the number of prisons has increased to four—Newgate; Richmond Penitentiary for young criminals, Smithfield; Richmond Bridewell, Harold's Cross; and Sheriff's Prison. Thus more chaplains and more stipends are required.

1649

From R. K. Douglas

28 King Street, Convent Garden [London],
Monday, 15 March 1830

Private

Sir,

[A long letter suggesting that O'Connell, as head of the Metropolitan Union,¹ should found a newspaper in London since all the existing newspapers would be unsuitable for the political purposes of the union. He then reviews the existing London newspapers as follows:]

The *Times* I need not mention. Its personal antipathy to you I make little account of because it is not Daniel O'Connell's honour but Daniel O'Connell's principles that are at stake but the *Times* never did and never will (and they are all alike on that point) attack any nuisance of the existence of which there are two opinions. What the Union wants and that is all the uphill work it has to compass is to persuade and convince the people that reform is wanted. I mean to give them such an intimate persuasion and conviction of this truth as may impel them to action. That once accomplished, the *Times* will be the first to back the reformers but not until it is accomplished. Then the *Herald*—I might say of it that its

general politics unfit it for a vehicle of the Committee's sentiments, that the eye of its master² is no longer capable of supervising it, that—but read or have read to you one of its city and one of its leading articles and then say if it be qualified to advocate any cause whose foundations are bottomed on commonsense. I might go through the whole of the morning and evening papers in like manner. The learned, wrongheaded [*Morning*] *Chronicle*, with its elaborations which nobody short of the average age of an antediluvian patriarch could find time to peruse . . . and the raving [*Morning*] *Journal* with its denunciations of tyranny and its adoration of Don Miguel—the *Courier*—the *Globe* down to the fixed *Star*—there is not one on which you can count for certain assistance or whose assistance, could you command it, would be really useful. The Sunday papers are all devoted to peculiar interests—the *Atlas* is too feeble and too moderate—the *Spectator* too learned and prudent—The *Examiner* is doubtless nearest the mark but though a radical paper its proprietors are too well aware of the value of its profits to put it under your charge unless your cause shall continue to identify itself with their continuance or increase. But it has another defect. It speaks a language which the common people, on whom the Union must chiefly rely, cannot understand. Its arguments are too logical, its wit too refined for their simple heads. There is no fourth weekly paper of real talent in London. . . . The editor's salary would amount to about £30 [of the proposed new journal] per week which a circulation of 5,000 without any advertisements would cover. But suppose it should cost the funds of the Union five hundred [pounds] a year, how could these funds be better employed? . . . I think however that . . . in a twelvemonth or two such a journal as I recommend would give not take from those funds. . . . [The writer mentions his writings which include three articles in the *Spectator*, Nos. 31, 47 and 58 are entitled 'The Member for Clare' 'What must be done with O'Connell' and 'O'Connell in Parliament.']. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 1647 note 1

2 John Sidney Taylor (1795-1841), a native of Dublin; called to the English bar in 1824; in 1827 he married Miss Hull, niece of James Perry, editor and proprietor of the *Morning Chronicle*; acted as editor of the *Morning Herald* for over a year when he resigned to continue his labours as a journalist and barrister. See *DNB*.

1650

From Matthew Anderson¹ to London

54 Marlborough Street, Dublin, 16 March 1830

Sir,

. . . On Thursday next a motion² is to be brought forward in the House of Commons by Lord [Francis] Leveson Gower respecting the Irish Court of Admiralty but which it is presumed shall be confined to certain charges made against Sir Jonah Barrington³ by the Registrar of the Court and concerning which I was examined before a select committee⁴ of the House in the month of May last. It is feared however that some observation may be made against the Court generally calculated to involve its practitioners in the misconduct of the superior officers of the Court, and to prevent such an impression I have to request that you will state in the House whatever may suggest itself to you on the following statement.

Since the year 1823 the duties of the judge of the Court have been exclusively performed by Sir Henry Meredyth⁵ as the Surrogate of Sir Jonah Barrington and that with an attention and assiduity unprecedented. Whenever business in any way required it, whether in vacation or in term, he was ready to sit and his house was open to the public and practitioners as a Court for which he never received any remuneration. Thus no *public* complaint can be made on this score.

The majority of the present proctors of the Court have been admitted since Sir Jonah Barrington left this country and therefore cannot be accused of participating in or sanctioning any acts of his but on the contrary feel much annoyance that they should be spoken of now in connection with such practices. No one can wish more anxiously than the Proctors for some changes in the Court and the first change that will benefit it will be the appointment of a judge who will preside in person and give his own country the benefit of that salary (£1,000 a year) which Sir Jonah Barrington has for 20 years past been spending on the Continent.

As to the practice of the Court I as a Junior Proctor and I believe all the junior proctors wish for many changes which must be advantageous to the suitors, and when the report of the Commissioners of Enquiry was laid before the House in February 1829 we all anxiously looked forward to some final and satisfactory regulation of the Court. . . . That report was

entirely made up on evidence of but two classes of people, the first ministerial or Patent officers of the Court and next persons who had complaints against and wished to criminate the Court and its members generally but in which, as the report itself will show, they wholly failed, but during the whole Enquiry no advocate or practitioner of the Court as such merely was examined although several of us sought for and earnestly solicited such examination. . . .

I wish it also to be understood that they [the present junior proctors] are not averse to enquiry into and reform in the Court; on the contrary I court both most anxiously and wish for many changes in its constitution and practice in addition to and different from some of those suggested by the Commrs of Enquiry and would gladly tender myself for examination in London *even at my own expense* rather than be entirely deprived of an opportunity of giving my opinions and suggestions on the subject. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1. Solicitor.
2. On Thursday 18 March the commons passed three motions concerning Sir Jonah Barrington in his judicial capacity and resolved to go into committee on the subject. See below note 4.
3. Sir Jonah Barrington, Kt. (1760-1834), judge of high court of admiralty, 1797-1830. See *DNB*.
4. The select committee appeared in 1829 'to take into consideration . . . papers connected with the conduct of Sir Jonah Barrington, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty in Ireland, in the discharge of his official functions'. Certain peculations on Barrington's part were brought to light by this committee, as a result of which Barrington was, by petition of both Houses of Parliament, deprived of his office (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Barrington, Sir Jonah'; also letter 1676, note 2 and letter 1678, note 2).
5. Sir Henry Meredyth, third baronet (1775-1859), K.C.; judge of the high court of admiralty for Ireland, 1831-38.

1651

*From Edward Dwyer to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street,
London*

Dublin 17 March 1830

My dear Sir,

The gentlemen concerned in the Tanning Trade . . . refer

you . . . to a letter written by Mr. Charles Haliday¹ to Mr. Moore.² . . . They had thought it best . . . not to send a second petition.³ They feel most grateful to you for your attention to their interests and hope for your future support. In the event of the excise duty being taken off they would wish to be obliged to pay for a license . . . in order to *render the trade respectable* and in my opinion to give a superiority to the wealthy over the poorer tanner. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Charles Haliday (1789-1866), merchant, Arran Quay, Dublin. Some-time consul for Greece. See *Boase*.
- 2 Probably George Ogle Moore (born c. 1779), son of John Moore, Co. Wexford. Called to the bar 1800. M.P. Dublin city, 1826-31. Deputy-registrar of deeds, 1802-31; registrar of deeds, 1831-46.
- 3 On 16 February 1830, O'Connell presented a petition from the tanners of the city and county of Dublin praying for the 'total repeal of the duty on leather and foreign bark'. At the end of March, O'Connell was invited by 'the gentlemen connected with the Tanning Trade in Dublin' to attend a public dinner 'as a mark of respect for his exertions in the repeal of the duty on leather in Ireland'. He was, however, unable to attend, allegedly due to pressure of business (*DEP*, 30 Mar. 1830).

1652

From his wife to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street, London

Merrion Square, 10 o'clock Wednesday morning
[17 March 1830]

My dearest Love,

I fancy that I am looking at you just going out to Mass with the largest shamrock that could be had in London looking as independent as if you were already Prime Minister of England. I wish I could think our dear Maurice was well enough to accompany you to fulfill the solemn duty which you never forget. Darling you have brought a blessing upon yourself and your family, and your example has done more for the Catholic Church than ever was done by a layman at any period. May the great God preserve you to me and spare our children to us.

. . . The girls, Morgan, Fitz-Simon and Ellen go to the Patrick's Ball this evening. The weather is most cruelly severe. It is well I have the good sense not to go to the Castle.

Going out by day and going out by night are very different to those who are apt to take cold as I am. I don't like, heart, you should venture over in any of the Holyhead packets. They are I hear very unsafe. Why not come by Liverpool? . . .

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X 719

1653

To Bishop Doyle, Carlow

5 Maddox Street, London, 19 March 1830

Copy

My Lord,

I wrote twice, more than half a letter, to your Lordship since I got yours in January last on the subject of the Poor Laws but I was unable to finish either from the constant recurrence of momentarily pressing business. I regret that much because if I be in error on that subject there is no one so capable of exposing my error as you are. But one of my leading objections to that system was the frightful immorality which it has introduced among the females of the poorer classes. The road to matrimony is prostitution, and pregnancy secures a husband.

This part of the system is, however, the *only one* which is taken up by the Government. Lord F[rancis] Leveson Gower has just brought in a 'Bastardy Bill' which involves all the causes of the evils of the English system. I send you by this post a copy of that bill.

It bears on the face of it an appearance of humanity but so does *that part* of the English Poor Laws that creates the bastardy code here. By the first enactment the *Vestry* appoint overseers who, with the *church-wardens*, are to provide for the maintenance and *education* of deserted children. I fancy it is fully obvious that under this law our Protestant neighbours of the poorer classes would 'desert' their children in order to have them maintained by us. But the great evil is in the other clauses.

The 3rd and 4th enactments enable any unmarried woman to 'affiliate' her child by her oath, and the father to whom she imputes the child must either provide for her lying-in *and then for the child*, or go to gaol. The more profligate the woman may be the more men will she have in her power; and

indeed it will not be absolutely necessary that there should be even the pretext of sexual intercourse as an abandoned woman may easily and without the possibility of detection impute the child to a totally innocent person. Nay, are the Catholic clergy quite safe from the vile perjury of any strumpet in the pay of an Orange or Biblical miscreant. In short, this enactment opens a wide door for perjury and to female profligacy. How many young women in the south and west of Ireland get husbands by swearing a rape when no actual force has been used? This law would facilitate seduction by enabling the young man to suggest that if there should be no pregnancy, then there would be no detection and that if pregnancy followed then that she would have it in her power to compel him to marry or to go to gaol. The evidence on this subject by clergymen of the Church of England presents a most frightful picture of depravity. I need not tell you that the only chance of preserving purity is by *holding* the moral and legal restraint over the female sex. The tribunal of Confession must have convinced you that the male sex in youth have their best control in the modesty and fixed principles of the women.

Ireland has been remarkable for the decorum of the sex, at least amongst her Catholic population, and it would be grievous if the Legislature were now permitted to hold out a temptation to vice.

How I long for your powerful aid to *demolish* this Bill,² an aid which will spring from the highest motives should your judgment discover the reality of the objections I suggest.

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

1 See letter 1639, note 2.

2 The bill was not enacted. See letter 1639, note 2.

1654

*From Edward Dwyer to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street,
London*

Dublin, 20 March 1830

My dear Sir,

I send you . . . the following Petitions—from Carrickbeg [Co. Waterford] against subletting and against the Vestry Act; from Dysart [Co. Waterford] against the Subletting Act;

from Drogheda for a repeal of the Union, the one for the Lords you may give to whom you please; from Clonalvy, Co. Meath against the Vestry Bill—mem.—*no Protestant in Clonalvy*. I also send one from Ardcath [Co. Meath] against the Vestry Act to Lord Killeen—only *one Protestant in the Parish*. I also send you a Petition from the parishes of Dublin, generally, to allow voting by ballot.¹ . . .

[P.S.] Frank² is engaged by the new proprietor of the *Freeman* (Mr. Lavelle).³ I had an interview with him and he [Lavelle] is determined to support you with all his might.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 O'Connell presented all the Commons' petitions (except that of Ardcath) on 22 March. Lord Killeen presented the Ardcath petition on 5 April (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1830, I, 930-32, II, 1233). The petition from Drogheda to the Lords was not presented.
- 2 Possibly Frank P. Dwyer.
- 3 Patrick M. Lavelle (c. 1802-37), a native of Co. Mayo; educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Proprietor and editor of the *Freeman's Journal* from 1830 (when he purchased it from Henry Grattan, M.P.) until his death on 28 May 1837. He spent two years, 1833 to 1835, in southern Italy owing to ill-health.

1655

From Denis McCarthy,¹ Middleton, Co. Cork, 22 March 1830

Acknowledges O'Connell's letter of 19th ult. and states he is sending a petition against church rates from the parish of Kilmahon, signed by 49 which is few but they are all 'respectable farmers'. Only two Protestant families in the parish.² 'The tithes of this parish are set for more than 10/- per English acre this year of distress. Of all the evils affecting the population of this country, this abomination is the greatest. The County cess³ is very heavy on the farmers, generally from 9d to 1/- per acre at each assizes.' The letter adds that an evil to be legislated against is the itinerant small pox doctors who inoculate children and cause many deaths. The English law on this subject should be extended to Ireland.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 A physician and landowner.
- 2 In 1834 the Protestants in the (Church of Ireland) parish of Kilmahon numbered 22. In 1837 the total population was 1,658, and the

tithe composition, £506.18.6. (W. Maziere Brady, *Clerical and Parochial Records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross* [Dublin, 1863-64], II, 281).

- 3 A tax raised by the grand juries for the execution and maintenance of public works.

1656

From H. Heny to House of Commons

[postmarked Dungannon] 22 March 1830

Suggests that revenue could be considerably increased if the banks which contract with the government for a certain annual sum of stamp duty, were obliged to 'pay duty on all the notes they issue, as *Private Banks do*.' The government has no check of the number or amount of notes issued. Such privileged banks can get away with issuing as much paper money as they please, and thus they can 'monopolise all the business of the country.'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1657

*From his brother James, Tralee, 23 March 1830 to
5 Maddox Street, Regent Street, London*

Concerns the difficulty being experienced by the family of Samuel McCarthy of Baliags (probably near Kilgarvan, Co. Kerry) to obtain a renewal of their lease from the marquis of Lansdowne. Seeks O'Connell's assistance as an act of charity.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1658

*From Edward Dwyer to 5 Maddox Street, Regent Street,
London*

Dublin, 23 March 1830

My dear Sir,

A deputation from the Pig Factors were here this morning. They are very anxious to have the petition¹ which I forwarded

to you on [the] 3rd inst. presented. The Mayor² continues his extraordinary conduct towards them. On each market day he sends the horse police and constables to disperse them and which is effected in the most violent manner by striking and maiming the poor animals. . . .

We can have no news from Cork until after packet hour. Both candidates have persons employed here canvassing any money for a vote.³

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 That presented by O'Connell on the previous day from a number of Dublin pig factors, complaining of the recent removal of the city pig market from Smithfield to May Lane; and of the lord mayor, Jacob West's use of the police to compel the pig factors to remove from Smithfield. The petition prayed for a parliamentary inquiry into the matter, and asked that the lord mayor be called to answer for his conduct at the bar of the House.
- 2 Jacob West, elected alderman 29 October 1821, lord mayor of Dublin, 1830. Proprietor of the firm Jacob West and Son, goldsmiths and jewellers, 9 Capel Street, Dublin.
- 3 In the Cork City by-election, which according to the *Dublin Evening Post*, was 'as close and costly a contest as ever occurred in Cork', the candidates were Daniel Callaghan and William Henry Worth Newenham. The former was elected by a majority of sixteen, 1176 to 1160.

1659

From D. W. Harvey¹

3 Little George Street [London], 31 March 1830

My dear Sir,

With many and sincere thanks for your kind manifestations towards myself I cannot consent to be kept any longer in suspense. It is personally most painful, and politically injurious, and if the trivial objects which have been intimated are unattainable, I must continue to struggle with the tide of injustice which to me has had no turn. I respectfully decline all offerings *after* Easter, and shall restrict my further claims on your indulgence, to the request that no time may be lost in bringing the long-delayed Report upon the Inns of Court² before Parliament.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, XV, 602.

- 1 Daniel Whittle Harvey (1786-1863). M.P. for Colchester, 1818-20,

and 1826-34; for Southwark, 1835-40; founded the *Sunday Times*, 1822; commissioner of London police, 1840-63. See *DNB*.

- 2 This report was not brought before parliament. Formerly an attorney, Harvey's application to be admitted to the bar had been rejected owing to certain malpractices charged against him. In 1834 a select committee of the Commons, of which O'Connell was chairman, exonerated him but this did not procure him admission to the bar (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Harvey, Daniel Whittle').

1660

*To Messrs. Wood and Boyd*¹

Merrion Square, 5 April 1830

Gentlemen,

I had the honour to receive your letter relative to the Baal's Bridge Act² and shall on my arrival in London make myself master of the provisions of that bill. I will also speak to Mr. Rice and if I find your apprehensions well founded you may depend on my giving the bill resolute and I should hope successful resistance.

SOURCE : Misc. MSS, William L. Clements Library

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 On 16 February 1830, a petition was presented in the Commons requesting that a bill be brought in to provide for the widening and repair of a bridge called Baal's Bridge, Limerick City, which was said to be causing an obstruction to traffic on the Limerick-Killaloe canal. On 9 March Thomas Spring Rice and the knight of Kerry were directed by the Commons to bring in a bill 'for the improvement of the Shannon Navigation from the City of Limerick to Killaloe, by rebuilding the bridge called Baal's Bridge, in the said City'. The bill was enacted on 12 June 1830 (11 Geo. IV, Local c. 126). O'Connell does not appear to have opposed it.

1661

To Denys Scully

Merrion Square, 5 April 1830

My dear Scully,

I got so little encouragement in your answer to my last communication respecting my poor friend Bennett that perhaps you will deem it an obtrusion that I should write to you again.

You indeed doubted my veracity when you suggested that I could get for you better terms than those which I offered as being to my knowledge the utmost he could do for you. It is therefore nearly in despair that I write to you again. Neither should I do so if I could not assure you, whether you believe me or not, that it is your interest to accede to the terms that Bennett now offers. You can easily drive him to insolvency and ruin, total ruin, but you will thereby only make yourself be placed in a worse situation much than you would be by accepting his offer. . . .

SOURCE : Scully Papers

1662

*From Denys Scully, Merrion Square, 7 April 1830,
to Merrion Square*

Concerning money owed to Scully by a third party, possibly Richard Newton Bennett.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1662a

To the Knight of Kerry, House of Commons, London

Merrion Square, 7 April 1830

My dear Sir,

Your letter of 'canvass' was here before me when I returned from Downpatrick. I have given my brothers the disposal of my interest in Kerry but I do not apprehend that you are likely to meet any opposition.

I hope my brothers will support you, but for my own part I could not consistently give my support to any member who goes in as an avowed ministerialist. I do not like the thing itself in any case. I see men in office voting as no disinterested man possibly could, and therefore I must think that the people when they happen to have a voice should not run the risk of having their representative by any possibility mistake his duty by reason of his interest. No man has made greater sacrifices than you have so that when I apply the principle to you I do not and can not imply any personal disregard. I have indeed strong objections to this ministry. I am convinced that

by their obstinate pertinacity on the question of Currency¹ they are impoverishing England and ruining Ireland. I have no patience with the cold blooded apathy they discover towards the millions who suffer by the transition from paper to gold. I need not say how much I dislike their conduct in Ireland. The working of the system here is as completely Orange as if the Relief bill had not passed. Can any thing in nature be more paltry than the *refusing* silk gowns to Catholic barristers. I do not of course allude to myself but twelve months are now elapsed and the Catholic Bar is as excluded as ever. The truth is we have an Orange Attorney General,² many Orange judges, Gregory—the very demon of Orangeism at the Castle, Darley who insulted the King is still at the head of the police. In fact Peel wedded the Orange Party while he was in Ireland and he has not the least idea of the rest of the country being of any value or estimation. Were you present when he praised the *fine presbyterian yeomanry* of the North,³ the perpetrators of one thousand murders! But I weary you.

I however wish you success and have the honour to be,

My dear Sir,

Your faithful and obedt. Servt.

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE : Knight of Kerry Papers

1 See letter 1546, note 8.

2 Henry Joy.

3 In a debate on the army estimates on 22 February 1830 Peel praised the Irish yeomanry and added: 'No country can produce a finer set of men than the Presbyterian yeomanry of the North of Ireland' (*Mirror of Parl.*, 1830, I, 347).

1663

From Louis Francois de Robiano-Borsbeck,¹ 8 April 1830

Original in French

The writer congratulates O'Connell on his work for the Catholic religion so widely known to Catholics in every country. He has written an article, designed to serve that religion now imperilled in Germany, France and Belgium. This article appeared in the newspapers of 24 February and has since been published in many countries. He asks O'Connell to have it published in some English newspapers. 'I have never had the honour of knowing you but it will not

be the first time you have received wishes from men for whom you devote your life.'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Louis Francois P. M. J. de Robiano-Borsbeck (1781-1855), a native of Belgium. Represented Ypres in chamber of deputies 1832-33. Created 1840 comte (Belgium); author of historical and literary works; director of Catholic library of Belgium.

1663a

To Loftus Keogh,¹ 24 Lower Sackville Street, Dublin

Merrion Square, 11 April 1830

Dear Sir,

I highly approve of your work² and beg of you to insert my name as a subscriber for two copies.

Do not put my name near Lord Plunket's. He is an English hearted man. I am a thorough Repealer. He was an anti-Unionist. I never will be content until I see the parliament in College Green.

SOURCE : Property of Alfred E. Day

- 1 Unidentified.

- 2 Unidentified.

1664

*From T. Forster, M.D., Berehan, Chelmsford, Essex,
15 April 1830, to Merrion Square*

Mainly on the consideration that harsh punishment of crimes came into being in England as a result of the growth in crime and juvenile delinquency that resulted from the Reformation.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1665

*From John S. Collins, 52 Grafton Street, Dublin,
17 April 1830*

Suggests means connected with excise duty of encouraging the native growth of tobacco.¹ He says he has complied 'with the general invitation for information you have given'.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The government proposed at this time to impose a duty on home-

grown tobacco. On 26 April a petition of cultivators of tobacco in and around Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford, was presented in the Commons stating that the petitioners had for several years been engaged in the cultivation of tobacco, and now learned with alarm that the government proposed to place a duty of 1/8d. per pound on home-grown tobacco. This, they believed, would put an end to the growth of tobacco in Ireland 'which has been hitherto found productive of many national advantages, and, . . . has furnished employment for men, women and children, particularly the latter, at seasons of the year when all other agricultural pursuits are at a stand'. Similar petitions were presented during the session from Waterford and Kilkenny. See letter 1797.

1666

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 17 April 1830

My dear Friend,

Upon looking over the list of notices of Parliamentary motions published in the papers I find one of yours touching Catholic Charities fixed for the 6th of May.¹ I am exceedingly anxious for your success on this point. The system of trusteeship to which the state of the law hitherto obliged Roman Catholics to recur has frequently defeated the intentions of those making charitable bequests. In this city there are several establishments for the Catholic poor, but a great portion of the funds destined for their support has been lost from time to time in consequence of the alternatives to which people were obliged to resort in order to keep them out of the hands of the Commissioners.² If the history of those institutions and the vicissitudes to which they have been exposed could in any manner tend to advance your objects in the motion which you are about to make, I would gladly supply you with the information. If it be for a committee of enquiry into the subject you mean to move, I would endeavour to be in London at the time. I think the motion should if possible embrace a something that would enable you to look into the charities managed by Protestants in this country. There is one Catholic charity in this city managed invariably by some member of our Corporation and I know that unfair returns have been made of the expenditure to those who audit public accounts. I was once chaplain to it and I happened once to see those accounts

and the master credited himself for £60 given to me as a year's salary whereas I never got more than £12 annually. . . .

I perfectly coincide with you as to the folly of those who think that Ireland can be happy unless more be done than the passing of the Relief Bill. If nothing more were done, I am clearly of opinion that we should have as bad and as vicious an oligarchy as ever crushing the energies of the people. The few Catholics who would get honour and distinction would hate the *people* as cordially as ever the Orangemen did, and provided they had the benefit of places and pensions, the miseries of the multitude would cause them very little uneasiness. We must therefore endeavour to turn the Relief Bill to its proper account, and I need not tell you that there is nobody in the community who are more cordially disposed to assist you than the clergy. But the independence of the clergy is absolutely necessary to render* their co-operation really and substantially useful. Their bishops must not for their appointment be under any compliment to any influence save that which is acknowledged and recognised. Upon this point however I must speak with reserve until I see you. I have much to say on it, and I really can never bring myself to reflect on it without coming to the conclusion that the period has arrived when the bishops, if they wish to possess the affection and confidence of the laity must take measures to guard effectually against all private and undue means in effecting their appointment. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 On 4 May O'Connell sought leave to bring in a bill to place charitable bequests of Roman Catholics in Britain on the same footing with those of Protestant Dissenters. He declared that, whereas in Ireland the bequests of Roman Catholics for charitable purposes were fully protected, in England Emancipation had not materially altered the position of such bequests. Thus a Catholic trustee could not be called to account in a court of equity for a violation of his trust (*DEP*, 8 May 1830). Although O'Connell's bill to remedy this situation was read a first time on 11 May 1830, the second reading was repeatedly deferred and the bill was allowed lapse. Sheehan mistakenly thought this bill applied to Ireland.
- 2 The Commissioners of Charitable Donations, a body established in 1800, which was overwhelmingly Protestant in composition and which included among its *ex officio* members a number of dignitaries of the Established Church (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, pp. 213-14).

1667

From Nicholas Whitworth¹ to Dublin

Drogheda, 19 April 1830

Dear Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 17th inst. . . .

You may rest quite secure of a seat for Drogheda and I believe without opposition; if it unfortunately happens that you cannot stand again for Clare, we shall have no difficulty in keeping the place open for you to the latest moment so that you may continue your canvass for Clare fearlessly until you can satisfactorily determine the proper course to pursue. The fear of losing Drogheda for want of declaring your intentions early, is, I presume, the reason why you wish an immediate canvass for your son² and as there is no immediate danger from delay, I hope you will agree with me that it will not be desirable to adopt the course you recommend; for although I make some well founded pretensions to popularity with the freeholders yet I could not presume upon their partiality so far as to venture upon the recommendation of any gentleman who had not earned a fair share of the public approbation by long tried exertions; . . . independent of a previous tender of assistance to Mr. Sheil if he should be driven from Louth³ and yourself from Clare; the public will expect from me a declaration in favour of some *veteran* in the public cause. . . .

It is only fair to add that I have introduced this subject to a few confidants for whose judgment I have great regard, and some of them do not coincide with me. They say (and I admit very truly) that the debt of gratitude due to you can never be repaid, and that the wish contained in your letter ought to be complied with on this ground alone; but that independent of this, your son would always be ready to further your views in parliament, and that in a little time he might become as potent as yourself. I candidly declare that I could not pretend to guess whether or not the experiment would succeed. The name of O'Connell has such a charm in it that nothing that could happen in the way of success would surprise me, and although for the reason before stated, I could not publicly canvass, yet I would do more than I feel I ought to do to gratify you. . . .

[P.S.] In writing to me, when you don't wish it be known

that you are corresponding with me, I must insist upon it that you do *not pay postage*. Many of these trifles make up large sums from which you ought to be exempt.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Nicholas Whitworth, a native of Drogheda. Engaged in the corn trade and in purchasing linens and butter since 1823. Gave evidence before the Select Committee on Tolls and Customs at Fairs and Markets in Ireland, 1834 (603) XVII, 229.
- 2 Maurice.
- 3 Sheil represented Co. Louth, 1831-32.

1668

From John Kenny¹ to Merrion Square

Kilrush [Co. Clare], 20 April 1830

My dear Sir,

I have received yours of the 17th in which you request to be informed what your probable prospects of support from the freeholders in this district may be at the approaching election,² supposing O'Brien,³ O'G Mahon, McNamara⁴ and yourself to be the only candidates. So far as I can form an opinion from the repeated declarations of the freeholders themselves in your favour, I have no hesitation whatever in saying that if no undue influence is resorted to, every ten pound freeholder in Moyarta and Clonderalow baronies, with about four exceptions would vote for you. If there shall be no other candidate opposed to you but the three you named, I do not think the landlords would require of their tenants to vote against you. O'Brien is by no means a favourite. MacNamara is very generally disliked by the aristocracy on account of his liberal principles, and O'G Mahon is fully as great an object of aversion to your greatest enemy in Clare as you yourself could be. From the pecuniary embarrassment of every one of the three, I do not think bribery would be resorted to, so that if no other candidate appears, your election may be in my mind considered certain.

I am however very far from thinking that the landlords will not set up a candidate. If they do, he will command the votes of the panders, the placemen, the expectants and such of the gentry as are radically opposed to you. The number of these is about 300. The freeholders amount to about 1,200 and as 300 should be bribed, I rather think no attempt will be made

to set up two candidates from what I conceive to be the impossibility of purchasing so many as would make up with the 300 the number necessary to constitute a simple majority of all the electors. Though the landlords could not secure the return of two they could by threats, bribery etc. certainly return one. In this event your election would be more certain than that of any other but the candidate set up by the landlords. As their influence would not be exerted against you in favour of any of the three candidates you named in your letter, I candidly confess I have no doubt of your return. I should be sorry however that anything should lead you into a false security. No time should be lost in setting on foot an active canvass. Cullinan is retained as conducting agent for O'G Mahon and Scott⁵ for McNamara. If you have not yet engaged one, you in my mind ought. You may command in any manner you please any services I can render you.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Rev. John Kenny (1792-1879), P.P. Kilrush, Co. Clare, 1828-48. P.P. Ennis and dean of Killaloe, 1848-79. A leading organizer of support for O'Connell in the 1828 Clare election.
- 2 It was known at this time that George IV was dying (see letter 1669). A general election would follow the death of the monarch.
- 3 Lucius O'Brien.
- 4 Major William Nugent MacNamara.
- 5 Richard Scott.

1669

To Bishop Doyle, Carlow

Copy

Merrion Square, 21 April 1830

My dear and respected Lord,

Many, many grateful thanks for your last more than kind letter. It was, I assure you, a cordial to me. It would, I think, please you if you could know what profound gratification that letter gave me.

In a former letter you alluded to a speech¹ of Peel's, in which he intimated an opinion that the Protestants should pay their own Vestry cess.² I have a floating recollection of that speech but I cannot find it and I am driven to the necessity of requesting that you will be so good as to let me know where I can find it. I have in London access to all the Debates and want

only a reference. Let me then entreat of you to be so good as to write to me in reply and give me that reference. I am going off this day for London and request of you to direct your letter to No. 5 Maddox Street, London. Pray write tomorrow that your letter may be there before me as I travel with my family and therefore slowly. Shall I make you any apology for this trouble? You have it already written on my heart and judgment.

Do not mistake me as to the state of religion in America. I would not adopt any such identical-like, but not identical, and yet some of its features very dissimilar. In America there is an ignorant rudeness of self-assertion which would domineer over the Church as it is paramount in the state. I would not go further than to separate the Church from 'the dominion' of the state but I would not trample her under the feet of the multitude. I would provide for her independence in property but not for gorgeous wealth nor yet property so secure as not to require exertion and the goodwill arising from the discharge of duty to make individuals comfortable. I would give legal protection and sanction to the discipline of the Church over all those who belong to that Church, I mean, so far as to enable the persons *entitled to livings according to that discipline*, to have a legal remedy for those livings so arranged as to leave the discipline entire and unaffected by the law.

My private letters represent the case of the King *truly*. He is dropsical; the dropsy in his chest is believed quite incurable. He may live these four or five months—he may die in a week. He refuses to allow *bulletins* to be published.

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

1 Unidentified.

2 Vestry cess was levied on all property holders to defray the expenses of performing divine service and maintaining and repairing the buildings of the established church. In 1826 the various vestry acts had been consolidated into one act (7 Geo. IV c. 72).

1670

From Richard Scott

Ennis, 24 April 1830

My dear Sir,

I have received your letter of the 21st inst., and am at a loss how to interpret the conduct of Major MacNamara as

described in your letter. This declaration of 'no coalition' with you, whether he means that he absolves you from all engagements towards him or not, I cannot ascertain as he is now in Dublin but I doubt much that he intended to do so, however he may have expressed himself.

I have seen a letter from O'Gorman Mahon to his brother William¹ these two days, in which he declares his perfect determination to contest the County, and *that Tom Steele is to be his proposer*. If your friends here act prudently and with activity I think (if you are at liberty to stand the contest without reference to the claims of any candidate) that you will be returned but I do not think O'Gorman Mahon and you will be *both* returned. Yet if he gets the money which I believe he will, it will be a matter of some difficulty to say what he can do. I have no doubt if he was out of the way that you and the Major would walk over the course. I think the tenantry will go more with their landlords than they have done, and that the gentry here will make it a point to return (at all events) one Protestant candidate and that if you do something *more in Parliament* than you have hitherto done, particularly about the Grand Jury laws² and resist inch by inch the increase of taxation³ intended for us, that you will probably have their support. It is right however to tell you that people here seem to think you have made 'a bad fight' in Parliament but I think you have sufficient time to set them right in that respect.

In this town the tolls are a grievance. First, in having them levied *every day* in the week, although Lord Egremont's⁴ patent only gives him the right on *one market day* in the week, namely every Tuesday. 2d., in the increase of toll on all tollable articles, and levying tolls on articles not tollable. 3d., in charging toll on *potatoes and turf*. There is a Bill now in progress through Parliament relative to tolls and customs.⁵ Work against this Bill generally, to abolish all toll as far as you can. It is a popular topic. At all events let the assistant barrister and magistrates at quarter sessions, upon petition of any inhabitant, have a power to enquire into the *right* of taxation and the *amount* on the articles mentioned in the schedule of tolls, with a right of appeal to the judges of assizes. The application to the Court of King's Bench is too expensive. Although potatoes are to be weighed *gratis* yet the provost under the name of toll is paid for weighing. Guard against this.

Have the *Weekly Register* or *Pilot* circulated here forthwith if an election is near⁶ and get the priests to canvass and secure you parish agents. This is all at present I can say to you in answer to your letter except that I wish you success.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Richard Mahon (born c. 1805), son of Patrick Mahon, Newpark, Ennis, Co. Clare and brother of James Patrick O'Gorman Mahon.
- 2 On 2 July 1830 O'Connell spoke briefly in support of a petition from the 'Gentry and People' of Co. Clare in favour of grand jury reform (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 607; *DEP*, 6 July 1830).
- 3 In his budget, read on 15 March 1830 the chancellor of the exchequer, Henry Goulburn, proposed to raise the duty on newspaper stamps in Ireland and also the duty on spirits made in Ireland (*Hansard*, N.S. XXIV, 321; see also letter 1672). It was also intended by Goulburn to increase the duty on stamps for receipts and for fire insurance policies (*FJ*, 30 Apr. 1830) and to place a duty on Irish tobacco (see letter 1665, note 1).
- 4 George O'Brien (Wyndham), third earl of Egremont (1751-1837). A prominent patron of the fine arts. See *DNB*.
- 5 On 23 March a bill 'to consolidate and amend the laws respecting tolls, customs and all other duties taken by local authority in fairs, markets, sea-ports and all other places in Ireland' was ordered by the Commons. The bill received its second reading and was committed on 3 April. On 26 April it was announced that the report of the committee was deferred and on 25 May a Select Committee on Tolls and Customs (Ireland) was appointed, O'Connell being a member. The bill was allowed lapse.
- 6 In view of the impending death of George IV (see letter 1669).

1671

From Michael Staunton

Dublin, 30 April 1830

My dear Sir,

I send you by this day's post two petitions, one on vestry abuses from Andrew's Parish,¹ the other praying an 'assimilation' as far as regards turnpike exemptions with reference to agricultural carts, waggons etc.² The latter has a considerable number of signatures including the names of *fourteen justices of the peace*. . . . Amongst the names is that of Arthur Guinness. If he is ignorant of the actual condition of things

in Ireland who is informed? Yet on signing this petition he declared it was quite new to him to hear that Ireland was peculiarly taxed and tolled in reference to agricultural vehicles and produce! He said he took blame to himself for requiring to be instructed on this head at this time of day!! No doubt he is just as wise as the wisest amongst us, and in his utmost ignorance fifteen times better informed than the persons called our representatives.

. . . [concerning the Trustees of the Malahide Turnpike]
 Nearly £3,000 a year pass through the hands of these trustees and they have the charge only of twelve miles of road. I believe they have been guilty of enormous peculation. The toll payers, five sixths of whom are small farmers, have to make good this sum annually and besides to pay $1/4\frac{3}{4}$ an acre Grand Jury cess though the highest cess in the country is not above $1/7$.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A petition from the tax-payers of St. Andrew's Parish, Dublin, presented on 4 May 1830, praying for the repeal of an act of 1826 (7 Geo. IV c. 72) intended for the regulation of parish vestries in Ireland.
- 2 A petition of Co. Dublin landholders, presented in the Commons on 8 July 1830. It prayed for the application to Ireland of an English act of 1822 (3 Geo. IV c. 126) by which a wide range of goods connected with agriculture was exempted from toll. It was stated that such a step would 'afford material relief to the cultivators of the soil in Ireland, and tend greatly to the improvement of the land part in that of His Majesty's dominions . . .'

1672

*From John McMullen*¹

Dublin, 2 [and 3] May 1830

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to put under cover a short and rather incoherent statement of some disadvantageous circumstances attending our linen trade, which I apprehend might with advantage be brought under the notice of Parliament.² . . .

I may by the way observe that the bounties paid upon the exportation of linen cloth in the last year were:

On the export of British and Irish linens and sail cloth	
from Great Britain	£156,586.13. 4
Direct from Ireland	6,886. 1.11
	<hr/>
	£163,472.15. 3

The immediate abolition of these bounties would produce a sum equal to the proposed revenue from the increase of stamp duties³ and the coal duty⁴ besides, taking the first at £100,000 and the second at £60,000, and would be besides a manifest advantage to the linen trade of Ireland. . . . Some persons who are engaged in making shipments of linens to foreign markets would probably object to it: but the intelligent, independent part of the trade have long been convinced of the propriety of the measure.

I am sure you will have been pleased to observe the unanimity with which the proposed measures of Government are met.⁵ Requisitions for additional meetings are in progress.

It is melancholy however to observe the stupidity or servility of the English press with respect to the late measure of Government for suppressing the Society of the Friends of Ireland:⁶ but all is working for good.

Should you consider the suggestion I made to you a week ago for a motion for the appointment of a committee to enquire how far any further assimilation of the taxes of Ireland to those of Great Britain may be consistent, 1st with the Treaty of Union, secondly, with the capabilities of the Country,⁷ I would venture further to suggest that returns *since 1782* of the quantities of malt, tea, sugar, wines, timber, bark etc. that paid duty in Ireland for home consumption ought to be moved for; with the addition of the *Rate at which duty was paid* and the *Revenue produced in each year*. In the year ended 25 March 1799 there paid duty in Ireland of

	Producing
Malt—4,445,723 bushels at a duty of 1/6	£333,429.4.1
In the year 1829 only 2,213,384 bushels	
at a duty of 2/6	276,673.1.2
Decrease in quantity, 2,232,339 bushels, in revenue,	
£56,756.2.11.	

I am persuaded similar results would appear in many instances.

If similar returns could be moved for in England the de-

crease on one hand and the increase on the other would be indeed striking. A statement founded on the principle was produced a few days ago at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce⁸ which probably caught your eye.

3 May 1830

[P.S.] I was too late for yesterday's Post, and I avail myself of the opportunity to draw your attention to a subject which on a former occasion I brought before the Society for the Improvement of Ireland:⁹ my attention is attracted to it by a discussion a few evenings ago in which you took part.¹⁰

I am anxious that in cases of insolvency the *majority* of creditors should be allowed to settle with their debtors, without recourse either to the expense of a Commr. of Bankruptcy or the exposure, imprisonment and disgrace of the usual proceeding in the Insolvent Court. My proposition is in substance that *three fourths* or three fifths of any body of creditors *should be at liberty to compromise with an insolvent trader, and to accept such composition as he might offer; the minority being bound by the decision of the majority.* . . . [McMullen goes on to say that resort to the Bankruptcy Court very often is so expensive as to ruin the estate of the insolvent].

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John McMullen, Blackhall Street, Dublin. Sometime secretary of the Grand Canal company.
- 2 On 4 May 1830 a petition was presented by James O'Hara in the Commons from the 'Gentlemen, Traders and Linen Manufacturers of Tuam, Co. Galway,' setting forth that the prevailing distress in the Irish linen trade affects all ranks of society in Ireland, and praying that the House will 'adopt such measures as will attend their [the manufacturers'] relief, which can only be effectively done by again granting an Export Bounty upon such description of Linen as has heretofore been subject thereto'. (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 374; *DEP*, 8 May 1830). O'Connell is not recorded as speaking on this petition.
- 3 Irish newspapers were at this period heavily taxed, paying a stamp duty of 2d. on every copy sold and a tax of 2/6d. on each advertisement published, besides a duty on newsprint, and other charges. A parliamentary commission set up in 1828 favoured the transfer of the corrupt and inefficient Dublin Stamp Office to London, but was careful to recommend that no assimilation of the Irish and English duties should follow, as this would mean an increase in the Irish newspaper tax. In his budget of March 1830 Goulburn proposed to assimilate the Irish and English duties at the English

level. In future, he declared, Irish newspapers should pay 4d. a copy for stamps and an increased rate for advertisements. The Tories went out of office before this measure was implemented (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 190-3).

- 4 On 13 May 1830 Spring Rice moved that the Commons should consider acts 40 Geo. III c. 4 and 41 Geo. III c. 33, with a view to repealing the duties on the importation of coal into Ireland. The motion was defeated by 182 to 120. O'Connell supported Rice's motion, declaring that 'it had been promised at the time of the Union to repeal this tax, and that ought now to be done, if it were wished that the Union should be advantageous to both countries'. (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 420; *Hansard*, N.S., XXIV, 696-703). See letter 1647, note 1.
- 5 At meetings in Dublin towards the end of the previous month, all the newspaper owners of Dublin and some from the provinces agreed to set up a standing committee in order to fight the proposed increase in the Irish stamp duties (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 192-3). Numerous petitions in favour of a repeal of the coal duty and against the proposed increase in the tax on newspaper stamps were dispatched to parliament from all parts of Ireland during the session of 1830. Early in May, 47 Irish M.P.'s, including O'Connell, met in London and passed resolutions condemning the proposed increase in the duty on newspaper stamps and spirits (*DEP*, 6, 8 May 1830).
- 6 The Society of the Friends of Ireland of all Religious Persuasions was suppressed by proclamation of the lord lieutenant, dated 24 April 1830 (*Dublin Gazette*, 27 April 1830). Founded by O'Connell on 6 April 1830 at a meeting in Dublin, the objects of the society included such immediate aims as repeal of the duties on Irish malt, coal and paper, the prevention of the threatened duty on Irish tobacco, and of the increase in Irish newspaper stamp duties. In addition it aimed at Repeal of the Union and of the subletting and vestry acts; reform of parliament, the law, corporations and grand juries. It was intended that it should turn its attention to Irish poor laws and education, work to abolish sectarianism and put down secret societies, promote the extension of canals, railways, roads and harbours and seek to have slavery abolished in the British colonies (*FJ*, 7 Apr. 1830). The society held barely half a dozen meetings (*FJ*, 12, 15, 19, 20, 26 Apr. 1830) before being proclaimed.
- 7 No such motion was made.
- 8 A meeting of Dublin merchants, members of the chamber of commerce, held on 29 April 1830 in order to express disapproval of the proposed increase in Irish newspapers stamp duties and on stamps for receipts and fire insurance policies (*FJ*, 30 Apr. 1830).
- 9 What appears to have been the first meeting of this society took place on 29 January 1828 under the chairmanship of the lord mayor of Dublin, Edmond Nugent. The attendance included Lord Clon-

curry, Henry Grattan, Jr., M.P., O'Connor Don, Michael Dillon Bellew and Nicholas P. Leader. The society declared itself 'uninfluenced by any religious or political opinions' and aimed at striving 'to make out some remunerative employment' for the people. (*F*l, 30 Jan. 1828). Between 1828 and 1830 the society held regular meetings, and O'Connell was a frequent participant in its debates.
10 Unidentified. The discussion may have been a private one.

1673

From Dominick Ronayne to 5 Maddox Street, London

[Postmarked Youghal. Postmarked Waterford,
6 May 1830]

[The latter part of a letter]

be proved for Richard Sheil if an opportunity be afforded, I say *must* with reference to Sheil because however disinclined he may feel to vex the powers that be, he is too far committed with me on the subject to shrink from declaring the truth. I have not seen Brewster's¹ report of those trials² which seems to have altered your impressions on this subject but the circumstances I have stated to you and many others I have observed touching the formation of juries, are matters which could not of course come within the cognisance of a reporter. With respect to the reporter in question I will only say if you had as good opportunities of knowing the sycophancy of his habits and his adulation of men in power as well as I do, you would never have given him the character for *respectability* you are reported to have done. I am happy to tell you that your warning [one word illegible] has raised the country [two or three words illegible] taxation plans our county convened by the High Sheriff meets tomorrow at Dungarvan. I am quite delighted at your last motion on the subject of vestry returns³ and that you have not forgotten Youghal.⁴ I have been detained here by Mrs. Ronayne's very delicate state of health. She is now, I thank God, much better. If she continue so I hope to be in Dublin in two [or] three days. . . .

P.S. I send you the enclosed precious specimen of vestry doings here which I hope you will make an exhibit on the next occasion.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

Abraham Brewster, (1796-1874). K.C. 1835; solicitor-general Febru-

ary-July, 1846; attorney-general, 1853-55; lord justice of appeal 1866-67; lord chancellor of Ireland, 1867-68. See *DNB*.

- 2 Abraham Brewster, *A Report of Seven Trials at the Clonmel Summer Assizes of 1829, including those which arose out of the occurrences at Borrisokane . . . [on] 26th and 28th of July 1829* (Dublin 1830; see also letters 1601, note 6, and 1608, note 1). O'Connell raised the question of these trials in parliament on 11 May 1830 (see letters 1674, note 7 and 1675, note 1).
- 3 See letter 1642, note 5.
- 4 Probably a reference to the petition presented by O'Connell on 12 February, 1830 (see letter 1636, note 4).

1674

To P. V. FitzPatrick

5 Maddox Street, London, 10 May 1830

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write merely to return you and my excellent, *excellent* friend¹ my most sincere and cordial thanks.² Indeed, to him I cannot be sufficiently grateful because it is scarcely possible that I should be ever able to evince that gratitude otherwise than by words. To you it is just within the verge of possibility that some occasion may arrive when I may be able to show you how deeply obliged I am, and how sensibly I feel my debt of obligation to you. Believe me, it consoles me to think that there are some estimable persons who look to me with gratitude.

I approve of everything you suggest and beg of you to write a particular note to each of my own connections who have [not] subscribed,³ stating that the subscription of others are delayed in consequence of the non-receipt of theirs.

I am assured that unless the Chancellor of the Exchequer be coerced by opposition from Ireland, he will force his measures⁴ through the Houses. The only persons who refused peremptorily to sign⁵ against the new taxation were the two O'Briens⁶ from Clare and Lord George Beresford.

The King may live months [sic]. He is not likely to survive one fortnight.

I begin my serious attack on Doherty this night.⁷

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 202-203

1 Jeremiah Murphy, Hyde Park, Cork. Died c. 12 November 1833.

2 That is for his exertions in organizing the O'Connell tribute (see letter 1707, note 3).

- 3 To the O'Connell testimonial.
- 4 See letters 1670, note 3 and 1672, note 3.
- 5 That is, subscribe to the resolutions passed in condemnation of the proposed increases in the Irish stamp and spirit duties drawn up at the recent meeting of the Irish members in London (see letter 1672, note 5). Neither Beresford nor the O'Briens were present at this meeting.
- 6 Lucius and William Smith O'Brien.
- 7 On 10 May 1830, O'Connell gave notice of his intention to bring before the House petitions on the subject of the trials connected with the shootings at Borrisokane, and with the Doneraile Conspiracy (see letters 1601, note 6, 1608, note 1 and 1616, note 2 to note 4). He clashed sharply with John Doherty, the Irish solicitor-general on the occasion. (*DEP*, 13 May 1830). On 11 May O'Connell moved for a copy of the coroner's inquest upon the body of Daniel Naylan for whose alleged murder in Milltown Malbay, Co. Clare, a policeman named William Ferguson had been tried and acquitted. On this occasion O'Connell was severely baited by Doherty before withdrawing his motion (*Hansard*, N.S. XXIV, 545-51). On 12-13 May O'Connell in bringing before the House 'a complaint of the mode of preparing criminal cases for trial in Ireland, by magistrates taking depositions without the knowledge of the parties charged', moved that copies of the informations sworn by one witness, Patrick Daly, in the trials connected with the Doneraile Conspiracy and of the notes of the judges who presided at those trials, be laid before the House. He accused John Doherty of acting improperly on the occasion by withholding evidence which would have helped acquit the prisoners (*DEP*, 15 May 1830). O'Connell's motion was defeated by 75 to 12.

1675

From Martin Lanigan¹

49 Jervis Street, Dublin, 15 May 1830

My Dear Sir,

As your motion on the B[orri]sokane petition² is postponed till Tuesday, it gives me time to be more explanatory than I was in my last which was written in the court in a great hurry. Mr. Sheil's conduct³ is much spoken of here. The facts respecting him stand thus. He received a letter from Mr. Doherty asking him for the conversation in Clonmel. He sent it in writing to Mr. D. without as I believe apprising you that he had done so until Monday last. This accounts for Doherty's anxiety to press you on, that he might take you by surprise by

reading Sheil's letter in the House. Now the conversation which Sheil has detailed in his letter to D. has nothing to do with the manner in which the trial was afterwards managed. That conversation took place on Sunday before the trial and of course Mr. D. made many promises and professions that he intended fair play, but does Sheil say anything in his letter of how those promises were performed afterwards. The difference of opinion, or rather as to fact, is as to whether Dr. Fitzgerald,¹ the magistrate who *committed* the witnesses, acted on his own responsibility or whether the Government sanctioned his act. Now taking as Mr. Sheil's *present recollection* is that Doherty then said he acted on his own responsibility. Yet what is the value of the denial that the Government sanctioned him *before he did it* when I inform you that, in a few weeks after, he was appointed a stipendiary magistrate by that same Government. So much for Sheil's letter to Doherty. I will not now mince matters and I have told Sheil so. I will if I am put to it show that Sheil used the following language in Clonmel during the assizes: 'Doherty's conduct is atrocious and, only [that] the people have treated me with ingratitude, I would put forward the facts I have collected here against him in the *Times* newspaper and crush him as a public man.' I have reminded Sheil of this language and he said: 'I have written down what occurred at Clonmel and my opinion upon it and if I shall be examined I will fearlessly *repeat them*.' This is fair, he has no other course to take, and you may now if you choose take high ground as to Sheil's opinion of the conduct of the prosecution and offer to set it off against his letter to Doherty containing D's promises *before* the trial. I know Sheil wishes the matter never to be brought forward because it will expose the part he (as he now says, incautiously) took in writing to Doherty without informing you *timely* that he had done so. Again let me impress on you the necessity of having the Petition so treated as that the press may publish. Do this and challenge enquiry. If enquiry shall be refused, public opinion must be in favour of the facts in the petition. I will maintain anything I have ever said on this subject and Doherty's cross-examination has no terrors for me.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Attorney. He was employed by the friends of the deceased at the Borrisokane trials at Clonmel to assist the prosecution.

- 2 The Borrisokane petition (see letters 1601, note 6, 1608, note 1 and 1674, note 7) was not presented. On 18 May O'Connell withdrew his notice of its presentation and in reply to a question of the solicitor-general, John Doherty, as to whether or not he intended to present it at all, he declared that, under the circumstances, he did not wish to press the matter further (*Hansard*, N.S., XXIV, 831).
- 3 Sheil was counsel for the family of one of the persons killed by the police at Borrisokane in June 1829 (see letters 1601, note 6 and 1608, note 1).
- 4 Gerald Fitzgerald, M.D., appointed police magistrate August 1829.

1676

From Robert Eyre

24 Chenies Street, Tottenham Court Road
[London], Monday, 24 May 1830

Sir,

In compliance with your desire, herewith I send two duplicate copies of my Petition¹ presented 28th May 1829 and two copies of my *Addenda which was not presented*.

Not having had the advantage of a previous introduction I feel it necessary to apologise for requesting of you to peruse each and to make such alterations as you deem prudent.

As a variety of petitions against the monopolies and tyranny of the East India Company have been presented and as a complaint against the turpitude of Sir Jonah Barrington is forthwith to be investigated,² I venture to solicit your favourable interpretation of my anxiety under your auspices to be conclusively redressed by compromise or Royal Warrant, as in your judgment may be most prudent, after you have done me the requested favour to peruse and to alter the printed duplicates, please to send to me a copy of each to be engrossed, and signify when you intend to present³ the Petition with or without the *Addenda* (by post).

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The petition of Robert Eyre setting forth that on 3 July 1781 Lt. Samuel Eyre of the '*Nymph*' sloop-of-war, with twenty-four crew members, captured from the Dutch the fort, settlement and factory of Chinsurah, near Calcutta. The petitioner contended that Eyre 'was undeniably competent to maintain his conquest' but he was treasonably and violently deprived of it by troops in the employ

- of the English East India Company. The petitioner set forth various court proceedings and prayed the interposition of the House.
- 2 See letter 1650, note 4. On 22 May the Commons resolved to request the king to remove Barrington from office. On 25 May it was agreed that a conference of Lords and Commons should be convened to consider the address to the king drawn up in compliance with the Commons' resolution of 22 May (*Hansard*, N.S. XXIV, 1075-83).
 - 3 The petition was not presented.

1677

From Michael Staunton

Dublin, 25 May 1830

My dear Sir,

I may be stupid and wrong as to the amount of our Revenue but it appears to me that we ourselves are in the habit of underrating it, and to do this is an evil since the vagabonds ground their new taxing scheme¹ on the alleged insignificance of our contributions to the Imperial Exchequer. . . . It is necessarily new to you and to us all at this side but I should suppose Sir John Newport would be a good authority to refer to.² It is plain at all events that wrong is done by bantering us on the small amount of our revenue, and omitting to include in the returns what we pay upon between three and four million lbs. of tea. The tax on that article and on those numerous ones shipped at Liverpool, Bristol, London and other ports for Ireland, *after* the Exchequer has had its own from them, cannot, I should think, be short of three million sterling. . . .

[Deals at length with the falling off in the stamp duty in 1830 on advertisements in newspapers which he considers should be pointed out by O'Connell if Goulbourn tries to maintain that the year ending last January showed an increase over any preceding year.]

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letters 1670, note 3 and 1672, note 3.
- 2 Newport had been entrusted by the Irish members (see letter 1672, note 5) with protesting to Wellington and Goulbourn concerning the proposed increase in Irish taxation. According to Newport 'the Ministers gave no reason for these measures—they simply stated it was their project, and that they would abide by it' (*DEP*, 1 June 1830).

1678

To Richard Newton Bennett, Harcourt Street, Dublin

[London] 26 May 1830

(strictly confidential)

My dear Bennett,

Though I mark my letter thus I have but about myself to write.

First—It was impossible for me to support¹ unfortunate Barrington. I could not lend him any of my character nor weaken the force of future attacks of mine on the judicial delinquency of others. He is, I suppose, very angry with me for what I said last night² but I am his best, perhaps here, his only friend. I mitigated the hostility of his enemies as much as possible and threw him on their compassion. He has nothing else to rely on or to look to. The case was proved against him by his own evidence, not of course in terms *but in substance*. So much for that ill-fated man.

Next as to Vesey Fitzgerald. You are the only man living to do what is *doable* in that respect. Mark me, my excellent friend, everything you do is to be done *by yourself, from yourself and without authority*. You will see that it can be so done with perfect propriety. Should you think otherwise fling it to the winds.

I have reason to believe that the friends of 'Vesey Fitzgerald' desire to coalesce with me, that we both may come in without contest.³ The thing is *perfectly practicable*, that is, no declared coalition but an arrangement made in *the county by his friends* having the same effect. You are just the only person living to make that arrangement as from yourself so as at the same time to make Fitzgerald your sincere and useful friend. You imagine that Major McNamara is a stumbling block. No such thing. He is perhaps the very means of insuring this result. Of course Fitzgerald should manage him. A *baronetage* for himself and a step of promotion in the army for his son *might* do all. Surely Fitzgerald could not have the least difficulty in getting these things and something also for one or two of his brothers, especially for his brother John.⁴ Surely the Ministry must *owe* so much to Fitzgerald.

Now you could *first* see Fitzg's friends—some discreet one

or two. Suggest the idea by degrees as your own, as exclusively your own. Act under the seal of secrecy. If the thing is rejected by 'the Vesey,' there is an end of it. If they think it plausible, bring it to a point with them. Then, *from yourself*, sound Major McNamara under the strictest seal of secrecy. Do not commit yourself to one word except under that seal. This hint is enough for you. Hickman⁵ may be spoken to in the first instance though he is no longer very confidential with Vesey. If his old father be in Dublin and in possession of his faculties, he might be sounded. Sampson,⁶ a Clare attorney, *may* be also looked to. Consult O'Loghlen⁷ without giving even to him the slightest hint that you heard from me. If you succeed in making an arrangement between the Major and Vesey, why then the gentry might all call on their tenants to give one vote for them, leaving them at liberty to give me the other. The poor people, I believe, would jump at it, and as to O'G[orman] M[ahon], he would be rapidly put *hors de combat*. I have distinct proof that he countenanced Beresford against Barron in Waterford.⁸

When you have read this letter you may as well to prevent accidents put it into the fire. Recollect—but I need not tell you so, you require no such motive, but recollect what pleasure it would give me if anything connected with me were to place you fairly and honourably as an object of patronage to such a man as V[esey] F[itgerald]. He *could* easily accomplish everything for you and for the Major. Do not depend on *either* Scarlett or Brougham.

SOURCE : Connolly Autograph Collection

- 1 See letter 1650, note 4.
- 2 On 25 May 1830 O'Connell declared in the Commons that the proceedings against Barrington had been carried on 'too slowly and with too much lenity' (*Hansard*, N.S., XXIV, 1080).
- 3 That is for Co. Clare in the general election following the expected death of George IV.
- 4 Possibly John MacNamara of Moher, Ennistymon, Co. Clare.
- 5 Poole Hickman, J. P., Kilmore, Kilrush, Co. Clare. Landowner.
- 6 Either Denis or George Sampson of 3 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin and Co. Clare, both attorneys.
- 7 Probably Michael O'Loghlen.
- 8 John Barron had been defeated by Lord George Beresford in the Co. Waterford by-election of March 1830.

1679

From Richard Scott to House of Commons

19 North Earl Street, Dublin, 9 June 1830

Private

My dear Sir,

I believe I wrote to you that Major McNamara would certainly stand for Clare and that he was much astonished at the construction you put on his conversation with you when you said he would let you off your engagement¹ to him. He is very much annoyed at the manner in which some of your friends in Clare are conducting themselves by publicly asserting 'the Major will not stand,' 'he has no chance,' etc. . . . There is also a rumour that you and O'Gorman Mahon are not so opposed to each other as people think and that Tom Steele has gone to London to negotiate between you. Why should your friends be canvassing against the Major whilst O'Gorman Mahon's are canvassing for him. Believe me, this will injure you.

The Major's son is canvassing actively for his father, and has secured Tom Brown,² A. Stackpoole,³ John McDonnell,⁴ Poole Hickman, George O'Callaghan,⁵ the Westropp's,⁶ etc. These are the FitzGerald party and will make the Major quite safe, for I am convinced the landlords will have influence on this election, at least for one vote if not both with most of their tenantry.

I am informed by Charles Studdert that Lucius O'Brien will certainly start, at least Sir Edward says so, but I think you and the Major need not fear him, whether you act separately or together. The danger is the split O'Gorman Mahon will make *on your interest*. I don't think, even if he were inclined, he can do much injury to the Major but you and O'Gorman Mahon, I am convinced, cannot by any coalition⁷ be both returned for Clare. Indeed you cannot expect it, when you consider your engagement to the Major to which he will certainly hold you if he finds it necessary. If he beats O'Gorman Mahon (as I am convinced he will), the battle will then be between you and O'Gorman Mahon, and I can only say again I wish you success.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1684, note 4.

- 2 Probably Thomas Brown, J.P., D.L., (1774-1847), Newgrove, Tulla, Co. Clare.
- 3 Andrew Stackpoole.
- 4 John McDonnell, J.P., D.L., (1789-1850), New Hall, Ennis, Co. Clare.
- 5 George O'Callaghan (1788-1849), Maryfort, Co. Clare; married 1824 Mary, daughter of Robert Westropp of Fort Anne, Co. Clare.
- 6 Probably of Fort Anne, Co. Clare.
- 7 There does not appear to be any evidence that O'Connell and O'Gorman Mahon intended to coalesce. However, the *Pilot* reported at this time that O'Connell and O'Gorman Mahon had recently been reconciled in London through a mutual friend Tom Steele, and, it remarked that the Clare election would now be 'unstained by any collision between the friends of Ireland. The most perfect neutrality will be observed by all the three candidates [i.e. O'Connell, O'Gorman Mahon and Major William Nugent MacNamara]' (*FJ*, 10 June 1830, quoting the *Pilot*).

1680

From Thomas Fitzgerald to 5 Maddox Street, London

Cork, 11 June 1830

. . . Kitty¹ joins me in saying that she and I are delighted at the account you gave of Mrs. O'Connell's good health and that of yourself. May you both enjoy it long. All your friends here are distracted with their Irish members at the very little support they give you. Mr. MacNamara offers himself and has addressed the Clare electors. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Kitty Fitzgerald (née McCarthy), wife of Thomas Fitzgerald.

1681

From Thomas Haughton¹ to Maddox Street, London

Kelvin Grove [Carlow], 16 June 1830

[Beginning of letter contains statement of resolution passed unanimously by a meeting of the inhabitants of the Borough of Carlow in the Commercial Club Room, Simeon Clarke² in the chair: 'That the marked and particular thanks of this Borough are due and hereby given to our talented countryman, Daniel O'Connell Esq., M.P., for his splendid

advocacy upon the presentation of our petition³ to the House of Commons as well as for the invaluable advice contained in the two letters he did us the honour of addressing to our Secretary.

Sim. Clarke, Chairman, Thos. Haughton, Secretary.']

My Dear Sir,

I believe it is scarcely necessary for me to assure you of the great pleasure I feel in being made the organ of transmitting the above resolution to you. . . . I fully participate with you in deploring the base apathy of the London Press in not giving insertion to many debates interesting to Ireland, but on the present occasion My Lord T.⁴ has equal cause to *feel sore* and be assured our *beggarly Corporation* are not a little annoyed at the speech of their Achilles not being reported. . . . I can assure you since your general opinion on the case had gone abroad the whole Corporation party are quailing and appear to expect nothing short of an *ultimate defeat*, their only *chance* of defeating us they say is on the precedent of 1703⁵ which they seem to think has decided against the right of Freemen voting, but I defy any man of common understanding to come to that conclusion on attentively reading the report of the Committee⁶ [he discusses briefly the legal history of the voting in the Borough]. . . . We are making every effort to procure the attendance of as many inhabitant householders *paying scot and lot*⁷ on 24 June to demand their freedom, agreeable to your advice. I hear the whole body of burgesses (including Lord T.) are to be here that day. They are on the alert in every quarter and terribly alarmed [the writer is obviously well versed in legal precedents and tells of various acts of himself and his group against the Corporation based on legal right to get rid of abuses].

It is now right to inform you that on Tuesday last a direct offer came from Mr. Francis Bruen⁸ declaring his intention of contesting the representation of the town with Lord Tullamore on the first vacancy,⁹ let the expense or the result be what it may. This offer came on us with surprise and perfectly unsolicited on our part in the first instance. We had a *hard card to play*! His means are ample, his private character without reproach, and as to his public one it is a perfect *blank sheet* and the only public act of his we ever heard of was his refusal to become a member of the Avondale Brunswick Club (God bless the mark!) when he resided there. He is not

exactly the person who might be chosen if *we* were 'great, glorious and free' but seeing that there are many and great difficulties yet to be surmounted, the general opinion was and *is* that, though as a general rule it would have the appearance of casting too great a power into the hands of the Bruen family, yet that, if an exception could be taken to the rule, it was [justifiable] on the present occasion, seeing that *the town* is comparatively speaking very poor and I need not tell *you* that a battle of this kind cannot be *fought* and *won* without ample means and a willingness to apply that means, and with no *niggard hand*! . . . Thus matters stood until Monday when Mr. P. Finn, Mr. Meylor¹⁰ and others set their heads to work to distract the councils of the town and heaped all manner of abuse on those who should declare for Bruen. We convened the Club¹¹ for last night and in the meantime Mr. P. Finn wrote to his brother (the counsellor)¹² to come down and of course poisoning *his* mind against the individuals who could *entertain* the proposition of Mr. Bruen for a moment and, though he abused them all, yet he did not attempt to point out any other way *in a tangible form* whereby the object could be effected. He talked about Sir Thomas Butler,¹³ he involved him! But he did not obey his bidding. He talked of Sir John Miley Doyle¹⁴ but when I asked Sir John in my own house he told me he would not spend a guinea on it! *We* mentioned Counsellor Finn himself but the Counsellor stated he would not expend £20 on the contest. . . .

[Mr. P. Finn's] whole object seems to be an unpromising hostility against Col. B.¹⁵ but how that ought to apply to *his brother* Francis I am at a loss to conjecture. We met last night and then Mr. P. Finn produced a letter from Counsellor Finn stating that Mr. Leader was ready to start if we could show that everything was clear and certain. This we cannot do. I however greatly regret that if it was Mr. Leader's serious intention to contest this Borough that he did not see the propriety of making you the organ of conveying his wishes and in such case every effort short of the ruin of our property should and *would* have been made to accede to your wishes, which would indeed be but a poor return on our part for your able exertion on our behalf. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Thomas Haughton, Kelvin Grove, Carlow. Distiller; brother of James Haughton.

- 2 Corn merchant, Carlow.
- 3 On 4 June 1830 O'Connell presented in the Commons a petition from persons residing in Carlow borough. The petitioners claimed their alleged right to the Freedom of Carlow as sons of freemen and citizens of the borough; complained of the misappropriation by the corporation of dues and customs; and complained also of the undue influence exercised by the earls of Charleville in securing the election of the member for the borough. The petition was referred to a committee (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 613-4). Only a very brief notice of O'Connell's remarks on presenting this petition appears (*Times*, 5 June; *Morning Register*, 7 June; *DEP*, 8 June 1830).
- 4 Charles William (Bury), styled Lord Tullamore 1806-35 (1801-51), Charleville Forest, King's Co. M.P. for Carlow borough, 1826-32; Penryn and Falmouth, 1832-35. Succeeded as second earl of Charleville, 1835.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 The select committee on Tolls and Customs (Ireland), to which the Carlow petition was referred (*Commons Journal*, LXXXV, 613).
- 7 Certain municipal taxes.
- 8 Francis Bruen, (1800-67), Coolbawn, Co. Wexford, son of Col. Henry Bruen (d. 1797). M.P. Carlow borough, 1835-39. Married 1823 Lady Catherine Anne Nugent, daughter of seventh earl of Westmeath.
- 9 Francis Bruen contested Carlow borough with Lord Tullamore in the general election of 1830 but was defeated. A petition was lodged against Tullamore's return, but he retained his seat.
- 10 Unidentified.
- 11 Presumably the Carlow Liberal Club (see 1473, note 3).
- 12 William F. Finn.
- 13 Sir Thomas Butler, eighth baronet (1783-1861), Ballintemple, Co. Carlow.
- 14 *Recte* Sir John Milley Doyle, K.C.B. (1781-1856), M.P. Co. Carlow, 1831-32. Entered army, 1794; lieut.-col., 1811. see *DNB*.
- 15 Henry Bruen, Oak Park, Carlow (died 1852), son of Col. Henry Bruen (d. 1797). Colonel in Carlow Militia. M.P. Co. Carlow 1812-31, June 1835-37; December 1840-52.

1682

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 24 June 1830

My dear Friend,

There is one thing actually oppresses my mind with regard to you. It is just this. I cannot even conjecture when or how I shall be able to show my gratitude to you.¹ If I saw any

prospect of letting you perceive how cordially grateful I am to you it would serve to relieve me from some anxiety. Of this be assured, that if the opportunity ever occurs, I will seize it with avidity.

Show *this* part of my letter to Mr. Dwyer and if he has any money of mine he will give it to you, if not, James Sugrue writes tomorrow, and on receipt of his letter there will be an abundant fund to repay you—and to repay you with gratitude—your expenditures on that journey which has been so beneficial to my interests.

Your plan of a 'Collection Sunday' I highly approve of, but it cannot be realised in the present state of starvation. We must prepare our grounds in August for an arrangement in September—rather late in that month, too, it should be. I will communicate with you again upon this invaluable suggestion.

There is nothing new. The Ministry tottering, despised and despicable. The King lingering beyond expectation, to die just when one is used to his continuing alive!²

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 205-206

¹ For assistance in organizing the O'Connell testimonial.

² George IV died on 26 June 1830 but parliament remained in session for nearly a month.

1683

To Richard Newton Bennett

Manchester Buildings [24 June 1830]

Most Confidential

My dear Bennett,

The frank will show you that I have spoken for you and I met a more friendly reception than I ever did before. Brougham desired you would write to Scarlett¹ and enclose the letter to him. Brougham and he would *present it* and *support it*. Write at once. Good may come of it.

Doherty made another attack on me, about *bank notes* and *gold*.² It was foolish but cheered.

I laughingly gave him some wicked hits upon his ignorance, dexterity etc.³ The people here are *wild* with me about the Bank notes. It has struck deep into the system. I did not

abate Doherty one jot nor the House either. He will get the start of me at the press but I will take care to have the strong part of my reply also inserted.

[P.S.] I will write about McNamara tomorrow.

Most confidential—between you and me—there must soon be a change in the Ministry.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

1 Sir James Scarlett.

2 In a letter dated 7 June 1830 to the Editor of the *Waterford Chronicle*, O'Connell advised the Irish people to 'fling off' the Wellington administration, in part because of its 'insulting and insane' attempt to increase Irish taxation during a period of national distress. To achieve this O'Connell urged that a call be made on 'the people—the honest, unsophisticated people—to send in the bank notes of every description and to get gold . . .' (DEP, 12 June 1830). In the Commons on 24 June 1830 O'Connell was criticized for having written this letter. In reply he declared 'he totally disclaimed the authority of the House over any acts of his that were done out of it'. John Doherty then spoke, comparing O'Connell to a strolling player who because he would not be hired by a particular company, went to the theatre one night and shouted 'Fire!', and because several persons were injured in the resulting stampede, came to consider himself a man of influence in the community (DEP, 29 June 1830).

3 See letter 1684, note 3.

1684

To Richard Newton Bennett

Confidential

[House of Commons, 25 June 1830]

My dear Bennett,

I wrote you a hurried line yesterday having the pleasure to perceive a degree of warmth and *confidence* in Brougham about you that I never found before. I believe the Ionian *place* is filled¹ but write at all events, as I bid you last night, varying your phrase so as to suit any other office. The King *cannot* live until Monday. His pulse has totally failed. It is imperceptible.

You will see by the papers that Doherty has reported *himself* in the *Chronicle*²—not a little favourably. The *Chronicle* gives

my second reply better than any other. I assure you I taunted him very successfully upon his sore point—his ignorance.³ I also flung off the attack upon me gaily and with sufficient contempt for all parties concerned in it.

My own opinion is that there will be a considerable change in the Ministry on the King's death. I do also conjecture that Brougham will come in with the new men. This is at present little more than conjecture but there *may* be something in it. I never was in better health or spirits.

(very private)

Tom Steele came to me the moment that Major McNamara denied that he held the conversation with me in which he rejected all coalition⁴ between us. It is strange that he should have denied it. It is in truth shocking. However Steele is gone back with an offer on my part to resign the county altogether if McNamara requires it. If he does require it he will not *serve* himself. You will not hear from him, I dare say. I have brought however the matter to a simple issue which will be decisive.

[P.S.] I write from the Committee's room—on tolls—Cantwell⁶ has given most important evidence. We are knocking Corporation exactions of all kinds to *fritters*.

SOURCE : Connolly Autograph Collection

- 1 Presumably some official position, which Bennett was interested in securing, on the staff of the high commissioner of the Ionian Islands.
- 2 That is, in the *Morning Chronicle* (London), in connection with his latest parliamentary encounter with O'Connell (see letter 1683, note 2).
- 3 O'Connell in his reply to Doherty (see letter 1683, note 2) referred to his 'stage trick, scenic skill, and forensic management . . . which . . . are so often found useful in the absence of ability, talents, legal knowledge, and research . . .' (*DEP*, 29 June 1830).
- 4 That is in the forthcoming Co. Clare election. According to Tom Steele, O'Connell claimed that MacNamara had called on him [O'Connell] in Dublin 'to tell him that there could be no coalition between them . . . that O'Connell should not oppose him; but that everyone should make the best fight he could'. MacNamara denied that this conversation ever took place, and claimed on the contrary that he had a letter in his possession, written by O'Connell before the (celebrated) Clare election, promising MacNamara his support, and even pledging himself to resign Clare in MacNamara's favour on a future occasion, if it should be in his (MacNamara's) interest for

- him to do so. O'Connell, according to Steele, admitted the existence of this letter but claimed it was offset by the conversation referred to above (Steele to the *Post and Sentinel*, 5 July 1830, *FJ*, 8 July 1830).
- 5 The committee on tolls and customs (Ireland), appointed on 24 May 1830, of which O'Connell was a member. Its report was not printed until 1834 (*Parl. Papers*, 1834, XVII).
- 6 John MacNamara Cantwell, attorney's apprentice. One of the defence attorneys at the state trials in 1844.

1685

To Richard Barrett

London, 28 June 1830

Private

My dear Friend,

I fear I led you astray on Saturday when I returned vexed at the absence of the Lord Chamberlain.¹ Some fifty or sixty members were sworn in² afterwards.

The swearing-in has gone on all day. I was sworn in about one o'clock: at that time more than three hundred members had taken the oaths. The House will proceed to business tomorrow. The address to the new King will be moved on Wednesday. It is said that Brougham will move an amendment but that will depend on intervening events.

The first act of the King was to direct that the Duke of Norfolk should be sworn in as a Privy Councillor. Long live King William!³

His second act was the direction that Sir Sidney Smith⁴ should be appointed full Colonel of Marines.

Nothing certain as yet relative to the new administration nor whether there will be any important changes. Some changes must take place.

The report of the day is that the Parliament will continue to sit for six weeks; that is, that the greater part of the business will be regularly gone through. In short, the period is critical in the extreme, and nobody knows with certainty what the next event will be. The King is frank and affable, quite ready to take trouble and *bustle*. He therefore will not be the mere puppet of his Ministers. He has not abandoned himself at once to the Holland House Party,⁵ as they expected. They are, you know, connected with him by a singular cross. The son of

Lady Holland by her present Lord, while she was *legally* the wife of another, is married to one of the FitzClarences.

SOURCE : Fitzpatrick, Corr., I, 206-207

- 1 James (Graham), third duke of Montrose (1755-1836); lord chamberlain of the household, 1821-27 and 1827-24 July 1830.
- 2 The swearing of allegiance to the new sovereign, William IV.
- 3 The duke of Norfolk was a Catholic.
- 4 Sir William Sidney Smith (1764-1840). Knighted, 1815. Entered Royal Navy 1777; rear-admiral, 1805; admiral, 1821. See *DNB*.
- 5 That is, a section of the Whigs. Holland House was the home of Henry Richard Fox, third Baron Holland and nephew of the celebrated Whig, Charles James Fox.

1686

To Richard Newton Bennett

London, 30 June 1830

Confidential

My dear Bennett,

I write but for one purpose. It is that you should see Hickman¹ and find out from him whether the Fitzgeralds will sell Ennis, for this term. It is theirs at present—and the person who desires to know the fact is an English gentleman of large fortune who would I think outbid anybody else. Enquire about this *discreetly* and speedily and communicate to me the result without delay.

I think there will be a considerable change of Ministry. It is indeed impossible for the present Ministry to go on together. The *Lady*² is in a high station. She *can* now serve you. The dissolution takes place within three weeks. Steele has not written to me as yet.

If there be a change of Administration, Doherty, I think, will get notice to quit.³

[P.S.] If you find Ennis is truly to be disposed of, you *may* in that case only name your man. He is [*remainder of letter missing*].

SOURCE : Connolly Autograph Collection

- 1 Poole Hickman.
- 2 This reference is obscure.

- 3 That is, as solicitor general for Ireland. The Grey ministry began however by retaining Doherty though on 23 December 1830 he was made chief justice of the Irish common pleas.

1687

From Richard Scott to House of Commons

19 North Earl Street, Dublin, 30 June 1830

My dear Sir,

I have received your letter of the 23rd inst., addressed to me to Ennis, where I have not been for the last two months and I confess I am sorry to find you persist in attributing to Major McNamara language and conduct which he disavows.¹ He had a conversation with you on which you put a construction and meaning that he neither intended nor wished. Whatever it was, it is clear from your statement it proceeded from him. If so, it is natural to suppose it must be with a view to his own benefit, and yet he does not act on it in any one way whatsoever but, on the contrary, disavows it. You on the other hand insist on it though evidently, as you say, to your disadvantage. You say he wished it to be understood there was *no coalition* between you. Whatever passed between you was, I suppose, in confidence for your mutual benefit yet you make this confidential conversation the subject of triumph in your letters to your friends and insist on it publicly as a total relinquishment of your engagements to Major MacNamara. Now I fear you have not a copy of your *written* engagement to the Major and therefore have not a good recollection of it. If you have either, you must be aware there was no stipulation for a coalition between you *in it*. You bound yourself to the Major. He did not bind himself to you. I know the contract between you and I insist on it, he has neither in public nor private to my knowledge attempted to violate it, or in any manner endeavoured to interfere with your prospects of a re-election. *The time for him to act on that document has not yet arrived* and I sincerely and honestly hope he never will have occasion to act on it.

Why should he insist on your abandoning Clare until he finds in the terms of your contract that you were interfering with his return and until then, why should he (like O'Gorman Mahon) call on you to resign? Has he as yet, I will ask you,

acted in any manner towards you to warrant you in supposing he is opposed or even neuter as to you? On the contrary, the enquiries of your friends, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Steele, as to his views and intentions would induce him and his friends to think that you feel that the Major is interfering with your election. This certainly is changing places with him but I advise you to steer clear of obliging him to act adversely against you. This and the other letters I have written to you on this unpleasant subject are entirely without his knowledge except that, when he first heard your construction of his conversation, he requested I would immediately undeceive you. I am convinced you have not served yourself as to your politics in Clare by your reconciliation at this particular moment with O'Gorman Mahon. Will he still insist on your alleged verbal promise to him not to stand for Clare if he does and that Major McNamara also produces your written promise to that effect? Ask yourself how will you get over it. If he does not, how stands your assertion as to no coalition with him? I again declare my anxious wish that you and Major McNamara should be returned but I confess I am so bewildered at your conduct towards him, and the turn Clare politics are likely to take that I know not and cannot pledge myself how I am to act at the next election either as an agent or an elector.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1684, note 4.

1688

To Richard Barrett

London, 1 July 1830

Private

My dear Friend,

The Stamp Duties¹ were abandoned; the increase on the spirits² alone remains; the distillers do not complain, so that, though the *Freeman's Journal* is certainly right respecting the effect of the new tax,³ yet it is not worth while to throw away any good agitation on that subject. I also think we need say no more about gold⁴ but perhaps to remark on the arbitrary act of the Bank of Ireland in requiring the name and address of every person requiring gold. This is an intimidation which should be lashed, and some person should go in with a note

or notes and demand payment in presence of a witness and then protest the note and sue them, or sue them without a protest. But use your own discretion on this point. Whatever you do on this or any other point, I will readily concur in because you see the *home market* closer than I do. Not that I think we should retract one word we have said respecting gold but at the utmost merely cease to fan the flame for the present. Yet you will use your discretion.

Now for news. For the present the King has adopted Wellington as the head of the administration. The only changes now contemplated are in the internal arrangements of the Cabinet itself. Goulburn's inefficiency is manifest to everybody and there is no doubt but that he must be *shifted*. They do not, I believe, know what to do with him. There will also be some minor arrangements but at present the Cabinet stands firm. Lord Grey's party and Lord Holland's are both thrown overboard, and accordingly hopes are being blasted. This was actually begun last night. The Lords were violent, but in the Commons there was a degree of acrimony and virulence seldom witnessed. It was manifestly the first ebullition of a settled party spirit. Even Lord John Russell⁵ was vituperative. He called the Galway Bill,⁶ as altered⁷ by the Duke of Wellington, *a job*. Of course that Bill will be rejected in the Commons.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 207-208

- 1 See letter 1672, note 3.
- 2 See letter 1670, note 3.
- 3 The *Freeman's Journal* published on 29 June 1830 elaborate statistics purporting to show the cost to Ireland of the proposed increase in the duty on spirits.
- 4 See letter 1683, note 2.
- 5 Lord John Russell (1792-1878), third son of sixth duke of Bedford; home secretary, 1835-39; colonial secretary, 1839-41; prime minister, 1846-52 and 1865-66. Created Earl Russell, 1861.
- 6 The Galway elective franchise bill, which Thomas Spring Rice and Sir John Newport were directed by the Commons to prepare on 10 March 1830. The bill was intended to repeal so much of an act (4 Geo. I c. 15 'for the better regulating the Town of Galway and for strengthening the Protestant Interest therein') as limited the franchise thereby created to Protestants. The bill received its second reading and was committed on 17 March.
- 7 The Galway franchise bill (or Galway Town Regulation Bill as it is styled in the Lords) was first read in the Lords on 26 May 1830. It received its second reading on 24 June. On 25 June Wellington

carried an amendment to the bill in committee, by which 4 Geo. I c. 15 was to be repealed rather than amended. Grey opposed Wellington's amendment on the ground that 'the effect of the Noble Duke's Clause would be to convert a bill intended to afford relief into a measure of disqualification' (*DEF*, 29 June 1830). On 13 July petitions were presented from the Roman Catholic bishop, the barristers and resident magistrates of Galway complaining of the amendments to the bill by the Lords. The bill was allowed lapse.

1689

From Thomas Steele to 5 Maddox Street, London

Ennis, 4 July 1830

My dear Sir,

I write this letter at the table of Charles O'Connell, and round that table are the following persons: Charles O'Connell, Father Lynch,¹ Father O'Gorman,² Mr. Kerin,³ Bryan O'Loughlin,⁴ John Magrath,⁵ Hewitt Bridgeman,⁶ Thomas Steele, Staunton Cahill and . . . a certain Austrian Irishman called Morgan O'Connell whom I brought with me from the Kingdom of Kerry for some rather important purposes which I shall hereafter explain.

Without further preface we all agree in this that O'Connell should not lose one moment in writing to his friends in Clare saying that *in pursuance of their desire* he will come to the County of which he is the representative, and in which his character has been assailed. . . .

With the concurrence of Hewitt Bridgeman, Charles O'Connell, Michael O'Loghlen and Dickson⁷ and your brother John on whom I waited in Kerry, I brought Morgan to Ennis to challenge Major McNamara for his daring to accuse his father of fabricating a conversation for the purpose of evading the performance of his written pledge.⁸

[Steele goes on to say that McNamara declined the invitation so that the gallant Morgan O'Connell is safe. He (Steele) then wrote McNamara the query: 'Do you, Major McNamara, require that O'Connell shall resign his pretensions to continue to be the representative in Parliament of the people of Clare to make way for you?' McNamara replied in a note that he would make use of O'Connell's written engagement at any time when he should find it necessary for his purposes.]

His Lordship, Dr. McMahon,⁹ was in town this day and honoured your friends by assisting us with his counsel.

The people were in a state of great ferment and anxiety all this morning when they heard of the resignation,¹⁰ there not being yet an opportunity of giving to them an exposition of the complex political machinery by which your election is to be engrafted on your resignation.

A placard however which I posted on the Court House accompanied by Charles O'Connell in the presence of the people, allayed their apprehensions. . . .

With regard to what you mention about the violation of the compact in London,¹¹ I shall say nothing now. You know very well what my feelings must be unless this be in the most distinct and unequivocal manner disavowed.

[Your friends think you should be here for the Assizes to defend some prisoners.]

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Rev. Daniel Lynch, P.P. of Kilmaly, Ennis, 1836-38; Inch and Kilmaly 1839-63. Died 1863.
- 2 Rev. Patrick O'Gorman, P.P. Clare Abbey, Co. Clare, from 1836 or earlier to 1848.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 Bryan O'Loughlen (1790-1861), Rockview, Co. Clare; son of Colman O'Loughlen, Port, Co. Clare and brother of Michael O'Loughlen, later first baronet.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 Hewitt Bridgeman, Tierne, Corofin, Co. Clare, brother-in-law of Sir Michael O'Loughlen. M.P. Ennis, 1835-47.
- 7 Unidentified.
- 8 See letter 1684, note 4. Steele had attempted to persuade Maurice O'Connell to go with him from London to Clare, in order to challenge Major William Nugent MacNamara for what he (Steele) construed as an insult to O'Connell. Maurice, according to Steele, was unable to come due to illness. Steele then set off for Derrynane where O'Connell's son Morgan, a captain in the Austrian hussars, was home on leave. Morgan at once accompanied Steele to Clare, and on arrival wrote MacNamara such a letter, according to Steele, 'as became a son, a soldier, and a gentleman'. MacNamara, however, declined Morgan's challenge to a duel (Steele to *Post and Sentinel*, 5 July 1830, *FI* 8 July 1830).
- 9 Patrick McMahon (died June 1836), Bishop of Killaloe, 1819-36.
- 10 O'Connell had decided, according to Tom Steele, on his (Steele's) advice, to resign the representation of Clare. Steele claimed that the basis of the reconciliation which he had effected between O'Connell and O'Gorman Mahon (see letter 1679, note 7) had been the promised neutrality of the parties in the forthcoming election. MacNamara, however, claimed that this violated O'Connell's written

pledge to support him (see letter 1684, note 4). Steele then told O'Connell that the letter being in Major MacNamara's hands and the conversation which he (MacNamara) so lately denied, being unfortunately without a witness, there was only one thing for him (O'Connell) to do, in order that he might 'sustain his character in its greatness', viz. to resign Clare. O'Connell agreed to this. (Steele to the *Post and Sentinel*, 5 July 1830, *FJ*, 8 July 1830). Speaking himself in Dublin on 13 July, O'Connell declared that his standing down as representative for Clare was due to his written promise to MacNamara (*FJ*, 14 July 1830).

- 11 This reference is ambiguous. It may refer *either* to O'Connell's compact with O'Gorman Mahon in London, in which, according to Steele, O'Connell agreed to observe neutrality towards all parties in the Clare election (see letters 1679, note 7 and 1689, note 10) *or* to his written promise to Major MacNamara, to support MacNamara (see letter 1684, note 4) *or* to MacNamara's alleged oral agreement with O'Connell to permit all the parties to remain neutral (see letter 1684, note 4).

1690

From Richard Scott

19 North Earl Street, Dublin, 6 July 1830

My dear Sir,

On receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst. I wrote to you confidentially and gave you an advice which, I am sorry to find by letters I have this day received from Clare, was too late, and that all my hopes of being able to serve you in Clare are now at an end. *You have been outgeneralled and ill advised* as to your conduct¹ towards Major McNamara and, from the copies of Mr. Steele and your son's letters,² I fear it will be my painful duty to advise Major McNamara to apply to the Court of King's Bench for a criminal information, even though it should have the unpleasant result of making public all your correspondence and transactions with regard to Clare politics.³

Sincerely lamenting the termination of my exertions for you.

I remain, Dr Sir, Yours very truly,
Richard Scott

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 See letters 1684, note 4 and 1689, note 10.

- 2 Steele's letter to the *Post and Sentinel*, 5 July 1830 (*FJ*, 8 July 1830) had employed some very offensive terms about MacNamara. Morgan O'Connell's letter challenging MacNamara to a duel (see letter 1689, note 8) had presumably been couched in similar terms.
- 3 There is no evidence that this advice was taken.

1691

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

London, 7 July 1830

My dear John,

. . . You will be glad to know that my letters from Clare this day show that the foolish expedition¹ on which Tom Steele took my son Morgan has ended happily and without any kind of public exhibition.

. . . Give any site you choose for the hospital. Let it be disengaged from other buildings. The excise on leather being off² this would be the time [? to buy a] tan yard. . . I am sorry you did not give more than £20 to the poor. If they are starving³ near Derrynane, kill some sheep or a cow and give them and the calves—as they are produced—I would not rear one while the people want the flesh and the milk. Feed the dogs with Grains and . . . such food as the people would not use. Have all the boats fishing for the people. Give them all the salt fish as well as the fresh. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See 1689, note 8.
- 2 In his budget, presented on 15 March 1830, Goulburn had said he would abolish the duty on leather from 5 July 1830 (*Hansard*, N.S., XXIII, 315).
- 3 Numerous reports of severe distress in several parts of Ireland appear in the press at this time.

1692

To Richard Barrett

London, 8 July 1830

Private

My dear Barrett,

I cannot avoid remarking on the singularity of the conduct

of Staunton towards me—that I never yet was in any *critical* situation but he, by some accident or the other, threw himself into the opposite scale. See his paper of Monday where he takes part with the reporters.¹ And on that very day I made three speeches which would have advantaged me in England and in Ireland and they were all, to use the galling phrase, ‘Burked’. Say this to him without asperity but with a sense of my not having deserved from him this usage. You already know that I am off on Sunday² and will see you, please God, early on Tuesday; this will give me time for further operations. I will send you tomorrow an address to the Irish electors generally. I have got rather good news from Clare.³ Second, I am invited to Drogheda;⁴ third, I have had a strong invitation to Wexford, exclusive of my friend Cloney’s partial wishes; fourth, the Powers wrote to me about Waterford; fifth, I have been written to about County Galway; sixth, about Meath; seventh, about Louth; eighth, about Cork; and but for Lord Kenmare’s brother,⁵ I would be returned for Kerry.

And yet, amidst all these prospects, I know not what to do. Write to Tom Steele the moment you receive this, or rather to Hewitt Bridgeman at Ennis. I confess I would prefer Wexford as it would free me from all my engagements and would be a splendid county. The letter of Steele gives the answer of Major McNamara in a way *that is most unsatisfactory*.⁶

You will perceive that my anxiety is not small to be able to take a *decisive* course. I am bound to McNamara too strictly, that is the fact. There is nothing new; the King doing occasionally strange things, and every effort making to keep his wildness secret. This, however, is to be treated gently; we must not quarrel with him unnecessarily.

The moment I get over I will *agitate* strongly an Election Committee for every county. The way is immediately to have an investigation made as to the capacity of each county to return a reformer; this plan makes me doubly anxious to be in Dublin. All the Irish business will be over this night. I was unable to attend last night for more than an hour, during which time I got all my objections to Irish Bills allowed before they were brought forward.

Sheil has given up Louth, as I am just told. If I got Wexford, Sheil could easily get Drogheda, and the more easily for my breaking the way for him.

Do not laugh at me for being *so* uncertain as to my course.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 208-210

- In the Commons on 2 July 1830 Thomas Spring Rice complained of being misreported in the press. O'Connell declared 'the misstatement had occurred in consequence of the clumsy manner in which the reports of the proceedings in that House were taken. It would be better, he thought, to have a responsible body of reporters. By the present system no one was responsible, and therefore every person was at liberty to misrepresent what occurred in the House' (*Hansard*, N.S. XXV, 891). The *Morning Register* of Monday, 6 July 1830, hinted that O'Connell's attitude was dictated by *pique* at the London newspapers for subjecting his speeches to the same curtailment as speeches delivered by other members, and declared he had been spoilt by the Irish press during the Emancipation campaign.
- 2 O'Connell arrived at Kingstown (modern Dunlaoghaire) on the morning of Tuesday, 13 July 1830 (*FJ*, 14 July 1830).
 - 3 O'Connell had probably heard that the electors of Clare wished him to stand again for the county. Four days later, on 12 July 1830 a meeting of electors in Ennis invited him to visit the county to witness its continued support for him (*FJ*, 15 July 1830) and on 13 July a deputation from the meeting waited on him in Dublin to present its resolutions (*FJ*, 14 July 1830). According to the *Freeman's Journal*, it was considered unlikely in these circumstances that Major MacNamara would continue to utilise O'Connell's written promise in order to prevent him (O'Connell) from again standing for Co. Clare (see letters 1684, note 4 and 1689, note 10).
 - 4 On 3 July the *Freeman's Journal* declared it probable, from rumours in circulation, that O'Connell would stand for Drogheda in the coming election. On 13 July O'Connell speaking in Dublin thanked the electors of Drogheda for being the first of eight constituencies to invite him to become their representative. He hinted, however, that it was unlikely he would stand for Drogheda (*FJ*, 14 July 1830).
 - 5 Hon. William Browne (1791-1876), third son of the first earl of Kenmare; M.P. for Co. Kerry, 1830-31; 1841-47; high sheriff, 1832.
 - 6 See letters 1684, note 4 and 1689, note 10.

1693

From Dominick Ronayne to Merrion Square

Ardsallagh [Co. Waterford], 12 July 1830

My dear Friend,

The honest and consistent Musgraves,¹ whom I this day canvassed for you, without hesitation declared *you should have their support* and were quite pleased at the prospect of your

being their representative.² They entertain *no doubt* of your success as they calculate that you will have in very many instances the two [i.e. the second] votes of those who vote for Lord George³ as well as of those who may vote for Power⁴ added to which the number of plumpers for you will give you a very decided majority. The expense they think will be much less than what your return for Drogheda would cost. This is the calculation supposing that there *will be a contest* but my opinion, and I do not hazard it on *light grounds*, is that if you offer yourself without delay and canvass that county there will be *no contest* at all and you and Beresford will go in without trouble as Power is *not prepared for a fight* and will, I think, give in without a struggle. If you come forward at once and *boldly*, the result will be that you will succeed in the way I have mentioned without any expense. Let me know your sentiments by *return of post*. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sir Richard Musgrave, third baronet (1790-1859), Tourin, Cappoquin, Co. Waterford. M.P. for Co. Waterford, 1831-32, 1835-37. John Musgrave (1792-1837), brother of Sir Richard Musgrave, third baronet.
- 2 O'Connell's address to the electors of Co. Waterford, soliciting their votes in the coming election is dated 13 July 1830 (see *FJ*, *MR*, 22 July 1830). Speaking in Dublin on 13 July on the subject of the elections, however, O'Connell gave no hint as to his intentions (*FJ*, 14 July 1830).
- 3 Lord George Thomas Beresford.
- 4 Richard Power, M.P.

1694

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Monday, 12 July 1830

My dear Sir,

I yesterday received your letter from London of the 8th and instantly drove over to Sir Thos. Esmonde's.¹ I slept there last night and drop this in the [post] office at Arklow on my return home. Sir Thomas had been prepared for the subject of your letter, T. Cloney having written to him about your standing for the County Wexford the day before. Esmonde had pondered on the matter and spoke it over at length last night and this morning. He desired me in the first place say

that if there was or should be such a fair chance of success, as to warrant the involving you in a contest for the County of Wexford, he would most gladly yield any claims of his own and use his best exertions for you. He thinks however your success in the County of Wexford would be very doubtful and certainly under present circumstances very expensive. There are at present 6 candidates—Lord Valentia,² Col. Chichester,³ Messrs. Ram,⁴ Waddy,⁵ Lambert⁶ and probably Boyse.⁷ Many of the independent interests—Catholics and former Brunswickers—are soliciting Sir Thomas to come forward himself. He is not anxious to do so and will only declare himself if he finds by so doing he can prevent the effect of a contest splitting the independent interests. He cannot make up his mind either about himself or as to the advice he would give you till this day fortnight when the assizes of Wexford begin and when the independent interests will know what they are to do. The independent interests here, *per se*, are not strong, the landlords, chiefly Protestant, having great influence and power. During the excitement of our question⁸ the landlords' power would have been set at nought but now it would be difficult to work against that power. And amongst the landlords of this county there is still much of the leaven of Brunswickism and much *high* Protestant feeling, all which Esmonde fears would be arrayed against you. He also thinks the county is in some degree pledged to Chichester unless the latter renders those pledges void by not openly declaring himself on the political questions now affecting Ireland. Corcoran⁹ of Enniscorthy also spoke to Sir Thomas about you. In strict confidence, however, I believe neither Corcoran nor Cloney have any influence in the county. Sir Thomas said he would be sorry you depended too much on his opinion. You may have other and better sources of information but, fearing your success would be very problematical, and believing the expense of a contest would be great, he thinks great caution and care should be taken before you commit yourself and, even more than expense, he would lament defeat in your case. . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Ballynastragh, Gorey, Co. Wexford.
- 2 George Arthur (Annesley), *styled* Viscount Valentia 1816-41 (1793-1841), Bletchington Park, Oxford, M.P. for Co. Wexford, 1830-31. Succeeded 1841 as ninth earl of Mountnorris.
- 3 Arthur Chichester (1797-1837), Dunbrody Park, Co. Wexford, first son and heir of Lord Spencer Stanley Chichester. Became lieut.-col.,

- Life Guards, 1827. M.P. Milborne Port, 1826-30; Co. Wexford, 1830-31. Created 1831 Baron Templemore (U.K.).
- 4 Of Rams Fort and Clonattin, near Gorey, Co. Wexford. A well known family.
- 5 Cadwallader Waddy (born c. 1783), Kilmacow, Co. Wexford; captain, 69th Regt. M.P. for Co. Wexford, 1834-35.
- 6 Henry Lambert, J.P., D.L., (1786-1861), Carnagh, Co. Wexford. M.P. for Co. Wexford, 1831-35. Married 1835 Catherine daughter of William Talbot, Castle Talbot, Co. Wexford and sister of Maria Theresa, wife of sixteenth earl of Shrewsbury.
- 7 Thomas Boyse, J.P., D.L. (1785-1853), eldest son of Samuel Boyse of Bannow, Co. Wexford. Though he took part in the election campaign, he did not stand as a candidate. High Sheriff, 1841.
- 8 That is, Catholic Emancipation.
- 9 John Corcoran, Catholic attorney and landowner, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford.

1695

From his wife to Waterford

Brewsterfield [Killarney], 24 July [1830]

My darling love,

This is the eight-and-twentieth anniversary of our wedding day—the day of the week too—which to me was the commencement of a happiness that through your fault was and never will be decreased. I have been the happiest of women since I first knew you and I feel that if you don't love me more, you do not now, in my old age, love me less. And oh darling how dear, how very dear are you to my fond and grateful heart! May God bless and protect you and send us a happy meeting. I am, thank God, much better; but they will not let me leave here until Monday next. . . .

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X, 719-20

1696

To Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman, Dungarvan

Duckspool [Dungarvan], 25 July 1830

Private

My dear Purcell,

If I knew you were at Ballygullane I should have called

for and asked your personal assistance. I have got the second votes of all parties, both the Duke's¹ and the Beresfords. It is the common cant of electioneering to talk of certainty of return, but my host, John Galwey,² who knows the county as well as any man living, offers in vain fifty to one on my return. He has bid me be as certain of it as of my own existence; but even without the weight of his authority I was already quite convinced of it. Only think that at Tramore, which gave Barron³ only three votes, I have no less than thirty-two, that is, *every vote*. Duckett,⁴ Manners,⁵ Ronayne,⁶ Carberry⁷ of this town, etc., are in my train. All the seculars have joined me except Power O'Shee,⁸ and his second votes are tolerably secure.

I have got decided and most friendly support from Power of Faithlegg⁹ and all his friends. Tell Charles O'Connell¹⁰ I make it a point that he will not oppose O'Gorman Mahon, and that I beg of all my friends not to oppose him.¹¹ If I could combat directly for O'Gorman Mahon, I certainly would do so, I have been so well treated here by his friends. You may use this fact for him as *you* please.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 210

1 Duke of Devonshire.

2 John Matthew Galwey (born c. 1790-1842), son of William Galwey, Dungarvan; married 1813 Anne daughter of Pierse Barron, Castle-town, Co. Waterford. Merchant, shipowner, land agent and landowner. M.P. Co. Waterford, 1832-34; contested Co. Waterford at general election of 1834-35 but retired on the day of nomination (see letter 2189a)

3 John Barron at the by-election in March 1830.

4 Probably Richard Duckett, J.P., Tramore, Co. Waterford.

5 Unidentified.

6 Dominick Ronayne.

7 Andrew Carbery, Main Street, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford. One of a family of prominent merchants.

8 John Power O'Shee (1809-59), Gardenmorris, Co. Waterford and Sheestown, Co. Kilkenny. High Sheriff Co. Waterford, 1832.

9 Nicholas Mahon Power.

10 Charles O'Connell, attorney, Ennis.

11 O'Gorman Mahon was returned for Co. Clare in the ensuing general election.

1697

From P. Sheehan¹ to Tallow

Waterford, 26 July [1830]

Dear Sir,

As I shall be obliged to leave this on tomorrow for Dublin on professional business, I have to request that you will occupy my brother's² house when you return to Waterford and make it your lodging house whilst you remain in this city. Mr. Coleman,³ my brother's curate, will be here to pay you every attention. . . .

I beg leave to warn against some of the persons by whom you are at present surrounded. They would wish to keep their terms with the Beresfords and make their peace with the people and, in the spirit of the system of delusion with which they have always acted, they would involve the pure and honourable in the same corruption with themselves. I cannot find language sufficiently strong to denounce the conduct of those *creatures*, and when I know that one of them (who by the by commands your ear almost exclusively) has said that he would not wish for £1,000 that you came to this county. I cannot forget Pierce Mahony and to warn you that there are more P[ierce] Mahonys in the world than one.⁴ . . .

Apropos, I suppose you have not heard that the Bishop⁵ suspended two of his curates for attending the dinner⁶ given to you here on Thursday last. This is part of the plan suggested by the persons by whom you are encompassed and the very line the Beresfords wish to have adopted generally. This silly bishop 'vested with little brief authority' would wish to put down public opinion and show it from the most unquestionable authority that in his heart he wishes you far from the County Waterford and that he would show it openly but for that which keeps all men in check—the public voice. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Patrick Sheehan, M.D., 9 Lady Lane, Waterford, brother of Rev. John Sheehan.
- 2 Rev. John Sheehan, P.P.
- 3 Rev. Maurice Coleman, C.C. St. Patrick's Waterford, 1830; C.C. Trinity Within and St. John's Waterford, 1836-40. Died, 1840.
- 4 Probably a reference to Mahony's soliciting O'Connell's and Sheil's services as election agents for the Beresfords in the Co. Waterford election of March 1830 (see letter 1583).

5 Dr. Abraham.

6 A dinner to O'Connell on 22 July 1830, in the Independent Club House, Waterford. It was attended by over seventy persons (MR, 26 July 1830, quoting *Waterford Chronicle*).

1698

*From Christopher Fitz-Simon to care of Rev. Mr. Sheehan,
Waterford*

Mount Street [Dublin], Tuesday, 27 July [1830]

My dear Sir,

. . . What are your wishes about my second vote for the County of Dublin. I give the same answer to all applications but I should be glad to hear from you as soon as you can. My own personal wish would rather be to oblige Lord Meath, living as I do in the same county¹ with him but on these occasions personal wishes ought not to be thought of. I have just heard that all the *writs* go down by this night's mail. Shall we see you here before the election, or can I be of any use to you by going down to Waterford?

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Co. Wicklow. Lord Meath lived at Kilruddery, Bray and Fitz-Simon at Ballinamona, Arklow, both in Co. Wicklow.

1699

To his brother James

August 1830

My dearest James,

This will be handed to you by my very kind and particular friend Mr. P. V. FitzPatrick. He is the eldest son of the late Mr. Hugh FitzPatrick. He has been one of the most useful, if not the most perseveringly useful, of the managers of 'the Fund'.¹ All the articles in the *Post*² on that subject have been written by him. I cannot describe to you how grateful I am to him. He is now going to the South of Ireland. I recommend him to you in the strongest terms. Invite him to your house whilst he remains in Kerry. Show this letter to John,³ and take care to *forward* him throughout the kingdom of Kerry.

I leave this letter open that he may show it in Cork to our friend Charles Sugrue, Tom Fitzgerald, etc.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 210-211

- 1 The O'Connell Tribute.
- 2 That is, the *Dublin Evening Post* which published many articles in support of the O'Connell Tribute.
- 3 O'Connell's brother.

1700

*From Thomas Shaffan¹ to Merrion Square
marked 'to be forwarded'*

1 August 1830

Dear Sir,

I came to Dublin to canvass² some persons here for your friend Mr. Leader. I met a Mr. Bradley, Sea Bank Cottage, Merrion, with whom I had some difficulty about his attending for us. He voted before for the Independents at your suggestion and said he was surprised you did not canvass him for Mr. Leader. He is a £50 freeholder. We want him, and the fact is, that a letter from you will however determine him, by promising to secure for him some certain draft of a marriage settlement which he says is in your custody or procurement. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Nicholas P. Leader was elected for Kilkenny City on 11 August 1830, but he had previously considered standing for Carlow borough (see letter 1681).

1701

*From his daughter Ellen Fitz-Simon to Waterford
c/o Rev. Mr. Sheehan¹*

[11 August 1830]

My dear Father,

Not having a *sheet* of *paper* I send you Fitz-Simon's letter² which I received this morning. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 This letter was written on one received by Ellen from her husband, Christopher Fitz-Simon (see note 2).

- 2 In this Fitz-Simon tells of the expected defeat of Maurice O'Connell (O'Connell's eldest son) in the Drogheda election and adds: 'As I told you before, we feel we must succeed on petition. On the poll I now see we cannot. Our registry has for the last two days turned out most defective, carried by the want of attention on the part of the liberal club. We have lost at least 50 votes by their want of care.'

1702

*From his son-in-law Christopher Fitz-Simon to Waterford,
readdressed to Cork*

4 Upper Mount Street [Dublin],
Friday, 13 August [1830]

My dear Sir,

. . . I came up from Drogheda yesterday morning. North was still keeping his freeman's booth open for any stragglers that might drop in, hoping they or some of them might turn out *resident* freemen. They say it has cost him near £10,000. He has raked together freemen from all quarters of the United Kingdom at a great expense. The state of the gross poll on Wednesday was North 337, O'Connell 267, majority 70. North polled but 5 freeholders and of his 332 freemen, they say there are not 150 *resident*. We had about 30 freemen of whom one half were resident, so that if the question of residents be the same as in Wexford, Maurice must be the sitting member. Nothing could equal the noble spirit of Drogheda. They have already several hundred pounds subscribed for the petition.¹ Maurice has throughout acquitted himself in the most satisfactory manner and has given proof of talent that even surprised his friends. All that is wanting is to induce him to exert his powers and I trust such will be the effect of his visit to Drogheda. . . . The independents have determined on chairing him so certain are they of victory.² The chairing to be today. We are all deeply indebted to Terence Dolan³ who showed the greatest zeal and talent in conducting the election. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Maurice O'Connell's petition against the election of North was presented to the Commons on 16 November 1830 but was unsuccessful.
2 That is, by bringing what was felt would be a successful petition against the election of North on the ground that non-resident freemen had no right to the franchise (MR, 13 Aug. 1830).

- 3 Terence Thomas Dolan, attorney, North Crescent, Mount Pleasant, Ranelagh, Dublin; sometime secretary of the O'Connell testimonial fund committee.

1703

To Thomas Wyse

[15 August 1830]

Excerpt

Would to heaven I could convince you that in the present state of public affairs it is the duty of every man of intellect and information to lead not check the public sentiment as it tends to bring the great principles of democratic liberty and self-government into practical operation.

SOURCE : James Johnston Auchmuty, *Sir Thomas Wyse 1791-1862* (London, 1939), 126

1704

To Robert White

Cork, 16 August 1830

My dear Robert,

. . . I am particularly anxious to have the *Sun*. It is the best daily London paper. . . .

Go to my house . . . and open the cases in the hall. Send me down a trunk that is I believe in my study and contains amongst other things law papers. . . . Send me in one case the following by the steamer on Wednesday. 1st. All Jeremy Bentham's works you find. 2nd. All the reports in blue paper (very large they are) of the Commissioners of Irish Education. 3rd. The Report upon Canada.¹ 4th. The reports of the Commissioners of Common Law,² there are two of them. 5th. The reports of the Commissioners of Equity.³ . . . Pray get Maurice to assist you in finding out these things. . . . Drive to Robinson's ironfoundry near the testimonial bridge, Parkgate, and get the Cobbett stove I spoke to him about. It ought to have been sent with the steam

boilers. Do let it come on Wednesday. [reference to payment for bills of exchange soon due]

SOURCE : Property of Mrs. Oriana Conner

- 1 *Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of civil government of Canada . . .*, 1828 (569) VII, 375.
- 2 *Report from the Select Committee appointed to consider the expediency of consolidating and amending the Criminal Law of England*, 1824 (205) (444) IV, 39, 349.
- 3 Probably *Reports of Commissioners respecting Courts of Justice in Ireland* which were published (twenty-one reports in all) in various years from 1817 to 1831 inclusive.

1705

From Sir Henry Hardinge¹

Dublin, 29 August 1830

Sir,

I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 24th inst. and having attentively perused the correspondence which has passed, I find that the case of John Leary² was, after consulting the Chief Law Adviser of the Government, decided upon in June last.

Although his Excellency would at any period be anxiously open to conviction, nevertheless having maturely and dispassionately considered this case and reviewed the decision formerly given, his Excellency in the exercise of his public duty is under the necessity of adhering to it.

The ship on board of which John Leary is embarked sailed on the 25th inst.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sir Henry Hardinge (1785-1856), chief secretary for Ireland 30 July-26 November 1830, December 1834-April 1835. Knighted 1815. Secretary at war, 1828-30, 1841-44; M.P. almost continuously, 1820-44; governor general of India, 1844-48. Appointed major-general on half-pay 22 July 1830, Lieut.-General, 1841, General, 1854. Created 1846 Viscount Hardinge. See *DNB*.
- 2 Daniel John Leary (born c. 1764), tenant farmer, Rossa, Doneraile, Co. Cork. Convicted at first Doneraile Conspiracy trial and sentenced to death September/October 1829. Sentence commuted to transportation; deported to Botany Bay August 1830; pardoned, 1837.

1706

From Thomas Cloney

31 Lower Bridge Street [Dublin], 30 August 1830

My dear Sir,

Now that you are enjoying the *otium cum dignitate* and can say with Caesar—*Veni, Vidi, Vici*, I trust I may not be considered importunate in calling to your recollection your kind promise to write the preface to my little narrative.¹ I do sincerely feel the delicacy of asking you to give up one hour of your precious time to me, every moment of time so seriously employed as yours generally is, few should expect for themselves but your true, your ardent love for Ireland will not suffer you to forget the most persecuted of her sons. I feel I could not place what is dearest to me in this world (my character) in any other hands so able and willing to do it justice as yours, and I'm sure there are ample proofs of the *iniquity, injustice and illegality* of much of the proceedings against me.² If you could only look into them. If not done while you are in the country it is hopeless elsewhere, and I much fear the documents have been left behind in London. If so, no more need be said on the subject. The books I sent Mr. Maurice³ have been repeatedly called for. I wish I had them. I'll not annoy by saying a word of the great value an early publication would be to me but if I cannot be certain of its taking place next spring, its value must be greatly diminished. . . .

P.S. Mr. Fitz-Simon is pressing forward a requisition to congratulate the French.⁴ . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 *A Personal Narrative of 1798* (Dublin, 1832). There is no evidence in the published work to show who compiled the preface but Maurice O'Connell prepared the work for the press. Shortly before its publication, O'Connell wrote a laudatory public letter to Cloney in which he states: 'It will help to point out to the people of Ireland the impossibility of attaining any great or permanent political improvement by violent or forcible means whilst it exhibits the horrors, the misery and the atrocious crimes which are inseparable from any contest in which human blood is shed' (*FJ*, 21 Aug. 1832)
- 2 In his above mentioned work Cloney claims he became a member of the United Irishmen more from necessity than choice, and details

irregularities in his court-martial and in other persecutions allegedly suffered by him.

3 Maurice O'Connell.

4 In connection with the 'July Revolution' of 1830 (see letter 1709).

1707

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 31 August 1830

Confidential

My dear FitzPatrick,

The elections are over—I may say triumphantly over. The harvest is getting in. The periodical distress is for the present over. This is the time to do something for the Fund.¹ This, of course, is confidential; that is, it must not be known to come from me; but I cannot tell you how delighted I was at the development of your plan for Diocesan Sunday Collection. One Sunday, is it not, for each diocese? Now would be the time to realize it. There should be a communication with each bishop, and first with those most friendly. I think in Waterford it should, if possible, commence. You should therefore feel your way there. Let us commence in action at all events. Cork diocese is favourable. The Bishop² would give his aid, and has indeed already recommended it to his friends. I think it would be well to put forward the idea that one shilling each from one seventh of the Irish Catholics would be one million of shillings or £50,000; more, in fact, than could be necessary.³ See what is to be done. Things of this kind want only collectors of energy and perseverance. I depend on you for both. Let me hear from you speedily, and assist me by your advice as well as active cooperation. I rely much, very much, on you and will never cease to be grateful.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 211-212

1 The O'Connell Tribute.

2 John Murphy (1772-1847), member of a well established Cork family. Educated Lisbon; archdeacon and vicar-general of Cork until 1815; bishop of Cork, 1815-47; collected Irish manuscripts and formed a large private library which was sold in London in 1848 with the exception of 120 volumes of Irish manuscripts bequeathed to Maynooth College.

3 It had obviously been decided to have an annual collection for

O'Connell. This collection, the O'Connell Tribute, was first taken up in the early months of 1831 (see letter 1795).

1707a

To Robert White, 18 Fleet Street, Dublin

Derrynane, 31 August 1830

My dear friend,

I sent you yesterday a cheque for £102 and this covers one for £200 so that you can take up Cahill's bill. I suppose you will have applied the cheque of £102 to repay the loan Mr. Curtis so very kindly made. Get Fitz-Simon to thank him for me until I can do it in person. The £200 bill was, as I was informed, made payable in Tralee and the provision made for it there. Primrose has sent off an express to have that provision sent to you, and the very day you get it, lodge it to my credit in the Hibernian Bank. I am greatly obliged to you for all the trouble you have had but I need not say that: neither need I tell you how impatiently I will await your coming here. Do, my dear Robert, come here as soon as you can and you may rely on a hearty welcome—as hearty as every man got.

Tell Jerry McCarthy I will send him tomorrow a cheque for £250 to take up a bill of mine which will be due the 5th of September. I also sent him a cheque for £70 to take up a bill due yesterday. Call at my house and scold them for their omission to send the docket for the £212 bill. It is however better as it is but another time the omission may be very vexatious.

With best regards to your *Lady*.

[P.S.] Do not leave Dublin until you get the £200 from Tralee and lodge it to my credit. *This is material*.

SOURCE : Property of Mrs. Oriana Conner

1708

From P. V. Fitzpatrick to Cahirciveen

27 Eccles Street, Dublin, 3 September 1830

Private

My dear Sir,

I never for a moment have lost sight of the fund.¹ Robert

White and I have had several conferences as to the plan to be pursued to make the new effort as successful as possible. While the excitement of the elections and indeed of the all absorbing foreign news² was abroad it would have been truly difficult to enlist the attention and cooperation even of our warmest friends. The moment however has arrived for the commencement of operations and I only await the arrangement of some personal business to start for Waterford which I entirely concur with you in thinking the most eligible point from whence to originate our movements. Indeed I have declined with a view to devote myself entirely to the matter the most pressing applications to undertake the management both here and in London of the petitions on the subject of the late City of Dublin Election,³ the offers connected with which were sufficiently tempting. My *project* is to induce if possible the Bishop at Waterford⁴ to sanction the plan for the Sunday Collection and if I succeed in so doing (of which I have reason to entertain confident hopes), on my return to Dublin I shall influence some of the most respectable members of the Committee (with perhaps Lord Gormanston to take the chair) to resolve that they approve highly of the Sunday collection suggested in Waterford as a mode of completing the Tribute. This done, we shall organize a select deputation to wait on Dr. Murray to solicit his cooperation which, if obtained, will almost beyond doubt secure the rest of the bishops and I will personally visit every district of importance to put the collectors in harness. . . . The idea of the shilling subscription is good but its promulgation must be immediately antecedent to the day of actual collection. It must apply to the 'great public' and by no means be permitted to interfere with the contribution of larger sums from those able and willing to give such. It was my intention this morning to have suggested to you to write some letters to the journals on attractive topics or declaratory of your intended course of proceedings in the next Parliament. Such things are useful stimulants and I am happy to perceive you have anticipated me by a communication to the Waterford papers⁵ while others are announced in your letter⁶ to Mr. Dwyer. You will of course appear in the shape of an eloquent eulogy on the French Revolution at the great meeting⁷ that will be held at the Exchange and which will owe its origin and *effect* to your excellent son-in-law and myself. The requisition will gratify you as an array of *good* names. It may be well timed to pay a compliment in some of your earliest papers

to the bishops and clergy. There will be little difficulty in doing this from the general admission that no praise can in their regard savour of flattery. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The O'Connell Tribute.
- 2 In connection with the French and Belgian revolutions of 1830.
- 3 A long and detailed petition of Henry Grattan, Jr. against the allegedly invalid return of Frederick Shaw for Dublin City in the late general election, was presented in the Commons on 4 November 1830. The petition was, however, subsequently given up.
- 4 Dr. William Abraham.
- 5 O'Connell to the People of the County of Waterford, 28 August 1830 (*DEP*, 4 September 1830). In this address O'Connell declared 'My only object in going to Parliament is the good of the People'. He stated as one of his objects Repeal of the Union, and went on to list a large number of reforms and improvements for which he intended to strive.
- 6 This letter to Dwyer was apparently not published.
- 7 See letter 1709.

1709

*To his son-in-law Christopher Fitz-Simon*¹

Derrynane, 11 September 1830

My dear Fitz-Simon,

I regret extremely that my remoteness from Dublin renders it impossible for me to attend the meeting to celebrate the triumph of liberty in France. No man participates more fully than I do in the feelings of joy and exultation which must fill the mind of every lover of the human race at that glorious triumph. No man more delights than I do at the dismay with which that event has filled the hearts of the tyrants and oligarchs of the world.

The French revolution is in all its aspects consolatory and deserving of the highest praise. The people were in everything right—the Government in everything wrong—and as an atonement to human nature for so many successful crimes patriotism was in this instance victorious and tyranny was completely overthrown.

There is one feature in this great and satisfactory change which as a Catholic I hail with the most profound conviction

of its utility—it is the complete severance of the church from the state. Infidelity, which is more persecuting in its nature than the most persecuting of the unhappy sects that have rent the seamless garment of Christ and disgraced as well as injured Christianity; infidelity, I say, which has deluged France with the blood of the Catholic clergy, was losing ground by degrees since the concordat obtained by Napoleon but the progress of Christian truth and of genuine piety was much impeded since the return of the Bourbons, by the unhallowed commixture of zeal for religion with servile attachment to the Bourbons. ‘*La religion et le Roi*’ were put in juxtaposition, and the latter *seemed* as much an object of worship as the former but only *seemed* for the Catholic clergy of France have been basely and atrociously calumniated by many and, I am sorry to say, by none more than by Mr. Brougham when he called them bigoted and besotted. They were not and are not either the one or the other. The charge is utterly false and indeed in every respect unbecoming and unworthy the able man by whom it was uttered. No; the Catholic clergy of France are learned, pious, exemplary and most charitable and zealous. But they were placed in a ‘false position.’ The events of the first revolution, written in characters of blood, convinced them that the safety of religion was connected with the security of the throne. When one reflects on the almost countless massacres which in the first revolution were perpetrated on the Catholic clergy—for the clergy of every other persuasion were spared and protected; when one recollects that the first revolution abolished even the forms of Christianity, declared that death was an eternal sleep, and struck out the day dedicated by God to his own service—the Sunday—from the calendar. When a man recollects these facts and reflects on this that the Liberals of the present day appear to have inherited from the Jacobins of 1792 all their hatred of the Christian religion. When these things are weighed it will not appear strange that the Catholic clergy of France should have fallen into the error of believing that religion was wedded to loyalty. The consequences, however, of this error were most deplorable. The Bourbons were a foolish race of despots, and every crime they committed was attributed to religion. Religion being thus enlisted as an ally of the Bourbons shared in the hatred which the acts of the Bourbons engendered. Almost all the patriots were anti-religionists if not infidels. All the courtiers pretended to devotion—or at least the far greater

part of them—and it was suspected that many affected more piety than they felt.

Religion was thus placed in a false position. Catholicity in France was situate somewhat as Protestantism has been, and to a certain extent still is, in Ireland. It was considered to be the enemy of the people and of liberty.

I heartily rejoice that the last glorious revolution has altered the position. Religion left to its own intrinsic merits may sustain some slights and will certainly be exposed to many calumnies but those merits and the heavenly beauty of its precepts and practices will be likely to win their way with more facility now that they cannot be ranged with any hostile party. The meek, learned, pious and zealous clergy of France no longer visited by the hatred for civil oppressions will, I trust in God, be able to make more real converts, will be surrounded certainly with a smaller number of hypocrites and, I hope, with a much greater concourse of sincere Christians—with Christians not merely in word and in outward profession but of inward and thorough conviction and of a piety which will certainly be unaffected and, I trust, will be consolatory and exemplary. Religion has regained its natural station and cannot fail to fructify under the hands of the holy and able men who are its guides and pastors.

I do therefore most sincerely rejoice at the severance of the Church from the State in France. It is an example of great and most useful import. Why should such an incubus as our unwieldy Protestant Church temporalities oppress the Catholics and various Dissenters in Ireland? France has set the great and glorious example and it only remains for every other country, where rational liberty and commonsense are respected, to imitate the precedent and protect the people from the oppressive absurdity of supporting clergymen from whom they do not derive any benefit whatsoever.

I conclude by again expressing my sincere regret that I cannot attend the meeting. If I were within reach I should be there. I participate glowingly in the popular triumph. I also rejoice that you have taken so active a part in procuring the expression of public sentiment on this most interesting event.

SOURCE : *Dublin Morning Post*, 16 September 1830

- 1 Though the above is a public letter it is now published because of its exceptional importance as an illustration of O'Connell's views on religious freedom and separation of church and state. On 15

September a public meeting was held in the Great Hall of the National Mart, Usher's Quay, Dublin, in honour of the French Revolution of the previous July. Lord Westmeath was in the chair, and O'Connell's son-in-law, Christopher Fitz-Simon, acted as secretary. The meeting was held on a requisition signed by some 180 persons—Catholics and liberal Protestants. The signatories comprised only two peers, Westmeath and Cloncurry, but fifteen M.P.'s including O'Connell, Richard More O'Ferrall, O'Conor Don and O'Gorman Mahon. (*FJ*, 15, 16 Sept. 1830). Two other M.P.'s, Lord Killeen and Thomas Wyse, wrote congratulatory letters which were read to the meeting (*DEP*, 16 Sept. 1830).

1710

To John O'Brien,¹ 60 Moore Street, Dublin

Derrynane, 20 September 1830

Sir,

Instead of your making any apology for writing to me on the interesting subject of your letter, I would wish you to understand that I consider it a high compliment to be consulted by any persons desirous of procuring redress in a legal and constitutional manner.

That redress can be obtained by you if you combine in a proper manner to attain it. Your questions show that you are desirous to do so, and I have great pleasure in answering those questions.

You first ask, 'the manner of meeting publicly and legally so as to give full expression to your feelings.'

The law permits any number of persons to hold such meetings as you describe. The only difficulty is to get a proper place to meet in. That I must leave to your discretion. It should be some room or covered place in order to take away the pretext of considering your meetings dangerous to the public peace. There should be no obligation imposed on any person to attend, nor any *oath*, *pledge*, or other *engagement* entered into. There should be nothing secret or concealed in your proceedings. You should avow all your objects, and those objects should be the procuring redress through the channels of the courts of law, and of the legislature. You should at all times give facility to the magistracy or to persons deputed by them to investigate all your papers, documents, etc. With these views and precautions you may meet at stated

or at uncertain periods, as you think fit. You may elect a chairman or president, secretary and committee of management.

It is quite true that the Act² called 'Wellington's, or the worse than Algerine Act', is still in force and will continue so until the end of the next session of parliament. But I advise you not to be intimidated by that statute as it is not in force against any meeting unless first proclaimed by the Lord Lieutenant and, although I have as contemptuous an opinion as possible of the present administration, still I do not think that the Lord Lieutenant will again presume to put that act into force.³ If he should be so weak or so wicked as to do so, which I do not believe, then you must dissolve the moment the proclamation issues. Until you are proclaimed, you violate no law in meeting.

You secondly ask, 'how you can collect the necessary funds?' My advice to you is just this. To make your funds consist of an admission subscription of, say, one shilling, the payment of that shilling to constitute a man a member, and each individual to continue a member as long as he contributes one halfpenny a week. By advancing two shillings each individual would be a member for half a year and would then have to pay but one shilling for every other half year. I would strongly advise you not to exceed the halfpenny a week or at all events not to go beyond one penny a week.

This money should be collected by a treasurer to be chosen by ballot. The names of the subscribers should be entered in a book as they pay, and that book should be always open to inspection. There should also be a copy of the weekly or monthly returns given to each member. When the treasurer collected the money then a legal difficulty arises under the Statute already mentioned—'the Wellington, or worse than Algerine Act'. That Statute prohibits the raising money to be at the disposal of any 'society or body of persons'. You should therefore give your monies, until the Wellington law expires—that is, until the end of the next session of parliament—to the disposal of some one confidential person. This is a serious difficulty, but can be got over by finding some one man of sufficient integrity and public principle who would be sure to devote your money according to your intentions. Fortunately you need not go far to find such a person. I can recommend to you a man of the highest and most trustworthy integrity. I mean my friend Mr. Edward Dwyer. You will find him at the

Parliamentary Intelligence Office,⁴ 26 Lower Stephen's Street. I would be answerable for him with my existence. He will lodge the money in his own name; *it must be* in a bank; and give you weekly returns of his receipts and expenditures.

The first step you should take would be to employ Mr. William Forde, a most skilful and honourable attorney whose name is probably known to many of you. He lives on Arran Quay. He has in his office two causes instituted by the Catholic Association to enforce the rights of Catholics and liberal Protestants to their freedom of the City of Dublin. These causes were stayed by the granting of Emancipation and the consequent separation [*sic*] of the Association. They could be revived if Mr. Dwyer or any other individual possessing your confidence had it in his power to advance to Mr. Forde the necessary funds to carry on those causes. The King's Bench in Ireland is unfortunately not as well informed on the law of this subject as could be wished, and their refusal to decide the questions on the return to the mandamus applied for by Mr. Forde is no great proof of their legal acumen; but fortunately there has been a case since decided in England that makes the law quite plain in favour of enforcing the right, and if your friends associate as I have suggested, and collect funds in the manner allowed by law and pointed out by me, you will, I think, completely succeed. You should also at your meetings prepare petitions to Parliament for a redress of the other grievances inflicted on the citizens of Dublin by the Corporation. You should also petition against such other legal obstacles as exist to the freedom of trade and commerce in Ireland. It is scarcely necessary for me to remind you that the poverty and misery of the operative classes in Ireland is mainly, and I may say exclusively, to be placed to the fatal measure of the Union.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 15473

- I A Dublin merchant who returned from America in 1830 and founded in that year the Liberal Mechanics and Traders Association (the *Argus*, 25 July 1846). It was later reorganized and held its first public meeting as the Dublin Trades Political Union on 19 August 1831 (*FJ*, 20 Aug. 1831). In November it changed its name to the National Trades Political Union (*FJ*, 14, 15 Nov. 1831). In doing so it had decided to become a countrywide body, admitting farmers and clergymen as well as artisans and merchants. Its first president was Marcus Costello 1831-c.1833. O'Connell became an honorary member in October 1831, and was elected president in

May 1835 (*FJ*, 4 May 1835). By the beginning of 1832 it had lost its working-class complexion and thereafter fell in with whatever policies O'Connell was pursuing until his death (Fergus A. D'Arcy, 'The Artisans of Dublin and O'Connell, 1830-47: an unquiet liaison') (*Irish Historical Studies*, XVII, No. 66, Sept. 1970, 224).

- 2 10 Geo. IV c.1, 'for the suppression of dangerous Associations or Assemblies in Ireland,' which became law on 5 March 1829.
- 3 The act had recently been used to suppress O'Connell's Society of the Friends of Ireland of all Religious Persuasions (see letter 1672, note 6).
- 4 See letter 1628a, note 3.

1711

From Alexander Sherlock¹ to Derrynane

[postmarked Waterford], 29 September 1830

Dear O'Connell,

I think you made a *mistake* in writing the letter² putting yourself on trial and you will make another by coming. What good can come of it? There will certainly be an angry discussion and much blackguarding. The disputation between the Barrons and F. Wyse³ is dropped. You could therefore say that to prevent its revival or lest new subjects of dispute might be started you thought it advisable not to come. J. Esmonde⁴ thinks with me on the subject.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Alexander Sherlock, Killaspy, Waterford.
- 2 A public letter from O'Connell to the People of Waterford dated 15 September 1830 (*Waterford Mirror*, 22 Sept. 1830). On the ground that only one popular candidate could procure election in Co. Waterford against Lord George Thomas Beresford, O'Connell had opposed the candidature of Thomas Wyse. On the second day of the poll (13 August) O'Connell announced that he would resign in favour of Wyse rather than risk the 'union of several who ought to be friends' whereupon Wyse resigned in O'Connell's favour, and O'Connell and Beresford were declared elected (*Waterford Mirror*, 14 Aug. 1830). Wyse explained his resignation in a public letter that implicitly betrayed some hostility to O'Connell.
- 3 Francis Wyse (died 1855), active in Waterford politics. Brother of Thomas Wyse, Emigrated to America where he lived in poor circumstances in Philadelphia.
- 4 James Esmonde (died 4 Oct. 1842), Gaulstown, Lisnakill, Co. Waterford, third son of John Esmonde, Ballynastra, near Gorey, Co. Wexford. Father of Sir John Esmonde, tenth baronet.

1712

*From Thomas Whitley, Limerick, 3 October 1830,
to Derrynane*

An inspector of inland fisheries at a salary of £150, he pleads that he was wrongfully dismissed and seeks justice.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1713

From P. V. Fitzpatrick to Cahirciveen

Commercial Hotel, Waterford, 3 October 1830

Private

My dear Sir,

Our friend White¹ will have apprised you that I proceeded to this county on Monday last to make the necessary dispositions for a prompt and vigorous effort to complete the Tribute. It is unnecessary to remind you that the Bishop (Dr. Abraham) is a person whose *enthusiasm* in this or any other public matter it would be perilous to count on. Still as Waterford is the natural place to originate the movements his cooperation must if possible be in the first instance secured and to effectuate this I have, I trust, adopted the best plan that could be suggested. You are probably aware that the democratic portion of the clergy here do not affect to possess much influence on their Superior. It became requisite therefore to approach him from another quarter and after a confidential discussion on the subject I decided on proceeding to Dungarvan and enlisting the good offices of the Vicar-General, Dr. Foran, with Dr. Abraham in the business. He was from home when I arrived in that town but I awaited his return and now have the satisfaction to announce that he undertook to make the proposition to the Bishop with the utmost earnestness and I have reason to think the best prospects of a favourable result. Quite *apropos* to our purpose a large meeting of the clergy is to take place at Cahir on Tuesday at which the bishop as well as the vicar-general will be present. The latter will submit the matter to Dr. Abraham there and canvass the clergy to support him in producing the concession of a Sunday (say the last in November) which I shall take instantaneous measures to produce the

adoption of for a simultaneous collection in every other diocese in Ireland. Supposing success to attend the application at Cahir, Dr. Foran or perhaps the bishop himself may be expected to furnish me with a kind of official intimation that the plan has been sanctioned and recommended to the clergy of this diocese by Dr. Abraham. Fortified with this I propose to proceed without loss of time to Dublin, *call the treasurers of the Fund together in a perfectly confidential way*, impress on them the necessity of a grand final exertion to wind up the matter in a creditable manner, point to the Waterford plan as obviously the most easy and effective for obtaining a quick and extensive increase, and I entertain sanguine hopes of then *inducing the Treasurers to form a deputation from among themselves to wait on Dr. Murray and solicit his approval and assistance*. This effected, my expectations of a highly gratifying result are strong indeed. I have already put William Murphy in possession of the projects which, I am happy to say, he quite coincides with us in thinking the most eligible that can be devised and I have the assurance of the Rev. Mr. Yore of Dublin whom I also consulted that no man in the Kingdom exceeds Dr. Murray in anxiety that the Fund shall be swelled to an amount becoming the nation and *the object*. I advised with our confidential friends here as to the propriety of my proceeding to Cahir on the day of meeting. It was thought right to leave Dr. Abraham the merit of appearing to have originated the measure himself and with that view I shall not go to Cahir but quarter myself at Clonmel where I shall have it in my power to canvass quietly some of the influential clergy as they pass to the meeting. I trust these arrangements will meet your approbation. . . . For instance should we not succeed to our wishes here, another diocese shall be selected as the 'base of operations' and I rely on the [?force] of public opinion to compel the cooperation of the unwilling.

I regret to find that 'Family Feuds and Election animosities' are deplorably rife in Waterford.² I dined with Mr. Galwey of Duckspool and it is vexatious to find that *you* have not now a warm friend in *him*. On the evening that I spent with him a letter arrived requesting him to join a committee of your friends in the City of Waterford who are getting up a public dinner in compliment to you. He stated that neither he nor any of his friends would attend it, in short that you had forfeited his good opinion by the part you took against Hutchinson³ of Tipperary, more especially by what he

(Mr. G.) termed a most uncalled reference to the Hutchinsons in a late letter⁴ to the People of Waterford. Now although it is to the last degree absurd to expect that you should sacrifice public principle to private friendship yet I perhaps will be forgiven for suggesting the *possible* good policy of your dropping in upon Mr. Galwey on your route from Cork. He may be and I believe *is* worth 'whistling back,' particularly as I find 'the unfriendly' in this district in somewhat greater force than I was prepared to expect. I speculate however on a speedy destruction of all hostile, all envious feeling in your regard not only from my reliance on your tact, honesty and usefulness but from the aid that you *must* derive from the exhilarating events that are every day springing up, an almost miraculous illustration of your principles and doctrines.⁵ . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 Robert White.

2 See, for example, letter 1711, note 2.

3 John Hely-Hutchinson (1787-1851), Knocklofty, Co. Tipperary, eldest son of Francis Hely-Hutchinson, M.P. Succeeded 1832 as third earl of Donoughmore; M.P. for Co. Tipperary, 1826-30, 1831-August 1832. See *DNB*.

4 O'Connell to the People of the County of Waterford, 29 August 1830 (*DEP*, 4 Sept. 1830). In this letter, referring to Thomas Wyse's defeat of John Hely-Hutchinson in Co. Tipperary in the general election of 1830, O'Connell said that 'the glorious victory over the last of the fallen Hutchinsons, has not only crowned our gifted Wyse with doubly merited laurels, but has also demonstrated the force of public sentiment in Ireland.'

5 Very probably a reference to the triumph of the 'July Revolution' of 1830 in France and to the similar movement in Belgium which culminated in the declaration of Belgian independence.

1714

To Richard Newton Bennett, Harcourt Street, Dublin

Derrynane, 5 October 1830 [franked 10 October 1830 and postmarked 12 October 1830]

My dear Bennett,

I was jealous of you for a curious coincidence of sentiment between you and a person who is not a friend of mine. I will explain my meaning when we meet but this little jealousy prevented me from writing to you sooner.

I cannot do anything with the Scullys. It is vain to attempt to soften the great brute of brutes¹ in his present state.

There is a friend of mine who wishes to borrow a large sum on the security of one of the best estates in the south of Ireland. He would expect to get the money at 4 *per cent*. It will be the only charge and he would pay the interest at a bankers in London, being allowed every year to pay off £1,000 of the principal. Another person wants £3,000 for three years at 5 *per cent*. If your friends are disposed to advance the money you shall have details when we meet. I will be in Dublin on the 18th inst.

The aspect of the times is exceedingly favourable. The Belgic revolution² is more important than the French. If the Corporations of Dublin would but now come forward, we would speedily repeal the Union. Whatever may happen, depend on it that if I *can* secure you, you shall command me but I cannot do anything about Tipperary.³ My subscription⁴ was sent from Cork.

SOURCE : Connolly Autograph Collection

1 Denys Scully who died on 25 October 1830.

2 See 1713, note 5.

3 That is, with the Scullys.

4 Unidentified.

1715

From Patrick R. Welch, Cottage, Carlow, 5 October 1830

Calls for the formation of an association for repealing the union.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1716

To Michael Staunton

Killarney, 11 October 1830

My dear Staunton,

I got your very interesting letter; with much of it I agree. The Union should now be agitated in every possible shape—in all those so well and wisely suggested by you—but not to the exclusion of the formation of a permanent society.¹ A

permanent society is absolutely necessary in order to collect funds *in primo loco*, to collect funds *in secundo loco*, and to collect funds, thirdly and lastly, because we have both mind and body within us and all we want is the means of keeping the machine in regular and supple motion. Corruption was said by Burke to be the oil that makes the wheels of government go. Money is as necessary to keep in due operation the springs of popular excitement. In this, Mad Lawless was most wicked in resisting the shilling admission to the last aggregate.² He only looked to a popular splash; but when you do not and cannot compel men to pay, giving them the choice to contribute or stay away is no hardship.

I left my mountains on Thursday; attended in Killarney that day the best public dinner I ever was at.³ On Friday we got up a most numerous meeting in honour of the French and Belgic revolutions in the court house of Tralee and passed many honest resolves.⁴ On Saturday another meeting⁵ in the same court house, and resolutions in favour of petitions against the Subletting and Vestry Bills, for radical reform and the Repeal of the Union. Today I attend a dinner⁶ to Leader at Kanturk; tomorrow I get a public dinner in Cork;⁷ on Wednesday, a meeting for redress of grievances in Youghal;⁸ on Thursday, a public dinner in Waterford;⁹ on Friday, a meeting in Waterford for redress of grievances.¹⁰ So that you see I am not idle.

P.S. The Lord Lieutenant¹¹ arrived at Lord Kenmare's¹² late on Saturday night. He attended yesterday at Church and returned on foot; there was an enormous crowd in the streets who drew up with great regularity and made a lane for the Duke but in solemn silence. He made a violent effort to obtain a cheer; for finding it was not spontaneous he took off his hat and made a graceful bow to the people. There was not the least reply. Capt. Herbert, R.N.,¹³ the Sheriff of last year, who is deservedly popular, then took off his hat and saluted the people. He imagined that he could get a cheer which might be attributed to the Lord Lieutenant; but no, the people returned his salute by taking off their hats but preserved their silence.

AGITATE! AGITATE! AGITATE!

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 227-228

- 1 This body, the Association of Irish Volunteers for the Repeal of the Union, was founded by O'Connell at a meeting in Dublin on 23 October 1830 (*DEP*, 26 Oct. 1830).

- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 The dinner took place on 7 October in the Assembly Rooms, Killarney under the chairmanship of John Stuart Coxen. Some 140 persons attended, including the bishop of Kerry, Cornelius Egan. According to the *Freeman's Journal*, 'The absence of every member of the Kenmare [i.e. Lord Kenmare's] family excited much surprise and disgust' (*FJ*, 12 Oct. 1830). The *Freeman's Journal* added 'The dinner was, in truth, a meeting for the repeal of the Union'. O'Connell spoke on this occasion in favour of Repeal and in support of the recent European revolutions (*FJ*, 12 Oct. 1830).
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 This dinner was described by the *Dublin Evening Post* as 'the most splendid fete that little town [Kanturk] ever saw'. The toasts included one in favour of Repeal (*DEP*, 16 Oct. 1830).
- 7 The dinner on 12 October, 1830 was held at the Imperial Hotel, Cork, presided over by Francis Bernard Beamish, the attendance comprising some 150 gentlemen. Amongst the toasts were ones in favour of parliamentary and municipal reform, and Repeal (*FJ*, 16 Oct. 1830).
- 8 A crowd of several thousands is said by one report to have accompanied O'Connell into Youghal. A meeting was held in the (Catholic) chapel at which resolutions were passed against the subletting and vestry acts. It was remarked that O'Connell at this meeting 'really appeared as if getting young again' following his recent sojourn at Derrynane (*FJ*, 16 Oct. 1830).
- 9 This dinner, presided over by Dominick Ronayne and attended by 170 persons, was held on 14 October. It was preceded by a triumphal entry by O'Connell into the town (*FJ*, 16 Oct. 1830).
- 10 A meeting of the county and city of Waterford, under the chairmanship of Henry Winston Barron, convened for the purpose of petitioning for the Repeal of the Union. The meeting was marked by clashes between Thomas Wyse, on the one hand, and William Winston Barron and Richard Walsh, on the other. O'Connell declared his intention of asking Lord George Thomas Beresford to support Repeal (*FJ*, 19 Oct. 1830).
- 11 The duke of Northumberland.
- 12 Kenmare House, Killarney.
- 13 Thomas Herbert (1793-1861), second son of Richard Townsend Herbert, Cahirnane, Killarney. Entered Royal Navy, 1803; rear admiral, 1852; high sheriff, Kerry, 1829. M.P. Dartmouth, 1852-57. Knighted, 1841. See *DNB*.

1717

*From Samuel Daly Langtree, 2 College Square West, Belfast,
14 October 1830, to Merrion Square*

A young man of liberal education, he seeks some position working for the Repeal of the Union.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1718

From Leslie Grove Jones¹

Brookes's [Club], [London] Saturday, 16 October 1830

My dear Sir,

By a cover of yours to my friend Colonel Thompson² I am aware you have left *your native mountains* and are wending your way to the House of Iniquity.³ When are we to expect you over? Will you let me know and make arrangements for dining with me on the 24th or 25th and I will get Hume, Warburton⁴ and any other person whom you may wish, to meet you. Hume is now on his way south. He's left Mattock, writes me he will be in town on the 20th. He wants to know what is going on and what is to be the Duke's⁵ plan of operations and *what others mean to do*. Now all this is beyond me. That offers have been made to, and been rejected by the giants, Melbourne and Palmerston,⁶ is certain. The Duke says and has even told Talleyrand⁷ so, that Lord Lansdowne will join him⁸ and that he is certain of the support of all the Liberals. Lord L.⁹ from Glasgow goes to Lord Grey's—he may also join. There has been an assembly at Althorp where *Brougham* was. He is now all wrath. We shall see how it will smooth down.¹⁰ He will be sadly galled by the article in the last *Westminster*.¹¹ The Scotch press has generally taken it up and states he is now appreciated as he ought to be, that he has never worked for the people but has only sought his own interests. The Irish should do the same—from the English nothing is to be hoped. He is so much their demi-god.

I hope you now see the *Chronicle*. You will there read how Coke¹² has spoken out. He deserves well of us. He is really a good Whig. His remarks on George the Third are glorious. This conduct of Coke's will be sadly galling both to the Duke

and to the King. You are aware that on the accession of William, he as one of his first acts sent for Coke and Lady Anne¹³ to Bushey.¹⁴ This was the work no doubt of the Duke of Sussex. How will he be pleased with this portraiture—too just—of his father.

You will have a most interesting but stormy session. Party will be more than ever [?decided]. My voice will be measures and not men and this I hope you will work with me to make *Hume* adopt. He must not fear by voting against the Duke to turn him out of office. Let him go out of office.¹⁵ Let office be filled with Tories or Whigs—*n'importe*. The oftener office changes hands the better, and often must it change before the interests of the people become the object of the Government.

Lord Holland is ever with Talleyrand. Talleyrand is everything with the Duke of Wellington. Talleyrand writes to Paris that he is all and all *with the liberals*, that is with Holland House etc. For his edification on my return to town yesterday, I sent him a newspaper of last Sunday in which was my letter as to state of parties. In the evening he acknowledged its receipt stating he should read the letter attentively. We used to be well acquainted both in England (but then I was a boy) and also in France. If he now chooses to [?receive] me I shall speak plainly to him and tell him wholesome truths. He is for sacrificing Belgium to England and *all our sages* are of opinion that the separation of that country from Holland *must wear out*, that the Belgians can of themselves do nothing. *Nous verrons*. And so they think of Ireland. By the bye *I do not thank you* for proposing the Repeal of the Union, though for Ireland it may be right; I should rather strive that such a reform could be effected as should make both countries happy and yet preserve the Union. If England will not do justice to Ireland then let her separate but I hope we may make the attempt for liberty together. The *Protestant Church* must be tumbled down with you. It must disappear but for godsake do not raise up a Roman one. Keep your faith but do not reestablish a priesthood. I only am an opponent to your Church because it cannot exist *without episcopacy*. Now episcopacy is the ruin of every church and it is not Christian. Goodbye after this attack from one who is yours most sincerely

Leslie Grove Jones

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Leslie Grove Jones (1779-1839), served in the Peninsular War;

- colonel, 1st Regt. (Guards), 1821; author of letters to the *Times* advocating reform under the pseudonym 'Radical'. Supported Catholic Emancipation. See *DNB*.
- 2 Thomas Perronet Thompson (1783-1869), general, writer and radical politician. A lieutenant-colonel unattached at this time. M.P. for Hull, 1835-37; Bradford, 1847-52, 1857-59. See *DNB*.
 - 3 Parliament.
 - 4 Henry Warburton (1784-1858), radical politician. M.P. Bridport, 1826-41, Kendal, 1843-47. See *DNB*.
 - 5 The Duke of Wellington.
 - 6 Henry John (Temple), third Viscount Palmerston (1784-1865), Secretary at War, 1809-28; secretary for foreign affairs, 1830-34, 1835-41 and 1846-51. Home secretary, 1852-55; prime minister, 1855-58 and 1859-65. See *DNB*.
 - 7 Charles Talleyrand (1754-1838), the famous French statesman.
 - 8 Lansdowne did not join Wellington, but shortly after the latter's resignation on 16 November 1830 he took office under Lord Grey as president of the council.
 - 9 Probably Lord Lansdowne.
 - 10 Brougham, who was at this time campaigning for parliamentary and law reform, Jewish emancipation and the abolition of slavery had been a frequent assailant of the Wellington ministry (see Chester W. New, *The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830*, London, 1961, 402-13).
 - 11 The *Westminster Review* of October 1830 had published an article harshly critical of Brougham.
 - 12 Thomas William Coke (1752-1842), Holkham, Norfolk, M.P. for Norfolk, 1776-1806, 1807-32. Created 1837 earl of Leicester. See *DNB*.
 - 13 Lady Anne Amelia Coke (1803-44), third daughter of fourth earl of Albemarle, married, 1822 (he 67 and she 18) as his second wife, Thomas William Coke.
 - 14 Bushey Park, south of Twickenham, London, residence of William IV.
 - 15 Wellington resigned on 16 November 1830.

1719

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 18 October 1830

My dear Friend,

. . . The people here are quite satisfied with themselves for their deportment towards you at your late visit.¹ I have heard that [New] Ross and Enniscorthy gave you enthusiastic

receptions.² I really begin now to think that Providence is about to bring about some mighty change that will compensate to our long afflicted country for all the injuries she has had to bear from her cold-hearted oppressors.

Belgium, I trust, will not allow of any connection with the family of that Royal Calvinistic rascal that first destroyed the liberty of her church and then in person of De Potter³ would trample upon the liberty of [the] Press.⁴ I think events would turn out favourably for the people in every quarter if the machinations of such statesmen as Talleyrand did not prostrate their influence.⁵ I do confess that his appointment⁶ annoyed me from the first moment for I could not expect fidelity to the cause of liberty from an apostate bishop.⁷ Cobbett, I find, is thrashing him in good style. I wish the popular papers in this country would intimate to him that the French may perceive what causes the diminution of our sympathy for them. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 See letter 1716, note 9.
- 2 No accounts of these appear in the press.
- 3 Louis Joseph Antoine de Potter (1786-1859), Belgian publisher and historian. Banished for eight years from Belgium in the spring of 1830, and returned during the revolution in October. He became a member of the provisional government towards the end of 1830.
- 4 De Potter attacked the government of William I in his newspaper *Courrier des Pays-Bas*, urging the liberals to cease their campaign against the Jesuits and instead to 'deride, cover with shame, and proscribe the supporters of the government'. In consequence he was fined, imprisoned and banished (H. Vander-Linden, *Belgium, The Making of a Nation*, Oxford University Press, 1920, 226, 228).
- 5 Talleyrand had from the first advised Louis-Philippe not to encourage what he termed 'the Belgian and French revolutionaries' (Vander-Linden, *Belgium*, 247; see also letter 1718).
- 6 Talleyrand was appointed ambassador to England in September 1830 and in that capacity took an important part in the negotiations respecting the foundation of the kingdom of Belgium.
- 7 Talleyrand had formerly been bishop of Autun.

1720

From Patrick Flood,¹ Granard, 19 October 1830

The writer, a former clerk in the office of the collector of Dublin excise, an office abolished in 1823, got no compensa-

tion whereas others in the same position did. He wishes O'Connell to present a petition to Parliament on his behalf.²

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Patrick Flood, Springfield, Co. Westmeath near the post-town of Granard, Co. Longford. He was a witness before the Select Committee on Fictitious Votes in Ireland, 1838. (643) XIII, Pt. II, 1.
- 2 The petition does not appear to have been presented.

1720a

*To Sir Henry Hardinge, Chief Secretary*¹

Merrion Square [24 October 1830]

Mr. O'Connell does not feel himself called on either to avow or disavow anything attributed to him by the public papers. At the same time, that if any allegation of *fact* be pointed out to him—attributed to him—which is not true, he will readily either disavow the assertion, if untruly attributed, or contradict and atone in every way possible for the allegation, if he made use of it.

No man living is more ready than Mr. O'Connell to disavow and atone for any error in point of fact, which he may have fallen into.

Mr. O'Connell will not receive any kind of communication with reference to a duel. He utterly disclaims any reference to such a mode of proceeding, be the consequences of such disclaimer what they may; repeating his readiness to retract and atone for any fact alleged by him not founded in proof.

He spoke of Sir Henry Hardinge in his *public* capacity as an instrument of despotism. He did not say one word of him in his private capacity.

As a public man, he did speak of Sir Henry as he would of any other man who trampled on the liberties of Irishmen, and he must say that fighting a duel would be a bad way to prove that Sir Henry was right or Mr. O'Connell wrong.

SOURCE : *Dublin Evening Post* 26 October 1830

- 1 On 18 October 1830, a proclamation for the suppression of dangerous societies or assemblies was issued by Sir Henry Hardinge, in the absence of the lord lieutenant. At a banquet in Dublin on 23 October, O'Connell attacked the proclamation and referred to Hardinge as 'that paltry, contemptible little English soldier'. That evening Hardinge wrote a note challenging O'Connell to a duel. The above is O'Connell's reply.

1721

To P. V. FitzPatrick

14 Manchester Buildings, Westminster, 30 October 1830

My Dear FitzPatrick,

These are times when it is hard for a man to find sincere and practical friends. In you I have one and I repeat that I hope that I will not die until I have some opportunity of showing you how sincerely grateful I am.

I see that Mahony and Conway have brought that most miserable of miserable dukes into play.¹ But before now the scene is over. My letters deceive me or there will be nothing mischievous adduced by the attempt. God help their precious skulls! Why, England is in a worse state than Ireland ever was since the fatal year of 1798.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 228-229

- 1 A reference to the 'Leinster Declaration' which was organized by Pierce Mahony. At a meeting in Dublin on 29 October 1830, under the chairmanship of the duke of Leinster, a declaration was drawn up expressing the desire of the signatories to preserve in the face of the current agitation for Repeal 'the permanence of the British connection' (*DEP*, 30 Oct. 1830). Frederick William Conway's *Dublin Evening Post* came out strongly in its favour (*DEP*, 30 Oct. 1830). During the following months the declaration was extensively signed, the signatories including by December some 75 peers and 23 M.P.'s (*DEP*, 18 Dec. 1830).

1722

To Edward Dwyer

London, 3 November 1830

My dear Friend,

The scene last night in the House was a most extraordinary one. There never was yet any man so beset as I was when I went into the House and, during the first speeches, every allusion to me of an unkind nature was cheered. Although Peel attacked me directly,¹ he sat down amid rapturous applause. I got up at once. They at first were disposed to slight me but I rebuked them with indignation and certainly took my wicked will of them fully and to my heart's content.² I

cannot be a judge of my own speaking but I know that I threw out in my old Association style. I also know that the result was most cheering for me for the men who had been standing off from me before, and were not only cool but hostile, became of a sudden most cordial in their manner and confidential in their declarations. One perceives a change of this description better than one can describe it, and the change was complete. . . . There has been a respectable tradesman in here this moment. He says he belongs to a society who read the newspapers in Paternoster Row and he came to know whether my speech in the *Morning Chronicle* was genuine because, if it were, they had entered into a subscription to get it printed and distributed *gratis*. I of course assented so, you see, the thing works. Every moment convinces me more and more of the certainty of our repealing the Union. Last night was, in my judgment, almost decisive of it. The House *will* yield to the unanimous petitions of the people.

SOURCE : Arthur Houston, *O'Connell's Journal*, 57-58

- 1 In the Commons on 2 November 1830, Peel accused O'Connell of fomenting agitation in Ireland with the ultimate object of forcibly severing the connection with England. He declared that the Repeal agitation was inspired by the 'July Revolution' in France, and would have a similarly violent outcome (*DEP*, 6 Nov. 1830).
- 2 In reply to Peel, O'Connell stressed that he spoke as the representative of the entire Irish people. He criticized the king's speech (see letter 1723, note 1) and enumerated the alleged ills which Ireland had suffered under the Union. He declared that for him Catholic Emancipation had always been subordinate to Repeal, but stressed that 'never did monarch receive more undivided allegiance than from the men who are disposed to agitate the question of the Union' (*DEP*, 6 Nov. 1830).

1723

To Edward Dwyer [? or James Sugrue]

London, Saturday, 6 November 1830

. . . I cannot write much today. I was hitting right and left last night. . . . I have heard nothing more of the attempt to negotiate about a change of ministry nor shall I until after this letter goes off to you but I do not myself think that the Duke [of Wellington] can stand. The exasperation about the King's Speech¹ is extreme. Nothing can equal the temper of

the people in their detestation of this ministry. It would surprise and amuse you to see how popular I am grown. I refer you to the Irish newspaper correspondents for more particulars. But you may be sure to hear *from me* on every debate and to hear from me to the purpose.

I am delighted to perceive that the Anti-Union spirit is alive and that its meetings continue with such vigour. The 'Saint Andrew's', etc. was a delightful treat.² Apropos of *treats*, I hope you have another political *breakfast* on foot.³ The conceit is admirable.

You may there get gentlemen to undertake particular counties so as to be responsible for petitions from that county. In short, let the next breakfast add *business* to *speechifying*. Improve on this and give the *boat a shove*.

You cannot conceive what a change has occurred already in the public mind here on the subject of the Repeal of the Union. It is not only *practicable* but certain if we persevere as we ought to do.

I intend tomorrow to write a letter on the subject of the expense of petitions.⁴ Get it printed. You know that I do not wish my letters to *you* to be printed. Read to yourself the letter in the cover: it relates to private business.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 90-91

- 1 The king's speech on the opening of parliament expressed regret at the Belgian revolution and at 'combinations for the destruction of machinery' in various parts of England. In an obvious reference to Ireland, the speech condemned 'the efforts which are industriously made to excite among My People a spirit of Discontent and Disaffection, and to disturb the concord which happily prevails between those parts of My Dominion, the Union of which is essential to their common strength and common happiness'.
- 2 A reference to a recent meeting of the parishes of St. Andrews, Anne's, Mark's and Peter's, Dublin, for the purpose of petitioning in favour of Repeal of the Union. (*F*), 6 November, 1830).
- 3 In order to evade the proclamation act the Repealers began at this time holding 'Repeal Breakfasts'. What appears to have been the first breakfast, attended by some 100 guests, took place at Home's Hotel, Dublin, on 1 November 1830 (*F*), 2 Nov. 1830).
- 4 This letter does not appear to have been printed.

1724

*To Edward Dwyer [? or James Sugrue]*London, 9 [*recte* 10] November 1830

... The times are exceedingly critical. This is just the period when good, wise and considerate men should urge their claims for amelioration. This is emphatically the moment to get as many places as possible to petition for the Repeal of the Union. The successors of the Wellington Administration,¹ whoever they shall be, will not be able to resist the cry of the people, if really raised. We shall see a daily progress towards the principle of democratic liberty. It is most important that those successors should be convinced that the Repeal of the Union is desired by *all* the people of Ireland with the exception of a few paltry jobbers. Tell this to every person who comes to the Rooms.² Let every man know from me that it is my decided opinion that we may have an Irish Parliament soon if the voice of the Irish nation shall be expressed by petitions so numerous as to place beyond any doubt the anxiety of Ireland for that measure. I do not say this lightly. I am convinced that what I say to you is of great importance to be attended to, and yet we are an *uncertain* race. Before Emancipation I saw that it would be necessary for us to have a rallying point for the future struggles of the country. I was therefore very anxious to get up a place for public meetings. The theatre in Great Brunswick St. was to be had cheaply but ———— and others disliked the owner, and I was overruled. Those who overruled me all promised to find another and a better place. They all saw the necessity of having a place for public meetings. We had funds *then* but not one step was taken by anybody but me to get that other place. I failed entirely. In fact, that theatre would now be quite a *treasure* for all kinds of useful agitation. At present the want of such a thing is severely felt, and each day it will be more and more so. Its utility would be constant. Every parish in Dublin would certainly meet if they could but be certain of having the use of a proper meeting place. It is quite clear that the store in Stephen St. is suited, admirably suited for the purpose; and now there is a fastidiousness about the street as not being *fashionable* enough although it is within four or five minutes' walk of either Stephen's Green, College Green or Dame St. Where will those who reject that spot find another?

I am perfectly content to become tenant at once to any other provided it shall be found but it would disgust any other man save myself from politics to find a practical measure of this sort abandoned or postponed first and then abandoned, upon the score of a paltry fastidiousness respecting the situation of the place of meeting.

Is there any man who does not know that but for getting the constant use of Clarendon Street Chapel we never could have got up the Catholic Association? We cannot have chapels now.³ Why then should not we have a perpetual substitute? I implore of all *real* Anti-Unionists to consider well of this and to lay their best thoughts together to procure a comfortable and extensive place for public meetings. We cannot do without one. Having thus vented my *spleen*, I come to the politics of the day.

Everybody says that the Duke of Wellington must resign. He will however cling to office as long as he possibly can, and I am convinced nothing will induce Peel to quit his secretaryship but absolute necessity yet everybody *insists* that they must resign. I myself cannot see how it is possible for them to go on. Now every change must be favourable. The new men are of necessity weak. It is calculated that the leaders of a new Cabinet will be Lords Grey and Lansdowne. As yet, however, I fancy that the resignation of Wellington has not been actually sent in. Since I began this paragraph however I hear that the Marquis of Lansdowne is to be at the head of the *Incomers*. *Nous verrons*, as they say elsewhere. The riot⁴ last night was a mere tumult, easily put down by the police though they are not armed. Yet, certainly, the King's shrinking from going into the city⁵ is calculated to encourage the tumultuous in the interior parts of England.

There never was a more critical or important period or one in which an extensive demand for the Repeal of the Union would have a better effect. I am now anxious to remain in Parliament. I think some good may be done in the House or rather through the House. I am determined to *stick* to it as long as I can.

SOURCE : John O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 91-96

1 Wellington resigned on 16 November 1830.

2 The parliamentary intelligence office, 26 Stephen's Street, Dublin (see letter 1628a, note 3).

3 On 9 February 1830, a pastoral from the hierarchy exhorted the clergy to refrain from active participation in politics. It was not

until July 1831 that the hierarchy (of the ecclesiastical province of Leinster) *explicitly* prohibited the use of chapels for political meetings (Broderick, *Holy See and Repeal*, 45-48, 58-60).

- 4 The riot occurred in the area of Westminster where unruly crowds had been loitering all day in anticipation of seeing the king pass towards Guildhall (see below, note 5) (the *Times*, 10 Nov. 1830).
- 5 The king and queen were due to dine on 9 November as guests of the city of London, at Guildhall. It was reported that 'magnificent preparations had been made for their reception and all London was in tip-toe expectation of the splendid procession' (*Ann. Reg.* 1830, p. 158). The king postponed the royal visit because, according to the *Times*, he had heard a rumour that the mob intended violence towards the duke of Wellington (the *Times*, 9 Nov. 1830).

1725

*To his son-in-law Christopher Fitz-Simon
at 30 Merrion Square*

London, 10 November 1830

My dear Kit,

You see by the papers how I am assailed¹ by the Fitzwilliam clique and also by Trench.²

Get me as speedily as possible an accurate list of all the families under notice to quit or under or lately under ejectment on the Fitzwilliam Estate.³ Lose no time in sending me the names of the farms, the number of *former* tenants if more than one, the number of under-tenants and every other detail. It is important to be as accurate as possible.

Then on Lord Monk's⁴ estate⁵ get me a list of those turned off or turning off since Trench came into the management of the estate. Pray, pray, my dear Kit, bestir yourself to procure this information and as soon as possible.

I had another battle and two or three victims last night.⁶ At one time the gallery cheered me. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 At a meeting of his Association of Irish Volunteers for the Repeal of the Union (see letter 1716, note 1), O'Connell, attacking the subletting act (see letter 1448, note 1), asserted that Lord Fitzwilliam intended, because of the act, to eject in November, 800 families from their holdings on his estate. He also asserted that Archdeacon Trench, land agent to Lord Monk, had executed similar clearances on Monk's estate (*FJ*, 25 Oct., *DEP*, 26 Oct. 1830). O'Connell's assertions were promptly contradicted in a letter to the press from Fitzwilliam's agent, Robert Challoner. In his reply to Challoner,

O'Connell stated that it was untrue that he had said, or that any newspaper had reported him as saying that Fitzwilliam was about to evict 800 families, but that he (O'Connell) had said he was about to evict families to the number of 800 persons (O'Connell to the *British Traveller*, 8 November 1830; *FJ*, 12 Nov. 1830). In parliament on 9 November O'Connell repeated this assertion (*DEP*, 13 Nov. 1830). Lord Althorp then declared he had received information from Lord Milton (Fitzwilliam's son) that 'there were only five families under notice to quit upon the whole of Lord Fitzwilliam's estates in Ireland' (*DEP*, 13 Nov. 1830). On 18 November, 1830 the *Freeman's Journal* published detailed statistics purporting to show that Fitzwilliam was due to evict over 1,500 persons. It did not state the source of its information (see letter 1726, note 4). O'Connell's motion for the repeal of the sub-letting act was defeated by 150 to 24 on 11 November 1830. See letter 1728.

- 2 Hon. Charles Le Poer Trench, D.D. (1772-1839), fourth son of first earl of Clancarty. Archdeacon of Ardagh, 1825-39, married, 1806 Frances, daughter of Thomas Elwood, Ashford Park, Co. Mayo.
- 3 In south Co. Wicklow.
- 4 Henry Stanley (Monck), second Viscount Monck (1785-1848) but created, 1822 earl of Rathdowne (I); married 1806 Frances, daughter of first earl of Clancarty.
- 5 Also in Co. Wicklow.
- 6 On 9 November O'Connell became involved in a very acrimonious debate in the Commons. He was challenged by the Irish solicitor-general, John Doherty, either to introduce a repeal motion or else cease forthwith from 'habitually indulging in irregular and vapid observations' on the presentation of petitions on the subject. George Dawson (a supporter of Emancipation), accused O'Connell of agitating Repeal 'out of doors' for the sake of mob popularity. O'Connell retaliated by attacking Dawson's conduct in public office, whereupon Dawson described O'Connell as 'a man of vulgar mind and mean ideas'. The debate wound up with O'Connell addressing the ministerial benches as, 'Ye placeholders, who revel on the hard earnings of the people . . . I am not to be intimidated by you. I shall continue to stand by Ireland, for I represent her wants, her wishes and her grievances' (*DEP*, 13 Nov. 1830).

1726

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, Saturday [20 November 1830]

My darling love,

The new ministry¹ are *being* formed. Brougham certainly is [lord] chancellor but your faith in Lord Anglesey will be at

an end when you learn that he keeps Doherty in his office.² This is decisive against him, and I have no doubt that he will be as unpopular in Ireland as he was before popular. He goes over now to put down the repeal of the Union as he went once before to put down the Catholic agitation. He will fail, to be sure, but he may seduce some. The Whigs, I think, will continue in office but a short time. They will fail by attempting to conciliate things that are irreconcilable—the popular sentiment with the interests of the ruling party.

Doherty attacked me last night but I paid him off though my dressing of him does not appear in any of the newspapers here. However you will see in the *Freeman* a correct report.³ The only thing I am afraid of is that the name of Lord Anglesey will contribute to relax the anti-Union zeal. . . .

Darling, I am, thank God, in perfect health and spirits and more confident than ever that there must be further and much more useful changes. I wish I had time to write a full letter for the Irish press. However I will try tomorrow what I may be able to do. . . . Fitz-Simon has done the thing properly.⁴ I am exceedingly obliged to him.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 On 15 November 1830 the Wellington ministry was defeated in the Commons on a motion concerning the civil list. On 16 November, Wellington resigned and the king requested Lord Grey to form a government.
- 2 Doherty was not long retained as Irish solicitor-general. On 23 December 1830, he was appointed lord chief justice of the Irish common pleas.
- 3 According to the *Freeman's Journal*, Doherty accused O'Connell of having circulated falsehoods with regard to evictions on Lord Fitzwilliam's estate (see letter 1725, note 1) and demanded, 'what sort of tribunal was the Hon. Member [O'Connell] about to make of this House, when he was incessantly bringing before them the complaints of the peasantry of Ireland?' Doherty's question was received with cheers from the House. O'Connell replied that if his 'unflinching hostility to the plunderers and oppressors' of Ireland were to be a cause of complaint against him, 'then do I count as my last reward the censure of the House' (*FJ*, 22 November 1830).
- 4 Fitz-Simon was probably instrumental in furnishing O'Connell, in response to his request, with statistics purporting to show that over 1,500 persons were due to be evicted from the Fitzwilliam estate (see letter 1725). On 19 November, O'Connell placed these statistics before parliament (*FJ*, 22 Nov. 1830).

1727

To Lord Anglesey

Manchester Buildings, 20 November 1830

My Lord,

After the most wanton *assault*¹ made on me last night in the House of Commons by the gentleman who is understood to be your Solicitor-General for Ireland, it may be quite superfluous for me thus to obviate any misconception of our last conversation.² Indeed, it cannot be necessary to say that nothing that fell from me could be construed into any pledge or promise to give any support to the now forming administration or to accept any kind of favour, even from your Lordship, should you accept the office of Lord Lieutenant.

I cannot conclude this last communication with which I shall ever trouble your Lordship, without expressing my unfeigned regret that a nobleman, so revered in Ireland as Lord Anglesey, should be likely to place himself in a situation in which the popularity he so honourably earned³ may suffer diminution.

Pardon me, my Lord, for the frankness of this remark, and I implore you to believe that it is suggested by motives of the most unfeigned respect.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast)

1 See letter 1726, note 3.

2 See letter 1744.

3 Anglesey had been a supporter of Emancipation, and his pro-Catholic sympathies were at least partly responsible for his being recalled from the office of lord lieutenant at the beginning of 1829 (see letter 1507, note 7).

1728

To Michael Staunton

London, 24 November 1830

My dear Staunton,

I got your book¹ as far only as page 48 and am exceedingly thankful to you for sending it. I am more obliged to you for composing so useful a work and beg of you to let me have the

remainder. I will then get it bound and a very pretty manual it will make.

Your reporter made just the mistake which of all others I would fain have avoided. See your paper of last Monday and you will find he makes me say 800 *families* where the sense shows I must have said 800 *persons*.² This provokes me for many reasons but particularly that your reporters are not, I apprehend, friends of mine.

Everything is in the most wild confusion in the English counties.³ You will soon hear of blood being shed. What a contrast between the Irish and the English insurgents. The latter demand money and take provisions by force. The White-boys⁴ despised the money and, even where it was offered, have repeatedly refused it.

Lord Anglesey will be going to Ireland in a few days.⁵ He is determined to weed the Castle of all the old leaven of dissension. He will go as far as he can to conciliate the people but he will not be able to delude them from the pursuit of the great measure of Repeal. That is the only permanent source of relief. We will have it if we choose. If Ireland were now unanimous, England could not refuse us. How bitterly I regret that the Irish do not perceive their vantage moment! Mahony will not have any of Lord Anglesey's countenance. He will be known as a species of schemer in politics for personal purposes.⁶ The Solicitor-General's place *is vacant*. It is not known who will get it.⁷ The ministerial party⁸ is now strong in the House [of Commons] and if they be true to their principles they will get powerful support.

I need not tell you that I am delighted with the way matters are getting on in Ireland. The anti-Union spirit is showing itself nobly.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

- 1 *Hints for Hardinge, being a series of political essays publ. originally in the Dublin Morning Register . . .* (Dublin, 1830).
- 2 The *Morning Register* was not the only newspaper to make this alleged mistake (see letter 1725, note 1).
- 3 A reference to outbreaks of rick-burning and machine-breaking at this time by agricultural labourers, particularly in the south of England.
- 4 A form of Irish agrarian secret society.
- 5 Anglesey arrived in Ireland and was sworn in as lord lieutenant on 23 December 1830.

- 6 For reasons why O'Connell felt so hostile to Mahony see letter 1721, note 1.
- 7 Philip Cecil Crampton replaced John Doherty as solicitor-general on 23 December 1830.
- 8 That is, the Whig followers of Lord Grey who replaced Wellington as prime minister on 16 November 1830.

1729

To Lord Anglesey

14 Manchester Buildings [London], 24 November 1830

My Lord,

A conversation I had with Lord Duncannon makes me think that I ought to set myself right with your Lordship, and atone for creating an impression on your mind which it is my most anxious wish to remove.

However awkwardly I might have expressed myself, I certainly did not intend to convey the idea that I really could apprehend that you, my Lord, would ever make any use of a confidential conversation¹ with which you were pleased to honour me. I heartily regret having conveyed that idea, and I beg now most distinctly to disclaim entertaining it for one moment.

The truth is that I felt, and still feel, the vital importance to the British Empire at large that you, my Lord, should preserve your Irish popularity at this most critical, I may say awful, crisis in our national affairs. Much of the peace of Ireland and all her prospects of avoiding convulsion depend on the wisdom, the prudence and the tact with which public men now manage her concerns, and if you were involved in any political intercourse with men who are held in great dislike—I use a *soft* word—it would be quite impossible for you to do that good which I am convinced it is your Lordship's desire to effectuate.

All parties in England have treated me as ill as they possibly could. I venture to assert that if they all had a fixed design to behave badly to me, they could not have succeeded so well as they have done. But I do most solemnly assure your Lordship that I forgive them all heartily and only desire one thing, the good of *the people* of Ireland.

I beg that you will pardon me for this intrusion, and in

your kindness, forgive that insinuation which my letter² conveyed without having the thought in my own mind.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast)

1 See letter 1744.

2 See letter 1727.

1730

From Lord Anglesey

Uxbridge House [London], 24 November 1830

Copy

Dear Sir,

I am satisfied with your second letter¹ just received because it removes the impression your former one² had made, that you imagined me capable of taking an advantage of the conversation³ I had with you, by turning your expressions to my own purposes.

When I requested to see you, it was to inform you of my inability to support the prayer of a petition for the Repeal of the Union that I had been called upon to present, and I took that opportunity of expressing myself freely upon the state of Ireland.

I hoped to effect some good for her by engaging you to cease to agitate a question which cannot be carried but which will not fail to endanger its tranquillity and to check the progress of much coming good.

Making every allowance for the circumstances under which you had been placed, I undisguisedly told you that I was disappointed at your not showing the magnanimity of smothering your private wrongs for public good.

You certainly engaged yourself in no pledge to me but you received my remarks in a manner that led me to hope I might be borne out in the contradiction that I had sometimes given to the assertion that you feel not for Ireland but only for yourself.

Circumstanced as I now am I will not pursue the subject. I will merely add that I am fully aware of the extreme difficulty and danger of the situation in which I am about to be placed;⁴ that I subscribe to your opinion of the necessity of wisdom, of prudence, of tact in the management of the affairs of Ireland.

To these qualities I do not make pretension; but I do pretend to a zealous and to an unbiassed mind, to a mind that will hear every man, that will be dictated to by none, that will do justice to all and that is filled with an ardent desire to promote the real interests of the whole body of the Irish people.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast)

1 See letter 1729.

2 See letter 1727.

3 See letter 1744.

4 A reference to Anglesey's appointment as lord lieutenant which took place on 23 December 1830.

1731

To Archbishop Curtis

London, 26 November 1830

My Lord,

I have had reason to think, *given me* by some who possess influence with the new administration, that there is a desire amongst a portion of the new members to divide the Kildare Place grant¹ equitably between the Catholics and Protestants. I have also reason to believe that this object would be advanced if the Catholic Clergy, and especially the dignitaries of the Catholic Church in Ireland, were without delay to petition on this subject;² that is, that on any future education grant of money care should be taken to apportion an adequate part to the education of Catholic children.

Petitions also from the laity would be useful for this purpose.

Should your Grace concur, I beg to suggest that those petitions should be sent to independent members rather than to men in power who, in truth, wish to be *driven* into the measure by others rather than act spontaneously. Lord Killeen, Mr. Wyse, Mr. More O'Ferrall,³ etc., would be most proper persons to present such petitions. Of course my humble services can be commanded by your Grace.

I should not trouble your Grace with this letter but that I have reason to believe that a strong exertion would secure the obtaining of this much of fair play for Ireland.

Lord Anglesey goes to Ireland⁴ with the best intentions. God grant he may alleviate, if he cannot cure, the national miseries.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 The annual parliamentary grant to the Kildare Place Society.
- 2 About a hundred petitions along the lines suggested by O'Connell were presented to parliament from Irish Catholics between 10 November 1830 and April 1831.
- 3 Richard More O'Ferrall (1797-1880), M.P. for Co. Kildare, 1830-47, 1859-65; Co. Longford April 1851-52. A lord of the treasury, 1835-39; secretary of the admiralty, 1839-41; governor of Malta, 1847-51; a secretary of the treasury in 1841. See *DNB*.
- 4 As lord lieutenant.

1732

To Lord Anglesey

14 Manchester Buildings [London] 26 November 1830

My Lord,

Accept my very respectful thanks for your kind letter.¹ It has set my mind at ease upon a point that gave me much pain. I felt that I was wrong.

In other respects, however, your letter has afflicted me. You think I indulged resentment when I thought I was gratifying feelings of patriotism, for such was, I hope, my leading motive for opposing the Administration of the Duke of Wellington.

I believe no man was ever more misunderstood or more misconstrued than myself. From you almost alone have I received anything like justice.

Permit me then to say—and I say it with the most profound respect—that I feel the most anxious desire for the success of your Administration in Ireland. I am quite convinced you will dissipate the remnants of the old factions. I am equally certain that you do not mean to countenance another and a worse party of mean sycophants who think of their country only as an object of traffic and personal emolument. No man living is less capable of enduring a party of that description than you. I therefore am persuaded that you, my Lord, will do everything for Ireland that can be done by a Lord Lieutenant and an English Parliament. I say this most unaffectedly

but, alas, the evils of Ireland lie more than skin-deep. There is a morbidity which reaches the heart's core of the social state. The pressure of a monstrous Church establishment, monstrous, I of course mean, in wealth, the heart's vein open to the drain of absenteeism, the oppressive and peculating monopoly of still bigoted corporators who increase in virulence like the dying adder as they approach to dissolution. But I run on beyond bounds.

Be assured that if one so powerless as myself and naturally so insignificant can in any degree facilitate the spread of the benefits which you *intend* for Ireland, I will be most happy to cooperate if that be not too strong a word—in my humble sphere—without offering that which you would scorn to accept—any sacrifice of principle.

SOURCE : Plas Newydd Papers (Belfast),

1. See letter 1730.

1733

To Archbishop Murray

Private

London, 26 November 1830

My Lord,

The present change of Administration¹ is one that promises much for Ireland. What the performance may be remains for time to disclose. In the interval one would desire to profit as much as possible by any favourable circumstances. I am on sufficiently friendly terms with at least some of the ministers to be able perhaps to assist in minor matters. There is for example the education grants. I presented last night a petition² from Connaught on that subject and stated distinctly *our* claims on the new Ministry.³ I had afterwards a confidential conversation with Spring Rice on the subject.

The result of all I see and hear is this, *that* it depends now principally on the Catholics themselves whether or not the grant is either to be suppressed or shared with us—*next* that beneficial to our purpose, *that* petitions in which the laity would concur would also be highly useful, *that* those petitions for such share (which can be most easily done) would be most

should be presented by independent Irish members such as Lord Killeen, Wyse, More O'Ferrall and your humble servant, *that* it is not desirable that they should be sent to any Minister to present as a man in office cannot urge the prayer of a petition without in some degree committing the government in an irregular manner, *that* the sooner petitions are sent over on this subject, the better.

Lord Anglesey goes to Ireland⁴ with the best intentions. Whether he will be able to do much for our poor people God only knows. I fear that the evil lies too deep for his skill at political surgery. I intend to give the new Administration as strong support in all their useful measures as any independent man can give without committing myself in any degree as a ministerial member. By adopting this course I will be able to advance every measure of practical utility such for example as the one we now have under consideration.

Should you, my Lord, concur with me as to the *mode* of obtaining a share in the grant you will of course command my best services. Indeed, it is not alone in that but in anything whatsoever within the reach of my poor power.

SOURCE : Dublin Diocesan Archives

- 1 Wellington had resigned on 16 November 1830 and his place was taken by the Whig ministry of Lord Grey.
- 2 On 25 November O'Connell presented in the Commons a petition from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Newport—Pratt (i.e. Newport), Co. Mayo. The petition complained that Catholics were 'positively and systematically excluded from any participation in the annual Parliamentary Grant of the public money for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, the management of that grant being entrusted to a Society [the Kildare Place Society] whose principles are contrary and opposed to the religious tenets of the Petitioners'. The petitioners prayed the interference of the House to obtain them a share in the education grant (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 133; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., I, 66-8).
- 3 On presenting the Newport petition (see above note 2) O'Connell expressed the confident hope that the new government would be mindful of the great injustice of 'allowing any grant of money for education in Ireland to belong to any one particular sect, to the exclusion of all others' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1830-31, I, 344).
- 4 As lord lieutenant.

1734

*To George Kernan*¹

London, 27 November 1830

My dear Kernan,

I have settled the draft of the will.² I have thought it necessary to give the trustees the most unlimited power to vest the property in private in contradistinction to public securities simply because the aspect of the times is such that I begin to fear or rather believe that public securities will become of very little value. I should not be surprised if coming events prevented the payment of a great part of the interest of the debt called national. This being a strong feeling on my mind, I cannot avoid giving a choice to sell out to any trustees who may have public funds entrusted to them. There are no public news. The interior of England is in a frightful situation.³ I really do not know what remedy can be applied to stop the evil. The Irish appointments are not as yet fixed but I am in great hope that they will be popular. I should not be surprised if our friend O'Loughlen was to be the Solicitor-General.⁴ I would not have my name mentioned as circulating this rumour but I think *you* will be glad to hear that there is every prospect of this appointment being made.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 233-234

1 George Kernan, attorney, 35 Old Dominick Street, Dublin.

2 Unidentified.

3 See letter 1728, note 3.

4 The post went to Phillip Cecil Crampton.

1735

To Edward Dwyer

London, 29 November 1830

[No introduction]

I approve of preparing for a procession to meet the Marquis of Anglesey on his return to the viceroyalty of Ireland; and I should think that it would not be at all amiss, but very much the contrary, if Marcus Costello¹ were to head the procession.²

Lord Anglesey, however, does not go over for at least another fortnight or three weeks and there will be time enough

to countermand the procession should he be betrayed into making unpopular appointments in Ireland. . . .

What I want to find out is, what is to be done for Ireland? They *say* a great deal—but what *is it*? Let me know that.

Such is my question. As to Spring Rice's 'nineteen bills',³ they may all be despatched in one word—*fudge*!

We shall soon see, I again fear, that the Marquis of Anglesey is getting into bad hands. The only good thing about him is his determination, which is fixed, to pack off the Gregorys etc. from the Castle.

I am sorry you had not 'resolutions' at the last breakfast.⁴ The government certainly will not meddle with any orderly public meeting. You know that Lord Anglesey's own letter⁵ to Mr. Kertland⁶ is quite a pledge upon that point; and I should have already put on its legs a new association but that I wish to see the new government actually under way and the Duke of Northumberland out of Ireland before we form another and arrange as to funds.

This alone prevents me from at once beginning. But depend on it, I will *meet* Lord Anglesey and his new Government.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 235-6

- 1 Marcus Costello (born c. 1801), son of Patrick Costello, a farmer from Co. Londonderry. First president of the National Trades Political Union, 1831-c.1833. Called to the Bar 1830. Attorney-general of Gibraltar 1842-68. A Protestant.
- 2 O'Connell had second thoughts on this proposed procession (see letter 1736) which did not subsequently take place (*FJ*, 24 December 1830).
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 A 'Repeal Breakfast' (see letter 1723, note 3) held at Home's Hotel, Dublin, on 13 November 1830 and attended by some 300 persons (*FJ*, 24 Nov. 1830).
- 5 Anglesey to William Kertland, 7 November 1830 (*DEP*, 13 November 1830). The letter was in reply to a request by Kertland to Anglesey to present a petition to the House of Lords in favour of Repeal, from the parishioners of Grangegorman, Co. Dublin (*FJ*, 16 Nov. 1830). In his reply Anglesey recommended that some other peer be chosen for the purpose as he himself was opposed to Repeal from 'a conviction on my mind that in separating the legislatures there would be imminent danger of total separation, and that in total separation there would be ruin to Ireland, irrevocable weakness for England, in short total eclipse of the power and glory of the British Empire'. In reference, however, to the current Repeal agitation Anglesey declared that, since he favoured the discussion

of every measure connected with Ireland, 'I would not have advised a suppression of those meetings which had that object [Repeal] in view.'

- 6 William Kertland, merchant; chairman of the Manor of Grange-gorman.

1736

To Edward Dwyer

London, Wednesday, 1 December 1830

My present opinion is that it is better to let the Marquis of Anglesey come in quietly without any show or procession.¹ I decidedly think the anti-unionists ought not to give him any *glorification*. This is the result of my deliberate judgment. Abandon then all thoughts of our friends joining in the procession unless the people against my advice desire it.

If they do, let them be gratified but mix the strongest anti-unionism with your honours.

The new government of Ireland is being organised. These things are certain—that young Stanley² goes to Ireland as Chief Secretary and that Mr. Doherty is out of office and will not get *any* situation under the Government.³ I have reason to believe that Lord Plunket will be the new Chancellor.

Depend upon it that the attempt to arrest the progress of anti-unionism will be a complete failure as nothing solid or substantial for the good of the Irish people will, or indeed *can*, be done by these Ministers or any British Ministers.

I am sincerely sorry to hear that 'the patriots' are so insensible to the necessity of having a place of meeting of their own.⁴ The store at the back of the premises affords such an opportunity of making an admirable place of meeting that I am almost disgusted at the apathy or *small* motives which prevent its being used for that purpose. I will, if I can afford it, be myself at the expense of putting it into proper shape and form. We can never be independent until we have a place of our own to hold an 'aggregate meeting'. I was thrown out of the theatre in Brunswick Street by miserable jealousies.⁵

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 236-237

¹ See letter 1735, note 2.

² Edward Geoffrey Smith (Stanley), *styled* Lord Stanley from 1834 (1799-1869), chief Secretary for Ireland, 1830-33. Secretary of state for the colonies, 1833-34, 1841-45. Succeeded as fourteenth earl of

Derby in 1851. Prime Minister February-December, 1852, 1858-59, July 1866-68.

- 3 On 23 December 1830 Doherty was made chief justice of the common pleas.
- 4 See letter 1724.
- 5 See letter 1724.

1737

*From his wife to 14 Manchester Buildings, Westminster,
London*

Merrion Square, Wednesday, [1 December 1830]

My dearest Love,

Thank God you have acted like yourself, and your wife and children have more reason to be proud of you now than they ever were. Had you acted differently from what you have done! it would have broken my heart. You cannot abandon the people who have always stood by you, and for whom you have sacrificed so much. You will, darling, be rewarded for all and you will have the prayers and the blessings of your country to cheer and console you for what you have given up. Had you been betrayed into an acceptance of the terms offered by Government you would die of a broken heart before six months expired. You now stand firmly on the affections and on the love of your countrymen, and when that country is aware of the *splendid sacrifice* you have made for them, depend upon it they will strain every nerve to reward you. I shall hold up my head higher than ever I did. I shan't be afraid to look at the people as I certainly should if you were a titled pensioner of the Government. For your children I shan't say a word, as they give you their sentiments with their respective signatures attached. I never saw anything like the pleasure that danced in their eyes when assured of your refusal. May God bless you, my own love! Words are inadequate to tell you how I love and respect you for this late act, so like and so worthy of yourself. My heart overflows with gratitude and pride for being the wife of such a man and the mother of such grateful children.

The report through town yesterday and this day is that you are to be the new Master of the Rolls. You may rely on our discretion though we long to have the great news public. What a welcome you will get from the people of Ireland! May God bless and protect you. You will carry the Repeal of the Union

without bloodshed as you did the Emancipation. I put my trust in that God who sees and knows the purity of your heart. I can't write more here, there are so many in and out.

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X, 720

- 1 The Whigs at this time offered O'Connell high judicial office (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 21, note 1). An examination of the sources used by Macintyre, particularly Paget's *One-Leg*, (377-8), suggests that the offer was more important than Macintyre thinks and may have extended to a government office. It is clear that Macintyre is correct in seeing the offer as a bribe to draw O'Connell's teeth. See letter 1744.

1738

To Bishop MacHale

London, 3 December 1830

My Lord,

I had the honour of receiving your Lordship's letter this day and feel heartily obliged for its length. I will, of course, present any petition you send me and never think of the trouble. In fact, it is none as I attend the House constantly from its sitting to its rising. But as you wish to diversify your favours, I would suggest (and which I do only because you require it) O'Connor Don, Wyse, O'Farrell [*i.e.* More O'Farrell] and, above all, Lord Killeen. Browne¹ also would cheerfully present some. I think you had better confine them to Catholic members. Give me as many of them as you please.

As to my obtaining cooperation or support from many of my countrymen, I must not complain on those heads. I have *done* but little, however much I *wish* to do for Ireland. . . . The signs of the times indicate great and mighty changes. The aristocracy of the feudal system has been reduced by the superior strength and information of the classes styled inferior. The silken and sordid aristocracy of the present day are, in my opinion, arrived at their last term. . . .

. . . The moral and political revolution is plainly on its march. It is, I may say, *self-moving*. I am as convinced as I am of tomorrow's sun that within the space of probably less than two years, the monopolies of corporations and the still more gigantic oppressions of the Established Church will have passed away for ever. 'The Repeal of the Union' is good for everything. It is good as the means of terrifying the enemies of the

people into every concession practicable under the present system. If I were to relax the agitation of that measure, then the men in possession of power would enjoy their state in repose and adjourn to the Greek calends all practical improvement. . . .

. . . The income accessory from the soil of Ireland and the labour of the inhabitants must be spent in Ireland. Conquest and confiscation had their function in the Union. They were made complete by that measure but they have exhausted the vitality of the land and it is no longer able to give sustenance of life to its inhabitants. There must be a law to take off the [Established] Church burden. An Irish Parliament alone can do *that*. There must be an end to absenteeism. An Irish Parliament alone can do *that*. The crying wants of the poor, the increasing indigence of the people, demand the restoration of a parliament which will not only keep at home 'the rents' but diminish their amount by the influence which tenants, voters, shares in a free government, neighbours, friends from kindness received, enemies from oppression practised, must necessarily have over the landlord who resides within their view and can hear with his own ears their curses on hardheartedness or receive their blessings for generosity. The machine of the state would break to pieces unless we consolidate it by a domestic legislation and thus preserve the kingdom of Ireland for the king's crown, and the connection for the benefit of both countries. Let me then respectfully urge the adding petitions for 'the Repeal' to those your Lordship mentions. . . . I shall support this administration as long as they observe their promise; but, of course, I scorn their offers of place or promotion for myself.

SOURCE : M. F. Cusack, *Liberator*, 599-600

I Hon. William Browne, M.P. for Kerry.

1739

*From his wife to 14 Manchester Buildings, Westminster,
London*

Merrion Square, Sunday [5 December 1830]

My dearest love,

. . . All our children quiz me not a little upon the regularity of your letters. I suppose they are surprised you

should think so much of a little old woman as to write to her every post. It is a doubt to me however if even Sheil, who has got so much by his lovely wife,¹ is as much attached to her as my darling old man is to his fond and grateful old woman. . . . Rely on it, love, your secret² is safe with us; not to your sister did I breathe it. I hope it will be public. If it should not, how can the people be aware of the sacrifice you have so nobly made for them? . . . Are we to have Lord Anglesey? I hope not, if he comes³ to continue his opposition to the Repeal of the Union. Dwyer will I suppose give you an account of the reception given by the Lord Mayor⁴ to the deputation yesterday.⁵ His speech⁶ was most impertinent and he deserves to be well humbled. How glad I am I did not visit the Lady Mayoress. I waited to know how he would act after his return from London.⁷ His head has been turned by the compliments there paid to him and he forgets that he was once one of the people and glad to have their support. . . .

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, X, 720-21

- 1 Richard Lalor Sheil married secondly Anastasia, daughter and co-heir of John Lalor, Long Orchard, Tipperary and widow of Edmond Power, Gurteen, Clonmel.
- 2 The fact that he had refused the recent ministerial offers of an appointment (see letter 1737, note 1).
- 3 Anglesey came to Ireland as lord lieutenant on 23 December 1830.
- 4 Robert Way Harty (born 27 Dec. 1779), Merrion Square and Prospect House, Roebuck, Co. Dublin, lord mayor of Dublin November, 1830-November 1831. Elected M.P. for Dublin city 6 May 1831 but his election was declared void 18 August 1831. Created baronet, 1831.
- 5 On 2 December 1830 a deputation of some 'twenty gentlemen of great respectability' waited on the lord mayor, Robert Harty, requesting that he preside at a meeting of the city of Dublin in support of Repeal. Harty postponed making a reply for two days (*FJ*, 4 Dec. 1830).
- 6 On the deputation again presenting itself on 4 December, Harty read the members his reply refusing to comply with their request. He declared that he did not regard Repeal as a measure 'of such practical and unmingled good, as could compensate for the unequivocal mischief that must ensue from reviving and maintaining a continued state of agitation in the public mind, after its recent and most salutary subsidence.' Edward Dwyer headed the deputation to the lord mayor (*FJ*, 6 Dec. 1830).
- 7 Harty had recently visited London, apparently for the expected dinner to the king and queen at the Guildhall on 9 November (*DEM*, 10 November. 1830; see also letter 1724, note 5).

1740

To Richard Newton Bennett

7 December 1830

My dear Bennett,

You ask me (for your friend) what *I want*. The question is easily answered.

For myself *nothing*—for Ireland much.

For Ireland I place my wants in numerical order, not according to their importance but as they chance to come uppermost:

1. The total repeal of the Subletting Act.¹
2. The repeal of the grand jury laws and a new system to be introduced for county taxation on the principle of a parochial election. I have matured a plan for this purpose.
3. The repeal of the Vestry Acts² and placing the expense of building etc. churches on those who want or use them.
4. The total abolition of all tolls and customs except where the public get value for them, as for example, I would leave the toll of *stallage* in a market house built by individuals or by corporations.
5. A total abolition of corporate monopoly, by abolishing fictitious rights of freedom, by taking away non-resident voters and by giving the freedom to all householders of a *certain value* in the corporate cities and towns.
6. There should be a strict inquiry into the disposal of corporate property and a public accounting in future.
7. *Speedy* means should be taken to terminate the existence of the horrid Charter schools.³
8. The education grants should be distributed according to the numbers of each persuasion, and the Kildare Place Society should have no control over public money.
9. The Orangemen and Ribbonmen in the North should be equally disarmed, and the yeomanry in the North reduced to the number in such one of the three other provinces as contains most yeomen.
10. The constabulary should not carry deadly weapons⁴ save in case of being attacked, and that force should be put on a scale of gradual reduction with a view to their total abolition.

11. Pecuniary grants should be made for public works in Ireland.
12. The temporalities of the Established Church should be at once taken into the hands of the government so that on the death of each *incumbent* the revenue should cease except according to the number of Protestants, that is, every Protestant clergyman should be well paid for doing duty, no clergyman to be paid but according to the duty he actually performs. The object is to exonerate the Protestant Dissenters and Catholics from the burden of the Established Church. There are Church lands in abundance to form an ample fund for these purposes.

I must add that the temporalities of the Protestant church *must* be reformed or *nothing* is in my judgment done for Ireland. All the rest are trifles compared with this. This is the giant oppression to be prostrated in the first instance.

You will perhaps smile at the extent of my views but recollect that the people of Ireland are the most miserable on the face of the earth and that palliatives will not assuage the daily accumulating evil.

The 'Repeal of the Union' would *produce* the only radical cure but you ask me to omit that and I only throw it in to show that I have not forgotten or mistaken the cause of all our misery.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

1 See letter 1448, note 1.

2 See letter 1669, note 2.

3 These were schools conducted under the direction of the Incorporated Society for Promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland. They had been founded about a century previously and from their early years had enjoyed an annual state subsidy. The Society's advertisement in the current (1830) *Watson's almanack* states: 'The Children . . . are carefully instructed in Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, and particularly in the Holy Scriptures, and the Doctrines of the Established Church; at the age of about fourteen years they are apprenticed into Protestant Families. . . .' Throughout most of their history they had been criticized for being proselytising institutions and for carrying out their educational work very inadequately (see Lecky, *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, I, 233-38).

4 In England the constabulary were only allowed to carry staves.

1741

From Francis Horner¹

Londonderry, 15 December 1830

Sir,

I have this evening transmitted a petition to Sir Robert Bateson² in favour of parliamentary reform.

The petition was carried by acclamation in a meeting³ held in this city yesterday at which there were present more than 2,000 citizens. It will, I am sure, appear to you as one of the most flattering admissions of the utility of your patriotic conduct which has as yet been recorded, when I inform you that in an assembly of Orangemen and Catholics I was directed to request Daniel O'Connell to support the prayer of petition coming from *Protestant Derry*.

I shall be glad to hear that you approve of our conduct.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Merchant, William Street, Londonderry.

2 Sir Robert Bateson, first baronet (1782-1863), Magherafelt, Co. Londonderry, M.P. for Co. Londonderry, 1830-42.

3 See letter 1746.

1742

From Eugene Macarthy, 18 December 1830

As stage manager of the Theatre Royal, Fishamble Street, Dublin he asks O'Connell to lend his name as the patron of a benefit night for Miss Escourt Wells, an actress.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1743

*From Robert Stack, 24 Stafford Place South, Pimlico, London,
21 December 1830*

Asks O'Connell to forward him his (O'Connell's) legal opinion 'as soon as leisure will admit of your kind *attention which* a Kerryman is always certain of at your hands'.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1744

To Richard Newton Bennett

Merrion Square, 31 December 1830

Strictly confidential

My dear Bennett,

No man possesses more influence over me than you do because I have great reliance on your friendship as well as on your judgement but it is quite in vain for you to urge me to postpone the Union question. Do you know that you actually made me angry with you by your urgency on this subject in London. My reasons for insisting now on the Repeal appeared to you and even to myself to partake of mere speculation but that which was speculative only while I was in London is sober and awful reality in Ireland. The Ministry know nothing of Ireland. Lord Anglesey and those by whom he is surrounded know nothing of Ireland. I now tell you to a certainty that nothing but the effect of my advice and influence keeps the people from violent courses. They all know that it is my decided conviction that they should not have recourse to force and that I would forsake them if they had recourse to violence. But for this you would have already a speedy but of course sanguinary revolution.

You may rely on it that I did not publish one word of the offers¹ which were communicated to me through you from anybody connected with government or pretending to be connected with them. But are you not aware that Lord Anglesey sent for me and talked to me for two hours to prevail on me *to join* the Government, that he went so far as to discuss my private affairs in order to prevail on me to repair my fortunes. If you now know this for the first time it will convince you that my allusions were not at all attributable to anything to which you were a party. To be sure, those things come within the general scope of my expression but who possessed of one particle of commonsense can blame you.

As to Mahony, he is a fellow capable of any political dexterity. Do you know that he is the confidential friend of some of the principal proprietors of the *Courier* and, whilst he thinks that through you he has me gagged at one side, he may be the very person to set that paper at me on the other. I think you should write to him strongly and peremptorily on this subject.

He shall not play fast and loose with me as he did once before.² Write to him, I beg of you, to get me some retraction from the *Courier*³ or do you dispense at once with my promise to you. You cannot think of holding me bound whilst that man opens his masked battery on me.

I am afraid this Administration will do nothing for you or anybody else save their own relatives and gang. Recollect that Lord Brougham conveyed to me in most intelligible language *what was not*—about Doherty, and an Irish lord brought me an untrue message from Lord Grey. *They are not to be relied on.*

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

- 1 See letter 1737, note 1.
- 2 Presumably a reference to the offer from Lord George Thomas Beresford in June 1829 (see letter 1583).
- 3 O'Connell returned to Dublin on 18 December and on the same day stated to a welcoming assembly in Merrion Square that he had been offered but had declined government office (*F*], 20 Dec. 1830). This claim was contradicted by the (London) *Courier* (22 Dec. 1830). On 24 December O'Connell at a public meeting in Dublin stated: 'I therefore tell the writer in the *Courier* that if any man will put his name in the newspapers and call on me to give the name of the person who offered me office, I will tell the whole of it (cheers), and I will promise to him that his masters will not feel obliged to him for the *exposé* (great cheering).' On 29 December the *Courier* again contradicted his assertion that he had been offered government office. No retraction was made by the *Courier*. On the contrary, its campaign against O'Connell continued (*Courier*, 8, 15, 17, 25, 27, 28, 31 Jan. 1831).

1745

*From John Walsh, 48 Capel Street, Dublin, 6 January 1831
to Merrion Square*

Thanks O'Connell for making him a member of the parliamentary intelligence office.¹

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1628a, note 3.

1746

From John Edwards¹

Londonderry 9 January 1831

Private

Sir,

. . . We had on the 14th of last month a large Reform meeting here. The Mayor was rather averse to convene one and the requisitionists—110 in number—met themselves at the linen hall. There were present at the meeting more than 2,000 citizens, the half of whom were Protestants. My friend Mr. Horner was in the chair. Capt. Hart,² the son of one of the representatives for the Co. Donegal, and himself a candidate for the representation of this city, attended and spoke (he was formerly a red hot Brunswicker) and [at] this meeting held in the 'Maiden City' it was agreed that a petition should be forwarded to Parliament in favour of triennial parliaments and vote by ballot and that Sir Robert Bateson should be requested to present it in the House of Commons and (*mirabile dictu*) that Daniel O'Connell should be requested to support it.

It was, I must confess, rather a singular exhibition to see 1,000 Protestants, many of them Orangemen, picking you out of the whole 'collective' as the only member worthy to be applied to on a Reform petition. I was not myself present, being compelled to attend a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce assembled to discuss the propriety of petitioning Parliament against the Corporation. This meeting was got up by some *time-servers* to injure if possible the Reform meeting. However, contrary to expectation, we carried a resolution for petitioning against the Corporation in a chamber in which many of the Corporation are to be found. The petition will be

submitted by the Council on the 17th. You were written to with an entreaty that you would support the prayer of the petition³ but as yet no reply has been received from you which has been a subject of some disappointment. Might I request that you would write to Mr. Horner a reply for publication,⁴ of course avoiding to mention that you received any communication from me on the subject. Your letter may have a very useful tendency by uniting contending parties. In it you will have room to speak of the shameful state of our city representative system. You will scarcely believe that, although Derry contains a population of 20,000 souls, yet we have not more than 150 freemen, the most of whom are non-resident. At the last election the shopkeepers and traders of Derry stood with their mouths open unable to give a vote while the member for Old Sarum⁵ and Sir A. B. King Bt. were both lending their 'sweet voices' to appoint the member for Derry. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Captain George Vaughan Hart (1805-95), Kilderry, Co. Donegal, fourth son of Lieutenant General George Vaughan Hart, M.P.
- 3 This petition was presented by Sir Robert Bateson on 18 March 1831, from the chamber of commerce of Londonderry, complaining that the corporation of that city had misapplied certain funds entrusted it by the government for the purpose of building a bridge across the river Foyle, and praying for a repeal of the act of parliament relating to the said grant (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 402; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., III, 528). O'Connell spoke in support of the petition (*Mirror of Parl.*, 1831, II, 948).
- 4 No such publication has been traced.
- 5 Either James Alexander or Josias Du Pre Alexander, relatives of Sir Robert Alexander Ferguson who was elected for Londonderry city in the general election of 1830.

1747

From John Edwards to London

[probably January 1831]

[Earlier part of letter missing]

Informs O'Connell of abuses including extravagance in the corporation of Londonderry. A petition¹ has already been forwarded by the chamber of commerce to be presented to the House of Commons complaining of these abuses but this

petition has really been prepared by corrupt members of the corporation to prevent more determined actions being taken by others who are trying to reform the corporation. 'Should a committee² be proposed, I think it would be advisable to summon Mr. Horner. On receipt of this it is particularly requested you will bring the matter before the House.'³ 'P.S. Our next general meeting⁴ takes place in a few evenings.'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1746, note 3.

2 That is, a parliamentary committee to inquire into the alleged abuses in the corporation of Londonderry. No such committee was appointed.

3 There is no record of O'Connell's having done so.

4 That is, presumably, of the chamber of commerce of Londonderry.

1748

From George Hill¹ to Merrion Square

Cappoquin [Co. Waterford], 10 January 1831

Dear Sir,

I cannot refrain from styling you Dear Sir since you have assumed the glorious name of 'Pacifator'² yet I have more than a crow to pluck with you, my *friendly* 'Agitator'.

You are aware from my last letter³ that I am opposed to you on the question of the Repeal of the Union. I am also opposed to you as a democrat for I will not hide my sentiments from you that I am an 'Aristocrat' but no oligarch. . . . Remember I am but a modified aristocrat, no corruption, no places and pensions and many other et ceteras. . . . By gaining the Repeal you may hasten the establishing of the Irish Church to be Catholic, but you (I might almost say) put a bar to the furtherance of that measure in England for ever. Be patient. England must soon (in her own defence) acknowledge us Catholic, yes, I trust, sooner than you (with all your might) could carry the Repeal and by continuing the connection we will be enabled to push our Faith upon our Saxon neighbours. I could adduce many arguments against you as to the temporal disadvantages of a Repeal of the Union, not frothy ones but true and substantial. . . . Perhaps I go farther in this principle of non-resistance than you do for I am resolved . . . that if a civil war (on the subject of the Repeal) should break out in Ireland, I will not be seen in the ranks of

either party. I will never fight against my religion *and my country*. Neither will I ever take up arms against my lawful sovereign. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Possibly George Hill (1809-69), a native of Co. Wexford. Writer of newspaper articles and reporter to *Waterford Mail* and others; a printer. See *Boase*.
- 2 At a public meeting in Dublin on 6 January 1831, convened for the purpose of founding his General Association of Ireland (see letter 1751, note 3), O'Connell declared that one of the purposes of the new organization would be 'to quiet Ireland'. He expressed his determination to put down illegal meetings of the peasantry and added 'I am proud, most proud, of being called the *Pacificator*. My great anxiety is to deserve the title, and I rejoice most in my influence over the people because it enables me, by my advice, to induce the people to be peaceful.' (*Pilot*, 7 Jan. 1831).
- 3 Unidentified.

1749

From the Secretary¹ of the Coventry Political Union to Dublin

Coventry, 15 January 1831

Honoured Sir,

I am desired by the members of the Coventry Political Union² and the reformers of Coventry generally to request that you will make Coventry in your way to London on the reassembling of parliament, and that you will inform us by letter on what day and hour you expect to enter Coventry, that we may have the pleasure of meeting you in a body and accompanying you into our City.³ Mr. J. Grant of Coventry will be most happy to be honoured with your company as a guest during the time you stay in Coventry. He is the patriarch of the Coventry reformers. Mr. Hunt, M.P. for Preston, made a public entry into Coventry last week and was very flatteringly received. He sojourned at Mr. Grant's house during the whole of his stay and he addressed the populace amounting to upwards of 3,000 persons from Mr. Grant's window which is the best situation in Coventry for that purpose.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Hickling.
- 2 A network of radical political unions was at this time springing up

in England for the purpose of organizing the masses in support of parliamentary reform.

- 3 O'Connell did not avail of this invitation.

1750

From Thomas McNevin¹

Oscott College, 16 January 1831

My dear Sir,

You will perhaps pardon any presumption when you hear that this letter comes . . . from one who yields to no individual in devoted attachment and affection to Ireland's favourite son, to yourself to have tuned her harp anew. . . .

In your exertion for 'a Repeal of the Union' I see the promise of Ireland's freedom, I see centuries of oppression buried in oblivion by future glory. . . . I am glad to perceive that Ireland is endeavouring to render a tribute of gratitude to her dearest patriot and I only hope it will at least equal that of your great predecessor, H. Grattan. . . . The genius of liberty is abroad. France, Poland and Belgium have set an example. Is there no country that will follow that example? Yes, Ireland will resolutely and constitutionally persevere, she will breakfast and dine herself into freedom; and she will petition her sons into liberty. . . . I have ever regarded you as *my second father* (the *pater patriae* of Ireland) and as such I have not hesitated to express my sentiments to you for your *private eye*. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- ¹ Thomas McNevin (1814-48), son of Daniel McNevin, solicitor, Dublin. President of TCD Historical Society 1838-9. Called to the bar 1839. Worked on staff of the *Nation* for two years. Died in an asylum in Bristol.

1751

From Leslie Grove Jones

17 January 1831

My dear Sir,

Many thanks for the *Pilots*¹ which I suppose are sent me by your direction. . . .

I sometimes tremble for you but I rely upon your superior

knowledge of the law to avoid falling into the snares of your enemies. I must own I differ somewhat from you in your views but then I am an Englishman and cannot be moved by the feelings of an Irishman. I desire not the Repeal of the Union, not that I would injure Ireland or rob her of one of her rights but I fear such a measure would both injure your oppressed country as I am confident it will our degraded country. . . . My objection to the Repeal of the Union is that it would in these days lead to a total separation and then neither kingdom would be so powerful as they ought to be and as they might be, united. . . . Ireland is not on a sufficient equality with England and this she is fully justified in demanding but I do not feel that a distinct parliament is requisite either for her happiness, her interests or her dignity. . . . Ireland . . . should have a greater proportion of representatives in the united Houses than she now has and I see no occasion of Representative Peers. If a House of Lords be essential to either kingdom, every peer should have a seat in it. . . . The Protestant Church should be abrogated in Ireland, its revenues applied to the general purposes of the State by which the Catholic, the Church, and the Dissenter of every description should be paid according to the number of their relative congregations. There should be no state ecclesiastical establishment. Demand this and I am confident the majority of the people of England would support your claims. If such justice was refused you, then go for the Repeal of the Union and no good Englishman would oppose you or sanction the views and measures of the accursed aristocracy and oligarchy who for their own dirty interests would gladly sacrifice both countries. We must have a reformed Parliament. See what that will do. I fear you are going too fast and I have a horror of civil warfare. The aristocracy lost America and I fear will lose Ireland but not without a sanguinary contest. I have no objection to fight but I would rather go [to] assist the Poles for the establishment of their liberty² than have to regirdle my loins with a sword that must be drawn in my native land for I feel Ireland is as much my home as England or Scotland. Demand the recall of Stanley in particular and perhaps also that of Anglesey. The former's flippancy and aristocratic conceit is insupportable, and how an honest gallant soldier as Anglesey should allow himself to be influenced by such an insolent stripling is to me inconceivable but that low creature, Lord Plunket, is I suspect at the bottom of all their folly.³ That man

is to me detestable, affecting liberality yet the most servile, possessed of talents to be employed in prostitution of them. As to Doherty, his appointment⁴ was an insult to the Irish Bar and even to the Irish people but then he is only a creature to administer to the vanity of a lord lieutenant or perhaps in some degree to do mischief of a minor kind.

A *great horror* is entertained of you and more so with the Whigs than the Tories but all of the Order⁵ or [those] connected with it are in full rage against you and you are abused and condemned generally. You are accused of having made the declaration at Drogheda or at some other meeting that you were offered to be made chief justice with a peerage and that your son-in-law might have been sent out to Bombay as a judge.⁶ Now the latter part is so ridiculous as to lead one to conceive that the whole is a fabrication. Did you at all declare what was the offer which was made to you? And what was it? . . . Both Hume and myself are anxious to possess the means of contradicting false statements made against you. We are perpetually attacked on your account, being generally taunted, 'What do you now say to O'Connell? Do you not now give him up, a gross liar as he is and a most wicked demagogue?' We can only say we not only believe but are assured that he was offered office, we think him right in his object but that he does not take those means to obtain it which we should recommend but we are not sufficiently conversant in the present state and feeling of Ireland to pronounce a decided judgment against him. You must on your return expect to be exposed to storms and hurricanes. I have the honour by some of my weak and timid countrymen to be associated with you, and we are both voted as meriting an halter. I hope you see the *Times* newspaper and have time beyond reading its abuse of yourself to read the letters of *Radical*.⁷ They are making a great noise and producing great effect. Many of my acquaintance now look very shy at me. . . . You have been engrossed too much to look probably at the *Spectator's* anatomy of the Commons House.⁸ It is very admirable, I may fairly say so, though I am its principal contributor. . . . I have given yesterday a letter in the *News*⁹ on the funds or tithes of the Scotch church preliminary to a series I propose on tithes in general and to show there are no vested rights in them and that *religion* has nothing to do with the system of tithes.

You will be glad to learn that a most admirable paper has been established at Manchester by the operatives called the

People's Voice. It is really an example [of] what the press should be. Take care of yourself and preserve your health for, with all your faults, and faults you have, you are now not only one of the most important but the most interesting. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones, ff. 210-14

- 1 The Dublin *Pilot* edited by Richard Barrett, a strong supporter of O'Connell.
- 2 A reference to the Polish insurrection against Russia at the end of 1830.
- 3 A reference to the measures recently adopted by the Irish government to curb O'Connell's agitation for repeal of the Union. He had for some years been relying for the maintenance of this agitation solely on the press, and on those meetings described as 'Repeal Breakfasts' (see letter 1723, note 3). He had recently sought to re-establish a permanent organization which he called 'The General Association of Ireland, for the prevention of unlawful Meetings, and for the protection and exercise of the sacred right of petitioning for the redress of grievances'. O'Connell launched this body at a meeting in Dublin on 6 January 1831 (*Pilot*, 7 Jan. 1831). The organization was promptly suppressed by proclamations of the lord lieutenant, dated 7 January 1831 (*FJ*, 10 Jan. 1831). On 10 January the lord lieutenant further proclaimed the weekly 'Repeal Breakfasts' and also 'all adjourned, renewed, or otherwise continued meetings of the same, or of any part thereof, under any name, pretext, or device whatsoever'. (*FJ*, 11 Jan. 1831). A final proclamation dated 13 January (*Pilot*, 17 Jan. 1831) suppressed the parliamentary intelligence office (see letter 1628, note 3). Anglesey had already, only two days after his arrival in Ireland, proclaimed a meeting of the Dublin trades in support of Repeal (*DEP*, 28 Dec. 1830). According to his biographer, he believed Ireland to be on the brink of rebellion, and was determined at all costs to crush the Repeal agitation (Anglesey, *Anglesey*, 247).
- 4 See letter 1736, note 3.
- 5 That is, the Orange Order.
- 6 No record of any such statement by O'Connell appears in the press reports of the public speeches delivered by him since his return to Ireland on 19 December 1830. He did, however, declare at a meeting of St. Michan's parish, Dublin, on 5 January 1831, that he had had an offer of high office from the ministry, and expressly contradicted a statement by the London *Courier* that the government had not offered him any office. He declared that in the event of any person publishing a signed letter denying that an offer of office had been made him [O'Connell] by the ministry, he [O'Connell] would thereupon publish a reply giving full details of the offer and of the persons who had made it (*Pilot*, 7 Jan. 1831; see also letter 1744, note 3).

- 7 The pseudonym used by Leslie Grove Jones.
 8 This article included the observation that owing to the abolition of the forty-shilling freehold franchise in Ireland a more intelligent, independent electorate had grown up 'who will not brook dictation from superiors, with whom for the most part they are at issue on the Union Question'. The article added: 'It is said that Mr. O'Connell, operating upon this feeling could return at this moment nearly half the members for Ireland, and those who are acquainted with that country credit the assertion' (*The Spectator*, 1831, Vol. IV, pp. 9-16).
 9 Unidentified.

1751a

From Thomas Wallace

Wednesday morning, 19 January 1831

Sir,

Though it is now some years since we have had any personal intercourse, I feel that circumstances justify me, at least to myself, in addressing this to you. I learn by the papers of last night and this morning, that the charge under which you were arrested,¹ is, for what is called, *a conspiracy to evade the late proclamations*. In my opinion, the charge savours strongly of *illegality* and *oppression* and in *this* view of your case, if my very feeble professional aid can be of use in your defence, I shall most cheerfully give it. With sincere respect for Lord Anglesey personally and a wish to support his government, even against you, so long as it is conducted on principles of *law* and *constitution*—his Lordship seems to me to have violated *both* in his proceedings on the unlawful assembly act.² Those proceedings are, by the act, those of the lord lieutenant *alone*, and it is, therefore, the less presumptuous to suppose they may be erroneous. To me it appears that he has misapplied that law to cases to which it was not applicable and has strained it in his proclamations—particularly the last³—to an extent which *greatly* endangers public liberty. This may be gross error, perhaps, on my part but the Court of King's Bench and a jury will prevent the error, if it be one, from being mischievous.

I am persuaded it is unnecessary for me to say that from the offer I take the liberty of making, no just inference can be

made of any adoption on my part of your political principles, nor any approbation of your *general* political conduct.

SOURCE : *Morning Register*, 20 January 1831

- 1 On 18 January 1831 O'Connell and five of his associates, Tom Steele, Richard Barrett, Jack Lawless, John Reynolds and Edward Dwyer were arrested on an elaborate indictment consisting of fourteen charges of conspiring to evade the proclamation act (see letter 1710, note 2) and seventeen charges of conspiring to evade the proclamations recently issued by the lord lieutenant under that act (see letter 1751, note 3). All were immediately released on bail (*Pilot*, 19 Jan. 1831). O'Connell, however, proceeded to 'outwit and outmanoeuvre' the government (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 23). The proclamation act was due to expire at the end of the current parliamentary session (it ended in April 1831). O'Connell relied on procrastination, and the trial of him and his lieutenants was protracted until May 1831 when the government (in need of O'Connell's support for the reform bill) used the fact that the proclamation act had expired as a pretext for dropping the charges against him (see Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 23-4; Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 87-96).
- 2 The proclamation act (see letter 1710, note 2).
- 3 That of 13 January which suppressed several O'Connellite organizations including the Parliamentary Intelligence Office (see letter 1751, note 3) (*Dublin Gazette*, 15 Jan. 1831).

1752

To Thomas Wallace

Merrion Square, 19 January 1831

My dear Wallace,

Permit me at least this once to address you in terms which I exceedingly regret have ever been unusual between us. It shall not be my fault if they shall ever again be altered. I accept with pride and pleasure your manly and generous offer.¹ I am deeply grateful for it. I am proud to have the support of a man who during a long and professional career and in times of great subserviency ever maintained the manly independence of his own character and won his way to the highest station in forensic business without any other means than those which liberality sanctioned and professional and personal honour justified and dictated, and won that high station by the single exertion of professional talent and integrity. I am proud to

have the support of a man whose reputation for learning in the criminal law stands second to none in the profession.

P.S.² Your letter is too valuable not to give it publicity; a friend of mine has it in his hand for that purpose. It will appear tomorrow³ *without even permission* but on my sole responsibility.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 239

- 1 See letter 1751a. Wallace appeared as counsel for O'Connell during the subsequent proceedings.
- 2 The postscript is taken from Edward Blackburne, *Life of Francis Blackburne*, (London, 1874), 73n.
- 3 This letter (1751a) was published in full in the *Morning Register* of 20 January 1831.

1753

From Thomas Wallace, K.C. to Merrion Square

Stephen's Green [Dublin], January 19 1831

My dear Sir,

On consideration, I think it better not to publish my letter to you: not that I have any objection to avow my sentiments, but I deem it better on the whole that they should appear only on the trial, should the prosecutor be so unwise as to proceed. I beg of you, therefore, not to publish my letter.¹

SOURCE : Blackburne, *Blackburne*, 73

- 1 Letter 1751a.

1754

To Thomas Wallace

19 January 1831

My dear Sir,

I do not know whether I was ever more afflicted than I was at the receipt of your second letter.¹ I left a copy of the first² with my friend, who awaited my son's return from your house, and as the conversation with you implied no prohibition, but left me to act on my own sole responsibility, without, of course, involving you, he, in my absence, committed it this evening to the press. I was absent at a meeting in Grange-

gorman Lane,³ and the moment I returned and found your second letter before me, I sent off to stop the press but was a full hour too late.

Dictate to me what I shall do now. I will, in the newspapers, take on myself the publication of the letter without your knowledge or consent. I will exonerate you in the fullest and most satisfactory manner from any participation whatsoever in the publication. In short, point out *anything* you wish, and I will do it; and I implore you not to impute to me this as a fault, which I solemnly aver was, under the circumstances, a pure accident.

Entreating your forgiveness, offering you all and every atonement in my power believe me always and for ever, your devotedly grateful and most sincere servant.

SOURCE : *Pilot*, 26 January, 1831.

1 Letter 1753.

2 Letter 1751a.

3 A Repeal meeting of the inhabitants of Grangegorman, in Phibsborough chapel on 19 January 1831. O'Connell spoke at length at this meeting (*Pilot*, 21 Jan. 1831).

1755

From William Carpenter¹ to Merrion Square

145 Strand, London, 19 January 1831

Dear Sir,

It is probable that you may have been apprised, through the medium of the advertisements² in the English and Irish papers, of my intention to present my subscribers with a portrait of 'Daniel O'Connell Esq., M.P. for Waterford,' on the 4th of the ensuing month. The demand for the *Political Letters* which this portrait is to accompany is already very large, and it has occurred to me that its extensive circulation in England would afford a most favourable opportunity to disabuse the minds of the people on the important question of the legislative union between this country and Ireland. There are to my knowledge many hundreds of persons among the working classes in England whose minds are greatly perplexed upon the question, and who only require that the facts of the case should be fairly set before them to enlist them on the side of the 'agitators'! They have been almost induced to believe that

your object is to excite in the minds of the Irish people a deep hatred towards the population of this country, to effect an entire separation and possibly to enter upon a sanguinary war! Their doubts arise more from the confidence which they have in your character and the attachment they feel to your person than from the conviction that these are gross and flagrant misrepresentations on the part of your enemies—the enemies of the people; and sure I am that thousands of them would rejoice to have their doubts entirely removed and to be able, from a conviction of its justice and utility, to become the advocates of a repeal of the union.

Viewing the subject in this light it has occurred to me to say that if you believed it would be worth your while to do so, I should be most happy to publish in the letter to which I have referred a letter or address from yourself to the people of England for the purpose I have suggested. The *Political Letters* circulate in almost every part of England and especially in the manufacturing districts. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Carpenter (1797-1874), reformer, author and editor. Issued pamphlets entitled *Political Letters* 1830-31 for which he was convicted in May 1831 and imprisoned for having refused to stamp them. See *DNB*.
- 2 The advertisement stated Carpenter's intention to present, gratis, to each purchaser of *The Political Letter* to be published on 4 February 'a splendid portrait of this distinguished patriot [O'Connell] engraven on steel'. Carpenter added that this would cost him £100 'at the lowest estimate' but 'it is not often that I shall find the opportunity to make a sacrifice to unsullied patriotism'. (*Pilot*, 3 Jan. 1831).

1756

From William Morris to Merrion Square

Balbriggan [Co. Dublin] 20 January 1831

Sir,

A week or ten days past I wrote to you requesting your support in Lectures I intended to hold at the Royal Exchange Coffee Room, according to the terms of the enclosed prospectus—but was stopped by a letter from Mr. Stanley¹ and by constables sent from the head police office who forcibly deprived me [of] the benefit of the Room I had rented. . . .

On my return home I found in *Saunder's* of the 12th inst. a letter from *John Bull to his Brother Pat*² and determined on sending [?] you a letter containing part of an answer to which other letters on the same subject may follow, explanatory of pecuniary injuries caused by the Union and those again followed by proofs respecting Irish trade, of the amount of benefits resulting from the patronage of Irish manufacturers, that *Ireland did not want an export trade in her provisions* etc.

I know your great influence. If you think that such letters would be productive of any good I shall regularly send one or two every week if any of the Dublin newspapers will give such return as you may think them worth but without [?such] I could not give up my time to the preparation of them. Each letter shall have a reference to the Repeal of the Union. . . .³

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The chief secretary.
- 2 John Bull, Esq. to his brother Patrick in Ireland, *Saunder's Newsletter* 12 January 1831. It is a vigorous justification of the Union.
- 3 Morris's intended letters do not appear to have been published.

1757

*To Richard Newton Bennett, to be left at
Alex Dawson's Esq., M.P., Downing Street, London*

21 January 1831

My dear Bennett,

I did not answer your letter of the 4th.¹ It contained menaces of danger to myself personally. Look at my conduct since and see whether they have had any effect on me; but it is natural for those who deem a duel the proof of valour to suppose that he who refuses to fight a duel must be timid. You at least should have known whether a threat of personal danger was likely to influence me.

The coming of Lord Anglesey to this country² is just the most mischievous thing that could possibly have happened. He has enough of character to make him imagine that he can do mischief with impunity. He is driving the country in spite of me to rebellion. But he shall not, if I can prevent it. Believe me the Whigs are deceiving you. Deceit is their motto. For myself I would have nothing to do with them. I do however

think that such a plan as you suggest might be realised. But it will not, nay, it is morally impossible to bring it about because nothing could be done until the Proclamations³ were withdrawn and the prosecutions⁴ given up. Yet your scheme⁵ is in its nature practicable but there are no *men* to do it. Anglesey is hair-brained. He *knows* nothing. I saw at once that he intended his popularity as a weapon to strike down Ireland. But it is no matter. Your plan could but will not be realised.

The Ministry are not aware of the true state of the country. The horrible game of rousing Orange prejudices again in the North has been resorted to by the Government with some success but are you aware of the result. The Orangemen are determined not to pay either *rents* or *tithes*. There is, in fact, a successful rebellion in the North. The rest of the country is ready to burst into action. It is with the greatest difficulty it can be restrained.⁶ If not so restrained and if my advice and *repeated* injunctions⁷ had not weight, at least three hundred thousand men would before now have attacked Dublin. The Proclamations have set the people wild. It is unnecessary for me to add that I never would accept of any personal favour and I am very apprehensive that they mean to delude and deceive you.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

- 1 Apparently one of three letters which O'Connell claimed in parliament on 28 February 1831 to have received from Bennett 'stating that an individual, not an actual member of the government, was authorised by certain persons in office to make propositions of great personal advantage to himself [O'Connell], with a view of bringing about a compromise between him and the Irish law authorities'. His [O'Connell's] answer was, that he should first hear upon what terms the government would dictate the compromise, so far as it referred to its intentions towards Ireland; and that for himself he would not enter into any compromise. He moreover desired that Mr. Bennett should not write to him again on this point of personal compromise. Mr. Bennett's last letter was written on the 6th of January ' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 1008).
- 2 Anglesey's second term of office as lord lieutenant commenced on 23 December 1830.
- 3 See letter 1751, note 3.
- 4 See letter 1751a, note 1.
- 5 According to O'Connell, speaking in parliament on 28 February 1831, Bennett claimed he had the authority of the government to state its willingness to enter into a compromise with O'Connell,

firstly, by withdrawing the proclamations (see letter 1751, note 3) and secondly, by withdrawing the prosecutions. Bennett then, according to O'Connell, declared 'that the government would enter into an arrangement as to the measures which they intended for the benefit of Ireland, and required to know if the agitation of the Repeal of the Union would, on those terms, be suspended, until after the present session, so as to give the ministry an opportunity of bringing forward their plans for the benefit of Ireland' (this statement by O'Connell appears not in *Hansard* but in the *Pilot*, of 4 March 1831).

- 6 In 1830 there began, according to Macintyre, 'the great anti-tithe campaign . . . which was to dwarf all previous attempts at resistance' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 176).
- 7 O'Connell at this time published frequent addresses in the press, appealing to the people to refrain from violence in seeking to redress their grievances (see, for example, O'Connell to the People of the County of Kilkenny, 3, 6 Jan. *FJ*, 4, 8 Jan. 1831; to the Labourers, Artisans and other Operative Classes, 8 Jan. 1831, *FJ*, 8 Jan. 1831; to the People of Ireland, 14 Jan. 1831, *FJ*, 15 Jan. 1831; see also O'Connell's speech at a public meeting in Dublin on 12 Jan. 1831, *FJ*, 13 Jan. 1831).

1758

To Thomas O'Mara

22 January 1831

My dear O'Mara,

I do most anxiously wish to confer with Lords Meath and Cloncurry on the present awful position of public affairs and the possibility of calming the public mind. I would wish that this desire of mine should be communicated to their lordships in the manner most respectful to them both and to each of them individually.

I have had a communication with a person in the confidence of the Ministry in England but whose name I cannot disclose,¹ who states distinctly that all the Ministry desire is to postpone the Union question until those of reform,² abolition of corporate monopoly and reformation of Church abuses are disposed of, thus leaving 'the Union' for the last.

I think this may be done by Lord Cloncurry and Lord Meath in such a manner as to carry with them the public mind, preserving only just so much or rather so little of popular agitation as would *continue* the confidence of the people in

the prospect of legitimate redress; such prospect being, in my mind, the only mode of preventing violence and outrage and *probable* rebellion. I think that Lords Meath and Cloncurry are the only persons in Ireland who can *certainly* save us all from scenes too horrible to be thought of but which will be accelerated by shutting the eyes to their imminent and approaching danger.

I would wish respectfully to offer my assistance to Lords Cloncurry and Meath; they should have that assistance cordially and sincerely. I would either appear prominent or stay in the background, precisely as they wished. I would either agitate with them or leave the entire and exclusive management of the necessary quantity of salutary agitation to them. I think I could give them much aid; and I am most desirous of throwing into their hands the full direction of all the influence which I may possess, whatever that be. In short, I would desire to converse with them on these subjects; and if I be wrong in any of my views of the present position of affairs in Ireland, there are no men living whose mature judgments would have more influence over mine. I would also be glad to communicate to them all the facts that have come to my knowledge respecting the state of popular feeling.

In fine, I am deeply convinced that Lords Meath and Cloncurry have it in their power to put themselves at the head of the popular party in Ireland and to do more good to the country and prevent more evil than any two persons ever had before.

I need not add that no part of this correspondence nor any communication that may follow, shall ever be disclosed, save by their direction; it being understood that an honourable secrecy is the basis of our meeting.³

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 243-244

- 1 Probably Richard Newton Bennett (see letter 1757, note 1)
- 2 That is, parliamentary reform.
- 3 O'Connell had recently been trying to involve Cloncurry in the agitation for Repeal but the latter rejected his overtures because, according to himself, he had confidence in Lord Anglesey and wished to give him an opportunity of implementing his Irish policy (Lord Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections* . . . Dublin, 1849, 417-18; see also, O'Connell to Cloncurry, 12, 13 Jan. 1831, *FJ*, 13, 15 Jan. 1831). O'Connell, however, persisted in his efforts to reach agreement with Cloncurry, and also with Lord Meath, and his letter, above, was written in compliance with Cloncurry's request that

O'Connell define the objects of their proposed meeting in writing. The meeting took place at Lord Cloncurry's house on the day the above letter was written. According to Cloncurry, O'Connell agreed to give up agitation, and use his influence to allay the current ferment, provided Meath and Cloncurry agreed to promote parliamentary, municipal and tithe reform, and pledged themselves to support Repeal at some future date. Meath and Cloncurry refused to accept these proposals, and this ended the negotiation (see Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*, 424-8; FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 245).

1759

From John Barclay Sheil, M.D., Sligo, 22 January 1831

Asks O'Connell's advice on the legal problem arising from his father's illness and inability to transact any business. The writer's stepmother was a sister of O'Conor Don, M.P. of whom he says, 'in every relation of life he is excellent.'

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1760

To Lord Cloncurry

Merrion Square, 25 January 1831

My Lord,

I heard yesterday with much regret that Mr. O'Mara totally mistook the meaning of a verbal message which I sent him,¹ and, in consequence of that mistake, called on your Lordship to return the letter² I addressed to him *nominally* but to you and Lord Meath *really*. That letter I made your property and of course could not reclaim it. Heaven knows it would be but little worth my while to trouble you about it.

The demand of Mr. O'Mara having arisen from a mere mistake—you are at liberty to do *anything* or *nothing* with the letter as your own judgment dictates. . . .

SOURCE : Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*, 358

¹ According to O'Mara, it was not he but O'Connell's son who mistook the meaning of this message (see O'Mara to Cloncurry, 24 Jan. 1831, cited in Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*, 426).

² See letter 1758.

1761

From J. Dowling¹

Killiney [Co. Dublin], 27 January 1831

Sir,

. . . I witnessed many of the foul deeds by which those who were accessories to the committal of this foul act [the Act of Union] were instigated. . . . The principal conspirator was not an Irishman for *he was* a Scotsman. This person done [*sic*] more to the accomplishment of this hateful measure than *Castlereagh, Cornwallis, Lord Clare, Mr. Pitt himself* for there was not a country gentleman of any note or circumstance from Cape Clear to Warrenpoint his influence did not reach. . . . [He] was the *late John Lees*,² afterwards *Sir John* (his *Union* title) . . . 'twas no uncommon thing in the interior of the country for country gentlemen having influence on the peasantry to get five hundred pounds for every thousand signatures in favour of the measure. This I saw practised in the Co. Leitrim and other places by the late *Miles Keon*³ when tables were spread at each chapel door and the poor deluded fools urged to put their mark to their country's destruction as they came out from Divine Service. I should fill volumes were I to enumerate the various stratagems employed by this old friend and his accomplices (particularly John Giffard),⁴ the *Dog* in office, etc. and hundreds of others in his pay as deputy post officers. . . .

Be as silent as you can with consistency about the established church or its retrenchment. Those *holy drones*⁵ . . . have stings. Do not draw more enemies about your ears than you can ward off nor leave it in the power of those who oppose you to hold up this bugbear to frighten old women, in doing which you will attach many Protestant gentlemen to you who now are staggered by those illusive threats to set those at variance that are now almost good friends.

With the greatest respect, I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

J. Dowling

(a liberal Protestant gentleman and anti-Unionist)

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Unidentified.

- 2 John Lees (1739-1811), son of Adam Lees, Camnock, Ayrshire. Secretary of the post office in Dublin, 1776-1811; created a baronet, 1804.
- 3 Myles Gerald Keon (died 1824), Keonbrook, Carrick-on-Shannon, Co. Leitrim. Delegate for Co. Leitrim to the Catholic convention of 1792. Towards the end of 1799 he collected more than 1500 Roman Catholic signatures to a petition in favour of the act of Union (Charles Vane, marquess of Londonderry, editor, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh*, London, 1849, III, 222-3).
- 4 John Giffard, known as the Dog in office, (died c. 1820), editor of the *Dublin Journal* from 1788-1816 when he severed his connection with it. High Sheriff of Dublin city 1794.
- 5 That is, the incumbents of the established church.

1762

From Thomas Fitzgerald to Merrion Square

Cork, 28 January [1831]

My Dear Sir,

All your friends here are greatly mortified at your being arrested¹ but hope you will triumph over your enemies.

In consequence of the run on the Banks here for gold by the country people,² all business for the last two days has been suspended. The merchants came to the resolution of not buying corn, pork etc. though the markets are crowded with those articles. Banks refuse to give any accommodation.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 See letter 1751a, note 1.
- 2 On 14 January O'Connell urged that, in the event of the freedom of the press being assailed by the government, the people should commence a run on the bank for gold (O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 14 Jan. 1831, *Pilot*, 17 Jan. 1831). On the following day, however, the *Pilot* declared that, until circumstances should alter 'we see no absolute necessity for peremptorily demanding gold' (*Pilot*, 15 Jan. 1831), whilst on 21 and 24 January 1831 it disclaimed responsibility on O'Connell's part for any demand for gold which might occur. According to Hall, a minor financial crisis did occur in January 1831 but it had been mounting since the previous November. In January 1831 the panic was intensified 'due to political agitation' and 'particularly in Waterford . . . several small savings banks . . . were forced to close their doors'. By the end of February, however, normal conditions were restored (F. G. Hall, *The Bank of Ireland 1783-1946*, Dublin, 1949, 152-3).

1763

From John McCarthy to House of Commons

Saturday evening [postmarked — Feb 1831], care of
Mr. Everett, 8 Coopers Row, Trinity Square

Dear Sir,

Many years back you rendered me a most essential service in bringing on a trial at Dublin of some considerable magnitude which no other gentleman at the Bar could accomplish. You possibly may recollect the case in 1814, *McCarthy* versus T. [or J?] *Costigan*. I shall ever recollect with gratitude your exertions on my behalf.

[The writer says he has for some time resided in the island of Jersey as a distiller making whiskey for the London market. He formerly used potatoes but has now discovered a substitute for potatoes in a species of beetroot. . . . Thus the price of potatoes in Jersey and Guernsey has fallen, and he could now procure potatoes at low prices to help the unfortunate peasantry in Ireland].

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1764

*To Richard Newton Bennett to be left at
Alexander Dawson's Esq., M.P., Downing Street, Westminster*

Merrion Square, 7 February, 1831

My dear Bennett,

*Maurice has answered your note and conveyed to you my sentiments.*¹ Since he wrote, the question of the representation of the County of Kilkenny has become important.² Lord Duncannon is a man for whom I have the highest respect, esteem and regard but he is now 'one of my prosecutors' and as the Ministry are determined to *crush* me, I must carry the political war into their quarters. He must expect opposition if the prosecutions³ go on. I have arranged materials for a powerful opposition. I have entered into the details of finding money and attorneys and I believe he will find it a hard task to succeed, coming forward in the shape of one of my prosecutors.⁴ I write this to you that you may if you think fit give a hint of this peril to the present flippant and *false* Ministry. I

do not mean to go to war with them unnecessarily but, if the *prosecutions* be not forthwith withdrawn, I will be obliged to *give* Lord Duncannon a violent contest and perhaps a complete defeat. He never was half so powerful in Kilkenny as Vesey Fitzgerald was in Clare. But why should I annoy you with more as I write this with the sole view of your being able to show that the Ministry themselves have an interest in the extinction of Lord Anglesey's most insulting prosecutions. Let me tell you for your private satisfaction that if they do not most grossly pack the jury they have no chance of a conviction. Their Attorney General⁵ is *bothered*. I write hastily and think I console myself for the feeling of ingratitude towards Lord Duncannon by giving this warn[ing]—*Valeat quantum*. The trial will certainly last an entire week. We have eight speeches besides a host of witnesses and then there are all the speeches and witnesses for the crown. I think it is little to say a week. I have written more than I intended.

[P.S.] Since I wrote the above, '*notice of trial*' has been served !!⁶ Do you not see that they are making a mere tool of you in order to delude me and throw me off my guard. If you are not now convinced of this, nothing can open your eyes. I told you repeatedly that they were humbugging you. Nothing but the instant withdrawal of the prosecutions will convince me that you are not made an instrument of delusion. I do not *indeed* believe you capable of *wilfully* acting such a part.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

- 1 O'Connell maintained that he had rejected efforts by Bennett to arrange a compromise with the government (see letter 1757, note 1). However, on 5 February, according to O'Connell, Bennett wrote to his [O'Connell's] son declaring 'Your father having refused to listen to any compromise, I address myself to you'. O'Connell thereupon dictated a note stating the terms upon which he would enter into a compromise with the government. This note was enclosed in a letter from O'Connell's son to Bennett stating 'that my father has been so much deceived and deluded by the present administration, that he will not enter into any negotiation with any of its members, till it first consents to abandon the prosecution against him [see letter 1751a, note 1] without any equivocation'. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 1008).
- 2 'In February 1831 Lord Duncannon, standing for reelection in his home county of Kilkenny on his appointment as First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, was elected by a majority of only 61 votes against opposition which had been inspired by O'Connell and

organised by his agents.' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 24; also, *Pilot*, 28 February 1831). Duncannon's opponent in Kilkenny was Col. Pierce Butler.

3 See letter 1751a, note 1.

4 That is, as a member of the government.

5 Francis Blackburne.

6 On 9 February 1831, however, O'Connell had his hearing in the court of king's bench adjourned to the following day, because, he alleged, he had not received the twenty-four hours clear notice of trial which the law demanded (*DEP*, 10 Feb. 1831).

1765

To Francis Blackburne

Merrion Square, 11 February 1831

Sir,

The public and private information which I have received from London this day impresses on me very strongly the necessity of my attendance in Parliament in discharge of my duties there. So urgent does that necessity appear to me that I take the liberty of stating it to you with as much of request as may be consistent with your official situation that the trial¹ of myself and the other gentlemen may stand over until the next term provided there be nothing in such postponement² inconsistent with your views of the interests of the crown and the public. All the traversers concur in this wish but it is one which I express only in one case, namely, that you see nothing in the delay inconsistent with what your office demands from you in the most rigid performance of your duty. I have only further to add that it is totally unnecessary for you to send any written reply to this letter. Indeed, I do not desire any other than a mere signification by the Crown Solicitor to my law agent, either that duty *allows* or *forbids* you to comply. I owe you an apology for this intrusion: that apology is to be found only in my conviction that my duty to my constituents requires my presence at this time in the House of Commons.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 247

1 See letter 1751a, note 1.

2 O'Connell's trial had been fixed for 17 February 1831 (*FJ*, 11 Feb. 1831). The attorney-general agreed on 12 February 1831 to a postponement (*FJ*, 14 Feb. 1831). On 15 February O'Connell left Dublin for London (*FJ*, 16 Feb. 1831).

1766

From Leslie Grove Jones

Brooks's [Club] [London], 12 February 1831

My dear Sir,

. . . I do not understand the absurd course which Government has pursued and is inclined to pursue against you.¹ I hope to heavens that among the twelve men that will be put into the box there will be some, say only one, who will be honest enough to cause justice to be done you. I never served as a juryman until the other day and, really, I was quite disgusted with the baseness of my countrymen and the attempt of my Lord Chief Justice Tenterden² to prevent justice. . . . My object is to prove to John Bull . . . that the abolition of the Protestant Church in Ireland need not affect that establishment in England no more than the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland has done. I want to show that neither tithes nor episcopacy are at all connected with religion and much less with pure Christianity. When I have done that, I will go boldly ding-dong to work in pulling down the Protestant Church in Ireland but, mind, I will not elevate the Catholic which will be on a level with the Presbyterian and Episcopal. . . . Hunt has done very well, he speaks too long but he has fallen into the business of the House as if he had belonged to it all his life. O'Gorman Mahon sadly lost himself the other night. He got into a passion and therefore destroyed the effect which he wished to produce.³ You are, I hope, content with Hume. His conduct was manly and straightforward.⁴ He only wants to have good assistants about him, someone who knows him well and can allow for his defects. . . . Sir H. Parnell is behaving well, but altogether there is a want of courage, a want of decision but, if the House does not improve, the public, *the people are improving* and will cause at last the improvement which can alone save the Empire. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones, ff. 252-54

1 See letter 1751a, note 1.

2 Charles (Abbott), created Baron Tenterden, 1827 (1762-1832). Chief Justice of the King's bench (England) 1818-32. See *DNB*.

3 Probably a reference to O'Gorman Mahon's clash with the speaker of the Commons in the course of a speech which he delivered in favour of Repeal on 8 February 1831. The speaker informed O'Gorman Mahon that 'this House never has been in the habit of

submitting to the manner in which the honourable member [O'Gorman Mahon] is now pleased to address the House' and threatened to bring him before the bar of the House to answer for his conduct (*FJ*, 12 Feb. 1831).

- 4 Speaking in parliament on the subject of Ireland on 8 February, Hume declared that he would give the liberty of free discussion on all subjects, and remove the establishment, with the vestry act, tithe system, and all their accompanying evils. No danger, in his opinion, was to be dreaded from revolution or rebellion, and he was sorry to observe so manifest a disinclination on the part of the House to entertain the Union question (*FJ*, 12 Feb. 1831).

1767

To Richard Newton Bennett to be left at Alexander Dawson Esq., M.P. Downing Street, Westminster

Merrion Square [13 February 1831]

My dear Bennett,

Give up all 'agitation' about those prosecutions.¹ They have ended in smoke but most shabbily on the part of the prosecutors, most shabbily.

Instead of abandoning them *they have made a miserable compromise*. They have given up the 17 counts charging 'fraud and conspiracy' upon the terms of our withdrawing our pleas to the 14 counts charging a violation of the Proclamation,² but no sentence and a writ of error consented to if we choose. Did you ever hear of anything half so paltry? See now how much better it would be to have acted on the terms³ you proposed but there is a fatuity about this Administration which involves them deeper in the mire every hour they flounder on. They yesterday struck off Alderman McKenny and Arthur Guinness from the panel⁴ and after that, this day, the[y] seek a mousehole to creep out. Well, well, well!

I will be in London on the morning of Thursday if possible. . . . I will soon know what these ministers mean to do for Ireland.

Your note speaks of Althorp and Burdett. Why? Of what importance is the opinion of poor Burdett to any rational being and, as to Lord Althorp, he is involved with his party and professes too little of personal power to command respect.

I think you will be surprised at the paltry termination of these proceedings. What a benefactor you would have been to

them had they adhered to your offer as *I was willing to accept it*. But I believe these men will excuse themselves by stating that it was dangerous to proceed with the trials. But what care I what they say? I hope I have not hurt your feelings in anything I wrote. If I had I should indeed be sorry.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 837

1 See letter 1751a, note 1.

2 See letter 1751a, note 1.

3 It is not clear what these terms were. Bennett had, however, attempted to act as intermediary between O'Connell and the government (see letter 1764, note 1).

4 That is, from the panel of jurors, in connection with O'Connell's trial.

1768

To Richard Barrett

Wolverhampton, 16 February 1831

My dear Barrett,

You will see by the papers that Mr. Stanley has fully confirmed my statement that there was no species of compromise of a political nature connected with the late law arrangement.¹ He, however, does not seem to have stated that arrangement at all. No matter. I will, please God, set that part of the business fully to rights on Friday evening in the honourable House.²

But Mr. Stanley is also reported to have said that I had solicited, by my friends, a compromise of the prosecution; whereupon, it is stated, he was cheered by all sides of the House. I do not believe, or at least I ought not to believe, one word of it because a greater untruth could not be told. It follows that he did not say so. Does it not?

I beg of you to contradict the report in the strongest terms.³ Nothing could be more false than that I ever solicited a compromise of the prosecution by any friend whatever. I will state this fully in the House on Friday. Until then, do you contradict the report emphatically.

How I long to hear of Colonel Butler's success in Kilkenny.⁴ If he succeeds you will have more anti-unionists amongst the Irish members than we will know what to do with.

[P.S.] I will be, I hope, tomorrow evening in the House to vote for the Jews if there be a division.⁵

SOURCE : *Pilot*, 18 February 1831

- 1 On 14 February, Stanley, in reply to a question from Lord Chandos as to whether the government had made any compromise with O'Connell in the matter of his prosecution (see letter 1751a, note 1) declared 'he [Stanley] was aware that an opinion had got abroad that O'Connell had pleaded guilty at the request of government. No such thing was the case. He could not, however, but say that the friends of Mr. O'Connell had been endeavouring to effect a compromise'. He added that in the matter of the prosecution the government would not recede 'one single inch' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 490-1; *FJ*, 17 Feb. 1831; see also Stanley's statement on 16 Feb. 1831, *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 609-13; *FJ*, 21 Feb. 1831).
- 2 O'Connell did not raise the matter of the prosecution until Monday, 28 February. He then asked Stanley to explain his statement that he [O'Connell] had sought through his friends to enter into a compromise with the Irish government so as to avoid conviction, and declared that 'he [O'Connell] had authorised no person on his behalf to offer any terms of compromise, and that no such compromise was proffered to his knowledge'. Stanley replied that the earl of Glengall and Richard Newton Bennett had laid before him [Stanley] a letter which was stated to him to have been dictated by O'Connell, and which had originally been enclosed in a note to Bennett from O'Connell's son, for the purpose of inducing the Irish government to abandon the prosecution. O'Connell in reply admitted having dictated the document to which Stanley referred, on receiving a communication from Bennett through his [O'Connell's] son. The document which O'Connell dictated consisted, he claimed, of 'the terms on which alone he [O'Connell] would enter into a compromise'. These terms, O'Connell claimed, were first that the prosecution should be unequivocally withdrawn, and, secondly, that the Irish government should state what measures of relief were intended towards Ireland. To this his son had added that 'as it may not be exactly conformable with the dignity of the Irish government to formally abandon the prosecution my father will not insist on a formal abandonment'. In this document, O'Connell declared, he also stated that he would abandon the agitation of Repeal 'if the measures of the government tended to the benefit and prosperity of Ireland'. 'This', he concluded, 'was all the compromise proffered on his part' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 1006-9). Stanley in reply claimed that O'Connell's statement bore out his [Stanley's] original statement (see above note 1) 'to the letter', and added that the Irish government had refused on receipt of the document dictated by O'Connell to enter into any compromise with regard to the prosecution (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 1010-11. The fullest account of this debate occurs in the *Pilot* of 4 March 1831).

- which appears to have obtained its information from O'Connell himself (see letter 1777): the reports in the other Dublin journals conform to that in *Hansard*).
- 3 Barrett complied with O'Connell's request (see *Pilot*, 16 Feb. 1831).
 - 4 See letter 1764, note 2.
 - 5 There was no division. On that day (17 February 1831) Lord John Russell presented to the Commons a petition from Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists of London praying the admission of Jews to full civil rights. O'Gorman Mahon is the only member noted as speaking on the petition (he supported it) (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 264; *Times*, 18 Feb. 1831).

1769

From Edward Dwyer to House of Commons

Dublin, 19 February 1831

My dear Sir,

. . . Your letter from Wolverhampton¹ has had a powerful effect in counteracting the calumnies of the enemies of Ireland respecting Stanley's speech. . . .

I send you a petition² from Leighlin Bridge in favour of Repeal. The *fund*³ is getting on much better than we expected. I think it will soon reach 25.⁴ It should be twice that but it had many obstacles to encounter. . . .

[P.S.] I am directed to ask you about a bill for £45 sent to you from Brooklyn, New York, per Rev. Mr. Farnan sometime in February 1829.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 831

- 1 Letter 1768.
- 2 O'Connell presented this petition on 28 February.
- 3 The O'Connell Tribute (see letter 1707, note 3).
- 4 That is £25,000.

1770

From P. V. Fitzpatrick to London

Hayes's Hotel, Dublin, 21 February 1831

(Private)

My dear Sir,

In consequence of your sympathy for that civilly excom-

municated body, some of your *quondam* friends of the Press have been qualifying you as one of the 'Jews.'¹ We have this day invested you with a special characteristic of the 'Nation' by making you a moneylender. Five thousand pounds of the Tribute² have been lent to James Pim, Junior³ through William Murphy at the rate of 4 per cent for three months certain to be withdrawn or paid at the expiration of that term on 7 days notice from either party. The collateral security consists of Grand Canal Loan Debentures which have been lodged in the Hibernian Bank at £14 per cent below present market price and we have a covenant obliging the borrower to make a further deposit should the market decline £5 per cent. The stock is quite unexceptionable [i.e. unobjectionable], indeed it is enough to say that William Murphy recommended it. A further sum of three thousand pounds has been lent to Codd and Brenan⁴ through John Power⁵ on a transfer of bank Stock and at 3½ per cent interest: to be paid or withdrawn in four months at the option of either party after notice as in the former case. . . . I mention this . . . that you may make the requisition to the Trustees for the sum you spoke to me as requiring, before my departure and while sufficient Funds remain in our hands unlent. You will do well to call for £1,000 more than you shall have need of as I shall explain when I have the pleasure of seeing you. Write a private letter to me enclosing that which I am to present to the Trustees and you will be good enough to express strongly in the latter that *the money will, in the way you require it, be most beneficial to your interests*. This they will wish to have for their own satisfaction.

Cash continues to come in steadily and satisfactorily and I am working the uncollected districts with gratifying prospects of success. I have no doubt of making the operation permanently productive and shall apply myself to effect the continuous increase as a fixed object. Indeed I cannot refrain from felicitating myself on having devised and so successfully accomplished the splendid *coup* that has been made. The process has made me acquainted with new channels through which great services cannot fail to be rendered within the next twelve months.

To keep the machine in motion I have agreed with the present proprietor of this house for one guinea per week for the room we at present occupy. Perhaps it might be well to take it for a year certain as it is now known as your Treasury,

and as your Chancellor of the Exchequer has become equally notorious.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Commenting on O'Connell's departure for London the *Dublin Evening Post* declared 'Having played the Jew with the poor populace here, by pouching their pennies, he is going, he says (such is his boundless liberality) to support the Jews in Parliament' (*DEP*, 19 Feb. 1831). See letter 1768, note 5.
- 2 The O'Connell tribute for 1831 (see letter 1707, note 3).
- 3 James Pim, Jr., stockbroker and insurance agent, 41 Dame Street, Dublin and Monkstown Castle, Co. Dublin. Director of Hibernian Joint Stock Co.
- 4 Merchants and corn factors, 126 Townsend Street, Dublin.
- 5 John Power (1771-1855), a trustee of the O'Connell tribute; distiller. Married Mary daughter of Thomas Brennan, Co. Wexford. Created baronet, 1841.

1771

From Edward Dwyer, to 16 Manchester Buildings, London

Dublin, 23 February 1831

My dear Sir,

I send you this day six petitions from the County of Kilkenny. It appears by the *Kilkenny Journal* which I have just received that up to last evening Duncannon polled 163, Butler 102. Majority for the former 61. The editor attributes the majority to the difficulties thrown in the way of Mr. B's¹ voters but has no doubt of his triumphing. There were 250 voters to poll.

The club² which I formed in St. Paul's Parish has subscribed £20 towards Mr. B's expenses. I hope to hear from you tomorrow. My office is crowded every morning to learn the news from you.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Col. Pierce Butler.
- 2 No doubt a Repeal or Liberal club.

1772

From Edward Dwyer to 16 Manchester Buildings, London

Dublin [Wednesday], 26 February 1831

My dear Sir,

I forward this day several petitions to your care. I believe that there is no likelihood of Col. Butler being returned *at this time* for the Co. Kilkenny. The majority for Duncannon at the close, it is supposed, will not exceed twenty.¹ Had a committee been formed a week earlier or had you not been prevented by other arrangements from going to Kilkenny, there can be no doubt but the Colonel would be the sitting member. The struggle will have one good effect at least as it proves the power, so long used by the aristocrats of the county, to be completely trampled down by the people. . . . The London papers of Thursday next will be anxiously looked for.

[P.S.] You will observe by the Dublin papers that we have got a second edition of E. G. Stanley's letter² (with additions) signed *Gossett*.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 His ultimate majority was actually 61 (see letter 1764, note 2).
- 2 On 1 January 1831 the *Dublin Evening Mail* published a circular letter dated December 1830, from Edward George Stanley to the magistracy of Ireland, which referred to recent meetings of 'mischievous tendency' alleged to have been held in various parts of the country 'under various pretexts of political discussion, or of public amusement'. (This was a reference to the device resorted to at this time of holding anti-tithe meetings in the guise of hurling matches). The letter went on to declare that while the government would always countenance 'the fair and legitimate exercise of the right of petition', and acknowledged the right of the people to meet for the purpose of 'innocent recreation', it was determined to put down illegal meetings, and it strongly urged the magistracy, on pain of incurring the 'severest displeasure' of the lord lieutenant, to disperse such meetings (*F*), 3 Jan. 1831). The second letter referred to was a circular dated 23 February, and signed by William Gossett, reiterating the directions contained in the first circular, and making it clear that the magistracy could exercise their large power subject to their own discretion as to what constituted an illegal meeting (*F*), 26 Feb. 1831).

1773

*From the Secretary¹ of the Hibernian Negroes Friend Society
to House of Commons*

Hibernian Negroes Friend Society's Office, 28 Upper Sackville
Street, Dublin, 26 February 1831

Sir,

The directors of the Hibernian Negroes Friend Society beg leave most respectfully to solicit your attention to the subject of Negro slavery in the British colonies, which will be brought under the consideration of the House of Commons on the 4th of March next² and they earnestly solicit the strenuous exertion of your influence and advocacy for the immediate and total abolition of a system so diametrically opposed to the dearest interests of nearly a million of His Majesty's subjects, as well as to the spirit of Christianity and the universally acknowledged principles of the British constitution.

Relying on your friendly cooperation on this occasion.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 W. J. Cross.

2 The only petition against slavery on 4 March was that presented by Thomas Wyse on behalf of the inhabitants of Cahir, Co. Tipperary, but on 2 March some twenty petitions, mostly from Wesleyan Methodists, were presented. They were not debated.

1774

*From Andrew Carbery, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford
27 February 1831 to London*

A long description of what occurred when the sergeant of police posted this morning Montgomery's¹ letter² to O'Connell and the address of the Catholics of Ballymena to the lord lieutenant and his answer.³ The posting was torn down by the people. 'This sergeant is a *Northern*, is reputed to be an Orangeman. His name is *Glinn*. It is also reported he had to fly *Carrick-on-Suir* for his northern tricks.' Carbery suggests giving full newspaper publicity to the occurrence.⁴

'P.S. The farmers and townsmen here *wish* to petition against pikes⁵ altogether. They *are* better pleased to pay all road cess in county charge *than* suffer pike *jobbery*. Do you approve of it?'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Henry Montgomery (1788-1865), Presbyterian minister in Ulster; headmaster of the English school in the Belfast Academical Institution, 1817-39; life-long opponent of Rev. Henry Cooke. Of Arian theological principles and with leanings towards Unitarianism, Montgomery supported Catholic Emancipation. See *DNB*.
- 2 Henry Montgomery was moderator of the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster which, with two other Presbyterian bodies, had sent an address to Lord Anglesey, pledging support for his government, and deprecating all attempts to upset the Union (*DEP*, 20 Jan. 1831). A few weeks before, O'Connell, who hoped apparently to enlist Montgomery's support in the Repeal agitation, had been describing him in public as 'my *excellent* friend'. At a public meeting in Dublin on 26 January, however, O'Connell declared that Montgomery was 'a paltry and pitiful slave' and 'a fauning, cringing sycophant' (*FJ*, 27 Jan. 1831). This evoked from Montgomery an elaborate reply, dated February 1831, described by the *DNB* as 'among the most powerful attacks upon the Liberator's position [which] . . . did much to alienate Irish liberals from his cause' (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Montgomery, Henry'). For Montgomery's letter, which was also published in pamphlet form, see the *Dublin Evening Post* of 10 February 1831.
- 3 An address to the lord lieutenant dated 15 January 1831, from the Catholics of the parishes of Ballymena, Kirkinraloe and Ballyclug, pledging their support for Anglesey's government. (For this address and Anglesey's reply, dated 22 January, see the *Dublin Evening Post* of 8 February 1831).
- 4 No such publicity appears to have been given.
- 5 That is, turnpike roads, upon which tolls were charged.

1775

To his wife, Merrion Square

Manchester Buildings [London], 28 February 1831

My own sweetest love,

I got your letter of Saturday just now. My mind is at ease about the Kilkenny election.¹ Whatever may be the ultimate fate of it, and I do not expect a favourable result, yet we have made a great and glorious fight and have given the aristocracy a shake. I am extremely pleased that we fought the battle at all events.

Darling, why do you fret yourself about Danny? If he was in the slightest degree unwell the Jesuits² would write to you at once and, as to the sweet fellow himself, a letter necessarily

takes away the play hours of a day. Besides, you have no idea of the rapidity with which time flies over at a school where everything is done like clockwork. I myself have my recollection of that rapidity quite vivid.

I dined yesterday with Charles Phillips. He has an extremely well furnished house in Chancery Lane. . . .

I have no political news to give you. My *exposé*³ this evening will disappoint all parties. I mean to be tame and quiet⁴ but distinct. This however is the last day of my acquiescence.

. . .

I have two rooms on the first floor and two excellent bedrooms over, that is, on the second floor. I pay four pounds a week and I can leave this at a week's notice. . . . Did I tell you that I had a visit from Mr. Kelly of Acton?

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 1764, note 2.
- 2 At Clongowes Wood College.
- 3 On the subject of his prosecution. See letter 1768, note 2.
- 4 The *Pilot* when referring to its report of O'Connell's performance in this debate, declared that the report, though 'correct in substance' fell 'short of the full spirit of Mr. O'Connell's statement and reply, which private letters describe as most effective and triumphant' (*Pilot*, 4 March 1831).

1776

*From Edward Dwyer, Dublin, 28 February 1831, to
16 Manchester Buildings, London*

Relays report that the Kilkenny election¹ may not yet be completed.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letter 1764, note 2.

1777

To Richard Barrett

London, 1 March 1831

Private

My dear Barrett,

There is but one thing cruel in the discussion¹ last night.

I had as decided a victory as ever was gained. You have no notion how I scattered the Philistines. I really, and without exaggeration, *put down the House*. I will endeavour to make out some amendment of the report and send it to you by coach or post tomorrow. I will help you to some part if not the whole. But rely on it that I had a complete victory. The *Morning Chronicle* gives my reply tolerably.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 250

1 See letter 1768, note 2.

1778

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 2 March 1831

My darling heart,

. . . We had a late sitting last night and will have another this night but I will not remain beyond half after eleven to twelve.

The reform plan¹ gives me great satisfaction in many of its parts. It is on the whole a substantial measure of relief. It is particularly good in knocking up all the corporations in Ireland. It gives them a complete sweep.² The election for Dublin will be in the hands of all householders paying ten pounds a year rent. I think then, darling, I will have a tolerable chance of the City if I choose to stand for it. This reform bill puts me into great spirits. Indeed, my mind is quite at ease on the subject as I see that an extensive reform must be carried.

My own love, I write this day peculiarly in great haste as I mean to speak this night if I get any time.³ I want to make some preparations. The committee in Maurice's case⁴ was struck last night. It is far from being a favourable one. If they can they will not seat him. On the Clare election I am sorry that the case⁵ is now going hollow against O'Gorman Mahon. There is the most distinct swearing to bribery. If he cannot shake the case now made he will lose his seat and cannot be returned again this session, I mean this parliament. Tell my sweetest Kate I hope to live to see her love a husband more than she loves her father though she may rely on it that her father will never love her less than he does at present. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The first reform bill (for England and Wales) was introduced by Lord John Russell in the Commons on 1 March 1831. For an analysis of the first reform bill as intended to apply to Ireland, see Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 30. For O'Connell's views of Russell's original proposals which, he declared, deserved 'the ardent and decided support of every friend of national liberty', see O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 5 March 1831 (*Pilot*, 7 March 1831).
- 2 Prior to the reform act of 1832, 18 of the 33 Irish borough constituencies were 'completely immune to contests of any kind, while many of the so-called "open" boroughs were controlled by local, usually Tory, magnates' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 29). Although the first reform bill did not propose the disfranchisement of any Irish borough, it did propose a uniform £10 household borough franchise for Ireland (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 30).
- 3 The adjourned debate on the first reform bill took place on 2 March 1831. O'Connell did not speak.
- 4 In August 1830, O'Connell's son Maurice, standing for Drogheda as a candidate in the general election, was defeated by John Henry North. On 8 and 16 November 1830 two petitions were lodged complaining of North's return, from the electors of Drogheda and Maurice O'Connell respectively. On 1 March 1831 a committee was appointed to try both petitions and reported on 3 March that North was duly elected.
- 5 A petition of Philip Casey of Seafeld, and James Fraser of Newmarket-on-Fergus, both of Co. Clare, complaining of the return for that county in the general election of August 1830 of James O'Gorman Mahon, was lodged on 15 November 1830. A committee to try this petition was appointed on 5 February 1831, and reported on 4 March that O'Gorman Mahon was 'by his friends and agents' guilty of bribery at that election. He was accordingly unseated, and a new writ was ordered.

1779

*From Edward Dwyer, Dublin, 3 March 1831, to
16 Manchester Buildings, London*

Sends two petitions, one from the cutlers of Dublin for Repeal, the other from Naas against the easement of burial bill.¹ A reply to the address² from the inhabitants of Bray, Co. Wicklow is expected.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 These two petitions were not presented to parliament.
- 2 Unidentified.

1780

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 4 March 1831

My darling heart,

Do not think I was out of spirits because I wrote you a short letter yesterday. No darling, thank God, the disappointment as to Drogheda¹ weighed little with me at such a moment as this when all the rotten boroughs are about to be opened and when the friends of the people are likely to have a full *selection* of places to be returned for. There is no occasion to fear that Maurice will not get a seat. I did not get any opportunity to speak last night but will without fail, I hope, this evening.² Indeed, I do not see how it is possible I should not, I think, notwithstanding the defeat of the Drogheda petition. Maurice may come over for a few days. . . . Let not Maurice come over until he hears from me on Monday. The Committee on O'Gorman Mahon's petition³ have decided against him. He is no longer an M.P. nor do I think he *can* sit again in this session although the report of the Committee *may* perhaps be so shaped as to allow him to do so. He says that he will either stand himself or set up his brother William as *one of his family* must represent the county. The Committee certainly behaved very ill to him. Of that there is no doubt but the case was made out strongly indeed. There was no doubt of the bribery and you know, love, he had no chance of being returned unless he bribed high. He appears to me to be now in considerable distress for money and, unless his sisters-in-law⁴ assist him, he cannot possibly *face* the Irish public. He must go to the Continent. I will write to you *an account* of my speech tomorrow. Give my tenderest love to our children. I approve highly of your letter 'to the Castle'.⁵ It was just what you should have done.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 1778, note 4

2 The adjourned debate on the ministerial plan of parliamentary reform (see letter 1778, note 1) was currently in progress. O'Connell, however, did not participate in the debate, which continued on 4-5 March 1831. See letter 1781.

3 See letter 1778 note 5.

4 The Misses O'Brien of Fitzwilliam Square, Dublin.

5 Unidentified.

1781

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, Saturday [5 March 1831]

My darling heart's love,

Still no speech¹ from me. I was on my legs *twenty* times last night to speak but the rascally Speaker passed me by. I will, I hope, speak early on Monday. You may rely on it that the motion shall not pass over without my speaking to it at some length. I am quite prepared and, if I am capable of a good speech, I will make one but I have literally the less chance of speaking well because I am puffed up with the vanity of thinking that I can and will do so. You cannot conceive what a change there is already towards me in the House. No man ever before came amongst such a set of enemies. Never was there a man so assailed at every side. How little do I care for the rascals of every description. But the thing is again on the change. The debate on reform will certainly consume two days more. It is a great scene and reminds me sometimes of the notions I entertained of the scenes in the French National Assembly at the beginning of the French Revolution. I laugh at them all.

Darling, I got all Bennett's letters² safe. He has acted a very mean and unbecoming part but the man is poor and his poverty makes him afraid of displeasing a ministry who have favours to bestow. Poor man.

I am afraid I will not be able to go out to Acton³ tomorrow. I must prepare myself for my Monday speech⁴ as fully in facts and details as I possibly can. Maurice had better remain with you until I see the Kellys. O'Gorman Mahon was expelled by the Committee⁵ and he is going over to set up his brother *William*. I have a strong notion that he is kept in town solely by the want of means to take him over, and yet he speaks as confidently of returning William as if his elec[tion] were a mere matter of course. Darling, O'Gorman Mahon is *not* to be relied on and his absence from the House is *not* a subject of regret. This entirely between you and me.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 In the Commons debate on the ministerial plan of parliamentary reform (see letter 1778).

- 2 See letter 1757, notes 1 and 5; and letter 1768, note 2.
 3 To see George Bourke Kelly.
 4 See letter 1782, note 1.
 5 See letter 1778, note 5.

1782

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 8 March 1831

My darling love,

I felt dispirited yesterday which was one of my motives for not *urging* myself upon the House but I am in possession this day. I moved the adjournment¹ and am to speak first. I am, darling, a foolish blockhead. Only think of my being so absurd as to feel nervous in the rascally House. Yet so it is. I must however speak out this day and I mean, with the help of God whose holy name be glorified, to speak out distinctly.

Darling love, I would wish to start Maurice for Clare² but for the inordinate vanity of O'Gorman Mahon who insists on having his brother Richard [*sic*]³ stand as his *locum tenens* although from everything I hear he has no more chance of succeeding than he would have of turning the Shannon. He paid nobody from the moment his object was gained.⁴ Yet it is not for Maurice to oppose him. Tell my honest friend, Tom Steele, that I could not consent at this moment that Maurice should be put at all in competition with anybody set up by O'Gorman Mahon and especially with his brother. I will write to the boys tomorrow in the style you suggest.

I am now preparing to go down to the House so, darling, I can write but little more. I will write to you tomorrow a more full account of myself than probably you can possibly get in the Irish papers. The only one having a reporter here is the *Freeman*.⁵ It is indeed quite possible that the papers on this question may report me more favourably than usual.

Give my tenderest love to our children. Tell Maurice to leave a note at Counsellor Wallace's in Stephen's Green to say that I left his letter⁶ at the palace with the servant of Lady Westmeath and that she was then in town. . . .

My own darling heart, my fame as a parliamentary orator depends on this day and I am speaking to an exhausted subject. . . .⁷

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 That is, the adjournment of the debate on the ministerial plan of parliamentary reform (see letter 1778, note 1) which he moved on 7 March and which was agreed to (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., III, 174).
- 2 One of the seats for Co. Clare had become vacant due to the unseating of O'Gorman Mahon on petition (see letter 1778, note 5). Maurice O'Connell was elected in Mahon's place on 23 March 1831 (see letter 1787, note 5).
- 3 That is William Richard Mahon.
- 4 Obviously O'Connell was referring to election expenses which seem to have included bribes (see letters 1778, note 5, 1780 and 1781).
- 5 That is, the *Freeman's Journal*.
- 6 Unidentified.
- 7 The debate on the ministerial plan of parliamentary reform (see letter 1778, note 1) was now in its sixth day. O'Connell on this occasion (8 March) made a long speech (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., III, 181-209). Charles Greville, wrote in his diary: 'The debate has gone on, and is to be over tonight; everybody heartily sick of it but the excitement as great as ever. Last night O'Connell was very good, and vehemently cheered by the Government, Stanley, Duncannon and all, all differences giving way to their zeal.' (Henry Reeve, Ed., *The Greville Memoirs*, London, 1874, II, 125). The *Times* described O'Connell's effort as 'an able speech . . . wherein he put the constitutional argument against the continuance of the rotten borough system with uncommon force and clearness' (*Times*, 9 March 1831).

1783

From Edward Dwyer to 16 Manchester Buildings, London

Dublin, 9 March 1831

My dear Sir,

Your determination¹ against bringing forward the Repeal question during the present sitting of Parliament must meet with the concurrence of every friend of Ireland. We are to have a preparatory meeting today for getting up a Reform meeting immediately. The Duke of Leinster's declaration party² are busily employed in getting up a meeting at which I understand it is intended to move a vote of thanks to Ministers for their *general* conduct. This is not pleasing to many. Our meeting will obviate the difficulty as we will thank them for the *Reform Bill* and endeavour to support them in carrying it.

The items which you settled with me for as having received from America are viz. :

From John G. Greeve and John J. Linn, New Orleans	£319.6.3
From Savannah per B. Parkinson	£100
	<hr/> £419.6.3

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Apparently a reference to O'Connell's letter to the People of Ireland, dated 5 March 1831, in which, in effect, he advised a postponement of the Repeal agitation pending the granting of parliamentary reform (*Pilot*, 7 Mar. 1831).
- 2 That is, the supporters of the 'Leinster Declaration' (see letter 1721, note 1).

1784

To his wife, Merrion Square

London, 10 March 1831

My darling love,

Do not smile, darling, at my vanity but it is so fed by everything I hear. So many have been here to flatter me in various ways. Sir Francis Burdett came after I closed my letter yesterday to pay me a visit of congratulation. The Atty¹ and Sol. General² for this country told Mr. Lynch,³ the barrister in the Court of Chancery, yesterday that my speech⁴ was the best made during the debate and was a generous speech. I dined at a dinner given yesterday to *the Poles*⁵ and I was more cheered than any other member of Parliament that was there. My speech⁶ you will find in the *Chronicle* and *Times* which I send you. All the newspapers here are now behaving as well to me as the Irish liberal papers. What a change! But, sweetest love, I am ridiculous in saying all this even to you though I think it will give you pleasure and therefore, darling, do I continue in this strain but indeed I flatter myself that whatever I write is pleasing to you because I know, Mary, that your handwriting is to me a source of most delicious pleasure in our unavoidable absence from each other. . . .

I did not stay in the House beyond one o'clock last night and yet I was obliged to remain in bed till after eleven I felt so sleepy and slept so soundly. Sheil sat again last night perfectly

silent. He does not speak to me. Indeed I believe, that is, I merely conjecture, that he was sent into the House for the very purpose of abusing me. I may be mistaken but this is my conjecture. What other business could Lord Anglesey have of sending him here. But of course I do not care. If he attacks me I promise you he shall have his answer. I will not spare him of all men, as a renegade is the worst species of traitor.⁷

I recognised with delight your *mother's heart* in your retracting the *scolding* I meant to give my poor boys. Darling, I need not tell you that I will take your advice readily. I will write the paragraph, please God, tomorrow.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Sir Thomas Denman, later Lord Denman.
- 2 Sir William Horne, Kt., solicitor-general 1830-32.
- 3 Andrew Henry Lynch.
- 4 O'Connell's lengthy speech in support of the first reform bill (see letter 1782, note 7).
- 5 A public dinner held at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in honour of the Polish envoy, the Marquis Wielopolskoi and other distinguished foreigners, supporters of Polish national liberty. It was attended by about half-a-dozen radical M.P.'s. (*Times*, 10 Mar. 1831).
- 6 At this dinner O'Connell, in proposing a toast to 'Italy—her union and independence', recalled the glories of Rome when at the height of her power, a democratic system of government had prevailed. 'Revolution was now spreading in Italy, and that beautiful country was at length about to assert its rights. He trusted that the period was not far distant when the church there would be separated from the state (cheers) for in every country that appeared to him an adulterous connection' (*Times*, 10 March 1831).
- 7 O'Connell and Sheil had become estranged, partly due to the latter's having agreed to act as counsel for the Tory Lord George Thomas Beresford in the Co. Waterford election of 1830 (see letters 1583, 1629, note 6) and also because during 1831 Sheil held aloof from the agitation of Repeal. On Anglesey's being appointed lord lieutenant, he established a friendly relationship with Sheil and offered him his borough of Milborne Port in Somerset, which Sheil accepted. He was returned at the end of February 1831, and on 8 March took his seat in the Commons (W. Torrens McCullagh, *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil*, 2 vols., London, 1855, II, 90-1).

1785

From Richard Scott

Ennis, 12 March 1831

Dear Sir,

I am requested by a number of the inhabitants of this town to call your attention to a Bill now in progress through the House of Commons, relative to the turnpike road between Tubber and Limerick through Ennis¹ with the enactments of which we are totally unacquainted, except from report, no copy of this Bill having been laid before the public here, and we are totally ignorant of the persons at whose expense this Bill is forwarding, unless it be the O'Brien family who have principally the management of the Limerick branch of the road under the act of the 40th of Geo. the 3rd, Chap. 98.²

[The writer adds that if the present bill is to continue that act, then several reforms are suggested to wipe out abuses and give better control to genuinely concerned parties.]

We request you will endeavour to delay the progress of this Bill until we can procure a copy of it and have time to petition³ the House of Commons. . . .

[P.S.] I have also written to Mr. Rice and Major McNamara on this subject.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 On 28 February 1831 a petition was presented in the Commons from trustees appointed to execute an act (see below note 2) for improving and repairing the road leading from Tubber, Co. Galway to Limerick city, setting forth 'That it is expedient to continue the term of the said act, and to . . . amend and enlarge the powers and provisions therein contained, and praying, that leave be given to bring in a bill for the same.' Permission to bring in such a bill was granted and William Smith O'Brien and William Nugent MacNamara ordered to prepare it. Spring Rice gave the bill its first reading on 21 March after which it was allowed to drop. No evidence has been traced to show whether or not O'Connell opposed it.
- 2 'An Act for improving and repairing the roads leading from Tubber, near the bounds of the counties of Clare and Galway, to Ennis, in the county of Clare, and from thence to Thomond Gate, in the County of the City of Limerick' enacted on 1 August 1800. The act appointed eighteen persons including Francis MacNamara (father of William Nugent MacNamara) and Sir Edward O'Brien.

Bart. (father of William Smith O'Brien), as commissioners and trustees of the said road, with extensive powers to raise tolls on it and to lease contracts for its repair. The act was to remain in force for thirty-one years.

- 3 No petition against the proposed act was presented.

1786

From William B. Conway to Merrion Square

Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., 12 March 1831

Sir,

[The writer says he is American born of Irish descent, praises the freedom of the U.S.A. and sympathizes with the sufferings of Ireland.]

We have this day published in the *American Manufacturer*,¹ of which I am the senior editor, an account of your arrest² and that of your brave compatriots. This account is accompanied by a long editorial article commenting and speculating on the probable consequences of this event.

We give our readers copious extracts from your eloquent and patriotic speeches, and those of others, together with ample details of Irish news; and whilst I am the conductor of a 'Free Press' the wrongs of Ireland and Irishmen shall not pass unregarded; . . .

I was sorry to read of the late treason³ of the editor of the *Dublin Evening Post* whose patriotism and integrity when weighed in the balance were *found wanting*; with whom, although a namesake, I claim no relationship.

For Mr. Lawless, as a brave man, . . . a pure and uncompromising patriot, I entertain much [? regard]. We have heard nothing of Mr. Sheil since his late marriage.⁴ Has domestic enjoyment caused him to forget his country? I hope not. A man of his eloquence should not be silent in such a crisis as this. . . . [the writer says he is in his 25th year].

[P.S.] . . . Should circumstances allow you to answer [this letter] . . . I should like you to express your sentiments towards our country, our institutions, and our worthy President, General Jackson; who is friendly to Catholics and to Irishmen, as with your permission I would publish your letter which would circulate throughout the whole United States.⁵

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The newspaper of that name in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The files for the first six months of 1831 are not extant.
- 2 See letter 1751a, note 1.
- 3 Presumably a reference to that newspaper's recent backing for the 'Leinster Declaration' in support of the Union (see letter 1721, note 1).
- 4 Sheil married for the second time on 20 July 1830 Anastasia, daughter of John Lalor of Cranagh, Co. Tipperary and widow of Edmond Power, Gurteen, Clonmel, a lady of 'considerable fortune'.
- 5 As the files of the *American Manufacturer* for this period are not extant, (see above note 1), there is no evidence to show whether O'Connell complied with this request.

1787

From Edward Dwyer to 16 Manchester Buildings, London

Dublin, 14 March 1831

My dear Sir,

I yesterday sent you a batch of petitions for presentation.

Several 'Agitators' met here yesterday and came to a determination to attend the meeting on Tuesday next prepared with a resolution of thanks to ministers for bringing in the Reform Bill and petitioning for the extension of the same clauses to Ireland as are intended for England.¹ Your name was put to the requisition² by William Murphy.

The Mahons called a meeting here on Saturday at which he, O'G[orman] M[ahon] did not attend. A great many came for the purpose of hearing him explain his first two months conduct in Parliament.³

Again on yesterday we had a great number at this office⁴ but the Mahons did not appear. William Mahon stated on Saturday that he had no property and that his brother, O'G[orman] Mahon could not assist him⁵ in a pecuniary way. He wished that M.O'C[onnell] would start for the County and that they would use all their influence to return him but it appeared to me that a *quid pro quo* would be expected. The general opinion amongst the friends of M. O'C[onnell] is that he should not stand at present, particu-

larly in connection with the Mahons. You can have no idea of the great feeling *against* the family altogether. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A meeting was held at the Royal Exchange, Dublin, on Tuesday, 15 March 1831, in support of parliamentary reform, under the chairmanship of the lord mayor, Robert Harty. (*DEP*, 15, 17 Mar., *Pilot*, 16 Mar. 1831).
- 2 The signatories to this requisition included the duke of Leinster and Lord Cloncurry. The requisition called on the mayor, Robert Harty, to convene a public meeting 'to express our satisfaction at the measure of reform proposed in the Commons . . . by Lord John Russell' (*Pilot*, 14 Mar. 1831).
- 3 O'Gorman Mahon arrived in Dublin on 11 March 1831 en route to Clare (see letter 1778, note 5). The *Freeman's Journal* meanwhile announced that a meeting of 'the friends of independence of Election and of Ireland' would take place on 12 March and it commented 'the exposé which may be expected on this occasion [from O'Gorman Mahon] cannot fail to attract a numerous attendance. . . .' (*FJ*, 12 Mar. 1831). On the day appointed, however, two police magistrates entered the room where the meeting was due to have been held, and secured an assurance from Edward Dwyer that no meeting would take place. O'Gorman Mahon and his followers did not appear, and the meeting was called off (*Pilot*, 14 Mar. 1831).
- 4 The parliamentary agency office in Stephen Street, headquarters of O'Connell's followers, and apparently a revival of the parliamentary intelligence office which had recently been suppressed (see letters 1628a, note 3 and 1751, note 3).
- 5 As a candidate in the forthcoming Clare election (see letter 1778, note 5). William Richard Mahon's address to the electors of Clare, dated 15 March, seeking their votes in the forthcoming election was published in the *Pilot* of 16 March 1831. On 19 March the *Freeman's Journal* announced that Mahon had resigned in favour of Maurice O'Connell. On 21 March O'Gorman Mahon himself declared his support for Maurice O'Connell at the hustings, against the only other candidate, Sir Edward O'Brien (*Pilot*, 23 Mar. 1831). On 23 March Maurice O'Connell was declared elected, with a majority of 140 (*FJ*, 25 Mar. 1831).

1788

From Michael Staunton to Manchester Buildings, London

Dublin, 19 March 1831

My dear Sir,

Congratulations upon the never to be forgotten speech on reform.¹

[Staunton asks for information on the tolls paid on the Annesley Bridge turnpike.² He suggests that agricultural vehicles be made exempt from turnpike tolls.]

Every rational and honest man feels how indispensable it is to pass the Reform Bill.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 1782, note 7.

2 O'Connell was a member of the select committee appointed on 15 November 1830 'to Consider the Returns of Tolls and Customs taken in Seaports, Fairs, and Markets in Ireland; and report how far the existing laws may require Amendment and Consolidation' so as to prevent 'any undue and illegal charges imposed on the sale or transit of commodities by local authority in Ireland'.

1789

*From James Daly*¹

Cork, 19 March 1831

Dear Sir,

I am directed to transmit to you a petition to be presented to the House of Commons agreed to at a public meeting² of the manufacturers and householders of this city. . . .

The tax, which we pray to have repealed, is levied under an Irish Statute.³ It was first granted to rebuild the cathedral of this city and the surplus to build a work house for the maintenance of sturdy beggars, vagrants and foundlings. It was first made for a limited time and subsequently made permanent. The tax is one shilling late Irish currency per ton on all coal and culm imported into the city and liberties of Cork.

The Statute that granted this tax makes the support of foundlings a secondary object and yet our *worthy* Corporation under whose management it is have converted the entire income to the use of the Foundling Hospital. I should mention to you that the Statute requires that all the children shall be reared Protestants, and zealously have the governors acted on this part of the law for the catechism which is put into the hands of the children is better calculated to promote hatred to the Catholics than Christian charity.

I write by this post to Mr. Callaghan⁴ to support the petition which I hope he will do.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 No account of this meeting has been traced in the press, nor does any petition on the subject appear to have been presented.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 Daniel Callaghan (1786-1849) Lotabeg, Cork, second son of Daniel Callaghan. A government contractor, merchant and distiller. M.P. for Cork city 29 March 1830-49.

1790

From Edward Dwyer

Dublin, 20 March 1831

My dear Sir,

. . . Believe me, you never stood higher with the Irish people than at the present moment. Some attempts were made to make the people believe that you were against the agitating of the Repeal question at all in consequence of the Reform Bill but that feeling has passed away and they now see the utility of the latter towards attaining the former.

It will be soon determined whether the Clare constituency have the real fire of liberty in their bosoms. If they have but one spark of it, they will show to the nation their determination not to be domineered over by the O'Brien faction. I was assured yesterday by a gentleman who is well acquainted with that county that Maurice stood a fair chance of being returned.¹ Steele has been and is working hard for him.

I cannot avoid expressing my surprise at the neglect of my friend James Sugrue—not a line from him. The tax men are here daily and the rent and new taxes will be sought for in a few days. I have not received a single subscription since your departure so that, unless some extraordinary change shall take place, I think it will be useless to keep this office² open. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Maurice O'Connell was returned for Clare (see letter 1787, note 5).
- 2 The parliamentary agency office (see letter 1787, note 4).

1791

From J. D. Mullen

Francis Street [Dublin], 24 March 1831

Dear Sir,

. . . I beg to express my congratulations on your late splendid effort for reform.¹ We had a meeting² here on the subject. Some of the Repealers were extremely impracticable and, were it not for your letter³ between them and the corporators, it would not have terminated so advantageously. I am thinking of getting a petition from the Chamber of Commerce to pray for the application to Ireland of Peel's Jury Bill.⁴

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1782, note 7.

2 See letter 1787, note 1.

3 Presumably O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 5 March 1831, which urged the Repealers to support parliamentary reform (*Pilot*, 7 Mar. 1831).

4 This act (6 Geo. IV c. 50) was passed at Peel's instigation in 1825. It consolidated in one clear and intelligible statute eighty-five earlier acts relating to the empanelling of juries (see Norman Gash, *Mr. Secretary Peel. The Life of Sir Robert Peel to 1830*, London, 1961, pp. 334-5).

1792

No letter of this number due to error in numbering.

1793

From Dominick Ronayne, Rev. John Sheehan and Roger Hayes to London redirected to Dublin

Waterford, 30 December [*sic*] 1831¹

Dear O'Connell,

On mature consideration your affectionate friends whose signatures are at foot have come to the decision that it is absolutely impossible without an unfavourable impression as to your influence and character and without disgrace to the

patriotic portion of the electors of this county that you should think of not standing for the County of Waterford.² Your election is certain. We will take [care] of your purse. We are

Your affectionate friends,

Domk. Ronayne, John Sheehan, Roger Hayes

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The correct date for this letter is 30 *March* 1831. It is mentioned in letter 1796 and bears the postmarks 2 April 1831 and 4 April 1831.
- 2 It was felt in the early months of 1831 that a general election was not unlikely because of the opposition of the Tories to the great reform bill (J.R.M. Butler, *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill*, London, 1914, 203).

1794

From Sir Henry Parnell to Merrion Square

Private

London, 1 April 1831

My dear Sir,

Although I cannot ask you for your vote, your interest in the Queen's County, as in every other county in Ireland, is not to be lost sight of by any candidate in these times.

I abstained from accepting office¹ until the Government proved its devotion to the public interests by their recent conduct on the reform question and further until I thought I could feel confidence in their good intentions with respect to several measures for the benefit of Ireland.

The first reply I have received to my applications for support contains the following passage: 'nothing short of my firm conviction that the measure for altering the constitution now proposed by the administration tends, among other evils, to the separation of Ireland from England, and to the destruction of the Church of Ireland, could induce me to withhold from you a support which has been so many years at your service.'

This comes from a person who is the most competent of any I know to start a non-reforming candidate against me so that, if the friends of reform fall out with me on account of any

other question, I may cease to represent the Queen's County.² . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Parnell was made secretary at war on 4 April 1831. He was thus obliged to seek reelection.
- 2 O'Connell at once commenced a campaign in support of Parnell, and informed the electorate 'It is my most anxious wish that . . . he should be again returned to Parliament, without expense, and without a contest' (O'Connell to the Electors of the Queen's County, 4, 5 Apr. 1831, *Pilot*, 4, 6 Apr. 1831). On 16 April 1831 Parnell was returned unopposed (*Pilot*, 20 Apr. 1831).

1795

From P. V. Fitzpatrick

Hayes's Hotel, Dublin, 5 April 1831

Dear Sir,

. . . The balance to the credit of your private account in the Hibernian Bank is stated to be £3,063.9.9½ and we have between £500 and £600 to put to the Tribute¹ account received since the £4,500 was had from the Trustees.

I intend to publish the third report² in the papers of Saturday next and I hope when some outstanding sums come to hand that we shall touch £25,000.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The O'Connell Tribute (see letter 1707, note 3).
- 2 The third report of 'Sums Produced by the "O'Connell Tribute Sundays"', was published in the *Freeman's Journal*, on Thursday, 14 April 1831. This showed that on and since 9 January 1831, a total of £24,524.16.9 had been received by the trustees of the tribute. The first and second reports were published in late January and mid-February.

1796

From Dominick Ronayne to Merrion Square

Ardsallagh [Co. Waterford] 6 April 1831

My dear O'Connell,

I wrote to you last week from Waterford jointly with your *sincere friends*, Sheehan¹ and Hayes². My anxiety about you

does not induce me to deceive *myself first* and you then, when I again repeat that your election³ for this County is *quite certain*. I therefore trust that nothing will induce you to desert us. Your going to any other county would be (I feel) neither creditable to *yourself* nor to *us*. Let no person persuade you that your standing for this county will involve you in an expensive contest. I know the feeling of the electors, of the priests, and even of Abraham⁴ (who is but a miserable substitute to poor Kelly)⁵ is with you. The county, you are aware, meets this day in Waterford to support the *Reform* Bill. That is the ostensible object but I am aware it is intended some arrangement should be made for ousting Lord George. There certainly never was a better opportunity.⁶ He will on this occasion lose the support of many of his former adherents, some on principle, others because he is no longer the ministerial candidate. Henry W. Barron was at Clashmore last week. He left a letter there for Power⁷ offering him his support [about 2 words illegible] conjunction with you. Power, I have reason to know, is still anxious to resume his seat but fears a contest, I think it quite likely that he will be the person chosen to be the instrument for putting out⁸ Beresford in which case I suppose you and he will have to run in couples. This *may* be *very* desirable but you must be extremely cautious of committing yourself with them for, though political necessity may force that party into a coalition with you, they hate you if possible more than the Beresfords do but don't misunderstand me, you will find me as hostile as ever to the Beresfords notwithstanding their supporters in Dungarvan. . . .

[P.S] . . . There are in this county some persons who have heretofore supported you and will *do so warmly* again and yet who would not be greatly *displeased* at your going to some other county in the hope that it may open a place for themselves. *Verbum sap.* . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Rev. John Sheehan, P.P.

2 Roger Hayes, called to the bar 1821. Resident of Waterford city.

3 See letter 1793, note 2.

4 Bishop William Abraham.

5 The late Bishop Patrick Kelly.

6 The meeting referred to, which took place under the chairmanship of Sir Richard Musgrave, was convened by a requisition, signed by twenty-one magistrates. The *Waterford Chronicle* remarked that it

had never witnessed a gathering more numerous or respectable (*Pilot*, 8 Apr. 1831, quoting *Waterford Chronicle*). At this meeting Lord George Thomas Beresford's conduct in opposing reform was strongly criticized.

7 Richard Power of Clashmore, former member for the county.

8 Beresford resigned from the contest for Waterford county before nominations took place (*Pilot*, 9 May 1831).

1797

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 6 April 1831

My Dear Friend,

I hasten to relieve your anxiety about the representation of this County. You have the Musgraves with you and no man dare oppose their wishes in this County. I had a conversation with both today in this city where they came especially to attend a meeting¹ for sustaining the Government in its bill for reform. There is only one man who can interfere with you and that man is yourself. Take care of your correspondence with H. Barron. Don't allow him to McNamara you.² Vanity is his predominant feeling and although he possesses a decent share of working talents, still his judgment becomes completely annihilated when he sees even a remote prospect of gratifying his ambition. He durst not refuse you his support in this County. He would wish to ensnare you into a resolution to retire. But do you hold fast. If it were known in this city that he dreamt of interfering with your election the people would stone him. I succeeded in a great measure in removing the prejudice which his base compact³ with the Beresfords created against him but if he fall a second time into a similar error, there is an end for ever to his political career. He is the greatest fool in the world if he interferes with you. For when the city constituency has been modelled according to the new bill,⁴ he is sure of success in it provided he plays an honest part in the County.

I think you should at your leisure write to Power of Faithlegg,⁵ Maurice Ronayne,⁶ Power O'Shee, A. Ryan,⁷ Power of Ballydine⁸ and any other friends who you can call to mind to assure them of your intention to cling to Waterford. If you can succeed in making the Tobacco growing prevention bill⁹ come into operation not sooner than the middle of next July, you

will greatly oblige some Quakers here. I think they will all vote for you. Mason¹⁰ is, I am sure a friend of yours. He showed me a letter he had from you today.

The meeting passed off well. They resolved to resist the pretensions of the Beresfords at the next election, should they continue opposed to the reform bill. There was a vote of thanks to you.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 See letter 1796, note 6.
- 2 A reference to the quarrel between O'Connell and William Nugent MacNamara in June and July 1830 concerning the coming general election of August 1830. See letters 1678 *et passim*.
- 3 Perhaps a reference to Henry Winston Barron's having withdrawn as popular candidate in the Co. Waterford by-election of 1830, which was subsequently won by Lord George Thomas Beresford (see letter 1623, note 2).
- 4 The parliamentary reform bill for Ireland (a sister measure to the English great reform bill) now before parliament.
- 5 Nicholas Mahon Power.
- 6 Of Knockaderry, Waterford.
- 7 Unidentified.
- 8 James Power, Ballydine, Co. Tipperary (died 1854), son of John Power, Gurteen, Co. Waterford. Captain in Tipperary militia.
- 9 A bill, extending to Ireland the prohibition on the growth of Tobacco in Great Britain, was passed by the Commons on 15 April but was not proceeded with by the Lords, probably because of the lateness of the session. According to the *Pilot* O'Connell had procured the insertion in this bill of a clause to permit the sale and manufacture of Irish tobacco grown before 1 January 1832 (*Pilot*, 15 Apr. 1831). The bill including this clause was enacted in the succeeding session of parliament, receiving the royal assent on 23 August 1831 (1 & 2 William IV c. 13).
- 10 Possibly Joshua Mason, Summerhill, Waterford, a merchant.

1798

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 13 April 1831

My dear Fitz,

I am in a great passion with you, and it is not easy to put me into a rage with you. But see whether I have not cause of quarrel with you. You are one of three who promised to call at the offices of the *Register*, *Freeman*, and *Pilot*, and

to get the papers sent to me beginning with Saturday last. I told you and you promised to give in my address—'House of Commons', London. I expected to have found Saturday's papers before me on my arrival, and to have got the newspapers of Monday this day but not one paper has arrived. Do you know that it gives me a sensation of sickness to be thus disappointed? I have no intelligence from Ireland save what I pick up from the miserable gleanings of the scoundrel English press.

I spoke often and *rather well, ipse loquitur*, in the House last night on various topics especially on the Union and [the] Jury Bill¹ but I am badly, very badly reported.

I am, however, too mortified to write more this day. Will you *atone* for this, your first offence, by going to the offices and giving *them* a good scolding? See whether you could get the missing papers sent me.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 252-253

- 1 A government bill to 'improve the Administration of Justice in Ireland'. The bill received its second reading on 20 April but was not enacted. On the day of its introduction (12 April) O'Connell declared that it was 'like the play of *Hamlet* with the part of *Hamlet* left out' since it 'omitted the most important matter. The object of the bill was to assimilate the laws of Ireland to those of England, and yet not a word was mentioned in the bill about the grand jury laws' (*Times*, 13 Apr. 1831).

1799

*To Lord Duncannon*¹

Brookes's [Club] [London], Sunday [24 April 1831]

My Lord,

Sharman Crawford² is the man for Down.³ I believe communication has been already made to him. He is one of the most suitable men in Ireland to be in parliament. I believe Lord George has but a poor prospect in Waterford. I understand from Sir Richard Musgrave that he has *none at all*—Sir Richard's expression that he cannot appear at the hustings.⁴

I believe we have at least one good man for Longford—Nugent⁵ of Donore. I have written to him.⁶

I have also made an arrangement to take a fair chance for two reformers in Dublin;⁷ *but* we would certainly succeed

if the Irish Government acted with vigour. *Tell them* that they have Dublin in their power—unless they allowed themselves to be insulted *by their own servants* for the police officers make them servants of any and every administration. If two or three police justices were dismissed for their recent conduct,⁸ and corporators friendly to government appointed in their stead, it would terrify the rest and effectually prevent them from opposing the reforming candidates. But if the administration will not show *vigour* against their real enemies, why, who can be of use to them?

I do not know much of Londonderry county but I entertain hopes of frightening both members,⁹ if not doing more against one of them.¹⁰ Monaghan ought to give one at least favourable. Lord Rossmore's son¹¹ might be the man.¹²

I go off after post. More tomorrow.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 254-255

- 1 A general election was now pending following the dissolution of parliament on 23 April 1831.
- 2 William Sharman Crawford (1781-1861), eldest son of William Crawford, Moira Castle, Co. Down; M.P. Dundalk, 1835-7, Rochdale, 1841-52. See *DNB*.
- 3 William Sharman Crawford unsuccessfully contested Co. Down in the general election of May 1831 with Lord Castlereagh and Lord Arthur Hill, the former an opponent, the latter a supporter of reform.
- 4 Beresford resigned from the Co. Waterford contest before nominations took place.
- 5 Percy Nugent (1797-1874), Donore, Co. Westmeath. Created baronet in September 1831; eldest son of Comdr. Thomas Fitzgerald, R.N. Bore his maternal grandmother's name of Nugent which he legally assumed in September 1831. M.P. Co. Westmeath, 1847-52.
- 6 Nugent did not stand for Longford in the general election.
- 7 Two reform candidates, the lord mayor, Robert Harty, and a liberal Protestant, Louis Perrin, stood for Dublin city in the general election of 1831, and were elected. They were, however, both shortly afterwards unseated on a petition (see letter 1831, note 1).
- 8 See letter 1800.
- 9 Sir Robert Bateson and Capt. Theobald Jones. R.N. (1790-1868). The latter was of Bovagh, Co. Londonderry; second son of Rev. James Jones, Rector of Urney, Londonderry; entered Royal Navy, 1803, Captain, 1828, retired Admiral, 1865; M.P. for Co. Londonderry, 1830-57. See *Boase*.
- 10 Bateson and Jones retained the representation of that county in the general election of May 1831, against Sir John Byng, commander of the forces in Ireland, and Captain Hart, both standing in the

reform interest (for Byng's and Hart's candidacies and political affiliations see *Pilot*, 13, 20 May 1831).

- 11 Henry Robert Westenra (1792-1860), M.P. for Co. Monaghan, 1818-30, 1831-2, 1835-42 when he succeeded as third Baron Rossmore.
- 12 Westenra, standing in the reform interest, defeated Evelyn John Shirley, one of the sitting members.

1800

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 27 April 1831

My Lord,

On arrival here this day I of course proceeded at once to business and I am happy to say that everything has as favourable an aspect as one could almost wish.

First, Dublin city. We have already our reforming candidate in the field and I hope before tomorrow evening we shall have another;¹ and success is certain if the government support their friends as they ought to do.² For example, Alderman Tyndall³ and other police magistrates opposed violently the Reform Bill; they would not have dared to do so under the late government if that or any other measure had the support of that ministry. Now if this alderman was removed from the police and another person who voted for reform on the Board of Aldermen substituted for him, it would have a decisive effect. I do not know Tyndall personally but I have heard he is just the man who is suited to be thrown overboard. One energetic step of this kind secures the corporation interest especially if aided by some small favours conferred on 'Judkin Butler'⁴ and one 'Sutter',⁵ both *agitators* of the common council whose assistance in canvassing might be, I think, easily procured. I will see both Lord Plunket and, if I can, Lord Anglesey on these subjects and *others* tomorrow. I have put myself in communication with the former already.

Second, Kilkenny. I saw Col. Butler himself this day. You are, I suppose, already apprised that you have no need *to think* of the election or to come over.⁶

Third, Carlow. As yet in doubt but there must be a contest⁷ against Kavanagh.⁸

Fourth, Longford. Col. White's brother—his name is Luke⁹—starts as a reformer with the fairest prospects of success.¹⁰ He *has* 50 votes, there are 150 Catholics who will vote with

him to a man, about 20 independent Protestants who support him as a Reformer, and 255 would secure a majority. He has *money* and is determined to succeed. Nugent, of Donore, of a respectable Catholic family, will, I trust, be the second candidate¹¹ and two can succeed as easily as one.

Fifth, Wexford. My accounts are very favourable. I think Lord Valentia has no chance but I will put a spoke in his wheel capable of retarding him even in a favourable career. I fortunately possess, by mere accident, the power of doing so.¹²

Sixth, Wexford town *declares* a determination to put out Dering,¹³ though not determined who to put in. I do not, therefore, reckon much (today) on this but hope for more distinct news tomorrow.

Seventh. One of the first in my thoughts. WATERFORD. My election is, I am told, secure¹⁴ but I should like a hint to the Powers of Clashmore to have their voters go with the Duke of Devonshire's as to *both* votes.¹⁵ Can you do anything to get Lady Cremorne's¹⁶ interest? The next and most important point is to put out Lord George. I may walk over the course with him but this is a crisis in which I prefer a contest. The sheriff¹⁷ is what we call a 'terrible Tory'. Only think that he is already, as I am assured, fitting up the gaol to hold the *freeholders* of the Beresfords, and it is intended to break open a passage thence into an adjoining store for the voters to pass in and out. This is an use to which a gaol should not be put, and no person has a right to break its walls. The sheriff *should* be prohibited from interfering in any such way and if he *perseveres* in refusing to promise not to do so, he should be superseded, and Villiers Stuart or John Musgrave or some other gentleman of high character appointed sheriff in his place. *Besides*, we do not want any increase of army or police during the election. I will answer with my head for the perfect peace of the county. The army or police can be *useful* only to overawe the popular electors and candidates.

Eighth. I have the satisfaction to tell you that we have got a reformer for Kerry. Certainly either my brother¹⁸ or Mr. Bernard¹⁹ of Ballynagar. The latter is a most suitable candidate; he would give place to my brother if I could get him to stand²⁰ but, at all events, we are sure of turning out the Knight. No man deserves such a fate better.²¹

Ninth, Drogheda. Wallace is *certain* of sending North adrift; this is beyond a doubt.²² Wallace supports the whole Bill.²³

Keep Lord Anglesey and Lord Plunket as well as you possibly can to the sticking point. If the Irish Government supports the reformers properly their success will be most exhilarating. I send as yet nothing of Clare. O'Gorman Mahon²⁴ intends to contest it with my son but his resources of bribery are exhausted. My son would give up the county but that the organization, become so frightful in that county, is, I fear and *believe*, much to be attributed to his antagonist. Of this more in my next. I weary you.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 255-258

- 1 On 29 April the *Pilot*, commenting on the electoral situation in Dublin city, declared that 'the lord mayor [Robert Harty] is still the only declared candidate in favour of reform'. It mentioned Arthur Guinness and John David Latouche as possible second candidates. Louis Perrin did not publish his intention of standing in the reform interest until 2 May (*Pilot*, 2 May 1831).
- 2 See letter 1831, note 1.
- 3 Samuel Wilkinson Tyndall, alderman since 1819; lord mayor of Dublin, 1827.
- 4 John Judkin Butler, secretary in 1829 to the city and county of Dublin Brunswick club. Sometime wine merchant, 60 Marlborough Street, Dublin 1821-8.
- 5 Robert Sutter, St. George's Place, Dublin. Inspector of pipe water and metal main rents and member of the Trinity guild of the common council.
- 6 Duncannon was returned for Co. Kilkenny without a contest on 9 May (*Kilkenny Journal*, 11 May 1831).
- 7 The sitting Tory members for Co. Carlow, Henry Bruen and Thomas Kavanagh, retired from the contest in the general election of May 1831. The two reform candidates, Walter Blackney and Sir John Milley Doyle were returned without a contest (*Kilkenny Journal*, 14 May; *Pilot*, 13 May 1831).
- 8 Thomas Kavanagh (1767-1837), son of Thomas Kavanagh, Borris, Co. Carlow. M.P. for Kilkenny city, 1798-1800; Co. Carlow 1826-30, 1835-37.
- 9 Luke White (c. 1787-1854), Racline, Co. Longford, third son of Luke White, M.P. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin; contested Co. Longford, 1819 and 1831; M.P. for Co. Longford 22 December 1832 but unseated on petition March 1833; contested the seat 1835, elected 30 December 1836 but unseated April 1837; M.P. for Co. Longford, 1837-41.
- 10 Luke White unsuccessfully contested Co. Longford against the sitting Tory members, Viscount Forbes and Anthony Lefroy, who coalesced to fight the election (*Pilot*, 4, 6 May 1831) and White retired on the second day of polling (*Pilot*, 13 May 1831).

- 11 No second candidate in the reform interest contested Co. Longford in 1831.
- 12 The Tory Lord Valentia contested Co. Wexford with two reform candidates, Lieutenant-Colonel Arthur Chichester and Henry Lambert. Valentia withdrew on the third day of polling when the count was Chichester 544; Lambert 515; Valentia 418 (*Pilot*, 18 May 1831). There is no evidence as to how O'Connell intended to oppose Valentia's election.
- 13 Sir Edward Cholmondeley Dering, eighth baronet (1807-96), M.P. for Wexford town from 3 June 1829 until the dissolution of April 1831. He retired from the contest before polling day, in the general election of May 1831, and Charles Arthur Walker was returned unopposed. FitzPatrick, in his *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*, I, 257, has written *Dauny* but this is obviously a misreading of *Dering*. In a word of this kind O'Connell's handwriting could easily mislead. The letter is not extant.
- 14 O'Connell did not stand for Co. Waterford in this election but for Kerry (see letter 1805, note 1).
- 15 The duke of Devonshire was a Whig and supporter of reform.
- 16 Obviously a reference to voters on the estate of either Anne Elizabeth Emily, widow of the second Baron Cremorne and wife of Major-General John Dawson Rawdon, or Philadelphia Hannah, the deceased widow of the first baron Cremorne.
- 17 Henry Connor Gumbleton, Curriglass House, Tallow, Co. Waterford.
- 18 Probably his brother John.
- 19 John Bernard.
- 20 Frederick William Mullins, a reform candidate, and O'Connell were elected for Kerry. No other reform candidate appears to have come forward.
- 21 The knight of Kerry was ousted from the representation of that county in this election (see letter 1805, note 1).
- 22 Thomas Wallace contested Drogheda with John Henry North. On 3 May O'Connell addressed an elaborate appeal to the people of Drogheda in support of Wallace's candidacy, and reminded them of 'the handsome manner, as well as the most important matter in which he [Wallace] rendered me a most important service' (see letters 1751a, 1752, 1753, 1754). North defeated Wallace by 330 to 279, his defeat, according to the *Pilot*, being due to the fact that the constituency was made up mainly of venal non-resident freemen (*Pilot*, 13 May 1831). But Wallace was returned for Drogheda without a contest on North's death in the following October (*FJ*, 20, 21 October 1831).
- 23 That is, the reform bill.
- 24 In publishing this letter W. J. FitzPatrick left blank the space for O'Gorman Mahon's name.

1801

From Lord Duncannon

London, 27 April 1831

My dear Sir,

I have just heard that I have a contest¹ in the county of Kilkenny. I have talked so openly to you on those subjects that I can have no difficulty in saying to you that I am anxious not to be taken away from hence for a longer time than is necessary as great exertions are needed here against the opposers of the Bill,² and my presence is necessary. I have no right to dictate to a large Co[unty] in the choice of their representative but for this particular case it is very desirable to support the supporters of Reform. This I am sure is your opinion and at all events I hope that your friends will not assist an opposition on this occasion. Col. Butler, I am told, considers himself pledged to stand. If you should hear anything on this subject you will much oblige me by letting me hear from you. The accounts from the country here are excellent but the opposers of the Bill are very vehement and determined in their opposition. Pray let me hear what is likely to occur in Waterford and in the northern counties.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 253-254

- 1 The contest which Duncannon anticipated did not materialize (see letter 1800, note 6).
- 2 That is, the reform bill.

1802

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 29 April 1831

My Lord,

I must write, I fear, incoherently, but *the business* presses.

First. You are before now certain that there will not be a contest in Kilkenny.¹ Col. Butler *put* the compliment on me of having declined in consequence of my letter² to him. But I am too candid to do so by you. All, however, is safe in that quarter.

Secondly, Waterford, and the turning out of Lord George. I am sacrificing everything to the extinction of *that* political

enemy³ but why talk now of myself? Winston Barron is the only second candidate we can get⁴ but he is unpopular and a Catholic. *Two Catholics* would raise an adverse Protestant cry. Now for our plan. We have fixed on Mr. Lamb.⁵ The terms are these: Mr. Lamb to stand with me for the county. *All his expenses shall be borne.* To that I pledge myself. Winston Barron to get Dungarvan.⁶ If Mr. Lamb be not returned for the county, Winston Barron takes the Chiltern Hundreds and Mr. Lamb gets Dungarvan without *any* contest. This may also throw me out of the county, in which case Barron equally resigns and I consider myself decidedly entitled to Dungarvan, Lamb *being* the county member. Consider all these terms as certain, and act upon them as such. I pledge myself to their literal performance.

With Mr. Lamb as the popular candidate, Mr. Power of Clashmore will vote for him *heartily*. The parsons who *belong* to the Duke would have an excuse for voting against Barron and me. I do not want them. But they will not be able to refuse voting for Mr. Lamb. I reckon on a difference of forty votes at the least in favour of Mr. Lamb which Winston Barron would not get and which will be decisive of the election.

Thirdly, we want two additional magistrates in the city of Waterford. The lord lieutenant has power to name them under the 7 Geo. IV c. 61.⁷ The election takes place in the city of Waterford. We want magistrates who will take care that the *peace shall not be broken by the paid conservators!!!* The case for more magistrates under the act is perfect. I propose Roger Hayes, Esq., a retired barrister, living in Waterford with a fortune of at least £1,500 per annum, and James Esmonde, Esq., worth more than £1,000 per annum, both magistrates of the county. It is essential I should have a letter directing this to be done⁸ if that be our usual course.

I deserve to be assisted to do good. I have Kerry at my hand without one shilling expense.⁹ I prefer a contest with a chance of sinking into a borough member because I see a prospect of destroying an interest adverse to the Reform Bill.

If Mr. Lamb can come over, the sooner the better. We will be prepared with a requisition to him to stand.

Wallace, on whom I relied for Drogheda,¹⁰ I hear is doing only mischief. There are some men born with heads that see all matters upside down and act accordingly. However, do not despair. There *shall* be a *popular* contest.

I can write no more this day but, like all projectors, I think

my Waterford scheme perfect and have all the materials *at our side* for carrying it into effect.

[P.S.] Dungarvan.—I have seen Dominick Ronayne. All is safe for Mr. Lamb. He need not come over.¹¹

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 258-260.

- 1 See letter 1800, note 6.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 Beresford had been O'Connell's opponent in the famous Co. Waterford election of 1826. They had also been opponents in the 1830 election for that county.
- 4 Henry Winston Barron did not, in fact, stand for Waterford county in 1831. He does, however, seem for a time to have been in the running for nomination as a reform candidate for the county (*F*), 7 May 1831). Sir Richard Musgrave and Robert Power secured the pro-reform nomination (see letter 1804, note 2) and were elected.
- 5 Hon. George Lamb (1784-1834), fourth son of first Viscount Melbourne and brother of Lord Melbourne, the prime minister; author of many essays and articles. M.P. for Westminster 1819-20, for Dungarvan 1826-34; under-secretary of the home department 1830-4. See *DNB*.
- 6 O'Connell's plan was not realised. In the ensuing general election George Lamb was re-elected for Dungarvan. Henry Winston Barron did not secure election to parliament until 1832, when he stood for Waterford city, which he represented almost continually from then until 1852.
- 7 An act 'for the more effectual Administration of Justice in Cities, Towns Corporate, and other local Jurisdictions in Ireland'. It became law on 26 May 1826. Under this act the lord lieutenant was entitled to create additional justices of the peace in any place in which he considered the existing number inadequate.
- 8 Neither appointment was made in 1831 but on 18 July 1832 Roger Hayes was sworn in as 'the first Catholic magistrate in Waterford [city] since the reign of James the Second'. (*F*), 27 July 1832).
- 9 See letter 1805, note 1.
- 10 See 1800, note 22.
- 11 Lamb was returned for Dungarvan without a contest (*Pilot*, 6 May 1831).

1803

To Sir John Milley Doyle

Merrion Square, 29 April 1831

My dear Sir John,

I am very happy to hear that you are about to join Sir

Thomas Butler in contesting the County of Carlow on Reform principles.¹ I have expressed to many my most anxious wish to be able to contribute in any way to his success as I am convinced it would be a national good to have him returned. I say this to excuse my not putting you in the front rank where you always liked to be. But if I can under those circumstances be of any use to you in Carlow as a second candidate, or in any *disengaged* place as the first candidate, you will not only command my best exertions but afford me great pleasure. I am convinced you will be as true in the senate as you were gallant in the field and that we shall together discomfit the Tories and gain the victory for the King and the Ministry on the great Reform measure.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 260-261.

1 Butler did not come forward for Co. Carlow.

1804

From Rev. John Sheehan to Merrion Square

Waterford, 1 May 1831

My Dear Friend,

Lamb as an opponent of Lord George is quite out of the question.¹ He arrived here this morning by the Bristol Steamer and, after having been waited upon by several gentlemen, he gave them a most distinct reply that nothing could induce him to start for the County. All parties are determined upon supporting with all their might the person selected at the meeting.² The people here, I mean the gentry, amongst whom are Sherlock,³ O'Shea⁴ and others are quite dissatisfied at your long silence. They say your address⁵ should have appeared ere now, and that you *must denounce the Beresfords*. For God's sake delay it no longer. If it arrive tomorrow, you may depend upon it that it will appear on Tuesday and that it [will] have [an] admirable effect on the meeting.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1802.

2 A meeting of the Independent Electors of Waterford convened by requisition at Dungarvan on 3 May. At this meeting Sir Richard Musgrave and Robert Power were chosen as the reform candidates for Co. Waterford (*Pilot*, 6 May 1831).

3 Alexander Sherlock.

4 John Power O'Shee.

5 An address, that is, to the electors of the county of Waterford, for which constituency Sheehan apparently still expected O'Connell to stand (see letter 1805, note 1).

1805

To his brother John

Merrion Square, 2 May 1831

My dear, dear John,

You never will repent what you have done, come good come evil; . . . You will see my address¹ in the *Pilot* of this evening. I had an address to the County of Waterford actually in print when your letter² and the Tralee paper³ arrived. You must now instantly begin to work. You must ransack the county. Speak to the bishop.⁴ Engage every voter. Write every priest. Send Maurice and Charles Brennan⁵ in every direction where a voter can be had. Write to James⁶ to come home at once and assist us. Do not deceive yourself as to my majority. Remember every promise you get makes a difference of two. Recollect (it is the only thing I shall remind you of) that, as you have made me throw away Waterford, you are bound to help me in Kerry.

I leave this tomorrow for Limerick but I cannot start early. In consequence of that I will not be in Limerick until the next day, Thursday, and then I must give my poor Maurice one day in Clare.⁷ That is Friday. I therefore cannot be in Tralee until Sunday.

I suppose the members of the Chamber of Commerce will become my committee. If proper arrangements can [be] made the expense will be as nothing. How I shall long to see your letter⁸ to Limerick! Write to everybody in my name or as Chairman of my Committee.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 261

- I On 2 May O'Connell published an address to the electors of Kerry, appealing for their votes in the forthcoming general election. 'I was' he informed them, 'always proud of being a Kerryman. It is the height of my worldly ambition to be the representative of Kerry men' (*Pilot*, 2 May 1831). On 14 May he was returned unopposed for Kerry, the knight of Kerry resigning from the contest. On the hustings O'Connell pledged that ' . . . while he lived he would never ask a vote from any man but a Kerryman ' (*Pilot*, 18

May 1831). He gave no reasons for throwing up Co. Waterford, and the O'Connellite paper, the *Pilot*, expressly declined to discuss the matter (*Pilot*, 9 May 1831). The *Dublin Evening Post* hinted that O'Connell's withdrawal from Waterford was due to his having secretly agreed with the Beresfords at the last Waterford election to share with them the representation of the county in the future. (*DEP*, 7, 10 May 1831).

2 Unidentified.

3 Unidentified.

4 Bishop Cornelius Egan.

5 Charles Brennan, Sunday's Well, Killarney, brother of Maurice, and cousin of O'Connell.

6 O'Connell's brother.

7 O'Connell's son, Maurice, and Major William Nugent MacNamara were the successful candidates for Clare. Maurice O'Connell had already the previous March been elected for Clare in place of O'Gorman Mahon, with the latter's support (see letter 1778, note 5). In the general election, however, O'Gorman Mahon again offered himself as a candidate for Clare, and there followed a bitter election contest between him and Maurice O'Connell (see letters 1808 *et passim*).

8 Unidentified.

1806

*To Charles Bianconi*¹

Limerick, 6 May 1831

Most private, most confidential

My dear Bianconi,

You will hear with indignation as well as surprise that Lord Kenmare has turned against me in Kerry. Having given up Waterford and being now doubtful in Kerry, many friends of mine have turned their longing eyes to Tipperary. I write to you for an answer to these two questions. First, could you get for me a Requisition to stand respectably signed?² Second, could you return me beyond any doubt?

Write to me here and do not show this letter to anybody unless in the strictest confidence.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 262

1 Charles Bianconi (1786-1875), the celebrated promoter of the passenger and mail car system in Ireland from 1815; mayor of Clonmel, 1845 and 1846; a friend and supporter of O'Connell. See *DNB*.

- 2 O'Connell got his requisition. On 7 May he was visited in Clare by a deputation from Tipperary, bearing a requisition, according to the *Pilot*, 'numerously and respectably signed', soliciting him to stand for that county. In reply O'Connell declared that he was deeply moved by the Tipperary requisition, but that as he had already addressed himself to Kerry 'I cannot . . . be my own master, until I shall have consulted those who have thus honoured me' (*Pilot*, 11 May 1831).

1807

To Thomas Spring Rice, 7 May 1831, from Ennis

Seeks Spring Rice's support for Robert Ryan¹ who wants to go out² with General Burke.³ Ryan has the support of Mr. Studdert⁴ of Bunratty and O'Connell's friend, Mr. Bridgeman.⁵

SOURCE : Monteagle Papers, NLI 13371 (3)

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 See letter 1812.
- 3 Major-General Richard Bourke (1777-1855), son of John Bourke, Drumsolly, Co. Limerick. Appointed major-general, 1821; lieutenant-general, 1837; general, 1851. Governor of New South Wales, 1831-37. Knighted, 1835. Later of Thornfield, Co. Limerick. See *DNB*.
- 4 Charles Studdert.
- 5 Hewitt Bridgeman.

1808

From E. G. Stanley to Limerick

Dublin Castle, 7 May 1831

Copy

Sir,

Your letters of yesterday's date have been communicated to me by Sir William Gossett and have been laid before the Lord Lieutenant. His Excellency will not shrink from any responsibility which he may incur, should he feel it necessary to take the most decisive measures for the restoration of tranquility in Clare and the neighbouring counties.¹

I am to convey to you his Excellency's thanks for the important information which you furnish respecting the lan-

guage and conduct² of Mr. O'Gorman Mahon. His Excellency fully appreciates its value and is prepared to act upon it, if justified by sufficient confirmation, with promptitude and vigour. If, therefore, evidence upon oath can be procured of the expressions imputed to him, I am to request you will communicate with Mr. Vokes³ or Capt. Vignolles⁴ before one of whom the depositions should be taken and who will receive by this day's post directions to act thereupon *immediately* upon their own view of the sufficiency of the evidence without waiting for any further instructions from hence. They will also be directed to communicate with you upon the subject.

With respect to proceeding against Mr. O'G Mahon for any penalties to which he may have subjected himself, his Excellency does not think it expedient to take any immediate steps. The subject however will be kept in view and such measures adopted as may be deemed proper with the concurrence of the Law advisers of the Crown.

Referring to your letter upon the subject of the Election for the Co. Kerry, I can only say that the feelings of the Government upon the Reform question must be too well known to leave any doubt of their wishes as between a reforming and an anti-reforming candidate but I am to express his Excellency's regret that the peculiar circumstances of the present case render it impossible to manifest those wishes by taking the course which you suggest.

SOURCE : Earl Grey Papers

- 1 An agrarian secret society designated the 'Terry Alts' was at this time very active in Clare and its neighbourhood.
- 2 According to the O'Connellite *Pilot* which bitterly attacked O'Gorman Mahon's candidacy in the general election for Clare (see letter 1805, note 7) the latter conducted his election campaign as an ally of the 'Terry Alts', and other agrarian secret societies (*Pilot*, 9, 11, 20 May 1831). The *Freeman's Journal*, on the other hand, declared of the *Pilot's* accusations against O'Gorman Mahon that 'we are fully satisfied . . . a more unfounded allegation was never circulated by an enemy' and it protested against the *Pilot's* 'publication of malevolent rumours prejudicial to the character of an honourable and high-minded man' (*FJ*, 20 May 1831).
- 3 Thomas Philips Vokes, police magistrate, Co. Limerick. A native of Limerick and member of a well-established Limerick family of merchants.
- 4 Samuel Vignoles (born 1796), police magistrate, Co. Clare. Married 1832 Louisa daughter of William Nugent MacNamara, M.P.

1809

*To E. G. Stanley**Copy*

Limerick, 8 May 1831

Sir,

I am honoured by the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date. I am perfectly satisfied that his Excellency's decision¹ respecting the Kerry election is quite right. I also acquiesce in the propriety of deferring the consideration of the suits for the bribery penalties.² Indeed I have not the least idea of thinking my opinion on these subjects of any other value than as a small ingredient in the ultimate decision by the proper authority.

With respect to the treasonable language³ attributed to Mr. O'Gorman Mahon I have ascertained that the witness is a person of undoubted veracity and quite intelligent. His name is O'Shaughnessy, his Christian name J — Edward. No difficulty can occur with respect to that as he is forthcoming. He is the nephew of the Catholic Dean⁴ of the town of Ennis. Another uncle of his is the agent for the Mail Coach owners in this city. I do not think it advisable for me to communicate either with Mr. Vokes or Mr. Vignolles as Mr. Barrington,⁵ the Crown Solicitor, a most respectable and intelligent man, is here. I am very intimate with him and will give him full information. . . .

I have a right to ask that you will not attribute my acting in this manner towards O'Gorman Mahon to an electioneering object. My object is single and simple, to assist in restoring the peace of the country and endeavouring to prevent robbery and murder.

I believe I can form a tolerably accurate estimate of the state of the Co. of Clare. I have my information from sources of the *safest* kind. I have seen much and heard more. I ought not to weary you with any details but give you as many results—shall I so call them?—as possible.

First. The spirit of Rebellion is extensive, the combination formidable from numbers and more so from the 'terror' that keeps it together.

Second. There is this consolation that there is not one man beyond the bare-footed daily labourer, that is not weary of the system. All the farmers, even the smallest farmers, are most

anxious to put an end to the dominion of miscreants. If they could be *protected*, they would join in putting down the *Whiteboys*,⁶ but it is impossible for Government to afford individual protection to a sufficient extent. The home of an Irish small farmer is anything but his 'castle' save in the theory of law. In practice it is worse than no defence. It makes him and his family liable to be burned to death altogether in disturbed times. But you can safely rely upon the fact that there is a great returning disposition to tranquillity in all but the great miscreants.

Third. I have good reason to believe and to hope that the real number of the desperate does not exceed forty in the entire county and scarcely amounts to that number.

Fourth. I can get the oaths, passwords etc. but they vary often. An attempt has been successfully made to give them an exclusively religious character. This is a most dangerous feature but like other wickednesses it is inconsistent with itself because they have attacked the Catholic bishop and not a few of the Catholic clergy.

Fifth. There is one feature in the present or rather late state of the county of considerable importance. They, the *Whiteboys*, have commenced to quarrel amongst themselves and to quarrel almost to blood. This I have always observed is the first symptom of the decline of our *Whiteboy* insurrections. When they quarrel, information on both becomes *procurable* by the Government and when that can be obtained, one or two assizes always terminate the then existing *Whiteboy* movement.

Sixth. Nothing can be more unfortunate than the present election in Clare. It is the only county that will not be ameliorated in its political condition by the proper political excitement of an election. But this unhappy man, O'Gorman Mahon, has uniformly canvassed only by and through the *Whiteboys*. He has publicly read threatening notices which he alleges were sent to freeholders to vote for him. Such notices have been since served and they have gone round swearing the voters to that effect. He has given the people distinctly to understand that he is a 'Terry Alt.' They recollect and believe his declaration in Parliament⁷ though he afterwards retracted that he had belonged for several years to a secret society. They are made to expect assistance from France⁸ and his exertions have given a strength, a permanency and a consistency to *this organisation* which no other within my memory ever had

Only think of a man canvassing for Parliament through the medium of actual felony if not treason.

Seventh. You have *all* the Catholic clergy with the Government most heartily desirous. They are to assist in tranquillizing the flame.

Eighth. There are two facts of which I have not the least doubt. For the first I have the most convincing evidence though not legal evidence. The other is purely prophetic. The first is that this person O'Gorman Mahon has been before his last election for more than 12 months countenancing the progress of the combination, the oaths, the meetings etc. The second, that as the present Parliament is not likely to last 12 months, he *must* do all he can to keep up this organization with a view to his return to the next Parliament.

Ninth. I have the heads of a clue to some at least of the murderers and if we had a return *towards* tranquillity I make little doubt that I would be enabled to put the magistrates in the confidence of the Crown on the track which would, and I trust will yet, enable them to bring the miscreants to punishment. Allow me to conclude by these two things. In the first place, I solemnly assure you on my sacred word of honour that if I was not most conscientiously convinced that the exclusion of O'Gorman Mahon from the representation of Clare was essentially necessary to the pacification of Clare, I would at once withdraw my son. You may appreciate my sincerity when I tell you that I know my son is placed in a situation of imminent personal danger, such danger as I would not be warranted in leaving him in if there were not a motive of the highest order to justify my act and console my tortured apprehension.

The last is—that the evils the people suffer are not imaginary. They are real, most afflicting, almost insufferable. They *must* be relieved, indeed they *must*. Allow me to add I have no doubt that you concur in that sentiment and desire it ardently.

My political knowledge of the evil and of the *strong* remedies necessary are not perhaps but they certainly ought to be, greater than yours.

Accept any little assistance I can give. My assistance is and must be *unnoticeable*, but it will not be the less sincere.

The Reform bill ought to be the foundation stone of quiet, preceded or accompanied by practical relief. . . .

You will, I fear, be heartily tired of such a correspondent as I am. But my mind is full of fuss and hope, and determination. I cannot help being tedious.⁹

SOURCE : Lansdowne Papers, Bowood

- 1 See letter 1808.
- 2 Probably a reference to charges of bribery against O'Gorman Mahon.
- 3 See letter 1808, note 2.
- 4 Rev. Terence O'Shaughnessy (1763-1848), educated in Paris where he remained during the revolution and witnessed what he always designated 'the King's foul murder'. Parish priest of Ennis and Dean of Killaloe, 1820-48.
- 5 Matthew Barrington (1788-1861), son of Sir Joseph Barrington, first baronet; crown solicitor for Munster, c. 1820-61; succeeded in 1846 as second baronet.
- 6 The name usually given to agrarian secret societies.
- 7 In the Commons on 8 February 1831 O'Gorman Mahon declared 'that he had himself been for eleven years and a half, heart and hand, a member of a secret society, consisting of Protestants and Presbyterians the only object of which was to obtain a Repeal of that Union, which was not brought about by negotiation, or by any fair process of dealing between two nations, but was purchased by treason and blood' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., II, 321-2).
- 8 O'Gorman Mahon had recently headed an Irish deputation to France to congratulate General Lafayette on the success of the 'July Revolution' (Gwynn, *O'Gorman Mahon*, 140-2).
- 9 There is a copy of this letter also in the Earl Grey Papers.

1810

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Tralee, 15 May 1831

My dear Friend,

I enclose you two cheques, one for a £400 bill, the other for a bill of £82.10. due about the 17th. Enquire at the bank of La Touche for a bill of mine for that amount from the Limerick branch.

I make no apology to you, my dear friend, for all this trouble. Indeed it would be paying you a bad compliment not to be convinced of the alacrity with which you would take trouble for me.

You have heard of the glorious result of our Kerry election.¹ We completely defeated the Knight. Perhaps there never was known a stronger instance of popular determination. The

aristocrats, as is usual, considered the county as their own but the people willed otherwise. The Chamber of Commerce of this town were the principal agents in emancipating the county. My Committee took up Mr. Mullins² and from that moment his election became secure.

Will you send to a Charity Society at No. 25 Patrick Street³ to say that I will be able to preside at their dinner on Monday, the 23rd inst., if that day answers their purpose.⁴

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 265-266

1 See letter 1805, note 1.

2 Frederick W. Mullins (1804-54), Beaufort Castle, Co. Kerry and Raby House, Leamington; grandson of first Baron Ventry; M.P. for Co. Kerry, 1831-37. Contested Co. Kerry 12 August 1837. See *Boase*.

3 The address of Mrs. Mahony's Great Rooms.

4 On 23 May O'Connell was chairman at a dinner of the friends and supporters of the St. Nicholas of Myra charity, which, according to the *Pilot*, 'clothes and maintains thirty-four orphans'. Over 300 gentlemen attended 'not merely to give their support to the charity, but to demonstrate, by their presence, their interest in the great questions of reform'. O'Connell and Sir John Milley Doyle appeared to have been the only M.P.'s present (*Pilot*, 25 May 1831).

1810a

*From his son Maurice to Limerick*¹

Ennis [Monday, 16 May 1831]

My Dearest Father,

The majority [about two words missing] this day was 22. The numbers stand thus—2nd day²

McNamara 412

O'Connell 252

Mahon 230

Come to us *at once*.³ The county is nearly exhausted, upwards of a thousand have polled.

Ever yr. affec. son,
Maurice

[P.S.] My total majority is 59.⁴

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 A letter (1810b) from Christopher Fitz-Simon to O'Connell is

written on the second and third pages of this letter.

- 2 That is, the votes cast on the second day of the polling, 16 May.
- 3 O'Connell arrived in Ennis on Wednesday, 18 May.
- 4 Maurice O'Connell's majority over O'Gorman Mahon's total—530 to 471.

1810b

From Christopher Fitz-Simon¹

[Ennis] Monday night [16 May 1831]

[No salutation]

. . . I write at Charles [?] O'Connell's desire, and by the [one word illegible] no one could be more completely devoted than he has shown himself. He desires me say that £200 more, at the very least, will be necessary and he begs you will *at once* place a credit to his name for that amount. Place it *to his name*, as I hope I may at length get free to return home. I have already given Charles the £300 for current expenses, the £48 to Maurice and for sending, leaving £8 in my hands. I hope the £200 now called for [? will be] sufficient. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 This letter is written on the second and third pages of the letter (1801a) from Maurice O'Connell to O'Connell.

1811

To Richard Barrett

Ennis, 19 May 1831

Private

My dear Barrett,

I came in here yesterday from Tralee. My brother, with several others, preceded me. We found the county polled out but O'Gorman Mahon keeping the poll open for mere purposes of vexation, and causing expense. His career has been one of the most extraordinary that ever yet was exhibited. No other human being but himself would have dared to attempt it. *First*, he canvassed as a 'Terry-Alt'¹ and continued to do so until the day of election. Even his speech, *as reported by himself*, is full of that strain.² His failure is, however, a proof that the influence of the miscreants of that party is not

paramount but it did a great deal for him. It is probable that, without the aid of the 'Terry-Alt' system, he could not poll one hundred votes by all his other exertions. Secondly, finding that the system of terror became insufficient, some of his friends resorted to the plan by which he got in before—namely, bribery.³ They, one way or the other (and it is believed chiefly by committing to his utter ruin his unfortunate youngest brother), raised between them some twelve *hundred pounds* and made a desperate effort with that sum on Monday. It was, however, soon exhausted and with it ended all hope of success. On Tuesday he polled but sixteen, on Wednesday but six; and yet, as the law allows him to keep open the poll this day, he does keep it open without having one single voter to produce. Thirdly, being defeated in their system of terror and exhausted in funds, so that there could be no more bribery, he resorted to rousing at his side the spirit of—what think you?—Orange bigotry! It is certainly a fact. He determined to 'put down the priests'. Such were his words, but infinitely more virulent, as I understand. Indeed nothing, it is said, could exceed the coarseness of his expressions. He got circulars written to all the parsons and to several of the Brunswick high party, promising to oppose the bill!!!⁴ and put down priestly domination. But although these circulars were in a great measure supported and indeed backed by a fat attorney of the name of Greene,⁵ one of the oldest Orangemen in Ireland, and by the noted Thomas Mahon,⁶ of biblical and Kildare Place⁷ celebrity, yet they so totally failed as not to produce one single vote. The parsons and the Brunswickers were too keen to be deluded with the proffered support of a man who, having been untrue to every other party and especially to his own, could not possibly be true to them; they rejected him with scorn. *The last attempt* came then. I hope and wish to believe that there was no kind of intention of carrying it to a murderous or felonious extent; but the facts appear to be that on Wednesday afternoon late he made a violent harangue and, as Gibbon says, 'his peroration was peculiarly eloquent' because he concluded by giving the butchers a 30 shilling note to drink whiskey, which they accordingly did, and in about half an hour the butchers appeared in the streets in a formidable state indeed because, although their number was not great, they were armed with long knives and hatchets. This, of course, created the utmost terror and dismay. I do not think that more than two persons

were cut. It became necessary to call out the garrison. The butchers were put to flight, six or seven of them lodged in gaol, and a charge was exhibited against O'Gorman Mahon of having instigated the riot, before Major Vignolles, whose conduct on this, as on many other occasions during the elections, deserves the highest praise. Having thus failed in every attempt, and Major McNamara having a majority of more than 500 and Mr. M. O'Connell a majority of 104, he was driven to desperation. He attacked Major McNamara in the streets, called him all manner of abusive names. The Major heard him with silent contempt. There was an immediate meeting of the friends of the Major, who at once decided that he was not only not to have any message sent to him for his unprovoked insult but he was not even to be prosecuted but was to be treated with total contempt and disregard. So ends his career. . . . Such then is the result of this mad campaign; but what else would you expect from a man who has acted the part he has? He cannot do any more mischief. In future he will be perfectly harmless.

[P.S.] O'Gorman Mahon⁸ has resigned. I have instituted a prosecution⁹ against his brother. I am a trustee for the public and cannot allow any man to carry an election by sheer violence or to make a second election by what would be assassination.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 263-265

- 1 See letter 1808, note 2.
- 2 This speech has not been traced. It is not among the election speeches of O'Gorman Mahon which were published in the *Freeman's Journal*.
- 3 See letter 1778, note 5.
- 4 That is, the reform bill.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 Thomas Mahon (born 1787), son of Rev. Thomas Mahon and a native of Leitrim, a director of the Bible Society, 7 Lower Abbey Street, Dublin; educated at Trinity College, Dublin.
- 7 That is, the Kildare Place Society.
- 8 W. J. FitzPatrick left a blank for this name as he did on all occasions when O'Gorman Mahon was mentioned, Mahon being still alive when FitzPatrick published O'Connell's correspondence.
- 9 Probably in connection with the alleged striking of Maurice O'Connell by O'Gorman Mahon's brother, William Richard Mahon, in the street in Ennis on 14 May. According to the *Dublin Evening Post* William hoped thus to provoke Maurice to a duel, but the latter 'coolly replied . . . that he would enquire into it after the

election' (*DEP*, 17 May 1831). Shortly after the incident, two carriages filled with gentlemen from Kerry and Tipperary, friends of the O'Connell's, all heavily armed, arrived in Ennis to act as bodyguards for Maurice (*Pilot*, 20 May 1831; see further, letter 1813, note 1). O'Connell does not appear to have pressed the intended prosecution.

1812

To Thomas Spring Rice, 20 May 1831, from Ennis

Asks that Robert Ryan be granted a free passage to New South Wales.

SOURCE : Monteagle Papers, NLI 13371 (3)

1813

To his daughter Betsey Ffrench, Frenchlawn, Ballymoe, Co. Roscommon

Merrion Square, 24 May 1831

My darling, darling Betsey,

. . . You will be glad to hear from *me* that Maurice's quarrel with the Mahons is *irrevocably* terminated. . . .¹

Let me ask you, my sweet Betty, to go to Communion in honour of the Sacred Heart and for your father's *intention*. Get as many others to accompany you *as you possibly can*. . . .

I owe him [Nicholas Joseph Ffrench]² £350 out of £1000 and he has only to let me know how and when he wishes for the money. . . .

SOURCE : Kenneigh Papers

- 1 See letter 1811, note 9. On 17 May an attempt was made to arrange a duel between Maurice O'Connell and William Richard Mahon but partly because of the difficulty of finding a sufficiently private site for the encounter, it was called off (*Pilot*, 23 May 1831; see also letter 1814, note 2)
- 2 Nicholas Joseph Ffrench, Frenchlawn and later Fortwilliam, Co. Roscommon. Married, 1831 O'Connell's youngest daughter, Betsey. Appointed a stipendiary magistrate in Oughterard, Co. Galway on 10 August 1836. He died there on 21 August 1842.

1814

To his wife, 5 Parliament Street, London

Merrion Square, 26 May 1831

My own sweetest Love,

. . . I have the Corporation case¹ to argue this day at the Rolls and I ought not to consume time from it *even in writing to you*, my own sweetest darling Love. All is well, perfectly well. It is impossible to have anything better than it is in every respect. Blessed be the great God.

You will see Mahon's counter or, rather, *confirmatory* statement² as Barrett well calls it. There is but one opinion here and that is decidedly favourable to Maurice, indeed most decidedly so and reprobatory of all the Mahons. How delighted I am that they are *thus* crushed. I suppose Maurice writes to you frequently. At least he promised me to do so, and I believe he will keep his word, do not you, sweetest. You have not said anything of the young lady of Acton.³ If she does not *forbid*, it is sufficient. Recollect *that*, darling. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The case of the attorney-general, at the relation of John McMullen and others, plaintiffs, against the corporation of Dublin and William Henry Archer, their late treasurer, defendants. The corporation was accused of misapplying large sums entrusted to it under 49 Geo. III c. 80, (the 'Metal Main Act', passed in 1809 for the purpose of improving the Dublin city water supply by replacing the existing wooden water mains with metal pipes). The case had its first hearing in the rolls court in May (*Pilot*, 25, 27 May 1831) but was not finally decided until 7 July 1831. On that day the master of the rolls ruled that the corporation were not guilty of actual fraud in administering the trusts vested in them, but expressed his 'decided conviction that they had *deliberately, wilfully and knowingly* violated the trusts reposed in them and in *various* instances *misapplied* the money placed within their control' (*FJ*, 8 July 1831). It is not clear what part O'Connell played in this case.
- 2 A long statement by William Richard Mahon published in the *Freeman's Journal*, 26 May 1831, in contradiction of an earlier statement (in the *Pilot* of 23 May 1831) by friends of Maurice O'Connell, concerning the latter's attempted duel with Mahon (see letter 1811, note 9). The *Pilot's* version of the incident had made it seem that Mahon shrank from the encounter.
- 3 The daughter of George Bourke Kelly of Acton with whom, it seems, O'Connell was anxious to make a match with his son, Maurice.

1815

To Lord Duncannon

Merriion Square, 28 May 1831

My Lord,

I beg of you to be so good as to let me know how soon *we* shall be wanted. I trust we are to have a new Speaker. If I may give my private opinion, but one very general in this country, much dissatisfaction would be created by continuing Mr. Mannors Sutton. Indeed, your enemies would attribute it to a timid subserviency or something not *so good*; whilst I believe all independent men—I mean men unconnected with ministry—are extremely offended with the conduct of the late Speaker. Mr. Littleton¹ has been spoken of. There may be nothing in the report but I believe his appointment would give general satisfaction. At all events, by your taking the trouble to let me know, I think I can promise you the attendance of the *two* members for Kerry and the *two* members for Clare, to vote for any *new* Speaker. . . .²

The state of Clare is very very bad. The poorest class have got the masterhood and even the small farmers are now enduring an atrocious tyranny. I go down again before my return to London and will either assist in a pacification or satisfy myself upon the necesstiy of harsher measures.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 266-267

- 1 Edward J. Littleton (1791-1863), M.P. for Staffordshire 1812-32; for South Staffordshire 1832-35. Chief secretary for Ireland May 1833 till December 1834. Created Baron Hatherton 1835. See *DNB*.
- 2 Contrary to O'Connell's hopes, Mannors-Sutton was, on the opening of parliament of 14 June 1831, re-elected speaker of the House of Commons, by acclamation and without opposition (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 73-9).

1816

To his wife, 5 Parliament Street, London

Ennis, 2 June 1831

My own darling Mary,

. . . Darling, my own darling, why will you injure your health by fretting? Why will you not confide in me but, above all, why will *you* fly in the face of Providence? Why will you,

to whom the great and good God has shown such protection in the undeserved protection of your husband and of your son¹ commit the sin of injuring yourself by grieving? I will not again ask you to confide in me.

Maurice is in Clare, and both the Mahons are in Dublin. We will not spend a second night in that city and, if we spent fifty, I do assure you that it is as impossible that there should be a duel between *any* of the Mahon party and Maurice as between one of them and me. But, sweetest, your last letter is breaking my heart. Indeed, my own Mary, it is. I shall find you as exhausted with fretting and ill. Indeed, indeed, darling, you afflict me most grievously. . . .

The dinner at the Lord Mayor's went off most splendidly.² There never was anything done in better style or, I believe, more useful in its way. Your husband was greatly applauded,³ which you will think strange. I got to bed at 20 minutes after twelve and certainly did not sleep more than three hours and a half. I left Dublin on the day coach at six and got to Limerick at half after nine last night. . . .

Darling, I should be as happy as *the day is long* if I could overcome your uneasiness. Mary, I have a plan to go down with you to Windsor before the business of the House actually commences. Will you get Baldwin⁴ *instantly* to buy me a box of the sea sickness pills and to send them to me *at once* in a parcel to Dublin? . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell was referring to the tumults of the recent Clare election, and the attempted duel between his son Maurice and William Richard Mahon (see letter 1813, note 1).
- 2 A public dinner which took place on 31 May at the Mansion House, Dublin to celebrate the return of the reform candidates for the city, Robert Harty (the lord mayor) and Louis Perrin. Lord Cloncurry presided and amongst the attendance were Lord Rossmore and nine M.P.'s. (*Pilot*, 1 June 1831).
- 3 O'Connell spoke to the toast 'Reform based on the rights of the People, making revolution impossible'. In his speech he declared the time was ripe for union of all parties in Ireland because, for the first time 'the power of the throne is exercised for the good of the people'. He appealed to the aristocracy 'as it is their duty to do . . . to ameliorate the condition of the poor', called on absentee landlords to return, and pledged Ireland's interest in 'a perpetual and an useful connection with England' (*Pilot*, 1 June 1831).
- 4 Probably Walter J. Baldwin.

1817

To Thomas Spring Rice

Ennis, 4 June 1831

Private

My dear Sir,

I am exceedingly obliged to you for your kind attention to the affair of the Ronaynes in getting justice done to them respecting the, I think, illegal seizure of their glass.¹ . . .

I have come here to assist in pacifying this county.² As yet I scarce see my way but I do entertain hopes of aiding in restoring its tranquility.

SOURCE : Monteagle Papers, NLI 13371 (3)

1 Unidentified.

2 On Sunday, 5 June O'Connell addressed a crowd of many thousands in the square in Ennis, Co. Clare. In his speech he urged the people to abandon secret societies as contrary to their religion, held out the hope that, in the event of their doing so, such offenders as had already been arrested would be set free, and threatened that martial law would be imposed on Clare if it were not pacified. He sympathised with the people in their oppression under the vestry and subletting acts (see letter 1448, note 1), and promised 'he would, with the assistance of their friends in parliament, tear the disgraceful subletting act to rags, and perhaps six weeks would not elapse before he would do so. . . . The vestry act . . . should be similarly treated. . . . The tithe system should be abolished'. He concluded with an appeal to the people to 'let me . . . go to parliament to say, I pacified Clare' (*Pilot*, 8 June 1831).

1817a

To William Conyngham Plunket

Ennis, 6 June 1831

My Lord,

I feel it my imperative duty to call your Lordship's attention to a complaint which I am ready to establish by the most distinct and satisfactory evidence against John Hewson¹ Esq., a magistrate for the County of Kerry.

The facts are these. A Protestant gentleman of respectability, many years a magistrate of the County of Kerry, who had supported the Knight of Kerry at several elections, deter-

mined on the last occasion to oppose him as an anti-reformer and to support me for the opposite reason.

Mr. John Hewson is a distant relation of the Knight by whose influence, as I understand, he got the commission of the peace though I believe it would be hard to say how he could be considered as qualified for that office.

A considerable number of the lower classes determined to pay Mr. Hilliard² a compliment not unusual in that part of the country—the planting of a May tree or pole near his house. They accordingly *acquired* a tree in a plantation called Bedford to the east of Listowel and they determined to bring that tree through Listowel to the habitation of Mr. Hilliard at the west of that town.

Accordingly on Sunday, the 29th of May, a number of persons proceeded towards Listowel to meet the car on which the tree was carried. They had bedizened themselves with some fantastic finery, a profusion of orange and green ribands, and each man was accompanied by a respectable female of his own class, in general his wife or sister dressed in white.

The procession was perhaps a foolish one but it certainly was one of mere harmless amusement. It gratified the parties engaged in it without injury to anybody and, if not violently interfered with, it could not possibly tend to any breach or violation of the peace.

Mr. John Hewson however resolved to disturb this innocent pastime and determined to do so in a manner which would have ended in bloodshed but for the interference of the Catholic priest of Listowel, the Rev. Mr. Mahony.³ On the morning of that day Mr. Hewson declared to the brother of Mr. Hilliard that he would not allow the procession to take place. The brother of Mr. Hilliard replied that it was not the first time his brother had such a compliment paid to him by the people. The reply was that neither he nor his brother should be gratified by it on that occasion.

Mr. Hewson hereupon got the police and the military quartered in Listowel ready, and as the procession reached the bridge adjoining that town with a flag on which the labourers arms were painted on a white ground Mr. Hewson determined to prevent them from crossing the bridge. The people, who were conscious that they were not guilty of any offence, determined on their part to cross the bridge, and there can be no doubt that blood would have been shed in profusion but that the Rev. Mr. Mahony, the Catholic priest

of Listowel, interfered and fortunately succeeded in prevailing on the people not to advance although he admitted to them that they had a perfect right to do so.

Thus in the first instance the people were at the peril of their lives prevented from enjoying an innocent amusement at the mere arbitrary will of Mr. John Hewson.

The people having retreated a mile or more from Listowel, the tree in a car passed through that town. Mr. John Hewson endeavoured to prevent its passing but the car with the tree having passed, the car overtook the people about two miles from Listowel. The people were perfectly quiet. There was no appearance of any riot and, unless interfered with, no possibility of a riot.

Judge what, under those circumstances, must be the indignation of the people at finding they were pursued as if they were a banditti, by Mr. Hewson with a strong party of military and police. Preparations were made for an immediate fight, the people being convinced it was the intention of Mr. Hewson to attack them.

The police at least had their arms ready loaded. Mr. Jackson,⁴ the chief constable of police, when ordering them to prime and load, directed them to be sure *to fire low*. One of the police of the name of Connor whose conduct at Listowel has rendered him very odious to the people, replied with exultation: 'You may be quite certain that his Majesty's *powder shall not be wasted*.' The force under the command of Mr. Hewson—the police having their arms loaded—approached fast the people and certainly bloodshed would have ensued but that the Rev. Mr. Mahony again interfered and after great and urgent entreaty prevailed on Mr. Hewson to return without attacking the peaceable and unarmed people.

The people left to themselves at length after having thus twice escaped from massacre took the tree in a peaceable manner to Mr. Hilliard's, and having planted it there, departed to their homes without any even the slightest breach of the peace.

I am bound to add that the greatest indignation and irritation prevails amongst the people at having had their lives exposed twice in one day to the intemperate wickedness of a man acting under the guise of magisterial authority. Under those circumstances I respectfully solicit investigation and punishment. It would be unavailing or at least little consolatory

to investigate the slaughter of the people after it has been perpetrated. Prevention is better—of course—than punishment, and if these facts be not denied, and if denied, I am ready to produce most respectable witnesses to prove them, if I say I have the facts either admitted or proved, I would then most respectfully call for the dismissal of Mr. Hewson from the commission of the peace.

I deem it a sacred duty to add that if after *these facts*, Mr. Hewson shall be considered fit to continue a magistrate, it will be impossible to answer for the preservation of the peace in a large district where there already exist the powerful stimulants of scanty food, absentee landlords and a total want of employment. I however of course do with great respect submit the entire matter to the impartial decision of your Lordship's sound discretion.

SOURCE : Papers of Mrs. Nicholas Shorter

- 1 John Francis Hewson, J.P., D.L. (1775-1847). Ennismore, Listowel, Co. Kerry.
- 2 Either Samuel Hilliard, Billerough, Listowel or William R. Hilliard, Ballyhorgan, Listowel.
- 3 Rev. Jeremiah (Darby) Mahony (died 1856), parish priest of Listowel from 1829. Revered for his charity, he prevented a serious food riot in 1846 by inducing a large crowd of desperate men to disperse.
- 4 Probably Samuel Jackson.

1818

From Charles Joseph Ffrench¹ to Merrion Square, redirected to Ennis, redirected to Merrion Square

Frenchlawn [Co. Roscommon], 6 June 1831

My dear Sir,

[Asks O'Connell for £200 since, he says, O'Connell had offered to give him such a sum.]

Our commission² commences in Roscommon on the 17th. I hope it will be effectual in preventing a continuance of disturbance which would never have existed had the poor been only treated with justice and not driven to extremes by the cruelty of their landlords and the high prices of land. We must have a remedy and that I hope shortly.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Charles Joseph Ffrench, fifth son of Frederick Ffrench, late of

Woodlawn. Entered Gray's Inn in 1799. He is probably a brother of O'Connell's son-in-law, Nicholas J. Ffrench.

- 2 A special commission composed of members of the Roscommon grand jury, convened to try some eighty persons, thirty-five of whom were charged with agrarian crimes of recent occurrence (*Pilot*, 22 June 1831). The commission concluded on 21 June, having sentenced three men to death, seven to transportation for life, and three to transportation for seven years (*Pilot*, 24 June 1831).

1818a

To Matthew Barrington

Copy

Tuesday [7 June 1831]

My dear Barrington,

I want to speak to you very very much.¹ Send me word *when* you will be at your lodgings. I would rather speak to you *there* than elsewhere. Do not bring on the Ballynakallagh case until after I see you and talk to you.²

SOURCE : TCD, MS 2126

- 1 From 2 June 1831 a special commission of two judges sat at Ennis to try about 290 men charged with agrarian crimes (William Smith O'Brien was a member of the petty jury empanelled). O'Connell was retained as counsel for nearly all the defendants (*MR*, 6, 7 June 1831).
- 2 This document has the following words: '7 June 1831. Recd. at 2 o'clock in court, fixed 1/4 past 3 to meet. Saw him; and he asked time—not to forward the persons to transportation or to have Carroll executed until he had time to communicate with Mr. Stanley and the Lord-Lieutenant—and that he would leave Ennis tomorrow morning'. Carroll had been tried, convicted and sentenced to death on 4 June for forcibly taking arms from a house (*MR*, 7 June 1831). According to a report from Limerick O'Connell left Ennis for Dublin on Wednesday, 8 June 'for the purpose of applying to government in favour of Carroll who, it is said here, has been certainly mistaken for another individual whom he resembles very much and who has come forward' to plead guilty (*MR*, 10 June 1831).

1819

From P. V. FitzPatrick

27 Eccles St. [Dublin], Saturday, 11 June [1831]

My Dear Sir,

I am in the dentist's hands and confined to the house so that I cannot have the pleasure of seeing you before your departure for London. Mr. Ayre,¹ who has been so useful a coadjutor of mine, will take any message you may have for me. He will explain to you that the receipts on the Fund² account, had since you drew the £1,400, will not do more than enable the Trustees to pay the amount of your acceptance of [lower part of page missing] the collections of January and February last is, you will perceive, small and of course I shall have it settled. How am I to deal with the larger account incurred in 1829? You will perceive by an advertisement of this morning that I am about to prepare the general report of the last Collection.³ This is indispensable for the satisfaction of the contributors who are putting us to daily postage on the subject. I will make it very serviceable to subsequent operations. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 Joseph Ayre, brother-in-law of P. V. FitzPatrick.

2 The O'Connell Tribute (see letters 1707, note 3 and 1795).

3 The advertisement appears in the *Freeman's Journal*, 11 June 1831. It declares that a detailed report of contributions to the O'Connell tribute is being prepared, and urges that late contributions be remitted before 15 June in order to secure inclusion.

1820

To Bishop Doyle,¹ Braganza House, Carlow

London, 16 June 1831

Copy

My dear Lord,

Your letter of the 6th I received only this morning. The ten days are accounted for by the uncertainty of my motions. It followed me to Ennis and thence here.

It has become a cant to talk of the refreshing influence of any literary composition but really your letter refreshes *both* soul and even my animal sensation. You say so well what I

have been clumsily thinking; you estimate so accurately those whom, with all my experience, I am only beginning to know but let us proceed to business.

In the first place having had interviews with Stanley and Lord Anglesey I can confirm your worst fears. They plan nothing but English domination. They look to Ireland with a *secondary* intention yet they desire to do good to Ireland *provided* it be in subserviency to English interest; but as the control of Ireland *must* be obtained as the *primary* object, everything Irish is looked at through that medium.

I rejoice at your *decision* to have the 'case of Ireland' fully stated. It *shall* be so. I will on Monday put a notice on the Book for a full consideration of the state of Ireland.² I am preparing my documents. I have much assistance from Staunton of the *Morning Register* who is a kind of living register of Irish grievances. Give me your best assistance. I devote every moment of my time to this great object. What heads of arrangement should I make? I will bring it forward under distinct heads giving as much of 'Statistics' under each as possible and referring to my authorities and proofs as I go along. I hope to make out 'The case of Ireland.' My assertion is that Ireland *has been* the most abused and worst governed country under the sun. Lord Clare admits that it was so until 'the Union.' I assert it is so still. The people are the poorest and most afflicted. I know not how far I shall go in pointing out remedies but I certainly will insist on the allocation of part of the Church revenues to the support of all *who cannot labour*. Another question and a most serious one arises on the subject of those who *could* labour if employment were not wanting; these are destitute also but another ingredient mixes with the question of subsistence, namely, on the one hand, interference with wages, on the other, the national propensity not to labour if food can be had in idleness. Then the machinery of compulsion to prevent the operation or rather the effects of that propensity, etc., etc.

But why do I forestall a discussion on the 'Poor Laws'? My business is with 'The Case of Ireland.' Give me '*heads*,' give me '*details*,' under each head. You owe me assistance as you are my chief tempter. *Who* so well able to give me that assistance? From this day forward until I make the Statement, and a great part or at least some of this day shall be devoted to *this* purpose.

The session is to be short, nothing but the 'Estimates,' and

the 'Reform Bill' are intended to be brought on by the Ministry. A 'Select Committee' therefore is not *available* this session nor without a *reformed* Parliament. But I can bring 'the facts' before the public and that will answer the purpose of leaving them to ripen until the next session. We are in a political 'hot-bed' and the slow operation of the regular system of tedious *efforts* for amelioration is long gone by. I did not absolutely *want* your inspiration but I enjoy it *so much* as to be scarcely able to write consecutively. As to myself, personally, my attempt may be a *personal* failure but it cannot be a failure for Ireland because after all she cannot be worse. However, I hope in God we are near a transition. The Government is putting down to a certain extent the old faction. *They* are scattered and their rallying point against Ireland is gone. We shall have a numerous augmentation of our forces from the ranks of those who were united by selfish bigotry to oppose everything useful to Ireland. I weary you.

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

- 1 In a letter dated 8 August 1831 Bishop Doyle says, 'I have been on the best terms with O'Connell since he relinquished the agitation of the Union and would most willingly labour to dissuade him from reopening that question if the state of Ireland be taken up in a decided way by government'. (FitzPatrick, *Doyle*, II, 328).
- 2 O'Connell did not bring forward his intended motion that session.

1821

*To O'Conor Don*¹

London, 29 June 1831

My dear O'Conor,

The death of my most respected and loved friend, your father, was to me a severe blow. It severed one of the most kindly of those links which bound me to society. How little does the world know of the value of the public services of men who like him held themselves always in readiness without ostentation or parade but with firmness and sincerity to aid in the struggles which nations make for liberty. . . . I really know no one individual to whom the Catholics of Ireland are so powerfully indebted for the successful result of their contest for Emancipation. . . . His was not holiday patriotism. . . . No, in the worst of times and when the storms of calumny and persecution from our enemies and apathy and treachery from

our friends raged at their height he was always found at his post. . . .

It was only last night that I could ascertain the precise time at which a new writ can issue² as there must be an interval of fourteen clear days of the sitting of the house to afford time for any person who might choose to petition against his former return. The writ therefore cannot issue before Wednesday the 6th of July. . . .

I need not say how earnestly I wish you success nor how delighted I should be with any opportunity however small to assist in procuring that event but I am happy to believe that you will meet with no difficulty.

SOURCE : Clonalis Papers

- 1 Denis O'Connor (1794-1847), Belanagare and Clonalis, Co. Roscommon. Eldest son of (Owen) O'Connor Don, M.P.; O'Connor Don from, 1831; M.P. for Co. Roscommon, 1831-47; a lord of the treasury, 1846-7.
- 2 A vacancy had occurred in the representation of Co. Roscommon following the death of O'Connor Don. His son Denis, now O'Connor Don, advertised his intention to stand for the county on 16 June (*Pilot*, 24 June 1831). On 25 July he was returned unopposed (*Pilot*, 27 July 1831).

1822

To Richard Barrett

London, Saturday, 2 July 1831

Private

My dear Barrett,

I intended to send you a letter to the People of Ireland on Stanley's humbug 'improvements' in the Irish Reform Bill but I was invited by a mutual friend to a conference on this subject with Lord Althorp and until that is over it would not be delicate or proper to discuss the matter with the public. Of course you will see that the fact of such intended conference is not to be published.

I got a letter this day from Staunton, breaking off the compromise² with Lavelle. I am sorry for it. I told Lavelle of Staunton's determination and learned from him that he had written to his editor, reproaching him strongly for the attack³ of which Staunton complains. Of course, after having been

engaged as *arbitrator*, I cannot be counsel for either party and in fact I would not. There was a retainer left at my house by Lavelle's attorney but I returned it to himself. I hope I will get the first Reform Bill⁴ modified—indeed I expect it—but we shall owe very little to the Ministry on that account or on any other. You will see by the papers a short sketch of the various battles⁵ I was engaged in last night. But, after all, the most important was the last, that on the Arms Bill.⁶ It is an atrocious act but one which I trust, we will defeat. There is not one single measure of utility to Ireland proposed or to be proposed by this Ministry save lending us money to be repaid with interest after being laid out in Grand Jury jobbing.⁷ The Arms Bill, if passed, would just come to this that whilst the Orange Yeomanry got arms from Government, the people were to be deprived of all means of preventing their throats from being cut with impunity; but I believe it will never pass. The public opinion here is very decided against the Irish Yeomanry and, indeed, I believe that Lord Anglesey and Stanley will be compelled to yield to the indignant sense of the independent English members. In the meantime, I would be sorry that my friend Staunton committed himself as a supporter of the hare-brained and vain Anglesey. Believe me, we have nothing to expect from him or Stanley save under the pressure of public opinion.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 267-268.

- 1 Stanley introduced the second Irish reform bill in the Commons at a late hour on 30 June. This differed from the first one in that it granted the vote to holders of leases of 19 rather than 21 years duration, the rent for such leases being also lowered from £50 to £20 per annum. O'Connell promptly 'protested against the injustice done to Ireland compared with England' because 'no measures were taken to remedy the injustice of having disfranchised the forty shilling freeholders. In England they had forty shilling freeholders and £10 copyholders. In Ireland, they had none of these. They might call it a franchise if they pleased, but it was one that placed Ireland in a worse condition than this country'. Sheil and Charles A. Walker also criticized the bill. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 570-2).
- 2 Michael Staunton and Patrick Lavelle were owner-editors of the *Morning Register* and *Freeman's Journal* respectively. Lavelle had pending, at this time, an action for libel against Staunton (*MR*, 23 June 1831).
- 3 Staunton had recently published an editorial complimentary to the lord lieutenant, Anglesey (*MR*, 21 June 1831). For this publication Lavelle's paper, the *Freeman's Journal*, strongly attacked the

Register, dubbing it, amongst other things, an apostate (*FJ*, 22 June 1831).

- 4 On 1 July O'Connell gave notice of his intention to move in the committee stage of the Irish reform bill 'that the people of Ireland might be placed on the same footing as the people of England, in the English bill of reform; also, that the forty shilling freeholders might be entitled to vote, or if that should not be carried, that persons possessed of property in fee at forty shillings a year be entitled to the same privilege, and that leaseholders of £10 a year . . . should be allowed to vote' (*Pilot*, 4 July 1831).
- 5 See above note 4, and below note 6. O'Connell on 1 July also criticized the government for issuing arms to the yeomanry, and called the attention of the House to the imminence of bloodshed should the usual Orange demonstrations on 12 July be permitted (*Pilot*, 4 July 1831).
- 6 In fact, a motion by Stanley that leave be given to introduce an arms bill for Ireland. Stanley explained that this measure provided, firstly, that all arms imported into Ireland should be registered and branded so that their distribution could be controlled; secondly, that persons having unregistered arms in their possession should be prosecuted for a misdemeanour; and thirdly, that in the event of the lord lieutenant proclaiming a district, any person found in such district with unregistered arms in his possession should be liable to seven years transportation (*FJ*, 5 July 1831). O'Connell designated this bill a 'frightful measure' which, he claimed, would deprive the people of that section of the bill of rights which entitled them to possess arms. On his motion Stanley agreed to postpone the introduction of the bill for a week (*Pilot*, 4 July 1831). On 8 July he expressed his intention, 'in deference to the opinion of Gentlemen connected with Ireland' of abandoning that clause in the bill which rendered possession of unregistered arms a transportable offence (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 976). It was not until 25 September that he formally introduced an arms bill. It was to revive for one year certain acts 'for the preventing improper persons from having arms in Ireland'. This milder measure does not appear to have met with any serious opposition and was enacted on 15 October 1831 (1 & 2 William IV c. 47).
- 7 A reference to Stanley's motion on 30 June that power be given the government 'to issue Exchequer Bills to an amount not exceeding £500,000, to be expended in the carrying on of Public Works in Ireland'. O'Connell objected to this mode of relieving distress, and said that the loan of money at interest would never have the effect of giving permanent relief' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 573-4). A bill 'for the Extension and Promotion of Public Works in Ireland' which included the above financial provision, was in due course introduced and enacted as 1 & 2 Will. IV c. 33.

1823

From Gerald Crean¹ to House of Commons

6 Lower Abbey Street, Dublin, 2 July 1831

Dear Sir,

At the commencement of the last session of Parliament, I had the honour of transmitting to you for presentation to the House of Commons a petition from the Education Society of the United Parishes of St. Mary, St. Thomas and St. George praying for a portion of the Grant² etc.

The Annual General Meeting of the Society having been lately held, it was resolved again to petition, but as the Committee have not been able to ascertain whether the former one has been presented, they are unwilling to forward another till they learn the fact. . . .³

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Gerald Crean, brother of Martin Crean; secretary to the Education Society, Printer, stationer and account book manufacturer.
- 2 That is, the annual parliamentary grant (for the Kildare Place Society) in support of the education of the poor in Ireland.
- 3 The petition had not been presented. No petition of the society was presented during the current session.

1824

*From Rev. James Walsh,¹ Newtownbarry [Co. Wexford],
5 July 1831 to House of Commons*

The writer states that he had a conversation with Dr. Keating² the previous day who had requested him to write to O'Connell to tell him of the 'dreadful massacre³ of the people which occurred in this town on Saturday 18th ult.' The letter is a very long one but, since the lower part of each page is decayed, the whole is not very intelligible. It concerns tithes, the impounding of cattle and the danger of having yeomanry at hand. The writer blames Capt. Graham,⁴ Lord Farnham's agent, whom he describes as 'a violent Orangeman,' for ordering the yeomanry to open fire.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Parish priest of Newtownbarry.
- 2 James Keating (1783-1849), appointed provincial coadjutor with right of succession 6 December 1818; bishop of Ferns, 1819-49.

- 3 The notorious 'Newtownbarry Massacre' of 18 June 1831. The rector of Newtownbarry, Co. Wexford, Alexander McClintock, seized some cattle for tithe from a local farmer, Patrick Doyle of Tombrick. The cattle were put up for auction in Newtownbarry under police escort, when the local magistrate, alarmed at the threatening crowds of peasantry, called out a force of some 190 yeomen. These, on allegedly slight provocation, opened fire, killing some twelve or fourteen persons on the spot, and wounding some twenty others (for an account of the inquest on the victims see the *Pilot*, 24, 27, 29 June, 1, 3 July 1831). The affair caused 'an immense outcry' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 184).
- 4 Capt. Graham, J.P., captain of the Wexford yeomanry and a veteran of the Peninsular War.

1825

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 9 July 1831

I have not time to write to you on politics but you will be glad to hear that the Reform Bill is safe for England¹ and must be improved for Ireland. Stanley is less self-conceited since I knocked up his Arms Bill.² I wish that ridiculously self-conceited Lord Anglesey were once out of Ireland. I take him to be our present greatest enemy.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 268

- 1 On 7 July 1831 the second reading of the second reform bill (England and Wales) was carried in the Commons by 367 to 231.
- 2 See letter 1822, note 6.

1826

To Richard Barrett

London, 11 July 1831

Private

My dear Barrett,

I am again unable to write my address to the people. I was this day at the Belfast harbour committee,¹ where nothing was done, and then at Lord Althorp's, where there was an immense meeting² of reformers but the doing of business was altogether interrupted by that stupid Lord Milton, who wants

to deprive leaseholders of their right to vote under the Reform Bill.

There is nothing new. Indeed, my thoughts are much engrossed by the increasing spirit of anti-unionism manifesting itself in Ireland. We certainly shall have the curse of 'poor laws' else; if the Union be not repealed, you will have all the frightful evils and much of the horrible immorality of the poor laws introduced into Ireland. How blind the Irish gentry and merchants are not to see this inevitable consequence of hanging back at this moment! We shall have A. B. King's grant³ on this night. I mean to support him—for which I shall, of course, be blamed. Tomorrow, the fight on the Reform Bill will practically commence.⁴ Lord Althorp, at the meeting this day, declared explicitly that the ministry determined to carry the three bills, English, Scotch and Irish through both houses *this session*.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 268-269

- 1 On 23 June 1831 a petition was presented in the Commons from the corporation, merchants, traders and shipowners of Belfast, praying that, in view of the great increase in the city's trade, a bill might be introduced for the purpose of improving its port, quays and docks. The petition was referred on 23 June to a committee on whose recommendation a bill for the improvement of the port of Belfast was ordered by the Commons on 24 June. This bill was enacted on 23 August (1 & 2 William IV Local c. 55).
- 2 According to the *Pilot*, this meeting, consisting of between two and three hundred M.P.'s, supporters of the reform bill, was convened in Downing Street by Lord Althorp specifically for the purpose 'of taking their opinion as to the proposed amendment of Lord Milton to the reform bill' (*Pilot*, 13 July 1831).
- 3 A petition of Sir Abraham Bradley King was presented (with the royal recommendation) in the Commons on 30 June 1831. The petitioner stated that his family had held by royal patent the office of king's stationer in Ireland from the year 1760. The government had recently discovered that King held his patent only at the royal pleasure, and it was accordingly revoked. When, early in 1831, King applied to the treasury for payment of his compensation, he was informed that the ministry would have 'considerable difficulty' in ratifying his claim, and he was advised to bring his case before parliament. The petitioner informed the House that he relied on his office of stationer for an income, and 'to be therefore in the decline of life deprived of it without compensation would be . . . an act of great hardship and injustice'. On 11 July, on the House resolving itself into a committee of supply, George Dawson, supported amongst others by O'Connell, moved that King be given compensa-

tion. Lord Althorp on behalf of the ministry opposed Dawson's motion, and the committee of supply voted by 103 to 45 against the payment of any compensation (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 1065-76). King was shortly afterwards declared a bankrupt (*Dublin Gazette*, 3 Nov. 1831). In 1832, however, he succeeded in securing his compensation (see letters 1902 and 1907).

- 4 On 12 July the (second) great reform bill (England and Wales) entered the committee stage.

1827

To Primate Curtis

London, 14 July 1831

My Lord,

I had the honour to receive your Grace's letter relative to the petition of the Catholic Prelates.¹ That petition reached me some day previously. I feel very proud in having so important a document confided to my care, and will of course give it all the support my feeble powers can afford.

. . . I have fixed the presentation of this petition for the day on which this grant will be canvassed, that is, on going into the discussion of the Irish miscellaneous estimates.

I take for granted that this petition will be successful.²

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 On 23 August 1831 O'Connell presented this petition from the Catholic bishops of Ireland, praying 'that the grants for education should be equally distributed in the education of the Catholic and Protestant poor of Ireland', and complaining of the Kildare Place Society whose system of education the petitioners considered as leading to strife, ill-will, persecution and proselytism (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., VI, 458).
- 2 On 9 September 1831 Spring Rice moved, and Stanley outlined, a scheme which provided for the withdrawal of the annual grant to the Kildare Place Society and similar institutions, and its transference to the hands of the lord lieutenant. Spring Rice and Stanley successfully moved that the grant, amounting to £30,000, be used to establish a Board of National Education, composed of Protestants and Catholics, who were to have charge of administering the new Irish national schools (*Hansard*, VI, 1249-61). Of this scheme Thomas Wyse declared that 'the grand point was at last conceded, that Ireland was to have a national education . . . not of the few, but of the many' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., VI, 1277).

1828

To Leslie Grove Jones

5 Parliament Street [London], 16 July 1831

Private

My dear Colonel,

I want to attack each of the boroughs in Schedule A¹ as its case arises. I want to speak *out* as to its present proprietorship and all the turpitude belonging to its nomination returns.² Could you or, rather, will you kindly assist me? If you have time to point out to me the sources of information on this subject, it will greatly oblige.

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 That section of the reform bill in which were listed those boroughs which it proposed to abolish completely.
- 2 Many of the members returned by the boroughs in schedule A were nominated by patrons.

1829

From Leslie Grove Jones

Brooks's, half past one o'clock, Saturday, 16 July 1831

My good friend,

If it be possible that I can give you any assistance as to the point you require,¹ I shall most gladly do so and for that purpose will call on you tomorrow at 2 o'clock. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 See letter 1828.

1830

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 July 1831

My dear FitzPatrick,

Many, many thanks for a further instance of your kind attention. You are, in fact, 'the friend in need, who is really the friend indeed.'

For the present all will go well with me until I reach Ireland early in September if I can achieve £300. . . .

There is nothing new but great commercial distress and difficulties. My own opinion is that they must come to a bankruptcy.

The Reform Bill struggles slowly through the House. The coronation measure¹ is merely as an excuse to make peers in order to *hurry* the bill through the Lords. The Earl Grey should be impeached if he does not make peers enough to secure the measure.

We are beating *the Gordons*² nightly in the House though the reporters omit everything Irish and the special reporters only catch from 'men say' a shadow of what has been said in the House. They do not, I believe, attend themselves at all. If what has been said of Kildare Street³ had been reported, the triumph of the popular party would be complete. I have no doubt that the entire grant for Kildare Place will not amount to one half the usual sum and that the residue will be put into better hands.

I am most anxious for facts about the Yeomanry on the 12th of July.⁴ Petitions on that subject would be most useful.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 269-270

- 1 George IV had died on 26 June 1830. The new king, William IV, had just issued a royal proclamation, appointing 8 September as the day for his coronation.
- 2 Probably a reference to men such as James E. Gordon, M.P. for Dundalk who at this time opposed the renewal of the government grant to Maynooth (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., V, 16-17, 23-4) and of whom Stanley declared that he was 'chiefly remarkable for his over zeal on religious matters' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., VI, 1256).
- 3 That is, the Kildare Place Society.
- 4 The anniversary of the battle of the Boyne, a day of celebrations for Orangemen. On 12 July 1831 five Catholics and two Orangemen were reported to have been killed in Banbridge, Co. Down while disturbances were also reported in Omagh, Co. Tyrone (*Pilot*, 15 July 1831).

1831

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 July 1831

My dear Friend,

I have been busily employed procuring the fullest attend-

ance possible of the liberal and independent members for tomorrow on the Dublin election ballot. I believe we shall have as fair a chance as possible of getting an independent and honest committee.¹ The Radicals have promised me to attend numerously so that it will be a mere mischance if a Tory Committee be packed.²...

The Reform Bill creeps on slowly; we cannot come to the Irish part for weeks and weeks. But I have the pleasure to tell you that the feeling in favour of a *Local Legislature* in Ireland is becoming daily more favourable here and the day is fast approaching at which we *can* succeed in carrying that measure unless it be our own fault. Communicate to those whom *it may concern* and who have any confidence in my opinion. This is my deep conviction if Ireland be but partially, that is, even partially true to herself, she can secure all the blessings of self-government. Everybody should by degrees prepare for that event. It is, I am convinced, the only thing that can secure the connection with the Crown and people of Great Britain.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 270

- 1 On 8 July 1831 a petition was presented in the Commons from freemen and electors of the city of Dublin, complaining that in the last election the lord lieutenant had coerced many of the electors into voting for the reform candidates Robert Harty and Louis Perrin 'under the intimidation of their being dismissed from their respective situations, offices, employments or business in case of their refusal. . . .' The petition complained of similar coercion in favour of Harty and Perrin from 'divers Peers of the Realm, high public functionaries, and great officers of state'. It claimed that Harty and Perrin and their supporters had exercised 'great bribery and corruption' of 'money, meat, drink and entertainment', and appealed on all these grounds that their election might be set aside. On 8 August a select committee reported that, due to bribery and undue government influence, Perrin and Harty were not validly elected, and a new election was ordered.
- 2 O'Connell was disappointed. On 28 July a select committee was appointed to try the Dublin city election petition. This committee was set aside on the same day on the ground that one of its members, Henry White, had voted at the election. Althorp expressed agreement with this decision while stating that the case was without precedent. On the following day a motion by O'Connell to have the committee accepted was defeated by 100 to 82. Thereupon a new committee was appointed (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 706-709; *Mirror of Parliament*, 1831, I, 905-906, 931).

1832

*To Edward Dwyer*¹

London, 6 August 1831

Private

My dear friend,

Announce that the Tobacco Bill has passed the Lords with my claim in it empowering the growers of tobacco in Ireland this year to sell their crop when they please without limit in point of time.²

The Dublin election is upset. The committee are *unanimous* in declaring it a void election. Perrin or Harty cannot sit again this parliament for Dublin. The Administration have behaved infamously. Lord Althorp and the attorney-general³ took away from us the best committee imaginable and contrived to give us just the very worst possible.⁴ I am sick of such ministers. There is a fatality about them touching Ireland which pervades their every act but the arming of the Yeomanry⁵ is so atrocious an act that we cannot expect any good from the men without heart or head who have done this act. The new election for Dublin must take place without any delay, in a week from the day you receive this letter.

There will be a special report⁶ against Lord Anglesey and Baron Tuyl,⁷ the German fellow, who was advising with the magistrates at the police office when Lord Anglesey* had the impudence to get us arrested.⁸ There is something singularly mischievous in every proceeding of his lordship.

The war,⁹ you will see, is actually commenced. In one week all Europe will be engaged from one end to the other. I believe it to be the last struggle between Despotism and Liberty. This will be the time to speak out, and I have no notion of bating my breath. I, for one, will speak out. England will, I trust, join the friends of freedom and, if so, Ireland will join her heart and hand, PROVIDED ALWAYS, as we lawyers say, that justice is in the first place done to Ireland. We must not trust to promises. A domestic parliament, an absentee rate,¹⁰ *an arrangement* of Church property—these are the *sine qua non* of our assistance. My heart beats and my spirits are light notwithstanding the Dublin defeat. Perhaps it is all for the better. It will show that Lord Anglesey can meddle in Irish affairs only to spoil them.

Let every possible preparation be made for a new contest for Dublin. Let us give them a contest at all events.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers and FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 272-3

- 1 The first part of this letter is in the Fitz-Simon Papers, the second part in W. J. FitzPatrick's edition of O'Connell's correspondence. An asterisk marks the division between the two parts.
- 2 See letter 1797, note 9.
- 3 Sir Thomas Denman, attorney-general for England.
- 4 See letter 1831, note 2.
- 5 O'Connell had for some time been strongly objecting to the revival of the yeomanry by the government (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 388-400, 582, 1412). On 27 June 1831 he made an unsuccessful attempt to scale down the government grant of £190,000 towards that force (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 388-400). About the beginning of August 1831 a score of Irish M.P.'s, including O'Connell, Lord Killeen (who acted as their spokesman) Sheil and Wyse, waited on Lord Grey to propose to the government an Irish programme, part of which included a provision that the Irish yeomanry be immediately disbanded. Grey declared it was impossible to dispense with the yeomanry and warned the deputation that if it pressed the government too hard on this and other Irish measures, it would merely open the way for a less friendly cabinet (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 155).
- 6 On 23-4 August 1831 a motion was made in the Commons on the basis of the report of the committee on the Dublin election (see letter 1831, note 1) to the effect that 'official influence . . . was unduly exercised [in the Dublin city election] . . . and that it is the opinion of this House, that such undue exercise of official influence was a gross violation of the Privileges of this House, and a direct contravention of the Law of Parliament. . . .' The motion was defeated by 277 to 66.
- 7 Lieutenant-Colonel Baron William Tuyll, a Dutchman who had emigrated from Holland at the end of the eighteenth century and entered the 7th Hussars. Private secretary to Lord Anglesey.
- 8 When O'Connell on his arrest in January 1831 (see letter 1751a, note 1) was brought before the magistrates at the head police office, he observed Baron Tuyll eavesdropping on the proceedings from behind a closed door. Upon this O'Connell turned to the magistrates declaring 'You are indeed acting under superior authority . . . Baron Tuyll is in the other room,' and called on the press to take note of the fact (O'Keeffe, *O'Connell*, II, 539-40).
- 9 A reference to the Dutch invasion of Belgium on 2 August 1831. The danger of French intervention on the side of Belgium made it seem for a time that a general European war was imminent.
- 10 That is, a tax on the rents of absentee landlords.

1833

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 9 August 1831

Confidential

My dear friend,

. . . We must rally and not allow the scoundrel Tories to carry Dublin.¹ Perhaps all will turn out for the better. The present plan is to start John D. Latouche² and Sergeant O'Loughlen. If Latouche will not come forward, why then we must have Sir John Byng³ as the second candidate. But O'Loughlen is certainly to be one of the candidates. Work, work, work. Everybody must work. I will go over if it be desired or desirable.⁴ The writ issues this day; by tomorrow week the election may commence. The Ministry have been guilty of such drivelling folly that they are, at length, ashamed of themselves and are, I believe, determined to meet the faction with vigour. Perrin is to get a borough.⁵ They will not be content to leave him out of Parliament. I cannot tell you how I pant for defeating the anti-reformers in the corporation and all the old tools of bigotry and corruption.

There should be an *independent* committee⁶ formed. It should not be called by any other name save some equally general. The last election was made void by reason of the name 'Perrin's Committee.' We must avoid this fault in the transaction. The *use* of thinking of the past is merely to correct the future. Money I hope and *believe* will not be wanting. O'Loughlen is not to spend one shilling of his own. In short, the time is come for every man to exert himself. We have only to break the Shaw⁷ party in the corporation, and all will be well. I doubt whether the Tories will find it easy to raise money enough for the fight.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 271

- 1 In the second election for Dublin (see letter 1831, note 1) the Tories Frederick Shaw and Lord Ingestre were returned. The reform candidates were David Charles Latouche, Sergeant O'Loughlen and (upon O'Loughlen's retirement) Marcus Costello (*Pilot*, 24 Aug. 1831). The final count was Shaw 1292, Ingestre 1250, Latouche 1052, O'Loughlen, 937 and Costello 28 (*Pilot*, 26 Aug. 1831).
- 2 John David La Touche (1772-1838), third son of Rt. Hon. David La Touche M.P., Marlay, Co. Dublin.

- 3 Lieutenant-General Sir John Byng (1772-1860), knighted 1815; commander in chief of the forces in Ireland, 1828-31; M.P. for Poole, 1831-35; created 1841 Baron Strafford, and 1847 Viscount Enfield and earl of Strafford.
- 4 O'Connell did not go to Dublin for the election.
- 5 Perrin did not 'get a borough' until January 1835, when he was elected M.P. for Cashel.
- 6 That is, a committee to fight the election on behalf of the reformers. The arrangements for this purpose were made at a meeting in Dublin on 16 August (*DEP*, 18 Aug. 1831).
- 7 Frederick Shaw (1799-1876), second son of Sir Robert Shaw. M.P. for Dublin city, 1830-32; Dublin University, 1832-48; recorder of Dundalk, 1826-28, recorder of Dublin, 1828-76. Succeeded his brother as third baronet in 1869. See *DNB*.

1834

To ?Edward Dwyer

London, 10 August 1831

My dear friend,

No news of importance from the Continent nor shall we till late tomorrow or the day after. But whatever be the result of the French movement on Belgium in the first instance, that is, whether or not it produces a general war, it is quite certain that its tendency will be to confirm the cause of popular liberty and to put down aristocratic pretensions. It will confirm liberty in Belgium¹ and give another chance to the Poles.² It will also strengthen the popular party in Ireland. If the Orangemen of Dublin would but see their own interest and join us now to reinstate old Ireland. Nor perhaps is this wish as vain as may be imagined. All but the fanatics must have common sense enough to see that their own interest is involved in ours. I hope you will write to me every day the news from Meath.³ How I long for Grattan's success and how I regret that I had not the opportunity of giving a blowing up to the paltry and indeed insulting pretensions of that Anglo-Saxon Bligh.⁴ I fear that he will succeed as *the club*⁵ divided. What a miserable set we are to be always quarrelling amongst ourselves.

A. Guinness would do very well⁶ in conjunction with O'Loughlen, either A. Guinness or Alderman McKenny if it be impossible to stir Latouche. But above all things activity.

The election must commence this day week. I have the pleasure to tell you that a sum quite sufficient to pay all reasonable expenses is already in collection for O'Loghlen and will *certainly* be completed. He at all events comes to the poll. A compromise has already been offered by Mr. Jones,⁷ that is, to allow O'Loghlen to come in without expense provided Shaw be permitted to come in also. This has been indignantly rejected by us and we feel that if proper exertions are made we can and must have both seats. There will be a great *sweep* in the Corporation. No man but a friend to the cause will be left in office. The hour of decision is come. Depend on it that the thing *will be done*. There will be no puff or display but *the thing will be done*. The most dangerous dogs are those that bite without barking.

I cannot write one letter without repeating the absolute necessity of a repeal of the Union. Everybody, Catholic, Protestant and Presbyterian, was the better for the legislative independence of 1782. Everybody will be equally so by the legislative independence of 1832.

We have formed a committee⁸ here. Get up your committees in Dublin. Set to work at once. Open booths for people—voters—to put down their names and addresses pledging themselves to O'Loghlen and the other reforming candidate. Let no stone be unturned.

We gave Sandy Gordon⁹ a great dressing¹⁰ yesterday. I spoke loudly on various Irish topics but all are nearly suppressed by the reporters.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 1832, note 9.
- 2 The Poles were at this time in revolt against Russia (see letter 1751, note 2).
- 3 Following the death of its representative Sir Marcus Somerville, Henry Grattan was returned for Meath on 11 August. His opponent, Hon. John Duncan Bligh, retired from the contest when the poll stood at 307 for Grattan and 150 for Bligh (*FI*, 13 Aug. 1831).
- 4 Hon. John Duncan Bligh (1798-1872), fourth son of the fourth earl of Darnley, Athboy, Co. Meath. Career diplomat from 1828. See *Boase*.
- 5 The Meath Independent Club, one of many local liberal organizations (see letter 1473, note 3). According to the *Pilot*, Grattan's success was due largely to the exertions of the club's members (*Pilot*, 12 Aug. 1831).
- 6 That is, as a reform candidate in the forthcoming Dublin city election.

- 7 Unidentified.
- 8 Presumably for the purpose of promoting the return of the reform candidates for Dublin city.
- 9 James Edward (Sandy) Gordon, M.P. for Dundalk, 1831-32.
- 10 In a discussion in the Commons on 9 August on the alleged drinking of anti-Catholic toasts by the Carlow grand jury, James E. Gordon, who denied the allegation, was attacked by O'Connell, Leader and Sheil. When Stanley, the chief secretary, stated that *some members* of the grand jury appeared to have drunk anti-Catholic toasts, Gordon was clearly put on the defensive (see *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., V. 1038-42).

1835

To Edward Dwyer

London, 17 September 1831

My dear friend,

I got your letter with the rules of the Trades Union.¹ I approve of them generally but will add some to make them more efficient and more legal. In the meantime, I write to urge the propriety of getting petitions to the House of Lords in favour of the Reform Bill. I think every parish in Dublin as well as my friends of the trades union should petition *strongly* the Lords for the bill. Use respectful language but *threaten* them as strongly as you can without direct menace; that is, *foresee* the effects of refusing the reform. Set about this as speedily as possible; it is material that we should *pour* upon that House the full vial of popular determination. I therefore urge all my friends to petition as speedily as possible.

We are at length beginning to press the Irish Government out of their Orange connections.

My opinion is that the Irish distillers will get no relief. The Committee² is so constituted and the Excise Board is so adverse that I think we have little chance of success. Ireland *cannot work* without an Irish parliament.

[P.S.] Commit your petitions to Lords Grey, Brougham, King³ (to choose), Radnor,⁴ Shrewsbury, Cloncurry, etc.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 273

1 See letter 1710, note 1.

On 23 June Spring Rice and Lord Althorp were instructed to bring in a bill 'to consolidate and amend the laws for suppressing the

illicit making of Malt, and distillation of Spirits, in Ireland'. The bill received its second reading on 5 July 1831 and was committed. The select committee on the bill (see letter 1836, note 2) did not report until 11 October 1831. At the second reading of the bill O'Connell objected to certain 'inquisitorial' clauses therein and commented that 'the powers given by this measure were exceedingly extensive' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 720). A petition against the bill from Thomas Haughton, a Carlow distiller protested against 'the Clause or Clauses . . . granting Drawback' (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 758; by 'Drawback' is meant a certain amount of excise or import duty remitted when the commodities upon which it has been charged are exported). The bill with amendments was enacted on 20 October 1831 (1 & 2 William IV c. 55).

3 Peter (King), seventh Lord King, Baron of Ockham (1775-1833).

4 William (Pleydell-Bouverie), third earl of Radnor (1779-1869); M.P. for Downton, 1801-2, 1818-19; for Salisbury, 1802-18, 1820-28.

1836

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 21 September 1831

Private

My dear friend,

I cannot get time to send you the amended draft of the resolutions constituting the political character of the Union of Trades.¹ I am desirous of becoming a member and wish to put the society on the most clear legal grounds. We never can repeal the Union which every day becomes more and more pressing except by keeping quite clear of any illegality whatsoever. I am, however, obliged to spend *my day* on the Malt Drawbacks Committee,² and you see that the House sits during the night. I hope in a day or two to be able to send you the regulations complete.

Tomorrow, Sir John Newport and I, as a deputation from the Irish members, are to have a meeting with Lord Althorp, Lord John Russell and Stanley on the subject of the Irish Reform Bill. It is very, very bad as it stands but I hope we will ameliorate it. I will let you know the result.³

The commotions in Paris⁴ will, I hope and believe, end favourably for the cause of civil liberty.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 271-272

1 See letter 1835; also letter 1710, note 1.

- 2 O'Connell was a member of a select committee appointed on 5 September 1831 'to inquire into the effects produced by allowing a Malt Drawback [see letter 1835, note 2] on Spirits'.
- 3 No account of this meeting has been traced.
- 4 A reference to the outbreak of rioting which occurred in Paris about this time.

1837

To Richard Barrett

London, 5 October 1831

Confidential

My dear friend,

I have suffered a good deal in health for the last three weeks so as to be unable to sit late in the House. I am, however, now quite restored and have the usual accompaniment of convalescence—an enormous appetite.

The Lords will, I think, to a certainty throw out the bill,¹ so that I expect to have the pleasure of seeing you *within* the next ten days. They are mad, stark mad, to dare to fly in the face of popular sentiment and popular indignation. I do think we shall live to see the hereditary peerage abolished in England. [A substantial portion of the letter is missing.]

. . . I care not which. His [probably E. G. Stanley's] feelings are all anti-Irish, his entire turn of mind is bent to the protection of all existing abuses. He would grieve if he had been compelled to give any substantial relief to any real friend of the country.

Lord Anglesey is holding mock levees. Poor Lord Cloncurry is so enamoured of the Welsh dignity² that he forgets poor Ireland. There is nothing in nature perhaps more ludicrous than to contrast Lord Cloncurry's conduct now with that which he adopted three years ago. At that time he wished to throw into the great excitement of the Catholic question the still greater excitement of the Repeal of the Union. Now he writes about our great excitement,³ forsooth! Pah! These are not times for such paltry sneaking from the assertion of the people's rights. The people should be prepared by the press for the line of conduct to be pursued. As soon as I arrive in Dublin I will begin with a public breakfast. The last was put down by a proclamation,⁴ the next can defy any attack. One or two public breakfasts will give a tone to the public mind. My

fifth letter⁵ on the Union may be a further stimulant. We will form a society to look to the registry of freeholds in each county. We will see how many anti-Unionists we can bring into action in each county. The course of proceeding must be the preparing petitions from each county. An anti-Union rent must be instituted and everything done.

The Carrickfergus Disfranchisement Bill⁶ will be postponed until next session. It is not possible to get it through the Lords during the present. There will not be any new writs issued to that borough. You may rely on it that the Government will put down the Orange magistracy.

Strictly, strictly private and most confidential. I COULD be Attorney-General—in one hour.⁷

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 274-5

- 1 The second reform bill (see letter 1839, note 1).
- 2 That is, Anglesey.
- 3 In accepting a recent petition from a local meeting in Dublin in favour of parliamentary reform, Cloncurry had declared his intention of supporting that measure 'in the hope . . . that it will . . . in Ireland render unnecessary those ulterior measures [i.e. Repeal] which cannot be discussed without too great an excitement and difference of opinion' (Cloncurry to Joseph Denis Mullen, 28 Sept. 1831, *FJ*, 1 Oct. 1831). He was already on terms of considerable intimacy with Anglesey (see extracts from their correspondence, June-December 1830, cited in Cloncurry, *Cloncurry*, 403-13). On 14 September 1831 he was created Baron Cloncurry of the United Kingdom. Following the rejection of O'Connell's overtures in January 1831 (see letter 1758, note 3) Cloncurry 'had but little intercourse with O'Connell from this period' until the close of his life (Cloncurry, *Cloncurry*, 429).
- 4 See letter 1751, note 3.
- 5 This letter, if written, was apparently never published. The four previous letters on this subject (dated respectively 6, 20, 24 and 27 Sept. 1830) were published in the press in the autumn of 1830.
- 6 No bill for the disfranchisement of Carrickfergus was actually introduced at this time. The borough was, however, notoriously corrupt, and in 1832 'came close to disfranchisement' on that ground (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 108).
- 7 Explicit evidence that the government offered O'Connell the attorney-generalship cannot be found but it is reasonably certain that some offer was made. Bishop Doyle was asked by Sir Henry Parnell to convey such an offer to O'Connell and did so but 'finding how isolated the proposal of office was made to him, I fully agreed with him that it should be rejected' (Doyle to Parnell, 17 Oct. 1831, FitzPatrick, *Doyle*, II, 333-4).

1838

From Edward Dwyer to Parliament Street, London

Dublin, 6 October 1831

My dear Sir,

. . . I beg to call your attention to the bill now before the House entitled 'a Bill to make provision for the relief of the Poor in Ireland in certain cases.'¹ The first clause as noted in the margin is 'owners of tithes to pay an annual sum'. This *appears* very fair but how is the income to be ascertained where leases are granted from year to year of lands and of houses by the agents of the clergy for the nominal rent of ten shillings to avoid the stamp duty where the *actual rent* or renewal fine² may be over a thousand pounds. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 James Grattan and Sir Richard Musgrave were instructed by the Commons to bring in this bill on 2 September 1831. The bill, however, did not reach its second reading.
- 2 That is, the sum which the tenant paid on the expiration of his lease in order to have it renewed.

1839

To Richard Barrett

London, 8 October [1831]

Private

My dear Barrett,

The Lords have had the audacity to throw out the bill.¹ *So much the better*. The sensation is powerful and the public sentiment will make itself be heard. The Ministry are determined not to resign. They are also determined to make a distinction between their friends and their enemies. To begin with the War Office. Lord Hill² refused to vote. He will be dismissed. The Lord Lieutenants of counties even will be discarded. Every enemy will be turned out. In Ireland a similar course is determined on, and the Tyndalls³ and other enemies in the paltry [Dublin] corporation will be forthwith dealt with by an unsparing hand.

The conduct, the foolish conduct of Lord Anglesey in

Ireland, is the subject of universal blame. Between him and Stanley they have just contrived to do all that they ought not to do. Lord Anglesey will be made commander-in-chief⁴ and Stanley will be promoted off.⁵ The Marquis of Westminster⁶ is likely to be the new Lord Lieutenant and Ellice⁷ of the Treasury is likely to be the Secretary.

The bishops behaved with all the hate of liberty for which the married bishops have been so notorious. Only think, the creature that the Whigs a week ago made bishop of Worcester⁸ refused to vote with them! Kyle,⁹ whom Lord Anglesey made a bishop, of course voted against them. Lord Caledon,¹⁰ Lord Enniskillen—in short, all governors of counties made by them the other day, voted against them. There has been this day a large meeting of members at the Thatched House tavern. They entered into strong resolutions to support the Ministry and to enforce Reform. Hume addressed the meeting in an energetic speech. He condemned the trivial policy of the Whigs, their unwise plan of supporting their enemies and promoting them and neglecting their friends. He insisted they should now and at once start on a different line of policy. He was loudly cheered. In short, the game is up and the Tories must be put down.

The parliament is to be prorogued until the first week in December. The King is firm and will create peers in abundance.¹¹ The new Bill is to be brought into the Lords in the first instance. It will be necessary to have sixty new peers. Of these, about twenty-five will be the eldest sons of peers called up by writ. These will not make any permanent addition to the peerage; the other thirty-five will be collected in various parts of the three kingdoms.

In the meantime there will be a cessation of tax-paying.¹² The Painters in London are already summoned to meet.¹³ The placards are surrounded with black. everything is to be in mourning. If the English be true to themselves they must trample over the scoundrel Aristocracy.

Expect to see me about Tuesday week, *not* Master of the Rolls nor Sir Daniel but honest and true and your sincere friend.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 275-277

- i The debate on the second reform bill opened in the Lords on 3 October and continued for five days. The division took place at an all-night sitting on 7-8 October, and on the morning of the 8th the pro-reform newspapers announced in black-bordered columns that

- the bill had been rejected by a majority of 41 (Halévy, *Triumph of Reform*, 40-1). The same was true of Irish newspapers.
- 2 Rowland (Hill), first Baron Hill of Almaraz (1772-1842), general commanding in chief, 1828-42.
 - 3 Samuel W. Tyndall.
 - 4 Anglesey remained lord lieutenant of Ireland until September 1833.
 - 5 Stanley remained Irish chief secretary until his appointment as colonial secretary in March 1833.
 - 6 The second Earl Grosvenor had been created Marquis of Westminster on 13 September 1831.
 - 7 Edward Ellice (?1781-1863), secretary to the treasury and liberal whip, 1830-33; M.P. for Coventry almost continually from 1818 to 1863; secretary at war, 1833-34; an influential and radical adviser to several ministers. See *DNB*.
 - 8 Robert James Carr (1774-1841), bishop of Worcester 1831 till his death. See *DNB*.
 - 9 Samuel Kyle (1772-1848), son of Samuel Kyle and a native of Co. Londonderry. F.T.C.D., 1798; Provost of TCD, 1820-31, bishop of Cork, 1831-48.
 - 10 Du Pre (Alexander), second earl of Caledon (1777-1839).
 - 11 O'Connell was mistaken in thinking that the king was at this time willing to create peers (see J.R.M. Butler, *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill*, London, 1914, 287).
 - 12 Threats to pay no taxes were frequent in England at this time in indignation at the rejection of the reform bill (Butler, *Great Reform Bill*, 295).
 - 13 The painters probably formed part of the procession of the parishes of London which on 12 October 1831 marched to St. James' Palace to deliver to the king addresses in support of reform. The procession was attended with some violence (*Ann. Reg.*, 1831, 280-1).

1840

From Daniel Callaghan

10 October 1831 [Monday]

Dear O'Connell,

. . . You mentioned to me on Wednesday or Thursday last that you had that day a letter¹ from an influential person etc. This I communicated in a casual conversation with Brownlow and I was asked by him to call on an official person who wished to speak with me in consequence. *I declined to do so* and having last evening accidentally seen this gentleman, he stated to me what had occurred and what was the feeling of the head of the Government both here and in Ireland to

advance your interest and stature with due regard to every consideration and motive which should influence your decision.² I have therefore to hope that in complying with a request so made of me you will believe that I have not the presumption to interfere in a matter so delicate further than to name to you, should you desire it, my informant who wished that until you did so I should not name him as he should, until he had this intimation of your receiving what he should say in strict confidence, prefer not being named to you.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Unidentified.

2 Probably in reference to a patent of precedence. See letter 1843.

1841

*From John James Hickson, attorney, Tralee to London,
10 October 1831*

Apologetically asking O'Connell for payment of a bond for £515.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1842

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, Dublin, 19 October 1831

My dear Lord,

I am rejoiced to be able to tell you that I found the popular mind here easy to be managed and directed so as to aid the cause of reform, and nothing but reform, until the bill is carried. But the state of things may be rendered worse than precarious unless the promised change of system immediately commences. The government is, in point of fact, as essentially anti-Irish and Orange as it was in the days of Peel or Goulburn. At least such is the public opinion; and allowing, as I readily do, that the intentions of the ministry are good, of what value is that when all their appointments are almost without exception from the ranks of their present and *continued* enemies?

It must be recollected that the present ministry are now more than ten months in office, and as yet they have not done any one service to Ireland. The causes of complaint, on the

other hand, are many and the giant sin of rearming the yeomanry¹ is recorded in letters of blood.²

In short, the time *should* be come for a change of system. The past may easily be buried in oblivion if means are taken to satisfy the people of Ireland that some practical good may be expected. But if it be imagined that it is safe to delay and to postpone giving proofs of a change, all I can say is that those who so think will find themselves sadly mistaken.

I do not conceive what part of the ministry it is that refuses to allow a liberal and popular plan of governing Ireland. Who are they that cling to the miserable system of allowing a faction all the benefits of domination and patronage in Ireland? It is, indeed, quite unintelligible to me why we should have a Whig ministry now twelve months, or nearly, in office and yet the Tory system and the Tory men are all powerful in this unhappy country.

I wish to stand fair in your opinion and I beg of you to recollect for me hereafter that I can now pledge myself that if the government will act with vigour on their own principles, Ireland will be a source of strength and comfort to them. But if they omit the present favourable opportunity of commencing to be friendly to their friends and ceasing to show partiality to their enemies, it will be discovered that Ireland cannot be deluded or managed under such circumstances. It is said that the ministers are afraid of the Orange party; that they have not the courage to avow a determination to discountenance that faction. If that be so, the result will be most unhappy and, indeed, ridiculous because there never yet was a sentiment of fear more unfounded. The real terror should be of offending and insulting the Irish nation at large. But I fear I weary you.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 277-278

1 See letter 1832, note 5.

2 A reference to the recent 'Newtownbarry massacre' (see letter 1824, note 3).

1843

From Sir William Gossett

Dublin Castle, 26 October 1831

Sir Wm. Gosset presents his compliments to Mr. O'Connell

and has the pleasure to inform him, by desire of the lord lieutenant, that the king's letter, giving precedence¹ to Mr. O'Connell, next after his majesty's second serjeant, was received this morning.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 That is, a patent of precedence (see letter 1032, note 2). Accordingly, O'Connell was formally admitted to the inner bar on 4 November (*Pilot*, 7 Nov. 1831). This honour constituted 'the only direct favour he received from any government' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 26, note 1).

1844

*From Thomas Fitzgerald, Cork, 2 November 1831,
to Merrion Square*

Sends bill of exchange for acceptance for payments including 'The annuity to Aunt Nagle £150 odd.'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1845

This letter is now number 2363a.

1846

*From Henry Smith, Kilmainham Prison, Dublin,
13 November 1831, to Merrion Square*

The writer explains that he emigrated to America when young. He asks if O'Connell can obtain his release from prison.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1847

From John McMullen to Merrion Square

Blackhall Street [Dublin], 23 November 1831

Dear Sir,

The coal meters continue to give us every possible annoyance.¹ A fund has been subscribed by the principal manu-

facturers for the purpose of resisting their exactions, which is in the hands of the chamber of commerce, and is at the present moment inaccessible to me. I have gone considerable lengths however at my own risk in defending such proceedings as they have had recourse to; and in this course I have been most warmly seconded by Mr. Stephen Fox Dickson² who has been exceedingly active in arranging the means and mode of resistance to this odious aggression.

They have in consequence instituted certain proceedings against him for *barratry* and *maintenance*, and Mr. R. W. Greene³ is, as I am informed, to attend tomorrow at College Street police office to sustain their case.⁴ This is certainly not the case of Mr. Dickson but of the people of Dublin against the corporation, and it has occurred to me that, if you should not be peremptorily occupied in court tomorrow at one o'clock when the case is to be heard, you would not be reluctant to meet Mr. Greene upon the question. I feel it unnecessary to offer you any apology for making the suggestion. I will not put it in the form of a request. I have not been slow to make sacrifices in the cause, and I am in consequence the man free to ask them from others.

[P.S.] An interview has been had with Mr. Stanley upon the pipe water question,⁵ and the case is now under consideration. An answer will, I believe, be given without delay.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Coal-meters or measurers were employed in Dublin to supervise the landing of imported coals with a view to ensuring payment of duties thereon. Their interference was, apparently, much resented by persons engaged in the coal trade. In February, and again in July 1831, a bill was introduced for the purpose of altering and abolishing the customs and duties payable on coal and other commodities imported from one part of the United Kingdom to another. This bill was enacted on 23 August 1831 (1 & 2 William IV c. 16). Though the act made no specific reference to coal-meters, these officials apparently feared it would eventually deprive them of their employment. Several petitions against the proposed act were presented from Dublin in 1831, including one in April from the Dublin Corporation of Weavers, Shoemakers, Smiths and Painters, praying for the insertion in the act of a clause to secure to the coal-meters their employment which, the petitioners stated, 'in the present state of commercial distress affords food to upwards of five hundred persons' (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 501). The fears of the coal-meters were fulfilled in March 1832 when an act regulating the

Irish coal trade declared that no meter might in future interfere with the measurement, weighing, delivery or storage of coals 'save upon the request and by desire of the buyer or seller thereof' (2 William IV c. 31). In August 1832, however, a further act (2 & 3 William IV c. 90) empowered the treasury to grant compensation to the Dublin coal-meters, the cost of which was to be met by a fine on coals imported into the city. According to O'Connell, the coal-meters, though they differed from him in politics and religion 'had no more warm friend to obtain them compensation and perhaps few more useful' (see letter 1929). See also letters 1672, note 4 and 1866, note 1.

- 2 A coal factor of 50 Townsend Street, Dublin.
- 3 Richard Wilson Greene, K.C. (1796-1861), son of Sir Jonas Greene, the recorder of Dublin; first sergeant, 1835; solicitor-general, 1842-6; a baron of the exchequer, 1852-61; author of several case histories. See *Boase*.
- 4 On 25 November Stephen Fox Dickson was tried before the magistrates of College Street police office on a charge brought by the guild of merchants through their coal-meter, Henry Fletcher, which accused him of 'assisting captains of coal ships in resisting the payment of an illegal tax, amounting to upwards of £7,000 per annum on coals, exacted under cover of a bye-law made by the lord mayor, recorder and board of aldermen on 18th May 1827' (*FJ*, 25 November 1831).
- 5 Perhaps a reference to the case brought against the corporation the previous May concerning the use of funds granted under the metal main act (see letter 1814, note 1).

1848

From Henry Hunt to Dublin

London, 25 November 1831

Private

Sir,

Yesterday I received a letter¹ the copy of which I forward you from a person named Courtenay who in applying to me for pecuniary relief has detailed a catalogue of crimes and atrocities mingled with cruelty and meanness such as never before assailed my ears and which she attributes to you but which I could never for one moment have credited had I not personally known your character.² She brought with her a manuscript of her history which, she said, she was about to publish in order to raise a sum to pay for the board and lodging

of one of her children which she ascribes to you. I declined to read a line of it, but a verbal description of her sufferings is enough to soften even the heart of a monster. I know you too well to expect anything like gratitude in return for this information, which might possibly enable you to take steps to prevent such an exposure as she contemplates. But I reluctantly relieve myself from a burden which has been imposed on me by performing this act of justice to myself. I am, Sir, a detestor of cant and hypocrisy.

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 This letter to Henry Hunt from Ellen Courtenay is as follows:

8 Bear Street, Leicester Square [London]

23 November 1831

Sir,

As the well known friend of the oppressed, the destitute and the unfortunate, I venture to address you in a case of peculiar hardship relating to myself and for which I am convinced your generous nature will require little apology.

I am the unfortunate victim of a member of the House of which you are a representative, the whole history of whose misfortunes and sorrows are recorded in a manuscript which I am advised to make public. In the meanwhile I am literally starving! And to add to the horror of my situation I am in hourly expectation of being arrested for a debt due for the maintenance of that member's child! I am literally in a state of distraction and that will in some measure, I trust, excuse the liberty I have thus taken in addressing you.

Why to an honourable and enlightened man like yourself should I disguise the fact. The seducer of my innocence, the destroyer of my happiness is Mr. Daniel O'Connell, the member for Tralee [*recte* Co. Kerry]. I implore you to stretch but your hand to save the wretched, the unfortunate and the ill used

Ellen Courtenay

- 2 Ellen Courtenay claimed that O'Connell had violated her and that she had given birth to his son in November 1818. Becoming involved in pecuniary difficulties in London she tried to obtain financial assistance from him for herself and the boy whom she claimed to be his son. He refused to assist her. While in prison for debt in London in 1832 she published a pamphlet: *A narrative of most extraordinary cruelty, perfidy and depravity perpetuated against her by Daniel O'Connell, Esq., M.P. for Kerry*. In 1930 Mr. (later Professor) Denis Gwynn wrote a monograph on the subject (*Daniel O'Connell and Ellen Courtenay*, Oxford, 1930). He concludes that the charges brought against O'Connell by Ellen Courtenay are devoid of credibility.

1849

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 27 November 1831

My Lord,

I very much deplore that any circumstances should occur to prevent your standing for Kilkenny county¹ but I cannot venture to dispute the decision you have come to, *connected as you are with the government*, because it would have been impossible but for that connection to separate the people from you. What a pity it is that *you* should be the victim of Lord Anglesey's want of intellect and of Mr. Stanley's insane presumption—you, I will say, naturally the most popular person that ever belonged to the party of the Whigs; you, whom everybody esteems and respects; you, to whom the Catholics owe a debt of gratitude and in whose personal qualities everybody places unlimited confidence.

It is really cruel that Lord Grey will still refuse to understand the mischiefs of handing Ireland over to men who govern by the *attorney-general*—by a vile Tory attorney-general,² and place the government in the odious situation of a common informer, chuckling over the verdicts they get and gloating over exacted penalties. I wish I could have the honour and satisfaction of half an hour's conversation with you. Lord Anglesey and Mr. Stanley have made the people of Ireland Repealers. They will, if they remain, make them separatists. In six months the connection between the two countries will have to be maintained by armed force unless Anglesey and Stanley be removed and the attorney-general cashiered.

I have had an intimation from Nottingham that you were to stand for that city, and you will smile at hearing that I have been called on for your *character*. What a strange resolution! As if you were not yourself, although belonging to the nobility, a more sincere and practical reformer than any one member of this political Union.

When the Irish parliament meets, there is this consolation that nothing can deprive you of the representation of Kilkenny save your taking your seat in the House of Lords.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 278-279

1 In February 1831 Duncannon had been returned for Co. Kilkenny only by a very small majority (see letter 1764, note 2). Though he

was returned unopposed for the constituency in the ensuing general election (see letter 1800, note 6) he felt, according to his biographer in the *DNB*, that he should not again risk a contest for the county. Accordingly, he resigned its representation, and was returned instead for Nottingham in 1832 (see *DNB*, s.v. 'Ponsonby, John William').

- 2 Francis Blackburne.

1850

From Lord Duncannon

Brighton, 28 November 1831

Private

My Dear Sir,

I saw the Chancellor¹ this morning and he tells me that in a speech² of yours you mention the probability of your not being at the meeting of parliament. Now I need not assure you how necessary your presence here will be and how great a triumph your absence would give to the opponents of the Reform Bill. I do hope you will come over to us and give us your powerful support and that you will ensure as much attendance as possible from other Irish members. I am sure, if you had been here, you would have seen that one of the great engines made use of against the meeting was that the Irish members would not come. Now this I have always expected would not be the case, and I should therefore [be] most mortified if we were now left without that assistance. The meeting I hold to have been absolutely necessary. The country requires it, and it would have been considered an abandonment if it had been postponed. It is indeed most inconvenient to many, particularly those at such a distance, but you and they have given it heretofore a most disinterested support, and I confidently hope you will continue it.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Lord Brougham.

- 2 In the National Political Union on 23 November 1831, O'Connell declared 'Parliament, I realise, meets in December—but I do not think I shall go over until after Christmas, as I consider that an attention to this [the National Political] Union is of infinitely more importance than anything to be done there can possibly be'. 'If they want me', he added, 'I can be with them in forty-eight hours and they can count me with their numbers if I be required'

(*Pilot*, 25 Nov. 1831). Parliament reopened on 6 December 1831, but O'Connell remained in Ireland. He was one of the Irish supporters of reform who paired in the division on the second reading of the third reform bill on 17-18 December 1831 (*Pilot*, 21 Dec. 1831).

1851

From Leslie Grove Jones to Dublin

Brooks's [Club], [London], 29 November 1831

My dear Sir,

It is with extreme regret that I have read the report¹ of your declaration that you do not purpose attending in your seat in parliament until after the Xmas holy-days but that, if your services are particularly required, you will come over on 48 hours notice. I cannot understand what has led you to imagine that you will be of more use in Ireland establishing a union² there than in the discharge of your duty in the House. You covet Reform, you felt that carrying the measure as was proposed by government was of the greatest moment and you are assured most positively that the new bill³ will be equally efficient. You cannot therefore but be as much inclined to support that which is to come on as you were to support that which is lost. No one knows so well as yourself the composition of the opponents of Reform in your present bad House. You must therefore know the necessity of your presence at the very opening of it. You would not forward their insolence or promote their buffoonery. However just you may be and however you consider your duty to Ireland as paramount to all other, yet you would not put to hazard so momentous a question as Reform in which the dearest interests of Ireland are involved. To ensure that great object should be the desire of even you Repealers of the Union for without it you have no chance of ever effecting that measure. Heedlessly you would not lend your aid to the Tory faction and certainly not intentionally. The man will merge in the patriot and the patriot will triumph over the man. Everything that is personal will, I am confident, be forgotten. You will not be angered by any act of Stanley's arrogance. You will forget anything that has been done to Daniel O'Connell and only consider what is becoming in the acknowledged Liberator of his per-

secuted and oppressed country to do. You must be aware of the hold you have obtained lately on the English public, how you have established yourself in the House of Commons. You must also be aware that to secure that hold with both, you are best promoting Ireland's cause. Be the Patriot of the Empire and not look only to the interests of that country which you consider more particularly as your own. Stanley, I feel, is a most objectionable person and ought to be called away from Ireland but he is very talented and not only that but a very powerful person as to connections and cannot be readily provided for elsewhere. You know the difficulties with which ministers are fettered. They cannot do all they could wish even if they were more mistaken than they are about some points and particularly as to Ireland, every allowance should be made for them as they are really in earnest about Reform. . . . I am not a friend to the Repeal of the Union but would oppose it with might and main, considering it not only as a measure which would be injurious to the Empire but as one that would not be beneficial to Ireland. I am aware you are full of Milesian pride, that I forgive for you have been sadly, shamefully oppressed. . . . I should personally dislike to hear you abused and not be able to defend you but I should be grieved to be obliged to attack and to condemn you myself. Forgive me when I say you are much nearer perfection here than when in Ireland. There is something there which intoxicates you. Pray come over and sober yourself here. There is a great deal of work to be done. Come and labour hard. . . . Wetherell is again to let loose and play the buffoon. Immediate notice will be given of the new bill and it will be if possible introduced on the following Monday and pushed through vigorously. Now if the division be less than last year, mark the consequence and to what purposes it will be turned, how it may and will induce many peers to hold out and pertinaciously resist. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 See letter 1850, note 2.
- 2 A reference to the National Political Union, O'Connell's latest foundation, the first meeting of which took place on 19 November 1831 (*Pilot*, 21 Nov. 1831). The primary object of the Union was 'to support the king and his ministers . . . in accomplishing . . . parliamentary reform'. Repeal was tacitly abandoned as a platform, the organization declaring its object to be to procure 'all the comforts, protection, political benefits, and fostering care, which could

possibly be procured by a domestic and local legislature' (*Pilot*, 25 Nov. 1831).

3 That is, the third reform bill.

1852

To Henry Hunt, M.P., Stamford Street, London

Merrion Square, 30 November 1831

The first thought that occurred to Mr. O'Connell on reading the enclosed was to send it to Cobbett as a specimen of inconceivable and insane insolence or indeed of much worse. The second thought is that which he now realizes, to send it *back* to the supposed writer, for it is scarcely credible that any being with a head on his shoulders should ever affect to be deceived by so idle a tale¹ even if it be true that the tale has been fabricated at all by *another* person. If the letter signed 'H. Hunt', be genuine, Mr. O'Connell treats it with all the contemptuous indifference so maniac a piece of impudence deserves. As to the copy or pretended copy of a letter annexed, he treats the absurd falsehood contained in it with all the disregard so base and indeed absurd a falsehood deserves. It is not possible for him to express the contemptuous defiance which he hurls at the pair of writers, or supposed writers if there really be a second of them. A calumny against Mr. O'Connell, the *Member for Tralee*!!! would have been worth any money in Ireland at any time during the last twenty years, that is, if it had the least face of probability but a falsehood of this description is only fit for a foreign market and for the noble patronage it has received. Mr. O'Connell expects gratitude from H. Hunt for the caution this letter contains. At the same time H. Hunt will perceive that it does not contain anything which *is like* an attempt to extort money but Mr. O'Connell is ashamed of giving himself so much trouble about so idle and ridiculous a subject.

Mr. O'Connell keeps copies of these precious documents. H. Hunt is likely to destroy the originals.

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

1 See letter 1848.

1853

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 4 December 1831

My Lord,

I owe you two or three letters but I must candidly say I do not know *how* to write to you. I have too sincere a respect for you personally to desire or intend to write anything offensive or even unkind but I cannot speak of the Government to which you are attached¹ without expressing myself with a strength of dislike and abhorrence which it is painful to me to address to you.

As to the Lord Chancellor of England,² I do really and sincerely hold him in the highest estimation. I believe veneration would not be an unsuitable word. Such a man has not been in his high office since the days of the martyr Sir Thomas More. May he too not become a political martyr to the drivelling folly and insulting obstinacy of his colleagues with regard to the offences of Ireland, a country too wise to be deluded and, I will add, too strong to be insulted for a continuance with impunity.

I can have your testimony to my readiness to act on Lord Ebrington's³ views,⁴ and to assist the Ministry in reconciling them to Ireland and Ireland to them. I need not say that I would not sacrifice my principles nor unnecessarily part with my popularity but I did think that Lord Ebrington spoke *advisedly* and that, therefore, my principles would be adopted in the management of Ireland and my popularity transferred to the King and the King's government. So far I was not only ready to assist, but I did assist. For on my arrival here I found a formidable Anti-Union organization complete, called the Trades' Union,⁵ headed by a man⁶ of popular qualifications and capable, I fear, of misleading. I took them out of his hands.⁷ I not only turned them but I can say I turned the attention of the rest of the country from the overpowering question of the Repeal to the suitable one of Reform, and I actually kept matters in suspense in this state for about a month after my arrival.

It was just the time to carry Lord Ebrington's *promise*—for such we considered it—into effect. It was the interval of perfect unanimity in which a kindly government would anxiously desire to proffer measures of conciliation to the

Irish nation. It was a breathing time which a wise Government would gladly lay hold of to begin the promulgation and practice of those measures which would reconcile the Irish nation to their policy. But no, not the least word was thrown out of any plan of utility, of conciliation, of punishment of the blood-stained murderers of the people or of dismissal of their enemies. I will not dilate on these topics but I will remind you that I made my complaint in a letter to you and in another to Mr. Hume. I know the latter reached the Chancellor and Prime Minister. But were my complaints on the part of the Irish people attended to?

Yes, they were, thus. Mr. Stanley, who has rendered himself more odious than any other man who ever assisted in the misgovernment of Ireland—Mr. Stanley, the snappish, impertinent, overbearing high Church Mr. Stanley, Mr. Stanley of Crimes Bill⁸ notoriety, who spoke of the ‘tried loyalty’ of the Orange Yeomanry, was sent over again to be chief and only real governor.⁹ It is idle to conceal it. Mr. Stanley *must* be put out of the government of Ireland. This you will call dictation; and it is so, but it is dictation only to this extent: Mr. Stanley *must* leave Ireland or the ministry *must* expect to lose the support of the Irish members. I make one of six, at the least, who would be in London on the first day of the session and every day after, supporting Earl Grey, if Stanley had been *promoted* off, out of his present situation. I say six because so many have actually put themselves into my hands. If I, however, said twelve and went on to twenty, perhaps I would be nearer the truth. I know how easy it is for the friends of Earl Grey in England to assume the mock heroic, and to *bravely* exclaim against dictation. But all that is folly. The people of Ireland must have a party to support their interests; that party cannot certainly be the Tories. Alas! It is not the Whigs. Who are to be the friends of Ireland? We must form—I am forming—an Irish party, a party without religious distinction. I am in this more successful than I could anticipate.

I worry you, I fear. My opposition to Mr. Stanley is founded on *this*—my experience and conviction of his principles and practice with respect to Ireland. The Subletting Act¹⁰ *must* be repealed; he hangs on to that Act. The Vestry laws¹¹ *must* be abolished; he clings to the system—that is, *the right* of Protestants to have Catholics and Dissenters pay for their churches, chapels, sacramental elements, music, the washing

of their church linen and the matting of the church floors, etc. The grand jury laws must be amended—that he admits—but he clings to the principle of *nomination* of Grand Juries,¹² the rotten borough system. Ireland insists on parochial election of those who are to lay on county taxes. I could write a volume on the contrast between him and Ireland. One word will do—TITHES. He says they are as sacred as private property. Ireland insists on their being abolished.

Again, has he consulted one single Irish member on the Irish Reform Bill? I have an idea that you, my Lord, are as rigidly excluded as I am. But is not this insulting? And yet Lord Grey and his Government prefer conciliating Mr. Stanley to conciliating Ireland! So be it.

Again, there are the Lord Lieutenants of counties. Vesey Fitzgerald is gone to Clare to organize the return of two Tories. Lord Wicklow¹³ is actively doing the same in Wicklow.¹⁴

Now can any Administration dare to ask for confidence from friendly persons when they place power in the hands of their enemies—when they wantonly, unnecessarily, I would say contemptuously, give their enemies power over those who desire to be their friends? Be it so.

The Yeomanry—but I am going too far. Recollect, my Lord, that Lord Killeen at the Navan dinner¹⁵ last week said just what I do: ‘The Whigs have been in office twelve months, and they have done nothing for Ireland.’

But even you yourself with all your undoubted good wishes for Ireland—you are Lord Lieutenant of a county¹⁶—is there one delinquent magistrate dismissed? The toast drinkers,¹⁷ the men who confined a wretch for months for the treason of singing a song with my name in it, the protectors of the Myshall Corps of Yeomanry in *all* their delinquencies.¹⁸ Why there they [*sic*] are Parsons—beggars and all—in the commission of the peace. Be assured that I take the liberty of saying this solely in sorrow and without any other anger than what arises from the recollection of the cold cruelty of the rest of the administration towards Ireland, when they prevent even your good wishes from developing themselves into good acts.

I remain here until after Christmas as, amongst other reasons, an expression of my just resentment. I detain others here on the same grounds. We will go over with all the indignation of men who think themselves basely used by Lord

Grey's government. As to poor Lord Anglesey, he now excites only compassion. Lord Plunket excites feelings of a different but not more favourable nature. His equity bill¹⁹ has made more 'Repealers' than ever I did.

I deem it a duty to be thus candid with you that you at least may understand that there is but one way of governing Ireland—that is, by not preferring individuals to the people but the people to individuals. Ireland is sinking into decrepitude. In Cork, in three of the parishes alone, there are 27,000 paupers!!! The evil of absenteeism is incurable unless there be a beneficent heart and firm hand to apply the proper remedies. And in such a state of things we have a Ministry—bless them!—who prefer an individual and the gratification of his pride to the wishes and wants of a nation.

I have written disconnectedly and in all the bitterness of sorrow. Lord Ebrington held out a false hope. We believed and have been deceived. Now that he has been falsified we expect *acts* to precede promises. The dominion, the absolute control which Stanley exercises over Lord Althorp shows us that we should not again encourage hope. Strike off the Tory Lord Lieutenants. Turn off Lord Lorton,²⁰ Lord Wicklow, Lord Forbes,²¹ Vesey Fitzgerald—your open enemies. Give these counties to your open friends. . . .

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 280-284

1 See letter 1764, note 2.

2 Lord Brougham.

3 Hugh (Fortescue), styled Viscount Ebrington until 1841 (1783-1861). Lord lieutenant of Ireland April 1839-September 1841; married secondly Lady Elizabeth Somerville, widow of Sir Marcus Somerville, on 26 July 1841 at the vice-regal lodge, Dublin. Succeeded as second Earl Fortescue in 1841.

4 See letter 1854.

5 See letter 1710, note 1.

6 Marcus Costello.

7 On his return to Dublin from parliament on 18 October 1831, O'Connell was presented with the honorary freedom of the Dublin Trades' Political Union (*Pilot*, 19 Oct. 1831). His speech on this occasion, however, disappointed his listeners 'because of his avoidance of Repeal' (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 114). O'Connell promptly set about weaning the Trades' Union away from Repeal and enlisting their support for reform (*Pilot*, 26, 28 Oct., 4 Nov. 1831). He attacked the leaders of the Trades' Union for endeavouring to separate the working from the middle classes (*FJ*, 17 Nov. 1831). He undermined the independence of the Trades' Political Union

- which became infiltrated with members of the middle-class and O'Connellite National Political Union (see letter 1851, note 2) and which thereafter dropped Repeal, and adopted O'Connell's reform policy (see Fergus D'Arcy, 'Trade Unionism in Ireland, 1800-50', unpublished M.A. thesis, University College, Dublin, 1968). At this time—mid-November 1831—the Dublin Trades' Political Union adopted a new constitution (*FJ*, 16 Nov. 1831) and changed its name to the National Trades' Political Union (see letter 1710, note 1).
- 8 Undoubtedly O'Connell meant, and probably wrote, *arms* bill (see letter 1822, note 6). In his handwriting *arms* would have been very similar to *crimes*.
 - 9 Stanley served as Irish chief secretary from November 1830 to March 1833.
 - 10 See letter 1448, note 1.
 - 11 See letter 1642, note 5.
 - 12 Grand juries were at this period nominated by the high sheriffs of counties, who were themselves appointed annually by the crown (R. B. McDowell, *The Irish Administration 1801-1914*, London, 1964, p. 164).
 - 13 William (Howard), fourth earl of Wicklow (1788-1869), lord lieutenant of Co. Wicklow.
 - 14 See letter 1854, note 11.
 - 15 This dinner, from the frecholders of Co. Meath to their representatives, Lord Killeen and Henry Grattan, took place on 28 November 1831. In his speech Killeen declared that he had just returned from 'the most arduous sessions of parliament that could be remembered'. 'In the last session what had been done for Ireland?—Nothing. Some improvement had been made in the education of the people, from which, no doubt, much good might be derived, but with that exception no practical good had been conferred on Ireland by the labours of that session' (*FJ*, 30 Nov. 1831).
 - 16 Duncannon was lord lieutenant of Co. Waterford.
 - 17 A reference to members of the grand jury of Co. Carlow (see letter 1834, note 10).
 - 18 Unidentified. Myshall was a village in the parish of the same name in Co. Carlow.
 - 19 On 2 September 1831 Plunket introduced in the Lords this bill 'for the better Execution of Decrees and Orders made in the Courts of Chancery and Exchequer in England and Ireland respectively'. It was passed by the Lords on 29 September and introduced to the Commons on the same day. The bill had not been further proceeded with when the session ended in October. A meeting in Dublin of attornies and solicitors on 3 December condemned the bill on the ground that it would mean the initial transference to England of the business concerning Irish land of the Irish equity courts and in consequence an increase of absenteeism among land-

owners (*FJ*, 5 Dec. 1831). A substitute bill was introduced to the Commons on 17 March 1832 and in due course enacted as 2 Will. IV c. 33, 'An Act to effectuate the Service of Process issuing from the Courts of Chancery and Exchequer in England and Ireland respectively'. This measure does not appear to have provoked any opposition from Irish lawyers.

- 20 Robert Edward (King), first Viscount Lorton (1773-1854), Rockingham, Boyle, Co. Roscommon. Second son of second earl of Kingston. Entered the army, 1792 and rose to the rank of general by 1830. Lord lieutenant of Co. Roscommon, 1831-1854.
- 21 George John (Forbes), *styled* Viscount Forbes (1785-1836); lord lieutenant of Co. Longford, 1831-6; M.P. for Co. Longford, 1806-32, 1833-36.

1854

To Leslie Grove Jones

Merrion Square 4 December 1831

My dear Colonel,

. . . I defy anybody to point out in history such a detail of crime committed by one country on another as England has committed on Ireland. . . . The Irish people are making up their minds to go to war with England. . . . You think I jest or exaggerate. I tell you I speak the words of soberness and truth. The Irish people are making up their determination for war. There is no conspiracy, there is no regular organization, there is an opinion daily gaining ground from man to man that Ireland will obtain independence through a bloody struggle. You will smile when I add that there is only one man who can prevent the coming fight. . . . I venture to assert that I will prevent the war and preserve the connection and preserve it in a shape highly advantageous to both countries. . . . The administration of Earl Grey is doing all it can to drive the people to despair . . . first, they appointed the leading Orangeman of the Bench, Mr. Joy, Chief Baron. 2nd, they appointed a fifth or sixth rate barrister, Mr. Doherty, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. 3rd, they appointed a dogged, *pertinacious* Orangeman, Mr. Blackburne, Attorney-General. 4th, they outraged by their proclamations¹ every idea of constitutional right. 5th, they made Lord Anglesey trail his veracity in the mud because they made him issue these proclamations after he had solemnly of his own act pledged himself that he would not

do so.² 6th, they prosecuted³ for *breach of a proclamation* ! ! ! 7th, they packed a jury, struck off gentlemen of the first respectability one of whom they soon made a baronet.⁴ 8th, they called out the Orange yeomanry.⁵ 9th, they left the murderous police with their arms covered with human blood the power to continue to murder.⁶ 10th, they have left in office every Orange magistrate. 11th, they have not removed from the commission of the peace even as much as Captain Graham of Newtownbarry although he, according to the official letter, called out the yeomen unnecessarily and that three yeomen so unnecessarily called out massacred fifteen men, women and children.⁷ 12th, they have supported and encouraged every species of party spirit under the pretence of furnishing such a combination as *might* repeal the Union. 13th, they brought in an 'Arms Bill'⁸ by which a gentleman who tried a fowling piece before he bought it might be transported as a felon for shooting with an *unbadged* gun. 14th, they appointed Lord Lorton the bitterest and most rancorous of their enemies lord lieutenant of a county⁹ of which the two members¹⁰ support the Ministry. 15th, Lord Wicklow. 16th, Lord Forbes. 17th, Lord Enniskillen. 18th, Vesey FitzGerald.¹¹ 19th, they have given Lord Wicklow and Vesey FitzGerald power to send into parliament four tories in the place of four Reformers. 20th, they are the only ministry that has dared to place their enemies over the heads of their friends to crush those friends and augment their enemies. 21st, they leave Lord Belmore¹² Governor of Jamaica whilst both his sons¹³ are voting against Reform and are virulent opponents of the Ministry. 22nd, they made Dr. Kyle a bishop just in time to vote against them and Reform as everybody knew he would. 23rd they made Lord Ranfurly an earl and his son¹⁴ a bishop though another son¹⁵ opposes them in the Commons and the bishop will oppose them in the Lords. 24th, they have twenty-one stipendiary magistrates and not one of them a Catholic in this Catholic country. 25th, they maintain the Subletting Act¹⁶ in great part. They maintain the Vestry acts in the entire, by which the Catholics and Dissenters are obliged not only to build, rebuild, repair, ornament and warm the Protestant churches but to pay for the very spitting boxes of the clerical functionaries. 26th, they proclaim the *eternity* of tithes: Stanley declares them as sacred and untouchable as private property. 27th, they employ the police and army for months together in serving processes, writs and citations for tithes. 28th, Stanley has rendered him-

self personally odious to every Irish member. He is the supporter of all existing abuses in Ireland. He praised the 'tried loyalty' of the murderous yeomen.¹⁷ He brought in the Arms Bill.¹⁸ He is the pillar of the system of tithes. Well, he *must* therefore continue to misgovern Ireland. They would not be *so weak* forsooth as to yield to the voice of Ireland clamorous for his removal. No, that would be dictation. They submit to the dictation of every enemy: they will not submit to the entreaty of their friends. 29th, they have not done one single act of any kind to benefit Ireland. 30th, they have brought in an *aristocratic* reform bill for Ireland: they have made it more aristocratic still. 31st, they have not condescended to consult any one Irish member upon the Irish Reform Bill either in point of principle or detail: Stanley commands and we are slaves. 32nd, all the commercial and manufacturing interests in Ireland are suffering under the inflictions of the partiality of the English revenue boards.¹⁹ The Irish distillers are all but in rebellion.²⁰ 33rd, Lord Plunket brought in a bill last session to transfer the Equity jurisdiction from Dublin to London.²¹ He has declared his determination to enforce this bill in the approaching [session]. My paper forbids me to continue else I would run the catalogue up to 100. I have shown you enough to account for my disgust at the conduct of ministers in Ireland. Lord Ebrington *promised* us a change of system. I will write to you again as soon as I can.

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 See letter 1751, note 3.
- 2 In November 1830, just before his reappointment as lord lieutenant, Anglesey had declared himself favourable to permitting public meetings to take place unchecked even when these were in favour of Repeal (see letter 1735, note 5).
- 3 See letter 1751a, note 1.
- 4 Alderman Thomas McKenny who was made a baronet in 1831. See letter 1767, note 4.
- 5 See letter 1832, note 5.
- 6 Numbers of peasants had been shot by the police during recent tithe affrays at Thurles, Co. Tipperary, Castlepollard, Co. Westmeath, Kilkenny city and Knocktopher, Co. Kilkenny (O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in Ireland, 1830-31' *Stud. Hib.*, VI, 1966, 77; O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 385-6; also, *DEP*, 15 Dec. 1831).
- 7 A reference to the 'Newtownbarry massacre' (see letter 1824, note 3). Graham must have been subsequently dismissed from the commission of the peace since on 1 June 1832 a petition was presented

- to the Lords from the magistrates of Co. Wexford praying that he be restored (*Lords Journal*, LXIV, 252).
- 8 See letter 1822, note 6.
 - 9 In October Lorton had been appointed lord lieutenant for Co. Roscommon (*Dublin Gazette*, 25 Oct. 1831). Heretofore he had been one of the three governors for the county.
 - 10 The members for Co. Roscommon were O'Connor Don and Arthur French of Frenchpark.
 - 11 An act of 1831 (1 & 2 Will. IV c. 17) gave the lord-lieutenant of Ireland power to appoint a lord-lieutenant for each county in succession to the existing governor(s). Each lord-lieutenant of a county had the power to appoint deputy-lieutenants, in succession to the existing deputy-governors, subject to the approval of the lord-lieutenant of Ireland. On the inauguration of the new system in October the lord-lieutenant appointed Wicklow, Forbes, Enniskillen and Vesey FitzGerald as lord-lieutenants of the counties of Wicklow, Longford, Fermanagh and Clare respectively (*Dublin Gazette*, 25 Oct. 1831). They had heretofore been governors for those counties. In about half the counties the newly appointed lord-lieutenant had been a governor (there was usually more than one governor for a county).
 - 12 Somerset (Lowry-Corry), second earl of Belmore (1774-1841), captain general and governor in chief of Jamaica, 1828-32.
 - 13 Armor (Lowry-Corry), styled Viscount Corry (1801-1845), elder son of second earl of Belmore. M.P. for Co. Fermanagh, 1823-31; high sheriff Co. Fermanagh, 1832. Succeeded as third earl of Belmore in 1841; and Henry Thomas Lowry-Corry (1803-1873), second son of second earl of Belmore; M.P. for Co. Tyrone, 1825-73; junior lord of the admiralty, 1841-5, secretary to the admiralty, 1845-6 and 1858-9; first lord of the admiralty 1867-8. See DNB. O'Connell was inaccurate since the elder son, Viscount Corry, was no longer in parliament at this time.
 - 14 Actually his *brother*, Hon. Edmund Knox (1773-1849), appointed, 1831 bishop of Killaloe; translated to Limerick 1834.
 - 15 The new (first) earl of Ranfurly had two sons in the Commons at this time—John Henry Knox, M.P. for Newry and James, sometimes described as John James, M.P. for Dungannon.
 - 16 See letter 1448, note 1.
 - 17 Probably a reference to Stanley's speech in the Commons on 27 June 1831, when he described the yeomanry as 'a body of men who were known to be loyal and devoted to the constitution', though he admitted that 'party feeling' did exist among some of their corps (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IV, 393).
 - 18 See letter 1822, note 6.
 - 19 The British and Irish customs and excise had been consolidated in 1823 (McDowell, *Irish Administration*, 89). On 28 November 1831 the *Pilot* declared that, as a result of the consolidation, 'our traders

are obliged to submit to the insolent, ignorant English excisemen sent over here . . .'

- 20 Partly because of the recent enactment of 1 & 2 Will. IV c. 55 (see letter 1835, note 2). At a dinner given on 30 November by the distillers of Ireland to the members of the malt drawback committee (see letter 1836, note 2) O'Connell's health was drunk 'and indeed so it ought . . . for we are assured by one of the Deputies who attended the sittings of the Malt Drawback Committee, that he was unceasing and unwearied in his exertions for the Distillers of Ireland' (*DEP*, 1 Dec. 1831).

- 21 See letter 1853, note 19.

1855

From Edward Hayes

7 December 1831

Sir,

. . . I am now removed to the metropolis and reside at 34 Westmoreland Street [Dublin]. If among your numerous avocations you will condescend to notice me I shall feel grateful—the honour of your patronage is what I seek and, from your patriotic desire to encourage the liberal arts amongst your countrymen, I trust my appeal to you shall not be made in vain. If you will condescend to sit for me¹ I shall feel highly honoured by it. I shall occupy but little of your precious time, and the circumstance may be the foundation of my future fame.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 There is no record of a portrait of O'Connell by Edward Hayes.

1856

From George Sinclair¹

62 St. James' St. [London] 10 December 1831

Private

Sir,

I fear that you will deem a very slight parliamentary acquaintance by no means an adequate apology on my part for taking the liberty to write to you. [Sinclair says he is a rigid Calvinist but respects O'Connell as a sincere advocate of the

claims of the Catholics the concession of which he had always considered an essential prelude to the welfare of Ireland. He now asks why O'Connell is being hostile to the government which is likely to do so much for him and for Ireland. 'I have scarcely any personal acquaintance with any of the Members of Government, and of course as a humble individual, speak entirely from conjecture.']

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 George Sinclair (1790-1868), M.P. for Caithnessshire at intervals from 1811 and continually from 1831 to 1841; strenuously advocated Catholic Emancipation and other reforms; succeeded his father in 1835 as second baronet; author of many pamphlets and articles. See *DNB*.

1857

*From Richard Boyse Osborne*¹

Graige, Bannow, Taghmon [Co. Wexford],
13 December 1831

Private and Confidential

My dear Sir,

. . . I sent to the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle an outline of a plan² or resolution. A neighbouring parish were ready to *adopt* them by the great excitement on the tithe subject in it, which it was believed, *if legal and safe* to be acted on would prove a death blow to the system, as I have reason to know in such case it would be very generally adopted.

I must be cautious and at three public meetings pressed it *in three different counties* and in Kilkenny actually I believe Dr. Butler³ and some others entered into a subscription⁴ to get up a prosecution against me for doing so, the Orange faction was quite correct in *speaking* of Protestant *persecution* for *I can vouch for meeting it copiously at their hands* but at none other.

I think from the *Times* article⁵ of the 9th on the tithes we may be certain ministers see they must *end* the reigns of humbug and *injustice* or be *ended* themselves by revolution. In this is my faith and that of many *here*.

I have also preparing in the press a short sketch for saving us from Poor Laws yet without any increased taxation providing well for near 20,000 of our poor.⁶ It has met the approba-

tion of *some honest* Liberals [? as] I trust it may yours in [1 word illegible] I will seek your support of a petition⁷ about to be founded on it.

If you approve the tithe *missionary* system,⁸ pray forward it to me amended or altered as you deem fit.

[P.S.] Dr. Doyle sent you the proposed plan on the 1st inst.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Richard Boyse Osborne, B.A. (T.C.D.) 1814, born c. 1793, son of Simon Osborne.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 Richard Butler (c. 1768-27 May 1841), Burnet Hill, Co. Kilkenny; vicar of Burnchurch, Co. Kilkenny, 1795-1841. Believed to have qualified as a medical practitioner in Edinburgh and to have treated his parishioners gratis.
- 4 Rev. Richard Butler, vicar of Burnchurch, Co. Kilkenny, had recently served processes on some 500 persons in his district for arrears of tithe amounting to £1,000. One of his proctors was promptly murdered, and he himself allegedly subjected to intimidation and reduced to penury (*Kilkenny Journal*, 21 Dec. 1831). No evidence has been traced of his prosecuting Osborne.
- 5 In this article the *Times* declared 'The relation between church and state in Ireland is such as to entail ruin upon both if it continues'. It ruled out the use of force as a solution to the problem of tithe arrears, and declared 'No man in his senses now talks of maintaining the Church of Ireland by tithe raised upon the Catholic population. No man is wild enough to suppose it possible that Irish Bishops should long enjoy such revenues, or exist in such numbers, as at present' (*Times*, 9 Dec. 1831).
- 6 The article in question does not appear to have been published.
- 7 No petition concerning poor laws from Osborne or his locality was presented in either house of parliament in the current session.
- 8 Unidentified.

1857a

*From Dom. Saulnier de Beauregard*¹

[Translated from the French]

Melleray near Nantes [France], 13 December 1831

Sir,

I desire to have the honour to write to you. I feel I need to do so. I am afraid of not writing clearly enough in English. Allow me to use French.

There is something on my mind, which when I tell you about it, cannot fail to excite your [?] interest] and which will give you a great and splendid opportunity to show loyalty to the Church and to develop those powerful means which Providence has granted you and which you know how to use in the defence of Catholics' freedom in so courageous and noble a manner.

I am the head of that community of Trappists who lived for twenty years in England near Lulworth Castle and who, during that long stay, were indebted for tokens of kindness and protection not only to the worthy and esteemed Weld family but also to all the members of a nation which prides itself for its greatness, generosity and hospitality.²

Louis XVIII, good and illustrious monarch, deigned in 1816 to invite me, through his ambassador in London, to return to his kingdom with my companions. This pious king sent a frigate which brought us to Brittany. There, through the generosity of my friends and my own savings I bought the former abbey of Melleray near Nantes where I founded and established a house, devoted to work and to prayer. The good agricultural methods which we used, the talents and expertise of some of my brothers and companions, enabled us to bring enlightenment into a province which in general was rather backward in these matters. We soon transformed barren heaths into good artificial meadows, into fields covered with rich crops. Our efforts drew the attention of the administrators of our Department and of the government, and we received encouragement and praise until July 1830. Our community however increased, and our different activities provided work for more than 150 *confrères*, labourers, half of whom were English and Irish, and half French, and we were also in a position to console the poor of the canton. In the seclusion of our house we adhered strictly to the rules and discipline of the Trappist Order, of which today I am the superior general, and outside it we were merely an agricultural establishment. Such is the spirit of the law in France.

For more than 15 years we lived peacefully and quietly in the world, sheltered from foreign laws, offending no one, and doing the little good in our power, when without any wrong, without any provocation, without any cause or motive, as the legal proceedings which I am instituting against our oppressors will prove clearly in the eyes of the whole of Europe, soldiers came with as much brutality as injustice, abusing the force of

bayonets, on the 28th of last September, to dissolve my establishment and to send my French *confrères* away. I complained, I protested with all the energy of innocence and a just cause but violence and fury will listen to no one. Having dispersed nearly all my French *confrères* they came back on the 12 of last November to intern my English and Irish *confrères* and workers by force. In spite of my repeated protests they were taken to Nantes in the midst of a numerous armed company of soldiers after they had been dragged violently from my house.

In Nantes they were locked up in a prison for eight days, and now they have just been sent, against their will, more than sixty of them, on the French corvette *l'Hebe* which will take them to Cork. Only fifteen, to whom her Majesty's consul was able to give asylum in his house, have been staying temporarily in Nantes.

I should like, moreover, to pay public tribute to Mr. Henry Newman, his Majesty's consul, who in this matter displayed the devotion, generosity and courage of a worthy and loyal representative of his Majesty. I have also hastened, Sir, to write to his Excellency, Lord Granville,³ and to inform him of this shameful and odious persecution, contrary to all laws, to peoples' rights and to the freedom which Frenchmen enjoy in his Majesty's dominions, and which by the same title English and Irish, resident in France, ought to enjoy. Vile and slanderous subalterns have dared to say and to write, in order to hide and to cover up for their odious oppression, that these quiet and peace-loving men had sought to excite the people to revolt. They didn't leave my cloister or my jurisdiction, and there isn't one in ten (among them) who can articulate a few words in French. We are reserving however ourselves for the magistrates before whom we will develop and confound these gross impostures.

But you, Sir, patron and eloquent defender of the rights of your Irish countrymen, won't you think this cause worthy of your religious zeal, of your love of justice? Won't you urge the government, the whole nation to demand a reparation for the rights (which have been) shamefully violated in the case of your worthy and innocent compatriots? Can these seventy faithful subjects of his Majesty, after living for more than fifteen years in my house, be banished like criminals, without judgment, only because, in spite of the law of France which has proclaimed religious freedom, people want to punish them

for being Trappist and Catholic. . . . I put it to you so that you will make reparation and damages be paid to them, so that they will be able to come back to me in complete freedom. Nobody, Sir, is in a better position than you to treat of, to set forth this great question which concerns religious freedom. You are the defender of the weak and of Catholics. I had thought to read in your mind, to penetrate a generous and tender soul in proposing to you the defence of such a worthy cause. The name of O'Connell cannot but lend a new interest to it, and a greater brilliance.⁴

I remain, with every possible consideration,
your most humble and obedient correspondent,

Saulnier de Beauregard

Propriétaire de Melleray, Superior General of the Trappists.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Charles Saulnier de Beauregard, French aristocrat and legitimist, first abbot (from 1813) of Our Lady and St. Susan, Lulworth, Dorsetshire.
- 2 A community of Trappists, refugees from the French Revolution, was established in 1794 near Lulworth Castle, Dorsetshire, the home of the Weld family. In 1817 the community moved to Melleray near Nantes. See Ailbe J. Luddy, *The Story of Mount Melleray*, (Dublin, 1952), 35 *et seq.*
- 3 Granville (Leveson-Gower), first Viscount Granville (1773-1846); ambassador to France, 1824-7 and 1830-41. See *DNB*.
- 4 This letter was read by O'Connell to the National Political Union on 5 January 1832. He stated his intention of presenting a petition to the king and to parliament 'claiming the protection of British subjects for these unfortunate men' (*MR*, 6, 7 January 1832). He did not present any petition to parliament but on 2 February he asked a question in the Commons of Palmerston, the foreign secretary, in regard to the Trappists. Palmerston replied that if such persons were to make official representations to him the British government would feel bound to take such action as the circumstances might call for. (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1832, I, 454).

1858

*From Michael Sheahan, 75 Cortlandt Street, New York,
15 December 1831, to London, redirected to Dublin*

Congratulates O'Connell on being the deliverer of his country and expresses the hope that he will succeed in repealing the Union.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1859

*From Daniel Supple, Junior*¹

Tralee, 17 December 1831

My dear Sir,

A letter from Mr. Mullins addressed to the people of Kerry appeared in the *Tralee Mercury* of the 14th inst. calling on them to petition forthwith for an extension of the elective franchise, for the enfranchisement of the £10 occupying leaseholders,² the abandonment of that part of the bill which relates to the payment of rates, cesses and taxes before voting,³ for the qualification of householders in towns and boroughs returning members to parliament of all occupiers of houses at £7 rent or £7 value,⁴ for an additional number of representatives beyond the five already granted,⁵ and for the adoption of the English system of Registry.⁶ I am sure you have read this letter before now. If so, and that you approve of the views Mr. Mullins has taken, by forwarding to me a draft of a petition as recommended by him, or any other you suggest, I will have it engrossed and will obtain the signatures of nearly all the inhabitants of this town and, if you consider it advisable to get up similar petitions in other towns in Kerry,⁷ I will do so and have them prepared for you before your departure for England. Should this meet your approbation, let me have the draft as soon as possible as the sessions commence on the 27th inst. Something is necessary to be done to rouse the people here, and a few lines from you to the chamber of commerce would have the desired effect. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Attorney, Tralee. Died, 1845.

2 It had originally been provided in the Irish reform bill that the only leaseholders to be enfranchised would be those holding £50 leases for 21 years. It was finally enacted however that the leasehold qualification should be reduced to £10 (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 30, 33).

3 The Irish reform act (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 88), enacted in 1832, provided that occupiers of houses of £10 annual valuation might vote in boroughs, provided always that such occupier had paid 'all such Grand Jury and Municipal Cesses, Rates, and Taxes, if any, as shall have become legally due . . . in respect of such premises, over and above and except One Half Year's Amount of such Cesses, Rates, and Taxes aforesaid'. This clause turned out to be a source of much confusion and difficulty in the registration of voters.

- 4 The Irish reform act created a uniform £10 household borough franchise.
- 5 Ireland's representation in the British parliament was increased from 100 to 105 by the reform act.
- 6 O'Connell objected in particular to two features in the registration clauses of the Irish reform act which differed materially from the system adopted in England. The English registration was 'to be effected by a person responsible to a jury for any wilful misconduct: ' the Irish equivalent of this official, the assistant barrister, was 'totally irresponsible.' In England no claimant could be called on to show his title without notice: in Ireland no such notice was required (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 35. For a detailed analysis of the differences prevailing between the systems of registration devised for Ireland and England by the reform acts of 1832, see *Report on the Registration and Election Laws of the United Kingdom, as prepared by a sub-committee of the Ulster Constitutional Association . . .*, Belfast, 1840).
- 7 No petitions from any part of Kerry in support of reform were presented in parliament during the current session of parliament.

1860

To Bishop Doyle, Braganza, Carlow

Merrion Square, 18 December 1831

My Lord,

I could write a volume in reply to the letter with which you honoured me if I had time and could venture to trespass on your patience, and yet, it would contain little more than two ideas. The first would be expressed in the strongest terms that could indicate the unaffected desire I entertain to assuage or at least to mitigate those angry feelings which I appear to have excited in your mind,¹ disclaiming as I now do in the most respectful manner any intention of showing you either disrespect or disregard. Indeed, although I know I am perfectly free on political subjects yet I do entertain too sincere a veneration for your 'order' not to speak with respect even when the chair might be unworthily filled. How different then must my intentions be when that chair is adorned by talents of the highest class, unaffected and disinterested love of sacred duty and ardent and persevering attachment to Ireland. Indeed you ought to believe me when I say that I did not mean any offence.

The second idea would comprise what I think is my vindication for what I did say. I have arrived at the deepest conviction that Lord Anglesey is an enemy to Ireland, one of the very worst enemies Ireland can have. I know he is *not to be relied on*, but at the same time I do not believe that he is our enemy from hatred or malignity. No, he merely desires to preserve the superiority of England. Anything consistent with that superiority he would do for the good of Ireland but when the good of Ireland clashed with English domination he would with the coldest disdain sacrifice everything dear and sacred to Irishmen. No person knows better than you do that the domination of England is the sole and blighting curse of this country. It is the incubus that sits on our energies, stops the pulsation of the nation's heart and leaves to Ireland not gay vitality but the horrid convulsions of a troubled dream. Lord Anglesey is all smiles and sweetness to the Catholics. The moment they leave him he calls out the Orange Yeomanry and promises them fostering care. I have heard of his engagement this year with that bad man, Boyton² of College, that beastly caricature of a clergyman. But I weary you. Convinced that Lord Anglesey is now our greatest practical enemy I thought it my duty to protest against his being praised by so high and venerated a person whose name gives weight to any sentiments he utters. You certainly have a right to differ with me and to express your admiration of him. It would indeed be despotism to prevent your doing so. But surely I have an equal right to dispute that praise, disputing it in no language of disrespect, and to censure him as I think him censurable. It would indeed be dictation and despotism to refuse me this right, especially as I am deeply convinced that its exercise is at this moment essentially necessary both in this country and in England.

One word upon one other topic. You need not, my Lord, tell me how vitally essential to my plans of utility is the support of the Catholic clergy. There never lived anybody more deeply convinced than I am of such necessity. May I however lose that support the moment any plan or proceeding of mine is not in its nature and consequences calculated to the permanent uprising of the condition of the people of Ireland. I hope I may retain that support just so long and no longer than the good of Ireland requires. I should retain it. I look into my heart and I think I discover nothing in it that tarnishes the purity of the wish I thus express.

SOURCE: Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

- 1 In a speech at the National Political Union on 6 December O'Connell had attacked Bishop Doyle for his recent pastoral on illegal combinations in collieries in Queen's Co. (it is published in the *Pilot* of 2 December 1831). He considered that it contained unmerited praise of Anglesey's administration which had done nothing for the people but oppress them, and accused Doyle of having been deluded by 'Castle smiles' (*Pilot*, 7 Dec. 1831).
- 2 Rev. Charles Boyton (1799-1844), son of Dr. John Boyton, F.T.C.D., 1821; Rector of Conwall, Co. Donegal from 1833.

1861

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 19 December 1831

My Lord,

I am much obliged to you for the early information you gave me of the period when the House meets again. I intend to be in my place.

I am bound to tell you that Mr. Stanley has continued to perform that miracle which was supposed quite impossible. He has united all the inhabitants of Ireland in opinion upon the Tithe question and that is, in unanimous execration of his plan.¹ He must be insane, and be allowed to amuse his madness with Irish government. But I am too full of this subject to be able to write upon it. Is it possible he can think it is *the mode* in which the established church is paid, and not *the payment* itself, that has revolted the people of Ireland! That it is a mere question of *manner* and not of *matter*. Reason help him.

Indeed, indeed, I much fear the consequences of that deep-rooted conviction which is spreading far and wide, that Ireland is not only to be treated with neglect but with premeditated and stupid contempt.

In everything Irish interests are treated most contemptuously—in the excise, in the customs, in the Law, in the Reform; and lastly, the tithes are to be mitigated by giving the Parsons the dominion of the soil.

*Quem vult perdere*²—You, my Lord, do not require I should finish the sentence. I implore your kind forgiveness for inflicting my poignant anxiety on you.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 285

- 1 On 15 December 1831 Stanley moved for a select committee to inquire into the collection and payment of tithes in Ireland (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IX, 259). In his speech Stanley declared that the chief object of reform should be the removal of irritants in the mode of collecting tithes, and declared that, for this purpose, he favoured 'a general and extensive, if not an entire commutation of tithes for land' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., IX, 276-7).
- 2 The first part of the maxim which translates: Whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

1862

*From Edmund Balfe,¹ 27 Marlborough Street, Dublin,
19 December 1831, to Merrion Square*

Asks O'Connell to arbitrate on a financial dispute between him and Nicholas J. Ffrench, O'Connell's son-in-law. A very long description of the dispute.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Attorney.

1862a

From Lord Duncannon

London, 26 December [1831]¹

My dear Sir,

I rejoice that you have made up your mind to be here on the first day of the session, as there are many subjects coming on in which we are all much interested in connection with Ireland and though we may not all quite agree in the extent to which the different measures should be carried, your opinion and assistance must always be most valuable. You are well aware of my opinion as to the state of Ireland, and that that state is attributable to misgovernment. I must, however, disagree with you in the very severe censure you pass on the present Irish Government. I see much that must be done but you make no allowance for the situation in which they came into power and the difficulty of altering old habits and prejudices. Consider the difficulty of naming even the tithe question and whether you thought it possible a year ago that such a subject should form a topic of the King's speech.² You may think Stanley's

proposal does not go far enough but surely it will be a great advantage to relieve the people from tithe proctors, ecclesiastical courts and process servers and yet you will find many who think he has gone too far, far too deeply into the Church establishment by even proposing this Committee.³ Do you believe the House of Commons would have entertained the question at all if much more had been proposed? With respect to the Irish Reform Bill, I regret as much as you can do that it does not give additional members to Ireland and that some other alterations are not made in it, but I cannot shut my eyes to this, that it opens nineteen boroughs and gives a free election to the other towns and cities. This must counter-balance many defects, and indeed, you acknowledged to me in London, covered many faults in it. I am sure you will use your talents and assiduity when you are here in improving rather than condemning generally measures that are in themselves good and I am therefore glad that you come over at once.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 44-45

- 1 FitzPatrick gives the year of this letter as 1835 but internal evidence proves that the correct date is 1831.
- 2 On the opening of parliament on 6 December 1831 the king's speech suggested making 'improvements in the Laws' concerning Irish tithes.
- 3 This select committee, with Stanley as chairman, was set up by the Commons on 15 December 1831 (see letter 1861, note 1).

1863

From Leslie Grove Jones

Brooks's [Club], [London], 30 December 1831

My dear Sir,

. . . I certainly have not the nationality which particularly distinguishes you and which leads you and your partisans to covet forming Ireland into a separate state or kingdom connected alone by a federal pact. . . . I cannot understand the feeling which leads you so perpetually to declaim about Ireland's being provincialized. I am confident Ireland would gain nothing by a repeal of the Union, . . . that her taxation would be only increased and a check given to her industry. Let her cease to be an integral part of the Empire, where would her productions find a market, would not her over-flowing popula-

tion become aliens in Great Britain? Do we English not maintain to the injury of our own people the thousands and tens of thousands of your necessitous countrymen? Should I pay any poor rates but triflingly so, were the Irish not fed in this country? That you have been misruled and oppressed is undeniable, that you are still misruled must be also admitted and that a great correction of abuses must be made before you should or ought to be satisfied. The dawn of justice has however appeared. . . . Have but a little patience, await the reform of the Imperial Parliament, the sun will then rise and shine upon Ireland and a real Union will be formed. . . . Englishmen are generally prepared to get rid of the system of tithes and of the political influence of the clergy in England as you are in Ireland. . . . Get rid of the nominees and let real representatives be sent¹ by the people and I am convinced you will have no longer reason to complain. . . . I cannot therefore but feel that the steps which you are now taking may endanger the question of reform and generally injure the Empire. . . . You are exhausting your strength by an excitement that may lead to disturbance but not effect independence. The report² of the Union is evidently yours and why you should have introduced the subject of the Ballot I do not divine, when every real reformer by general assent had left it unnoticed, however, decided an advocate he might be for its introduction and establishment because he would not give a handle to the enemy to make still further opposition to the measure of government. . . . I am as staunch an advocate . . . of the Ballot as yourself but as the Ballot has nothing to do with the annihilation of nominee representation, of proprietary boroughs and of rotten corporations and the great extension of the franchise as proposed by ministers, I remain tranquil and equally so as to the direction of Parliament. Why embarrass ministers? Why throw additional obstacles in the way? . . .

The Ballot and triennial parliaments will follow. . . . The present measure of reform is but a means to effect a still farther reform. . . . The certainty of victory is not so secure as to authorize the sounding of trumpets before the combat has been fought and won. There are I fear many more difficulties to overcome than you contemplate. . . . I apprehend that the conduct of your Union will only tend to increase the difficulty and protract the contest. You are evidently a corps which from its great vanity will perpetually act independently and often take up a dangerous position from obstinacy which may en-

danger the safety of the whole army. You are partisans whose discipline is so imperfect that your assistance cannot be relied on. The commander-in-chief must form his line without placing you in it and have a corps to watch you as if you belonged to the enemy. I hope there is much more talking than any intention to act.

How can it be expected or hoped for that the forty-shilling freeholder should as yet be reestablished³ in Ireland? Who could or who would vote for it? Will you have such an ally as Henry Hunt? . . . Who were your forty-shilling freeholders? Were they not serfs? Would they not be so again at this moment? In practice it is yet impossible, it is impracticable, it would be mischievous, it would not benefit the poor man but it would injure him. It would not enfranchise the peasant but restore him to slavery before he had barely tasted of liberty. Hereafter it may be restored. It will not be refused by Englishmen when it shall not give strength to the great proprietor not to a party nor to a priesthood nor to any popular and deservedly popular chief. For the purpose of emancipating your countrymen, as a means of securing that blessing, did you not yourself sacrifice the forty-shilling freeholders? If I mistake not you voted for the abolition of such franchise or, rather, gave your assent to it. Why now introduce its restoration? You are however quite right in urging that a distinction should be made as to the amount of the household franchise between England and Ireland and that seven pounds in the latter should be as equivalent to ten pounds in the former. . . . This distinction equally applies to Scotland and also to the northern counties of England, nay even to the southern and western ones. . . . Ten pounds is not too high for the metropolis and it may be also fitted for the great towns and cities. . . . But your 'else', your 'else'⁴ I must confess is laughable. It rises to the absurd. What did the 'else' of the Volunteers⁵ amount to? What did it produce? Are you prepared to fight and are you capable of fighting? . . . Calculate your means before you rush on to the hazard of such a contest. . . . You tell me yourself there is no organization but there is a general feeling growing to a struggle against English authority, a feeling to war. If there be lamentably that feeling, it ought not to be encouraged, and that *man* who could allay it ought to do so. I readily grant that five members is not a sufficient increase of your number of representatives. . . . You are one third of that [the population] of the Empire but when property and taxation are taken

into consideration you are not more than as a fifth, and a fifth part you are fairly entitled to, and then you would only be entitled to 113 and a fraction. . . . The declaration [by you] of a positive number and that no other shall or will be accepted is too pompous and it exposes you to more than censure—to ridicule. . . . The common observation is, ‘O’Connell cannot be honest. He has some selfish object in view.’ ‘Does he want another subscription?’ is the enquiry. Personally I sadly regret all this because I feel you are evidently losing your consequence and that you will have to fight your battle over again in the House of Commons. Your great talents must always command respect but do not rely on them against public opinion. . . . You seem to have made a great mistake, that all Ireland is concentrated in yourself and that the Government has only to look to you and to the Catholics, that the Protestants and Dissenters are below zero and are not deserving of any consideration. . . . They are a powerful body and demand great consideration, not so much probably from their comparative numbers with you but from their moral and political superiority, from their more perfect organization, from their wealth and also from their being armed. They are at least 1,600,000 and do you consider a tolerably well disciplined corps of yeomanry of 27,000 stout men excited by as violent and probably more determined spirit than yourselves as nothing? . . . Have you arms in the south and west as they have in the north? Will all the Catholic gentry join you? Will all the rich tradesmen of your faith unite with you? Will all your clergy declare for you? Will all your Hierarchy sanction your conduct? Will there be no schism, no division? . . . As a soldier and having a local knowledge of Ireland and knowing somewhat of the Irish character I will tell you that you will be finally crushed. You will not have merely to fight against mercenaries . . . but against your fellow countrymen . . . assisted by regular troops. . . . Do not build upon popular tumult in England. You may see a repetition of the Bristol horrors but you will have no organized insurrection against the government. . . . Ireland will be saturated with the best blood of your countrymen. . . . You alone are capable of preventing the great mischief that is fast gathering. . . .

. . . I allow that your whole statement of grievances can be substantiated and that you would readily carry on their number to 100. You have more reason on your side than I would wish you to have. All the law appointments you name

were wrong. . . . Stanley's conduct is most reprehensible. He is as desirous to leave Ireland as you are to be rid of him. . . . Let the Reform Bill pass even as it is with all its defects. Only have a little more patience. The Lords are yet most malignant and as infatuated as ever. Nothing but a great creation⁶ will do. I am working hard to effect it. . . . I hope you will not delay your coming over. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 That is, to parliament.
- 2 A report on the third reform bill drawn up by O'Connell and adopted by the National Political Union on 22 December 1831. The report expressed disappointment that the suffrage was not further extended by the bill, and that it made no provision for the ballot (*Pilot*, 23 Dec. 1831).
- 3 O'Connell's above mentioned report included a demand for the restoration of the franchise to the forty-shilling freeholders in Ireland.
- 4 A reference to the threat contained in O'Connell's above-mentioned report to commence a new agitation for Repeal should its demands in connection with the Irish reform bill not be met.
- 5 A reference to 'Free Trade—or else!', one of the slogans which the Volunteers in 1779 had slung around the pedestal of William III's statue in Dublin. By 'else' the Volunteers were indicating (if not too seriously) a revolution.
- 6 That is, a creation of a sufficient number of peers to outvote those opposed to the reform bill.

1864

This letter is now numbered 1793.

1865

*From George Colomb¹ to Merrion Square*Knockbren, Gatehouse, N[orth] B[ritain],² 1 January 1832

My dear Sir,

. . . I write to you as the son-in-law of Sir A. B. King in whose cause³ I understand you are still generously exerting yourself and, without further preface, in consideration of your valuable time, allow me at once to ask you if you think in sincerity he has any chance of obtaining justice or redress in his cruel case by a further appeal to Government or Parliament.

He speaks, as he has a right to do, of your great kindness and seems to understand that from your exertions and those of other Irish members of the Commons House of Parliament he is almost sure of success. The unjust and unexpected blow which demolished his fortunes left not his mind unscathed and he is unfit for active business.

He believes his speedy presence in town necessary and wishes me to accompany him. My time is much and valuably occupied but still I ought not and would not refuse to assist him if I could be assured of the chance of a good result or that there was something more than the bare hope of success and that his presence with that of some active friend in London is absolutely necessary.

Of you, Sir, stranger as I am, I hesitate not to ask that question confidentially or not. I am an Englishman but a strong friend to Ireland. Need I other excuses for this appeal to you? Certainly not, and though I could urge others, I will not use them.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 George Thomas Colomb (died 1874), major on half-pay. Married, 1819 Mary, third daughter of Sir A. B. King. See *Boase*.

2 That is, Scotland.

3 See letters 1826, note 3 and 1907.

1866

From John McMullen

Blackhall Street [Dublin], Tuesday, 3 January 1832

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to remind you of the argument before the recorder this day.

As every effort will be made and readily sanctioned to defeat our application¹ I have been requested to submit to your consideration some observations of which you are better able to estimate the value than I possibly can be. They are founded on the servants wages act² which I beg leave also to enclose.

You will have seen with satisfaction the result of my application to the treasury on the subject of the city dues on shipping.³

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 McMullen had discovered that a series of pre-Union enactments imposing restraints on the Dublin coal trade were liable to become operative again on 25 March 1832, when the most recent act passed for their temporary suspension (51 Geo. III c. 11) was due to expire. Several applications seeking the permanent repeal of the restrictive enactments had been submitted to Anglesey, Spring Rice, Stanley and Sir Henry Parnell, by persons connected with the coal trade (*DEP*, 3 Jan. 1832). See also letter 1672, note 4.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 McMullen had recently presented an application to the treasury on behalf of the trading and manufacturing interests of Dublin, complaining that certain fees were being collected for the Dublin corporation by the customs officer from ships frequenting the port. He received a reply from Spring Rice which stated that the collector of customs had been forbidden to collect fees for Dublin corporation (*FJ*, 3 Jan. 1832).

1867

From the Wolverhampton Political Union

Wolverhampton, 3 January 1832

Sir,

I am deputed by the Council of the Wolverhampton Political Union¹ to express our sentiments of approbation and esteem for the uniform, zealous and uncompromising exertions

you have ever evinced in the cause of Reform and to mark our admiration at the vastness of your genius and the magnificence of your eloquence. Grateful for what you accomplished time past, the *emancipation of the seven millions*, for which and your patriotic efforts to restore us to our political rights, we earnestly desire to express our feelings of unfeigned thankfulness, and humbly solicit an opportunity to present an address as a memorial of our gratitude to the *Great Liberator* of religious disabilities.

If you could spare an hour on your route to London on the opening of parliament, perhaps you would then allow us an opportunity to present an address from *ten thousand humble but honest men* and you will afford them that which will leave your impress indelibly engraved on their affections. If then you can devote so much of your valuable time, we propose meeting you in procession at the entrance of the town; accompanying you to the hotel where a deputation from the union will wait upon you and present the address. After that the procession will escort you to the outward boundary of the town; and you will leave ten thousand whose hearts will be too full to express all their gratitude.²

I have the honour to be, Sir, your very obedient humble servant,

Richard Fryer, Jn., Hon. Sec.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 One of the numerous radical organizations established in several parts of England after 1830 in order to rally mass support for the reform bill. In October 1831 all the local political unions were united in the National Political Union which confined itself to supporting the ministry's reform proposals (Halévy, *Triumph of Reform*, 45.)
- 2 O'Connell accepted the invitation. He arrived in Wolverhampton on 19 January, received a public reception and addressed a crowd gathered to welcome him (*FJ*, 24 Jan. 1832).

1868

From Abercrombie Willock to Merrion Square

45 Great Windmill Street, London, 5 January 1832

Dear Sir,

I have had the honour of being deputed by certain

emigrants, inhabitants of Prince Edward Island, to deliver to you for due presentation petitions to His Majesty and the Honourable House of Commons 'on a subject of vast and essential importance to the dignity, credit, strength and stability of His Majesty's Colonial Government, and to the improvement and prosperity of this Colony.'¹

My friend, Mr. Patrick Trant, of 8 Bachelor's Walk, Dublin, will have the pleasure of waiting on you with a copy of the petition to His Majesty. The other to the House of Commons contains the same facts and by the petition you will be better enabled to have an idea of some of the great abuses existing in that part of the world than from any statement of mine by letter. . . .

I shall be anxiously expecting to have the honour of a personal interview with you in London. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 This petition does not appear to have been presented.

1869

From Frank P. Dwyer

Friday, 6 January 1832

My dear Sir,

In reference to Mr. Shea Lalor's motion for the appointment of an agent in London¹ allow me to remind you that, notwithstanding my humble pretensions, I am nevertheless a candidate for that honour. . . . I would have the office in London divided into three *separate* departments [the first would be exclusively for the use of Irish M.P.s, where they could meet, read Irish newspapers and deal with correspondence, and obtain necessary information on Irish affairs. 'Mr. Leader complained and very justly at Kilkenny that the Irish members could not act as they should have acted in the Castlepollard and Newtownbarry cases² because they had not the necessary information.' The second department should be for the use of persons connected with private bills, petitions and witnesses from Ireland. The third would be for the use of members of the Political Union of Ireland³ and serve as a branch office of the main office in Dublin]. I would respectfully submit that such an office in London where . . . there are at least 50,000 Irish residents, would add incalculably to the

strength, numbers and funds of the Political Union of Ireland. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Shea Lawlor gave notice of a motion in favour of appointing a parliamentary agent in London at a meeting of the National Political Union on 5 January 1832 (*FJ*, 6 Jan. 1832). Lawlor does not appear to have persevered in his motion.
- 2 See letters 1854, note 6 and 1824, note 3.
- 3 The National Political Union (see letter 1851, note 2).

1870

From William Smith

William 4th Greatancots Street, Manchester, 10 January 1832
Sir,

The national convention¹ chosen by the people have carefully examined the Reform Bill proposed by Lord John Russell and . . . have unanimously come to the conclusion that it will not give satisfaction to the country. . . . They have drawn up a reform bill expressive of the just claims of the British people, they have also made ample provision for Ireland, they have given 4 members to the city of Dublin and also 4 to the county. You will be pleased to take this for the sample.

The convention will forward you a printed copy of their bill. Your answer to this will be thankfully received.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Presumably a reference to the National Political Union (see letter 1867, note 1).

1871

To Colonel Leslie Grove Jones

Merrion Square, 14 January 1832

Confidential

My dear Colonel,

I start for London on Monday so as to be in my place on Friday. Many thanks for your friendly intervention.

The *Satyrst* was sent me but the enclosed¹ will give you an idea of the prime mover. The others are a half maniac but

ingenious of the name of Hynes² and the Miss Courtenay whose name is Mrs. or Madame St. Julien, an elderly strolling actress. I do not care twopence for anything unless I am able to bring home to Hunt. But secrecy is necessary on this point. Of course I at once set about enquiries. But, mark this, I am accused of seducing a client in 1817. I have discovered she was an actress in Thornton's [Kernton's?] Company in England during the years 1815, 1816 and 1817, particularly at Gosport in the Isle of Wight. Hunt says she has *children*. I have ascertained *she has not one!!!* I thought that it would not be easy to manufacture a son of fourteen years. You will perceive how necessary it is to keep these [*sic*] secret because, if it was known that I found out the woman was actually childless, they would sooner accuse me of burking it than give up the imposition. My simple object is to bring the matter home to Hunt. If I do not that, I do nothing. Keep the enclosed for me and, of all things, make no indiscreet use of it. In great haste as I write this I cannot avoid thanking you most heartily for the interest you show me.

SOURCE : Letter book of Leslie Grove Jones

- 1 A note in Jones' letter book: 'Mr. O'Connell took no notice of my letter of counsel but writing to communicate to him the calumnies that were in circulation against him he wrote me as follows [above letter] enclosing a most extraordinary correspondence with Hunt'.
- 2 P. S. Hynes, 115 Crawford Street, Portman Square, London; otherwise unidentified.

1872

From Leslie Grove Jones

Upper Gloucester St. [London], Sunday, 22 January [1832]

My dear Sir,

You have not shown and have, I fear, been making a *dinner* speech at Birmingham.¹ I like you best in the House of Commons. . . . I am anxious to have a long talk with you on the earliest occasion and to restore to you the copy of the most extraordinary letters² I ever read. Hunt is scarcely worthy of your notice. If *he* be the prime mover, you may be totally indifferent to the calumny. . . .

SOURCE : Letter Book of Leslie Grove Jones

On 20 January O'Connell entered Birmingham on his way to

London. He was received by the Birmingham Political Union and addressed a crowd reported as consisting of some 15,000-20,000 persons. In his speech O'Connell demanded a reform bill for Ireland fully equal to that about to be given to England, which would involve, among other things, the re-enfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders, and the raising of the Irish representation from 105 to 125. O'Connell stressed that he would, in any case, support the English reform bill. He also denied that Repeal meant separatism, and pointed by way of proof to the American system of local legislatures. Finally, he condemned the corn laws (*FJ*, 24 Jan. 1832).

2 See letter 1848.

1873

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 February 1832

My Dear FitzPatrick,

I cannot write to ask of the distillers respecting my son's brewery.¹ I am acting for them as a *public* man on *public* grounds,² and unfortunately doing them very little good. I therefore am sorry to refuse your request but I could not comply with it without feeling that I was availing myself for private purposes of parliamentary exertions such as they are. Besides, is it not quite clear that the distillers are driven from *your shop* either because they find it more their interest to deal elsewhere? In which case I would no more influence them, if even I could, than I would take any other bribe, or by their thinking that they owe me no gratitude, or from a combination of both causes; so that in every view of this subject, anxious as I am for the success of the brewery—and my anxiety is very great—I will not in any way interfere with the distillers, that is, while I am in parliament. When I leave the House and return to my profession, I then will not hesitate to canvass for the interests of my darling child, but until then not one word. I am not the less grateful to you for the suggestion from which I thus differ. I know it proceeds from the present desire to serve the interests of my darling child. Nothing new. The TITHES ARE GIVEN UP.³ Depend on this.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 288

- 1 O'Connell had recently established his son Daniel as one of the partners in a new brewing firm entitled Daniel O'Connell, Jun. &

Co., in Watling Street, Dublin. FitzPatrick was one of the partners. The partnership was dissolved on 21 June 1841, the brewery continuing, but under the name of John Brenan and Company (*Dublin Gazette*, 22 June 1841).

- ² See letters 1836, note 2 and 1854, note 20.
- ³ Contrary to O'Connell's expectations the government did not give up the tithe arrears without a struggle. In June 1832, 2 Will. IV c. 41 was passed (see letter 1906, note 4). Under this act a vigorous campaign for the collection of tithes was launched between June 1832 and June 1833, by the police and military. The campaign proved an expensive failure, little more than £12,000 of the arrears being collected at a cost of about £26,000 (Macintyre. *The Liberator*, 185).

1874

From Thomas Steele

London [c. 14] February 1832

My dear Sir,

I have not introduced the words '*Subsequently to last July*' without a cause although they may appear to be quite immaterial in the order.¹

*There never was any business transaction between you and me previous to Mahon's publication in July.*²

Exceptio probat regulam—and I do not care that all the world knew of this present exchange of your draft on your banker for my order on the receiver.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- ¹ On the reverse side of this letter is a note from Steele to Pierse Carrick, dated 14 February 1832, requesting him to pay O'Connell £52 'which I have got from you subsequently to last July, in exchange for this order on you, as the Receiver appointed by the Court to get the rents of my property, and to pay me the allowance it decided on when an application was made by my counsel'.
- ² This publication has not been traced. It was probably in reply to it that Steele published a letter in July 1831, claiming O'Gorman Mahon had accused him in public of having forged his [O'Gorman Mahon's] signature to certain bills. Steele denied the accusation, and claimed he had letters in his possession proving O'Gorman Mahon had earlier accepted these bills (Steele to the *Morning Chronicle*, 12 July 1831).

1875

From Geo. Colomb

Junior United Service Club, Regent St. [London],
[c. March 1832]

My dear Sir,

We have been day after day expecting you in town and I just find from your son that you are not expected here till some time after Easter.¹

In Sir Abraham's cruel situation² delay may be dangerous to him and we know not what to do.

It appears absolutely necessary that you and Mr. Lefroy should see my Lord Althorp and he himself expects this.

We are wholly averse to Mr. Lefroy's seeing Lord A. himself either alone or with anybody but yourself, as the case cannot be so well as in your powerful hands. But Sir A. may be without means to go on.

Pray oblige us so far as to let me know *when you will be over* or *how we should proceed*, should they force on the Estimates now or soon after Easter. You said Mr. Goulburn's letter³ should not be printed or circulated with the others. Should it be shown to Lord Althorp first and then printed or do you wish to produce it yourself? In haste to save post but with *every respect* and *apology* for this trouble.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 O'Connell was in Dublin from 4 March to 24 April (F), 5 March, 25 April 1832). Easter was 22 April.

2 See letters 1826, note 3 and 1907.

3 Unidentified.

1876

To his wife care of Maurice O'Connell, M.P., 4 Parliament Street, London

Tralee, Tuesday [13 March 1832]

My own darling Love,

I got no letter from you last night which annoys me as it always does when any accident prevents me from hearing from you. The cause of *Hurley -v- Crosbie* has not come on but is fixed for first tomorrow morning. I hope it will be over early in the day. At all events I mean to go to Killarney to-

morrow night so as to reach Clonmel for dinner hour on Thursday. I go by Mallow, Mitchelstown etc.

I get a great public dinner¹ here this day which upon the whole I am rather sorry for as it will keep me out of bed later than I could wish. You will hear a flaming account of my various receptions.² Everything is arranged for a most *amazing* entry into Cork. If the day be fine we shall have one hundred thousand persons in my train.³ I perceived that Maurice spoke on the tithe question but as usual he is miserably reported.⁴ I am not sorry that the rascally ministry are so very pertinacious on the subject of the Irish tithe committee. It will show everybody how little reliance is to be placed on the present administration and how little we have to expect from even the liberal English party. . . .

I wish to God we were together, darling, and that Derrynane agreed with you as well as London. But I hope, darling, that you will come back so stout as to be able to *run about*. I am getting a road from the end of the kennel road to the chapel which will greatly extend your usual drive and thus give you a little *circuit* of your own. I will take care to have a good car horse for you, love.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell made a triumphal entry into Tralee on Sunday, 11 March, being met five miles from the town by a crowd which increased 'till the road, as far as the eye could reach, became one dense, black, moving mass. Horsemen, carriages, people, wands, banners and musicians—all crowded in one interminable chain, presenting a splendid and awful spectacle'. On Tuesday 13 March he was entertained at a public dinner in the chamber of commerce (MR, 19 March 1832).
- 2 On 15 March O'Connell was given a public dinner in Clonmel which was attended by 'upwards of 170 gentlemen'. The roads between Cahir, Mitchelstown and Clonmel were 'so densely crowded that O'Connell's carriage travelled only at a walking pace' (FJ, 20 Mar. 1832).
- 3 See letter 1877, note 1.
- 4 On 8 March Stanley moved for the Commons to resolve itself into a committee on the tithe question. Charles Brownlow, supported by Maurice O'Connell, proposed an amendment that 'with a view to a full inquiry into the whole question of tithes, and to the just appropriation of church property, the debate be adjourned till the whole of the inquiry be concluded by the Tithe Committee, and the evidence and the Report be both laid before the House'. The amendment was defeated by 313 to 31 (Hansard, X, 1331-42).

1877

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Cork, 19 March 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . There never was such a scene as we had yesterday.¹ It is impossible to form an idea of it without having been a spectator. It beat all the processions I ever witnessed all to nothing. It is decisive of the Repeal. You may smile at this but I think you would not if you saw the respectable and *considerate* thousands who shouted for it yesterday—Protestants, Catholics and Presbyterians.

I supposed that all the householders of Dublin were to be assessed under the recent cholera statute.² I therefore did not subscribe but if there be no present assessment, send £20 for me to the Mansion House and send *privately* £5 to the Rev. Mr. Ennis in Townsend Street and £5 to Mrs. MacAuley³ at the convent, Baggot Street. Let these two be perfectly private. . . .

I will write again to you from Bath. I cannot express to you my anxiety to hear daily from Dublin.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 289

- 1 A reference to O'Connell's triumphal entry into Cork which appears from press reports to have been a very impressive one (*FJ*, 21 Mar. 1832).
- 2 The act referred to (2 Will. IV c. 9 'for establishing fever hospitals and for preventing contagious diseases in Ireland') became law on 20 February 1832. The act provided that the lord lieutenant might advance money when necessary from the consolidated fund to local health officers, for which advances the inhabitants of the parishes to which they were granted were afterwards to be assessed. Cholera had already occurred in Britain; it appeared in Belfast on 16 March (*DEP*, 20 Mar. 1832), and in Dublin about a week later (*DEP*, 27 Mar. 1832). Early in March 1832 the *Dublin Evening Post* deplored the fact that almost nothing had as yet been done by the citizens of Dublin to guard against the disease apart from the work of the Mansion House Committee which had received £5,000 from the government (*DEP*, 6, 8 Mar. 1832).
- 3 Catherine McAuley (died 1841), foundress of the Sisters of Mercy.

1878

From Royal College of Surgeons Anatomical Committee

Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, 23 March 1832

Sir,

I have the honour to transmit to you the enclosed resolution of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland [a resolution, passed on 15 March 1832, thanking those Irish M.P.s who had exerted themselves to procure a legislative enactment to facilitate the study of anatomy in Ireland and to uphold its school of surgery], and respectfully to acquaint you that the anatomy bill as altered in committee does not appear to the college at all calculated to facilitate the study of anatomy in Ireland or to protect the public from outrages by persons employed to procure subjects for dissection; and that they have communicated this their conviction to Mr. Stanley and requested him to oppose the extension of a measure so imperfect and inappropriate to this country.¹ [Signed by Francis White,² chairman of the anatomical committee.]

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Much difficulty was at this time encountered by the (Irish) College of Surgeons in obtaining corpses for dissection, due to the fact that no legal provision existed by which it might obtain a regular supply of cadavers. In the Commons on 6 February 1832, in the course of a debate on the proposed English anatomy bill it was stated that a deputation from the (Irish) College of Surgeons was in London 'for the purpose of obtaining for Ireland a bill for regulating the schools of anatomy, similar to the English bill now in progress through the House. Those gentlemen believed that such a bill was necessary to prevent the schools in Dublin from being abandoned'. O'Connell declared on this occasion that if an anatomy bill were not passed, students would abandon Britain and Ireland for France 'where bodies could be procured for a few francs' whilst Sheil declared that 'so much were bodies in demand in Dublin that . . . £20 was given for one though formerly it might be had for 20s.' (*Hansard*, IX, 1277-8). Stanley wished to test the English anatomy bill before legislating similarly for Ireland (*Hansard*, X, 836-7). However, the anatomy bill, enacted on 1 August 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 75), applied both to Britain and Ireland.
- 2 Francis White M.R.C.S.I. (born 1757), 41, Dawson Street, Dublin; son of John White and a native of Dublin, educated T.C.D.; a prominent surgeon.

1879

*To his daughters Kate O'Connell and Betsey Ffrench,
Athleague, Co. Roscommon*

Cork, Monday, 26 March 1832

My own Betsey and my darling Kate,

. . . Now what I want is this, that you should keep my intention of going to see you a profound secret until after my arrival. Nobody in the County of Roscommon has seen me and therefore my arrival would, if announced, subject me to an enormous crowd. I therefore, darlings, wishing to spend my time quietly with you, request and *insist* you will keep my secret. . . .

SOURCE : Kenneigh Papers

1880

To his wife, 4 Parliament Street, London

Roscrea [Co. Tipperary], Friday, 30 March 1832

My darling Love,

Here I am, darling, after another splendid triumph. I left Cork at eight yesterday morning and arrived at two at Cahir. I was met there by *the procession* which continued the ten miles to Cashel. There were at least from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand persons, banners, bands etc. I made them a long and merry speech, afterwards a public dinner, everything admirable. I leave the public papers to give you the details.¹ I am here only for a few moments on my way to sweet Betty.² I was not one bit fatigued by my exertions yesterday, and never had a more refreshing sleep. I could rave of the scenes I have gone through. I however now write only a hasty line, darling. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 According to a press report O'Connell's entry into Cashel was 'the proudest spectacle which we have ever witnessed', the road between Cahir and Cashel being thronged by a crowd of between 200,000 and 300,000 (*FJ*, 4 April 1832).
- 2 See letter 1879.

1881

To his wife, 4 Parliament Street, London

Fortwilliam [Co. Roscommon], Saturday, 31 March 1832

My darling Love,

How delighted I was to find that you *thought of me* and directed your letter here. I got it before we left the breakfast table at *half after twelve*. I found my darlings quite well, Betsey thin but looking well and, I am assured, feeling and being well. She has passed it seems the time of great sickness as her mother *sometimes* used. Catty is perfectly well. So are Morgan and Ffrench.

I came all the way from Cashel yesterday. I left it at ten but did not arrive here until past twelve as I got the rascalliest driver in Athlone who ought to have had me here a full hour sooner. This is a sweet pretty place, in a flat country but with a good view of water. I read Maurice's speech¹ in the *Pilot* and like it very much. He was perfectly right throughout and the men who deserted him on the tithe question will find themselves woefully mistaken when they come back to Ireland. He really spoke excellently. I am going out to ride. Baldwin² bid me take as much horse exercise as I could and positively ordered me to take *some* every day. I am determined to take his advice and to ride or walk every day while I am in London. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 On 27 March, Stanley, in again moving that the House go into committee on tithes, referred slightly to the minority of 31 members who voted against his motion on 8 March (see letter 1876, note 4). Maurice O'Connell thereupon declared 'It was not a question between 27 Irish and four English, and 314 English members—not between a minority and a majority in that House, but between a minority and a majority of the people of Ireland.' 'He cared not,' he declared, 'for the opinion of the majority in that House. He looked to Ireland for his majority'. He added that it was in Ireland, and not in that House, that the question of tithes would be settled. He condemned the three quarters of the Irish members who had failed to vote in the division in question, and concluded by accusing the government of deliberately withholding the evidence of the select committee on tithes (*FJ*, 31 Mar. 1832).
- 2 Probably Dr. Herbert Baldwin.

1882

To his wife, 4 Parliament Street, London

Merrion Square, Tuesday, [3 April 1832]

My own darling Love,

. . . Darling, we left Betty¹ quite well yesterday morning. We were detained about three hours at Athlone by processions, speeching etc., came on then to Clongowes where we did not arrive until near nine at night. I billeted Morgan and Catty upon a Mr. Aylmer² in the vicinity and slept myself at Clongowes having first devoured a quarter of beef. Catty got her dinner from the Jesuits and helped to demolish a turkey and a ham. Danny³ is grown full and does not look so tall as he did when I saw him last. Banish all kind of uneasiness on his account. It is not possible for him to be better. You will find my Kate also in perfect health and Morgan as stout as a lion. Tomorrow week will, please God, bring us to you. We go down tomorrow to Ballinamona⁴ and return on Thursday. I must conclude without saying one half of what I have to say to you of Danny and the Jesuits. They praise him to the skies and are in raptures about Maurice—*so am I, sweetest.*

[P.S.] 8 days to vacation.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 1881.

2 Very probably of Painstown, Co. Kildare.

3 His youngest son, then at school at Clongowes Wood College.

4 Home of his son-in-law Christopher Fitz-Simon, near Arklow, Co. Wicklow.

1883

To his wife, 4 Parliament Street, London

Merrion Square, Wednesday [4 April 1832]

My own darling,

And so you would not write to me on Monday. I was going to call you a saucy cocknose but no, darling, I saw your letter to Hannah¹ and that makes me *quiet* as to Maurice.

. . . We go down in an hour to Nell's,² Kate and I, and will be up again tomorrow. I myself never was better in health or spirits. . . . Maurice should write to Sir Francis Freeling³

complaining of this misconduct.⁴ . . . Get Maurice to be on the lookout for a safe horse for me to ride. I must ride every day. Baldwin⁵ ordered me horse exercise and I found it agreed admirably with me in Connaught. . . .

[P.S.] Seven days to vacation—hurrah!!!

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 A maidservant.
- 2 His daughter, residing at Ballinamona, Arklow, Co. Wicklow.
- 3 Sir Francis Freeling (1764-1836), secretary to the General Post Office, London. Created baronet 1828. See *DNB*.
- 4 The misconduct had presumably some connection with Maurice O'Connell's mail.
- 5 Probably Dr. Herbert Baldwin.

1884

From Patrick D. Madden¹ to Merrion Square

Tarbert [Co. Kerry], 10 April 1832

Sir,

I feel called upon to acquaint you that on the 2d inst. Captain Pierse Leslie² accompanied by his yeomanry corps (who are chiefly composed of Orangemen) marched in battle array with their guns and ammunition etc. to the lands of Kilcolgan in this parish, for the purpose of erecting a salmon weir on the strand of said lands (contrary to the will and pleasure of the tenants who hold said place by virtue of a lease) which they effected by their united forces, by land and water and not content with a vast number whom they dispatched well armed by land, but likewise ordered off a bribed host of his bloodthirsty yeomen in his sailing boat who anchored within a musket shot of said weir in order to annihilate the owners of said premises if they only attempted to take up the poles which he erected on their strand. They were ready to fire upon the unarmed industrious people by a signal given by their whitewashed captain and certainly would have killed numbers of them, had not their landlord, Thomas O'Connor,³ intervened, and agreed to leave the matter in dispute to the decision of Council [*sic*]. Not content with their illegal and murdering intentions at the shore-side they returned to Tarbert in an intoxicated state more like hired murderers than loyal subjects. If his Majesty's arms and ammunition are to be

abused after this manner by an Orange yeomanry corps God only knows where their unguarded fury will end. This whitewashed captain and his hellish corps are exciting the minds of the people who are the most peaceable in the world. I am sure he expects to get the commission of the peace again from which the lord chancellor removed him for reasons best known to himself. I forgot mentioning that his permanent serjeant, Wm. Gallagher, in company with a few pensioners conveyed his corps to the intended field of slaughter. All this can be authenticated by most respectable witnesses.

In consequence of the public odium which I incurred those years past from the aristocracy of this neighbourhood by subscribing my name to many letters which I wrote against them together with my having my chief support from Protestants whose children are at my school, I would be extremely obliged to you to keep my name secret on this occasion. You have the reins in your own hands chiefly to curb their career and keep them within the barriers of justice and loyalty. In a word, unless this Orange corps are disarmed this part of the country will shortly be in as disordered a state as the county of Clare. Therefore all devolves on your patriotic influence either in the House or elsewhere to give publicity to this naked and well known fact.

P.S. I have written this day to your son, the member for Clare, on this subject. We request you will have the kindness to speak on this matter before the House of Commons and demand an immediate investigation why his Majesty's arms and ammunition should be thus used for the destruction of the peaceable and industrious portion of *his* constituents in this part of the country.⁴ We don't interfere in the legal rights of either party in erecting a weir, be that their own question. We only publicly complain of the whitewashed captain and his Orange myrmidons using the army on so uncalled for and unconstitutional an occasion.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Patrick D. Madden conducted a 'hedge' or 'native' school at Kilnaughtin (Tarbert). A classicist of some repute he had in 1835 some thirty-four pupils who paid fees.
- 2 Pierse Leslie (1795-1872), Aghana, Tarbert, Co. Kerry; captain-commandant of Tarbert yeomanry; formerly in Kerry militia.
- 3 Of Aghana Green, Tarbert, Co. Kerry.
- 4 No evidence has been found to show whether O'Connell complied with this request.

1885

From Richard Boyse Osborne

Graige, Bannow, Taghmon [Co. Wexford], 10 April 1832

Private and Confidential

My dear Sir,

. . . The independence and liberty of this county *hitherto great* is in jeopardy and may fall beneath the tyranny of aristocrats and milk and water Liberals.

Our independent press¹ which *really* did immense good to the cause is dead and *all* our aristocracy rejoice therein, and with but three exceptions not one would contribute (*though pressed to do so*) a guinea to save it nor yet to get up *now in this hour of need* another. John Talbot, the only Catholic who came forward, offered 20 g[uineas]. [Apparently another person offered 100 and a third 20 guineas]. . . .

Carew,² who certainly is no ultra Li[ber]al, though my connection, and does not despise either the Castle or its aristocratic minions, will be raised to the peerage and his apathy to say the least has *annihilated* his popularity. A vacancy takes place³ and *not* an *honest*, straightforward man qualified can be found to come forward to the hustings. Thus Valentia and Rowe,⁴ on the *Episcopal* gold and saintly sovereignty of lordlings will walk over the course and they will get a footing that if suffered to go by at least without a powerful struggle, ultimately will *unseat* Lambert who deserves well of his county.

Sir T. Esmonde is spoken of but his withdrawing from our Newtownbarry conflicts⁵ and from *the People* and from the public zeal renders it very doubtful (even if he would spend a guinea which it [is] said he will not) he would be *by* the people supported. Talbot will not. Wm. Harvey⁶ has one *leg in the grave* and it is a question whether the C. Clergy would be *zealous*, without which nothing [[?] can] be effectually *done*. Thomas Boyse neither has strength of body nor would anything induce him to quit this for to him alone is due the merit of keeping alive the national [[?] cause]. . . . Under these circumstances I am induced by our little Liberal *knot* here to implore you to address the county through the medium of the *Pilot*. Your voice would animate the lethargic, intimidate the *ferocious*, decide the calculating *looker out* for *which way* the

winds may blow and though last not least give zeal and energy to the *People's* Clergy.⁷

Believe me, their ability to serve our cause can only be equalled by the monstrous *system* of corruption of Church and State. No man living is *more* zealously bent in labouring hard to *revolutionize them*, that is, turn a system of evil into *good*. *My labours*, I am told, have not proved abortive particularly in aiding that divorce between *Church* and *State*, their long course of *adulterous intrigue demands at the bar of national justice*.

Pray read the enclosed⁸ and forward it with a line to Barret. I know no man we could place reliance on *better*.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 There were several Wexford newspapers in existence about this time.
- 2 Robert Shapland Carew (1787-1856), only son of Robert Carew, Castleborough, New Ross, Co. Wexford; M.P. for Co. Wexford, 1812-34; created, 1834 Baron Carew; 1838 Baron Carew (U.K.).
- 3 That is, the vacancy which Osborne anticipated in the event of Carew's being raised to the peerage.
- 4 John Rowe J.P., D.L., (born 1809), son of Ebenezer Rowe; Ballycross, Co. Wexford.
- 5 See letter 1824, note 3. What was Esmonde's connection with that affair is not known.
- 6 Probably William Harvey (born c. 1767), s/o Rev. Christopher Harvey, of Kyle. Called to the bar, 1792.
- 7 No such address by O'Connell has been traced. Neither does he appear to have made any references to Wexford politics in his speeches of the time at the National Political Union.
- 8 Unidentified.

1886

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Merrion Square, Saturday, 14 April 1832

My Dear John,

. . . I also intend to send you £500 to pay off so much *principal money* of my Iveragh debts. I am in a hurry to get rid of all my debts all over the world. *I have* £5,000 lent on a mortgage of stock to keep by me. This I do not touch. I have settled that is paid off or deposited £2,000 out of Betsey's fortune. Blessed *be the great God* I expect soon to be quite independent and not to have my income cut down by auditors.

Is there anybody that teazes you particularly for money. If so, state it to me and we will, with the help of God, get rid of that auditor. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

1887

From William R. Hilliard, Ballylongford, Co. Kerry

16 April 1832

The writer asks O'Connell to get a job such as revenue officer or mounted coastguard for Ulysses Fitzmaurice.¹ He says: 'although I well know you keep aloof and always have done so from Government, yet . . .'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Probably one of the nine sons of Maurice Fitzmaurice, of Duagh House, Listowel.

1888

From his brother James to Merrion Square

Lakeview [Killarney], 18 April 1832

My dear Dan,

. . . I thank you much for the offer you make me of the loan of £5,000 if I am making a purchase which I have no occasion for. . . . My landed property I intend to divide between my sons *Maurice and Dan* and if I should be able to save as much money as will provide for *my other children*, without leaving a heavy debt on my small landed property, it will in my humble judgment be the most prudent course for me to pursue. Borrowing money to purchase land has generally been found a most ruinous speculation. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1889

To O'Connor Don

Friday [22 April 1832]

My dear friend,

Will you join my son and me with Major McNamara in a

chaise and four to Liverpool? I have here the chaise which brought my family up. It will contain us comfortably. We can send our servants by the public coach. You will thus travel¹ comfortably and sufficiently expeditiously.

SOURCE : Clonalis Papers

- 1 O'Connell left Dublin for London on 24 April 1832 (*FJ*, 25 April 1832).

1890

To Walter J. Baldwin, 91 Newman Street, Oxford Street,
London

Worcester, 29 April 1832

My dear Walter,

I received your letter since I left Dublin as I proceed with my family by easy journeys to London. . . .

In the meantime you must not publish anything about *my fair friend*.¹ What she wants most is to have a controversy raised and I am sure that no friend of mine who appreciates her attack at its just value will indulge her in a controversy. You therefore, let me say it, *must* not indulge you *cacoethes scribendi* on this subject as I am sure that my request which is very unequivocal will decide you not to publish one line upon the subject. Nothing could annoy me on this subject but a publication purporting to come from a friend.

I do not understand your allusion to Sir Robert Peel. Let me know in a letter directed to Bath. Has he taken any part on this subject?

If you have got her book² keep it for me. I should be glad to see what she has written. Does she specify the day on which she alleges the crime was committed? . . .

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 Very probably a reference to Ellen Courtenay (see letter 1848, note 1).

- 2 See letter 1848, note 2.

1891

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Bath, 3 May 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write again to urge you to send me to London the receipt

of the Hibernian Bank for, if possible, £3,500. I am anxious to have this receipt before me on my arrival in London.

I am also anxious to hear that you and all friends are well. I trust in God the malady¹ is diminishing; it is an awful visitation. We are—blessed be the great God!—in excellent health.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 289

1 The cholera epidemic (see letter 1877, note 2).

1892

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Bath, 3 May 1832

My dear John,

[Routine business dealings, O'Connell apparently paying off debts including £1,100 to John Collis of Kinsale.]

Get Cahirciveen cleansed, whitewashed and as far as possible purified. I will readily sacrifice ten pounds or if necessary twenty for this purpose. The back yards of several of the houses were exceedingly filthy. It is incumbent to have cleanliness everywhere. Should this pestilence¹ reach that country, convert the old bridewell at my expense into an hospital or, if the new be finished, use it for that purpose. Give Mr. Fitzgerald² in the event of the malady reaching you forty pounds from me to be laid out in *nourishing* the most destitute, for nourishment is of all things the best preservative. Nourishment and cleanliness are the two great protectors under God from this malady. Indeed I should hope that we are likely amongst our mountains to be free from it. It has principally settled in large towns.

[P.S.] Prevent Maurice from throwing away more money on his yacht. See whether you could get the boiler which is at Derrynane set up. It is not a steam boiler but a common one.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 The cholera (see letter 1877, note 2).

2 Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, P.P., Cahirciveen.

1893

To James Dwyer

Brooks's [Club] [London], 17 May 1832

My dear Dwyer,

Everything is in train of settlement, and I am told a public and satisfactory announcement will be made this evening.¹ The fact is that the people of England must *have Reform*.

This alone would make me regret the aid you tender to our political Union.² Mere reformers in Ireland are not worth a bullrush. I would not be at the trouble of courting them. You must have seen that I do not urge on the Repeal when it could interfere with Reform but I utterly decline making any bargain on this head. I will not postpone the Repeal by contract although I tacitly allow it to stand over for a fitter season which is now very near. The English Reform Bill will be law in ten days,³ and from that moment the Repeal will be our cry; it will serve every purpose. In the first place it will compel a better Reform Bill for Ireland in order to disarm some of those who would otherwise join in the Repeal. Secondly, it will prepare the English mind for the more direct and constant agitation of the Repeal measure. It is absurd to suppose anything else could serve Ireland. It is impossible to manage Irish interests by men who are either careless or inimical even from mercenary motives. I totally reject your proffered aid and unpatriotic friends.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 291

- 1 Grey had resigned on 8 May on the defeat of the reform bill in the Lords. Wellington accepted the king's invitation to form an administration, but was forced to abandon the attempt on 15 May. The king at once recalled Grey, who desired Wellington to give a public undertaking that he would abandon further opposition to the reform bill. It was expected that Wellington would make the announcement in the Lords on 17 May. However, he delayed his announcement until 19 May, and made it then only when he discovered that the King had consented to create peers (Halévy, *Triumph of Reform*, 54-8).
- 2 Probably a reference to the National Political Union. O'Connell's expression of opposition to Dwyer sprang no doubt from the latter's desire to support Lord Grey in the hope that his ministry would bring about Irish reforms. Such a course implied at least a temporary abandonment of Repeal. For an open expression of Dwyer's lack of enthusiasm for Repeal see letter 1915, note 2.

- 3 The English reform bill (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 45) became law on 7 June 1832.

1894

From Edward Dwyer to House of Commons

Dublin, 27 May 1832

My dear Sir,

. . . your series of [public] letters¹ will do us much service with our *new* friends² in England. They will show clearly the way we have been treated and the way in which our Viceroy-leader proposes to treat us. You will be pleased to hear how well the people of Kildare and Carlow behaved at the late attempt to force a sale of Mr. Germain's³ cattle for tithes. Dominick Ronayne passed through them on Friday. They were drawn up in close columns in the rear of the army with the neighbouring clergymen riding in front to preserve order. Not a man tasted spirits. Of course all were sober. When the Sheriff ordered the sale to commence, not a bidder could be found. The Officer Commanding (I believe Major Ryan)⁴ was informed that a man with a musket was concealed behind a cowshed. He immediately went and found him with some more of the McKew⁵ family. He interrogated him and it appeared that he belonged to a Yeomanry Corps. He was taken prisoner to the barracks, his gun examined. It was charged with powder and balls. What might have been the consequence had this scoundrel fired on the army as he evidently intended, it must have been either a Newtownbarry or Carrickshock affair, lamentable in either case. Every man had his hat marked with *NO TITHES*. The Sheriff ordered the cattle home to Mr. Germaine and the immense multitude gave him and the army three cheers. Mr. R[onayne] says they numbered over 40 to 50,000. They dispersed in the most orderly manner, their clergymen leading the way to their parishes. You may rely upon it that, let the Parliament vote as they may, *Tithes are abolished in Ireland*.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- : Two public letters to Dwyer, dated 15 and 21 May were published in the *Freeman's Journal* of 18 and 25 May 1832. The first of these letters suggested in the event of a dissolution the exaction of a pledge from all Irish parliamentary candidates of support for the English and Scottish reform bills, and the extension to Ireland of

a bill shaped on similar principles. It alleged that while O'Connell was doing everything to support Grey's ministry, the latter's servants in Ireland were being paid to undermine him (O'Connell). In his second letter O'Connell made a lengthy attack on Anglesey's administration. A third letter from O'Connell addressed to the reformers of Great Britain and dated 23 May 1832, set out the inequalities obtaining between the English and Irish reform bills and reiterated his demand for a bill equal in all respects for Ireland. This letter was not published in the *Freeman's Journal* until 28 May but was probably known to Dwyer a few days previously.

- 2 Presumably a reference to the radicals and more liberal Whigs in Britain.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 Thomas Ryan, 50th foot.
- 5 McKew was one of the names by which agrarian secret societies were known.

1895

*From P. V. FitzPatrick, 27 Eccles Street, Dublin,
28 May 1832*

Sends £300 as requested by O'Connell.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1895a

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 30 May 1832

No news. The English Reform Bill is going on swimmingly. The Irish Bill is as bad as bad can be. If my son should come across you, explain to him how impatient I am for his arrival here.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 292

1896

To Edward Bulwer¹

[c. June 1832]

[excerpt]

I am as convinced as you are of the great advantage the

cause of genuine Reform would obtain from his return.² His readiness to carry the Reform Bill into practical effect towards the production of cheap government and free institutions is enhanced by the talent and information which he brings to the good cause. I should certainly express full reliance on his political and personal integrity, and it would give me the greatest pleasure to assist in any way in procuring his return, but that, as I have told you, I have no claim on Wycombe, and can only express my surprise that it should be thought I had any.

SOURCE : William Flavelle Monypenny, *Benjamin Disraeli*, I, 212

- 1 Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer (1803-1873), M.P. at intervals from 1831-66; novelist and litterateur; created baronet, 1836; 1866 created Baron Lytton of Knebworth. See *DNB*.
- 2 Benjamin Disraeli (1804-1881) was not elected to parliament until 1837.

1897

From William Cobbett

Kensington [London], 19 June 1832

My dear Sir,

I congratulate you on the evidence of rage in your enemies last night.¹ It proves that you are working with effect. As to the *fighting* part of the matter, the rascals do not recollect that when Mr. Thistlewood² challenged Sidmouth, the judges *put him into jail for it* though Thistlewood was much more upon a level with Sidmouth in point of *real rank* than these villains are with you.

Mr. Scales³ says 5,000 people will meet you *in his quarter*. Perhaps he will write to you on the subject but I shall see him on Friday. You are doing incalculable good by the agitation.⁴

SOURCE : *Irish Monthly*, XI, 402.

- 1 In the Commons on 18 June both E. G. Stanley and Philip Crampton accused O'Connell of not being a gentleman because he insulted opponents with abusive language and then refused to fight duels when challenged (*FJ*, 22 June 1832).
- 2 Arthur Thistlewood (1770-1820), the celebrated Cato Street conspirator and member of the Spencean Society; challenged Viscount Sidmouth, c. 1818, and jailed; hanged for conspiracy 1 May 1820. See *DNB*.
- 3 Michael Scales.

- 4 O'Connell was at this time agitating in London in support of the granting to Ireland of a parliamentary reform equal to that received by England. On 16 June he addressed a meeting of the National Union of the Working Classes (presided over by Michael Scales), and attended by William Cobbett, at which a resolution was passed in support of the extension of such a measure to Ireland (*DEP*, 19 June 1832).

1898

*To John Walter*¹

4 Parliament Street [London], 21 June 1832

Sir,

I venture to address you *in your proper person* because I have to ask a favour.

Let me say by way of preface that if the House had continued to sit another half hour I should have exonerated the management of the *Times* from all blame. I intend to do so *in my best manner* tomorrow.²

I have seen Mr. Nugent,³ the reporter, and am quite satisfied on the subject of the report. The favour I venture, therefore, to ask is that you will overlook his error. I should feel unhappy if I were the means of doing him any injury.

It is quite true that I can have no means of compensating you in any mode for granting me this favour but I will not be the less sensible of it.

Will you, then, allow me to say that if, on the whole, you think I have any claim to have my feelings consulted, you will comply with my request and grant me this favour?

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 294

- 1 John Walter (1776-1847), second son of the founder of the *Times*; sole manager of the *Times* from 1803, sole editor, 1803-10, joint editor, 1811-47; M.P. for Berkshire, 1832-7, Nottingham, August 1842-April 1843. See *DNB*.
- 2 O'Connell had complained in the Commons on 20 June of a breach of privilege committed against him by the *Times*, which, he claimed, had deliberately misreported one of his speeches of the previous night in such a way as to place him in a very unfavourable light before the public (*FJ*, 25 June 1832). He evidently intended to refer again to the matter on 21 June, but the House adjourned prematurely on that day because a quorum was not present (*FJ*, 25 June 1832). On 22 June he informed the House that 'the gentleman who reported the speech in question had since waited on him and

convinced him that the mistake was quite unintentional and that the conductor of the *Times* could have no knowledge of it, and that he perfectly acquitted the reporter of any intention to misrepresent him' (*F*), 25 June 1832).

3 Michael Nugent.

1899

From [?Daniel] Egan¹

Mountrath [Queen's Co.], 25 June 1832

My dear Sir,

It has just occurred to me that as Sir H. Parnell has forced an enquiry into the state of the Queen's County² that I should put you in possession of as many facts connected with it as may be useful to assist in the examination of witnesses etc. Sir Henry is a great fox and as all his measures have had the appearance when first broached of being for the good of Ireland and ultimately being rather curses than benefits, he must be well watched. Stanley's acknowledgement that he caused the change in the registry clause³ is capital. I saw a letter from him a few days after quitting office⁴ in which he expressed himself quite confident that the ministry would be changed. He is the representative of the aristocracy of this county except [almost a line illegible] he would not be supported by a Liberal in the county.

There are a number of persons summoned to attend. I shall mention what I know of their different characters.

Col. Johnston,⁵ Stradbally, a half-pay officer, a new magistrate, a most violent party man with a violent temper, a brother to Sir Allen Johnston,⁶ a Biblical, has another brother a minister⁷ and magistrate, one of the most disliked men in the county. William Wellesley Despard,⁸ nearly the last of a most bigoted family. He has the remnant of the estate, about £300 a year, a distressed aristocrat, a hasty tempered man, an open avower of Orange and Brunswick principles, an active magistrate looking out for a place, has had many informers in constant practice, is supposed to have the command of money for such purposes. Edge,⁹ a tool of Lord De Vesci's, Secretary to Grand Jury, Queen's Co., a cunning Scotchman. Rev. Mr. O'Connor, P.P.,¹⁰ Maryborough, a most zealous priest, a very humble man in appearance but not so in reality, the Liberals of the Queen's Co. always considered him too

much under the influence of the aristocracy, has a pension from [the] Grand Jury for attendance at Jail, has much information collected by Dr. Doyle who, I understand, had him summoned.

Rev. Mr. Delany, P.P.,¹¹ Ballinakill, a very prudent, sensible man and an honest patriot. Mr. John Bray, Mountrath, a shopkeeper here, a singular character having singular ideas on almost all subjects, a sort of oddity. He knows little of the causes of the disturbances, being rather a cautious person and a very cold politician. He has some notion that if estates were allowed to be broken up and sold in small parts it would do much good. . . . He knows much about the corrupt practices of a magistrate here (Dr. Smith)¹² who turned his authority as a magistrate and Dispensary Doctor to the best account he could for his personal interest. Mr. O'Reilly¹³ of the Heath near Maryborough, a distressed magistrate, every man's man apparently but in heart a rank Tory but said to be a man of talent. It is said Mr. Despard, Johnston, Edge etc. go to show that it was the opposition to tithes which causes the disturbances but such is not the fact. They were in existence two years before Mr. Lalor's¹⁴ speech at a County meeting at Maryborough when he declared he would never again pay tithes.¹⁵ This was in reality the beginning of the opposition. If I can be of any use, command me.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 A brewer.

2 On 31 May Parnell moved for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the disturbed state of the Queen's County. O'Connell, Thomas Wyse and Nicholas Leader criticized the motion, and Wyse successfully moved an amendment altering the committee's aim to an enquiry into 'the immediate causes which have produced these events and the efficiency of the laws for the suppression of outrages against the public peace'. Egan attaches to his letter an interesting report on the disturbances.

3 Speaking in the Commons on 18 June on the Irish reform bill, Stanley declared that 'the alterations made in the present bill, . . . in reference to registration, were recommended by Irish members . . . on the ground that the machinery did not exist by which the plan originally contemplated could be carried into effect in Ireland.' He mentioned Parnell as one who had recommended the change (*R*), 22 June 1832).

4 Parnell had been appointed secretary at war on 4 April 1831 but was dismissed at the end of January 1832, mainly for refusing to support the ministry in the division on the Russo-Dutch war ques-

Dr. Boyton my hearty thanks² as a private gentleman and quite independent of politics. I wish it may be in my power to show them, and especially Mr. R. Sheehan, the readiness and the pleasure I should have in doing anything that could oblige or serve, I am very glad . . .³ has attacked me, because it has enabled me to see the personal good qualities and high-mindedness of men who have been, and are upon principle, my very violent and most decided political enemies. It is pleasant to find that Irishmen are better than our passions and prejudices make us imagine.

I trust, between you and me, that the day is not distant when we will join our 'little senates,'⁴ and compose only one body concerting together for the good of Irishmen of every class and persuasion.

I want £200. I want the sum without delay. Send it to me by return of the post. I allow these things to remain over too long, and then have to use an urgency which might easily be spared.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 294-295

- 1 Thomas Sheehan, part proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Mail* with his brother Remigius Sheehan, having bought Joseph Timothy Haydn's share in 1824. They were made freemen of the city of Dublin in 1828 being, according to the *Morning Register* of 28 August 1828, the first Catholics since the 1793 relief act to receive this honour. In fact, they were *lapsed* Catholics.
- 2 The files of the *Dublin Evening Mail* throw no light on this reference. It has probably some connection with the allegations recently made concerning O'Connell by Ellen Courtenay (see letter 1848, note 1; also letter 1903).
- 3 W. J. FitzPatrick has left a blank against this person's name.
- 4 O'Connell probably had in mind the National Political Union (see letter 1851, note 2) and the rival Irish Protestant Conservative Society founded the previous year, of which Boyton and the Sheehans were members.

1901

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

[London], 17 July 1832

My dear John,

We are preparing to leave this vile town for Derrynane. . . . I beg of you to enquire of Dr. Baldwin whether he could not

procure me a young physician or surgeon of sufficient skill to reside in my family till November, to be ready to go with me to Derrynane and to remain there taking care of us all until November. . . .

I am anxious about my warm bath. I hope and trust to find *an useful* boiler for the hot water, ready set and fit for work. I also desire to have the bath itself made water-tight. The lead that was put on it as lining was quite too thin. You must give it a second lining over the first of sheetlead twice as thick as the present coat. It will thus be made water-tight leaving of course a place to let the water run off when the valve for that purpose is opened. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1902

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 19 July 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

I wrote to you yesterday for £200. I now draw another draft on you. Send £10 *privately* to Mrs. MacAuley, Sisters of Charity House, for the sick poor under their charge. Send £10 *privately* also to the Rev. Mr. Ennis, Townsend Street, for the sick poor under his charge. Send also £10, the first instalment of my subscription for the new chapel in Westland Row.¹

You will perceive by the newspapers that I have succeeded² for Sir Abraham Bradley King. I venture to assert that between both parties he would have been left a beggar if I had not taken him up. May God forgive me if I be wrong, but I do not think the act will be thrown away when we come to our next effort for conciliation.

I have now disembarrassed myself of my share of public business and, if the Kilkenny Assizes be postponed, will be able to attend.³ I leave, please God, for Bristol next Monday. I intend going by Cork and Killarney to my mountains to prepare for another campaign which, with the blessing of God, will be more useful for Ireland. You have seen in the papers what a triumph Brady has—I mean J. C. Brady—over the Chief Justice and our rascally Irish judges on the subject of peremptory challenges in transportable felony cases. The

Attorney-General and Campbell⁴ declared themselves decidedly in favour of his opinion.⁵

[P.S.] I do not think Stanley will be able to carry his Tithe Bill⁶ this session. His prosecutions⁷ are considered silly and vexatious.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 296

- 1 The new church of St. Andrew of which the foundation stone was laid in April 1832 and in the construction of which O'Connell took a keen interest. As a resident of Merrion Square it was his parish church and replaced Townsend Street Chapel which had been erected in 1750. It was built at a cost of £26,500 (Nicholas Donnelly, *Hitory of Dublin Parishes*, II, [Dublin, undated], 144, 151-3).
- 2 For details of King's case see letter 1826, note 3. On 18 July O'Connell asked Lord Althorp whether the government intended granting compensation to King, and declared that Lord Francis Leveson Gower had given him authority to state that, had the government under which he (Gower) acted, and under which an arbitration committee had recommended payment of compensation to King, not granted King that compensation, he would have resigned. Upon this Althorp declared he would 'take the earliest opportunity of bringing the subject forward, and recommend the payment of the sum agreed upon'. Peel and Goulburn spoke in support of carrying out the arbitration committee's recommendation (*FJ*, 21 July 1832).
- 3 At the Kilkenny assizes which opened on 19 July, eighteen persons were due to stand trial charged with the murder of twelve policemen in the notorious tithe affray at Carrickshock, Co. Kilkenny, in December 1831. It was expected that O'Connell would defend those accused (*FJ*, 21 July 1832). He did not, however, do so. All the accused were acquitted (*FJ*, 23, 24, 25, 26 July 1832; Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 184).
- 4 John Campbell (1779-1861), solicitor-general of England November 1832-February 1834; knighted 3 December, 1832; attorney-general for England March-December 1834 and April 1835-June 1841; lord chancellor of Ireland 22 June-3 October 1841; created Baron Campbell of St. Andrews on 30 June 1841. See *DNB*.
- 5 On 18 July O'Connell questioned the attorney-general (for England), Sir Thomas Denman, concerning the right of peremptory challenge in cases of felony (by peremptory challenge is meant the right of objection to particular jurors without showing cause. In cases of felony the number of jurors who might be so challenged was twenty). In Ireland, O'Connell claimed, a distinction was made between cases of felony punishable by death, and cases of felony

punishable by transportation. He believed this distinction was not founded in law, and asked the attorney-general whether it prevailed in England. The latter replied that it did not. Peel and the solicitor-general for Ireland, Philip Cecil Crampton, objected to the raising of the question, the latter stressing the fact that the lord chief justice and 'another eminent judge' in Ireland had recently argued that the distinction was founded on authority. O'Connell replied that the point had originally been raised and 'very ably argued by a distinguished young barrister, Mr. Brady; and he [O'Connell] fully concurred with him, that the distinction was not founded in law' (*FJ*, 21 July 1832). John Campbell also considered the distinction did not prevail in England (*FJ*, 21 July 1832).

- 6 The Tithe Composition Act (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 119) which received the royal assent on 23 August 1832. For details of its workings see Macintyre, *The Liberator* (186-7). The act shifted responsibility for the payment of tithes from tenants at will or from year to year to the landholder immediately above them. O'Connell declared himself strongly opposed to this part of the bill, which he described as 'the most violent invasion of private property I ever read of', and called on Irish landlords to petition against the bill (O'Connell to the *Pilot*, 16 July 1832, *FJ*, 19 July 1832).
- 7 Doubtless the prosecutions authorized by 2 & 3 Will. IV c. 41. See letter 1906, note 4.

1903

From P. V. FitzPatrick to London [first letter]

Dublin, 19 July 1832

Private

Dear Sir,

I shall throw myself in the way of Mr. Sheehan of the *Mail* as you desire and express to and through him to Dr. Boyton your estimate of their gentlemanlike conduct with relation to the attempts [about 1 word illegible] their services in the propagation [1 or 2 words illegible] slander.¹ Since I wrote, that *person* has made a new application to Sheehan abandoning the claim previously put forth as upon a political enemy of yours and requiring him as a journalist to send a reporter to the Lord Mayor's Court to which the Party will now, it appears, refer with a view of obtaining an order to see an alleged child. I believe this a very silly attempt, that Court being incompetent to entertain the application. If you think

anything necessary to be done to defeat the matter, however, I shall have the proper steps adopted under instruction.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13651

1 See letter 1900, note 2.

1904

From P. V. FitzPatrick [second letter]

Dublin, 19 July 1832

Dear Sir,

Herewith you have an order for £200 which you wished for without delay. . . . I also enclose Dr. O'Reardon's bill in your favour for £100. . . . I have paid on your account also the premium on the life assurance to the Royal Exchange Company. . . .

Sir David Roose has undertaken to make the preliminary enquiries respecting Rev. Mr. Kelly's¹ state of health with a view to the proposed assurance of his life for £1,000 for your indemnification. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 Probably Rev. Matthias Kelly, P.P., St. James' parish, Dublin.

1905

From P. V. FitzPatrick to London

Eccles Street, Dublin, half after post hour, 19 July 1832

My Dear Sir,

'Of a verity' I *am* chagrined at having been too late for the post by a minute today with the remittance you required and which must now reach you with this letter. I hope however it will still arrive in sufficient time for your purposes. A good deal of gossiping anxiety is evinced respecting your appearance at the Kilkenny assizes. Great fears are entertained of numerous convictions and inevitable executions in the Carrickshock case¹ as new evidence of a very direct nature is asserted to have been obtained by the crown since Kennedy's acquittal.² The testimony may perhaps be considered irrefragable even by the friends of the accused but, were you personally present as their advocate, strong hopes would be enter-

tained for them from the *Caesaren vehis* feeling which induces the Irish people to rely so much not only upon your great powers but also on your *fortune*. By the way this goddess is clearly a jilt to all who court her *without proper pretensions*.

Evans³ of Portrane is, I believe, certainly *up* for the county of Dublin and a very active rumour makes Christopher Fitz-Simon likewise a candidate.⁴ A *good* authority assured me yesterday that no man will be returned by the county that refuses the pledge of *Repeal*. The same is averred of the city of Limerick with the addition that the 'Representative Aspirant' must exhibit *your* introductory letter. So much for the tattle. As to the *lettera scripta*, I conceive your communication⁵ to the *Newry Examiner* regarding your vote in support of Shaw one of the most useful of the many valuable papers that have recently come from your pen. It *was wanted* and it must satisfy every fair man who quarrelled with the line you adopted on that occasion. Stick to the system of conciliating the north. It is the very true mode of *nationalising* us, and the time has arrived at which this paramount object can be effected. When dissent from the people at large *ceases* to be profitable it will be felt to render the dissentients uncomfortable. The results are quite intelligible. You may with justice take credit for the good temper exhibited by the Ulster Catholics on the 12th instant.⁶ It was purely your work.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 See letter 1902, note 3.
- 2 Kennedy was one of those acquitted in the first Carrickshock tithe trial in March 1832. He was, however, remanded in custody on another charge connected with that affair (*FI*, 20 July 1832). An affidavit from the crown solicitor stated that the jury had been intimidated in this case, and the attorney-general had in consequence put back the trial of the other prisoners to July (Nicholas Leader in the Commons on 30 March, *FI*, 2 April 1832).
- 3 George Hampden Evans, Portrane, Co. Dublin; son of Hampden Evans, United Irishman, M.P. for Co. Dublin 1832-41.
- 4 Evans and Fitz-Simon were elected for Co. Dublin on 22 December 1832.
- 5 O'Connell to the *Newry Examiner*, 10 July 1832, republished in the *Freeman's Journal* of July 1832. The *Newry Examiner* had stated that O'Connell supported 'Mr. Shaw's motion for continuing the franchise to non-resident freemen'. In reply O'Connell denied that any such motion had ever been made by Shaw. What Shaw did seek to have incorporated in the Irish reform bill, O'Connell claimed, was the right granted by the English bill of the franchise 'to all

future freemen becoming entitled to it *by birth or servitude*, as of right, *upon the condition . . . of residence*'. O'Connell said he had supported this motion of Shaw's though it would be more useful to Protestant than to Catholic operatives because of the nature of Irish corporations. 'I was not deterred by these or any other considerations from supporting a measure which would put Irish operatives, no matter what their religion may be, on the same footing, in point of political rights, with the operatives of England.' 'I wish', he added, 'to be understood in the North of Ireland. I think that if the Orangemen of the North understood my views . . . as well as all classes, including both the Catholics, the Protestants and the Orangemen of the South—there would be little difficulty in reconciling all Irishmen to each other and thus becoming so strong in our mutual cooperation as to be soon able to restore to Ireland legislative independence and general prosperity.'

6 The day of the annual celebrations by Orangemen.

1906

From P. V. FitzPatrick to London

Dublin, 21 July 1832

My Dear Sir,

Your several ten *pounders* shall be duly *discharged*.¹ I read your letter to Mr. Sheehan yesterday who set great value on the compliment and conveyed his proper share of it to Mr. Boyton.² Mr. S. remarked that effects of an *important* nature might be found prospectively to be produced by the interchange of such kindly sentiments between parties hitherto so actively belligerent.

The accounts of this morning left the jury still shut up after two hours' deliberation in the first Carrickshock case³ and an acquittal was confidently anticipated. Your non-appearance caused great disappointment and dismay. I send you the *Dublin Gazette* of Thursday with its 'supplements' occupied as they are by the proclamations and schedules rendered necessary by the precious 'Act to facilitate the recovery of tithes'.⁴ Here are the advertisements connected with *three* recusant parishes out of upwards of 2,000. Rely upon it, the expense of printing if matters are followed up in this way will make a *very large instalment* on the total amount of the tithe tax to be recovered. Advertisements in the *Gazette* are always charged exorbitantly. Say one shilling per line and the ruled work of the schedules justify a great increase of price being

called by printers from that circumstance and the small amount of manual labour expended on it 'A bit of Fat'. When to this formidable outlay for mere printing the legal gentlemen, whose province it is to take proceedings against defaulters, bring in their small codicil of charges, the public pocket will be picked in a way that would do honour to the best days of the old regime. Lest your privilege⁵ might be too heavily encumbered I send the *Dublin Gazette* under Maurice's covers. If you intend making any use of the point with which this information arms you it might be well to enquire . . . the price of advertising in the *Gazette* as I am at this moment but inaccurately informed on the subject.

Every day convinces me that the antagonist party in Ireland will speedily be predisposed to conciliation and, through their moral and numerical powers in Ulster, they are yet quite capable of fatally impeding the progress of Ireland to the position of a nation. They are mistakenly influenced by the apprehension of the establishment of a Catholic ascendancy, and every good Irishman should seek to disabuse them of an idea which is as injurious to our common interests as it is untrue. . . .

[P.S.] I have just saved myself from stupidly sending the *Gazette* under cover. It will reach you as any other stamped newspaper.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letter 1902.

2 See letter 1900.

3 See letter 1902, note 3.

4 2 Will. IV c. 41, 'An Act to facilitate the Recovery of Tithes in certain Cases in Ireland, and for Relief of the Clergy of the Established Church', which received the royal assent on 1 June 1832 (see letter 1873, note 3). In the *Dublin Gazette* of 19 July 1832, are published a number of proclamations under this act directed against tithe defaulters.

5 The M.P.'s privilege of free postage.

1907

From Sir Abraham Bradley King

Spring Gardens, London, 4 August 1832

My dear Sir,

The anxious wish for a satisfactory termination of my

case,¹ which your continued and unwearied efforts for it ever indicated, is at length accomplished. The vote for compensation passed last night. To Mr. Lefroy and yourself am I indebted for putting the case in the right position to my Lord Althorp, and for his lordship's consequent candid and straightforward act in giving me my full dues, and thus restoring myself and family to comparative ease and happiness. To *you*, Sir, to whom I was early and long politically opposed, to you, who nobly forgetting this difference of opinion, and who, rejecting every feeling of party spirit, thought of my distress and sped to succour and support me, how can I express my gratitude? I cannot attempt it. The reward I feel is to be found only in your own breast and I assure myself that the generous feeling of a noble mind will cheer you into that prosperity and happiness which a discriminating Providence holds out to those who protect the helpless and sustain the falling. For such reward and happiness, to you and yours, my prayers shall be offered fervently; while the remainder of my days, passed, I trust, in tranquillity (by a complete retirement from public life, and in the bosom of my family), will constantly present to me the grateful recollection of one to whom I am mainly indebted for so desirable a closing of my life.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 297

1 See letters 1826, note 3 and 1902, note 2.

1908

To John Primrose, Sr., Hillville

Derrynane, 7 August 1832

Confidential

My dear John.

I cannot express to you how uneasy I feel about the money I received out of Segerson's¹ lands after his death. I must satisfy my mind to the last shilling. I have an impression I received £72. I will pay it all over again if I [one word illegible] and if I should not recollect, *it must be paid*. I begged of you to ascertain something for me but you did not. Where are the Brennans I put out of Bahaghs? It was for putting them out I made some compensation. There was a balance due to them of a bond debt by Segerson. I wish you

could come to me as soon as convenient. Really this subject is troubling my mind and conscience. Of course I say this in confidence.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Probably John Segerson.

1909

From Viscount Althorp

Downing Street, [London], 10 August 1832

Confidential

My dear Sir,

I find myself very awkwardly situated with regard to you. You called upon me in the House of Commons to pledge myself that the Government would do their best to carry the Irish Jury Bill¹ in the House of Lords. Before I answered you I sent Sir James Graham² to Lord Melbourne to ask him whether he would authorise me to make this pledge. Sir James Graham on his return told me that Lord Melbourne did authorise me to do so and I accordingly made the pledge to you with which you expressed yourself satisfied. I since that time have felt myself bound in honour to you to take care that this promise should be performed and have consequently repeatedly pressed the subject on the attention of my colleagues. Up to last night I had no reason whatever to believe that the Bill would not be persevered in and I heard for the first time with great surprise and mortification that it was without any communication to me abandoned in the House of Lords last night. I hear that Lord Melbourne was too ill to come down himself and that, in consequence of some representations from the judges in Ireland as to amendments which would be required, he, thinking that there was not time to make them, wrote a note down to the House of Lords desiring that the orders might be discharged. From the nature of this letter I must beg you to consider it confidential but I have felt it due to my own character to put *you* in possession of these facts.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 A government bill designed to extend the English Jury Act (6 Geo. IV c. 50) to Ireland. It passed the Commons on 2 March. On its

- second reading in the Lords on 3 April, Wellington declared it to be of 'doubtful validity' and maintained that in view of the alleged intimidation of jurors in the Carrickshock tithe trials (see 1902, note 3, 1905, note 2) it ought to be postponed. Melbourne, the Irish lord chancellor (Plunket) and Leinster urged its acceptance (*Hansard*, XI, 1248-53) and on Ellenborough's proposal the bill was referred to a 'Committee above stairs'. On this committee's issuing its report on 7 August, Wellington and Lord Westmeath again objected to the bill, the latter declaring that 'if the effect of the bill would be to make the constitution of [Irish] juries more popular, he thought that, after the recent example of Kilkenny, the time was very badly chosen' (*Hansard*, XIV, 1172-3). The bill was not proceeded with. See letters 1910 and 1912.
- 2 Sir James Robert George Graham, second baronet (1792-1861); M.P. almost continually from, 1818-61; first lord of the admiralty, 1830-4 and 1852-5; home secretary, 1841-6. See *DNB*.

1910

From Viscount Althorp

Downing Street [London], 10 August 1832

Confidential

My dear Sir,

Since I wrote to you this morning it occurs to me that I did not state with sufficient clearness that the Jury Bill was abandoned in the Lords without the knowledge of Sir James Graham or indeed of any member of the Government who belongs to the House of Commons.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1911

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 11 August 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

You will be happy to hear that my health is, blessed be God! quite restored and I now enjoy my pristine elasticity of animal sensation. There never was so great a change in the tone of animal functions in any man within so short a period. I enjoy my mountain hunting on foot as much as ever I did

and expect, with the help of God, to be quite prepared for as vigorous a winter campaign as ever I carried on. It is quite necessary.

I want you to pay the following sums for me: 1st. The ten pounds a month to the Rev. Mr. Blake,¹ for Townsend Street Chapel, as removing.² 2nd. To pay half a year's subscription for me to the *Repealer* newspaper.³ 3rd. To pay Pat Costello at his office £50 on my account. 4th. To send me down, by the Rev. Mr. L'Estrange, the *New Monthly*,⁴ *Tait's Edinburgh*,⁵ the *Irish*⁶ and the *Catholic* magazines,⁷ all for August. Send me also, if you can procure them, my four letters⁸ on the Repeal question. They were printed as small pamphlets by O'Flanagan, 26 Bachelors' Walk. Send me also the third number of Marchman's *Illustrations of Pol. Economy*,⁹ also the Reform Bill the moment Grierson gets it after it has received the royal assent.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 298-299

- 1 Rev. Michael Blake (1775-1861), parish priest of Townsend Street, 1831-3; bishop of Dromore, 1833-61.
- 2 See letter 1902, note 1.
- 3 The *Repealer and Tradesmen's Journal*, a twice weekly newspaper, was established about this time, the first of a number of newspapers which emerged from the ferment resulting in Ireland from the passing of the reform bill. It represented 'something new in Irish history, a paper designed to circulate among the working classes'. It prospered for a time but, once the initial enthusiasm for reform had waned, it collapsed under the weight of taxation (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 204-5).
- 4 *The New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, London.
- 5 *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* edited by William Tait, first published in April 1832, and issued monthly until December, 1864. It was a political and literary magazine noted for its radicalism.
- 6 The *Irish Monthly Magazine of Politics and Literature*, a radical publication.
- 7 Unidentified.
- 8 These were addressed to the People of Ireland and dated 6, 20, 24 and 27 September 1830 (*DEP*, 14, 25, 30 Sept. and 7 Oct. 1830). Thomas O'Flanagan published them as a pamphlet; *Letters on the Repeal of the Legislative Union Between Great Britain and Ireland*, (Dublin, 1830).
- 9 Unidentified.

1912

To Lord Althorp

Derrynane, 17 August 1832

My Lord,

I had the honour to receive the two letters¹ which your Lordship was pleased to write to me on the 10th inst.

For the personal civility and courtesy of these letters I feel exceedingly obliged. . . . I also recognise your right to command that it should be treated by me as a confidential communication. It shall be so as long as your Lordship pleases to treat it as such.

But you on your part will I am quite sure recognise my rights and my duties. The pledge you gave me was not a private but a public one. It was unequivocal and indeed your letter recognises it as such. It was, as you have accurately described it, a pledge 'that the Government would do their best to carry the Irish special jury bill in the Lords'. I of course admit that I was satisfied with this pledge. How is it possible I should not! Neither could I dream that it was possible it should be violated. You also candidly acknowledge 'that you were bound in honour to take care that this promise should be performed'.

But in point of fact *the pledge is violated. The promise is not performed* and allow me to request of you to recollect that this violation of a solemn and public pledge occurs at a moment when the Government to which your Lordship belongs has instituted more than one hundred prosecutions against the press² and against individuals who have taken a part in endeavouring to procure the legal extinction of tithes.³ England has this jury bill for now near six years. The last Administration was pledged to this bill for Ireland and would have redeemed that pledge. You, my Lord, pledged this Administration to it and your colleagues, knowing that pledge, have distinctly and unequivocally violated it. I therefore cannot deny that your Lordship is right when you say that you 'feel yourself very awkwardly situated'.

Although, my Lord, we have never found you since the formation of the present Administration friendly to Ireland on any one point, and although you have on every occasion supported to the fullest extent the harsh measures of the Irish

portion of your Government (I speak in the most mitigated terms possible) yet I will do you the justice to avow my most thorough and unhesitating conviction that you are as incapable as any man living of a wilful violation of your promise and that you have been deceived and in fact betrayed by your colleagues and in particular by Lord Melbourne whose unnatural alliance with a reforming ministry may instigate him to avenge himself for his sacrifice of his long cherished opinions by involving his allies in awkward and distressing predicaments. His conduct in Ireland has however prepared us to expect the worst from him, and as to his yielding to the objections of the Irish judges, why the great value of the Jury bill was that it would serve to check these very judges! We wanted it most as a protection against the judges and no country ever wanted such protection more than Ireland.

. . . Notwithstanding my gratitude for your personal courtesy I have a duty to perform to my constituents and my country in exposing this additional want of good faith on the part of the English Government. It is indeed a curious fact in our history that the Irish never broke faith with the English government and that our English rulers *never, never, never* kept faith with us.

SOURCE : Spencer Papers

- 1 Letters 1909, 1910.
- 2 For some account of these prosecutions which affected practically the whole of the Dublin press, and many provincial newspapers, see Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 197-201.
- 3 See letter 1906, note 4.

1913

To John Primrose, Sr., Hillgrove

[Derrynane] 17 August 1832

My dear John,

. . . I also earnestly request you will *at once* find out all particulars of the Brennans of Bahaghs.¹ 1st, to whom by name was the bond due from Segerson? 2nd, is that person alive or who is his representative? I cannot, my dear John, bear delay in this matter. . . .

Say to him [Rev. Edward Fitzgerald] that I will want

a Mass on Sunday—on which day Mr. L'Estrange leaves Dublin to be here before the ensuing Sunday.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 1908.

1914

From P. V. FitzPatrick to Derrynane

27 Eccles Street, Dublin, 28 August 1832

My dear Sir,

. . . I suspect that there is much of silent machinery at work to extinguish the Repeal as a pledge or recommendation at the coming elections.¹ The Committee² to facilitate the registry in Dublin will probably require to be well watched as *with some decided exceptions* they are downright Anglesey men and some of them are already chuckling at the prospect of the triumph which the Whig Government in their opinion cannot fail to have in the returns which will be made from Dublin and many other places where persons favourable to Repeal might have been expected to be chosen. They say that if you do not stand for Dublin³ the fate of the question is sealed for the next Parliament and there is little doubt of the correctness of their views in this particular. On that all-important measure the metropolis must give the example to the country at large and if Dublin shall return men of questionable principles thereon the effects will be very bad indeed. All parties allow that your election would be *certain*, and *even an intimation* that you might, if properly invited, be induced to start for the city, must be attended with most useful consequences. I opine that the Anglesey men who are active and influential will take advantage of the moment of application to register, to secure promises from the voters for some person sufficiently popular to justify their introduction. If you had no objection I would undertake (without affecting any authority from you) to get up a counterplot which would very probably derange their operations most successfully, viz. I propose to invite those anxious that you should stand for Dublin to come forward immediately and inscribe their promises of support in books which I would have opened for the purpose at central points of the City. This much is certain that through your influence alone can the metropolis be pre-

served from appearing to have abandoned at least for the present the Repeal and only by some such plan as that which I thus hurriedly suggest can that influence be made in your absence practically available to defeat the measures now in progress to put the question in abeyance. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The general election of December 1832-January 1833 which returned 39 supporters of O'Connell was remarkable for 'the highly successful use of the Repeal pledge' which was never repeated in O'Connell's lifetime. For examples of the pledge, which O'Connell used 'with brutality and some disregard for consistency' see Macintyre, *The Liberator*, (52-7).
- 2 This committee was established at a meeting in Dublin on 22 August, 1832. Amongst those attending were Joseph Denis Mullen, David Pigot, Carew O'Dwyer, Richard Barrett, and the ex-lord mayor, Sir Robert Harty (*FJ*, 23 Aug. 1832). The committee opened an office at the Commercial Buildings on 29 August. It consisted, according to a report delivered on 11 September, of 'five professional gentlemen, with clerks to assist them, in preparing notices for the registry, according to approved forms, and under the inspection and advice of counsel'. The forms were 'prepared with checks, carefully copied and preserved, so, as to secure the owner of the franchise from all hazard and miscarriage. . . .' A charge was made of 6d. for each notice, 'to which such persons as desired it' might add one shilling to pay the clerk of the peace his legal fee. In September, the committee complained of a shortage of funds (*FJ*, 12 Sept. 1832).
- 3 O'Connell was elected for Dublin city on 17 December along with another Repeal candidate, Edward Southwell Ruthven.

1915

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 29 August 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . Can you find out for me the motive for Marcus Costello's outrageous conduct¹ at the Political Union? I beg of you personally to watch him, and give me any intelligence you consider perfectly accurate as to his motives. You perceive that my mind is made up upon two points: first, that every exertion should be used to register as strong a force as possible in Dublin, without quarrelling about the candidates; and secondly, that when the time comes no candidate should be

tolerated but a Repealer. James Dwyer was very idle on this subject.² A Whig or an Angleseyite is as bad for Ireland, indeed much worse, than a Conservative. A Conservative has but one fault, which is indeed a *thumper*: he wants ascendancy—a thing impossible to be revived. But he is, after that, Irish, often very very Irish, and whilst in opposition he may be made more Irish than the Irish themselves. An *Angleseyite*, on the contrary, is a suffocating scoundrel who would crush every Irish effort lest it should disturb the repose of our English masters.

I wish I could get Boyton and Shaw, the Recorder, to join me for the Repeal.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 301-302

- 1 At a meeting of the National Trades Political Union on 23 August 1832, a discussion took place as to whether Repeal pledges should be made a condition of the Union's supporting candidates in the forthcoming general election. Marcus Costello declared 'they [the members of the election committee of the National Trades Political Union] had reserved to themselves the power of modifying or withholding any one of those pledges'. He also declared his willingness to support the candidacy of Louis Perrin for Dublin, despite the fact that Perrin was said by James Dwyer to be unwilling to give such a pledge. At this the chairman of the meeting, John Browne, declared Costello out of order. Costello retaliated by moving that Browne be called on to leave the chair. After an acrimonious discussion, Costello was persuaded to withdraw his motion (*DEP*, 25 Aug.; *FJ*, 24 Aug. 1832).
- 2 In the above discussion, Dwyer declared that the decision of the National Trades Political Union to support none but Repeal candidates in the ensuing election 'would prove most injurious to the cause of liberty at this present crisis' and that 'it would be a sure means of causing a split among the liberal party, and throw the representation into the hands of the Conservatives' (*DEP*, 25 Aug. 1832).

1916

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 31 August, 1832

One hasty line for two purposes. First, I am quite satisfied you should try how the ice will bear in Dublin. I am quite ready to coalesce with a Conservative on the basis of the

Repeal. I am also convinced that any triumph of the Anglesey party would be over the heart of Ireland.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 302

1917

From P. V. FitzPatrick

O'Connell Brewery, Watling Street, Dublin, 4 September 1832
(*Private*)

Dear Sir,

As I leave Eccles St. each morning for this Establishment before the delivery of the letters you will do well to address your communications to me here for the present. . . . You perceive that I have got the Newfoundland money,¹ the greater portion of which was absorbed by the two payments just referred to [£157]. I am sanguine at getting up the annuity² to the 'round dozen' of thousands so as to constitute a national subsidy of £1,000 per month.

The Conservatives appear to hope that the split which the Repeal may occasion³ in the antagonists party will enable them to put in both their men from Dublin. I have no doubt of their being soundly drubbed in the contest. The lower classes of voters on our side have been very active within these two days in taking proper steps for being registered but it is observed that the wealthier people are not coming forward at all. If these last shall continue intentionally disqualified it will strengthen the Repealing interest among the *Anti-Conservatives* but it *might* give Boyton and Co. a *chance*. The general impression is however that you must come in if you shall offer yourself, and Alderman Smith⁴ asserts that you can ensure the success of any colleague you may choose. Up to midday of 'this present' the Trades Union had inscribed 1500⁵ and the Commercial Buildings Committee⁶ 1200 names on their books. Have you served the necessary notice for your own vote? I presume Mr. Fitz-Simon can also qualify. If you choose to commission me in the matter I shall have it done. It may be well that you should *send the form regularly drawn in your own handwriting. This I will have posted in a conspicuous part of the offices for Registry.* The Anglesey people are quite alarmed for the issue of the coming election here

and *they* at least have good reason for their apprehensions. The Unions are *very* anxious to know how you like their proposal⁷ of Ruthven as your fellow candidate but several persons—Repealers too—think the nomination of that gentleman to have been too precipitate. I tell you *confidentially* that our friend Richard Barrett seems quite favourable to Perrin and he may be right but how can Perrin be supported by your legions if he will falter about the Repeal?⁸ You ask me what can be the motives which induced Marcus Costello's late conduct at Burgh Quay?⁹ People here are as much at fault as you in seeking to account for it. I do not find however that any direct suspicion attaches to the 'President of the Trades'.¹⁰ As to Lavelle's insinuations¹¹ they perhaps to a great degree are traceable to the acrimonious hostility existing personally between him and his '*quarry*' but it is right to state that some misgivings are abroad regarding Costello's objects and these in quarters of *proven* honesty from whence a call will be made upon you to put the party out of the capacity of being mischievous should any distinct case of evil intent be made out. After all it is a proud thing to remark how few the cases were of public delinquency in the late extensive movements of the Country¹² and until we can hit upon a palpable blot we may (with due vigilance) esteem the President a 'True Man'. I have been sedulously canvassed to volunteer my little services for George Evans who seeks the County of Dublin. . . .¹³ The hesitation on his part however to declare for the Repeal¹⁴ has so far compelled me to decline conceding whatever assistance it is in my power to give him. It must be admitted that he is among the best Irishmen of his *caste* that could be indicated in these or other days and I think his return matter of good certainly. Numbers of his supporters regret his coquetting (for it may be called so) on the great question but profess their personal attachment to him to be such as to induce them to give him a *respite* on the Repeal. He takes advantage of Stauntons '*golden mean*' for giving the go-bye to the pledge by offering, when the measure shall be brought forward, to resign his seat at the 'requisition' of the majority of his constituents provided he shall not decide on supporting it. This proposal is one in which evasion can obviously be practised with great success. The machinery is cumbrous and how is the question as to the majority to be ascertained? Occur what may, the Anglesey Party rejoice greatly at having such a candidate [Evans] for the Metropolitan County and they at

least feel assured of his triumph. A vague rumour today gives Carew O'Dwyer to Drogheda as candidate. . . .¹⁵

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 A contribution from 'the inhabitants' of St. John's, Newfoundland to the O'Connell Tribute, possibly brought by Patrick Morris (1789-1849), a native of Waterford city who had distinguished himself in Newfoundland politics and was visiting Ireland about this time. It amounted to £178.11.2 (*FJ*, 1 Sept. 1832).
- 2 The O'Connell Tribute. FitzPatrick's hope was realized. The tribute for 1832 amounted to £12,242 (*Pilot*, 2 Jan. 1833).
- 3 See letter 1915, notes 1 and 2.
- 4 Richard Smyth, 27 Harcourt Street, Dublin; lord mayor of Dublin 1823-4. Sometime chairman of the Dublin Paving Board.
- 5 This means that the registration committee of the National Trades Political Union had entered in its books the names of 1,500 persons who had applied to it to serve notices of registry on their behalf. The reform act required that persons seeking to register as electors should serve such notices of claim either on the clerk of the peace for the county, his deputy, or the high constable of the barony. Service of such notice was required if the claimant were to obtain a hearing at the registry sessions, which were held once a quarter and at which the assistant barrister acted as adjudicator. See O'Connell's *Seven Letters on the Reform Bill and the Law of Elections in Ireland*, Dublin, 1835. These were written and published in the press in the autumn of 1832.
- 6 See letter 1914, note 2.
- 7 Ruthven, a Repealer, was nominated as O'Connell's running-mate for Dublin city at a meeting of the National Political Union on 30 August but only after much argument (*FJ*, 31 Aug. 1832). See letter 1925.
- 8 Perrin had apparently refused to give the repeal pledge (see letter 1915, note 1).
- 9 See letter 1915, note 1. The National Trades Political Union held its meetings in the Corn Exchange Buildings at Burgh Quay.
- 10 That is Marcus Costello, president of the National Trades Political Union.
- 11 Patrick Lavelle was editor of the *Freeman's Journal*. Referring to the question of imposing repeal pledges (see letter 1915, note 1), the *Freeman's Journal* declared 'The only object its originators had was to cajole the people and to support the present administration. The creatures of government know that their masters are detected in Ireland—and to parry off the . . . blow, they are storming heaven and earth to cause a division in the popular party' (*FJ*, 25 Aug. 1832).
- 12 A reference to the extensive anti-tithe campaign being carried on at this time in which Costello had taken a prominent part.

- 13 Evans was elected for Co. Dublin on 22 December 1832.
 14 Evans did not become a Repealer. He was, in fact, supported in his canvass of Co. Dublin by the Whig Lord Lansdowne, who addressed a circular to his tenants urging that they vote for Evans (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 100).
 15 O'Dwyer, who stood as a Repeal candidate, was elected for Drogheda on 15 December 1832.

1918

To P. V. FitzPatrick

[Derrynane] 11 September 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

At the other side you have my notice of registry.¹ Get it served. It is for honest Ruthven and for any Corporator that will come forward for Dublin on Repeal principles. I will address the freemen² so soon as the Registry is over. The worst party in Ireland is the Anglesey party. I prefer the Conservatives to the Angleseyites. The Conservatives cannot hold together. The conservation of tithes is the basis of their union, and that takes away from them all the honest dissenters and very many Establishment Protestants.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 302

¹ See 1917, note 5.

² That is, the freemen of the Corporation of Dublin. The registry appears to have closed in Dublin city on 19 September (*FJ*, 17 Sept. 1832). No address from O'Connell to the freemen of Dublin, has, however, been traced after that date.

1919

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 16 September 1832

Private

My dear Barrett,

I sent you a letter for publication on Stanley's blundering Proclamations.¹ If I had published it sooner it might have retarded persons otherwise disposed to serve notices. At present it cannot do any harm and it may do some good. The towns having clerks of the peace by charter are sadly misled by

Stanley. But his grand blunder is putting *all* the counties at once under deputies whilst he throws overboard the *principal*² altogether. If the committee at the Commercial Buildings have any spirit they will avail themselves of both these points and get a new register. The notices already served will be available for that purpose, I mean for the new session, if it can be obtained.

Between you and me, you will see in the *True Sun*, a strong letter by me on the subject of the Wallstown massacre.³ I take it that the slaughter *there* was a palpable murder. There is no such right, as that claimed by the parsons, of going into any man's farm to value his growing crop. It was in the exercise of this claim, which I take to be illegal, that the people were shot.

Thus the case is one of murder because in my view of the law the parson and his party were trespassers and it was lawful to resist them. Do not publish *this* letter⁴ but you may put the point quietly. You will, of course, publish the other letter, that respecting the blunders.

The publication for which you are prosecuted is one entirely depending on the jury for *its* guilt. No fair jury can convict you. An unfair or packed jury would have a sufficient excuse for a conviction. But it is a very favourable publication to speak to, and your prospect of an acquittal is indeed great. The business, in the meantime, is to make the Government ashamed of their multiplied prosecutions.

Have we any chance of seeing you here during the vacation? I need not tell you how happy I should be to show you this place and talk to you without interruption of my plans for ameliorating the condition of the Irish people.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 303-304.

- 1 The letter was published on 20 September. In it O'Connell attacked Stanley on two grounds, connected with the reform act. He declared, firstly, that that act recognized clerks of the peace (to whom it provided that notices of registry should be sent) for counties, cities, towns and boroughs. 'He [Stanley] takes for granted that because some boroughs have no clerks of the peace, that all are without them, and sends down directions . . . stating that the notices for registering as voters for the said boroughs respectively, should be given to the clerk of the peace of the said county.' Secondly, O'Connell claimed that, while the reform act laid down that registry sessions should be held before the assistant barrister Stanley had 'thrown overboard the assistant barristers altogether and inserted

in the proclamations that the special sessions are to be held before the deputies of the assistant barristers'. O'Connell also attacked Anglesey for refusing to comply with the urgent request of the Commercial Buildings Registration Committee (see letter 1914, note 2) 'to procure from the government an extension of the time for complying with the forms which the reform act makes necessary'. In consequence of this refusal, O'Connell claimed, between one third and one half of the Dublin city constituency would remain unregistered at the next election (*FJ*, 20 Sept. 1832).

- 2 That is, the assistant barristers. See note 1 above.
- 3 This letter in the *True Sun* (O'Connell to the Reformers of Great Britain 14 September 1832) was published a few days later in the *Freeman's Journal* and the *Pilot*. The occurrence took place on 5 September 1832 at the village of Wallstown near Doneraile, Co. Cork. The local rector, Rev. John Gavan, accompanied by magistrates, police and military went into the fields of a farmer, James Blake, to value a standing crop. A crowd of some hundreds assembled armed with stones and scythes and resisted the attempt to value the crop, with cries of 'Hurrah for O'Connell' and 'Fág a Bealach' (clear the way). The military fired on the crowd, killing four persons, and wounding a dozen. At the inquest a jury brought in a verdict of 'justifiable homicide' (*FJ*, 8, 10, 13 Sept. 1832: O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 405-9). O'Connell in his letter to the *True Sun* claimed that by law Gavan had no right to attempt to value the standing crop, that he and his followers were trespassers whom Blake was entitled to resist, and that they were guilty of 'foul unnatural murder'. He called on the English reformers for aid in securing the dismissal of Stanley and Anglesey who were, he claimed, chiefly to blame for the incident (O'Connell to the *True Sun*, 15 Sept. 1832 published in *FJ*, 24 Sept. 1832).
- 4 That is, the letter to the *True Sun*. O'Connell's instruction was not followed. According to Inglis, Patrick Lavelle, editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, decided to publish O'Connell's letter, and Barrett 'had no alternative but to disobey . . . and follow suit in the *Pilot*'. The attorney general, Francis Blackburne, after some hesitation, began proceedings against both papers. His colleagues in England, however, refused to proceed against the *True Sun*, because they feared O'Connell would have a very fair chance of proving the authorities *were* guilty of murder at Wallstown. On this ground Blackburne allowed the charges against the *Pilot* and *Freeman's Journal* to lapse on a technicality (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 199-200).

1920

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 19 September 1832

Is there any chance of George Evans taking the pledges?¹ Will he repeal the Union? If he agrees to that then he commands all our support. If nobody else starts on the Repeal, I will get FitzSimon to address the electors,² if the registry is favourable to a good man and true. I shall be very impatient to hear what notices³ have been served in Dublin. If that city would but return two Repealers—Ruthven and a Corporator, pledged to the Repeal. It is great folly and wickedness to exclaim against a coalition of this description. What every honest man has desired, and every good man prayed for, was an opportunity to bring Irishmen of every party together to cooperate for some object useful to Ireland on which they could completely agree. It is really quite provoking that there should have been so much cant on this subject if there were any reality in the expression of a desire for an opportunity of this description. Here is one ready made and yet some men will prefer continuing in thralldom to the British, selfish, ignorant Parliament rather than get one at home at the expense of a mere prejudice. For my part, I will leave no stone unturned to create cooperation for the Repeal.

I did not intend to write half as much, but the Repeal runs away with me.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 302-303

1 See letter 1917, notes 13 and 14.

2 Of Co. Dublin.

3 That is, notices of registry (see letter 1917, note 5).

1921

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 22 September 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am not sorry that the Counsel for the Crown think the Session may go on under deputies alone. But I differ with them *as to* the proclamations issued by Stanley who could appoint *deputies* or *assistants* to, but not *superseders* of, the

chairman of each county.¹ Be it so, however. Let us only go on as if Stanley were right.

It is curious what idle reports are circulated in Dublin. It is totally untrue that there was ever any understanding between the Recorder² and me on the subject of the Dublin election. We never in London talked for one moment seriously on the subject. We joked about it and I laughed at the idea. But I should, since my coming to Ireland, have been glad to make a coalition between him and a radical, the basis of which should be 'the Repeal'. *This is the only basis I would accept of* because my object in any such coalition would be that and nothing else. I certainly would propose that coalition, and endeavour to enforce it on all my friends if I could, that is, exclusively on the basis of 'the Repeal'.

My political life is devoted to that object. Everything else is trivial and unimportant. Self-government is necessary everywhere but Ireland cannot subsist without a local and domestic legislature. And it would be best and most satisfactory to obtain that legislature with the consent of persons of all parties and persuasions.

As to the report of the Kerry landlords preventing their tenants from registering,³ I hear it for the first time. You may contradict it emphatically if it be worthwhile. I expect, on the contrary, that we shall have a large registry. As to my return it seems not to have entered into the head of anybody in this county to imagine it possible to prevent it. I myself certainly do believe it to be totally impossible. I trust I shall prevent Mullins also from being disturbed.⁴ He avows himself an '*extinguisher*'⁵ and a *Repealer*. My highest ambition is to represent this county. Nor would I give it up except to carry or greatly to advance the Repeal. The game to be played in Dublin is to return Ruthven and a Corporation Repealer. That would be a triumph indeed.

As to Perrin, I speak with you candidly. He behaved exceedingly ill to me on the Proclamation prosecutions.⁶ I think he behaved most unprofessionally ill. I am sure I experienced on that occasion nothing like friendship from him. But I heartily forgive him and of course cannot entertain anything like a hostile feeling.

The point he behaved ill on was the *deserting* ME on Blackburne's infamous attachment motion,⁷ upon this paltry pretence that I was not the person *nominally* attacked. His conduct was very bad indeed but he is so superior to the great

mass of his profession, he has so many good and excellent and amiable points about him, that I would not oppose him for any friend or relative; no, not for my son himself. But the Repeal is my first, my immediate, my constant duty. If Perrin would declare for the Repeal, I would walk from this to Dublin barefoot to get him one vote. But a Repealer for Dublin is my motto and my sacred duty.

This brings me to O'Loughlen. He is the best and most excellent creature. I love him as my son and would trust him exactly in the same way. I would share my bread and my cup with him to the last drop and sup. I would share my heart's blood with him. But I deal with him as I do with Maurice. If Maurice refused to give the Repeal test I would oppose him, decidedly oppose him, if I could get a *Repealer* in his place. I should bitterly lament to be in any species of hostility with O'Loughlen but 'Angleseyites' are now the bane of Ireland. Repealers are its only chance.

As to the Duke of Leinster, he is the first of his race who was un-Irish and he is un-Irish to the backbone. I believe anything adverse to the real interests of Ireland respecting that man. I repeat that I have not and never had any ambition to represent Dublin. It would be a sacrifice to me to represent it, and never was there a greater falsehood propounded than the assertion that I had any understanding with the recorder on the subject.

There never was any such thing. But I was always ready to coalesce with him, and am ready to coalesce with him or with any other Corporator on the sole basis of the Repeal, but I believe he is opposed upon some fantastic notion of Protestantism to the Repeal; a notion which there is no hope of banishing because it is impervious to argument or reasoning. His not acceding to the support of the Repeal made and makes it impossible for me to *suffer* any coalition. But any Corporator should have my second vote who declared for the Repeal, taking care that Ruthven should have the first. We all owe Ruthven a duty to return him.

I have run on with my rambling simply because the Repeal appears to me to want nothing but sincere and uncompromising advocates. I have at present bright prospects on that subject. I may be deceived and disappointed but I do expect two Repealers for the county of Cork, two for the city, two for the county of Limerick, two for the city, two for Kerry, one at least for Clare—*vile* Clare I call it, corrupted as

it has been by that bad man Mahon, one for Tralee, one for Youghal, etc.⁸

If the City of Dublin and the County of Dublin return each two Repealers⁹ the business is done. Backed by the Irish nation the Repeal becomes quite irresistible.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 304-307

- 1 See letter 1919, note 1.
- 2 Frederick Shaw, M.P.
- 3 The report has not been traced.
- 4 Mullins had been M.P. for Co. Kerry since 1831. He retained his seat until 1837 when he quarrelled with O'Connell.
- 5 That is, in favour of the extinction of tithes.
- 6 See letter 1919, note 1.
- 7 A prosecution for contempt of court of the two newspaper editors Patrick Lavelle and Michael Staunton (see letter 1951, note 4).
- 8 In the forthcoming election a Repeal candidate, Feargus O'Connor, the future Chartist, was returned for Co. Cork; two Repealers, Daniel Callaghan and Herbert Baldwin, were returned for Cork city. Co. Limerick did not return a Repealer, though Limerick city returned two—William Roche and David Roche. For Kerry the Repealers Frederick William Mullins and O'Connell's son-in-law Charles O'Connell were returned, for Clare two Repealers, William Nugent MacNamara and Cornelius O'Brien. O'Connell's sons Maurice and John were returned for Tralee and Youghal respectively.
- 9 O'Connell himself and the Repealer Edward Southwell Ruthven were returned for Dublin city, and one repealer, O'Connell's son-in-law, Christopher Fitz-Simon, for Dublin county.

1922

*From Thomas FitzGerald, Cork 22 September 1832 to
Derrynane*

Re bills of exchange and goods ordered for Derrynane.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1923

To FitzPatrick¹, Killarney

Derrynane, 26 September 1832

My dear Sir,

I am without any intelligence I can rely on from our electioneering *interests* in and about Killarney. The pestilence² amongst its other frightful consequences has I fear interfered. At any rate you can give me distinct and full information. Do you know whether Cronin³ has registered his tenants, that is, has [he] given the necessary notices?⁴ I intend, please God to be in Listowel on the 9th so as to make an impression on the first day as to proofs,⁵ I do not know who is to be the barrister but this I know that we could not possibly have worse than Freeman.⁶ In the meantime I will publish in the *Pilot* directions of proofs for every case. I am sure you will read them carefully.

My family are pledged to support Mullins. I am anxious for his success as a Repealer and an extinguisher.⁷ He has done his duty right well by the country and the country ought not to desert him. All my family give him their decided support. Capt. Herbert⁸ is a very respectable gentleman but he ought not to think of excluding a gentleman who has behaved so honestly and attentively as Mullins has done. Give me your ideas fully on all these subjects.

SOURCE : Property of Rev. Fr. Declan Crowley

1 Unidentified.

2 The cholera (see letter 1877, note 2).

3 Daniel Cronin, Sr.

4 That is, for their registration as voters. See letter 1917, note 5.

5 That is, on the first day of the registry sessions.

6 William Deane Freeman (died 1852), assistant barrister for Co. Kerry; later for Co. Galway, 1841-52. Queen's counsel, 1841. See *Boase*.

7 That is, one who favoured the extinction of tithes.

8 Capt. Thomas Herbert, R.N.

1924

From Thomas Fitzgerald (Dublin) to Derrynane

42 Dame Street, Dublin, 28 September 1832

Dear Sir,

I met Lord Blaney yesterday in the street and having accompanied him to his lodgings the conversation as was natural turned on the Repeal question and on yourself. He seemed very desirous that his sentiments should be communicated to you and for this purpose he wrote the enclosed¹ that I might forward it to you.

There is one admission of importance coming from [him] that is that our affairs have hitherto been neglected in the united parliament and that some change in the way of domestic legislature is proposed by him. You will be better able to judge for yourself from the document than from anything I can add.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Not extant.

1925

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 29 September 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . You have named the best man living as a candidate for Dublin, my beloved friend Cornelius McLoughlin, but a little common sense is very much wanting to those who for the present press him on. Why in the name of all that is absurd not wait until you know your strength before you talk of candidates, at least before you pledge yourselves to them or make them pledge themselves to stand? The game *was* this. A Corporator and an Agitator should have coalesced on the Repeal principle. The coalition should have preceded any declaration of any candidate. I believe it might have been well if I were the Agitator—well not for me, but for the cause. That plan, however, is knocked on the head by the premature starting¹ of Ruthven. Since I became anything of a public man, the starting so hastily and so soon of Ruthven

was the most foolish thing I ever heard of. But he *is* started. He must be stuck to, or the popular party is disgraced. The plan, therefore, was stifled and it became Ruthven and a corporator. Our man is chosen, we invite the junction of a corporator, and thereupon you go dreaming of another popular man to the total exclusion of a Corporator, and to the prevention of our taking the first great step to Repeal.

I can hardly tell you how you annoy me. It will be now said it is I who stand in the way of Cornelius McLoughlin, my best and kindest friend, for you have been already talking to White² about this matter. For my part, I will not say one word until I *know* how the Constituency stands. And I do implore of you to wait for that period before you start any new project. If my coalition be destroyed, the Repeal of the Union is thrown back.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 308

¹ See letter 1917, note 7.

² Robert White.

1926

Letter withdrawn. Public letter.

1927

From Michael Staunton to Derryane

Dublin, 12 October 1832

My dear Sir,

[Staunton expressed satisfaction that O'Connell has considered his catalogue of the 'fallacies'¹ as a useful work. 'If you could put in your addresses² to the English Reformers the most useful parts of it, great good would undoubtedly be done.' Then the writer deals with Irish revenue since the Union and points out that revenue calculated on the import of spirits, wines and other luxuries proves that the country has not prospered from the Union. He mentions that his figures had been criticised adversely by 'a man here in the Stamp Office (Stanley³ to whom the Cloncurry prize⁴ of £200 was assigned by Sadlier and Baron Smith)' but that Stanley considers his present figures to be correct.]

Something I find has been mentioned to you regarding Pierce Mahony. His observations were made to me, and they were mistaken by Barrett. There certainly was no threat but there was a complaint of your following up a vigorous hostility against one who had no feeling of hostility against you and would serve you this day if he could. There was a statement that while you were active in this hostility, he was passive. Then there was an observation of this kind: 'If I have abstained from annoying him, surely it cannot be thought that it was because I had no opportunity. Might I not for instance give him the trouble of contesting an election in Kerry?' If there was a threat it only amounted to this. For my own part I think Pierce is a goodnatured fellow. I think this after knowing him since 1801 when we were schoolfellows and class fellows. In public I think he has done good and harm, the latter in my opinion unintentionally. He is of course no fit member for Limerick⁵ if a better can be procured. I would however far rather see him in than a Brunswicker,⁶ unless the Brunswicker were a Repealer. Whether we carry Repeal or not I altogether agree with you that it is of the utmost importance to increase votes for it. . . .

I have a letter from Sheil in which he complains of a misreport of his speech⁷ in the *Tipperary Free Press*, and tells me he learns from high authority that Stanley will not return.⁸

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 At a meeting of the National Political Union on 27 September, Staunton delivered a lengthy speech in which he expounded in detail on the 'fallacies' (he listed fifteen in all) which had influenced legislation for Ireland since the Union. Staunton's argument consisted mainly of statistical data connected with taxation and revenue. 'He attributed', he said, 'a great portion of the miseries of the people to excessive and disproportioned taxation', and he claimed his argument would 'annihilate every argument founded upon the tables given in the report of Mr. Spring Rice's committee on the state of the Irish poor in 1830' (*FJ*, 28 Sept. 1832).
- 2 For some account of the tenor of O'Connell's addresses to the Reformers of Great Britain, see letter 1919, note 3. His second address, dated 1 October 1832, (*FJ*, 11 Oct. 1832), deals with the same subject and contains an attack on Althorp for having agreed to abandon the Irish jury bill (see letter 1909). O'Connell's third letter, dated 9 October 1832, (*FJ*, 19 Oct. 1832) is also concerned with the Wallstown tithe massacre.
- 3 William Stanley, 45 Upper Rutland Street, Dublin; later secretary to the Poor Law Commissioners.

- 4 In 1831 Lord Cloncurry donated two prizes of £100 each for the best essays on the following subjects: 'Absenteeism: the Union reconsidered after thirty years' and second, 'The Population and Territory of Ireland, with a view to Improvement'. Rev. Franc Sadlier, D.D., Trinity College, Dublin and Sir W.C. Smith, baron of the exchequer, were appointed judges. They awarded the two prizes to William Stanley (FitzPatrick, *Cloncurry*, 403).
- 5 Mahony attempted to stand for Limerick city but on being vigorously attacked by O'Connell, withdrew his candidature (see letter 1930, note 1).
- 6 A supporter of the Orange Brunswick clubs (see letter 1483, note 1).
- 7 The speech delivered by Sheil at a meeting convened in Clonmel on 7 October 1832, for the purpose of establishing a liberal club in the town.
- 8 Stanley did not, in fact, cease to be Irish chief secretary until March 1833 when he was transferred to the office of colonial secretary.

1928

From Nicholas Markey

Welchestown [Co. Louth], 21 October 1832

My dear friend,

. . . We live in strange times, the *great little patriot*, Sheil, burned in effigy yesterday in Dundalk. His conduct¹ does not surprise *me*. I know him well.

[five lines illegible] No half and half measures will satisfy the party who act with *me*.

On Friday next we are to have a county meeting. That day I think will leave but little doubt of our future prospects.

No man has a higher respect for Sir Patrick Bellew than I have yet I cannot offer him my feeble support unless he gives an unqualified pledge.² The probability is that his brother³ will start. Fitzgerald⁴ is also spoken of but nothing *certain* of either. I have no great opinion of the latter. [four lines illegible]

O'Dwyer⁵ is up for Drogheda. What stuff is he made of? I can do something more if necessary. Need I tell you I shall be entirely guided by your instructions. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sheil had accepted an invitation to stand for Dundalk in the forthcoming election but then decided to stand for Co. Tipperary where he was elected in due course. A letter in the *Freeman's Journal* of

- 22 October 1832 attacked him for abandoning the Liberals of Dundalk.
- 2 In support, that is, of Repeal (see letter 1914, note 1).
 - 3 Richard Montesquieu Bellew (1803-80), second son of Sir Edward Bellew, sixth baronet. M.P. for Co. Louth, 1832-1852, 1859-65; a lord of the treasury, 1847-52. See *Boase*.
 - 4 Thomas Fitzgerald was elected for Co. Louth and died in 1834.
 - 5 Andrew Carew O'Dwyer, a Repealer, was returned for Drogheda in 1832.

1929

To William Scott¹

Derrynane, 25 October 1832

My dear Sir,

I received your kind and welcome letter only last night.

I answer your questions at once and distinctly, that as to Tipperary, I would respectfully suggest you to increase the force on the registry² of Repealers and not to commit yourself with any candidates until we find *how sincerely* they will give the Repeal pledge.³ We are sure of Otway Cave. The second is the question. My letters tell me that Wyse starts for Waterford and Sheil for Tipperary, but my maxim is to be perfectly candid with everybody and I do not hesitate to tell you that, unless Sheil gives the most explicit and unequivocal pledge to the Repeal—such a pledge as could not be explained away—I, for one, would not support him. I know him well and it would require a stout rope to keep him steady. He is a clever fellow and would be of use if we steady him; but it costs him a great deal of trouble by not going straightforward. Secondly, as to myself. I never had, nor have I, any personal views on Dublin. I am quite secure in my native county. I do not think three per cent of the voters would vote against me and really I am convinced that a million of money will not render my return doubtful. It will not cost me one single shilling. My ambition and, if you please, my vanity are most abundantly gratified. I have, therefore, not the least occasion to think of Dublin, and rest quite assured that I do not think of it for myself. But you should know all. I did offer the Recorder⁴ to stand for Dublin along with him if he thought that conjunction would facilitate his return upon the explicit Repeal pledge—the open and avowed basis of our cooperation

to be the Repeal, and nothing but the Repeal. But even then I told him I would part Kerry with regret, and certainly would not stand for Dublin at all, even with him, unless he was deliberately of opinion that my so standing was essential to bring him in on the grounds of being a Repealer. I need not add that he would not pledge himself to the Repeal, and so the matter finally ended. Since then Ruthven has been put forward without my concurrence or consent,⁵ but I cannot separate from my party merely on account of a name, so I must support him, and there is, therefore, not room for myself if I were even inclined for Dublin because I deem it quite essential to the Repeal that one of the two Dublin representatives should be a Corporator as well as a Repealer. My object is to combine as much of the corporation as I can, and all, if possible, with the people in order to carry the Repeal. We are sure of the people and all we want is the corporation. I think you made a display of considerable strength, constituted as the common council now is. They were in 1782,⁶ and later, the best patriots in Ireland. I want to see them so again, and therefore the second candidate for Dublin should be a Corporator. I will on this subject just add that it has been intimated to me (this I tell you in confidence) that the government would support me for Dublin if I coalesced with Sergeant Perrin. They have not committed themselves; it was merely an experiment but it totally failed and I tell it to you that you may judge how idle the calumnies on me in the government newspapers are on the subject of Dublin. As I said of Sheil, it saves me all manner of trouble to be candid and undisguised and straightforward. I wish Sheil had the commonsense to see how much better in point, even of policy, to say nothing of principle, my plan is. Thirdly, you next ask me whether I will support you. My answer is, really I am pledged to Ruthven as one, and I now heartily, readily, and at once pledge myself to you as the second. I will support you in person, by my influence, and I will aid a subscription for the expenses of the contest, putting down in the first instance £50 for Ruthven and £50 for *your* return. I will, besides, get you some, probably several volunteer agents. The election, even if contested, cannot last more than two days. We will bribe none, and therefore I do reckon with confidence that less than £500 will cover all you can personally have to pay. I would not, for one, consent to have you injure yourself in such a contest.

I will address the freemen. I may possibly make some impression. The Coal-meters, differing with me, as Dalton and most of them did, in politics and religion, had no more warm friend to obtain them compensation,⁷ and perhaps few more useful. I believe my adhesion to their cause decided the question in their favour. I could easily have roused an opposition, which probably would have been fatal to them, and some of my own party, whom I esteem, urged me to that course. Are you aware that it was I who fought out Sir A. B. King's pension⁸ for him? I can positively assert that he never would have got it but for me. I tell you these things to show the freemen that, although King was Deputy Grand Master of Orangemen and had, on the king's visit, behaved treacherously to myself⁹ yet I got an act of justice done for him when his own party literally threw him overboard.

I hope to be in Dublin in a fortnight and then we will go to work. It would be most essential to have a Repeal Club composed of men of all parties. At all events, we must get up a grand Repeal dinner. It is desirable to have persons of every creed and colour at that dinner. I will certainly have such a dinner 'to celebrate the memory of the Volunteers of 1782'. I will arrange with you the practical details of these *agitations* when we meet. They all must have a tendency to the practical measures which will return you and Ruthven free of expense, and then the practical measures which will restore the parliament to College Green,¹⁰ not as a triumph of one party over another but by a combination of all.

I am glad to find you can be useful also in Down. It is shocking that an Irish county should return a man who bears the odious title of the Assassin of his country—Castlereagh.¹¹

There never yet was anything so absurd as the apprehension of an ascendancy. The time is gone by when either Catholic or Protestant could establish an ascendancy. We want rather to combine against the spread of infidelity than to apprehend an over zeal at the present day of any sect or persuasion. Men do not now quarrel about religion unless politics interfere, or personal or public gains. The pounds, shillings and pence are the causes of such quarrels now; and take away the *exclusive* right to these and you take away the possibility of quarrel.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 309-312

1 Sheriff of Dublin 1830.

- 2 See letter 1917, note 5.
- 3 See letter 1914, note 1.
- 4 Frederick Shaw. See letter 1921.
- 5 See letter 1917, note 7.
- 6 The year in which legislative independence was granted to the Irish parliament.
- 7 See letter 1847, note 1.
- 8 See letter 1826, note 3.
- 9 In connection with George IV's visit to Dublin in 1821 (see letters 911-15). How King 'behaved treacherously' is not known.
- 10 Where the Irish parliament (now the Bank of Ireland) was situated.
- 11 Frederick William Robert (Stewart), *styled* Viscount Castlereagh, 1822-54, (1805-1872); M.P. for Co. Down, 1826-52. Succeeded as fourth marquess of Londonderry in 1854. He was a nephew of the celebrated Lord Castlereagh who as chief secretary for Ireland had been instrumental in obtaining support for the passing of the Act of Union.

1930

To Richard Barrett

Cork, 29 October 1832

Private

My dear Barrett,

Insert in your paper the following: 'Birth at Darrynane Abbey, the lady of N. J. Ffrench, of Fort William, in the county of Roscommon, Esq., and youngest daughter of Daniel O'Connell, M.P., of a son and heir.'

I send you a broadside¹ against Pierce Mahony. Insert it on Wednesday and send twenty newspapers to John Boyse, Esq.,² Limerick. His clerk will call and pay you.

The Tithe trials³ are ending in smoke. Hodnett⁴ was convicted⁵ in the city before Baron Pennefather⁶ *who, it is clear, though it is not safe to say so, behaved exceedingly ill to him and sentenced him to three months' imprisonment—an excessively severe sentence. There are many others for trial but who have foolishly run themselves into the meshes of the law by posting anti-tithe notices which is a transportable offence. Having secured them against transportation, that is, having a private—mark!—a private understanding that they should not be transported, I have got them to plead guilty. They will be sentenced tomorrow and it is understood that*

their sentences will be light. If I had been in Ireland I hope, and perhaps believe, that these persons would not have got themselves into the trammels of the Whiteboy Acts.⁷ You know I steered the Catholic cause for twenty years and upwards free of all such dangers.

But these incidents will not have the least influence in retarding the downfall of tithes. On the contrary, they have an excellent popular effect, keeping the people from violating the law but at the same time making them doubly anxious to obtain redress by legal means.

We are certain of two Repealers for the City of Cork and I verily believe two also for the county.⁸ The Conservatives are totally impotent and they are backing down to aid Liberals. But it will not do, the people insist on Repealers.

Youghal certainly gives a Repealer,⁹ Mallow another,¹⁰ and I am much deceived if Kinsale and Bandon do not do as much;¹¹ Kinsale I may say with much confidence, Bandon with much probability. The conduct of the Government makes it imperative on every man to be a Repealer.

I expect to be in Dublin within ten days.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 312-313

- 1 O'Connell to the People of Limerick, 29 October 1832. In this letter O'Connell called on the electors of Limerick city to reject Pierce Mahony as a candidate in the coming election. He denounced Mahony as the 'prince of political jobbers' who 'came in at the fag end of the emancipation struggle', and was later responsible for organizing the Leinster Declaration against Repeal (see letter 1721, note 1).
- 2 Attorney, Brunswick Street, Limerick.
- 3 On this day O'Connell appeared at Cork assizes on behalf of a number of defendants charged with resisting tithes. On his advice they agreed to plead guilty to the charges against them. Among those sentenced were Dominick Philip Ronayne (3 months) and Jeremiah O'Lomasney (6 weeks) (*F*), I, 6, Nov. 1832).
- 4 James Hodnett, a paper manufacturer, 58 Patrick Street and Sunday's Well, Cork.
- 5 James Hodnett was convicted on 27 October of taking part in an illegal anti-tithe meeting.
- 6 Richard Pennefather.
- 7 The principal acts were 5 & 6 Geo. III (Ire.) c. 8 and 15 & 16 Geo. III (Ire.) c. 21. The punishments prescribed by these acts were mitigated in October 1831 (1 & 2 Will. IV c. 44).
- 8 See letter 1921, note 8. The second member returned for the county—Garret Standish Barry—was a Liberal rather than a Repealer.

- 9 In 1832 it returned O'Connell's son John.
 10 William Joseph O'Neill Daunt. He was unseated on petition by order of the Commons on 24 April 1833.
 11 Neither Kinsale nor Bandon returned a Repealer in 1832.

1931

From James Hawkins¹ to Derrynane

Killarney, 2 November 1832

Sir,

I have received an answer from Sir William Gossett to my letter from Kenmare enclosing yours to me. . . . May I request you will have the kindness to let me know about what number of claimants still remain to be disposed of in the barony of Iveragh of those who have given notice to register.² A few from Cahirciveen have been registered here and those I heard as they appeared as they came from a distance. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Probably James Hawkins, B.L., 19 Middle Gardiner Street, Dublin.
 2 That is, to register their votes. See letter 1917, note 5.

1932

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 7 November 1832

. . . See Richard Farrell, the Catholic barrister—he is Chairman of Kilkenny County, and let him know the precise day I will be in Dublin—the 17th inst. Let him get me, two or three days after that, to argue the Trimbleston cause¹

See the managers of as many Catholic charities as you can. Tell them of my time of arrival. In particular, see a namesake of yours and find from him whether I am not bound to preside first at his dinner.² See Fr. L'Estrange on this subject, and let not these charities clash. I am literally terrified from writing to any of them lest I should commit myself to an engagement which I may not be able to keep. At one time two charities advertised that I would preside at each on the same day and I had not influence enough with either to induce a postponement. This makes me excessively cautious on these points. . . .

The time is come to agitate, agitate, agitate. If it were possible to induce a cooperation between the people and the corporate powers, Lord Anglesey would be disarmed of 'his jurors,' and then I would make him a present of all imaginable corruption and profligacy on the Bench, if any such there be.

How shortsighted, how blind must the men be who do not see the advantage of increasing our own forces by taking in deserters from the enemy unless those deserters give themselves up tied hand and foot! Above all things, not to see that the oppressions under which Ireland labours are now continued because the corporate party furnish *willing jurors* against the people. The Lancers and the Artillery are nothing compared to the jurors. If I had jurors honest I would repeal the Union in one month. I long now to be on the scene of political action.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 313-314

- 1 The newspapers have no account of the case to which O'Connell refers.
- 2 The 'First Grand Public Dinner' of St. Bridget's Orphan Society of which William FitzPatrick was vice-president and founder. The dinner, at which O'Connell presided on 22 November, had been postponed since the previous February 'at the request of Mr. O'Connell'.

1933

To Rev. Dr. Andrew Fitzgerald

Derrynane, 7 November 1832

Respected Sir,

I cannot help inflicting one more letter on you. It shall be the last.

Let me begin by offering you my most grateful thanks for your very kind and flattering letter. You, I fear, gratuitously attribute to me the best of motives, perhaps if you could see the real springs of my conduct in deprecating the hostility of the clergy of Carlow you would find those springs to arise from the vanity of a wounded spirit. But of this no more.

Your letter gave me great pleasure. I was delighted to find that none of the clergy of Carlow attribute to *me* any participation in the publication¹ of the brother of William Finn.² I

feared much that they did and especially because of a piece of dexterity practised by some friends of mine—sincere friends they really are but mistaken—who procured Tom Finn³ to delay his publication, as they have since boasted, until I had sailed for England. Choosing to overlook this, that if I had myself dictated that letter and wished to conceal the part I took in it, I would do precisely what those friends concerted, I would not have it published until after my departure from Ireland. The truth therefore is that in a case in which I was altogether innocent my friends furnished an inference of guilt. I am rejoiced however that the clergy of Carlow refused to draw the inference and that I have no occasion to vindicate myself from that charge.

You have candidly stated to me the causes of alienation which do exist between the clergy of Carlow and myself. I never deserved their '*affectionate attachment*' but I always desire their cordial cooperation in promoting the interests of Ireland. We are at length arrived at a period when a sincere combination of the people, a sincere concentration of all good influences are in my conviction alone requisite to annihilate almost all the political evils of Ireland. We have never yet been a people. A faction has ruled and a prostrate population yielded an unwilling and coerced obedience. The ruling party have been and are to their most remote ramifications *essentially bitterly* hostile to the people. An Irish government, a parliament emanating from the people can alone terminate this species of rancorous spirit of power. I am most anxious not to be the cause of preventing the cooperation to extinguish that spirit.

But to return to your candid statement I am accused, it seems, of two things. Your words are (1) 'but remember your reflections on Dr. Doyle's pastoral,'⁴ your calling it a delusion, (2) 'and your insinuations of his close and secret connections with Lord Anglesey.' I am too familiar with the progress of hostile impressions, how they in time leave out all that mitigates and preserve only the harsher features to be surprised at hearing that these are the recollections of the clergy of Carlow. Yet they are founded in some truth and I acknowledge leave me much to explain and more to regret.

Will you allow me to give you a more accurate view of the fact, coloured on the other hand by my natural unwillingness to admit myself in the wrong. I did not call Dr. Doyle's *pastoral* a delusion. I used the word delusion—it was a wrong

word—in relation to the opinion of Dr. Doyle respecting the public virtues of Lord Anglesey. The mode in which I used the word *delusion* did not imply that [*remainder of letter missing*].

SOURCE : Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives

- 1 Probably the letter referred to by W. J. FitzPatrick in his biography of Doyle. According to FitzPatrick, the break-down of Doyle's health during 1832 was 'said to have been accelerated by a public letter from his old foe, Mr. Finn, in which he taunted Dr. Doyle with having allowed the vile League [of the Whitefeet, a secret and violent combination of the Castlecomer mine workers] to grow and prosper in the very heart of his diocese and under his very eye; and . . . sneered at the Bishop's decline of power, because his observations and threats to an obstinate portion of his flock had passed unheeded'. The date of this letter has not been ascertained (FitzPatrick, *Doyle*, II, 407).
- 2 That is, William F. Finn.
- 3 Thomas Finn, of the *Waterford Chronicle*, son of William Finn, proprietor of Finn's *Leinster Journal*; and brother of William F. Finn, O'Connell's brother-in-law.
- 4 See letter 1860, note 1.

1934

*From C. A. Walker*¹

Belmont, Wexford, 8 November 1832

Private

My dear Sir,

I understand that Mr. Cadwallader Waddy has written to you to induce you to interfere in his behalf to forward his views as a candidate for the County of Wexford on the question of Repeal. Whether the question of Repeal should or should not be agitated is not necessary now to discuss. I know you agree with me that a good deal as to the policy of doing so depends on *local* circumstances in each county. As a *general* matter of stimulation it is perhaps a very useful weapon; as a measure of good if practicable I fancy among liberal Irishmen there can be very little difference of opinion, and I further consider that whenever it comes to a vote, and which of course it will come though to an unsuccessful one in the ensuing session, it must meet the support of many who will *not now* use it as a *means of recommendation* to their constituents. . . .

There is a *very strong* (I'll not call it Protestant) but ultra bigotted high church and ascendancy party in this County. They form the majority of the aristocracy of the County but there is also a very formidable Protestant tenantry, strongly tinctured and linked to this aristocracy. This ultra party [about two words illegible] knew their own strength and our policy [more than a line illegible] party on the other hand is not so strong nor so well organized as it should be, and although we have constantly made every exertion to make it act with vigour and union, it has failed and indeed from its *composition* it is *impossible*. The ultra high church party are *all united* thoroughgoing bigots, while the liberal party is composed of the thoroughgoing radicals who would of course take up the Repeal question if we wished but have sense enough to see they form the *minority*, and the remaining liberals, who are those of influence among the party, are some of them really conscientiously opposed to Repeal while more of them are only liberals in appearance and because they think we are the most powerful party but *who would turn on us if they saw us sinking*.

Now until about 6 years ago the liberal party always fought to advantage. The two parties were very nearly balanced but by generalship we conquered; we have often been accused of manoeuvring etc. but it could not be done otherwise, and by degrees we were increasing, and wearing down the opponents. Unfortunately the general election before the last the independent interest had a split and the consequence was we were licked, we only returned one member and the high church returned *Lord Valentia*. From that hour their strength has been increasing and they began to know it. They have perfect union among themselves and, I may say, the Protestant Bishop of Ferns² and his clergy are their directors; they are also [about three words illegible]. The most serious loss our strength suffered was the desertion of the Morgan³ (late Grogan) and Rowe interests. You may judge the loss where parties were so evenly balanced when I tell you that their freeholders alone are upwards of 300. When the young Morgans and Rowe came of age, they being connected with the Enniskillen family, they became high church.

Thus the parties stand at this moment. The liberals, by means of the new franchise⁴ and great activity at the registry, with an *undoubted majority united* in the *persons of Carew and Lambert as candidates* or in case Sir Thomas Esmonde was

in place of Lambert, but *sure of a fatal split* if the liberal candidates were *any other* persons. Now the high church party, they are now decidedly in the minority but firmly united and really unpleasantly strong, relying on returning Rowe if they can cause a split among the liberals, and *if they can* do so, *they will return him*, and Rowe will not stand unless Waddy is fool enough to do so.⁵

Now with respect to Waddy's chance. He is a bad landlord, a hard miser, *detested* by the country people. As an instance, a few years since when we had a failure of all crops and a famine, the dwellers on some poor land of his a few miles from Wexford were actually existing on nettles and watergrass, every other landlord in the County was not only forgoing rent but were subscribing to support their tenants, Waddy sent out bailiffs and distrained those wretches and brought their half-starved cattle into pound for the rent, seized their miserable furniture and this has not nor ever will be forgotten. This is only one instance out of *many*. Further, the people *know he cannot be trusted*, they believe he would not be *over nice* in his *political* honesty. *Rely on it*, in Waddy's person the Repeal is a failure be he [about four words illegible] mischief, to cause much trouble, and to throw out the liberal party, and to put in a conservative member but beyond this he cannot, he never can come in himself.

Rowe's friends (nephew to Dickey Radford Rowe) *publicly boast* that *Waddy will return Rowe*. I do believe even the conservatives have an understanding to that effect, knowing that Waddy cannot succeed but that, by dividing the liberals, Rowe will.

In this case Carew and Rowe would be returned. *Nothing could* throw out Carew. The *majority of both parties* are his sure supporters. If Lambert *declared for Repeal* he would be *beat at once*. So *would any other man standing* in the liberal interest. . . .

Waddy and Rowe are in constant communication and walking arm in arm through the town, which I assure you has not escaped the observation of our country people. They know that *Rowe* is supported by the Protestant clergy to a man and they know that the clergy would not support him if he intended [one word illegible] against tithes etc. in the way the people would wish. Talbot is *sure of* [New] Ross, and I of Wexford.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Charles Arthur Walker (1790-1873), Belmont, Wexford, M.P. Wexford borough 1831-41. See *Boase*.
- 2 Thomas Elrington, D.D.
- 3 Hamilton Knox Grogan Morgan (1807-54), Johnstown Castle, Co. Wexford; M.P. for Co. Wexford, 1847-52. He married the second daughter of Ebenezer Rowe, Castletown House, Co. Wexford.
- 4 That created by the reform act of 1832.
- 5 Waddy did not contest Co. Wexford in 1832 when Robert Shapland Carew and Henry Lambert were returned for the county defeating Rowe. After Carew's elevation to the peerage in July 1834 Waddy was elected in his place.

1935

From his nephew Robert McCartie

Woodview, Kanturk [Co. Cork], 12 November 1832

My Dear Uncle,

You forgot to write to my father¹ to make some settlement for his family which is absolutely necessary for him to do. It strikes me that if I opened a porter store in Kanturk for the sale of *your porter*² by retail I would make a fortune of it. If there is no objection or if you are under no restrictions which may prevent you from sending porter to the county of Cork I would be anxious to commence this business and, upon hearing from you, will prepare myself for it. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Jeremiah McCartie.
- 2 That is, the ale produced in O'Connell's brewery (see letter 1873, note 1).

1936

*From Peter Warren Locke,
Athgoe Park, Rathcoole, Co. Dublin, 14 November 1832,
to Merrion Square*

Locke offers to stand as a Repeal candidate for Co. Dublin, George Evans having refused to declare in favour of Repeal. Locke is apologetic for having advertised his intention to stand in the press before obtaining O'Connell's advice.¹

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Locke entered the contest for Co. Dublin but resigned on 17

December. His place was taken by Christopher Fitz-Simon who was elected.

1937

*From the Portarlington Committee,
Portarlington, Queen's County, 16 November 1832*

John Robert Saunders, Chairman of the Committee for enquiring into the abuses of the borough of Portarlington, sends a retaining fee.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, USD

1938

From Thomas Moore

Sloperton, Devon, 26 November 1832

My dear O'Connell,

I have seen, and I assure you with the sincerest gratitude, the warmth with which you have taken up my cause at Limerick,¹ but alas! my resolution is fixed, and not even *your* word (which would seem, like Joshua's, to be able to command far greater luminaries than I can pretend to be) has now the power to change it. You have seen, I doubt not, some of my letters on the subject, and, particularly that addressed to the Limerick Union, which ought to have been before now laid before them. By the decision expressed in those letters I must, I grieve to say, abide, much as it goes to my heart to disappoint not only myself but those hearty and admirable fellows who have shown such kindness to me. Dr. Griffin² told me that you meant to write to me, and I have let some posts pass since his letter reached me, in the hopes of hearing from you. But this was more lest I should be thought wanting in courtesy or gratitude than from any idea that what you had to say would have any effect upon my determination. Never have I had so much reason to regret my poverty as in its depriving me of the chance of serving Ireland at this crisis.

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XII, 157

- i The Limerick Repealers expressed the wish that Moore should stand for their city in the forthcoming general election (William Roche to the Limerick Political Union, 29 Oct. 1832, *FJ*, 2 Nov.

1832). Moore declined their invitation on the ground that 'my circumstances render such an appropriation of my time impossible' (Moore to the Limerick Political Union, 8 Nov. 1832, Wilfred S. Dowden, ed., *The Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1964, II, 1019-20). On 22 November, however, the *Freeman's Journal* published an undated note from O'Connell to Tom Steele, stating O'Connell's intention next week in Limerick to 'concert measures . . . to secure the return of the glorious patriot Moore, and the gallant and patriotic De Lacy Evans'. At a meeting in Dublin of the National Political Union on 25 November O'Connell declared that Moore had written to say he could not stand. O'Connell added: 'I attribute much of the present state of feeling in Ireland to his works—he has brought patriotism to our homes' (*FJ*, 26 Nov. 1832).

- 2 Gerald Griffin (1803-40), dramatist, novelist and poet; a native of Limerick city, he moved to London in 1823; author of *The Collegians* (1829), a novel based on a famous murder (O'Connell defended the man convicted for the murder. See letter 820). Entered the Irish Christian Brothers, 1838. See *DNB*.

1939

From Michael Doherty¹ to Merrion Square

Clonmel Prison, 27 November 1832

Dear Sir,

I enclose two pounds, the subscription of my fellow sufferer, Mr. Laffan,² and myself to the National Rent.³ May we request the honour of being proposed as members of the political union⁴ by you. It will be a source of pride to us to have our names introduced into that illustrious body while suffering in a dungeon by the Liberator of our country.

These are decisive times. The next few weeks will be teeming with events important to Ireland and much will depend on the energy of the people during that brief period. What a glorious object the people have to struggle for! How magnificent is even the hope of national liberation! As all bitter feelings against petty injustice and local tyranny are merged in the nation's predominant aversion to the Union, so all the mind and the might of the people should be directed to its *Repeal*. For our part we forget the iniquitous system under which we suffer and its consequences to ourselves while contemplating that measure of real national utility—the Repeal of the Union—and not being in a situation to forward it by

anything but our warm aspirations. We shall continue to offer them up to the God of nations for its success.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5242

- 1 Michael Doheny (1805-62), third son of Michael Doheny. A native of Co. Tipperary; Young Irelander; escaped to New York after 1848 insurrection. Admitted to New York bar; colonel 9th New York State militia; author of the *Felon's Track* and other works. See *Boase*.
- 2 Imprisoned for their resistance to tithes.
- 3 That is, the O'Connell Tribute.
- 4 The National Political Union. On O'Connell's proposal, at its next meeting, on 29 November, the two were admitted as members (*FJ*, 30 Nov. 1832).

1940

From Henry R. Westenra

Sharavogue, Roscrea, 30 November 1832

Private and most confidential

My dear Sir,

Being anxious from old recollections and associations for the independent interest of this County, I came off here before I started for Monaghan and am sorry to say I find the cause in a bad state enough.

Nic. Fitz-Simon¹ has just been here and returns to dinner. In consequence of Lord Tullamore's resignation,² his lordship's relatives [and] friends are disengaged. Not one of them will vote for Fitz.

The only means by which Lord Oxmantown³ can be now foiled will be (if it can be achieved) a requisition to my brother⁴ from the Protestants to come forward. They are incensed against Lord Rosse as they say his family have represented themselves and not the King's County but they will *not* support a *Repealer*.

If you could take measures to suggest the propriety of not demanding any pledge⁵ from one of our family, the independent interest of this County may thus be saved but I despair of its success in any other way.

I am proud to say *I do think* our family *deserve* Irish confidence. My father's⁶ public conduct and mine is before the view of Irishmen and I defy boldly one of them to put his finger on an act or a word that had not the benefit of Ireland

for its object and that did not go to prove that her prosperity was the subject nearest and dearest to our hearts. We have already done the state some service 'and are *ready, able and willing*' to continue our exertions. We have got nothing for ourselves or one of the family from Government for I cannot regard the Lieutenancy of Monaghan as anything, where Lord Rossmore was *Custos Rotulorum* and there was no other resident peer to whom it could have been given.

Should we find on further investigation that Fitz cannot succeed, will you work with us or not?

Let me have your answer and opinion on all this by return of post as I must set off for Monaghan on Monday or Tuesday next to take care of myself there.

*Val. Bennett*⁷ and others have refused to support Fitz.

By adopting measures prompt, vigorous and decisive, with a little generalship, the cause may still triumph but your influence may be necessary and might be exerted beneficially. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Nicholas Fitz-Simon (born 1806), Broughall Castle, King's Co. and Farm Hill, Dundrum, Co. Dublin; son of John Fitz-Simon. Married Katherine, second daughter of John Power (knighted 1841); M.P. King's Co., 1832-41; knighted, 1841; a magistrate in Dublin Castle from 1841.
- 2 That is, from the contest for King's Co. for which he apparently had intended to stand (*F*), 26 Nov. 1832). He had been M.P. for Carlow town since 1826. In the general election of 1832 he was elected for Penryn and Falmouth.
- 3 William (Parsons) styled Lord Oxmantown 1807-41 (1800-67); M.P. King's Co., 1821-35. He succeeded as third earl of Rosse in 1841.
- 4 Hon. John Craven Westenra (1798-1874), third son of second Baron Rossmore and younger brother of Henry R. Westenra; M.P. King's Co., 1835-52.
- 5 The Repeal pledge. (See letter 1914, note 1).
- 6 Second Lord Rossmore.
- 7 Valentine Bennett, J.P., D.L., Thomastown House, Frankford, King's Co., a Catholic.

1941

From Daniel Supple Jr.

Tralee, 3 December 1832

My Dr Sir,

I did expect to be in Dublin long since but have now given

up any idea of going until after the election. The Conservatives are hard at work but in vain. They are now endeavouring to bribe but let them do what they may, the borough is secure as you will perceive by the enclosed list which I have marked accurately. The names marked thus X are persons who have promised us but being very poor may be put out of the way. Even so you will on reading the names be satisfied that there is not the least chance of Sir Edward's¹ success. Mr. O'Connell² is most attentive and everything going on to his satisfaction. The Conservatives have not as yet put forth any person for the County. They are using every exertion I understand to prevail on a member of the Kenmare family to come forward.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sir Edward Denny, fourth baronet (1796-1889), succeeded his father to the baronetcy 1 August 1831. M.P. for Tralee, 1818-19; high sheriff Co. Kerry, 1827.
- 2 Maurice O'Connell.

1942

From Michael Staunton

Dublin, 10 December 1832

My Dear Sir,

. . . I write this to direct your attention to a letter of mine in the *Register* of today. It contains a history of the fiscal management of Ireland since the Union, . . . I have made Spring Rice's tables useful in two ways, first in contrasting the Irish consumption of excisable articles in 1800 and 1827, and secondly, in ascertaining the difference of the rate of taxation between the two periods. . . . [Staunton gives many statistics of taxation and returns].

If you can find leisure, take some opportunity of making your own summary of these matters and putting it on paper. This is what will best impress the facts on the memory.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1943

To his wife, Merrion Square

Limerick, 17 [and 18] December 1832

My darling Heart,

John¹ is with you before this hour and has given you every detail. I found before me an account of Maurice's election² and that he had won 'golden opinions' from everybody. Sir Edward³ being unable to thank him, he received the thanks of *the party* in the strongest terms from John Jas. Hickson.⁴

My plan is to go to Kerry tomorrow evening to meet John⁵ at the fair of Listowel. I heard yesterday that Brown⁶ will not stand. Perhaps he is making way for the worthy knight⁷. This is but a mere conjecture.

18 December

. . . I made a great speech yesterday, another this day.⁸ My plan is to *make* either John⁹ or his son¹⁰ member for Kerry. I go this day to Listowel, tomorrow to Tralee. . . .

My object is to secure the election of my brother or nephew. That is now my chief ambition. Blessed be the great God, everything has hitherto gone as well as possible. . . . I need not tell you that I am impatient for the return of Fitz-Simon. I wish I was there to help my dear Ellen's excellent husband and my darling Morgan.¹¹ If I had not stood by John I believe he would not have been returned.¹² My opinion is that the two Roches will be returned for this city.¹³ I am also in hopes for the county.¹⁴

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 His son.

2 For Tralee.

3 Sir Edward Denny, fourth baronet.

4 Attorney, Tralee.

5 His brother.

6 Hon. William Browne.

7 The knight of Kerry.

8 In the course of his Limerick speech on 17 December O'Connell referred to the 'handsome manner' in which Pierce Mahony had retired from the contest for Limerick city (see letters 1927 and 1930), and declared 'I never had any personal animosity to Mr. Mahony . . . and I now declare that there is no gentleman of his profession . . . to whom I would be more willing to trust my affairs' (*FJ*, 20 Dec. 1832).

- 9 His brother.
- 10 Morgan John O'Connell.
- 11 His son Morgan was elected for Co. Meath on 19 December 1832.
- 12 His son John was returned for Youghal on 15 December 1832.
- 13 David Roche (1791-1865), only son of David Roche, Carass House, Croom, Co. Limerick. M.P. for Limerick city, 1832-44; created baronet 8 August 1838; agent to Edward Bouchier Hartopp, Little Dalby, Leicestershire who had extensive property in Iveragh. William Roche was the second Repeal candidate returned for Limerick city.
- 14 O'Connell's hopes were disappointed. The two Repeal candidates, Alexander McCarthy and Godfrey Massey, were defeated.

1944

To his wife, Merrion Square

Tralee, Thursday, 20 December 1832

My darling Love,

At length, darling, we have come to the time for franks. To you *alone* have I sent *any* as yet, and this is my first real frank.¹

. . . My plan is to remain here until the election is completely over. I have not succeeded in getting either my brother John or his son² to stand for this County. I wish I had thought of having my dear Charles³ here. I think I could get him returned if he were in Kerry and allowed me to do so.⁴ But it is too late at present to think of it. I am thus placed in a disagreeable predicament but I submit to the will of God, hoping all will turn out for the best. I am of course extremely anxious to hear about Fitz-Simon and Morgan. I have as to the former [*sic*] great reliance on the Meath Club⁵ and my hopes have been much raised as to Fitz-Simon⁶ by the letters of Patrick FitzPatrick who writes to me every post and gives me the most accurate intelligence to the latest hour before the post office closes. Nothing has given me greater pleasure than the return of Daunt⁷ for Mallow. He is an extremely clever and honest fellow.⁸ Baldwin⁹ too will prove a great addition to the House. His return seems by the last accounts placed beyond any doubt. In short, darling, everything appears quite prosperous. Yet the post of this evening may reverse much of the pleasing picture. In either event may God's holy will be done. I have not yet seen your

poor mother but the account I hear of her is very favourable. She continues to enjoy good health. *Our* little Mary¹⁰ is, I believe, in a certain way that will give another O'Connell to the tribe. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Having just been returned (for Dublin city) to parliament O'Connell could again exercise the privilege of franking his letters.
- 2 Morgan John O'Connell.
- 3 His son-in-law Charles O'Connell.
- 4 See letter 1945, note 2.
- 5 One of the liberal political clubs numerous in Ireland at this time.
- 6 Christopher Fitz-Simon was returned for Co. Dublin on 22 December.
- 7 William Joseph O'Neill Daunt (1807-94), only son of Joseph Daunt, Kilcaskan, Ballineen, Co. Cork. Secretary to O'Connell as lord mayor of Dublin in 1841; Repeal director for Leinster and Scotland, 1841; author of *Personal Recollections of the late Daniel O'Connell* (1848) and other works of historical interest. See *Boase*.
- 8 Daunt did not long hold his seat since he was ousted on petition, in favour of his opponent, Charles D. O. Jephson, Whig-Liberal.
- 9 Herbert Baldin, Repeal M.P. for Cork city.
- 10 Mary Frances, daughter of John Bindon Scott, Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare. She married Maurice O'Connell in 1832, having eloped with him in his yacht from Cahircon which is on the Shannon estuary. They were married at Tralee in a Catholic ceremony on 29 September 1832 and at Kenmare in a Church of Ireland ceremony (since she was a member of that church) on 1 October 1832. Their marriage ended in separation in the 1840's. Cahircon is now a convent of the Salesian Sisters.

1945

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Tralee, 20 December 1832

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am sincerely thankful to you for the punctuality and accuracy of your intelligence.¹ Everything has—blessed be God!—hitherto passed in the most satisfactory manner. If Meath and Dublin county do as well, why we shall be all triumph—and the best kind of triumph, that which furnishes hope and indeed appears to reduce hope into the certainty of being able to accomplish something for Ireland. My return for Dublin unsolicited, and even unavowed by me, is perhaps

the greatest triumph my countrymen have ever given me. I am more anxious than I can possibly express to be able to accept the seat for Dublin and I have done everything in my power to procure a *substitute* for Kerry but hitherto in vain. However, between you and me, I will continue those exertions and I still have some hopes, although faint ones, of being able to succeed. We shall see. It would be most important to me to be successful.² All this, however, has totally precluded the possibility of my going to assist Nich[ola]s Fitz-Simon. Be assured that I have felt the deepest anxiety to be with him and, if it were possible, I should have been aiding him. Yet I think anybody that recollects that I was not able to give Morgan an hour in Meath or to return to assist Fitz-Simon, my son-in-law, in Dublin County, will not be difficult to persuade that my business in Kerry has been too important to enable me to have left this. Browne, Lord Kenmare's brother, resigned the shrievalty to contest this county. I had therefore a contest to prepare for but he has fled from the field and unless he changes his mind again, or sets up some at present 'great unknown,' there will be a quiet election; but this is a state of things which beyond any other requires the utmost attention. I must not allow a Boyton trick³ to be played off against me or my *party*. It is (you therefore see) absolutely impossible for me to leave Kerry before the election is over. Make 'the facts' my excuse to my most respected friend John Power. I do solemnly declare I would go as far to serve a son⁴ of his as I would for one of my own sons. I approve highly of the calling of the National Council⁵ for the 15th of January. It ought to be done as it was in the last year—first, by a circular from the Trades Political Union, and afterwards by a circular from the National Political Union. The letters should be sent to every Irish peer and to *every* person elected to the House of Commons in *any* part of Ireland; in short, to all the Irish members without distinction.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 315-316

1 On election news. See letter 1944.

2 O'Connell's difficulties were soon resolved. On 24 December Frederick William Mullins, and O'Connell's son-in-law, Charles O'Connell, both Repealers, were elected for Kerry. Earlier a meeting of electors of Kerry had passed a resolution declaring their unwillingness to part with O'Connell as their representative (*FJ*, 8 Dec. 1832).

- 3 On 12 December the *Dublin Evening Mail* announced that the government was supporting the Conservative candidates for Dublin city, Sir George Rich and John Beatty West against the Repeal candidates, O'Connell and Edward Southwell Ruthven. A few days later the newspapers carried an official denial that the government was taking any part in the Dublin city election (*DEM*, 14 Dec.; *FJ*, 15 Dec. 1832). Rev. Charles Boyton, in a public letter, dated 18 December, stated that he had been given to understand on good authority that the government was supporting the Conservative candidates. He attributed the official denial to the influence of Plunket, the lord chancellor (*DEM*, 21 Dec. 1832).
- 4 That is, John Power's *son-in-law*, Nicholas Fitz-Simon.
- 5 A resolution in favour of calling a national council of all Irish peers and M.P.'s following the election to consider the state of the country, was moved by Richard Barrett at a meeting of the National Political Union on 30 December 1832 and passed unanimously (*FJ*, 31 Dec. 1832). According to Macintyre (*The Liberator*, 57), 'Of the 30 to 35 M.P.'s who attended the Council's two sessions in a hotel opposite the old Irish parliament in College Green, only three were not Repealers. The Council heard a report on Irish revenue taxes and funded debts from Michael Staunton . . . it discussed the soap and paper trades, grand jury reform, the abolition of tithes and various measures of franchise reform, but there was no discussion of Repeal itself and in general the results of the Council disappointed those . . . who hoped that it would lead to unity of purpose and action and that it would act as the working model of an Irish legislature'. See letter 1948, note 2.

1945a

To P. V. FitzPatrick

[Tralee, 24 December 1832]

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have cut the Gordian knot. I am member for Dublin [city] only. I succeeded in getting the patriotic people of Kerry to elect my son-in-law, Charles O'Connell, with Mr. Mullins, and I BELONG TO DUBLIN.

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal* 27 December, 1832

1945b

To his wife, Merrion Square

Tralee, 26 December 1832

My own darling love,

I was doubly delighted at getting a letter from you this night as I imagined no post left Dublin on Christmas Day. I enclose you a letter from Mr. Magee¹ which I opened. You must get one of your sons to translate the Latin for you as your husband is not at home. What an odd idea, darling, to write Latin to a lady. I confess I do not approve of *his* piece of plate. I wish you would write to him to beg he would give you the selection of it. A tea urn would be, I think, the best shape they could put it in but at all events if you do not like the piece he suggests, write to him to wait until you arrive and select better. Darling little Mary² has a sore throat and she stayed in bed all day nursing it. I have determined that she and Maurice should travel more slowly to Dublin. A [two words illegible] answer to their carriage. I mean [about 3 words illegible] arriving, please God, at seven or very soon after. I have sent on to bespeak horses at Castleisland, Abbeyfeale etc. I expect to have no difficulty in going from Limerick to Dublin on Saturday. Leaving by seven in the morning I ought to be in Dublin by nine at night or, at all events, before ten. Mary and Maurice will leave this about ten on Friday and stop that night either in Abbeyfeale or Newcastle[west], then go on the next day to Limerick where her mother will be before her. She will remain in Limerick all day on Sunday with her mother and go on Monday to Monasterevan so as to dine with us on Tuesday, New Year's Day. I hope to persuade the trades to give up the chairing. It is the most idle and foolish thing that can be imagined. I will certainly strain every nerve to get them to abandon that silly ceremony. . . .

I should be delighted if he [Richard Leyne] were to reside in this town. He would do an immense deal of good now that we have the party completely down. John Primrose, the elder, and his family are also coming to live here. They have actually taken a house in Denny Street. These are sure voters for Maurice.

Darling, the post of this morning relieved all your anxiety about Dublin.³ My sweet Kate owes me a kiss for writing to

her. Give her my tenderest love, also to our boys. Maurice and little Mary write in love to you. The family here are surprisingly well. Maurice⁴ goes up with me to get some favour from the College of Surgeons.

SOURCE : Papers of B. M. Heron

- 1 Very probably Rev. Anthony Magee, D.D. (died c. 1858) parish priest of St. Mary's Westminster from before 1836 to 1851; parish priest of St. Helen's and St. Mary's, Bayswater, London, 1852-8.
- 2 His daughter-in-law.
- 3 Presumably a reference to the fact that he could sit in parliament for Dublin city now that he had procured the election of Charles O'Connell in place of himself for Co. Kerry.
- 4 Maurice Connor, Mary O'Connell's nephew.

Index of Persons

In this index no distinction is made between persons mentioned in letters and those mentioned in notes, or between a name mentioned once or more than once in a letter and its notes. Numbers in italics indicate that the person is either the writer or the recipient of the letter; a form of relationship after a name indicates relationship to Daniel O'Connell. All numerical references are to letter numbers.

- Abbott, Charles, 1st Baron Tenterden, 1766
 Abraham, William, Catholic Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 1623, 1629, 1697, 1708, 1713, 1796
 Addington, Henry, 1st Viscount Sidmouth, 1897
 Alexander, Du Pre, 2nd earl of Caledon, 1839
 Alexander, James, 1746
 Alexander, Josias Du Pre, 1746
 Allanson, Charles Winn, 2nd Baron Headley, 1507
 Althorp, Viscount, *see* Spencer, John Charles
 Anderson, Matthew, 1650
 Anglesey, 1st marquis of, *see* Paget, Henry William
 Annesley, George Arthur, *styled* Viscount Valentia, 1694, 1800, 1885, 1934
 Archbold, Rev. John, 1648
 Archer, William Henry, 1814
 Armagh, Catholic archbishop of, *see* Curtis, Patrick
 Armagh, Protestant archbishop of, *see* Beresford, Lord John George
 Attorney Generals, *see* Saurin, William; Plunket, William Conyngham; Joy, Henry; Blackburne, Francis
 Attwood, Thomas, 1640
 Aylmer, Mr., 1882
 Ayre, Joseph, 1819

 Baines, Edward, Jr. 1566
 Baldwin, Herbert, 1881, 1883, 1901, 1921, 1944
 Baldwin, Walter J., 1890: 1816
 Balfe, Edmund, 1862
 Baring, Alexander, 1562, 1637
 Barnes, Thomas, 1561
 Barrett, Richard, 1685, 1688, 1692, 1768, 1777, 1811, 1822, 1826, 1837, 1839, 1919, 1930: 1558, 1630, 1751, 1814, 1885, 1914, 1917, 1919, 1927, 1945
 Barrett, Timothy, 1616
 Barrington, Sir Jonah, 1650, 1676, 1678
 Barrington, Matthew, 1818a: 1809
 Barron, Henry Winston, 1623, 1631, 1716, 1796, 1797, 1802
 Barron, Lieut. John Winston, 1623, 1626, 1629, 1630, 1631, 1678, 1696
 Barron, Pierse George, 1623, 1624
 Barron, Mrs. Pierse George, 1623
 Barron, William Winston, 1623, 1626, 1716
 Barry, Garret Standish, 1930
 Barry, James, M.D. (Cahirciveen), 1614
 Barry, John Maxwell-, 5th Baron Farnham, 1824
 Bateson, Sir Robert, 1st baronet, 1741, 1746, 1799
 Battersby, William Joseph, 1510
 Beamish, Francis Bernard, 1716
 Beauregard, Charles Saulnier de, 1857a
 Bective, earl of, *see* Taylour, Thomas
 Bellew, Michael Dillon, 1550a, 1672
 Bellew, Sir Patrick, 7th baronet, 1928
 Bellew, Richard Montesquieu, 1928
 Belmore, 2nd earl of, *see* Corry, Somerset Lowry-,
 Bennett, Richard Newton, 1505, 1678, 1683-4, 1686, 1714, 1740, 1744, 1757, 1764, 1767: 1661, 1662, 1687, 1768, 1781
 Bennett, Valentine, 1940
 Bentham, Jeremy, 1529, 1541, 1628a 1641
 Beresford, Lord George Thomas, 1583, 1629, 1630, 1674, 1678, 1693, 1711, 1716, 1784, 1796, 1797, 1799, 1800, 1802, 1804, 1805
 Beresford, Henry de la Poer, 3rd marquess of Waterford, 1588

- Beresford, Lord John George de la Poer, Protestant archbishop of Dublin, later Armagh, 1583
 Beresford, William Carr, 1st Viscount Beresford, 1583
 Bernard, John, 1800
 Berwick, Edward, 1620
 Berwick, Walter, 1618
 Bianconi, Charles, 1806
 Bingham, Charles B., 2nd Baron Clanmorris, 1507
 Blackburne, Francis, 1765: 1764, 1849, 1854, 1919, 1921
 Blacker, William, 1544
 Blackney, Walter, 1800
 Blackwood, John O'Reilly, 1644
 Blackwood and Blackwood, 1644
 Blake, Anthony Richard, 1516, 1545
 Blake, James, 1919
 Blake, Rev. Michael, P.P. (later bishop of Dromore), 1911
 Blayney, Andrew Thomas, 11th Baron Blayney, 1924
 Blennerhassett, Ellen (formerly O'Connell), 1944
 Bligh, Hon. John Duncan, 1834
 Blount, Edward, 1533, 1550a 1566, 1623, 1626
 Bonaparte, Napoleon, 1545, 1709
 Borsbeck, Louis F. de Robiano-, 1663
 Bourke, Major-General Richard, 1807
 Bouverie, William Pleydell-, 3rd earl of Radnor, 1835
 Boyse, John, 1930
 Boyse, Thomas, 1694, 1885
 Boyton, Rev. Charles, 1860, 1900, 1903, 1906, 1915, 1917, 1945
 Brabazon, John Chambre, 10th earl of Meath, 1698, 1758
 Bradley, Mr. 1700
 Brady, J.C., 1902
 Bray, John, 1899
 Brennan, Charles, 1805
 Brennan, John and Co., 1873
 Brennan, Maurice, 1561a, 1561b, 1805
 Brennans (Bahoss), 1908, 1913
 Brewster, Abraham, 1673
 Bric, John, 1586
 Bridgeman, Hewitt, 1689, 1692, 1807
 Brougham, Henry Peter, later Lord Brougham, 1505, 1525, 1526, 1536, 1566, 1569, 1678, 1683, 1684, 1685, 1709, 1718, 1726, 1835, 1850, 1853
 Brougham, James, 1526
 Brown, Thomas, 1679
 Browne, John, 1915
 Browne, Valentine, Viscount Castle-rosse, later 2nd earl of Kenmare, 1549, 1716, 1806
 Browne, Hon. William, 1692, 1738, 1943, 1945
 Brownlow, Charles, 1840, 1876
 Bruen, Francis, 1681
 Bruen, Col. Henry, 1681, 1800
 Bulwer, Edward, 1896
 Burdett, Sir Francis, 5th baronet, 1532, 1536, 1566, 1576, 1578, 1767, 1784
 Burke, Edmund, 1716
 Burke, General, *see* Bourke, Major-General Richard
 Bury, Charles William, *styled* Lord Tullamore 1681, 1940
 Butler, Charles, 1529
 Butler, Edmond, 1st earl of Kilkenny, 1619
 Butler, John Judkin, 1800
 Butler, Col. the Hon. Pierce, 1619: 1704, 1768, 1771, 1772, 1800, 1801, 1802
 Butler, Dr. Richard, 1857
 Butler, Richard, 2nd earl of Glengall, 1507, 1768
 Butler, Sir Thomas, 8th baronet, 1681, 1803
 Byng, Lady Agnes, 1602
 Byng, Captain George Stevens, 1602
 Byng, Sir John, 1799, 1832
 Cahill, Charles Staunton, 1635, 1689, 1707a
 Caledon, 2nd earl of, *see* Alexander Du Pre
 Callaghan, Daniel, 1840: 1658, 1789, 1921
 Callaghan, Gerald, 1602
 Campbell, John, 1902
 Cantwell, John MacNamara, 1684
 Carbery, Andrew, 1774: 1696
 Carew, M. 1526
 Carew, Robert Shapland, 1530, 1885, 1934
 Carpenter, William, 1755
 Carr, Robert James, bishop of Worcester, 1839
 Carrick, Pierce, 1874
 Carroll, —, 1818a
 Carroll, Charles Rivers, 1524
 Casey Philip, 1778
 Castlereagh, Viscount, *see* Stewart, Frederick William Robert
 Castlereagh, Viscount, *see* Stewart, Robert
 Cave, Robert Otway, 1606, 1929
 Cavendish, William George Spencer, 6th duke of Devonshire, 1629, 1631, 1696, 1800, 1802
 Challoner, Robert, 1725
 Chandos, Lord, *see* Grenville, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-, Chichester, Arthur, 1694, 1800
 Chief Secretaries, *see* Lord Francis Leveson-Gower
 Childs, Joseph, 1520:
 Clanmorris, 2nd baron, *see* Bingham, Charles B.
 Clare, 1st earl of, *see* Fitzgibbon, John
 Clarence, Prince William Henry, duke of, 1521a, 1524

- Clarke, Simeon, 1681
 Clifford, Hon. Hugh Charles, 1578
 Clive, E.B., 1526
 Clive, Robert, 1526
 Cloncurry, 2nd baron, *see* Lawless,
 Valentine Browne
 Cloney, Thomas, 1706: 1692, 1694
 Coates, —, 1629
 Cobbett, William, 1897: 1536, 1537,
 1576, 1578, 1719, 1852
 Codd and Brennan, 1770
Cody-v-White, 1591
 Coke, Lady Anne Amelia, 1718
 Coke, Thomas William, 1718
 Cole, John Willoughby, 2nd earl of
 Enniskillen, 1839, 1854
 Coleman, Rev. Maurice, 1697
 Collins, John S., 1665
 Collis, John, 1892
 Colomb, George, 1865, 1875
 Connor, —, (policeman), 1817a
 Connor, Maurice, 1945b
 Connors, Edward, 1616
 Conway, Frederick William, 1720, 1786
 Conway, William B., 1786
 Cooke, Rev. Henry, 1774
 Coppinger, William, 1601
 Corcoran, John, 1694
 Cork, Catholic bishop of, *see* Murphy,
 John
 Cork, Protestant bishop of, *see* Kyle,
 Samuel
 Cornwallis, Charles, 1st Marquis
 Cornwallis, 1761
 Corry, Armor Lowry-, *styled*
 Viscount Corry, 1854
 Corry, Hon. Henry Thomas Lowry-,
 1854
 Corry, Somerset Lowry-, 2nd earl
 of Belmore, 1854
 Costello, Marcus, 1710, 1735, 1833,
 1853, 1915, 1917
 Costello, Patrick, 1899b: 1911
 Courtenay, Ellen, 1848, 1871, 1890,
 1900
 Courtney, T.P., 1526
 Coventry Political Union, secretary of,
 see Hickling, William
 Coxen, John Stuart, 1716
 Crampton, Philip Cecil, 1728, 1734,
 1897, 1902
 Crawford, William Sharman, 1799
 Creagh, Michael, 1616
 Crean, Gerald, 1823
 Cremorne, Lady, 1800
 Cronin, Daniel (Killarney), 1923
 Cross, W.J., 1773
 Crumpe, Miss M.G.S., 1625
 Cullen, C. Sinclair, 1628a 1641
 Cullinan, —, 1668
 Cumberland, Ernest Augustus, duke
 of, 1525, 1528, 1598, 1605, 1610
 Curran, Henry, 1546
 Curran, Waring, 1546
 Curtis, Mr. 1707a
 Curtis, Patrick, Catholic archbishop
 of Armagh, 1731, 1827
 Daily, Owen, 1616
 Daily, Patrick, 1616
 Dalton, —, 1929
 Daly, James (Cork), 1789
 Daly, Patrick, 1674
 Darley, Frederick, 1544, 1546, 1662a
 Daunt, William Joseph O'Neill, 1930,
 1944
 Dawson, Alexander, 1756, 1764, 1767
 Dawson, George Robert, 1546, 1725,
 1826
 Day, Rev. John Godfrey, 1608
 Delany, Rev. James, P.P., 1899
 Denman, Sir Thomas, knight, 1784,
 1832, 1902
 Denny, Sir Edward, 3rd baronet,
 1572
 Denny, Sir Edward, 4th baronet,
 1941, 1943
 Denvir, Rev. Cornelius, 1546
 Denvir, Robert, Jr., 1546
 Denvir, Robert, Sr., 1546
 Dering, Sir Edward Cholmondeley,
 8th baronet, 1800
 Despard, William Wellesley, 1899
 D'Esterre, John Norcot, 1593
 Devereux, John, 1601
 de Vesci, 2nd Viscount, *see* Vesey,
 John
 Devonshire, 6th duke of, *see* Caven-
 dish, William George Spencer
 Dickson, Mr., 1689
 Dickson, Stephen Fox, 1847
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 1896
 Doheny, Michael, 1939
 Doherty, John, 1601, 1602, 1608, 1616,
 1639, 1674, 1675, 1683, 1684, 1686,
 1725, 1726, 1727, 1728, 1736, 1744,
 1751, 1854
 Dolan, Terence, 1702
 Donoghue, —, 1632
 Douglas, R.K., 1649
 Dowling, J., 1761
 Doyle, James Warren, (JKL) bishop of
 Kildare and Leighlin, 1506, 1513,
 1530, 1597, 1653, 1669, 1820,
 1860: 1837, 1857, 1899, 1933
 Doyle, Sir John Milley, knight, 1803:
 1681, 1800, 1810
 Doyle, Patrick, 1824
 Dromore, Catholic bishop of, *see*
 Kelly, Thomas
 Dublin, Catholic archbishops of, *see*
 Murray, Daniel
 Dubois, John, bishop of New York,
 1606a
 Duckett, Richard, 1696
 Duggan, Rev. Malachy, 1629
 Dunally, 2nd baron, *see* Prittie,
 Henry Sadlier
 Duncannon, Lady, 1596

- Duncannon, Viscount, *see* Ponsonby, John William
- Dwyer, Edward, 1519, 1526, 1532, 1536-37, 1551, 1564, 1566-67, 1577, 1579, 1635, 1651, 1654, 1658, 1722-24, 1735-6, 1769, 1771-2, 1776, 1779, 1783, 1787, 1790, 1832, 1834-5, 1838, 1894: 1549, 1555, 1628a, 1682, 1708, 1709, 1739, 1751
- Dwyer, Frank P., 1869: 1654
- Dwyer, James, B.L., 1893: 1915
- Easthope, John, 1526
- Ebrington, Viscount, *see* Fortescue, Hugh
- Edge, J., 1899
- Edwards, John, 1746, 1747
- Egan, Cornelius, bishop of Kerry, 1716, 1805
- Egan [?Daniel], 1899
- Egremont, 3rd earl of, *see* Wyndham, George O'Brien
- Ellenborough, 2nd baron, *see* Law, Edward
- Ellice, Edward, 1839
- Ellis, George James Welbore Agar-, 1562
- Ellis, Lieut. John, 1598
- Elrington, Thomas, Protestant bishop of Limerick, later bishop of Ferns, 1616, 1934
- Ennis, Andrew, 1549
- Ennis, Rev. John, 1589, 1877, 1902
- Enniskillen, 2nd earl of, *see* Cole, John Willoughby
- Ensor, George, 1617
- Esmonde, James, 1711, 1802
- Esmonde, Sir Thomas, 9th baronet, 1552, 1694, 1885, 1934
- Evans, George de Lacy, 1938
- Evans, George Hampden, 1905, 1917, 1920, 1936
- Evans, Henry, 1616
- Eyre, Robert, 1676
- Eyre, Lt. Samuel, 1676
- Farnan, Rev. Mr., 1769
- Farnham, 5th Baron, *see* Barry, John Maxwell-
- Farrell, Richard, 1932
- Faulkner, William Cole, 1621
- Fenton, John, 1529
- Ferguson, Sir Robert Alexander, 2nd baronet, 1746
- Ferguson, William, 1674
- Ferns and Leighlin, bishop of, *see* Elrington, Thomas
- Ffrench, Betsey, *see also* O'Connell, Elizabeth Mary (Betsey) (daughter), 1813: 1881, 1882, 1886, 1930
- Ffrench, Charles Joseph, 1818
- Ffrench, Nicholas Joseph, 1813, 1862, 1881, 1930
- Fingall, 8th earl of, *see* Plunkett, Arthur James
- Finn, Patrick, 1681
- Finn, Thomas, 1933
- Finn, William F., 1681, 1933
- Finucane, Michael, 1525
- Finucane, William, 1525
- Fitzgerald, Rev. Andrew, O.P., 1933
- FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick, 3rd duke of Leinster, 1507, 1721, 1787, 1909, 1921
- Fitzgerald, Rev. Edward, P.P., 1607: 1892, 1913
- FitzGerald, Gerald, M.D., 1675
- Fitzgerald, Kitty, 1680
- FitzGerald, Maurice, knight of Kerry, 1513a, 1524a, 1535, 1555a, 1561b, 1563, 1605, 1608, 1662a: 1555b, 1660, 1800, 1805, 1810, 1817a, 1943
- Fitzgerald, Thomas (Cork), 1680, 1762, 1844, 1922: 1699
- Fitzgerald, Thomas (Dublin and Co. Louth), 1924: 1928
- FitzGerald, William Vesey, 1552, 1555a, 1555b, 1569, 1574, 1577, 1584, 1586, 1628a, 1678, 1686, 1764, 1853, 1854
- Fitzgibbon, John, 1st earl of Clare, 1761, 1820
- FitzMaurice, Henry Petty, 3rd marquess of Lansdowne, 1569, 1573, 1657, 1718, 1724, 1918,
- Fitzmaurice, Ulysses, 1886
- Fitzpatrick, —, 1923
- FitzPatrick, Hugh, Sr., 1545, 1699
- FitzPatrick, Patrick Vincent, 1674, 1682, 1707, 1708, 1713, 1721, 1770, 1795, 1798, 1810, 1819, 1825, 1830-31, 1833, 1836, 1873, 1877, 1891, 1895, 1895a, 1900, 1902-6, 1911, 1914-18, 1921, 1925, 1932, 1945-45a: 1567, 1699, 1944
- FitzPatrick, William, 1932
- Fitz-Simon, Christopher, 1694, 1698, 1702, 1709, 1725, 1810b: 1635, 1644, 1652, 1701, 1706, 1707a, 1708, 1726, 1751, 1883, 1905, 1917, 1920, 1936, 1943, 1944, 1945
- Fitz-Simon, Ellen, *see also* O'Connell, 1701: 1652, 1943
- Fitz-Simon, Nicholas, 1940, 1945
- Fitzwilliam, Charles William Wentworth-, styled Viscount Milton, 1725, 1826
- Fitzwilliam, William Wentworth-, second Earl Fitzwilliam, 1629, 1725, 1726
- Fletcher, Henry, 1847
- Flood, Patrick, 1720
- Fogarty, Rev. Patrick, 1566
- Foran, Rev. Nicholas, 1629, 1631, 1713
- Forbes, George John, Viscount Forbes, 1507, 1800, 1853, 1854

- Ford, Sir Richard, knight, 1543
 Ford, William, attorney, 1710
 Forristall, M.S., 1643
 Forster, T., M.D., 1664
 Fortescue, Hugh, *styled* Viscount Ebrington, 1853, 1854
 Foster, John Leslie, 1608
 Fowler, John, 1647
 Fox, Henry Richard Vassall, 3rd Baron Holland, 1581, 1688, 1718
 Fraser, James, 1778
 Freeling, Sir Francis, 1st baronet, 1883
 Freeman, William Deane, 1923
 French, Arthur, 1854
 Fryer, Richard, Jr., 1867
 Fuller, John, 1550a
 Fulton, *see* Fuller, John
 Furnell, Michael, (the younger), 1586

 Gallagher, William, 1884
 Galloway, Alexander, 1899a
 Gallwey, Stephen, 1561a, 1561b
 Galwey, John Mathew, 1623, 1696, 1713
 Gavan, Rev. John, 1919
 George III, 1718
 George IV (*see also* George Augustus Frederick, prince of Wales, later prince regent) 1525, 1528, 1529, 1531, 1669, 1670, 1682, 1684
 Germain, or Germaine, Mr., 1894
 Giffard, John, 1761
 Glengall, 2nd earl of, *see* Butler, Richard
 Glinn, (police sergeant), 1774
 Godfrey, William Duncan, 1561a
 Goldsmid, Isaac Lyon, 1604
 Gordon, Lieut. James Edward, R.N., (Sandy), 1830, 1834
 Gordon, Robert, 1538, 1539
 Gormanston, 12th Viscount, *see* Preston, Jenico
 Gossett, Sir William, knight, 1508, 1843: 1772, 1808, 1931
 Goulburn, Henry, 1670, 1672, 1674, 1677, 1688, 1691, 1842, 1875, 1902
 Gower, Lord Francis Leveson-, 1546, 1639, 1648, 1650, 1653, 1902
 Gower, Granville Leveson-, 1st Viscount Granville, 1857a
 Graham, Capt., 1824, 1854
 Graham James, 3rd duke of Montrose, 1685
 Graham, Sir James Robert, 2nd baronet, 1909, 1910
 Grant, J., (Coventry), 1749
 Grant, Robert, 1609
 Granville, 1st Viscount, *see* Gower, Granville Leveson-,
 Grattan, Henry, Jr., 1672, 1708, 1834, 1853
 Grattan, Henry, Sr., 1750
 Grattan, James, 1838
 Greene, —, (attorney), 1811
 Greene, Richard Wilson, 1847
 Greeve, John G., 1783
 Gregg, Thomas Edward Lawlor, 1612
 Gregory, William, 1544, 1546, 1662a, 1735
 Grenville, George Nugent-, 2nd Baron Nugent, 1559
 Grenville, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-, *styled* Lord Chandos, 1768
 Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl Grey, 1537, 1573, 1688, 1718, 1724, 1726, 1744, 1830, 1832, 1835, 1849, 1853, 1854, 1893
 Grierson, George, 1911
 Griffin, Gerald, 1938
 Grosvenor, Robert, 2nd Earl Grosvenor (later 1st marquis of Westminster), 1839
 Groves, Rev. Edward, 1549
 Guinness, Arthur, 1549, 1671, 1767, 1800, 1834
 Gumbleton, Henry Connor, 1800

 Hacket, John, 1600
 Haliday, Charles, 1651
 Hanly, John, 1549a: 1565a
 Hannah, a domestic servant, 1883
 Hardinge, Sir Henry, knight, 1705, 1720a
 Harold, Richard, 1615
 Hart, Sir Anthony, knight, 1507, 1550a
 Hart, Capt. George Vaughan, 1746, 1799
 Hartopp, Edward Bouchier, 1943
 Harty, Robert Way (later 1st baronet), 1739, 1787, 1799, 1816, 1831, 1832, 1914
 Harvey, Daniel Whittle, 1659
 Harvey, William, 1885
 Hatton, George William Finch-, 10th earl of Winchilsea, 1542
 Haughton, Thomas, 1681: 1835
 Hawkins, James, 1931
 Hayes, Edward, 1855
 Hayes, Roger, 1793: 1796, 1802
 Headley, 2nd baron, *see* Allanson, Charles Winn
 Heny, H., 1656
 Herbert, Capt. Thomas, 1716, 1923
 Hewson, John Francis, 1817a
 Hibernian Negroes Friend Society, secretary of, *see* Cross, W.J.
 Hickling, William, 1749
 Hickman, Poole, 1678, 1679, 1686
 Hickson, John James (Tralee), 1841: 1943
 Hill, Lord Arthur, 1799
 Hill, George, 1748
 Hill, Sir George Fitzgerald, 2nd baronet, 1583, 1638
 Hill, Rowland, 1st Baron Hill, 1839
 Hilliard, Samuel, 1817a
 Hilliard, William R., 1887: 1817a

- Hodnett, James, 1930
Holland, 3rd baron, *see* Fox, Henry Richard Vassall
Holland, Elizabeth Lady, 1685
Homan, Sir William, 1st baronet, 1592
Horne, Sir William, knight, 1784
Horner, Francis, 1741: 1746, 1747
Howard, Bernard Edward, 12th duke of Norfolk, 1529, 1533, 1578, 1685
Howard, Henry, (Corby Castle), 1566
Howard, William, 4th earl of Wicklow, 1853, 1854
Hume, Joseph, 1638, 1718, 1751, 1766, 1839, 1853
Hunt, Henry, 1540, 1848, 1852: 1536, 1537, 1578, 1647, 1749, 1766, 1863, 1871, 1872
Hurley-*v*-Crosbie, 1876
Hutchinson, John Hely, 1713
Hutton & Sons, John, 1515
Hynes, P. S., 1871
Ingestre, Viscount, *see* Talbot, Henry John Chetwynd-
Jackson, President, 1786
Jackson, Samuel, 1817a
James (a servant), 1611, 1642, 1644
James, Sir John Kingston, 1st baronet, 1544
Jephson, Charles Denham Orlando, 1538, 1539, 1645: 1643, 1944
Jerningham, George William Stafford, 17th Baron Stafford, 1570: 1578
Johnston, Sir Allen, 1899
Johnston, Rev. Henry Hunt, 1899
Johnston, Lt.-Col. Ralph Henry, 1899
Jones, Mr., 1834
Jones, Leslie Grove, 1718, 1751, 1766, 1828-29, 1851, 1854, 1863, 1871-2
Jones, Capt. Theobald, 1799
Joy, Henry, 1608, 1662a, 1854.
Kavanagh, Thomas, 1800
Keating, James, Catholic bishop of Ferns, 1824
Kelly, Miss (Acton), 1814
Kelly, George Bourke (Acton), *see* O'Kelly
Kelly, Rev. Mathias, 1589: 1904
Kelly, Patrick, Catholic bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 1796
Kelly, Thomas, Catholic bishop of Dromore, 1547
Kenmare, 2nd earl of, *see* Browne, Valentine
Kennedy, —, 1905
Kenny, Rev. John, P.P., 1668
Keogh, Loftus, 1663a
Keon, Myles Gerald, 1761
Kerin, Mr., 1689
Kernan, George, 1734
Kerry, bishop of, *see* Egan, Cornelius Kerry, knight of, *see* FitzGerald, Maurice
Kertland, William, 1735
Kift, John Thomas, 1601
Kilkenny, 1st earl of, *see* Butler, Edmond
Killaloe, Catholic bishop of, *see* O'Shaughnessy, James; McMahon, Patrick
Killeen, Lord, *see* Plunkett, Arthur James
King, Abraham Bradley, later 1st baronet, 1907: 1746, 1826, 1865, 1875, 1902, 1929
King, George, 3rd earl of Kingston, 1616
King, Peter, 7th Lord King, baron of Ockham, 1835
King, Robert Edward, 1st Viscount Lorton, 1853, 1854
Kingston, 3rd earl of, *see* King, George
Knox, Hon. Edmund, Protestant bishop of Killaloe, 1854
Knox, Hon. James, 1854
Knox, Hon. John Henry, 1854
Knox, Thomas, 2nd Viscount Northland and later 1st earl of Ranfurly 1854.
Kyle, Samuel, Protestant bishop of Cork, 1839, 1854
Lafayette, marquis de, 1809
Laffan, Mr., 1938
Lalor, John Shea *see* Lawlor,
Lalor, Patrick, 1899
Lamb, Hon. George, 1802, 1804
Lamb, William, 2nd Viscount Melbourne, 1718, 1909, 1912
Lambert, Henry, 1694, 1800, 1885, 1934
Langdale, Hon. Charles, 1578
Langtree, Samuel Daly, 1717
Lanigan, Martin, 1675
Lansdowne, 3rd marquis of, *see* Fitzmaurice, Henry Petty
Latouche; David Charles, 1833
Latouche, John David, 1549, 1800 1833, 1834
Lavelle, Patrick M., 1654, 1822, 1917, 1919, 1921
Law, Edward, 2nd Baron Ellenborough, 1909
Lawless, John, 1524, 1533, 1536, 1601, 1716, 1751a, 1786
Lawless, Valentine Browne, 2nd Baron Cloncurry, 1760: 1507, 1549, 1672, 1709, 1758, 1787, 1816, 1835, 1837, 1927
Lawlor, John Shea, 1869
Leader, Nicholas Philpot, 1672, 1681, 1700, 1716, 1834, 1869, 1899, 1905
Leary, Daniel John, 1616, 1705
Lees, Sir John, 1st baronet, 1761

- Leeson, Joseph, 4th earl of Milltown, 1507
 Lefroy, Anthony, 1800
 Lefroy, Thomas Langlois, 1598, 1608, 1875, 1907
 Leinster, 3rd duke of, *see* FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick
 Leslie, Capt. Pierce, 1884.
 L'Estrange, Rev. William, O.D.C. (Francis Joseph in religion), 1516, 1537, 1550a, 1577, 1579, 1600, 1911, 1913, 1932
 Leyne, Captain Richard, 1945b
 Liddle, M., 1526
 Limerick, Protestant bishop of, *see* Elrington, Thomas
 Linn, John J., 1783
 Littleton, Edward John, 1815
 Lock, M., 1526
 Locke, Peter Warren, 1936
 Long, Rev. Paul, 1645a
 Lord Chancellors of Ireland, *see* Hart, Sir Anthony
 Lords-Lieutenant of Ireland, *see* Whitworth, Charles; Talbot, Charles Chetwynd Chetwynd; Wellesley, Richard; Paget, Henry William; Percy, Hugh
 Lorton, 1st Viscount Lorton, *see* King, Robert Edward
 Louis XVIII, King of France, 1857a
 Louis-Philippe, King of the French, 1719
 Low, George Bond, 1616
 Lynch, Andrew Henry, 1529, 1784
 Lynch, Rev. Daniel, 1689
 Lynch, David, 1549
 Lynch, Patrick, 1616
 Lyne, Cornelius (Con), 1616: 1611
- McAuley, Catherine, 1877, 1902
 MacCabe, Jennings Patrick, 1628
 McCarthy, Alexander, B.L., 1509, 1943
 McCarthy, Charles (Droumbeg, Listowel), 1634
 McCarthy, Denis, M.D. (Midleton), 1655
 McCarthy, Edmond (attorney), 1509
 McCarthy, Francis, B.L., 1616
 McCarthy, Jeremiah (Dawson street, Dublin), 1524: 1707a
 McCarthy, John (distiller), 1763
 McCarthy, Samuel (Baliags), 1657
 McCarthy-v-T [?].] *Costigan*, 1763
 McCartie, Jeremiah, 1935
 McCartie, Robert, 1935
 McClelland, James, 1598
 McClintock, Alexander, 1824
 McDermott, William (London), 1626: 1623
 MacDonnell, Eneas, 1533, 1626
 MacDonnell, John, 1679
 MacHale, John, coadjutor bishop of Killala, 1738
- McKenny, Thomas, 1544, 1767, 1834, 1854
 MacLoughlin, Cornelius, 1518: 1549, 1567, 1925
 McMahon, Patrick, Catholic bishop of Killaloe, 1689
 McMullen, John, 1672, 1847, 1866: 1814
 McNamara, Dillon, 1524
 MacNamara, Francis, 1785
 MacNamara, John, 1678
 MacNamara, William Nugent, 1593, 1668, 1670, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1683, 1684, 1687, 1689, 1690, 1692, 1785, 1797, 1805, 180a, 1811, 1889, 1921
 Macneven, William James, M.D., 1565a, 1606a
 McNevin, Thomas, 1750
 McSweeney, Rev. Patrick, 1645a
 Macarthy, Eugene (Fishamble Street), 1742
 Madden, Patrick D., 1884
 Magee, Rev. Anthony, 1945b
 Magrath, James, 1616
 Magrath, John, 1689
 Maguire, Henry, 1546
 Maguire, Rev. Thomas, P.P., 1524
 Maher, Nicholas, 1606
 Mahon, Darcy, 1545
 Mahon, James Patrick O'Gorman, 1585: 1507, 1533, 1536, 1601, 1624, 1629, 1642, 1668, 1670, 1678, 1679, 1687, 1689, 1696, 1709, 1766, 1768, 1778, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1787, 1800, 1805, 1808, 1809, 1810a, 1811, 1816, 1874: 1921
 Mahon, Thomas (of the Bible Society), 1811
 Mahon, Thomas (Greenlawn, Co. Clare), 1525
 Mahon, William Richard, 1670, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1787, 1811, 1813, 1814, 1816
 Mahony, David, 1583-84, 1588
 Mahony, Rev. Jeremiah (Darby), P.P., 1817a
 Mahony, Pierce, 1544-46, 1555b, 1581, 1593-95, 1598-99, 1601: 1533, 1549, 1550, 1553, 1583, 1588, 1593, 1623, 1626, 1629, 1607, 1721, 1728, 1744, 1927, 1930, 1943
 Manners, 1st Baron, *see* Sutton, Thomas Manners
 Manners, —, 1696
 Markey, Nicholas, 1928
 Mason, Joshua, 1797
 Massy, Godfrey, 1943
 Mathew, Rev. Theobald, 1589
 Maxwell, Marmaduke, 1758
 Meath, 10th earl of, *see* Brabazon, John Chamber
 Melbourne, 2nd Viscount, *see* Lamb, William
 Meredith (or Meredyth), Sir Henry, 3rd baronet, 1650

- Meylor, Mr. 1681
 Miller, John, 1514
 Milltown, 4th earl of, *see* Leeson, Joseph
 Milton, Viscount, *see* Fitzwilliam, Charles William Wentworth-,
 Mitchell, —, 1610
 Molony, James, 1507
 Monck, Henry Stanley, 1st earl of Rathdowne, (formerly 2nd Viscount Monck), 1725
 Montgomery, Henry, 1774
 Montrose, 3rd duke of, *see* Graham, James
 Moore, George Ogle, 1651
 Moore, Stephen, 3rd Earl Mountcashel, 1616
 Moore, Thomas, 1938: 1569
 More, Sir Thomas, 1853
 Morgan, Hamilton Knox Grogan, 1934
 Morris, Patrick, 1917
 Morris, William, 1756
 Mountcashel, 3rd Earl, *see* Moore, Stephen
 Mullen, Joseph D., 1791: 1914
 Mullins, Frederick W., 1800, 1810, 1859, 1921, 1923, 1945, 1945a
 Murphy, Jeremiah (merchant, Cork), 1673
 Murphy, John, Catholic bishop of Cork, 1707
 Murphy, John (Valentia), 1511
 Murphy, William (Smithfield), 1549, 1713, 1770, 1787
 Murray, Daniel, archbishop of Dublin, 1639, 1733: 1552, 1708, 1713
 Murray, Daniel (Surgeon), 1546
 Musgrave, John, 1693, 1797, 1800
 Musgrave, Sir Richard, 3rd baronet, 1693, 1796, 1797, 1799, 1802, 1804, 1838

 Nagle, Honora, 1844
 Naylan, Daniel, 1674
 Nelson, Horatio, 1524
 Newenham, William Henry Worth, 1658
 Newman, Henry, 1857a
 Newport, Sir John, 1st baronet, 1677, 1688, 1836
 Norfolk, 12th duke of, *see* Howard, Bernard Edward
 North, John Henry, 1702, 1778, 1800
 Northumberland, 3rd duke of, *see* Percy, Hugh
 Nowlan, William, 1616
 Nugent, 2nd Baron, *see* Grenville, George Nugent-,
 Nugent, Edmond, 1672
 Nugent, George Thomas John, 8th earl of Westmeath, 1709, 1909
 Nugent, Michael, 1898
 Nugent, Percy (later Sir Percy, 1st baronet), 1799, 1800

 O'Brien, Christine, 1550a, 1552, 1642
 O'Brien, Cornelius, 1921
 O'Brien, Donough Acheson, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1599, 1601
 O'Brien, Sir Edward, 4th baronet, 1595, 1679, 1785, 1787, 1790
 O'Brien, John (Moore st., Dublin), 1710
 O'Brien, Lucius, 1581, 1593, 1595, 1599, 1668, 1674, 1679
 O'Brien, Misses, 1780
 O'Brien, William Smith, 1581, 1593, 1674, 1785, 1818a
 O'Callaghan, George, 1679
 O'Connell, —, brewer, Limerick, 1567
 O'Connell, Catherine (Kate) (daughter), 1516, 1879: 1602, 1778, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1945b
 O'Connell, Charles, (son-in-law), 1921, 1944, 1945a
 O'Connell, Charles, (Ennis), 1689, 1696, 1810b
 O'Connell, Daniel, (son), 1550a, 1607, 1775, 1873, 1882
 O'Connell, Dan (of Lakeview), 1888
 O'Connell, Lt. Gen. Daniel Charles, Count, 1590
 O'Connell, Elizabeth (Bess), (née Coppinger), 1601
 O'Connell, Elizabeth Mary (Betsey) (daughter), 1550a
 O'Connell, James, 1522, 1587, 1657, 1699, 1888: 1561a, 1614, 1632, 1662a, 1805
 O'Connell, John (son), 1921, 1930, 1943
 O'Connell, John (brother), 1507, 1805: 1601, 1662a, 1689, 1699, 1800, 1943, 1944
 O'Connell, Mary (wife), 1515, 1517, 1525, 1527-29, 1533-34, 1549-50a, 1552, 1554, 1561, 1572, 1602-3, 1611-13, 1633, 1642, 1644, 1652, 1695, 1726, 1737, 1739, 1775, 1778, 1780-82, 1784, 1814, 1816, 1876, 1880-83, 1943-44, 1945b: 1516, 1680
 O'Connell, Mary Frances (daughter-in-law), 1944, 1945b
 O'Connell, Maurice (son), 1810a: 1516, 1528, 1529, 1533, 1549, 1550, 1550a, 1552, 1586, 1607, 1635, 1652, 1667, 1689, 1701, 1702, 1704, 1706, 1764, 1778, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1787, 1790, 1800, 1805, 1809, 1810b, 1811, 1813, 1814, 1816, 1876, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1892, 1895a, 1906, 1921, 1941, 1943, 1945b
 O'Connell, Maurice (of Lakeview) 1888
 O'Connell, Morgan John, 1943, 1944
 O'Connell, Morgan P. (son), 1590: 1550, 1652, 1689, 1690, 1881, 1882, 1943, 1944, 1945
 O'Connor, Feargus Edward, 1921

- O'Connor, Rev. N., P.P., 1899
 O'Connor, Thomas, 1884
 O'Connor, Denis, 1821, 1889: 1854
 O'Connor, Owen, 1531: 1672, 1709
 1738, 1759, 1821
 O'Connor Don, *see* O'Connor, Owen;
 O'Connor, Denis
 O'Donnell, Col. Henry Anderson,
 1582
 O'Donnell, James, 1591
 O'Donnell, William, 1630
 O'Dwyer, Andrew Carew, 1914, 1917,
 1928
 O'Ferrall, Richard More, 1709, 1731,
 1733, 1738
 O'Flanagan (printer), 1911
 O'Gorman, James, 1525
 O'Gorman, Nicholas Purcell, 1556,
 1568, 1624, 1696: 1532, 1533, 1536,
 1537, 1549, 1612, 1631, 1642
 O'Gorman, Mrs. Nicholas Purcell, 1537
 O'Gorman, Rev. Patrick, 1689
 O'Gorman Mahon, *see* Mahon, James
 Patrick O'Gorman
 O'Hara, James, 1672
 O'Kelly, George Bourke, 1578, 1775,
 1781
 O'Loughlen, Bryan, 1689
 O'Loughlen, Michael, 1628, 1678, 1689,
 1734, 1833, 1834, 1921
 O'Lomasney, Jeremiah, 1930
 O'Mara, Thomas, 1758: 1760
 O'Meara, William Aloysius, O.F.M.,
 1541
 O'Reardon, John, M.D., 1904
 O'Reilly, Myles John, 1899
 Orpen, Emanuel Hutchinson, 1574
 Osborne, Richard Boyse, 1857, 1885
 O'Shaughnessy, J. Edward, 1809
 O'Shaughnessy, Rev. Terence, 1809
 O'Shea, Miss, 1552
 O'Shee, John Power, 1696, 1797, 1804
 O'Sullivan, Roger (nephew), 1579
 Oxmantown, Lord, *see* Parsons,
 William
 Paget, Henry William, 1st marquis of
 Anglesey, 1547, 1553, 1727, 1729-30,
 1732: 1507, 1509, 1544, 1549, 1552,
 1569, 1573, 1581, 1726, 1728, 1731,
 1733, 1735, 1736, 1739, 1744, 1751,
 1751a, 1757, 1758, 1764, 1774, 1784,
 1800, 1808, 1820, 1822, 1825, 1832,
 1837, 1839, 1849, 1853, 1854, 1860,
 1866, 1894, 1919, 1932, 1933
 Paget-v-Gerald Callaghan, M.P., 1601,
 1602
 Palmerston, 3rd Viscount, *see* Temple,
 Henry John
 Parkinson, B., 1783
 Parnell, Henry Brooke, 4th baronet,
 1794: 1517, 1578, 1597, 1766, 1837,
 1866, 1899
 Parsons, Lawrence, 2nd earl of Rosse,
 1940
 Parsons, William, *styled* Lord Oxman-
 town, 1940
 Payne, John Howard, 1577a
 Peel, Robert (later Sir Robert, 2nd
 baronet), 1507, 1529, 1532, 1545,
 1569, 1584, 1662a, 1669, 1722, 1724,
 1791, 1842, 1890, 1902
 Pennefather, Edward, 1644
 Pennefather, Richard, 1930
 Percy, Hugh, 3rd duke of Northumber-
 land, 1544, 1550a, 1672, 1716, 1735
 Perrin, Louis, 1799, 1800, 1816, 1831,
 1832, 1833, 1915, 1917, 1921, 1929
 Phillimore, Joseph, 1643
 Phillips, Charles, 1775
 Pigot, David Richard, 1616, 1914
 Pim, James, Jr., 1770
 Pitt, William, The Younger, 1761
 Plunket, William Conyngham, 1st
 Baron Plunket, 1817a: 1663a, 1736,
 1751, 1800, 1853, 1854, 1909, 1945
 Plunkett, Arthur James, 8th earl of
 Fingall, 1549
 Plunkett, Arthur James, *styled* Lord
 Killeen (later 9th earl of Fingall),
 1507, 1533, 1549, 1626, 1654, 1709,
 1731, 1733, 1738, 1832, 1853
 Pollock, Jonathan Frederick, 1528
 Ponsonby, John William, *styled*
 Viscount Duncannon, 1596, 1799-
 1802, 1815, 1842, 1849-50, 1853,
 1861, 1862a: 1552, 1562, 1612, 1629,
 1729, 1764, 1771, 1772, 1782
 Portarlington Committee, *see* Saunders,
 John Robert, Chairman
 Potter, Louis Joseph Antoine de, 1719
 Power, James (Ballydine), 1797
 Power, John, distiller, 1549, 1770, 1945
 Power, Nicholas Mahon, 1696, 1797
 Power, Richard (Clashmore), 1693,
 1796, 1800, 1802
 Power, Robert, 1802, 1804
 Preston, Jenico, 12th Viscount Gorman-
 ston, 1549, 1708
 Primrose, John, Jr., 1511, 1523, 1542,
 1557, 1632, 1691, 1886, 1892, 1901:
 1550, 1605, 1608, 1707a
 Primrose, John, Sr., 1908, 1913: 1945b
 Prittie, Henry Sadleir, 2nd Baron
 Dunalley, 1507
 Quin, Michael J., 1645a: 1635
 Radnor, 3rd earl of, *see* Bouverie,
 William Pleydell-
 Ram, —, 1694
 Ranfurly, 1st earl of, *see* Knox,
 Thomas, 2nd Viscount Northland
 Rathdowne, 1st earl of, *see* Monck,
 Henry Stanley
 Redington, Miss, 1550a, 1552
 Reynolds, John, 1751a

- Rice, Thomas Spring, 1610, 1807, 1812, 1817: 1513a, 1572, 1573, 1597, 1615, 1660, 1672, 1688, 1692, 1733, 1735, 1785, 1827, 1835, 1866, 1927, 1942
- Rich, Sir George, 1945
- Richard (coachman), 1642
- Riversdale, 2nd Baron, *see* Tonson, William
- Robinson, Sir G., 1526
- Roche, David, 1921, 1943
- Roche, James (Cork), 1575
- Roche, James (Doneraile), 1616
- Roche, William (Limerick), 1575: 1921, 1943
- Ronayne, Dominick, 1631, 1673, 1693, 1793, 1796: 1696, 1716, 1802, 1894
- Ronayne, Dominick Philip, 1930
- Ronayne, Maurice, 1797
- Roose, David C., 1904
- Rossmore, 2nd Baron, *see* Westenra, Warner William
- Rowe, Dickey Radford, 1934
- Rowe, John, 1885, 1934
- Royal College of Surgeons Anatomical Committee chairman of, *see* White, Francis
- Russell, Lord John, 1688, 1768, 1778, 1787, 1836, 1870
- Russell, Lord William, 1526
- Ruthven, Edward Southwell, 1914, 1917, 1918, 1921, 1925, 1929, 1945
- Ryan, A., 1797
- Ryan, Robert, 1807, 1812
- Ryan, Major Thomas, 1894
- Sadlier, Franc, D.D., 1927
- St. Julien, Mrs. or Madame, *see* Courtenay, Ellen
- Sampson, —, 1678
- Saunders, John Robert, 1937
- Saurin, Mark Anthony, 1598
- Scales, Michael, 1521, 1576: 1897
- Scarlett, James, (later Sir James, knight), 1569, 1678, 1683
- Scott, Bindon, 1522
- Scott, Frances Percy, 1945b
- Scott, Richard (attorney), 1670, 1679, 1687, 1690, 1785: 1566, 1567, 1668
- Scott, William, 1929
- Scully, Denys, 1661-2: 1545, 1714
- Segerson, John James (Cade), 1908, 1913
- Shaffan, Thomas, 1700
- Shaw, Frederick, 1708, 1833, 1834, 1905, 1915, 1921, 1929
- Sheahan, Michael, 1858
- Sheehan, David, 1616
- Sheehan, John (Londonderry), 1638
- Sheehan, Rev. John, 1623, 1629-30, 1666, 1719, 1793, 1797, 1804: 1697, 1796
- Sheehan, Rev. Maurice, 1636
- Sheehan, Patrick, M.D., 1697
- Sheehan, Remigius, 1900, 1903, 1906
- Sheehan, Thomas, 1900
- Sheil, John Barclay, 1578, 1759
- Sheil, Richard Lalor, 1516, 1519, 1524, 1583, 1623, 1629, 1667, 1673, 1675, 1692, 1697, 1739, 1784, 1786, 1822, 1832, 1834, 1878, 1927, 1928, 1929
- Sherlock, Alexander, 1711: 1804
- Shine, William, 1616
- Shirley, Evelyn John, 1799
- Shrewsbury, 16th earl of Shrewsbury, *see* Talbot, John
- Sibthorpe, Emily, 1580
- Sidmouth, 1st Viscount, *see* Addington, Henry
- Sinclair, George, 2nd baronet, 1856
- Slaney, Harvey (Robert Aglionby), 1646
- Small, John, 1646
- Smith, Alderman, *see* Smyth, Richard
- Smith, Henry, 1846
- Smith, James, M.D., 1899
- Smith, William, 1870
- Smith, Sir William Cusac, second baronet, 1927
- Smith, Sir William Sidney, Kt., 1685
- Smyth, Richard, 1917
- Somerville, Sir Marcus, 4th Bt., 1834
- Spencer, John Charles, styled Viscount Althorp, 1909-10, 1912: 1566, 1725, 1767, 1822, 1826, 1831, 1832, 1835, 1836, 1853, 1875, 1902, 1907, 1927
- Spratt, Rev. John, O.C.C., 1600
- Staats, Cuyler, 1627
- Stack, Robert, 1743
- Stackpool or Stackpoole, Andrew 1679
- Stafford, 17th Baron, *see* Jerningham, George William Stafford
- Stanhope, Hon. Leicester FitzGerald Charles, 1641
- Stanley, Edward Geoffrey Smith, 1808-9: 1736, 1751, 1756, 1768, 1769, 1772, 1782, 1818a, 1820, 1822, 1825, 1827, 1830, 1834, 1836, 1837, 1839, 1847, 1849, 1851, 1853, 1854, 1861, 1862a, 1863, 1866, 1876, 1878, 1881, 1897, 1899, 1902, 1919, 1921, 1927
- Stanley, William, 1927
- Starkey, William, 1546
- Staunton, Michael, 1555, 1671, 1677, 1716, 1728, 1788, 1927, 1942: 1524, 1566, 1692, 1820, 1822, 1917, 1921, 1945
- Steele, Thomas, 1512, 1689, 1874: 1507, 1533, 1585, 1670, 1679, 1684, 1686, 1687, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1751, 1782, 1790
- Stewart, Frederick William Robert, styled Viscount Castlereagh, 1799, 1929

- Stewart, Robert, Viscount Castlereagh, later 2nd marquis of Londonderry, 1761
 Stourton, William Joseph, 18th Baron Stourton, 1578
 Stuart, Rev. Charles, 1622
 Stuart, Henry Villiers, 1583, 1584, 1592, 1800
 Stuart, John, 1526
 Studdert, Charles, 1599, 1679, 1807
 Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw, 1560
 Sugrue, Charles (butter merchant), 1569: 1699
 Sugrue, James, 1558-60, 1562, 1565, 1573, 1577, 1614, 1637, 1723-4: 1516, 1561, 1601, 1682, 1790
 Supple, Daniel, Jr., 1859, 1941
 Sussex, Augustus Frederick, duke of, 1718
 Sutter, Robert, 1800
 Sutton, Charles Manners-, 1558, 1563, 1564, 1566, 1568, 1637, 1781, 1815
 Sutton, Thomas Manners, 1st Baron Manners, 1563, 1564, 1568

 Tait, William, 1911
 Talbot, Henry John Chetwynd-, styled Viscount Ingestre, 1833
 Talbot, John, 16th earl of Shrewsbury, 1549, 1835
 Talbot, John H., 1885, 1934
 Talleyrand, Charles, 1718, 1719
 Taylor, John Sidney, 1649
 Taylor, Richard, 1540
 T aylour, Thomas, styled earl of Bective, 1507
 Teahan, Rev. Denis, 1607
 Temple, Henry John, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, 1718, 1857a
 Tenterden, Lord, *see* Abbott, Charles, Thistlewood, Arthur, 1897
 Thompson, Col. Thomas Perronet, 1716
 Tierney, George, 1562
 Tonson, William, 2nd Baron Riversdale, 1507
 Trant, Patrick (Dublin), 1868
 Trench, Archdeacon the Hon. Charles Le Poer, 1725
 Trench, Hon. Power Le Poer, Protestant archbishop of Tuam, 1524
 Tuam, Protestant archbishop of, *see* Beresford, William; Trench, Hon. Power Le Poer
 Tullamore, Lord, *see* Bury, Charles William
 Tuyll, Baron William, 1832
 Tyndall, Samuel Wilkinson, 1800, 1839

 Valentia, Viscount, *see* Annesley, George Arthur

 Vavasour, Sir Edward M., 1578
 Vesey, Catherine, 1st Baroness Fitz-Gerald and Vesey, 1569
 Vesey, John, 2nd Viscount de Vesci, 1899
 Vicars, Rev. Robert, 1609
 Vignoles, Capt. Samuel, 1808, 1809, 1811
 Vokes, Thomas Philips, 1808, 1809

 Waddy, Cadwallader, 1694, 1934
 Wakely, Dr. *see* Wakley, Thomas
 Wakley, Thomas, 1645
 Walker, Charles Arthur, 1934: 1800, 1822
 Walker, Rev. Robert, 1520
 Wallace, Thomas, K.C., 1751a-54: 1782, 1800, 1802
 Wallis, Michael, 1616
 Walsh, Sir Edward John Johnson-, 2nd baronet, 1899
 Walsh, Rev. James, P.P. (Newtownbarry), 1824
 Walsh, John (Capel Street), 1745
 Walsh, Richard, 1716
 Walter, John, 1898
 Warburton, Henry, 1718
 Washington, George, 1577a
 Waterford and Lismore, Catholic bishop of, *see* Kelly, Patrick; Abraham, William
 Waterford, 3rd marquess of, *see* Beresford, Henry de la Poer
 Welch, Patrick R., 1715
 Weld, Rev. Dr., 1578
 Wellesley, Arthur, 1st duke of Wellington, 1507, 1524, 1529, 1536, 1542, 1544, 1550a, 1559, 1598, 1605, 1610, 1628a, 1677, 1688, 1718, 1723, 1724, 1726, 1732, 1893, 1909
 Wellington, 1st duke of, *see* Wellesley, Arthur
 Wells, Escourt, 1741
 West, Jacob, 1658
 West, John Beatty, 1945
 Westenra, Henry Robert, 1940: 1799
 Westenra, Hon. John Craven, 1940
 Westenra, Warner William, 2nd Baron Rossmore, 1507, 1549, 1816, 1940
 Westmeath, 8th earl of, *see* Nugent, George Thomas John
 Westmeath, Emily Lady, 1782
 Westminster, 1st marquis of, *see* Grosvenor, Robert, 2nd Earl Grosvenor
 Westropp, —, 1679
 Wetherell, Sir Charles, Kt., 1851
 White, Francis, 1878
 White, Col. Henry, 1831
 White, Luke (c. 1787-1854), 1800
 White, Robert (Fleet St., Dublin), 1521a, 1704, 1707a: 1708, 1713, 1925

- Whitley, Thomas, 1712
 Whitworth, Nicholas, 1667
 Whyte, N., 1623
 Wicklow, 4th earl of, *see* Howard, William
 Wielopolskoi, Marquis, 1784
 Willcocks, Sir Richard, Kt., 1591
 William I, king of the Netherlands, 1719
 William IV (*see also* Clarence, Prince William Henry, duke of), 1685, 1688, 1692, 1718, 1723, 1830, 1839, 1893
 William of Orange, 1638
 Willock, Abercrombie, 1868
 Winchilsea, 10th earl of, *see* Hatton, George William Finch-,
 Wolfe, *see* Woulfe, Stephen (1787-1840)
 Wolverhampton Political Union, Secretary of, *see* Fryer, Richard, Jr.
 Wood and Boyd, 1660
 Worcester, bishop of, *see* Carr, Robert James
 Woulfe, Stephen (1787-1840), 1516
 Wright, John, 1549, 1550a
 Wright, William, 1571
 Wyndham, George O'Brien, 3rd earl of Egremont, 1670
 Wynn, Charles Watkin Williams, 1558, 1559, 1562
 Wyse, Francis, 1711
 Wyse, Thomas, 1703: 1709, 1711, 1713, 1716, 1731, 1733, 1738, 1773, 1827, 1832, 1899, 1929
 Yore, Rev. William, 1713

