

THE
CORRESPONDENCE
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume V

1833-1836

THE
CORRESPONDENCE
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume V

1833-1836

The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell

Volume V

1833-1836

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 V

1833-1836

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



BLACKWATER DUBLIN

for the Irish Manuscripts Commission

© THE BLACKWATER PRESS
FOLENS & CO LTD, AIRTON ROAD,
TALLAGHT, CO DUBLIN, IRELAND.

All forms of micro-publishing
© The Blackwater Press

ISBN 0 905471 01 6

PRINTED IN THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND BY
FOLENS & CO. LIMITED, AIRTON ROAD, TALLAGHT, CO. 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. A special acknowledgment to the Bank of Ireland is in this volume.

Abbreviations	vi
Books cited in abbreviated form in footnotes	vii
Correspondence	
1833 (letters 1946-2030)	1
1834 (letters 2031-2182)	92
1835 (letters 2183-2299)	244
1836 (letters 2300- 2369)	350
Index of Persons	415

Acknowledgement

The early development of joint-stock banking in Ireland owes much to the support of Daniel O'Connell. He became Chairman of The National Bank Limited in 1836 and had encouraged the establishment of The Hibernian Bank Limited in Dublin in 1825.

These two banks subsequently played very important roles in the development of the commercial life in Ireland. The Hibernian Bank Limited and the Irish business of The National Bank Limited are now integrated with the Bank of Ireland.

The Bank of Ireland is pleased, therefore, to sponsor the publication of this volume of the Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell.

Abbreviations

BM	British Museum
<i>Boase</i>	Boase, Frederick, <i>Modern English Biography</i> . . .
<i>DEM</i>	<i>Dublin Evening Mail</i>
<i>DEP</i>	<i>Dublin Evening Post</i>
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>FJ</i>	<i>Freeman's Journal</i>
<i>MC</i>	<i>Morning Chronicle</i>
<i>MR</i>	<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

Sources not listed in Vol. 1 are listed in Vol. VIII.

In the footnotes the journals of the House of Lords and House of Commons are usually not cited when they are the sole authority for a statement. They are always cited when combined with other authorities.

Books cited in abbreviated form in footnotes:

Auchmuty, Wyse	Auchmuty, James J. <i>Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862</i> . London 1939.
Berry, Glasnevin	Berry James. <i>Glasnevin Cementary: a short history of the famous Catholic necropolis</i> . Dublin 1932.
Blackburne, Blackburne	Blackburne, Edward. <i>Life of the Rt. Hon. Francis Blackburne</i> . London 1874.
Brett, <i>Reminiscences of Louth</i>	Brett, William. <i>Reminiscences of County Louth</i> . Dundalk 1857.
Broderick, <i>Holy See and Repeal</i>	Broderick, John F., 'The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Act of Union with England, 1829-47,' <i>Analecta Gregoriana</i> LV. Rome 1951.
Cloncurry, <i>Personal Recollections</i>	Cloncurry, Valentine Browne Lawless, Lord. <i>Personal Recollections of the Life and Times, with Extracts from the Correspondence of Valentine, Lord Cloncurry</i> . Dublin 1849.
Cole, <i>Short History of the British Working Class</i>	Cole, G.D.H., <i>A Short History of the British Working Class Movement, 1789-1925</i> . 3 vols. London 1925-27.
Fagan, O'Connell	Fagan, William. <i>Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell</i> , 2 vols. Cork 1848.
FitzPatrick, O'Connell Correspondence	FitzPatrick, William J., ed. <i>Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell</i> . 2 vols. London 1888.
Gash, <i>Politics in the Age of Peel</i>	Gash, Norman. <i>Politics in the Age of Peel: a study in the Technique of Parliamentary Representation 1830-1850</i> . London 1953.
Hall, <i>Bank of Ireland</i>	Hall, Frederick G. <i>The Bank of Ireland 1783-1946</i> . Dublin 1949.
Inglis, <i>Freedom of the Press</i>	Inglis, Brian. <i>The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841</i> . London 1954.
Kitson Clark, <i>Peel and the Conservative Party</i>	Kitson Clark, G. <i>Peel and the Conservative Party: a study in party politics 1832-1841</i> . London, 1929, 1964.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Le Marchant, <i>Althorp</i> | Le Marchant, Sir Denis. <i>Memoirs of John Charles, Viscount Althorp, third Earl Spencer</i> . London 1878. |
| McCullagh, <i>Sheil</i> | McCullagh, W. Torrens. <i>Memoirs of Rt. Hon. Richard Lalor Sheil</i> . 2 vols. London 1855. |
| McDowell, <i>Public Opinion</i> | McDowell, R.B. <i>Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846</i> . London 1952. |
| Macintyre, <i>The Liberator</i> | Macintyre, Angus. <i>The Liberator: Daniel O'Connell and the Irish Party 1830-1847</i> . London 1965. |
| O'Brien, <i>Concessions to Ireland</i> | O'Brien, R.B. <i>Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881</i> . 2 vols. London 1883. |
| O'Connell, <i>Last Colonel</i> | O'Connell, Mrs. Morgan John. <i>The Last Colonel of the Irish Brigade</i> . 2 vols. London 1892. |
| Parker, <i>Graham</i> | Parker, Charles S., ed. <i>Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, Second Baronet of Netherby, 1792-1861</i> . 2 vols. London 1907. |
| Patterson, <i>Burdett</i> | Patterson, M.W. <i>Sir Francis Burdett and his Times, 1770-1844</i> . 2 vols. London 1931. |
| Read and Glasgow, <i>Feargus O'Connor</i> | Read, Donald and Glasgow, Eric. <i>Feargus O'Connor: Irishman and Chartist</i> . London 1961. |
| Senior, <i>Orangeism in Ireland and Britain</i> | Senior, Hereward. <i>Orangeism in Ireland and Britain, 1795-1836</i> . London 1966. |
| Walpole, <i>Russell</i> | Walpole, Spencer. <i>Life of Lord John Russell</i> . 2 vols. London 1889. |

1946

*From William O'Connor*¹

36 Thomas St. [Dublin], 1 January 1833

[No Salutation]

William O'Connor presents his compliments to Daniel O'Connell Esq., M.P., [and] begs to remind him of the grievous suffering by the soap manufacturers *of Ireland*. The guild of tallow chandlers and soap boilers, Dublin, feel in common with the traders on the subject, but from the narrow and bigoted policy hitherto pursued by the guild some of the traders have objections to their holding a meeting with, or called by, the guild on any subject. Others think it better to have their cooperation. I beg your opinion on the point which would conclude all and to say when it would be convenient for you to attend the meeting which will be made to suit your convenience.²

If you consider the meeting should be called by the soap manufacturers only, you can name the time and place of meeting. If called under the charter of the guild of chandlers etc, it necessarily would be in the Chandlers Hall, at such time as you would name.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Soap and candle manufacturer.

2 A requisition appears in the *Freeman's Journal* of 10 January 1833, for a meeting 'to take into consideration the ruinous state of our soap manufacture in consequence of the extensive importation and sale of English soap in the Irish market . . .' The meeting was held at the Chandler's Hall, on 11 January 1833, being attended by O'Connell, his son Maurice, William F. Finn, M.P. and Carew O'Dwyer, M.P. O'Connell there alleged that he had already had interviews with officials of the treasury on the subject of the Irish soap trade. He said that if the government failed to implement measures to improve the soap trade 'they could hold the rod of Repeal over them' (*FJ*, 15 Jan. 1833). On 22 February he presented a petition to the Commons from the corporation of chandlers and soap boilers of the city of Dublin complaining of the effects of English competition on their trade (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., 1833, XV, 1098).

1947

To William Murphy, John Power, David Lynch¹ and Andrew Ennis²

Dublin, 5 January 1833

Gentlemen,

Please to draw from Mr. James Pim, Junior, the sum of five thousand pounds sterl. lent him from the National Tribute and have the same lodged to my private account in the Hibernian Bank.

Your most obliged and faithful servant,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: F.S. Bourke Papers, NLI 10731

- 1 David Lynch, merchant, 57 Dominick Street, Dublin, a trustee of the O'Connell Tribute.
- 2 Andrew Ennis (died 1834), merchant, 21 Harcourt Street, Dublin, and Roebuck, Co. Dublin, a trustee of the O'Connell Tribute; father of Sir John Ennis, Bt.

1948

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Merrion Square, 10 January 1833

... See John Power about his son-in-law.¹ Let him not listen to base advisers. He is ruined for ever if he shrinks from the people at this juncture.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, 1, 316

- 1 Nicholas Fitz-Simon, who had been elected for King's Co. in the recent general election.
- 2 See letter 1945, note 5. Letters from M.P.'s accepting or rejecting the invitation were published from 2 January onwards. Nicholas Fitz-Simon's acceptance, written from King's Co. and dated 9 January (*Pilot*, 14 Jan. 1833) was one of the last received, hence O'Connell's fear that he was not going to accept.

1949

To Lord Duncannon

Merrion Square, 14 January 1833

Confidential

My Lord,

You are the only person connected with power to whom I could write what I know and what I believe and indeed I should not feel at rest if I did not tell you that the Government cannot appreciate the exact state of this country. Stanley has had considerable success in enforcing the Tithes.¹ He has overawed many, very many parishes, and there was an adequate force for that purpose but the result is just what those who know Ireland foresaw — the spirit which is curbed by day walks abroad by night. Whiteboyism is substituted for open meetings. *There is an almost universal organisation going on.* It is not confined to one or two counties. It is, I repeat, *almost universal.* I do not believe there is any man in the rank of a comfortable farmer engaged, not one man probably entitled to vote. But all the poverty of our counties is being organised. There never yet was, as I believe, so general a disposition for that species of insurrectionary outrages. We will do all we can to check it. I believe that we will keep the County of Meath free because we have a County Club² in operation — persons in whom the people have confidence and whose advice they will be likely to follow.

You may be quite sure that if I were not convinced of the frightful extent of the impending mischief, I would not trouble you. All I can add in the way of advice is that the more troops are sent over here the better. In every point of view it is best to increase the King's troops. If the Yeomanry are called out the consequences may be terrific. Avoid that of all things; they will prove to be weakness not strength.

I know you will excuse me for my cause in troubling you at this length. But, indeed you who are acquainted with the history of Irish affairs, must have been prepared for this result. The insanity of delivering this country to so weak a man as Lord Anglesey and so obstinate a maniac as Stanley, is unequalled even in our annals.

Pray pardon me for using harsh words but really I cannot endure with patience the miserable misgovernment which has brought us to this state nor can I without anguish contemplate the approaching crimes and punishments. You will readily believe that I will use all my influence to stop the career of those who are engaged in urging on the people.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 317-318

1 See letters 1873, note 3 and 1906, note 4.

2 For a description of these clubs see letter 1473, note 3.

1950

*From Townley Richardson, 44 Nassau Street, Dublin,
21 January 1833*

Asks if O'Connell would be interested in abuses and misapplication of public property in Irish public institutions. He has information about such in three institutions (though he does not give any of this information in the letter).

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1951

To Michael Staunton

Bangor [Wales], 25 January 1833

My Dear Staunton,

Many, many thanks for your manual.¹ I cannot express to you how I prize it. I had not time to concert measures to have it printed and I must own I *want* to have some of the effect of the *novelty* to the English members of your views. But you may depend on it you shall not be stripped of the laurels you so well merit. My sincere conviction is that your financial discoveries — for so I may call them — and your elucidations of the trickery of Spring Rice and Parnell have done more to advance the cause of the Repeal than any other man — your humble servant not excepted. I say this with perfect truth.

I want three documents, which you must get copied and sent to me. *First*, Lord Anglesey's letter² to Kertland. It will be found in the newspapers between the 1st of October, 1830 and 1st of February, 1831. *Second*, Lord Anglesey's letter during the late contest, denying that the government took any share in the election.³ *Thirdly*, my letter to my constituents of Waterford for which the motion for an attachment was made against you.⁴ I greatly want these documents and have no opportunity of getting them in London. Anglesey's two letters are short and could be copied in three minutes. Pray, pray get them copied and send them to me without any delay. I want to make use of them the

first day's debate, say on Saturday, the second. Do not delay sending me Anglesey's two letters the post after you receive this; the other is longer, and may be delayed another day. I will do as much for you one day or another. I will write you or Barrett *private correspondence*⁵ whenever anything is worth *sending*. We had a most excellent passage. I hope to reach Shrewsbury tomorrow as I am *bespoke* to the public dinner at Birmingham⁶ on Saturday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 318-319

- 1 Staunton's *Hints for Hardinge, being a series of political essays publ. originally in the Dublin Morning Register . . . containing observations on the Report of Mr. Spring Rice's Committee on the State of the Poor in Ireland*, (Dublin, 1830).
- 2 See letter 1735 n5.
- 3 In December 1832, at the time of the general election, Lord Anglesey issued a public statement that 'the Government takes no part whatever in the Dublin election' (*Pilot*, 15 Dec. 1832). The under-secretary, Sir William Gossett, seems to have made an unauthorised promise that the government would support the Conservatives but this promise was apparently not kept (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 119).
- 4 For O'Connell's prosecution by the government in January 1831, see letter 1751a n1. On 22 January 1831 O'Connell published a letter, dated 21 January 1831, to his Co. Waterford constituents in Staunton's *Morning Register* and Lavelle's *Freeman's Journal* denouncing the 'paltry prosecution' as a government manoeuvre to remove him from parliament during the forthcoming session. He declared it could succeed only through 'the most audacious perversion of fact, and a . . . flagrant violation of law'. A few days later conditional orders for an attachment against Staunton and Lavelle were granted for contempt of court in consequence of their having published this letter (*FJ*, 25 and 28 Jan. 1831). The main purpose of these two prosecutions was to force O'Connell to acknowledge authorship of his letter or face the embarrassment of having others suffer on his behalf (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 24).
- 5 That is, reports written by O'Connell from London and published anonymously under the heading 'Private Correspondence'.
- 6 A public dinner in O'Connell's honour given by the radicals of Birmingham on 26 January 1833. It was presided over by Daniel Whittle Harvey, secretary of the Birmingham Political Union (*Pilot*, 30 Jan. 1833).

1952

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Bangor [Wales], 25 January 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I want you to put your shoulders 'to the Volunteers'.¹ Get young barristers and other good agitators to attend every meeting,

and make them do business. The objects are petitions from every parish, national rent from every parish, an arbitration tribunal² in every parish. There is, as a preliminary, the appointment of three persons for every county, five for every barony, seven for every parish. These persons' duties are — the three for the counties to attend, that the five for each barony report the progress of the parishes and the seven in each parish to get the petitions forwarded, the national rent³ collected, the arbitration tribunal established, and the Volunteers arranged to prevent Whiteboyism, riots and breaches of the peace. I will write these details to Dwyer before the next day of meeting. In the meantime get as many working men as possible in my absence to attend the Volunteers on Tuesday next and every subsequent Tuesday.

I have got a house in Berkeley Square at ten guineas a week, not dear. Direct to me there.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 319-320

- 1 On 3 January 1833 O'Connell adjourned the meetings of the National Political Union *sine die*, replacing it with the 'Society of Irish Volunteers for the Repeal of the Union' (*FJ*, 4 Jan. 1833). In taking this step he declared 'The Reform Bill is now a law, and it is our duty to come back with double exertion to seek for a repeal of the Union' (*FJ*, 3 Jan. 1833). The Volunteers would carry Repeal, he declared, by action similar to that of the Old Volunteers in 1782 (*FJ*, 23 Jan. 1833). The organisation was suppressed by proclamation of the lord lieutenant on 10 April 1833 (*Pilot*, 12 Apr. 1833).
- 2 At a meeting of the Volunteers on 22 January 1833 O'Connell cited the example of the people of Castletownroche, Co. Cork, who had been dissatisfied with the decisions of the local magistrates. They had set up an arbitration jury of their own choice, to decide local disputes. He said that the decrees of this body secured instant obedience on the part of the people, and the neighbourhood was accordingly pacified (*FJ*, 23 Jan. 1833).
- 3 The O'Connell Tribute.

1953

*To Sir Francis Freeling, Secretary to the General Post Office,
London, 27 January 1833, from Birmingham.*

Requests that his mail and that of his three sons, Maurice, Morgan and John, should in future be sent to 14 Albemarle Street, Piccadilly.

SOURCE: National Library of Scotland

1954

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 31 January 1833

The Ministry are greatly puzzled. They know not what to do. As to Ireland they intend to do just nothing unless we drive them to it. Lord Anglesey returns to Ireland¹ because no other man can be found to undertake Stanley's dirty work. The Duke of Leinster has even been spoken of as a lord-lieutenant. What folly! They may as well talk of Lord Cloncurry.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 320

- 1 By this O'Connell meant that Anglesey was not superseded as lord lieutenant.

1954a

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[London], 2 February 1833

Send me a list of the Barrack Board with a description of the station in life, wealth and character of each member.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 320

1955

To Edward Geoffrey Stanley

Albemarle Street [London], Monday morning, 4 February 1833
Mr. O'Connell presents his complts. to Mr. Stanley.

In reply to Mr. Stanley's note of the 2d. inst. (which did not reach Mr. O'Connell until late that night) he begs leave to say that he will attend at the Irish Office at two o'clock precisely this day to receive any communication Mr. Stanley may deem right to make to him on the subject of the local taxation of Dublin.

SOURCE: Library of the University of California at Los Angeles

1955a

To P. V. FitzPatrick

House of Commons, Friday evening [15 February 1833]
My dear FitzPatrick,

Lord Grey is on his legs abusing agitation and agitators but as yet not disclosing his measure of severity.¹ I have the pleasure, however, to tell you that any such measures will be more stoutly opposed in the house of commons when they arrive there than you or I would have supposed from the debates and majorities on the address. In the interval let us think of something more pleasing. You have seen that the Vestry Cess is to be abolished, totally abolished. Ten bishops to be dispensed with, and the management of ecclesiastical property to be committed to Parliamentary Commissioners.² This is good for a *beginning*. It establishes valuable principles — first, that Parliament is to *cut down* the magnitude of the *establishment* (admitting, by way of parenthesis, that the establishment is too large) to a reasonable extent. It establishes, also, the parliamentary right to manage *that* species of property. I assure you it is deemed very defective — very short of what it ought to be in point of extinction of burden, and this by the English members. In short, the work is going forward.

There is another matter also of vital importance — the renovation of the Corporations.³ I want some half dozen good witnesses to prove the entire System of Dublin Corporation abuses. Enquire and send me their names, men of information, coolness and good sense. I mean to write again tomorrow to Mr. Roe,⁴ the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, on this subject. I take it that every £10 householder in Dublin will be a free man and that none others will be free. I believe the city will be divided into wards or districts and that the common council will be the representatives of such wards. The real representatives of the inhabitants will thus have the election of sheriffs, aldermen, etc. In short, the present monopoly, political and religious, will, I believe, be annihilated and the corporation in all its offices will be as open and popular as the representation of Dublin in parliament is at present. Get me, however, good witnesses. I devote myself to *this* committee. We can compel unwilling witnesses to attend. The summons will be sent off on Monday for the witnesses *I mentioned* on the Corporation question. It is a comfort that the monopoly should end *there*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 334-336

- 1 This was the Whig coercion bill, 'for the more effective Suppression of Local Disturbances and Dangerous Associations in Ireland'. It was intro-

duced by Grey in the Lords on 15 February 1833, passed the Lords rapidly, and was introduced in the Commons on 22 February. It became law, despite bitter opposition from O'Connell and his followers on 2 April 1833 (3 Will. IV c. 4). The bill empowered the lord lieutenant for a year to proclaim disturbed areas where no meetings of any description might be held, to suspend *Habeas Corpus*, substitute courts martial for the ordinary courts and ban all meetings for petitioning parliament unless ten day's notice were given and his permission obtained (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 48).

- 2 A reference to the Irish Church temporalities bill, introduced in the Commons by Lord Althorp on 12 February 1833. It proposed among other changes that church cess be abolished and replaced by a tax on the higher clerical incomes; that the four archbishoprics be reduced to two, and the 22 bishoprics to 12. Its most controversial clause (later abandoned) dealt with the compulsory sale of episcopal estates as a result of which a surplus would be created to be disposed of by parliament. This was known as the appropriation clause. When it was abandoned O'Connell attacked the bill vigorously (see Macintyre, *Liberator*, 39-41). The amended bill was enacted on 14 August 1833 as 3 & 4 Will. IV c. 37.

- 3 See letter 1956 n1.

- 4 Robert Roe, merchant, a member of the firm of distillers of Crampton Quay, Dublin.

1956

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 17 February 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I want the list of the Ballast Office with an exact description of each member and the names of anti-corporation witnesses¹ as speedily as possible.

You have seen the project of Ministerial despotism.² I have reason to believe it will be strongly opposed here. The Irish, of course, will fight it inch by inch. We begin tomorrow, nor will they be able to do anything but fight the preliminary steps tomorrow. I will lead the ball.

There is nothing so necessary as to pour the vial of popular indignation on all the Irish members who are liable to popular influence and yet desert their colours on this vital occasion. Send me every *Evening Mail*³ which contains any atrociously bloody passage.

It is pleasant to find so general a disposition on the part of the English members to oppose the 'Despotism Bill'.

I need not tell you to assure our friends that, if I am not much mistaken, they will be pleased with the exertions of the Irish representatives.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 321-322

- 1 A select committee to inquire into the state of municipal corporations in England, Wales and Ireland was appointed by the Commons on 14 February 1833. O'Connell and Peel were members of this committee.
- 2 The coercion bill.
- 3 The *Dublin Evening Mail*, a Tory Protestant newspaper hostile to O'Connell.

1957

To P. V. FitzPatrick¹

14 Albemarle St. [London], 21 February 1833

Confidential

My dear FitzPatrick,

The conversation you had with Dr. Boyton fills me with pleasure. It is true it may lead to nothing. It may be an ebullition of disappointed *expectation* on his part but I hope it is rather a symptom of his really entertaining those sentiments of honest Irishism which I often and with pleasure perceive to mix with his party politics. He is at all events right in his conjecture that the policy of this Administration is purely *English domination* over the Irish of all parties. This is their principle. It requires only a rational calculation of self-interest to see whether it be *better* for any one party (better purely as a party) to join the English Government in advancing their domination or to join the Irish people at large in insisting on the self-government of a domestic legislature. If Dr. Boyton comes to perceive that as a partisan he would be worse off than as a *repealing* Irishman, contrive some mode to let him know that I will most cheerfully cooperate with him and his friends. The basis of our cooperation shall be as distinct and explicit as he pleases. It shall be *as binding* me and mine *in writing*. It may be on his part merely verbal. I will bind myself to secrecy, that is, to observe the strictest silence on everything coming from him unless by his express permission in writing. I will require no secrecy or concealment by him of anything coming from me, leaving him at his fullest discretion to publish or conceal, to communicate to the public or to a few, just as he pleases.

The full preservation of all vested interests would be an indispensable preliminary stipulation. No living man to be made worse than he is.

A total abhorrence of any approach to or attempt at, directly or indirectly, any Catholic supremacy. The perfect, entire and honourable maintenance of Protestant equality of rights, franchises,

honours and privileges.

He could not desire more precautions to avoid the possible infringement of these great principles than I should. I would if possible go before him in every such precautionary measures.

Put yourself, therefore, again in his way. Tell him also, and pledge yourself to him as a truth, that I have no kind of personal hostility, not only towards him, whose talents and energies I respect, but towards *any* of his party. Urge upon him the obvious tendency of the Government management. One day they strike down Protestant monopoly; next day, they trample on Catholic freedom. Let him see how, in the Corporation reform,² they strike down the last but powerful remnant of Protestant ascendancy. Communicate with him freely and without disguise. Pledge yourself to observe secrecy. Leave him at full liberty. Use my name directly. Acknowledge that you are authorised by me. Give him the substantial part of this letter. There are some expressions in it which I do not think it proper you should show him by my authority. If I were to authorise you to show it I would not leave one word which could offend. But, subject to this caution, give him, if you find him prepared for it, my entire sentiments in substance and effect.

Of course I would not join in any violation of the law. My plan is to restore the Irish parliament with the full assent of Protestants and Presbyterians as well as Catholics. I desire no social revolution, no social change. The nobility to possess lands, titles and legislative privileges as before the Union. The Clergy, *for their lives*, their full incomes — to decrease as Protestantism may allow that decrease. The Landed Gentry to enjoy their present state, *being residents*.

Every man to be considered a resident who has *an establishment* in Ireland.

In short, salutary restoration without revolution, an Irish parliament, British connection, one King, two legislatures.

You see how I run on, inspired by the pleasing hope of a reconciliation between all parties. On my part it shall be *most cordial, most sincere*.

All this may be only a day dream but you have made me dream it. And it is delightful even as a vision. Would to God it could be realised.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 324-326

- 1 According to a memorandum by P.V. FitzPatrick this letter was written some days after an interview he had with Dr. Boyton, when the latter apparently foresaw the dissolution of the Conservative Society (see letter 1971 n2) under the coercion act (see letter 1955a n1). Boyton asked

FitzPatrick 'whether it was not possible to find a *common ground* on which the two great Irish parties [the Tories and Repealers] could stand together'. At O'Connell's request, FitzPatrick outlined to Boyton the proposal contained in O'Connell's letter above. According to FitzPatrick Boyton listened with interest but finally declared O'Connell's proposal unfeasible because of the prejudice of his [Boyton's] party, who, he said, were 'actuated by an abstract detestation of Popery which seems to forbid all hope of coalition' (FitzPatrick, *O'Connell Correspondence*, I, 327).

- 2 By this O'Connell meant the reform of the municipal corporations which he hoped would take place as a result of the inquiry recently set on foot (see letter 1956 n1).

1958

Copy

From Edward J. Littleton, Irish Office, London, 27 February 1833

Returns Mr. C. O'Grady's petition¹ and suggests that when it is presented to the Commons, notice of it should be given to Col. Fitzgibbon,² the lieutenant of the county.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 Unidentified.
2 Col. Hon. Richard Hobart Fitzgibbon (1793-1864), Mount Shannon, Co. Limerick, younger son of John, first earl of Clare. M.P. Co. Limerick 1818-41; succeeded his brother as third earl of Clare in 1851.

1959

To P.V. FitzPatrick

1833¹

[Fragment]

See Sheehan of the *Mail* and tell him from me that all offers of conciliation on the part of the popular party are at an end and that, if anything can hereafter be done in that way, the first step *must* be taken by the Orange party. We have done our share, and done it without any useful effect. In the meantime I do not, of course, expect, still less do I ask for, any personal forbearance. I am part of the stock-in-trade of *abusers*. But, for my part, I will not directly or indirectly assail the individual with or through whom I have sought conciliation. As to Dr. Boyton, I really like the man. I am sorry for his sake, that *we* must attack even the vested interests of the present incumbents.² They have driven us

to *this* position.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 328

- 1 Internal evidence suggests that this letter was probably written about October.
- 2 Probably a reference to the tithe issue.

1960

From Athlone Trades Political Union, 4 March 1833

They note with sorrow that their M.P.¹ has voted² with the government against O'Connell and they will displace him if he does not reverse his conduct. Signed by Thomas Hart, secretary.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Hon. James Talbot (1805-1883), eldest son of third baron Talbot de Malahide; M.P. for Athlone 1832-34; succeeded to the barony 1850; created Baron Talbot de Malahide (U.K.) in 1856.
- 2 Presumably on the motion of Edward Southwell Ruthven on 1 March for an adjournment to the Commons debate on the coercion bill, which motion was heavily defeated (*Pilot*, 4 Mar. 1833). The name of James Talbot, M.P. for Athlone, does not appear amongst the Irish and English members who voted with O'Connell on the motion for the adjournment (*Pilot*, 6 Mar. 1833).

1961

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 6 March 1833, Corporation Committee
My dear FitzPatrick,

I do not as yet know when the Committee¹ will be ready to go into the question of *Irish* corporations but I shall know tomorrow. Until a precise day is fixed it would be idle to summon.

Since I wrote the last page the Recorder has come in, and the committee have fixed this day fortnight, namely, Wednesday, the 20th inst., to go into the case of Dublin. The Committee *require* the attendance of the treasurer, Sir J.K. James, and of Mr. Archer,² the town clerk. The Recorder proposes in addition to examine Alderman Beresford.³ Now for *our* side. I must get an authentic list of witnesses. I will not be allowed to summon in the first instance more than three or four witnesses at *the public expense*. Any other person who will *volunteer* to come over at

his own expense will be examined. From what I have heard from various quarters I should propose to summon in the first instance Mr. McMullen, Mr. Maley⁴ the elder, Mr. Staines⁵ and Sheriff's Peer White.⁶ Write to me at once, that is, after consulting with intelligent friends at the Chamber of Commerce as to what witnesses we should examine. Surely the one pound per day with travelling expenses, being what the Committees generally allow as expenses, ought not to be such an object as to keep in Dublin any independent witness. It is *so* important to *show up* all the abuses in the Corporation that I should hope we will have many *volunteers* ready to be examined; I do not mean political volunteers. The more I know of the Committee, the more do I expect to have *all* Corporations thrown open. The great question is, *who* should be '*the freeman*'. The £10 householders are those that are generally suggested. If corporations were thrown open to *that extent*, then the other abuses will be easily *corrigible*. Pemberton⁷ I will also get summoned if I can. But recollect the great object is to throw the Corporations open to the inhabitants at large and to have the new Corporators to investigate the frauds of the old and to look for legal or legislative relief. But the frauds now existing ought to be proved. You now understand me.

I do not despair of Ireland; Despotism is not as yet law. The English public are certainly *rousing*, and I have reason to believe that by the delay of the bill⁸ we shall *emasculate* the act at the very worst. The weakness of the ministry is not as yet *seen* but when they come to deal with England and taxation, and it appears how little the people will benefit by the Reform Bill, then we will have an English force of discontent which *may* and indeed I think, *must* shake this vile Administration.

I only smile at the attacks made on my character. I am so familiar with every species of calumny that, my good friend, it is really nothing but time lost to defend me. Allow everyone who chooses to abuse me to their heart's content. All the answer I will give is working as well as I can for our unfortunate country. Believe me that it was not possible to give so strong an impulse to Repeal by any other means in this country as by those coercive measures. In the House and out of the House many are daily declaring that they do not see any chance of justice for Ireland without a resident legislature.

You will see that some of our members have behaved *infamously*. This is the way with Ireland always; we have been turned into a province and are now made slaves by our own miserable dissensions or rather by the desertion of those who ought to assist but actually *stab* their country. Yet I do not despair. In recent years I

have seen so many instances of measures intended to annihilate Irish Liberty turn out most beneficial to that very freedom which they were introduced to destroy.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 332-333

- 1 See letter 1956, note 1.
- 2 George Archer, attorney, 7 Henrietta Street, Dublin.
- 3 John Claudius Beresford (1766-1846), third son of John de la Poer Beresford. Alderman of Dublin from 1808; lord mayor for the year 1813-1814; M.P. almost continually 1790-1811.
- 4 Michael Maley, Sr., Cavendish Row, Dublin, a retired builder.
- 5 Henry Staines, law agent to the chamber of commerce.
- 6 Robert White, 51 Camden Street, Dublin. Sheriff of Dublin city 1819.
- 7 Benjamin Pemberton. In a petition to the House of Commons presented on 6 June 1833, he describes himself as a civil engineer, mason and bricklayer of North Anne Street, Dublin, and states that he has been refused admission to the corporation of bricklayers and plasterers. He asks that the committee on municipal corporations be directed to consider his case. He may have been an eccentric. See also Fergus A. D'Arcy, 'The Trade Unions of Dublin and the attempted Revival of the Guilds,' *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, CI, Part 2, 1971, pp. 117-8, 125-6.
- 8 The coercion bill (see letter 1955a, note 1).

1962

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 8 March 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

The entire day has been spent in presenting petitions against the atrocious bill.¹ The Government have become alarmed and, *only think*, they are mean enough to solicit the *Times* not to give full reports of the debate on the second reading of the bill! There is one thing exceedingly in our favour: it is the reports arriving from Ireland of a run for gold in several places. This is creating the greatest alarm. The Bank of England, it is confessed, cannot meet a three days' run and of necessity their notes will come in upon them if the run continues in Ireland. For my own part, I do not know what to do. The run injures friends as well as foes. I cannot think without apprehension of the worthy men I may injure if I call for gold. On the other hand, I am quite convinced that a general demand for gold would *now* at once stop the bill. Consult our best friends; ask those who think the most soberly, and let me know what advice they give on this most vital subject. I wish I saw my own way. There is, however, this consolation, that the people of England are *being roused*. It would have pleased you to have

seen the batch of petitions poured in on this subject. Believe me, all this will tell well yet, and the Repeal instead of being postponed will really be advanced beyond any comparison more than I could have possibly expected. It embodies the lovers of liberty in this country with the Irish people.

There is no discovering with any certainty whether the Ministers mean to do anything about the Malt duties. You may be quite sure that it would not be safe to *speculate on any* information you may receive on this subject.

There never yet was a fellow *so busy* as I am. I never knew what it was to have every moment devoted to business so completely. I wish I could revise my long speech² and publish it as I learn from a most *powerful* source that it has made an impression. Perhaps this is an indulgence of my vanity.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 333-334

1 The coercion bill (see letter 1955a n1).

2 Probably that delivered by O'Connell on 5 March 1833 against the Coercion bill (*FJ*, 9 Mar. 1833).

1963

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 March 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

It lightens my heart to write to you. I am afflicted beyond measure at the conduct of many of the Irish members: ¹Lambert of Wexford — atrocious; Keane² of Waterford County — treacherous to the last degree; Evans³ — very, very bad. But all this is idle.

We spent three hours today receiving petitions against 'the bill' from all parts of England and Scotland; but one in favour of it and that from Londonderry. This bill will throw out the Ministry. Sooner or later it *will* throw them out — and what next?

The second reading will take place before we rise this night. Then the battle commences in the Committee. It will be a hard-fought fight in Committee and I do believe that much of the Bill will be altered. But, take it in any shape, it is a measure of atrocious tyranny and demonstrates that no Parliament but a local one can do justice to Ireland.

The murder of Leonard, near New Ross,⁴ is not only horrible in itself but most unfortunate in point of time. This it is which breaks my heart. Yet I do not, and will not, despair for Ireland. I believe all that occurs in this country is working for good. It

makes the cause of the Irish people connect itself with popular rights.

You have not sent me a list of anti-Corporation witnesses⁵ with the address of each. It was said that there was a grand Petition⁶ on this subject coming from Dublin. Why does it not appear? I ought, or somebody ought, to have it to present. The 20th is the day for going on with this subject, this most interesting subject. I will do the best I can to open up the Corporation in all its details. You should print the Petition in the newspapers;⁷ if not, in another form, and let me have a printed copy. This is more important than can well be known in Dublin. If in the newspapers, send me one dozen copies. If we can get the Corporation monopoly put an end to, we will break a gap in the enemy's fortifications. Could you send me a list of the Common Council, with each man's trade or occupation? I want to show how they violate Lucas' Act⁸ which requires that every man should be of the trade of the Guild which he represents. Look to this at once.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 329-331

- 1 In supporting the coercion bill.
- 2 Sir Richard Keane, second baronet (1780-1855), Cappoquin House, Co. Waterford; M.P. Co. Waterford 1832-35.
- 3 George Hampden Evans.
- 4 On 8 March Joseph Anthony Leonard, a Catholic landowner residing in New Ross, Co. Wexford was stoned to death by a party of men who way-laid him at Annaghs, Co. Kilkenny. The murder was thought to have been committed in consequence of Leonard's having distrained a tenant's property for rent (*FJ*, 11 Mar; *Pilot*, 20 Mar. 1833).
- 5 To give evidence before the select committee set up to inquire into the corporations of England, Wales and Ireland (see letter 1956 n1).
- 6 A petition setting forth a long list of abuses in Dublin corporation. On 15 March the *Freeman's Journal* appealed for signatures to this petition which, it announced, was lying at the Commercial Buildings (*FJ*, 6, 15 Mar. 1833). A petition of the 'merchants, manufacturers, tradesmen, and other inhabitants of the city of Dublin' requesting a reform of Dublin corporation was presented in the Commons on 26 July 1833.
- 7 The petition is printed in the *Pilot* of 15 March 1833.
- 8 An act 'for the better regulating the Corporation of the City of Dublin' (33 Geo. II Ire. c. 16). Called Lucas' act because Dr. Charles Lucas had long campaigned for such a measure.

1964

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 13 March 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I will not call for a run for gold. I do myself believe that *I ought*. At this moment it would force the Ministry to give up the vile Coercion Bill. But I yield to the authority you mention,¹ and I will not call for Gold, nor have I. But I cannot go farther. I cannot call on the country to refrain from doing that in favour of which my own private judgement certainly is. I give up my private judgement but I cannot reverse it. You may rely on this, that I will not say one word in favour of a run.

Do not put any *letter* with the papers of Friday because if the parcel does not come on Sunday, I will not release it. One Monday they paid 6s. 4d. for the parcel which was delivered on that day. . . .

I have sent over orders for Maley, John McMullen, James Vance² and Robert White.³ I could not get more orders for the present. . . . I have *some chance* of being able to present the Chamber of Commerce Petition⁴ tomorrow. I will, of course, write fully when I do but you have no idea of the impossibility of getting in petitions except by throwing them on or rather under the table at two in the morning so as to appear in the votes. I will not do that though I delay the Petition a little.

I am in better spirits than when I wrote last. I begin to think this bill will work good for the people of Ireland. I am now convinced it will accelerate the Repeal.

I have been speaking at a great meeting at Lambeth,⁵ and received better than ever I was in Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 339

1 Unidentified. A serious bank crisis involving a demand for gold had occurred in Ireland during February and early March but the panic had run its course by 12 March (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 154-5).

2 Attorney.

3 Robert White, 51 Camden Street, Dublin.

4 A petition praying for the repeal of 'so much of the Act 34 Geo. 3 (Ire.) c. 8, as imposes a penalty on the Masters of Vessels lying in the River Liffey for having fires on Board' was presented by O'Connell in the Commons on 15 March 1833. On 28 March a bill to effect this purpose was introduced in the Commons and duly enacted (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 26).

5 Unidentified.

1965

*To James Cleary*¹

Albemarle St. [London], one o'clock [19 or 20 March 1833]
My dear Sir,

I am only just come downstairs, not having got to bed until near four this morning, and so anxious are the supporters of the 'despotic bill' to extinguish every trace of constitutional liberty in Ireland that they insist on proceeding again this night with that most detestable measure. I must be prepared to continue the contest until four tomorrow morning. The bill was urged with indecent haste through the Lords and even in the reformed House of Commons there is, alas, little disposition to treat either Ireland or liberty more favourably.

I am exceedingly anxious for an opportunity to address the people, the honest, candid, rational freedom-loving people but you perceive how impossible it is for me to attend at the Cartwright Club this day. I bitterly regret that inability.

I will contend for the liberty of the Irish people to the last but even should our freedom be extinguished, England shall ever find me the humble and untalented but the zealous, the uncompromising, the persevering advocate of every measure that can diminish the burdens, increase the franchises or promote the prosperity and happiness of her people.

I am the enemy of the oppressors of Englishmen and will ever join them to ameliorate their institutions and to procure for them *cheap* and *good* government.

[P.S.] Your circulars to the Irish members arrived *too late* for distribution.

SOURCE: Bodleian Library, Oxford

- 1 Unidentified but probably a relative of Thomas Cleary who was honorary secretary of the Cartwright Monument Committee in 1828.

1966

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 21 March 1833

My dear friend,

The Bill, the Atrocious Bill, is *emasculated*.¹ We have succeeded

far beyond my hopes. It is now more a foolish than an infernal bill. To be sure it tramples on great principles, marking the rascality of those who bring it forward but it contains little that is formidable in its powers.

I battled against it in despair but, blessed be God!, not in vain. Last night I got a clause inserted taking away *all retrospective* effect whatsoever.² The papers report us miserably. I cannot tell you how my heart is at ease. The press is left perfectly untouched.³ Hurrah!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 340

- 1 Several amendments mitigating the severity of the coercion bill (see letter 1955a n1) were secured on 20 March 1833 (see below ns. 2 and 3).
- 2 The courts martial clauses of the coercion bill were amended to the effect that 'it shall not be lawful for any such court martial to convict or try any person for any offence whatsoever committed at any time before the passing of this Act' (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 191).
- 3 An amendment was made to the courts martial clauses of the coercion bill to the effect that 'Nothing in the Act shall be deemed or taken to give such Court Martial any power or jurisdiction to try any person or persons charged, or to be charged, with the printing, publishing or circulating any libel . . . but that all such offences unaccompanied by force or threats . . . shall remain triable according to the course of the common law' (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 191).

1967

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[c. 22 March 1833]

I beg of you to muster a force against Lord Milltown's¹ motion.² It would be pleading guilty to the accusations of our worst enemies were we to dissolve. I should have been glad that Dominick Doyle's³ motion⁴ had been carried. It would have been a compliment to make me justly proud. But no matter. At all events I am most anxious that the volunteers should be dissolved only by *proclamation*. We shall see whether the Government will proclaim us down, and not the Conservatives or Orange lodges. This is worth waiting for. I wish Lord Milltown could be prevailed upon not to make his motion. Ireland owes him a deep debt of gratitude which some day, I trust, shall be repaid.

Send me a complete set of the lessons used by the Education Board.⁵ I want them for a well-disposed but a little bigotted individual.

See Mr. Sheehan of the *Mail* again. Put your communication to

him from me on the same footing with that to Dr. Boyton⁶ — he to be free to disclose all, I to be bound to the strictest secrecy. Ask him what security he would require from our party to his. I am for giving them every practicable and possible security. Would *they* take up *the Repeal* as founded on the basis of a local parliament for *local objects* merely and the present 105 members to come over to the Imperial Parliament for all *general* purposes, as at present? In short, see what we can do to satisfy him and his.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 341-342

- 1 Joseph Leeson (1799-1866), fourth earl of Milltown.
- 2 At a meeting of the Society of Irish Volunteers on 19th March 1833 Milltown stated his intention to introduce a motion at the next meeting for the voluntary dissolution of the society before the coercion act should come into operation (*Pilot*, 20 Mar. 1833). When this meeting was held, on 26 March, a letter was read to it from Milltown withdrawing his notice of motion (*Pilot*, 27 Mar. 1833).
- 3 A prominent member of the Volunteers Society.
- 4 A motion of national confidence in O'Connell moved by Dominick Doyle at a meeting of the Volunteers on 19 March 1833. It proposed that '... we the Volunteers of Ireland, declare, that Mr. O'Connell possesses the unbounded confidence of the people of Ireland, and that from the period that the Society may be dissolved by any coercive and arbitrary act, its confidence is reposed, and its influence and functions transferred to Daniel O'Connell, the parent of his country' (*Pilot*, 20 Mar. 1833). The motion was not passed but was referred to the standing committee of the society.
- 5 The Board of Commissioners of National Education which had been set up at the end of 1831.
- 6 See letter 1957.

1968

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 23 March 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Tell my esteemed friend John Browne¹ that I differ from him very much. I think his motion² should be to direct *us* to remain for the good of the people of England and Scotland, and to advise us to take all steps consistent with principle to procure the dismissal of that weak and wicked Administration which has violated the Union and laid the seeds of discontent and national animosity between the two countries.

Something of this kind should be the motion made, not to desert our posts whilst we can *do good to any part of the people*. You may also tell Browne to cheer his spirits, that we have cut down the worst provisions of the Bill.³ At present it continues to

assert unconstitutional principles but it does not give real power save to *disperse meetings* and in addition, to crush Whitefeet.⁴ The latter is most desirable but certainly need not have been purchased by a sacrifice of the most important of all rights — *the trial by jury*.⁵ Believe me that the 'infernal bill' shall not retard the great Repeal Question.

Do not send me any more *cut up* papers. They are of no value.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 340-341

- 1 Town traveller for Guinness' brewery: remembered as 'orator Browne'. (FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 340).
- 2 Unidentified. This motion was probably made or intended to be made at a meeting of the Irish Volunteers Society.
- 3 The coercion bill (see letter 1966).
- 4 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, the Whitefeet were 'mostly colliers in the Queen's county and Co. Kilkenny mines' (Fitzpatrick, *Corr.*, I, 336 n5).
- 5 The coercion act (see letter 1955a n1) provided for the trial of offenders in certain cases by courts martial rather than by jury.

1969

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Wednesday, 3 April 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Put down as the first Item in *any* new account between the public and me £100 sent me in an anonymous letter. Set it down thus to begin: Anonymous in England, £100.

I got it in a letter just stating that it was sent as earned by me by my expenses and services to my country. I have not the least trace of the quarter whence or the person from whom it came. It is one of those strange fantasies of personal kindness to myself such as I believe no other man ever received and which, of course, I cannot deserve.

I never knew a more foolish mistake than that which relates to my opposition to an *amendment* in the bill. You say I opposed an amendment prohibiting the lord lieutenant from proclaiming any district by reason of *disturbances* arising from tithes. How could you be so gulled? I opposed a claim declaring that the Lord Lieutenant should not proclaim a district to be in a state of disturbance and outrage *merely because tithes were not paid*.

I opposed this clause as foolish and also because it was hypocritical, leading people to believe precisely what it seems you believe — that it prevented the Lord Lieutenant from proclaiming

any district by reason of *disturbances* arising from the payment or nonpayment of tithes.

The *True Sun* took up this silly — pardon me — view of the matter and attacked me. I have not time to defend myself.

I have passed the bill¹ for the Chamber of Commerce through the second reading and will, I trust, get it through the House of Commons the week after the recess. Tell this to some of my friends in the Chamber. It repeals effectually the obnoxious clause under which the mayor has bound the ship captains. Let Mr. Brophy² in particular know that I am attending to this business.

The Corporation witnesses³ fully proved our case; that is, they fully and indeed candidly admitted the exclusive nature of the Dublin Corporation including the nomination of the sheriffs, who return all juries to the highest courts of law. I have reason to know that the Committee are perfectly satisfied that we must have a full reform. That reform, if the leading corporators would join me, we could have at once and amicably; but if it be postponed until next session, it will come under the English precedents and be *sweeping* as the English corporation reform certainly will be. I do not expect that the leading corporators are as yet sufficiently aware of their danger but they cannot reasonably blame me. It was no object to me to make their witnesses contradict each other or to irritate or provoke hostility. I know that if they denied *exclusiveness* or the exclusive nature of the nomination of sheriffs, I could easily prove the fact as it really is. This is the hinge on which the reformation of Corporations turns, namely, how far there is a *monopoly* in a *part* of any town or city of corporate rights and above all how far that monopoly includes 'the administration of justice'. In this essential point the Corporation of Dublin is manifestly within the 'category' of those cases which require imperatively reform and of course *total* alteration. You see, therefore, that I want no adverse witnesses to prove *this* case. The plan of *eight wards* in Dublin, the £10 householders being the electors, four aldermen to be elected by each ward, and eight Common Council men. The twenty-five guilds to consist each of the trade for which it was instituted. No title to constitute freedom to a guild save *apprenticeship*. The guild of *real* merchants to return four members to the Common Council, each other guild to return one common council man. Such is the outline. It will identify the people with the new corporation. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 343-345

1 See letter 1964 n4.

2 Peter Brophy, wine merchant, 88 Upper Abbey Street, Dublin; member of Chamber of Commerce.

- 3 Those Irish witnesses appearing before the Select Committee on municipal corporations (see letter 1956 n1).

1970

To Charles D.O. Jephson

14 Albemarle St., London, 16 April 1833

Dear Sir,

I got a letter from my friend, Mr. O'Neill Daunt, some days ago, requesting I would inform you that he did not intend to defend his seat for Mallow and consequently to take any steps I could to procure your substitution in the manner least expensive to you. I waited until the Speaker¹ came to town and consulted with him yesterday. He tells me that Mr. Daunt cannot now formally withdraw to let in others to defend nor does he wish to do so. His object is — and it is mine — that as he will not defend the seat, you should now have it at as small cost to you as possible. You will therefore have no occasion for counsel or agent. If you allow me I will give you my advice before the Committee. One witness to prove any ten or whatever his majority consisted over you to be disqualified by being beyond the limits of the present borough or for want of value will be quite sufficient. You must however have the Poll Books brought over. Every facility that can be given you shall be so. The officer of the House strikes off eleven for the sitting Member when he does not attend. I will readily carry Mr. Daunt's wishes into effect to give you as little trouble and to diminish the expense as much as possible.²

SOURCE : Jephson, *Anglo-Irish Miscellany*, 191

1 Charles Manners-Sutton.

2 William Joseph O'Neill Daunt, returned in the general election of December 1832 for Mallow, Co. Cork, was unseated on petition and his opponent, Charles Denham Orlando Jephson, declared elected (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVIII, 304-5). According to Daunt's daughter, O'Connell had volunteered to save Daunt from being legally liable for the expenses of the unseating petition but neglected to keep his promise. *A Life spent for Ireland. Being selections from the journals of the late W. J. O'Neill Daunt*. Edited by his daughter (London, 1896), 15.

1971

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 April 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I do not know whether Sheehan and the Conservatives are angry with me or not but I do know that I behaved to them as you could wish. If there had been a sturdy English Chairman, they would not have got off so well, that is certain.¹

What are the Conservative Society² to do? To shrink *from* the proclamation I suppose, and so to confess themselves unworthy. I do perceive *that it is believed* that the 'Trades Union' will also hold out the white feather.³ It is just the course I should have expected from *some* of the most burly amongst them but I did hope that there was at bottom a fund of honest manliness which would go more than the poor length of meeting a proclamation and so yielding in preference to avoiding to assemble and by such shrinking to admit that they merited the appellation of '*dangerous*'. It certainly would have had a better effect if they had acted as boldly as the Volunteers did,⁴ especially as the suppression of a 'Trades Union' would have had a strong effect on the unions in this country. Can you discover who it was advised them to take the cowardly course?

I was defeated in point of numbers but most triumphant in the argument on the Proclamation of the *city of Kilkenny*.⁵ I intend to bring it on again in another shape on Monday next. One of the leading men of the government said to me in private, *it was a most unwise proclamation*. Anglesey will not reign long nor indeed will the Whigs. In Ireland you have no idea of the progress of the public mind in this country. It is going forwards in *our* direction.

I am sure you are not losing sight of the arrangements for Antrim.⁶ You will, I perceive, find difficulties from some of the bishops. It will require all your zeal, activity and friendship to make anything of it. I apprehend much want of success. Another year like the last would *complete* me. But these are dreams.

Hobhouse⁷ is a most inefficient Secretary. I have not much to contend with in point of ingenuity or force. Stanley's venom answered the English rascals much better. Hobhouse is only milk and water. I am pressing Hobhouse to immortalise himself by a reform of the Corporation of Dublin. Who knows?

I get the Sunday's parcel regularly. Perhaps it is not right for me to set the work *a doing* on that day.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 345-347

- 1 O'Connell was chairman of the committee set up on 28 March 1833 to try a petition against the election of Conway Richard Dobbs for Carrickfergus, Co. Antrim. The withholding of certain documents connected with the election caused the committee to adjourn on 2 April. These documents were in the hands of the Dublin Conservative Society, which had contributed £500 in support of Dobbs' return in the election (*DEM*, 12 Apr. 1833). The documents were, however, produced before the committee on 9 April (*DEM*, 12 Apr. 1833). On 15 April O'Connell on behalf of the committee declared Dobbs' election null and void, recommended the disfranchisement of Carrickfergus due to 'the most gross and scandalous bribery' on both sides in this and former elections, and added that great expense had been occasioned the parties due to the delay in producing certain documents connected with the election (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 271). O'Connell was one of the persons ordered on 25 May to prepare a bill for the disfranchisement of Carrickfergus. This bill was not, however, persisted in.
- 2 The Irish Protestant Conservative Society, founded in 1831, described by one authority as 'a tory imitation and at times parody of O'Connell's associations'. It held weekly meetings in Dublin and took steps, among other things, to raise a 'Protestant Rent' which in one week amounted to £2,000, register voters, assist Tory candidates and distribute propaganda. In April 1833 the society dissolved in order to avoid infringing the coercion act (see letter 1955a n1) though the staff was kept on and occasional meetings held (for an account of the society see McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 116-17).
- 3 O'Connell was mistaken. The National Trades Political Union was suppressed by proclamation — on 17 April (*FJ*, 19 Apr. 1833).
- 4 This society had refused to end its existence voluntarily (see letter 1967 n2) and was suppressed by government proclamation on 10 April (*Pilot*, 12 April 1833).
- 5 Kilkenny city and county were proclaimed under the coercion act on 6 April 1833. On 17 April a motion in the Commons by O'Connell in favour of an inquiry into the reasons for this proclamation was defeated by 115 to 28.
- 6 Probably a reference to the collection of the O'Connell Tribute.
- 7 Hobhouse had been appointed chief secretary for Ireland on 29 March, and was succeeded by Littleton on 17 May.

1972

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 April 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is confusion in the 'Camp of Agramont'.¹ I have no doubt that the scoundrel Algerine Whigs are out, and I have done my best to give them the last kick. The base hypocrites, with Liberty in their mouths and tyranny of the worst kind in their hearts! The

fact is, it is impossible for them to remain in. Last night we got rid of the one half of the malt tax and it is certain that they must repeal the house and window tax.² Thus between both they never can *progress*, as the Americans call it. I said one month ago that they could not possibly hold together. The meeting at the *Crown and Anchor* decided their fate.³ The conduct of those who met there was actually rebellious. I was the only moderate man or who confined himself within legal bounds. These things are, of course, only between *us*. But in reality nothing could be more violent than the conduct of the meeting. I was received as well as an Aggregate in Clarendon Street⁴ *could, would, should, or ought* to receive me.

I am, as you perceive, in great spirits. The Whigs must go out, the Tories cannot come in. The people of England will have cheap government. They cannot be hectored over like the poor unfortunate Irish. It is here, it is here that the Repeal is to be carried. You have no notion of the state of the public mind. The day of the Tories is gone by and everyone asks, what next? The Ministry have been sitting in council since three o'clock but no doubt can be entertained of the result. The Ministry must resign this day or tomorrow and no Ministry can now go on without a property tax. That is a tax which will rouse the *personal* patriotism of all the Aristocracy. The battle between the landlords and the fundlords is raging. The monied interests would not give us cheap currency and now the people at large are not able, or at all willing, to pay the dividends in gold.

I am writing at Brooks's⁵ amidst many doleful faces. How I triumphed over that scoundrel party who introduced the Coercion Bill! I really would prefer the Tories to this Algerine Administration. But the best of it is that we will not have either. It is, however, in the agitation of the English mind and of the English people that Irish safety consists. The Algerine Ministry and that greatest of vagabonds, Anglesey, would easily trample on us but that the people of England are in a state not to be trifled with. I do trust, hope, and begin to believe that within one fortnight I will be allowed to bring in a bill to repeal the Despotism Act.⁶ Hurrah!!

The Report of the Volunteers⁷ was an excellent quiz.

I want one hundred guineas. If you can send them to me you will greatly oblige.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 347-48

1 *Recte* Agramant, a fictional character in late medieval poetry. As king of the Moors he waged war against Charlemagne.

2 On 26 April Sir William Ingilby seriously embarrassed the government by carrying a resolution in the Commons in favour of drastically reducing the malt tax. On 30 April-1 May Sir John Key's resolution in favour of

abolishing the house and window tax was defeated by a government amendment. A second amendment to Key's motion was moved by the chancellor of the exchequer, Lord Althorp, restoring the malt tax (Commons Journal, 1833, LXXXVIII, 317, 329: *DEM*, 29 April, 3 May 1833; Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 111-13).

- 3 A public meeting, attended by leading parliamentary radicals, at the Crown and Anchor tavern on 25 April 1833, to procure the total abolition of the house and window taxes. O'Connell attended and spoke in condemnation of the ministry (*Times*, 26 Apr. 1833).
- 4 The church in Dublin where Emancipation meetings were frequently held.
- 5 This was the Whig-Liberal club.
- 6 The coercion act.
- 7 According to W.J. FitzPatrick this was 'one of the amusing pasquinades which FitzPatrick loved to throw off' (FitzPatrick, *O'Connell Correspondence*, I, 348 n6).

1973

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 2 May 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have the most sincere satisfaction in complying with the Rev. Dr. Boyton's request,¹ and no request could give me greater pleasure than one coming from him. I agree entirely in the principle on which the exemption of the present Fellows rests. They have purchased by unremitting labour the vested right to succeed to the College livings and most certainly ought not to be the only class of clergymen excluded from the benefit of the exemption. I will therefore put forward or support their claim as may be deemed most useful to their interests. I will consult Lefroy on this subject or the Recorder without mentioning *the request*.

The truth is, we shall know one another better soon, and then hurrah for Ireland 'a *Nation* and not a *Province*!'

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 350

- 1 Regarding the Church Temporalities bill. On the committee stage on 13 May O'Connell expressed the hope that the bill would not deprive fellows of Trinity College, Dublin of livings to which they had a just right to succeed (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XVII, 1142). The matter was settled ultimately on 29 July by an amendment in the Lords by Grey at the suggestion of Wellington whereby ten livings were set aside to be filled by fellows (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XX, 55).

1974

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 10 May 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Hurrah! Hurrah for old Ireland! The scoundrel Whigs are beaten again. Evans¹ is returned by a small majority of 67 but it is as good as 6,700.² This is the strongest proof of the utter impossibility of the Whigs continuing in office. Burdett must now resign as he declared that he would not sit with Evans.³ Nothing can exceed the consternation amongst the rascals who carried so triumphantly the bill to make silly Lord Anglesey despotic.⁴ That silliest of silly creatures is really the cause of all the loss of character which this Ministry have sustained. You have no notion of the depreciation of the ministers in the public mind by reason of their total dereliction of principle. We are working them out, believe me, and the paltry set that now rule Ireland will soon find themselves deserted by all parties.

I have seen the Government plan for Negro emancipation.⁵ It contemplates a loan of fifteen millions and a working out of this loan by the Negroes. It will never, never do.

No Secretary for Ireland and as yet no likelihood of getting one.⁶

I am on the Committee of Trade⁷ and I want witnesses from Ireland, not foolish *prosperity* men such as Rice had examined but men who know and can detail the distresses of our trade, shipping and manufactures. Speak to MacDonnell⁸ and others on this subject and let me have good witnesses. I wrote to Mr. Thomas Jameson⁹ on this point for the Chamber of Commerce. He had written to me for a Parliamentary Report for that body. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 350-351

- 1 George De Lacy Evans (1787-1870) M.P. for Rye 1831-32; Westminster 1833 which he represented almost continually until 1865; knighted 1837; appointed lieutenant-colonel 1815, major-general 1846, lieutenant-general 1854 and general 1861. See *DNB*.
- 2 This was the Westminster by-election of 9-11 May in which Sir John Cam Hobhouse was defeated by Evans with a majority of 152 (*Times*, 10, 11, and 13 May 1833). In consequence of voting against the government on the house and window tax Hobhouse, presently chief-secretary for Ireland, had resigned his seat for Westminster and was seeking re-election.
- 3 Though Burdett did threaten to resign his seat in the event of Hobhouse, his fellow-member for Westminster, being ousted (Burdett to Col. George de Lacy Evans, 19 Nov. 1832, Patterson, *Burdett*, II, 615) he continued to represent the seat after Evan's election.

- 4 The coercion bill.
- 5 This was the measure, providing for the abolition of slavery in the British colonies, which after several amendments was enacted in July-August (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 73).
- 6 On 29 March Sir John Cam Hobhouse had succeeded Stanley as chief secretary for Ireland. On 17 May Edward John Littleton succeeded Hobhouse.
- 7 A select committee appointed by the Commons on 3-4 May 1833 '... to inquire into the present state of manufactures, commerce and shipping in the United Kingdom ...'.
- 8 Probably either John or Myles McDonnell, both members of the Dublin chamber of commerce.
- 9 Thomas Jameson, merchant, secretary to the Commercial Buildings Company; sometime member of Dublin chamber of commerce.

1975

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 May 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

... As yet no secretary for Ireland.¹ A Mr. Carter² was spoken of but is not to be the man. My own belief is that Mr. Littleton, member for Staffordshire, is to be the man. He is supposed to be of a calibre sufficient to keep that crazy Lord Anglesey in check. In fact the great difficulty that the government have is to manage that exceedingly foolish and vain man. I am in great hopes that the trial of Walsh for a speech, on the evidence of an informer employed by a Government newspaper as a reporter,³ will give the *coup-de-grace* to Lord Anglesey and his very scoundrelly Attorney-General.⁴

I go down after Mass tomorrow to Birmingham to attend the great meeting for the removal of Ministers.⁵ I intend to be back in my place in the House on Tuesday. I believe I will have no difficulty in disfranchising Carrickfergus.⁶

I have seen the Vintners' deputation and got them to assent to so much of the bill as overrules the rascally discretion of the magistrates.⁷ I have also brought them to the single question whether the Grocers should be licensed to sell spirits on their premises or not.⁸ This is a question of great importance which no person but those in the government should be called on to decide, and it is one which must ultimately fall on the Government to decide. I advised the Vintners' deputation to wait on Spring Rice on the subject, and I beg of you to call on — and tell him. I think there should also be a deputation from the Grocers to

sustain their interests. Whatever way the Government determines will be decisive.

Are you preparing your plans of the autumnal campaign?⁹

Littleton has accepted the Irish Secretaryship. He will be announced on Monday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 348-349

- 1 See letter 1974 n6.
- 2 John Bonham Carter (died winter 1837/38), barrister; M.P. for Portsmouth 1816-37; influential in Tory circles.
- 3 A speech delivered in the National Trades Political Union by John Walsh, a member of that body, on 12 February 1833, is reported in the pro-government *Dublin Evening Post*, of 16 February 1833. According to the report, Walsh declared, among other things, that the act of Union was illegal and that the laws passed by the United Kingdom Parliament were thus not binding on the consciences of Irishmen. On 17 February, Walsh 'publicly disclaimed and protested against' this report of his speech and called on the editor to contradict it (*FJ*, 18 Feb. 1833). Walsh was prosecuted for his speech and on 27 May was sentenced to six months imprisonment and fined £20 (*FJ*, 15 May; *Pilot*, 27 May 1833).
- 4 Francis Blackburne.
- 5 A meeting of the Birmingham Political Union held on 20 May 1833 and alleged by the *Freeman's Journal* to have been attended by 260,000 persons. O'Connell arrived in the company of Thomas Attwood. Among the banners displayed was one in favour of repeal of the union. The speakers indulged in sweeping condemnations of the ministry, O'Connell urging the organisation of nationwide petitions calling for their dismissal (*FJ*, 24 May 1833).
- 6 See letter 1971 n1.
- 7 O'Connell, Louis Perrin and Andrew Henry Lynch were directed on 28 March 1833 to prepare a bill 'to consolidate and amend the laws in Ireland relating to the sale of wines, spirits, beer and cider, by retail'. The bill received the royal assent on 28 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 68). The act laid down that application for a license to sell intoxicating liquors might be considered valid if accompanied by a testimonial signed by six householders of the parish, irrespective of the recommendation of a magistrate or justice of the peace.
- 8 The above act did not prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors by grocers. This was, however, forbidden by an act of 1836 (see letter 2338).
- 9 In connection with the raising of the O'Connell Tribute.

1975a

To Richard Barrett

London, Saturday [c. 25 May 1833]

My dear Barrett,

I have heard of all the stages of the intended prosecution against you.¹ The downfall of the present Ministry may prevent it but at

all events and on every contingency, you can command and you may rely on me. I will, of course, do *all* that is right and if prosperity ever smiles distinctly on me, you shall share it. I will also share your adversity. In short, command me to the fullest extent. Let me hear from you *if* — or I rather should say, I fear, when the Bills are found. There is nothing whatsoever in the point of my concentrating the Volunteers.

The Ministry must go out. The people will not bear the Tories. But the great and cheering prospect is from the state of dissatisfaction of the public mind. Our allies are amongst the English people who will not *allow* the taxes to be paid. You cannot imagine how high my expectations are. They may be disappointed but I do confidently believe they will not; at all events, I cannot express *in words* my gratitude to you, nor shall you ever find yourself disappointed with me. *You command me.*

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 396

- 1 Richard Barrett, editor of the *Pilot*, was prosecuted by the government for having published on 8 April 1833 one of O'Connell's letters to the People of Ireland. He was tried on 26, 27 and 28 November and found guilty (*Pilot*, 27, 29 Nov. 1833), being imprisoned for six months and fined £100 (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 271; Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 200-201, 201-03; J. Morgan, *Report of the Speech of the Solicitor-General . . . on the trial of the case of . . . Richard Barrett*, (Dublin, 1834); *Repeal of the Union. Mr. O'Connell's address to the jury in the case of the King v. Barrett . . . , Dublin 1833 or 1834*). During his imprisonment O'Connell paid Barrett a total of £656, consisting of his £100 fine, £150 in American subscriptions, and weekly sums during his imprisonment amounting to £406 (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 84).

1976

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 May 1833

Private

My dear FitzPatrick,

There is a Mr. Blood¹ will call on you for £31. Pay it to him. It is to close expenses of the Youghal election.²

See Sheehan and Dr. Boyton. Speak to them confidentially of the trial of Barrett.³ This ministry is *tottering*. If they are defeated on *that* trial, it will be decisive of Anglesey's fate *at least*, probably of the existence of the Whigs. It is Ireland that is keeping them in. *This* defeat would shake them to the centre.

Barrett's jury is high Tory. If Sheehan or Dr. Boyton wish to lay

me under an everlasting obligation, NOW IS THE TIME. I may never have an opportunity to show my gratitude but I also *may*, and most certainly I *would* show it with drops of my heart's blood. I have forgiven and forgotten one thousand injuries. I never yet forgot an act of kindness. Some think I carry my sense of gratitude too far; I never think I can carry it far enough. Look to this discreetly. You can, I believe, vouch for my not being ungrateful. If we could but get a fair and impartial jury, Barrett would certainly be acquitted.

How can you be so weak as to credit any idle story of my being about to be called to the English bar or to stay in this country? I am wedded to Ireland for life, whatever may be my dower. I do believe that, if I chose, I could be Master of the Rolls in *this* country. But keep this fact to yourself. I would not accept the office of English Chancellor. In short, my ambition and my pride as well as my first and most sacred duty bind me to struggle for Ireland — and I will struggle for her to the last. Do you know that I confidently expect success? England can never again *face* danger without being compelled to do justice to Ireland, and the moment that the Protestants forget ascendancy and consent to endure equality with cordial good temper, we will be too strong for our enemies. My hopes are high and not remote *because the tendency of this country* is decidedly for a change in its institutions, which *must* give us an opportunity to be nationalised once again.

Tell Croker, Codd and Co.⁴ I will write to them so soon as I can see Mr. Rice on their business. The law is monstrous and their case one of the greatest hardship.⁵ I will leave no stone unturned to get them redress.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 351-353

- 1 Thomas Blood (born c. 1797), 45 Lr. Gardiner Street, Dublin and Youghal, Co. Cork; son of Edmund Blood, B.L. and a native of Co. Limerick; called to the bar 1822; recorder of Youghal from 1831 to 1832.
- 2 O'Connell's son John was returned for Youghal, Co. Cork in the general election of 1832-3.
- 3 See letter 1975a.
- 4 Croker, Codd & Son, corn and malt commission merchants, 52 Townsend Street, Dublin.
- 5 The government had seized a quantity of illicit malt against which Croker, Codd & Son, allegedly unaware of its being illicit, had made an advance. Francis Codd applied on behalf of the firm to the treasury to have this advance returned and, when unable to obtain satisfaction, appealed to the chancellor of the exchequer, relying on O'Connell's influence to secure his claim a favourable consideration (FitzPatrick, *O'Connell Correspondence*, I, 362-4). On 31 May 1833 O'Connell presented a petition to the Commons from the Dublin chamber of commerce (of which Edward Croker was a member) praying for the repeal of 'so much of the Act 7 & 8 Geo.

IV c. 53, as empowers the officials of excise to seize on articles which had been the property of manufacturers, subject to the laws of Excise, after the said articles had become the property of *Bona fide* purchasers, or of factors having a lieu thereon' (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 444; *Pilot*, 3 June 1833; see letter 2070 n2).

1976a

*To the Speaker of the House of Commons*¹

Albemarle Street [London], 29 May 1833

Mr. O'Connell presents his compts. to the Speaker and sensible of his many curtesies [*sic*] ventures to ask for one more – the placing the name of Mr. Hume² of *Dublin* on the list for a seat under the gallery tomorrow evening at the Slavery discussion.³ Mr. O'Connell solicits this favour the more anxiously as Mr. Hume represents the Irish Anti-Slavery party which is not only numerous but highly respectable.

SOURCE: University of Texas Library at Austin

1 Charles Manners-Sutton.

2 Probably William F. Hume, 16 Middle Gardiner Street, Dublin.

3 A motion on slavery in the British colonies was now in the committee stage. This motion led eventually to the introduction of the bill to abolish slavery (See letter 1974, note 5).

1977

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Saturday, 1 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have a thousand things to say to you and little time to say them in. In the first place, the remarks on the Corn Laws are very shrewd and sensible. He is a clever man who made them and if a *constituent*, whether friendly or otherwise, I should be glad to receive any communication from him. I am myself an abolitionist but, *if the Corn Laws are to remain*, the suggestions for their improvement are truly valuable. State why you did not communicate the name of the suggester.

Now for another point. Lord Ingestre¹ is gone down to Staffordshire. A Tory in my presence offered to lay five to one that he would defeat² Mr. Littleton. If he do, the Ministry must resign or if they totter on, it can be only for a few weeks. Keep what I tell

you quite private. A friend of mine told me that Lord Munster³ personally told *him* that the King was making his final arrangements to turn them out. This, you see, is pretty close to the throne. But then they have support near that throne from a notion that they have so strengthened themselves in Ireland that they are able to control and keep down *all parties* in that country. The defeat of Barrett's prosecution⁴ would shake them to the centre but what prospect is there of such defeat? The Irish ascendancy men, although some of them are more clear-sighted, yet in general they are so blinded by their *former* passions that they do not see how much it is their real interest to get rid, at all events, of this Ministry. What good, for example, will it do *that* party that Barrett should be imprisoned or fined? What will *they* gain by it? On the other hand, an acquittal would finish the career of this Ministry by dissipating the illusion of their Irish power.

The indictment is one intended to suppress the agitation of the Repeal of the Union. It states it to be *sedition* to bring the Union into what the law calls *contempt*. It is *also* strange that the ascendancy party will not perceive that, if they allow the Repeal thus to be condemned, they destroy one of the weapons that *it might* be very useful for them to bring forward again, as they have done before, at least to the extent of *threats* of injuring that measure. In short, more depends on a defeat of this prosecution than can well be calculated; whilst, on the other hand, little or no benefit will be achieved to *any* Irish party by its success.

See Barrett and tell him he *shall* certainly hear from me by Monday's post. John⁵ writes to him this day. You must contrive before his trial to give him £50 on my account. This is essential. I must and will cheerfully take care that no *pecuniary damage* reaches him directly or indirectly.

Leave your direction after you that my letters may be forwarded to you during your absence. We have got his compensation⁶ for Fox Dickson, and I am in hopes of knocking up the Whitehaven shipping monopoly where it interferes with the price of coals in Dublin.⁷

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 353-354

- 1 Henry John (Chetwynd-Talbot), styled Viscount Ingestre 1826-49 (1802-1868); M.P. for Hertford 1830-31; Armagh borough May to August 1831; Dublin city 18 August 1831-1832; South Staffordshire 1837-1849. Succeeded 1849 as third Earl Talbot of Hensol and in 1856 as eighteenth earl of Shrewsbury.
- 2 In the South Staffordshire by-election, necessitated by Littleton's appointment to the Irish chief secretaryship, which took place shortly afterwards Littleton defeated Lord Ingestre by 433 votes after 'a short but not inexpensive contest' (*DNB*, 'Littleton').

- 3 George Augustus Frederick (Fitz-Clarence) (1794-1842), eldest of the five illegitimate sons of William IV and Mrs. Jordan; created earl of Munster 1831. See *DNB*.
- 4 See letter 1975a.
- 5 John O'Connell, M.P.
- 6 Unidentified.
- 7 A petition from Stephen Fox Dickson, a Dublin coal merchant, was presented in the Commons on 6 June 1833 praying for an inquiry to be made into this matter. The petition was referred to the select committee on manufactures, commerce and shipping (see letter 1974 n7).

1978

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 4 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I wrote to you yesterday to say that I had a sudden demand for £500. I would wish you could get it on my bill at three months from private hands without getting into circulation. . . . I want at once £200 here and £100 for Barrett. Let him know you will give him £100 in lieu of the £50 I mentioned before. . . . I must, of course, bear all his extra expenses as well as make him pecuniary compensation for anything he may suffer.¹

I write in the morning to say that the ministry have resigned. All things are in a state of confusion. It can do us no harm that they should resign. All must be for the better.

I wrote to Croker, Codd and Co. after my interview with Spring Rice. That interview was satisfactory.²

This is the very crisis of the fortunes of the Whigs. If they get a dominion over the Lords by new creations they may go on but if not they are lost for ever. The people are against them and the King detests them. More news if possible in my second edition.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 354-355

1 See letter 1975 n1.

2 See letter 1976 n5.

1979

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 4 June, 1833. 1/2 past six.

My dear FitzPatrick,

I delay to the last moment to give you intelligence but in vain as

to anything decisive. The Ministry must resign. Whether they shall be brought back by *the people* or not is another question. THEY MUST RESIGN. In fact, Lord Grey is gone for that purpose to Windsor. He is not yet returned. This visit will decide all as he must get power to create peers or he and his party are gone for ever. It is not *safe* to prophesy as to what will so speedily be known but my opinion decidedly is that this Ministry cannot longer hold together and that their efforts to conquer the King must fail. *They actually WANT the power to make at least twenty-five peers.* They have not *now* the popular voice with them although they have a great majority of the House of Commons. A new Ministry, strictly Tory, could not endure. It would be, according to Talleyrand's phrase, *Le commencement de la fin.* Keep up the spirits of the friends of Ireland. Every change is for the better for us. We shall see whether Lord Anglesey is to serve again under the Duke of Wellington or not.

Look to a speedy dissolution, and let my friends see whether, with a Tory Government, it would not be better for me to return to Kerry. But I care little about that point. I will, of course, write again tomorrow. Everything is at sixes and sevens. It is a comfort to have this scoundrel Administration in trouble. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, Corr., I, 355-356

1980

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 5 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Tell Barrett, to whom I have despatched a letter, that Lord Grey is come back from Windsor. The King declared he would not accept his resignation *but he did not promise to make peers.* I told you there would be a resignation. The papers and the ministerialists denied it. You see the resignation has been tendered. *They must have done it;* and now we are in an attitude to assail the peers. The war begins tomorrow. We have again an adjournment. The Speaker¹ is most conveniently sick — quite a *propos.* You have no idea of the great revolutionary feeling that is afloat.² This, I repeat, is the Crisis. The Lords must become cyphers. I am taking a strong part with the Government and have had the honour of some of their confidential communications, but this to be to yourself, not to be printed or communicated save to Barrett

privately. Give Barrett the £100. A little bird whispers me, 'No prosecution.'³ But no matter. You will hear again from me tomorrow.

We are in the throes of a civil revolution.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 356

1 Charles Manners-Sutton.

2 Some angry popular meetings had recently occurred in London and other great towns in protest against the government's taxation policy (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 112).

3 See letter 1975a n1.

1980a

*To ? P.V. FitzPatrick*¹

[c. 6 June 1833]

I do not apprehend the post office yet I take this precaution.

My own hopes are high. I see that the popular party is daily winning its way.

[P.S.] *We* — the Irish Members — meet on Monday² to overrule Fergus O'Connor in his folly of bringing on the question of repeal at a time when it is impossible to do it any service.

SOURCE: *The Brookes Collection* belonged to the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne deposited in the Northumberland Record Office

1 The first part of this letter is not extant.

2 See letter 1984, note 2.

1981

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 7 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write on receipt of the £492. 3.10d draft, to acknowledge it and to return the draft accepted. You have done the thing in the best possible way. No person could be more anxious to husband resources than I am but, alas, my expenses in the public service are enormous. I doubt exceedingly the success of this year, and if success there be it will be all your own good management.¹

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 357

- 1 A reference to the forthcoming collection of the annual O'Connell Tribute. It was successful in 1833, a total of £13,908.18.0 being raised (see *Detailed Report of Contributions to the O'Connell National Annuity for . . . 1833*, Dublin, 1834).

1982

To Richard Barrett

[London] 7 June 1833

Confidential

My dear Barrett,

First as to politics. I joined the Whig ministry last night and contributed perhaps a good deal to the extent and satisfactory nature of their victory.¹ I have helped them at this crisis which, however, is not yet over. The Duke of Wellington has the peers and will try another battle. There is a kind of interregnum; how it will end is uncertain but this quite clear, that the Tories cannot possibly hold power. In the meantime Germany is in the actual throes of a revolution.² 'Wait a while.'

My speech and vote last night gave me a *proper introduction* to Mr. Littleton. If anything can be done it is now. I am, I think so at least, formidable as an enemy. I have shown an act of unmerited friendship. We shall see whether anything can be done. Littleton will be in town this day. *Act*, however, on your part as if there was no chance of anything but trial and conviction. The question is, how you *will* act. You perceive that I recognise my pecuniary obligations. All *extra* expenses, all usual expenses and compensation as far as money and my means can compensate for personal sufferings — such are my duties towards you.³ What shall be your conduct? I would not have put the question but for your letter through Lynch.⁴ I object to your consulting Staunton. He has been at every critical moment of my political life my enemy — on the 40s. freeholds, on the Union, on the attachment motion.⁵ What a difference between his conduct and that unfortunate Lavelle⁶ on that motion! It was with difficulty that I could get a respite in point of time from Staunton whilst Lavelle made up his mind and gave it in writing as his determination not to give me up although he had from my own lips the avowal that the letter was mine. I have not shown any gratitude whatsoever to Lavelle. To Staunton's interest I have been much attached. I do not deserve from him hostile advice, and I deprecate your being led by him. In fact, Staunton was the first man at the Irish press that announced the doctrine of giving up authors to screen publishers, forgetting

that the publishers, and none more than Staunton, reject what they please and publish that which will promote their circulation. All the profit that can be derived from the transaction belongs to the publishers. John Magee did not betray⁷ Grattan; Eneas MacDonnell did not betray Scully, nor did FitzPatrick.⁸ The three were content with having the pecuniary expenses made good. But I have said enough on this subject; more, indeed, than I should if Staunton's advice did not make part of your letter.

The facts between us are these. I never concealed from you the state of the law nor the fact that every letter I ever published *could* be declared a libel. I described the libel law as that which could produce a conviction with a proper judge and jury for the Lord's Prayer with due legal inuendoes, as they are called. There was, and is, nothing to be tried between me and the government on any of my letters. Conviction to me must be certain. Why, then, did I publish in your paper?⁹

Because you knew the risk and accepted it. If I had not thought that you did, if you had not told me as well emphatically by actions as by words that you did, I would not have published in Ireland at all. Upon the attachment motion your conduct was still more straightforward and unequivocal than Lavelle's. In short, you left no doubt on my mind as to our relative positions. When I began to publish in the *True Sun*¹⁰ I mentioned my terms. I said, 'I pay all, you take the personal suffering.' It was agreed to at once. I also may be mistaken but am convinced that there never yet was a moment of my political life in which it was so essential to the interests of Ireland that I should be *at large*. My power of locomotion in England as well as in Ireland is, I think, essentially necessary, for the sake of Ireland, to be preserved at this critical juncture. To be sure, I may be mistaken; I may be deceiving myself; but I would not have published one line in Ireland if I thought such publication would put me in a situation to be withheld from action for *three years*, a period which the Court of King's Bench would readily inflict on me.

You urge against me that I ought not just now attend the Birmingham meeting¹¹ and other meetings. You do not know the Whigs. To be respected by them they must feel one to be a formidable enemy. They have always courted their enemies. I look to success *with* them only from attacking them with virulence until they believe me formidable. If I was sentenced, there would be no chance of mitigation without absolute and entire debasement, at least a resignation of my political career. I should therefore have been mad if I were to publish in Ireland without *considering* myself safe from personal detention.

You now know my sentiments. Except from your letter, which I call the Staunton letter, I always heard you concur with me in these views. I only add that the pecuniary obligations are mine and mine alone. I think the personal suffering, subject certainly to the right to the fullest compensation within my power, is yours. I do not hold out hopes which may be idle and deceptive. You will act as if I held out none. But it is to me a consolation to be convinced that, as in Tracey's case,¹² the persuasion that I could *not* be reached would alone operate to terminate the suffering.

I deem it right to be thus candid and explicit. There is not one word in this letter that can be construed into a reproach or a suspicion as between you and me. I only for the present reply to Staunton's advice. I left his paper altogether *simply* because of our difference on that point.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 357-60

- 1 A reference to the Commons' vote of confidence in the government's Portuguese policy on the previous night. It was an answer to a virtual vote of censure on that policy by the Lords on 3 June (G. Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, London, 1929, 126-8).
- 2 A reference to recent expressions of discontent with their governments by assemblies and the populace in several German states.
- 3 See letter 1975a n1.
- 4 Probably David Lynch.
- 5 A reference to the prosecutions in January 1831 of the editors of the *Freeman's Journal* (Patrick Lavelle) and *Morning Register*, (Michael Staunton) for publishing one of O'Connell's letters (see letter 1951 n4).
- 6 A reference perhaps to the poor state of Lavelle's health at the time.
- 7 Unidentified.
- 8 See letter 343 n1.
- 9 *The Pilot*.
- 10 O'Connell was at this time publishing his letters to the People of Ireland in the *True Sun*, a radical London newspaper.
- 11 The great radical meeting in Birmingham on 20 May which had condemned the government on a variety of charges. O'Connell urged the meeting to take steps to replace the present ministers with honest men so that 'the Reform Bill would not be a dead letter, but would be carried into full effect. Then they would have cheap government, cheap religion and cheap law, — above all, they would have cheap food' (*Times*, 21 May 1833).
- 12 A reference to Harding Tracey, a printer for the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, who in 1815 was sentenced to two years' imprisonment and fined £300 for printing a speech of O'Connell's. According to Brian Inglis, 'his release several months before the sentence had expired was . . . the result . . . of ministerial admission that they had failed in their real object — the trapping of O'Connell himself' (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 143). A long account of this affair, accusing O'Connell of base ingratitude to Tracey, is published in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 11 February 1834. Tracey died about 1822.

1983

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I send you for Barrett £50, a cheque on the Hibernian Bank, to make up the £100. . . .

With respect to the indictment against Barrett,¹ the only way it could be laid as an offence to repeal the Union is by intimidation. It would not be an offence otherwise. Therefore the Government roguishly laid it that way. But in the article itself there is not one word of intimidation so that they must be unwise Repealers who do not see through the scheme. But, alas for Ireland, there are some of her people always ready to fall foul of the rest, and this is the cause of our present degradation.

The Ministry are running out their career. 'Wait a while', a little while will place us upright.

Your letter this day cheers me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 360

1 See letter 1975a n1.

1984

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*London, Thursday¹, 13 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I got your advice on the Repeal too late to be of any use as the question was decided by us here on the day your letter is dated.² But I am bound in candour to tell you that the advice of my friends in Dublin would not induce *me* to consent to bring it on this session because I know that any rational discussion upon it is impossible in this advanced and complicated state of the public business. We should have been either deprived of a house by members going away or we should be treated with contempt and ridicule by men who are now thinking of nothing else save *escaping* from London and getting rid of the session. You have no idea of the effect which must be produced in this country as well as in Ireland by the total and ludicrous failure of the attempt to debate it *now*. It would literally be equal only to the plan of 'privateering after the war.'

I have given my notices³ for the *first* day of the next session. I will bring them on the next thing after the King's Speech is dismissed. I will begin the actual and immediate preparation of my speech from this moment. Every day will add to my materials or to the arrangement of them.

See Barrett the moment you receive this and tell him I will begin my publications⁴ again in the *True Sun* of Monday unless I hear from you by that post, desiring me to postpone. It is necessary that I should show the Irish nation my reasons in detail for opposing discussion⁵ this session, and commence my operations to be prepared for the new. Every day's experience convinces me that with a little perseverance we shall carry the Repeal as the people carried the Catholic question and now are carrying the *actual* abolition of tithes. The first step was taken last night.⁶ I had certainly a great triumph in the decision of the Speaker⁷ who, while he decided I was disorderly in calling the 'shouters' ruffians, decided that they deserved the appellation by being equally disorderly.⁸ I made a much better speech than is reported — at least *so I think*.

One great reason why I would not bring on the Repeal this session is, that it would give a fictitious patriotism to men who have been voting badly through three fourths of the session; and indeed it is just such men who in general are for forcing it on at present. Only think of men who have supported the present Algerine Ministry against the people of England on questions of taxation, *working up* their popularity by giving a vote for Repeal just at the moment when no rational result could ensue for the idea of bringing in a Repeal bill at this time of the session is quite ridiculous even if there were a majority in its favour.

I repeatedly urge Spring Rice on the subject of the claim of Croker, Codd and Co.,⁹ and I get repeated promises of doing them justice. I will now press for *the returns* on the subject of the Liffey bill.¹⁰ I am promised to have my bill pass the lords without more delay.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 360-362

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick dated this letter Monday, 13 June 1833 but the 13th was a Thursday. Internal evidence proves that this letter was written on the 13th, therefore on Thursday.
- 2 Feargus O'Connor, the future Chartist, had threatened to bring in a motion in parliament in favour of Repeal (Read and Glasgow, *Feargus O'Connor*, 34). At a meeting of the Irish Repeal M.P.'s on 10 June 1833 it was decided in accordance with O'Connell's wishes, by 12 to 10, with 10 abstentions, not to bring forward any motion in favour of Repeal that session (*FJ*, 13 June 1833; Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 126).
- 3 That is, with regard to a motion in favour of Repeal of the Union.

O'Connell did not bring on this motion until April 1834 when it was overwhelmingly defeated.

4 Of his letters to the People of Ireland.

5 Of Repeal, in parliament.

6 On 12 June a debate took place in the Commons in connection with a government motion to consider facilitating the collection of tithes in Ireland and relieving the clergy of the established church. 'The first step' was an amendment by Henry Lambert, M.P. for Co. Wexford, that 'it is the opinion of this House, that the pledges given by His Majesty's Ministers, that the Bill for the suppression of local disturbances in Ireland should not be applied to the collection of Tithes, and that the arrears of Tithes should be got rid of, have not been fulfilled; and also, that the employment of the Military and Police Forces in serving Civil Processes and Tithes is highly unconstitutional and ought to be discontinued.' The amendment was lost by 197 to 45 (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 480; *FJ*, 17 June 1833; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., 1833, XVIII, 622-61).

7 Charles Mannors-Sutton.

8 On 12 June the Commons erupted when O'Connell spoke in favour of extinguishing tithes. The *Freeman's Journal* published a special report: '“What”, exclaimed Mr. O'Connell with indignant vehemence, (extending his arm and erecting himself with a lofty boldness of mien and gesture) “... talk to me after this of your union! I am an Irishman; it is my crime in this house that I am an Irishman, but what has my country done — what have I done that you should dare assail me thus” (increased uproar and indignant cries of hear, hear, from the Irish members, mixed with shouts of order, order, oh, oh, and great confusion) “Why” demanded O'Connell, “should that House dare to assail him with those ruffian shouts?”' On Stanley and Lord Sandon's objecting to O'Connell's language, the Speaker interposed to declare that though 'the language of the honourable member for Dublin [O'Connell] was undeniably disorderly ... the provocation he received was equally disorderly.' O'Connell was allowed to proceed without further interruption (*FJ*, 17 June 1833).

9 See letter 1976 n5.

10 See letter 1964 n4 and 1969.

1985

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 19 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I received all your letters and thank you again and again. ... I have laid Rooney's¹ petition² before Mr. Littleton with the strongest recommendation I could give it. I am in great hopes of success but I would not raise the worthy man's expectations for fear of a disappointment. I shall know tomorrow or the day after. If we get relief from Mr. Littleton, well and good; if not, I will bring the matter before the House and the public. I also attack Spring Rice daily on Croker & Codd's business.³ I am promised a

very speedy answer.

With respect to politics, we are not much advanced since I wrote last. The Tories shrank from their threatened defeat of Lord Brougham on Monday.⁴ I did think that shrinking was from mere terror of the consequences. I am led from circumstances to believe it rather arose from a delicacy towards the King who yesterday dined with the Duke of Wellington. Since I wrote the last page I saw a high Tory (who told me what might be a *hint* that I had nothing to fear from the change.) He also says that the Tories will certainly go to war.⁵ Everything is really in the state preceding a crisis in this country, and this just the moment when Lavelle, who has always availed himself of any turn up to assail me, and O'Higgins,⁶ who owes me a grudge since the affair of Reynold's⁷ letter, to insinuate I know not what against me.⁸ Heaven help them! If any one anti-Unionist save myself COULD get what I could — I tell you I COULD get tomorrow or even this day for forsaking or injuring *the Repeal* — I have the impudence to think he *would* swallow the bait. No matter. Tell Barrett that I do not publish another letter in compliment to him. I await his permission before I even vindicate myself. I owe him certainly this deference. But to resume. We will probably have elections within six weeks, perhaps within a month. I think I may say that the Tories will make the experiment. What a crisis! One day they despair, the next they are going to battle. If the elections come on, are we quite sure of our ground? Alas! how little do men in Dublin know of the precarious state of public affairs. I am deprived even of my power of warning. But no matter. A great and merciful God has hitherto guided every event for the good of Ireland for many of the latter years, and my mistaken errors and political follies have frequently had more beneficial results for Ireland than any acts of my poor wisdom. I have got credit for the result when, in fact, I should have been blamed for the rashness and precipitancy of my sudden and ill-considered resolves, and an opinion has grown up of my political sagacity which I did not deserve. On the other hand, I have been sometimes attacked without adequate cause. We are, however, now at the most portentous crisis of our affairs, and I perceive that circumstances are just now running away with my political influence. Why, if men thought me really honest, would they not admit that I am in a position to see more of the game than those who, residing in Dublin, cannot know one half of the circumstances on which political conduct ought to hinge? We are arriving at a crisis. God's holy will be done in everything.

- 1 James Rooney, grocer and spirit merchant, Townsend Street, Dublin: sometime alderman of Dublin corporation.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 See letter 1976 n5.
- 4 On Monday 17 June Lord Chancellor Brougham moved that the House go into committee on the law courts bill. Lord Lyndhurst opposed him vigorously but the matter was not pressed to a division (*FJ*, 21 June 1833).
- 5 Presumably a reference to the civil war which had for some years been in progress in Portugal. This reference is obscure since on 3 June Wellington had carried a resolution in the Lords in favour of preserving English neutrality.
- 6 Patrick O'Higgins (died 1854), merchant, 14 North Anne Street, Dublin, later known as the 'Irish Chartist'.
- 7 Thomas Reynolds, merchant, son of Henry Reynolds and Margaret Bulkeley, daughter of a medical doctor of Nenagh, Co. Tipperary; vice-president of the National Trades Political Union.
- 8 The *Freeman's Journal* had strongly favoured an immediate discussion of repeal (see letter 1984 n2) and had expressed strong disapproval of the decision, which O'Connell favoured, to postpone that motion (*FJ*, 3, 6, 14, 15, 19 June 1833). O'Higgins was a personal friend of Feargus O'Connor who had suggested the introduction of a Repeal motion.

1986

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Thursday¹, 20 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

The House is *up*. None of the Ministers attended for more than a few moments. Many reports afloat but nothing certain. The ardent friends of the Whigs now begin to think that as the grand struggle is delayed it never will take place. I am not of that opinion. It seems as if, on the contrary, everything was preparing for the fight. In fact, we are in a species of interregnum. Nothing is stable or fixed. What a time to think of bringing on the Repeal question without petitions in its favour!² I am, however, tired with this subject and will only add that if I can get the management of the question, I will undertake to have a million petitioners before next session. The King was facetious and foolish at the Duke of Wellington's on Tuesday.³ His going there at all was proof that he acts under other advisers than his Ministers. One result of the present agitation is certain: either the Whigs go out, and that will be an actual good or, if the Whigs stay in, Toryism can never again raise its head, which also will be an actual good.

I am much afraid that I cannot get any relief for poor Rooney. His is a case of gross oppression but the name of Anglesey mixes

with it, and the Government must at all hazards protect him. I will bring his case fully before the public. It shall not be my fault if he does not obtain redress.

I will follow the county plan you suggest.⁴ I may be embarrassed by the interference with my, at least, *honest* views. What frets me is that men in Dublin equally honest with myself will not recollect that I am equally honest with them, and that I have a much better opportunity of knowing how the land lies and what are the circumstances which could render any discussion⁵ available for any useful purpose whatsoever. My speech on the Poor Laws,⁶ the most efficient all to nothing which I made since I got a seat in Parliament, was burked. I intend to obviate this on my discussion of the Repeal by getting the *True Sun* a set of reporters for that debate. I expect to have it last several nights.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 366-367

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick dated this letter Monday, 20 June 1833 but the 20th was a Thursday. Internal evidence proves that the letter was written on the 20th, therefore on Thursday.
- 2 See letter 1984 n2.
- 3 On 18 June the king dined at Apsley House as the guest of the duke of Wellington in honour of the anniversary of the battle of Waterloo (*Times*, 19 June 1833).
- 4 In connection with the raising of the O'Connell tribute.
- 5 That is, of Repeal.
- 6 Probably a reference to a short speech delivered by O'Connell in the Commons on 17 June in which he condemned the principle on which the English poor laws had always been based, namely, in giving 'able-bodied labourers not employment but maintenance when out of work; and that is the ground of all the evils of the poor laws' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1833, III, 2369). In its report of this debate the *Times* did not mention that O'Connell had taken part in it.

1987

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 21 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

No further news of the approaching collision.¹ The Queen² has been, it is said, very active in her exertions to procure a new ministry. But my own opinion is that the Tories are frightened. I do not think they will dare to show fight although some of their partisans are of a different opinion. Reports contradictory of each other continue to be created. No *fact* can be relied on save this obvious one, that the suspense still continues. We are still in a state

resembling an interregnum. The Ministry are working from hand to mouth.

I will have no opposition from Government against bringing in my bill to regulate the corporations.³ I intend to divide the City into eight Wards, to give each ward the election of three aldermen, and of a fourth in rotation to each. Each ward to elect eight Common Council men and to remodel the guilds, giving each one Common Council man, four to a real guild of merchants. I will leave almost all the rest as it stands because the machine in itself is good provided it were well and honestly worked. The £10 householders will be the 'freemen' or electors in the wards, save that every tradesman will be an elector in his own guild, provided an apprenticeship anywhere.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 367-368

- 1 Between the government and the Tories supported by the House of Lords.
- 2 Adelaide (1792-1849), queen of William IV.
- 3 On 1 August 1833 O'Connell and Edward Southwell Ruthven obtained leave to bring in a bill 'for the better regulation of the Corporation of Dublin' but the bill was not introduced.

1988

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 22 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am sorry to find that eighteen members of St. Audeon's parish should have given my enemies such a triumph over me.¹ Why, how is it possible that you should not in all that parish have been able to procure fifteen more friends of mine to turn the scale? Well, well, well, how idle it is for every man to expect to be treated with fairness! To insinuate that I interpose a delay to carrying the Repeal! I am sincerely sorry indeed to see that my friend Thomas O'Connor² should be thus arrayed in the adverse ranks. I thought he knew me better than to believe that anything but the impossibility of doing good and the certainty of doing harm would have induced me to postpone a discussion. It does, I confess, mortify me especially after your representations on the subject.

I succeeded in a most important amendment of the Church Temporalities Bill last night.³ The newspapers do not do me justice but the delegates from the assize⁴ will, I believe, do so. They felt that my exertions, and the distinctness with which I put the merits of the question, carried it; but whilst I am thus praising

myself others are censuring me upon a point on which I am perfectly right.⁵ 'These *be our* rewards.'

The Government have truckled to the Tories. I suppose it is agreed that there shall be no collision⁶ this session. One does not know what to think or how to judge. The parties are manifestly afraid of each other and Lord Grey in particular fears to confide to popular support. In the meantime an universal uncertainty prevails. No man can tell who will be minister this day week. I gave Stanley and the Ministry a *cruel crushing* last night.⁷ There was no rally against me at all, and even those who voted for the Ministry admit that no men ever deserved better to be abused. In the meantime the session appears actually interminable. We have three or four days more on the Church Bill,⁸ then the Anti-Slavery Bill,⁹ Indian Bill,¹⁰ Bank Bill,¹¹ etc. I repeat this thing to you because I feel dissatisfied and disgusted with the triumph that has been had over me by Reynolds and O'Higgins and beings of that description.¹²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 368-69

- 1 At a meeting of the parish of St. Audeon's, Dublin, on 19 June 1833, several resolutions were passed in favour of Repeal, including the vital one which deprecated the decision (see letter 1984 n2) to postpone bringing on a motion in parliament (*Pilot*, 21 June 1833). Also spelt St. Audoen's.
- 2 Probably Thomas [O'] Connor, merchant, 37 Usher's Quay, Dublin, who was the proposer of the vital motion at the St. Audeon's meeting.
- 3 The Irish church temporalities bill contained a clause whereby tenants of ecclesiastical lands were to be enabled to purchase their holding (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 39-40). On 21 June O'Connell supported an amendment by Lord Oxmantown designed to give the tenants of ecclesiastical lands the benefit of any improvements they had made when it came to estimating the purchase price of their holdings. The amendment was carried by 85 to 49 (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 511; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., 1833, XVIII, 1065-72).
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 A reference to the above-mentioned St. Audeon's meeting.
- 6 Between the government and the Tories supported by the House of Lords.
- 7 Just before this debate of 21 June the government had decided to abandon the appropriation clause of the church temporalities bill (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 40-41). In consequence O'Connell attacked the government furiously in the debate, accusing the ministers of having 'sacrificed their principles to keep their places' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XVIII, 1075-7).
- 8 The Irish church temporalities bill.
- 9 See letter 1974 n5.
- 10 A bill for effecting an arrangement with the East India Company, for the better government of the British East Indian territories (that is, for the government of India), enacted on 28 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 85).
- 11 A bill to regulate the charter of the Bank of England ordered on 4 July 1833 and enacted on 29 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 98).
- 12 Thomas Reynolds was present at the meeting in St. Audeon's.

1989

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 June 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Feergus O'Connor¹ has had his brains blown out by the trash in the *Freeman's Journal*² and he has, without condescending to consult me, fixed his Union debate for the 16th of the next month.³ He will do great mischief, and the Repealers will, I trust, show Mr. Lavelle that he has speculated badly in setting on this uncalculating and coarse-minded fellow to do mischief. At present my family are determined that I should neither speak nor vote. My wife — who in almost all my political resolves has been, I believe, uniformly right — is strongly against my taking any part. I myself think I should merely stand by and reply to some late speaker. It is cruel to have my plan deranged by this interloper.⁴ His debate can do nothing but mischief.

My fifth letter⁵ will appear in the *True Sun* of Monday. I will send to Mr. Dwyer a letter on this subject. I have written a great part of it, but could not finish without abandoning my Committee duty⁶ which is not a little severe.

This session will last so long that I do not despair of getting my Corporation bill⁷ through the House.

The Ship Canal⁸ I thought a bubble but we have had documents laid before us this day from which I conjecture that it will be successful and eminently useful to the health as well as the commercial prosperity of Dublin.

No further movement amongst the Ministry but they cannot stand. I believe some of the Government are very angry with the 'honest old daggerman.'⁹ I believe he has written a line or two too many of abuse. More of this hereafter; but to me the creature seems to have gone mad with rancour.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 370-371

- 1 Feergus Edward O'Connor (1794-1855), Fort Robert, Ballineen, Co. Cork, the Chartist leader, son of Roger O'Connor, a United Irishman; M.P. for Co. Cork 1832-35; Nottingham borough 1847-52; the original family name was Conner, O'Connor being an assumed one. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 1985 n8. Feergus O'Connor had written two letters (dated 17 and 19 June 1833) to the *Freeman's Journal* in support of his proposal to bring forward a parliamentary motion in favour of Repeal of the Union (*FJ*, 20, 22 June 1833). In publishing the letters the *Freeman's Journal* gave enthusiastic editorial support to O'Connor's proposal.
- 3 In the Commons on 16 July O'Connor announced that he would not proceed with his intended motion (*FJ*, 19 July 1833).

- 4 Feargus O'Connor.
- 5 His fifth letter to the People of Ireland dated 1 July 1833. It was published also in the *Pilot* of 3 July 1833.
- 6 The Carrickfergus committee (see letter 1971 n1).
- 7 See letter 1987 n3.
- 8 O'Connell was one of the members of a select committee appointed on 20 June 1833 'to inquire into the expediency . . . of constructing a ship canal between the city of Dublin and the . . . harbour at Kingstown.' According to W.J. FitzPatrick, it was intended by this project (which never materialised) to enable vessels drawing sixteen feet to reach Dublin even at low water (FitzPatrick, *O'Connell Correspondence*, I, 370).
- 9 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, this alludes to Frederick W. Conway, proprietor and editor of the *Dublin Evening Post* (FitzPatrick, *O'Connell Correspondence*, I, 371, n9). Conway was about this time pouring much abuse on O'Connell and his followers in his newspaper.

1990

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 5 July 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Go to Jerry McCarthy from me. Show him *this part* of my letter and get him at once to make the arrangement you propose. He will comply with my request which I thus make.¹

You have heard that it has become the unanimous opinion of all² but Feargus O'Connor that we should not attempt to discuss the Repeal this session. If that discussion had come on I would, of course, have given it all the aid in my power. But I could not have said *this* in public, because the silly advocates for an immediate discussion would at once have called it a change of opinion — an acquiescence on my part in the propriety of their views — and would thus have turned my determination to do my duty under the most unfavourable circumstances into an approval of those who produced those very circumstances.

I will now begin in earnest to prepare myself for the contest. All my fame, alas, as an orator and statesman depends on *this* exertion.

I will follow your county and parochial plan.³ I will begin with the bleak north. Wait a few days before you begin *your circuit*.⁴ Let the *discussion* question⁵ be at rest first.

The Commission to inquire into corporate abuses⁶ comes out immediately. Perrin and six Catholic barristers on the one hand, and six liberal Protestants on the other, will make a searching inquiry into corporate funds, charities, etc. In fact, there is a determination to probe everything to the bottom.

I am so engaged between the Ship Canal⁷ and the Carrickfergus Committee⁸ that I wish to have the *ubiquity* of Sir Boyle Roche's bird – to be in *two* places at once.⁹

Mr. Spring Rice who has, as usual, behaved badly to us all on Croker and Codd's business¹⁰ has promised to let me see the report made on this case. I will write to them so soon as I can get the perusal of that document.

I hope to leave this by the 10th of August. I will stay in Dublin only a few days. I want the country air exceedingly although I have worked more and am in better health this than any former year.

The reporting in the newspapers is scandalous. I made a speech last night on the Liverpool question¹¹ which was more cheered than any I believe I ever made. The report is in a few insignificant lines.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 371-372

- 1 Probably concerning some money loan.
- 2 O'Connell was apparently referring to the pro-Repeal M.P.'s (see *Pilot*, 8 July 1833).
- 3 A reference to the collection of the O'Connell Tribute.
- 4 FitzPatrick presumably intended to traverse the country in order to organise the Tribute.
- 5 That is, on the propriety of bringing on a Repeal motion in parliament (see letter 1984, note 2).
- 6 On 4/5 July the Commons resolved to set up a royal commission to inquire into the state of the municipal corporations in England, Wales and Ireland. In consequence, on 20 July, Louis Perrin and twelve other barristers, were commissioned to make the enquiry. Their report was published in 1835 (*Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations of Ireland*, London, 1835). The six Catholic barristers were Maurice King, John R. Corballis, Philip Fogarty, David R. Pigot, Henry Baldwin and Mathew R. Sausse; the six Protestant were James Moody, William Hannah, William E. Hudson, Acheson Lyle, Maziere Brady and John Colhoun.
- 7 See letter 1989 n8.
- 8 See letter 1971 n1.
- 9 'A man couldn't be in two places at once, barring he was a bird.' Sir Boyle Roche (1743-1807), a member of the Irish House of Commons for many years, was noted for his 'Irish bulls'.
- 10 See letter 1976 n5.
- 11 On 1 April a select committee of the House of Commons reported that allegations of corruption in elections for the borough of Liverpool were substantially correct. On 4 July a debate took place as to the propriety of pursuing enquiries further. O'Connell spoke in favour of doing so (*Pilot*, 8 July 1833) and on 5 July it was decided by 166 to 84 to pursue the enquiry.

1991

From Edward J. Littleton

[Copy]

Irish Office [London], 6 July 1833

Private

My dear Sir,

I have thought a good deal about Leary's case¹ and have read all the papers which at different times have been sent here on that subject. I have also read the parliamentary discussion on the petition presented by you some time back.²

As I find the two chief secretaries who preceded me both looked at the case and came to the decision that the sentence ought not to be disturbed, I might well excuse myself from any revision of the grounds of their judgement.

I confess to you, however, there is one point on which I am desirous of explanation but which I am sure I should not obtain by correspondence. I mean, therefore, when I go to Dublin to have some conversation on the subject with the law officers.

You shall know the result of my opinion on the case.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2016.

2 This petition, asking a free pardon for Leary was presented to the Commons by O'Connell on 19 September 1831 (*Commons Journal*, LXXXVI, 855; *FJ*, 22 Sept. 1831).

1992

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 16 July 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

The Tories are gone for ever — extinguished beyond and without hope. They have stuck to the Church Bill,¹ and the link that bound them together is broken for ever.² The session therefore is drawing to a close. The India Bill³ is going through the House slowly; it will take a week longer. Then we have the West Indies Bill⁴ which will require near one month. Many of its provisions will be violently contested. In fact, although the ministry have determined to rise by the 15th of August, I do not think they can possibly get through during that period half what remains to be done. Lord Harrowby⁵ sent in his adhesion to Government on the

Church Bill yesterday, about three o'clock. This made them give up the call of the House. But I would not be deluded. If they⁶ get the support of four or five more Lords they will command the House of Peers, and then the direct battle will arise between them and the Radicals. The crisis is therefore over for the present, but for the present *only*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 372-373

- 1 The Irish church temporalities bill.
- 2 On 15 July Wellington is believed to have advised a meeting of peers at his house that they should pass the Irish church temporalities bill, but this advice was not taken by the Ultra-Tories (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 134-5).
- 3 See letter 1988 n10.
- 4 The bill for the abolition of slavery (see letter 1974 n5).
- 5 Dudley (Ryder), first earl of Harrowby (1762-1847). See DNB.
- 6 The Ultra-Tories.

1993

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 July 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

The crisis being over,¹ there are no news. The Ministry are somewhat improved by the fright they have gotten, and the violent conduct of the Orangemen in the north of Ireland² is another most useful feature in the 'case of Ireland' at the present moment. All we want is to get rid of Blackburne, and much practical good would be done. If Anglesey was not such an egregious ninny, we could easily get rid of that scoundrel. If anything could tempt me to join the Ministry, it would be to cashier Anglesey and to turn out Blackburne. But I remember the story of the horse and the man, and nobody shall ride me even to get rid of the enemies of Ireland because, if I were once in harness, I could not be free to work for Ireland alone again.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 374

- 1 See letter 1992.
- 2 In the course of the annual Orange demonstrations on 12 July, six Catholics were killed in Cootehill and its neighbourhood in Co. Cavan (*FJ*, 16, 22 July; *Pilot*, 26 July 1833). A reward of £100 was offered by the lord lieutenant for the arrest of John Allen, the alleged leader of the Orangemen in the area who were considered to have been responsible for these deaths (*Dublin Gazette*, 23 July; *Pilot*, 26 July 1833).

1994

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[London] 19 July 1833

I believe every hour will bring us nearer to the creation of an anti-Orange feeling in Ireland. It is my conviction that this is the spirit in which Mr. Littleton intends to carry on his government. If — I repeat it over and over — we were once fairly rid of Blackburne, I should expect all to be better. I think I have got that scoundrel in a *cleft stick*, as it is called.

It is pretty clear that upon Perrin's motion¹ we shall be rid of Baron Smith. I am flinging a stone at the rest of the lads of the Exchequer.²

No news.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 373

- 1 The attack on Baron Smith was not proceeded with until 1834 (see letter 2034 n2).
- 2 Probably arising from the fact that on 16 May 1833 the Commons had accepted O'Connell's motion that the Irish court of exchequer should produce papers in connection with payments made to certain jurors (*Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 398; *Pilot*, 20 May 1833).

1995

Letter withdrawn. Circular letter.

1996

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 July 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

... It seems we are to have the crisis after all.¹ Whilst I write the Cabinet Council is sitting. No person as yet knows what they will do. I will not close this letter until the last moment so that you shall know all that is *knowable*.

I am in the midst of my battle with the reporters.² I hope they *shall not* put me down. I am resolved to give battle to the uttermost. If the *Times* does not report me, it shall not report anybody else — *that is flat*. Five or six successful speeches of mine have already been *burked* and, above all, my exertions on the anti-

Slavery side have been concealed.

The thing is settled for the present: the Ministry do not resign. Lord Grey has just threatened to do so and he said that in case any other *verbal* alteration was made in the bill,³ he would certainly throw it up. Thus the matter stands for the present.

(Twenty minutes after six.)

I have succeeded against the Press — the *Times*. I have got an order upon the printer and one proprietor of the *Times* to attend at the Bar on Monday. The truth is that I *would* not be put down.

My relative, Dr. Baldwin, poor man, attacked me yesterday.⁴ Mad O'Reilly⁵ of Dundalk attacked me this evening,⁶ but was put down by the speaker⁷ who has conducted himself exceedingly well on this occasion. I told you the scoundrels should not put me down. I believe I am the only man in either House of Parliament who would dare to beard so powerful a Press, which triumphed over Spring Rice — *That was easy* — over Windham and over Tierney.⁸ But I attacked that press directly and never beat about the bush. I am foolishly proud of that victory.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 377-378

- 1 It was expected that the Irish church temporalities bill would have a difficult time in the later stages of its passage through the Lords. However, they passed it without any unacceptable amendment (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 135-7, see also letter 1992).
- 2 O'Connell was offended by the fact that the English press drastically abridged many of his parliamentary speeches, particularly those he delivered on the anti-slavery bill. At a radical meeting in the Globe Hotel he severely criticised the standards of press reporting, attacking the *Times* in particular for its 'designedly false' reports. On 25 July the parliamentary reporters of the *Times* published a statement informing their editor that until such time as O'Connell should retract his alleged statements, they would not report his speeches. A motion by O'Connell that the printer of the *Times* be arraigned before the bar of the House was lost by 153-48. O'Connell then proceeded to use his privileges under the standing orders to have the reporters excluded altogether from the House. After about ten days, however, both sides tacitly agreed to abandon further hostilities (for a remarkably impartial account of this incident, see Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 252-60).
- 3 The Irish church temporalities bill.
- 4 Speaking on 25 July on O'Connell's motion that the press reporters in their treatment of him (see above, n2) were guilty of a breach of privilege, Baldwin declared that O'Connell had been well reported and had no reason to complain (*Pilot*, 29 July 1833).
- 5 William O'Reilly (1792-1844), Seafarm, Balbriggan, Co. Dublin, eldest son of Matthew O'Reilly, Knock Abbey, Co. Louth; called to the bar 1829; M.P. for Dundalk 1832-34.
- 6 O'Reilly was probably the member ('name unknown') who on 26 July declared on O'Connell's motion censoring the reporters (see above, n2) that 'he thought before the hon. and learned gentleman [O'Connell]

brought forward a motion to charge others, he should himself have clean hands.' He was brought sharply to order by the speaker (*Pilot*, 29 July 1833).

7 Charles Manners-Sutton.

8 William Windham M.P., (1750-1810) had in 1810 supported a proposal that reporters be excluded from the House of Commons. This provoked the hostility of the press, which for some time refused to report his speeches (see *DNB*, 'Windham'). The 'triumphs' over Spring Rice and Tierney have not been identified.

1997

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 5 August 1833

Private

My dear friend,

I am, you perceive, after another hard fought field. I have conquered the tyranny of the Press. I am the only person to whom the scoundrel reporters ever struck. They have done it, to be sure, in congenial Billingsgate but the thing is done.¹

I will make you smile at the lures which have been thrown out to me to accept office but I need not tell you I never will whilst Ireland is without a Parliament of her own. It is said by many *that* will never be. Do not believe them. I am tolerably experienced in political struggles, and remember I tell you that *the Repeal* is making great way in both countries. I cannot be deceived and would not deceive you. The English people are beginning to wish it in order to get rid of *the deluge* of Irish paupers and Irish workmen in manufactures and agriculture. In Ireland nothing prevents its success but the miserable Orange feud. The conduct of the Orangemen on the 12th of July² does indeed exhibit a miserable attachment to party virulence. But in proportion as the Government acts against them will their party zeal cool, and every addition to the *liberality* of the Government is another death-blow to the *over-loyal* workings of Orangeism. The Corporation inquiry³ and the certainty of corporate reform⁴ are also means of dissipating Orange power and extinguishing the hopes of faction. When they fully understand their position and see that they have no interest adverse to the rest of the country, we will *all* be Repealers. Believe me that time approaches and if Ireland returned even ninety Repealers, there would be no difficulty in bringing about the Repeal. I hope to be in Dublin within the next fortnight. Let me hear from you in the meantime.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 378-379

1 See letter 1996 n2.

2 See letter 1993 n2.

3 See letter 1990 n6.

4 The Irish municipal corporations were not reformed until 1840.

1998

From Edward J. Littleton

[Copy]

Irish Office [London], 7 August 1833

My dear Sir,

I return you the papers in the Sheas' case.¹

It seems to me that it is a matter in which I can render no assistance. The attorney-general, having stated his willingness to consider the propriety of signing a *fiat* so soon as he should receive the usual certificate from counsel setting forth which of the records it was desired to remove, I do not see what step I can take in the business; more especially as an effort has already been made and failed to procure a mitigation of sentence by memorial to the lord lieutenant.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 Unidentified.

1999

To Richard Barrett

London, 8 August 1833

Most confidential

My dear Barrett,

I write this letter as a really private letter but I wish you and my friends should know my movements and my motives. I go off with my family tomorrow morning early. I could not bear to remain here after them, neither have I *anything to do*. The Grand Jury Bill¹ is gone through this day. It is as little mischievous and as positively useful as we could make it. The Special Jury Bill² is to be amended on Perrin's suggestion and mine. It *will be useful* but of this not one word is to be said and of course nothing published until *after the thing is done*. The Change of Venue Bill³ is to be allowed to drop unnoticed so that everything is done. You perceive

how confidential this letter is. Littleton is a famous fellow. You must not praise him in the *Pilot* — at least, for the present. Lord Anglesey reads the *Pilot*, attributes to me everything in it, and he is just the man to counteract the good intentions of Littleton if he be *put forward* at all. Mark this particularly — ALL WILL BE WELL. The House will drawl on another week. Peel is gone off and so are nine-tenths of the independent members. There remain only a few of the latter and a ministerial majority. I have been now near seven months attending my parliamentary duty without missing one single day. I want some repose but the moment I arrive in Dublin I will begin again. We have the Ship Canal⁴ and Corporate Abuses⁵ to meet about. I have already my sinews arranged to *agitate*. Recollect that we can get no good out of Anglesey but by his appearing to be the person to do it. Littleton appears to me to have great tact.

I have written a great part of my first chapter⁶ on Repeal. I will publish my Repeal letters through the *True Sun*.

I hope for better times for Ireland. The Corporation abuses commission will sit on the 25th of August. I want to be in Dublin to arrange the evidence on that subject. — In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 379-380

- 1 A bill to amend the laws relating to grand juries in Ireland introduced in the Commons on 19 February and after being considerably amended received the royal assent on 28 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 78).
- 2 On 7 March 1833 O'Connell and Louis Perrin were directed to prepare a bill to amend and consolidate the laws relating to special juries and juries in criminal cases in Ireland. It received the royal assent on 28 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 91).
- 3 This bill 'to provide for the more impartial trial of offences in certain cases in Ireland' — was introduced by Grey in the Lords on 21 February 1833. It provided for the trial of offences outside the counties of their origin, so as to offset the alleged intimidation of juries in some parts of Ireland. Contrary to O'Connell's belief, the bill was not dropped. After a protracted struggle in the Commons, it received the royal assent on 28 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 79).
- 4 See letter 1989 n8.
- 5 See letter 1990 n6.
- 6 This was a letter to the People of Ireland headed 'Chapter I' and published in the *Pilot* of 12 August 1833.

2000

To Bindon Scott,¹ Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare

Merrion Square, 15 August 1833

My dear Sir,

Permit me to offer you my very cordial congratulations on the safety and good health of your dear little Mary. She has blessed us with a darling little girl this morning. . . .

Allow me also to offer you my most sincere thanks for the kind and very considerate step you took in setting her mind at ease by extending your affectionate forgiveness to her before her confinement. [O'Connell praises her gentle manners, ladylike habits and deportment] At the same time I am quite free to confess that she did wrong, very wrong, to marry without your consent but I need not assure you that neither I nor Mrs. O'Connell were in any the slightest degree ancillary to her taking that step. It is true I had consented to the match, for surely I could find no objection to your daughter as the wife of my son but I consented to the match only to authorise my son to make proposals to you and not by any means to marry without your authority.

Your objections to the son of a person who has taken such a line in politics as I have done, were quite natural and I easily understand them and consider them perfectly reasonable.² I therefore am not at liberty to entertain any jealousy on that account and now solicit permission to wait on you when I next go to your County. I will then talk to you on business or not precisely as you choose. But I beg to assure you that your choice in that respect is one perfectly free because whatever that choice be, it makes no difference in the provision for your darling daughter in the event of her surviving my son. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

1 Bindon Scott, J.P., Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare, father-in-law of Maurice O'Connell, M.P. He died on 23 February 1837.

2 A Protestant landlord Scott had supported Vesey FitzGerald in the Clare Election of 1828.

2001

To Edward J. Littleton

Merrion Square, 16 August 1833

My dear Sir,

You have given me the privilege of stating facts — or what I believe to be so — to you and I the more readily avail myself of that privilege because I know that you estimate my information only at what you on examination and enquiry find it to be intrinsically worth.

With this impression I state to you that much dissatisfaction is felt in this country and the working of the government to make a popular government party. That which every efficient government should have is exceedingly impeded by the *prevalent opinion* that the counsels at the Castle are swayed by three exceedingly unpopular men, Sir John Harvey,¹ Col. Gossett² and the attorney-general.³ There is no indelicacy in my adding the public conviction that Lord Anglesey is a man whom it would be impossible to buy or force but who could be easily managed.

The popular sentiment is that the Castle is governed by the triumvirate I have named and from their hands *goodwill* would come soiled. Indeed, in the [about one word illegible] of the law as for example on circuits, the very worst of the Orange [? party] at the bar are those employed and, as it were, [one word illegible] for government employment. In other departments the same complaint can be probably made. It is certainly founded as to the bar. These are not, believe me, trifles. They give a colour to every [? act of] the government and distemper all [? their] proceedings.

I deem it next *a duty* to inform you I expect to have the honour of seeing you on Wednesday next and to give you my support for your *temporary* tithe bill.⁴ I go back on account of the recent burning at the Custom House,⁵ and although I write entirely from myself and both in form and reality *sans aveu*, I would wish to give you materials for considering the claims which I believe the mercantile interests will make on the government for their losses by the late fire.⁶ In the first place it is right you should know that the real loss, although stated at £300,000, does not in my opinion exceed £130,000. But such is the state of trade in Dublin that this loss if it shall ultimately fall on the merchants will be ruinous in the last degree. It will create bankruptcies innumerable and throw thousands out of employment. I send in this parcel a sketch of the stores which were consumed, that is, of the basement for they were three stories high.

... There is a clear case to recover the amount against the Scovills, the persons *in occupation* of the stores under government, if they were *tenants*, not caretakers or occupiers merely under government and if they be solvent. If the government has entrusted the keeping of the stores to insolvent persons, then there is surely the strongest possible [? case] for compensation from the government.

To prepare you for *our* interview with you, for let me say by way of parenthesis that I leave this after Mass on Sunday to accompany a mercantile deputation to the government, I wish to tell you some of the facts so as to enable you to collect the rest.

These stores are the only government stores as I believe in the British dominions.

The Commrs. of the customs were authorised by the act of the 5th of George IV c. 92, sec. 7, to demise these stores to a tenant.

The Council of the chamber of commerce of this town remonstrated against any such demise. They were overruled and all their representations on this subject have been disregarded or but partially attended to.

This statute does not exonerate the commissioners from claims of merchants whose goods may be damaged as the 43 G. III c. 132, sec. 16 does the commissioners in England in similar cases.

The Scovills were permitted to convert part of these stores into stores for *private accommodation*. The part marked 'Free Goods' on the sketch shows the part of these stores which the Scovills [? allocated] for this purpose. The fire originated *there*. It originated amidst goods which would never be [? marked] king's stores properly speaking because they were goods not liable to any duty import from Britain into Ireland. The fire was caused by placing [? cans] of palm oil which were leaky in [? contact] with 'cotton waste', a contact which [? may] produce self combustion within [? forty-eight] hours.

The lease to Scovills was put an end [? to] in September last but they have been since suffered to remain in possession three months to three months in the most irregular manner and without the execution of any bonds or giving any security. The only thing actually done for these three months was a treasury letter signed by Mr. Rice on the 21st. June last stating that '*pending the consideration of the subject the Scovills were to be continued in occupation for three months from the 24th of June then inst.*'...

I am giving a faint outline of *our case*, not stating all the particulars but just enough that we should not come up on you or the government by surprise.

I am myself seriously convinced that we have a right to call on

the government to make good *to us* the loss, turning [?] then] round upon the Scovills for indemnity.

I think it will be difficult to sustain the position that the merchants of Dublin are to have no redress save from the Scovills who were put upon by compulsion and who may be [?] insolvent]. If insolvent, it was the government placed them in the care of our property. If solvent, the government have its remedy against them.

... I am quite convinced we will experience the utmost candour and open dealing from you. I wish therefore to give you as much time as I can to be prepared as to the facts between the government and the Scovills.

If ... you should deem it a duty to support this claim, certainly nothing could render Lord Anglesey's government more popular in Dublin than giving its aid on this occasion to the Dublin merchants who cannot afford loss or delay.

I will take the liberty of speaking to you about the late 'affair' at Cootehill⁷ when I have the honour of seeing you.

... I am most thoroughly persuaded of your unaffected desire to do all the good you *possibly can* to Ireland. I wish it was in my power to offer you more assistance.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 Col. Sir John Harvey, inspector-general of police for Leinster; knighted 1824.
- 2 Lieut.-Col. Sir William Gossett, under-secretary.
- 3 Francis Blackburne.
- 4 On 5 August Littleton carried a resolution in the Commons in favour of advancing to the Irish tithe owners a sum of £1,000,000 sterling on the security of the Irish tithe arrears (*Pilot*, 9 Aug. 1833: *Commons Journal*, 1833, LXXXVIII, 639). On 9/10 August Littleton introduced a bill to this effect which was in due course enacted as 3 & 4 Will. IV c. 100.
- 5 A great fire occurred on 10 August at the Customs House warehouse in Dublin which destroyed large quantities of sugar, wines and whiskey (*MR*, 12 Aug. 1833).
- 6 A meeting of Dublin merchants, attended by O'Connell, was held on 17 August 1833. It resolved to dispatch a deputation to London accompanied by the city members of parliament to place their case for compensation before the government (*Pilot*, 19 Aug. 1833).
- 7 See letter 1993 n2.

2002

To his wife, Merriion Square

Stoney Stafford,¹ Thursday night [22 August 1833]

My darling love,

In my letter from Dunstable I said nothing of Morgan's folly

with respect to Anne Costigan. It grieves me to the heart that he should trifle with the dear and lovely girl. Because it is trifling or worse of him to speak to her of marriage. I love and esteem her too much to allow such a thought to be entertained. If he had an independence for a family there is not a girl living I would prefer for him. But they would only produce a progeny of beggars. He has no energy, no endeavour to work out an independence in any way. He never will better his condition by any efforts of his own, and as for the O'Mullane property,² he will be a very old man if ever he lives to enjoy that. No, my heart, you must put an end to the idea. . . . Break the matter off therefore, darling, in the kindest way you possibly can. She deserves every consideration, and for her sake it is chiefly that I desire it may not be more thought of. I will speak to him before we reach Dublin. . . . I am sorry this has arisen to annoy you, darling, for I know you love and regard Anne Costigan as much as I do. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 A mistake for Stony Stratford, Buckinghamshire.

2 In 1826 O'Connell bought the O'Mullane lands (the property of his mother's family) at Brittas near Mallow, Co. Cork, and gave them to his son Morgan (see letters 1339 and 3218).

2003

To Edward J. Littleton

Stoney Stafford,¹ 22 August 1833

My dear Sir,

Having done *all* I could for my constituents I now beg leave to place their interests in your hands but I should not take the liberty of writing to you about them but that I wish to inform you that they felt and expressed themselves very grateful for your attendance this day at Lord Althorp's.² It is not possible to describe the anxiety with which the result of that conference and of the statement which I prepared for the deputation and which will be presented early tomorrow will be looked to in Dublin. There are hundreds of persons in comparative affluence who will be beggars if the Government does not interfere at least so far as to secure the sufferers from any insolvency on the part of the Scovills. . . .

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 A mistake for Stony Stratford in Buckinghamshire.

2 Accompanied by a deputation of Dublin merchants (see letter 2001 n6)

O'Connell had an interview with Althorp, Littleton, Spring Rice and others in which he advocated the claim of the merchants to compensation in consequence of the late fire (*Pilot*, 26 Aug. 1833).

2004

From Edward J. Littleton

[Copy]

Irish Office [London], 23 August 1833

My dear Sir,

It is impossible to have made a more forcible representation of the case of the Dublin merchants than that which you submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer yesterday at the Treasury.¹

I have sent both your communications to me on that subject to Lord Althorp. As the matter is now under the consideration of the Government, I abstain from expressing any opinion on it.

I need not add how sincerely I deplore a calamity that may prove ruinous to many families.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2003

2005

From Edward J. Littleton

Irish Office [London], 27 August 1833

Copy

Dear Sir,

I have extracted the enclosed from the *Northern Whig*. I am perfectly ignorant of the subject to which it refers. Can you give me any information on it? I am quite confident that no petition, paper or memorandum on this subject¹ was ever placed in my hands. I remember that on one occasion in the House of Commons you mentioned some petition which you were about to present and asked me to take charge of it. I replied that you had better present the petition and give me a memorandum of the complaint and I would enquire into it. It is possible that that petition may have been the one in question but I certainly never received from you any further communication on the subject.

Will you do me the favour to answer this to Teddesley, Pentridge, Staffordshire where I am about to stay ten days on my road

to Dublin?

[P.S.] For the sake of dispatch I have taken the liberty of dictating this to my private secretary who writes shorthand. I suppose you are at Derrynane Abbey. When shall you return to Dublin?

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2006

2006

To Edward J. Littleton

Derrynane, 3 September 1833

Dear Sir,

I return the paragraph from the *Northern Whig* and hasten to give you the best account I can of the transaction. I fear I am much to blame as your omitting to take notice of the facts contained in Mr. Finlay's petition¹ was probably occasioned by what I must consider a mistake of mine. . . . Mr. Finlay prepared a petition stating the circumstances to which he alludes. He was attending as a witness before the second Carrickfergus Committee.² I offered you the petition to read in the House of Commons [but Littleton found it too long so O'Connell promised to send him the details but, through a misunderstanding, did not do so]. I am therefore quite ready to take my full share of the blame and I will if you permit me write to Mr. Finlay to that effect. But there is in fact no time *lost*. The enquiry into these transactions can take place after your arrival in Dublin and, if the Orange magistracy could be brought to believe that complete impunity is not to attend their misconduct as it has hitherto uniformly done, you will find them *then* easily manageable.

How bitterly do I regret that after your appointment the Ministry should have persevered in the 'Trial of Offences' bill.³ It deeply convinces *us* that Ireland is never to be spared either injury or mere wanton insult — and then the speech⁴ closing the session I believe that since the world began there never was in my humble judgement — pardon me for saying so — a speech so much the reverse of good sense or good feeling. It will thrill to the heart's core of a sensitive people whose feelings have never been spared and whose best interests have been uniformly neglected or at best rather mocked than gratified. There is not one sentence in that speech that is not a pregnant text to show the hatred and contempt

of Ireland which is entertained by so many of the present anomalous and peer-fearing cabinet. . . . The closing speech of the session will have more *unpleasant* effects than even the most violent of the measures of the session. You may smile when I tell you it literally makes my blood boil. . . . The Church Temporalities Bill for the laity and the Tithe Bill⁵ for the clergy are forsooth the proofs of that parliament which enacted martial law. . . .

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 This petition was not presented to parliament.
- 2 This was appointed on 3 July 1833 'to make further enquiry into the proceedings of the last and former elections for the borough of Carrickfergus, and into the state of the population and other circumstances of the said borough, with a view to the propriety of its being represented in parliament.' Finlay's petition was not presented to parliament but it may have been one of the four read to the second select committee on 5 July 1833. Finlay did not in fact give evidence before the select committee.
- 3 Otherwise known as the change of venue bill (see letter 1999 n3).
- 4 The king's speech at the close of the session.
- 5 See letter 2001 n4.

2007

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 6 September 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I sometimes fear me that you are not well as I do not hear from you. You were so punctual a correspondent that your silence now creates the apprehension of an unpleasant cause. Relieve my mind from this fear.

I want to get the Edinburgh magazines — *Tait's* and *Johnson's* — the *New Monthly*, the *Metropolitan* and the *Irish Magazine* — all for September. I want one of the August magazines. It is that which contains an account of various existing constitutions with two chambers.

You promised to send me Leland's *Ireland*¹ and Carey's *Vindiciae*.² Pray make a parcel of the entire. I beg expedition.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 382-383

- 1 Thomas Leland's *History of Ireland from the Invasion of Henry II*, (Dublin, 1814).
- 2 Matthew Carey's *Vindiciae Hibernicae; or Ireland vindicated; an attempt to . . . expose . . . errors and falsehoods respecting Ireland . . . particularly in legendary tales . . . of 1641* (Philadelphia). There were at least two editions (1819 and 1823).

2008

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 13 September 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I can assert positively that a distinct declaration was made by Lord Althorp that the duty paid on consumed goods should be refunded. I can prove that declaration in any court of justice. Of course there could be no charge on individuals for duty not paid. It was a declaration of refunding that I spoke of then lightly in reply. I think I may pledge myself unequivocally to succeed so far but then I will not stir one step until the claims for compensation — for full compensation — are disposed of.¹ It would be treating me badly to have any movement for the refunding the duty made until the other matters are definitely disposed of — so far as the government is concerned. It would be treating the principal sufferers most outrageously ill to interfere with the refunding claim before the claim for full compensation was definitely disposed of. Let this, I implore of you, be distinctly understood and in particular that my aid will be confined to those persons who *paid* duty and will *wait* until the other and greater question is disposed of.

Excuse me as well as you can to Ffrench.² I will write to him tomorrow. I should be sorry the £500 bill was protested but I see I cannot help it. Pay the interest part of it, if it be *renewable*. But certainly it will afflict me much to have it protested. . . .

I rejoice at the coming³ of Lord Wellesley who is a mere driveller but who is another name for his son-in-law, Mr. Littleton. I rejoice most heartily in the expulsion of that scoundrel Anglesey. His mortified vanity at being unpopular and totally failing to manage Ireland made him ferocious and spiteful. He did all the mischief he positively could and he goes away against his will because his career was not any longer to be indulged in. Why does Staunton praise him?⁴ Never did any man less deserve praise. It is quite true that in 1828 he was in a right position⁵ and acted to a certain extent well but not so well as he got credit for. But his present administration has been full of the grossest faults and indeed crimes. He armed the yeomanry, he prosecuted over and over again, he allowed juries to be packed, he let loose the police and military upon tithe campaigns, he fostered the vilest of Catholic traitors and Orange delinquents, especially at the Bar. Fie upon him for a Saxon oppressor! But his day is gone by, I think, for ever. Lord Wellesley will be, of course, every day more odious to

the survivors of the Ascendancy Party. His appointment shows Littleton's power and his determination. You now can see that the Attorney-Generalship and the Chancellorship in prospective are at my command. This is, of course, between ourselves. But Ireland is my first and ought to be my only object. It looks like affectation to say so but it is, after all, proved by my not looking for office. I am determined not to accept any situation but surely I need not tell you so! I look on the Repeal not only as necessary, absolutely necessary, but as inevitable. He will have a great commingling of Protestants. I see them *a-coming*.

The Corporation reform⁶ is of more vital importance to allow them to be — nay, to make them reformers, than any other measure possibly could be. Cultivate for me Sheehan and the *Mail* party.⁷ Assure them, as you can do, that I will observe the most sacred good faith with them *as Repealers*. Tell Sheehan two things. *First*: as relates to himself and his personal friends, his party would not do more for him than mine *shall and will*. There is room for all us Irish when we shut out intruders. Secondly: that I am ready to do everything the most suspicious of his party could desire to obviate the possibility of a Catholic ascendancy. Indeed I am convinced such an ascendancy is impossible but Sheehan's party may think otherwise and they are entitled to be fully satisfied. I am ready to commit myself in writing to the terms and not to require any of their party to commit himself personally. But as my actions direct themselves with the tendency to secure perfect religious equality, I am ready to commit myself *in writing or in print* on the subject as may be desired. All I require of the Protestant party is to join for the Repeal as honest Irishmen, sharing to the fullest extent its honours, emoluments and advantages, both individually and generally.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 383-385

1 In connection with the Customs House fire (see letter 2003 n2).

2 Probably his son-in-law Nicholas J. Ffrench.

3 Marquis Wellesley replaced Lord Anglesey as lord lieutenant on 26 September 1833.

4 In its issue of 10 September 1833 Staunton's paper, the *Morning Register* praised Anglesey for his many and important good acts and for having done more in 1828 than any other man in office for the cause of Catholic Emancipation.

5 As lord lieutenant of Ireland.

6 See letter 1990 n6

7 The Dublin Protestant Unionists, whose organ was the *Dublin Evening Mail*.

2009

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 14 September 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

You cannot send me down too much Irish history. But you are mistaken as to one magazine. That which I want is a London magazine — I believe the *Monthly*. I want it for its leading article on *Constitutions having Two Chambers of Legislators*. Pray let me have it.

It is too late now to address the several corporations. If they were not stimulated by my Dublin corporation speech¹ the fault is entirely their own and I cannot help them.

If there be any statistical surveys of Antrim, Armagh, Tyrone or other Northern County, send them to me. My plan is this. I am writing an *expose* of my conduct in parliament and the good we have done for the country. This will be ready for sending to the *Pilot* in two or three days.² I will then begin my country letters and publish two or three a week. I will include tithes with the *Repeal*.

Why do you not tell me when Barrett leaves Dublin? What an exquisite article³ he has published on that thorough scoundrel Anglesey!

Staunton certainly deserves the greatest credit for his financial discoveries. His last is a 'thumper'⁴ but he should not have permitted his foolish good nature to overflow with any kindness for the harsh, virulent, proud, good-natured, good-for-nothing, palavering — Anglesey. His name is Scoundrel and he ought not to be forgiven one letter of it.

The porter has arrived.⁵ It is greatly liked by the drinkers of malt of which I am not one. I tried it yesterday and thought it strong and palatable but it seemed to me as if it had a sourishness of taste. I am, however, no judge.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 386-7

1 The speech delivered by O'Connell in the Commons on 1 August 1833, in applying for leave to bring in a bill to reform the corporation of Dublin. In it he sketched his plan for an extension of the municipal franchise in Dublin (see letter 1987) but stressed his belief that '... there existed the outline of a good corporation, and the only thing that was wanted was a sufficiency of good materials to fill it up. He did not think it would be found desirable to alter any of the leading features of the corporation at all' (*FJ*, 5 Aug. 1833).

2 See letter 2011 n2.

3 An article strongly critical of Anglesey's vicerealty in the *Pilot* of 11

September 1833.

- 4 Staunton published at this time a series of letters addressed to the Irish chief secretary, E.J. Littleton, which, amongst other things, contained an elaborate series of figures purporting to show that Ireland under the Union was overtaxed, that her industries were in decline, and that Irish public money was mis-spent (*Morning Register*, 3, 7, 11, 14, 18, 21 Sept. 1833. These letters were afterwards incorporated in a pamphlet entitled *Lights for Littleton* . . . , Dublin, 1833). The 'thumper' was the letter dated 10 September 1833 and published in the *Morning Register* on 11 September 1833.
- 5 The produce of the brewery of which O'Connell's son Daniel was a proprietor (see letter 1873 n1).

2010

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 17 September 1833

Private

My dear FitzPatrick,

The reports of my taking office are now only so much less idle than formerly by this circumstance, that the Ministry have made, and are making, more direct offers to me. They are also putting out of the way all those with whom I would not and could not act. But all this does not make me one whit the less immoveable. If I went into office I should be *their servant*, that is, their slave. By staying out of office I am, to a considerable extent, their master. Stanley was on this account removed from Ireland.¹ Lord Anglesey now is obliged reluctantly to retire.² Blackburne will be put *on the shelf*.³ But all these relate to men; what I want are measures. In the three hours' dialogue I had with Lord Anglesey, when he was first appointed by the Whigs, my constant reply to every approach to my own interests was, first, 'What will you do for Ireland?' The answer was, 'Everything.' Now 'everything' means nothing and indeed the administration since has proved it. Without taking office I will be able to get, first, a number of bad magistrates removed; second, the yeomanry disarmed, third, the tithes abolished; fourth, the establishment of the Protestant church reduced in every parish the overwhelming majority of whom are Catholics or dissenters; fifth, to have offices filled with Liberals to the exclusion of Orangeists. These are great things and instead of soliciting some of them, as I *should* do were I in office, I will command them when out of office. Add to these the redress of Corporate abuses and you will see that prospects advance for the Irish people, and I must keep out of office to be disengaged to

forward the movement, instead of being a clog on the wheel which I should necessarily be if in office. Then lastly, but first in order of magnitude, there is the Repeal of the Union. We never can thrive without the Repeal. Nothing prevents the irresistible force of the cry for Repeal but the remaining strength and hopes of several of the Ascendancy Party. All the measures I speak of, and especially the Corporate Reform, are brain blows to that faction. 'Wait a while,' and you must see the strongest Repealers in that party. They will be bitter; we are merely determined. It is impossible not to see with half an eye these two things: first, that the Orange party are necessarily disengaging from day to day from the Government; and secondly, that when once they lose power, as they are daily losing it, they have only to lose the hope also of restoration in order to make them have no other inducement to action save the good of Ireland unless it be animosity to the Ministry which will in that case give increased energy to their exertions. Believe me that if God is pleased to spare my life but a few, very very few years longer (perhaps *months would* do, and I believe *months will* do), I will certainly have multitudes of Protestants of my party for the Repeal.

But may not the Repeal be dispensed with if we get beneficial measures without it? This is a serious question, and one upon which good men may well differ; but it is my duty to make up my mind upon it, and I have made up my mind accordingly — that there can be no safety for, no permanent prosperity in Ireland without a repeal of the Union. This is my firm, my unalterable conviction, a conviction which it requires only a knowledge of the British parliament, and indeed of human nature, to render irresistible. We must have the Irish rents spent in Ireland. We must have no foreign landlords. Let those who will not live in Ireland sell their Irish estates. The rents of Ireland *must* be spent in Ireland! Irish affairs must be managed by Irishmen; and, indeed, they *certainly* will be so managed so soon as hope becomes extinct in the Orange leaders. Yes, the Ministry are, as the *Mail* truly says, doing my work infinitely more decidedly and efficaciously than I could myself.⁴ Ireland will be a nation again.

I now imagine you will see how impossible it is I should accept office. I will do better; I will watch the officers.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 387-9

1 Stanley had been succeeded as chief secretary for Ireland by Hobhouse on 29 March, and was appointed colonial secretary on 3 April.

2 From the lord lieutenancy of Ireland.

3 Blackburne remained as attorney-general until 1835.

4 An editorial in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of 9 September saw the appoint-

ment of Wellesley as lord lieutenant as a victory for O'Connell and the Catholics so that the government were, it considered, doing O'Connell's work.

2011

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 20 September 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

Pay Scully¹ a small account I owe him of about four pounds. I believe all my money dealings are now wound up until November. . . . I send by this post a long rambling letter² for publication to Barrett. It is the first of those letters which shall appear at least twice a week whilst I am out of Dublin. I smile at the alacrity with which so many are voting me into office and crowing over the abandonment of the Repeal. This letter will, I think, convince them that I will not take office and that I will not abandon the Repeal. There is a lull in politics just now but the land breeze will soon spring up, and we shall have a stiff gale before we are much older. I pause to obtain Protestant aid. That is now my leading object. I want the Government to throw the Protestants into the ranks of the Repealers, and my ardent fancy makes my reason the more easily convinced of a truth which nobody can rationally doubt, that the government are doing nothing for me *mighty neatly*.³

May God bless you, my good friend. Write to me when you conveniently can.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 389-90

- 1 Joseph C. Scully.
- 2 The letter gave an account of O'Connell's parliamentary conduct during the late session. He claimed that as M.P. he had been mainly instrumental in securing improvement in the Dublin soap and leather trades, and in the Irish distillery trade, the amelioration of the sub-letting act and the abolition of vestry cess. He promised the speedy abolition of tithes, and called for petitions for that purpose to be linked with petitions in favour of repeal (O'Connell to his constituents, 11 Sept. 1833, *Pilot*, 23 Sept. 1833).
- 3 'Nate — mighty nate' is a catch-phrase constantly used by one of the characters in Lady Morgan's *Florence MacCarthy: an Irish tale*, first published in 1818.

2012

To Pierce Mahony, Merrion Square

Derrynane, 21 September 1833

My dear Mahony,

You judge of me quite right. I should be extremely happy to serve you professionally. It would indeed give me extreme pleasure to do so upon any account but in the present instance I have every possible motive to urge me. In the first place it would be impossible to find a more fit professional man to fill the office you look for.¹ You *will*, I trust I may say, *will* fill it with the utmost ability and the greatest integrity. I wish my judgment on your professional merits could be of service to you. In the second place it is intolerable that these Plunkets should be gorged with official plunder. It really is too bad. The country is already disgusted with them as well as with their voraciousness, and what have they done for Ireland? I really do not know a more unpopular family. Their father had some character. He *was* a man of talent and lent that talent on more than one splendid occasion to the service of the Irish people. But then he was the Attorney-General of the atrocious Vestry Law and Subletting Act. Besides, he has had enough, heaven knows, and he really is gone by — quite effete. But, as for his sons and connections, why they are conservatives of the most virulent caste where their own individual interests are not at stake. The Government, if they were to leave this office at the disposal of that vile Orange tool, Blackburne, could not do worse with it than give it to one of the Plunket *seed, breed or generation*.

You will therefore easily perceive how ready I should be to assist you if I could but what can I do? I introduced one solicitor (to whom the Wellesley dynasty are much indebted) to Mr. Littleton *on this subject*. He indeed, a great personal friend of mine also, has given up the pursuit. But still *what* can I do for you? I *could* not write to Mr. Littleton. Otherwise, *believe me*, I would do so with the greatest pleasure but I am, I may say, at daggers drawn with the administration. Their paltry insolence in crowing over this wretched country after compelling it to submit to their atrocious coercion bill fills me with rage and indignation. I allude to the King's closing Speech to Parliament.² They would not *forgive us* one single insult. I therefore could not write for anything like a favour to Mr. Littleton. I, in fact, as a public man care little for promises to do good to Ireland. Littleton really thinks he can do a great deal for our nation. You will see that he will be *bamboozled* or, as the Irish peasants call it, *flummoxed* by

those who will surround him and perhaps it would be hard to give a stronger proof of the process of *flummoxing* than the means which must be put in motion by the Plunket party to carry this office into the store when they have already laid up so much public plunder. But I most sincerely wish I *could* be of use to you.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 Mahony was seeking appointment as solicitor of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland. He was not successful. The *Pilot* of 27 September 1833 published an article praising Mahony and denouncing William Conyngham Plunket's relatives for their avarice. This article must have been written by O'Connell since it contains many passages that are in the above letter.
- 2 See letter 2006.

2013

To his daughter Ellen, Ballinamona, Arklow, Co. Wicklow.

Derrynane, Sunday, 22 September 1833

My dearest Nell, my own best of children – no father was ever blessed with such a darling treasure of a child – may well imagine how afflicted I was and am at hearing of the accident of my dear dear Fitz-Simon. Blessed be God it was no worse. Darling Nell, I do assure you I do not think I love him one bit better on your account than on his own. I never met a more right-minded, pure-hearted gentleman, never darling, and so I admire and love him for his own sake with just a sense of tenderness because he is the loved husband of my best and noblest of children. You must either yourself or get somebody to write to me three times a week until he is quite well. If darling doat of a Mary¹ was able to write, what a sweet darling correspondent she would now be to her grandfather who actually idolises her. Give her my tenderest love and to my own admirable babe O'Connell² and to dear dear Christy³ and to my *own* little Hen[ry].⁴ . . . I wish I could find words to express to you how my heart of hearts gloats of you, my own sweet Nell.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Mary O'Connell Fitz-Simon (1828-1877), second child and eldest daughter of Christopher Fitz-Simon, M.P. and Ellen O'Connell.
- 2 Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon (1829-1844), third child and eldest surviving son of Christopher Fitz-Simon, M.P. and Ellen O'Connell.
- 3 Christopher O'Connell Fitz-Simon (1830-1884), fourth child of Christopher Fitz-Simon, M.P. and Ellen O'Connell.
- 4 Henry Fitz-Simon, fifth child of Christopher Fitz-Simon, M.P. and Ellen O'Connell, died in infancy.

2014

To James Kiernan

Derrynane, 24 September 1833

My dearest friend,

[Seeks the help of Kiernan as a lawyer in protecting the interests of the next-of-kin of Miss Mary Ann Lalor (*recte* Lawlor) deceased of Killarney.]

We are here in a state of suspense. The two Kings of Brentford,¹ Anglesey and Wellesley, are smelling to the same nosegay. Littleton certainly has everything in his power. Whether he has discretion to use that power properly is not a little doubtful. *Nous verrons*. I might be anything I please so I do but give up the nationality of Ireland but that is *not* the mission which my presumptuous vanity makes me believe I am charged with. Such is my folly that I allow a vain pride to buoy me up in the fond expectation that Providence will enable me to do something for Ireland, for religion and liberty. God help me. How silly may be that thought but yet I must act as if it were *realisable* for this reason that it is my duty to cling to the interests of the religion and liberty of Ireland. I will not take any office, I have made up my mind to *that*. I will not take any office until Ireland is a nation. And certainly to arrive at that desirable result becomes to my view daily more and more probable. If I had hired the Government to play the game into my hands, they could not do it more completely than they are. The Catholic people of Ireland are already Repealers to a man and the Government are *giving me* also the Protestants and Orangemen. There is a political lull just now but you will soon hear of our movements.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Two characters in a seventeenth-century English farcical comedy, *The Rehearsal*, who come on the stage hand in hand.

2015

From Edward J. Littleton to Derrynane

Copy

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 1 October 1833

Private and Confidential

My dear Sir,

On my arrival here I had intended to have made some enquiry

into Mr Gregg's¹ conduct² as detailed in the public statement which I enclose. But I found everything involved in the confusion incident to an almost sudden change of a lord lieutenant,³ and my time exceedingly occupied. However, as I feel as strongly as you can the great interest the country has in rendering the magistracy impartial at all events and popular if possible, I am unwilling notwithstanding the length of time that has elapsed since the occurrence to let it pass by without at least calling on Mr. Gregg for an explanation and showing that the Government views such conduct neither with favour nor indifference. But the matter must be brought regularly before me. For the purpose a memorial to the Lord Lieutenant had better be presented by Keegan,⁴ detailing the case and asking for enquiry. . . .

In these proceedings however *my name must not be mentioned* and it is one in which I ought not perhaps to advise, the parties having neglected of their own accord to bring it before the Government.

I am anxious to check the extreme *scurrility* of the press. I shall take a very effective step with respect to one limb of it and hope to succeed with another. Pray cooperate with us. The *Evening Mail* is in my view a government paper. I would not have it changed in any one particular. I would not alter a feature of its countenance. Its abuse is what we like best. But between the *Pilot* and the [*Dublin Evening*] *Post* I should like to see a courtesy in their warfare which notwithstanding past occurrences I will not believe it impossible to improve in the course of [a] short time into a better feeling. When you return to town I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 Fortescue Gregg, J.P., Belfast.

2 Unidentified.

3 On 26 September Wellesley succeeded Anglesey.

4 Unidentified.

2016

To Edward J. Littleton

Derrynane, 9 October 1833

My dear Sir,

I had the honour of receiving your letter on the subject of the complaint against Mr. Fortescue Gregg for misconduct as a magistrate. I have written to Mr. Finlay who was the medium of

transferring that complaint from the party named Keegan. I have *of myself* advised him to transmit to your office a memorial from Keegan on the subject¹ and thus I am bound to say that, as far as you are concerned, the party has a right to be quite satisfied that ample justice will be done if properly sought for.

I take the liberty of sending to you in this parcel three documents. The *first* is the petition of ten Catholics, prisoners in Enniskillen Gaol.² The *second* is a letter from the Rt. Rev. Dr. Kernan,³ Catholic Bishop of Raphoe and the *third* a letter from his brother, Randal Kernan,⁴ a barrister.⁵ Both these letters relate to the petition. I deem it a duty to send them to you precisely as I received them. . . . Considerable delay has occurred since these letters were written, occasioned by my having left London before they arrived. . . . Latterly I waited until the present Irish government should come into *undivided* power.⁶

I of course know nothing of the facts myself. [Pays a tribute to the integrity and reliability of the Bishop and his brother]. In the present state of the north of Ireland it would have a good effect both on Catholics and Protestants if Mr. Kernan, the barrister, obtained countenance from the Government. There are many enquiries to be made of local grievances or local misconduct of magistrates, police etc. and the employing Mr. Kernan upon any such enquiries would have an excellent effect. . . .

. . . Respecting the working of the system of *late* or rather *former* misrule in Ireland I think it right to inform you that Mr. E. Scott, the assistant barrister, is one of the Kildare Place-Saints⁷ — they were sneeringly called — who got promotion at the Irish Bar by force of bibles without note or comment, religious tracts, Conversion of Jews Societies and other acts of that description. He however is not one of the worst of those who during the joint reign of Mr. Saurin and Lord Mannors were patronised and put forward. These persons with all other public functionaries in Ireland — the few attached to the popular party excepted — have had hitherto perfect impunity, and it certainly would be of great advantage should the facts turn out as represented by Mr. Kernan, the barrister, that Mr. Scott, the chairman of the sessions should at least be removed from the County of Fermanagh. The Orange chairmen, that is assistant barristers, might *with good effect* be removed from the north to the south and the liberal part of that body — few indeed in number — be sent to the north. It is in these practical details that much deserved popularity *might* be worked out by government for themselves. . . . The removal, I mean the dismissal, of one Orange assistant barrister and of twelve or from that to twenty Orange magistrates would do more to conciliate the

people to the government and even to the Union than anything else which could take place.

Allow me to call your attention to another subject upon which you authorised me to write to you when you should be settled in Ireland, I mean the case of an old man named *Daniel Leary*⁸ convicted for what has been called the Doneraile Conspiracy. The trial took place in October 1829 at a special commission in Cork — Baron Pennefather presided. I will remind you of these facts:

1st. There were several atrocious attempts at assassination made upon respectable persons in the vicinity of Doneraile, amongst them upon one of those most mischievous of all possible beings in this country — an *active* magistrate, Mr. Bond Low.⁹ 2nd. Several persons were taken up for these crimes one or two of whom were caught in the fact. [*sic*] The rest were charged upon the oaths of spies employed by the magistracy and who participated in all those crimes for the purpose *as they alleged* of detecting the perpetrators. 3rd. It is to the last degree probable that these spies actually instigated to and promoted the perpetration of these crimes but still the perpetrators certainly deserved all the severity of the law. No mercy could be shown them. 4th. There were four persons accused of having participated in all this guilt in the highest degree. It was sworn that these four persons formed the committee of direction, that they directed all the proceedings of the Rockites¹⁰ and in particular the assassinations. They were sworn to as having themselves kept free from the danger of committing the crimes but to have commanded and sent persons to commit them. 6th. The four chief assassins were sworn to be farmers of considerable property: Daniel Leary was one of the four. The entire four were arrested and imprisoned along with Leary. 7th. The place where it was alleged these four committee men met and whence they issued their murderous orders was in a tent or drinking booth at a fair. The spies swore they were present and amongst those who received the orders. The evidence of guilt was precisely the same against each of the four committee men, Leary and his three companions. 8th. There was much *dexterity* in the manner in which the cases were tried by the present chief justice of the Common Pleas, Mr. Doherty, who conducted the trials as solicitor-general. He tried Leary the first day with others who were guilty of the *actual* crime. Leary with them was convicted. 9th. I was not present at the first trial. I was counsel for the other three. Discoveries were made, especially by the aid of Mr. Baron Pennefather who read the written depositions of the spies and gave the prisoners' counsel the use of them. They contradicted the evidence in court against the four committee men. It was quite

a different story though the day and place were the same. In short, each of the other three committee men was by a separate and distinct jury acquitted. They are at home with their families: Leary is transported. The evidence against Leary as far as it charged him with crime was precisely the same as that against the other three.

At Leary's trial the spies were unimpeached by their own contradictory swearing. At the other three trials that contradiction was established. At the first trial this contradictory evidence was in the possession of the magistracy but not produced. Leary therefore was convicted by the prosecutors' withholding evidence which would have acquitted him as it served to acquit the three others charged in the same indictment and for the same offence precisely. If Leary were guilty he most certainly ought to have been executed. The mitigation of his punishment shows that the Government did not believe him guilty. The truth is that he was transported as a peace offering to the magistrates, everyone of whom ought on the contrary to have been dismissed from the commission.

Baron Pennefather whose conduct on this as upon every other capital case which I have seen him try — and they were most numerous — was marked by intelligent and judicious humanity and was, I am quite convinced, very strongly of opinion that Leary ought under the circumstances have been pardoned. I solicit on his behalf very respectfully a free pardon and a free passage home from New South Wales. I think he claims these as a matter of right.

I hope you do not deem me wanting either in courtesy or hospitality in not congratulating you on your arrival in Ireland. The ancient philosophic maxim treated no man as happy until he was dead, and I unfortunately believe that no Irish Secretary should be congratulated until after his departure from Ireland. Hitherto no Irish Secretary ever did any good to Ireland. It would be glorious to be the first great exception, and indeed I am convinced beyond any doubt that you wish and intend to be that exception. You have begun with good feeling and good taste in suppressing the ribaldry of the government press. Believe me I will feel proud to lend any aid in my power to produce a similar cessation on the part of such of the popular press as I can possibly influence. . . . Allow me to add that you have a great advantage in having a lord lieutenant come over with whom you probably can concur without effort or any possible jealousy upon every subject interesting to Ireland. The mistakes of his predecessor were enormous. You begin with the greatest advantages. There is an universal confidence

in your intentions and permit me without the slightest flattery to say in your high intellectual powers. Besides, you are prepared to listen to everybody. If you do not succeed in doing good to Ireland and in making the Government popular — aye — and in fairly organising by force of public opinion a strong and a natural government party no Irish Secretary will be able to do any one of all these things. . . .

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 In January 1833 some fifteen Catholics were sentenced to from twelve to eighteen months imprisonment for a riot, although Protestants allegedly engaged in the same riot so blatantly as to be convicted by an Orange jury, were sentenced to only a fortnight in gaol, according to the O'Connellite *Pilot* of 30 October 1833. The petition was successful (see letter 2018).
- 3 Edward Kernan, D.D., (died 1844), bishop of Clogher 1824-44. O'Connell was mistaken in describing him as bishop of Raphoe.
- 4 Randal Kernan, 25 Blessington Street, Dublin; called to the bar 1805.
- 5 Randal Kernan had advised these Catholics to petition the government against their sentence (*Pilot*, 30 Oct. 1833).
- 6 Now that Wellesley had been appointed to succeed Anglesey it seemed that the Irish administration would be more united since Littleton was Wellesley's son-in-law.
- 7 A member of the Kildare Place Society. 'Saint' was a nickname for an evangelical Protestant.
- 8 That is, Daniel John Leary.
- 9 George Bond Low, J.P., Clogher, Co. Cork, eldest son of James Low, of Sally Park, Cork.
- 10 Followers of Captain Rock, mythical leader of an agrarian secret society.

2016a

To Gerald Crean, Esq.,¹ 31 Upper Ormond Quay, Dublin

Derrynane, 11 October 1833

My dear Sir,

I would at once write to you and fix with the committee for a day to hold the Dinner for the benefit of the Josephian Charity² but that I can not ascertain when I shall be in Dublin or how long I may remain there. The first display in Parliament on the Repeal question is one which to do it justice would require months of seclusion and I should wish to remain here until I had made the far greater part of my preparations, because I am one of those whose opinions are daily more fixed that no solid or substantial good can be done for Ireland until we have a domestic Legislature in Dublin.

The moment I arrive in Dublin — which will be announced to

you by all the newspapers — I will be ready to make any arrangement which you may deem useful to the Charity.

SOURCE: Haddo Papers

- 1 Printer and stationer.
- 2 The Josephian Orphan Society and Female Orphan House, 41 Paradise Row, Dublin. O'Connell presided at the dinner on 3 December and made a long speech in support of the Repeal of the Act of Union (*MR*, 4 Dec. 1833).

2017

To William Fagan

Derrynane, 20 October 1833

My dear Fagan,

Are my friends in Cork still ready to honour me with a public dinner? If so, I could and would be with them on Monday, the 4th November — I should add, if that day appeared to them suitable. The truth, however, is that matters of this kind, if once allowed to *grow cool*, are difficult to be warmed again into activity. I therefore consult you rather as my private and kind friend than as the chairman. Let the matter drop if there be any indisposition to put it on its *right legs* again. If it shall go on, I hope to see the members of the county on the occasion. Barry¹ is a prime good voter, and unaffectedly right on all occasions. O'Connor may be a little self-willed occasionally but he is calculated to be a useful man, and I have a great regard for him. I say nothing of the city members;² they, if they approve of my course of action, ought to be *entertainers*, not entertained.

You perceive I write to you in the most perfect confidence. My movements will be guided by your reply.

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 267

- 1 Garret Standish Barry (c. 1789-1864), Leamlara House, Middleton, Co. Cork; M.P. Co. Cork 1832-41.
- 2 Daniel Callaghan and Herbert Baldwin.

2018

From Edward J. Littleton

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 25 October 1833

*Copy**Private*

My dear Sir,

The Lord Lieutenant has directed the release of the ten Catholic prisoners confined in Enniskillen gaol,¹ concerning which you interested yourself on the representations of Dr. Kernan, the Catholic bishop of Raphoe [*recte* Clogher] and his borthor, Mr. Randall Kernan. I have written to the latter gentleman to tell him of the success of his application.

When you return to town I shall be anxious to see you about a proceeding I contemplate with the object of devising some plan for a new valuation of Dublin and a consolidation of its local taxation. Leary's case² is now before the Lord Lieutenant.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2016.

2 See letter 2016.

2019

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 31 October 1833

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you a cheque for £32. I have taken up the £236 bill.

I leave this tomorrow after Mass. I go the next day but one, Saturday, to Killarney; on Sunday evening to Macroom; on Monday, to a public dinner at Cork;¹ and getting out of the way to Clongowes² on Sunday, the 10th, I intend, God willing, to reach Dublin by the 11th, to remain there until the House of Commons meets in February and to proceed with all manner of due agitation. I am perhaps out of spirits, unjustly or without cause, but I feel a sensation of desertion of me when I ought not. This, however, is certain, that I never will desert the country — and less now than ever. I will write to you again from Killarney. Be assured that no man could be more grateful to another than I am to you. What alarms me principally is that, although I see some newspaper puffs, I do not see anywhere, save in Cork, the organisation which *could* promise success.

Barrett's paragraphs³ about Walker and Sullivan⁴ are, I see by the scoundrel *Freeman*, attributed to me.⁵ Well, I cannot help it but they do most certainly contain my sentiments of both those gentlemen and whatever be the result to myself, I cannot regret that those paragraphs have appeared. They are strictly true.

May God bless you, my good friend! Tell *all whom it may concern* that I intend to be in Dublin on the 11th.

[P.S.] I doubt whether my parliamentary duties, to which I shall devote myself, will allow me to attend to law business. What are you doing in Dublin? I know that some of the clergy there are not over friendly but this we must *not observe*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 393

- 1 See letter 2017. The dinner, attended by 250 persons, took place in the chamber of commerce in Cork city on Monday, 4 November, William Fagan in the chair (*Pilot*, 8 Nov. 1833).
- 2 Clongowes Wood College.
- 3 The *Pilot* criticised the parliamentary conduct, mainly because of absenteeism, of Richard Sullivan and Charles A. Walker during the late session. In addition, Sullivan's constituents were advised to watch him carefully as one who, during the Emancipation struggle had 'stood at a supercilious aristocratic distance from the popular cause', and who was not always a supporter of Repeal (*Pilot*, 28 Oct. 1833).
- 4 Richard Sullivan (c. 1795-1855), merchant, eldest son of William Sullivan, Kilkenny; member of a wealthy family of brewers, malsters and millers; M.P. for Kilkenny city 1832-36. Resigned his seat in 1836 in favour of O'Connell. Mayor of Kilkenny 1837-8.
- 5 The *Freeman's Journal* condemned the *Pilot's* attack on Walker but made no reference to Sullivan. It did not make any explicit reference to O'Connell except in so far as it suggested that some one other than the editor of the *Pilot* had supplied the information for the attack on Walker (*FJ*, 24, 28 Oct. 1833).

2020

From Thomas Steele to Cork

Dublin, Friday [1 November 1833]

My dear Sir,

I think it right to let you know that the report of the trial¹ in the *Evening Post* was calculated to do Maurice injury with the Scott family² unless counteracted.

He was described as giving some answers in a form which would be highly disrespectful to Mr. Scott and consequently deeply insulting to Maurice's Mary³ and her mother.... I called on

Michael O'Loughlen and have his evidence that Maurice's answers in his examination were admirable . . . and I write this day quietly a letter to Maurice framed in such a form that if he puts it into Bindon Scott's hands, it will not only counteract any evil but perhaps do some service.

My association with your family is dignified and delightful. The former because you trust to me to the extremity that you do that I will act prudently in your political machinery, and delightful that I am treated less as a friend than as one of your family.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The trial of Mrs. John Scott, nee Mary Jane Cockbourn, for bigamy. She was indicted for having on 2 March 1833 feloniously married John Bindon Scott (brother-in-law of O'Connell's son Maurice), being the wife of Anthony Galway at the time (*DEP*, 31 Oct. 1833).
- 2 In the report of the trial in the *Dublin Evening Post*, Maurice referred to his father-in-law throughout as 'old Scott', and aroused laughter in the court when he admitted that he had married without his father-in-law's consent (*DEP*, 31 Oct. 1833). There is no substantial difference between the accounts of the trial as reported in the *Dublin Evening Post* and in the *Pilot* (see *Pilot*, 1 Nov. 1833) but Steele's letter was no doubt written before the *Pilot* (an evening paper), of 1 November was published.
- 3 Frances Mary O'Connell, nee Scott.

2021

From his son Maurice, Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare, 3 November 1833, to Cork.

First part of letter not extant. Concerning bigamy case against the wife of John Scott,¹ Maurice O'Connell's brother-in-law.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 John Bindon Scott (c. 1811-c. 1884), only son of Bindon Scott, Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare. High sheriff for Co. Clare, 1841. See letter 2020.

2022

From Mrs. Frances Scott¹

Cahircon [Kildysert, Co. Clare], 18 November 1833

My dear Sir,

The evening I had the pleasure of your company here I did not like to take up your time reading the letters *to* that *horrid* woman.² I am so anxious you should see them, I send with this the copies

of them. She gave the originals herself to John and which I suppose Mr. Hickman³ or Mr. Dudgeon⁴ have since you were here. I try not to think of or fret about the business but as little as possible. You cheered me so much.

It gave me much pleasure to hear you [and] Mrs. O'Connell and your son had arrived safely in town. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Frances Percy Scott, wife of Bindon Scott, J.P. and mother-in-law to O'Connell's eldest son, Maurice. She died at an advanced age on 20 March 1857.
- 2 John Bindon Scott's allegedly bigamist wife. See letter 2020.
- 3 Edward S. Hickman, attorney and crown solicitor for Connaught, 17 Middle Gardiner Street, Dublin.
- 4 Samuel Dudgeon, solicitor, 17 Middle Gardiner Street, Dublin.

2023

From Edward J. Littleton

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 23 November 1833

My dear Sir,

I have transmitted a copy of that part of the Memorial¹ you delivered to me on the part of certain inhabitants of Macroom, to Lord Shannon,² the Lieutenant of the County. His lordship is very anxious to reestablish a Petty Sessions at Macroom and has recently recommended one of the gentlemen named in the Memorial to the Lord Chancellor,³ who has appointed him a magistrate but Lord Shannon is also in communication with the magistrates who have absented themselves from the Petty Sessions, with a view if possible to induce them to attend.

With respect to that part of the Memorial which refers to the occurrence at a recent funeral, you are probably aware that the point in dispute was one in which any interference on the part of the Government would have been of very doubtful propriety. Our attention was directed to it by various representations at the time; but it did not appear to be a case in which the Government could judiciously institute any proceeding.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Henry (Boyle), 3rd earl of Shannon (1771-1842), Castlemartyr, Co. Cork; lord lieutenant of Co. Cork 1831-1842.
- 3 Lord Plunket.

2024

From Edward J. Littleton

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 5 December 1833

My dear Sir,

The case of Patrick Nugent, the prisoner, shall be brought under the consideration of the Lord Lieutenant as soon as the proper report can be procured. You shall be informed of the result.

I have written to town for copies of the Dublin Valuation¹ for you. . . . I find that any bill for altering the rates and consolidating the collection must be a private bill, which requires notices. All the former Acts have been so treated. I fear any proposal to make a bill for an alteration of the basis of collection and a consolidation of the collection a public bill would be resisted as a very inconvenient precedent.

Several persons to whom I have talked on this subject seem anxious that the collection etc. should hereafter be regulated by the Corporation.

I incline therefore to think that further delay will prove unavoidable. I shall have much pleasure in seeing you at any time on the subject, and rendering you any assistance in my power.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Under an act of 1824, 5 Geo. IV (local) c. 118, commissioners were appointed to revalue the houses in certain areas of Dublin. They completed their report in 1830 and it was printed in 1833 by an order of the House of Commons of 7 February 1833.

2025

From Doagh Reform Committee

Dunadry [Doagh], Co. Antrim, 5 December 1833

Dr. Sir,

As the man of the people, I address you on a subject which embraces the welfare of a great number of people who are not only aggrieved by the attempt to impose the payment of tithes upon them but also by the *very* contemptuous treatment of Sir William Gossett, who since he was transmuted into the Marquis of Anglesey or the Marquis into him, appears to have forgotten the common courtesy of a gentleman. Sir William was petitioned on the 3 Sept. last by a number of the most wealthy and independent farmers and gentlemen with two resident magistrates at their head

within the same bounds in the North of Ireland [but Gossett treated their petition with contempt. The committee then wrote to Littleton who replied courteously. They were worried by an attempt to collect tithes on the Grange (parish of Doagh Grange) land which had not been collected formerly, the attempt having been made by the present incumbent, Rev. Mr. Johnston¹ who] by the dictatorial influence of his Right Honble. and Learned brother-in-law, the late Baron McClelland, obtained a verdict against us at Carrickfergus; upon the *broad principle* as laid down by the learned personage that *all lands were subject to tithe, should pay tithe and those who had not done so were so much in arrear*, and in addition they were most abominable sinners [but the committee obtained a prohibitory order from the court of king's bench that Mr. Johnston should not levy tithe until he had shown title. Consequently, he did not attempt to levy tithe until this year.] Should they force us into law again, we must get *you* to lead us, with such assistance as you may require, and I conclude by stating that you have done more *honour to yourself, to mankind and to posterity* by a few sentences in your letter from Derrynane implying in substance that every sect of Christians should pay their own clergy,² than all the scribblers and councils from the 3d century to the present day. . . . A number of us most cordially hate the *Regium Donum*.³ It has in particular fostered a talented scorpion, Dr. Cooke,⁴ who is endeavouring to move Earth and Hell amongst the dregs of Belfast Orangemen against the system of National Education.⁵

Forgive me the length of this and believe me,

Very respectfully your obedient servant,

John Shaw, Junr., Secy, of Doagh Reform Committee

P.S. On the most careful perusal of the act to which Mr. Littleton referred us; as well as the Million act, [Church] Temporalities act. etc., the simple question of whether those who hold lands *Tythe free*; either by *bequest purchase* or *Lease* became the Lay Impropietors . . . remains to be guessed . . . ; them and the absentees are your Game of whom we have a precious specimen in our neighbourhood, the Rt. Honble. Lord Visct. Templeton⁶ and whose actions at law in Carrickfergus and Monaghan agt. his Tenantry during the last year was rather amusing. They were published in a small pamphlet which we can send you if you accept it. The tithe and absentee question is making slow but very sure work among the Anti-Repealers of the North which I am very extensively acquainted with.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Rev. Philip Johnson.
- 2 In this letter O'Connell declared '... the principle of my public life is — that no one Christian should be compelled to contribute to the support of a church to which he does not belong, or of a religion from which he dissents' (O'Connell to his constituents, 11 Sept. 1833, *Pilot*, 23 Sept. 1833).
- 3 The state grant-in-aid of the clergy of the Presbyterian church.
- 4 Rev. Henry Cooke (1788-1868), leader of the evangelical and orthodox Presbyterians in the north of Ireland; a forceful preacher and orator; opposed Catholic emancipation. See *DNB*.
- 5 The board of national education had been established in 1831. See letter 1827 n2.
- 6 John Henry (Upton), second Baron Templetown (1771-1846), created Viscount Templetown 1806.

2026

*From Thomas Steele, Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, Wednesday
[18 December 1833]*

Informs O'Connell that he has located the rock-altar of the days of 'open persecution'.¹ The ground on which it stands — apparently near Birr — belongs to Mr. Hudson Rowe, a Protestant in commercial business in Nenagh. He is prepared to present it in honour of O'Connell and provided it is used for a religious purpose. Tomorrow Steele will have it taken to Co. Clare and placed under the oriel window of the Liberator's chapel² overlooking Lough O'Connell and the O'Connell Mountains.³ Steele adds that he must get the rock (which apparently contains 'an antique rude cross') away in the morning early before any bigoted persons might try to smash it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 That is, a 'mass rock', where mass would have been celebrated occasionally in secret in the sixteenth or seventeenth century.
- 2 This was no doubt a chapel which the enthusiastic Steele hoped to build or, possibly, a ruined chapel to which he had given this name.
- 3 Steele gave this name to certain mountains in east Co. Clare.

2027

From Edward J. Littleton

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 19 December 1833

*Copy**Private*

My dear Sir,

The Lord Lieutenant, after a most patient investigation of all the proceedings both in court and in parliament relative to O'Leary's [*sic*] case,¹ is of opinion that there does not exist any ground that would justify an alteration of his sentence and a reversal of the decisions of the two former governments.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2016.

2028

From Samuel Hilliard

Billerough [Listowel, Co. Kerry], 19 December 1833

Dear Sir,

I beg the liberty of soliciting a favour of you with respect of a nomination on your family Burse¹ in the Irish College in Paris in the Medical department for my son William. . . . He has a claim on it as having the honour of being a relative to the founder before a person who is not a relative to your family. It's now, my dear Sir, in your power to enable me to give my son a profession. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 1121 note 8.

2029

*To Charles O'Connell, Bahoss, Cahirciveen, Co. Kerry,
24 December 1833, from Merrion Square*

Encloses two bills of exchange for £500 each which will be punctually paid.

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

2030

To Edward J. Littleton

Merrion Square, 31 December 1833

Dear Sir,

I beg leave to return you my cordial thanks for the copies of the parliamentary publication of the valuation of Dublin¹ which you were so good as to procure and send me.

I also thank you for the trouble of informing me of the decision of the Lord Lieutenant on the case of the unfortunate man, Leary.² Since the world began there never was a more unjust decision. Of course I do not mean upon the documents which were before the Lord Lieutenant, but the injustice is created by his fate being determined upon documents which were never seen by any person who took an interest in him or who could procure contradiction of alleged facts or explanation of matters misrepresented. I know his case from the evidence in his and the subsequent trials and from the opinion of the able judge³ who tried him. . . . Poor man. May God help him. He was born at the wrong side of the channel.

Perhaps I ought not to ask for the inspection of the documents on which the decision was made. I fear I ought not and therefore alone *do not*. But if there were nothing *irregular* in showing them to me I would deem it a great favour. I am the more desirous of making the request as I must otherwise resort to that most hopeless of proceeding – a motion to the reformed parliament for their production but I am bound to add that I will do so only to liberate my mind from some of the overpowering sensations of injustice done to this wretched old man.⁴ He certainly ought either to have been executed or pardoned altogether. . . .

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

1 See letter 2024 n1.

2 See letters 2016, 2027.

3 Baron Richard Pennefather.

4 On 5 February 1834 O'Connell presented a petition to the Commons for a full pardon for Leary. In his speech supporting it he said that Pennefather, 'one of the best criminal judges who had ever adorned the Bench,' had more than once advised that Leary be pardoned (*Times*, 8 Feb. 1834). Leary did not receive a pardon until 1837 on the accession of Queen Victoria. He never returned to Ireland but one of his sons went to live with him on a farm in Queensland, where he died some years after his release. (We are indebted for this information to an unpublished work on the Doneraile Conspiracy by Rev. J. Anthony Gaughan, 66 Monkstown Avenue, Dublin).

2031

From Edward J. Littleton

Phoenix Park, 3 January 1834

My dear Sir,

Your letter of the 31st¹ reached me in the Queen's County or should have received an earlier reply.

I regret that I cannot consistently with the usual and necessary rule of the Government submit to you the documents on which the Lord Lieutenant has formed his decision on Leary's case but I may state to you generally that your own lengthened observation on it, which I had copied out of a letter of yours written to me in October last,² and also Baron Pennefather's statement of his views of the case, were submitted to the Lord Lieutenant, and that these papers were not submitted to any other party.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 2030.

2 See letter 2016.

2031a

To John Matthew Galwey

Extract

Merrion Square, 8 January 1834

In the name of Ireland why do not I hear from you? Surely you will put your shoulders to the wheel to help us to keep the *scoundrel* nominees of the *vile* Duke of Devonshire out of Dungarvan!¹

SOURCE : *Dublin Evening Post*, 28 May 1835

- 1 This extract was published in a letter, dated 25 May 1835, from Galwey to the *Dublin Evening Post*. In his letter Galwey defended himself against the charge that he had received support from 'the Conservative Interest' against Michael O'Loughlen in the election campaign for Dungarvan (O'Loughlen was elected unopposed on 12 January). Galwey was a candidate for Co. Waterford but was prevailed on by his election committee not to demand a poll when Sir Richard Musgrave and Patrick Power were declared elected on a show of hands (*Waterford Mail*, 21 Sept. 1835).

2032

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 19 January 1834

My dear Friend,

I am only telling you the strictest truth when I assure you that the Honest Repealers of this place feel quite disheartened that no proper candidate has as yet been named for Dungarvan.¹ I tell you that the Wyse party are here very busy about him.² I understand that the Devonshire interest is likely to [be] arrayed in his support. He is in London himself and his brother George³ started for the same place on last Thursday to convey to him the deliberations of the party here. I have witnessed great activity at *certain* quarters lately. The visits were frequent at the palace,⁴ and I feel quite confident that an announcement of his intentions will appear immediately if the Repeal candidate do not precede him. Wyse has no chance if Galwey⁵ agree with you as to the candidate. Settle then with him about the man but let no time be lost.⁶

There will [be] a Repeal meeting here on Tuesday.⁷ Not one of the Wyse party signed the requisition.

If Wyse ever get in you will have another Luttrell⁸ to annoy you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Dungarvan borough was vacant because of the death of George Lamb, on 2 January 1834.
- 2 Thomas Wyse contested Waterford city in the general election of 1832 but was defeated, largely because of his refusal to take the repeal pledge (Auchmuty, *Wyse*, 140-2). He did not stand for Dungarvan in 1834.
- 3 George Wyse (1793-1867), second son of Thomas Wyse, the Manor of St. John, Co. Waterford; called to the bar 1832. See *Boase*.
- 4 Bowling Green, Waterford city, the residence of William Abraham, Catholic bishop. According to Patrick Power, he 'seems to have had the knack of being on the unpopular and gentry side' (Patrick Power, *Waterford and Lismore. A Compendious History of the United Dioceses*, Dublin, 1937, 38).
- 5 John Matthew Galwey.
- 6 Galwey did not support O'Connell's candidate (see letter 2038 n2).
- 7 This meeting took place on Tuesday, 21 January under the chairmanship of Alexander Sherlock of Killaspy House. Amongst those attending were Henry Winston Barron, M.P. and 'several honest and truly liberal Protestants' (*Pilot*, 27 Jan. 1834).
- 8 Henry Luttrell of Luttrellstown, Co. Dublin, a colonel in James II's army in Ireland who defected to William III. See *DNB*.

2033

To Edward Dwyer

London, 7 February 1834

My dear friend,

I hope you have received the £100 from P.V. FitzPatrick. We thought it was a *subscription* for Dungarvan¹ but you know it is not. It is *on account* of salary. I hope to see you *fully* paid. No man ever deserved it better — nay, none so well.

You perceive that we have got the business of *Hill's*² *Treason*³ in full blow. The moment that Lord Althorp avowed his share of the calumny, it would have been idle to think of sticking to such small fry as Hill. He has, therefore, been let off altogether, at least for the present. The more I reflect on the transition from him to the government the more convinced am I that the prudent course has been taken. We are now at direct war with the Government upon the subject of the treason charge. I am quite convinced that we shall have a complete triumph for Sheil. The Tories are certainly with us. Every independent man in the House is with us and, remember, I tell you the facts are with us. I repeat my conviction that Sheil's triumph will be complete. The charge has, indeed, dwindled down from a mountain to a molehill but even the molehill must be crushed. On Monday I will certainly move for a committee.⁴ They will give it to me or they will not. If they do give it, then we will have a complete acquittal. If they do not, they shrink from the trial, and our triumph is, if possible, greater. Hurrah for Old Ireland!

I never conceived that the Government and the parliament of this country had half the rancorous hatred to Ireland which I have perceived since I came here. The fact is, they perceive we are becoming too great and too strong for their domination, and they hate us just in proportion as they fear us. If we can but keep the people of Ireland tranquil, if we can keep down Whitefeet agitation and crime, we shall have the Protestants joining us in shoals, and then the Repeal is inevitable.

Send everywhere to the country for Repeal petitions. Let me have them over as speedily as possible. Despatch every petition the moment you receive it. Urge everybody to do the same. But do not be sending to me petitions for the Lords. It is too bad to be asking me. . . . [remainder of letter missing]

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 401-402

1 The Dungarvan borough election.

- 2 Matthew Davenport Hill (1792-1872), M.P. for Hull 1832-5; counsel for O'Connell in the state trial of 1844. See *DNB*.
- 3 The celebrated case of 'Who is the traitor?' In a speech to his constituents at Hull on 22 October 1833, Hill declared 'that he happened to know that an Irish member, who spoke with great violence and voted against every clause of that bill [the coercion bill for Ireland of 1833] went to ministers and said "Don't bate one single atom of that Bill, or it will be impossible for any man to live in Ireland."' On 10 November the *Examiner* called for a full inquiry into Hill's allegations. Several Irish members at once publicly disclaimed the application of Hill's charge to themselves, and O'Connell pronounced it a fabrication. Hill offered to exonerate any member who applied to him directly. Several Irish members did so, and were accordingly exonerated. Sheil in public denied that Hill was referring to him but he did not write to Hill, and 'it soon got out that Sheil was the "traitor"' (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 273). On 5 February O'Connell questioned Althorp who replied that he did not believe that any Irish member had made such a statement to any cabinet minister but one or more of them, who had voted and spoken against the bill, had 'in private conversation used very different language.' On O'Connell's asking if he was the Irish member referred to Althorp replied, 'no'. Then Sheil asked if he was one, and received the reply, 'yes'. Great excitement followed, Sheil solemnly denying Althorp's accusation as based on 'a gross and scandalous calumny', and the sergeant-at-arms being obliged to take both into custody in order to prevent a duel (*DEP*, 8 Feb. 1834: McCullagh, *Sheil*, II, 152-7).
- 4 On Monday, 10 February, O'Connell in the Commons moved that the paragraph from the *Examiner* containing the report of Hill's address, be referred to a committee of privileges. The motion was carried by 192 to 54, and a committee met on the following day. Hill refused to provide the committee with the name of his original informant, and failed otherwise to substantiate his allegations. He finally made a statement to the effect that his charges against the Irish members were 'totally and absolutely unfounded' and that he had made them in 'a hasty and unpremeditated speech, under a firm persuasion that he had received it on undeniable evidence.' He apologised for having given the charges circulation (*Annual Register*, 1834, 12). In their report issued on 14 February, the committee declared their conviction 'that the innocence of Mr. Sheil, in respect to the whole matter of complaint referred to their investigation, is entire and unquestionable.' (For Althorp's retraction, see letter 2037 n3). It was hinted at the time that O'Connell resorted to the inquiry in the hope of destroying Sheil as a possible rival (see, for example, *Annual Register*, 1834, 13). According to Macintyre, although 'it is unlikely that Sheil was entirely innocent... his fears that O'Connell would use the incident in order to ruin him were unfounded' (MacIntyre, *The Liberator*, 151, n1). This historian believes that, since Althorp had 'an enviable reputation for sincerity and honesty' the episode must remain 'a blot on Sheil's character and a further blow to his party's reputation' (MacIntyre, *The Liberator*, 151).

2034

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Friday, 7 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Many, many thanks for your kind attention to all my commands.

Sheil's business¹ will, believe me, end triumphantly for him. Already he is more than half acquitted. His going to any part of the Ministry is now denied; the advising to enforce a Bill which he opposed is given up. Something said *in private*, inconsistent with his opposition to the Bill itself, is all that is *now* insisted on. I have got the management of *the cause* and I hope in my vanity that it will not fail in my hands. If it do it will be *all* my fault. Sheil is plainly free from guilt or from stain. The only difficulty is to ensure his triumph without so strongly damaging the ministry that their minions may interfere and prevent our success or at least diminish its splendour.

I find the House of Commons more intolerant of Ireland than it was last session — hating us more — more disposed to do us mischief. It is a disposition which will evince itself in some overt acts before this session is over. Well, it will make more honest as well as determined Repealers.

I got the paper containing Baron Smith's charge.² I hope to have a committee appointed on his case next Thursday.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 402

1 See letter 2033 ns. 3 & 4.

2 Smith's charge to the grand jury, delivered at the opening of a special commission in Green Street, Dublin, on 27 October 1833 (for a verbatim report of the charge see *Pilot*, 28 Oct. 1833). In his charge Smith expressed his opinion on a large number of Irish political matters.

3 See letter 2037 n4.

2035

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 February 1834

Exert yourself above all things to get new subscribers. Get every street in Dublin ransacked for subscribers for the *Pilot* and call on Mr. Dwyer to aid him in forwarding my circular.¹ Do not lose sight of this. Suggest to me any other steps I can take. I am preparing

my reply² to that paltry creature, Lord Cloncurry, though Heaven knows I have enough to do besides but no matter.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 400

- 1 In November 1833 Richard Barrett, owner-editor of the *Pilot*, was fined and imprisoned for publishing a letter of O'Connell's (see letter 1975a n1). On 23 January a meeting was held under the chairmanship of Edward Southwell Ruthven 'to make arrangements for extending the circulation of the *Pilot*, during the incarceration of ... Richard Barrett.' O'Connell attended this meeting (*Pilot*, 24 Jan. 1834). A circular from O'Connell, dated 30 January 1834, expressed his regret at being forced to leave Ireland at a time when 'if I could remain, it was my intention to make an arrangement for having at least one *Pilot* in every parish in the land.' He appealed to his friends to undertake this project and requested Edward Dwyer to transmit to him lists of new subscribers to the *Pilot*, 'not for publication, but to show me personally how many parishes and places contain friends to the liberty of the press, and to the Repeal of the Union' (*Pilot*, 14 Feb. 1834).
- 2 In an undated letter to the *Dublin Evening Post*, 30 January 1834, Cloncurry remarked that bad health 'and perhaps good taste' having recently confined him to his home, 'advantage has been taken of the fact to defame me at various public meetings by a person [O'Connell] who if he had in his composition a particle of patriotism, of decency or of gratitude, would have refrained from so doing.' He accused O'Connell of conducting his agitation for selfish motives and concluded that 'the chief difference between me and O'Connell seems to be my wish to put money into the people's purse — his target to take it out.' O'Connell's reply, if ever published, has not been traced.

2036

To P.V. FitzPatrick

12 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Sheil's case,¹ I have reason to believe, is going on admirably. Do not publish anything on the subject; nor am I at liberty to say one word on the subject, but keep 'the friends' in good spirits. *Sheil will triumph*. Give £50 as soon as you can to the Dungarvan election² if the contest goes on. I confess I am exceedingly nervous about it and am right glad that Maurice went down there.³ His going will be a matter of exultation to our enemies if we be defeated but in any event it will be no small consolation to me. I will then not have to blame myself. I hope tomorrow's post will bring me intelligence decisive the one way or the other on this subject. I am, indeed, *impatient*. It will be a triumph to us or over us.

The public attention here 'out of doors' — as our slang is — is so

engrossed with the assessed taxes⁴ that they think of little else. In either way Friday next will either give an impetus to the public mind on this subject or disengage it for other and more useful purposes.

I thank you for the punctuality of your correspondence. It is quite a consolation to me to get your letters.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 403

- 1 See letter 2033 ns. 3 & 4.
- 2 On 15 February Ebenezer Jacob, the candidate supported by O'Connell, was elected for Dungarvan by a small majority over Pierse George Barron (*Pilot*, 17 Feb. 1834).
- 3 O'Connell's son Maurice took a prominent part in this election (see *Pilot*, 14 Feb. 1834). According to a local correspondent '... for our triumph we are principally indebted to the active, the zealous, the untiring exertions of the Honourable members for Tralee and Clonmel [Maurice O'Connell and Dominick Ronayne] (*Pilot*, 19 Feb. 1834).
- 4 Concerning the budget which Althorp introduced on 14 February.

2037

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Friday, 14 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am without any Dungarvan news¹ but *Io triumphe!* here. Hill came into the committee this day and made a very handsome apology for having made the charge at all; declared that, as well from the evidence already given as from his own particular enquiries, he was *now* convinced that the charge was totally unfounded and he felt it his duty to beg Mr. Sheil's pardon. We are now engaged in drawing up the report. It is most satisfactory and gives Sheil in every respect the most complete victory.² It remains to be seen what Lord Althorp will *now* do.³

My victory in Baron Smith's case⁴ is also another subject of gratulation. The fact is that Littleton and the Ministry came down to the House determined to oppose my motion. But I made so strong a case for inquiry that they felt I ought not to be resisted. The debate was curious. The Ministry were divided but you see I had a decided majority.

I will tomorrow write to you to make *inquiries* — necessary for the Committee. In the meantime find out witnesses to prove Baron Smith's *delays*. What newspaper did *his speech*⁵ first appear in? Send me an abstract of the calendar at the sessions at which the charge was made, containing the names and *crimes*.⁶ In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 403-404

- 1 News of the election (see letter 2036 n2).
- 2 See letter 2033 ns. 3 & 4.
- 3 Shortly afterwards upon Sheil repeating his denial in the Commons, Althorp retracted the charge, and asked Sheil's pardon (Le Marchant, *Althorp*, 479).
- 4 On 13 February O'Connell moved for a committee of inquiry into the conduct of William Cusac Smith, 'first, for neglect of duty as a judge, and secondly for making compensation for that neglect by becoming a violent politician.' He declared the Irish judiciary did not possess the confidence of the public, partly because many of the judges had grown too old to be efficient, and he urged that 'no money could be better expended in Ireland . . . than in buying off inefficient judges.' He cited specific examples of Smith's improper conduct of trials, including some that began after midnight and lasted until 6 a.m. O'Connell's motion, supported by Littleton and Stanley, was carried by 167 to 74 (for the debate and division, see *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 272-352; also *Pilot*, 17 Feb. 1834). O'Connell's victory was, however, shortlived (see letter 2042 n2).
- 5 See letter 2034 n2.
- 6 A memorandum attached to this letter by P.V. FitzPatrick states 'I decline to mix myself up with the proceedings against Baron Smith. His long course of liberality in politics, his humanity as a judge and accomplishments as a scholar had rendered him up to this time an object of admiration to me. Mr. O'Connell, in a subsequent letter, says he respected my sentiments in this particular' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 404). The *Pilot* on 19 February urged on similar grounds that the motion for a committee to inquire into Smith's conduct should not be pressed.

2038

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Monday, 17 February 1834

Private

My dear FitzPatrick,

Many thanks for your communications about Dungarvan. They have set my mind at perfect ease. Indeed, the return of Jacob¹ is one of the most pleasing events of my life, especially after the desertion of John Galwey.²

You must send me over witnesses' names for the committee³ on Baron Smith. He behaved very ill at Dundalk;⁴ he also behaved ill on the Castlepollard affair.⁵

First, can you get me witnesses' names to prove his partiality to some Orange murders at Dundalk and his severity to some Catholic rioters there?

Second, what evidence of misconduct can I get as to [the] Castlepollard Trials — I mean the trials of the Police for the massacre at that town? Write to Father Burke⁶ privately on this subject.

Thirdly, give me the names of the proprietors of the newspapers to which Baron Smith sent his charge at the October commission,⁷ also the names of the reporters for those papers.

Fourthly, send me the names of any other reporters who heard his charge and can testify to its general accuracy.

Fifth, see Sir. D[avid] Roose for me and get from him privately, and in the strictest confidence, the names of the persons who can prove the loss his son's client sustained last term by Baron Smith's late sitting. I want to prove the hour he sat each day so as to show that his usual hour for sitting was as late as half after twelve to half after one or later.

Sixth, see Fearon,⁸ the sub-sheriff, on this subject and act with him also in confidence. He will tell you, as he is a sincere friend of mine, what *he* and *others* can prove respecting the hours of sitting after Lent term.

Seventh, give me as much assistance as you can respecting every point of evidence included in my charges against Baron Smith.

More tomorrow.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 406-408

- 1 Ebenezer Jacob (died c. 1839); 20 Upper Gloucester Street and later 54, Harcourt Street, Dublin; elected M.P. for Dungarvan 15 February 1834 but election declared void; re-elected 16 May 1834.
- 2 For Jacob's return (see letter 2036 n2). John M. Galwey was M.P. for Co. Waterford. Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman urged him to support Barron: 'O'Connell's party always distrusted you. They smiled as long as you worked with them; the moment their object is gained they will throw you away like a squeezed orange' (cited in FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 406). Jacob claimed that he had refused to absolve Galwey from his promise to vote for the Repeal candidate (Jacob to the *Pilot*, 7 Feb. 1834, *Pilot*, 7 Feb. 1834; see letters 2041 and 2045).
- 3 See letter 2037 n4.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 The trial on 26 July 1831 in which the police were acquitted of the manslaughter of several persons at Castlepollard, Co. Westmeath on 23 May 1831. (*DEP*, 28 July 1831).
- 6 Fr. John Burke, P.P. Castlepollard.
- 7 See letter 2034 n2.
- 8 Henry Johnson Fearon, Rathmines, Dublin.

2039

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Thursday, 20 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Take the enclosed at once to Barrett. Tell him I bid you read it

so as to be prepared to speak with you upon its details. I wonder you and Staunton did not consult Pigot before you resolved upon any course.

If Pigot be not in Dublin, consult O'Loghlen and Perrin professionally as to whether Barrett may not safely work off the stamps which he has already got¹ in continuing the publication of the *Pilot*. My opinion is that he can do so safely. There is no penalty added in the twenty-first sec[ti]on,² and I take it that, without the reiteration of the penalty, none would accrue.

The second plan suggested is that Barrett should become proprietor of the *Patriot*.³ Let the opinion be taken whether he is entitled to stamps as proprietor of *another* paper.

Then, if not, we must get a proprietor. We surely are not so destitute of friends as not to get some person who will run the risk of proprietorship, passing his bond for a large sum as the price. I will indemnify any such person. I will engage Barrett as editor of the *Pilot* or of the *Patriot*, whatever name is the better, at a salary to be paid by me. I will run the risk of the actual proprietor paying me the proceeds of the paper or of any sum in lieu thereof. I will not require any promise or contract from such proprietor to pay me anything. In short, I will do every act necessary to make the purchaser of the paper the real proprietor of it. He must run the risk of libels; that is all.

Consult with Barrett. Look about you. Get somebody between you who will take the temporary risk of libels, for certainly the clause under which he is proscribed⁴ *must be repealed*. If nobody else will take that risk I will, for Barrett must be sustained.

I was not aware of this Act until I had the notice. Lay the copy of the indictment against Barrett before the lawyers you consult. Let them say whether it be an indictment coming under the terms of the Act. Send me also a copy of the indictment.

In short, we must bestir ourselves. I repeat, Barrett must not be the sufferer. I infinitely prefer going to jail myself to having him thus suffer.

If the new proprietor be a person of character, let him set up the *Patriot* even without passing a bond to Barrett, if he has any scruples as to swearing to proprietorship.

Instituting the *Patriot* would, I think, free the matter from any scruple. I will take Barrett off the proprietor's hands whilst I canvass eagerly, anxiously for the paper.

I would also prefer a jail to giving up my charge against Baron Smith;⁵ that is the most useful movement I ever made. It will strike a salutary terror into a set of the greatest scoundrels that ever disgraced humanity. The Government intend to oppose Sir

Edward Knatchbull's motion,⁶ so we shall have the committee after all. Indeed it would be a proof of great weakness if they did not do so.

I will bring the matter before the House and the public. I will apply for leave to bring in a *short bill* for the purpose of assimilating the Law of Ireland to that of England in this particular. I do not foresee any opposition to such a Bill.⁷

In short, this is another spirit-stirring incident, taking care that Barrett shall not suffer. I will, I hope, be able to make it useful.

[P.S.] If Maurice be in Dublin, tell him I implore of him to come over.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 408-410

- 1 Richard Barrett was, on 18 February 1834, informed by the commissioners of stamps that due to his recent prosecution (see letter 1975a n1), he was no longer entitled to receive stamped paper for the printing of newspapers (*Pilot*, 19 Feb. 1834). This, as Sheil pointed out in parliament a few days later, amounted to depriving Barrett of the means of livelihood (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 641). For at least the first half of 1834 the *Pilot* received no stamps but was, as O'Connell hoped, able to continue its existence for a while on the stock of stamps already in hand. Thereafter, for some months, it borrowed them — an illegal procedure (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 202-3; see, further, n3 below; also letter 2040 n2).
- 2 The twenty-first section of 55 Geo. III c. 80 ('An Act to provide for the Collection and Management of Stamp Duties on Pamphlets, Almanacks, and Newspapers, in Ireland') which prohibited any printer or publisher of a newspaper, who had been convicted of printing or publishing a seditious libel, from continuing to print or publish such newspapers.
- 3 That is, that Barrett should change the name of the *Pilot* to the *Patriot*. A pro-government newspaper of that name went out of circulation in 1829. On 19 February readers of the *Pilot* were informed that since the *Pilot* was being suppressed, it would be published as a second edition of the *Morning Register*. This device was, however, dropped within a week.
- 4 That is section XXI of 55 Geo. III c. 80 (see above n2).
- 5 See letter 2037 n4.
- 6 See letter 2042 n2.
- 7 To repeal that part of 55 Geo. III c. 80 prohibiting the stamp commissioners from issuing stamps to printers convicted of seditious libel. O'Connell and A. Carew O'Dwyer were preparing a measure (*Pilot*, 28 Feb., 3 Mar. 1834) but were anticipated by the government which on 27 February obtained leave to introduce such a bill. In due course it was enacted as 4 & 5 Will. IV c. 71.

2040

To Richard Barrett

Friday, 21 February 1834

My dear Barrett,

I am so engaged about you that I can think of nothing else. I am happy indeed to say that all England is up in arms on this point. The *Times* is, indeed, decisive.¹ The Statute² will be at once repealed or you will get a free pardon.³ Say nothing of this — publish nothing of what I write to you until the *Pilot* or the *Patriot*⁴ comes out *proprio vigore*. I write only to relieve you from, I trust, all uneasiness; at all events, you may rely on me and I do hope and believe that this persecution will be only a new advertisement of your paper. I did not expect so much of public sympathy. Believe me, it will be irresistible. I will write to you every day. Sheil made a great impression on all the Members of the House.⁵ The attack on property is the chief stimulant in England. It will enable us to carry before us all opposition.

Publish that immediate steps will be taken to re-establish the *Pilot*. Call on the Irish people in your name and mine not to desert you at this juncture. Be argumentative and firm without violence; but in truth, in this state of transition, I am not sobered down enough for advice. All I know is that you SHALL NOT be the sufferer.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 399-400

- 1 The action of the commissioners of stamps in withholding stamps from the *Pilot* (see letter 2039 n1) 'at once recoiled upon the government'. The English press, led by the *Times* took up the *Pilot's* cause. The commissioners' action was debated in the Commons on 25 February, when O'Connell and the other Irish members 'were able to make a formidable indictment of the Whigs' treatment of the press in Ireland.' The Commons ordered the publication of correspondence between the government and the commissioners, which revealed that Littleton, the Irish secretary, was responsible for the commissioners' action (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 202).
- 2 Section 21 of 55 Geo. III c. 80.
- 3 Barrett did not receive a pardon. He served the full term of his sentence.
- 4 See letter 2039 n3.
- 5 On 21 February, Sheil delivered a speech in the Commons in condemnation of the government's action in depriving Barrett of stamps (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 639-41; see also letter 2039 ns 1 and 3).

2041

To John Matthew Galwey, M.P., Dungarvan

London, 21 February 1834

My dear Galwey,

You have fallen back *a little* at the election.¹ But you have been and are too valuable for me not to be anxious that all should be made up and forgotten. Pray, pray allow me to assist in arranging an amnesty, and take your proper place again at the head of the people of Dungarvan.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 15554

1 See letter 2038 n2.

2042

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 22 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

This day's post will tell you that it is unnecessary for us to take any more trouble about Baron Smith. Of course I would, as I ought, respect your delicacy¹ if the matter had been otherwise. This defeat² is easily borne especially as it saves me from an extreme deal of trouble.

But it is an admirable topic of Repeal agitation if our friends of the Liberal Press would for a moment forget their foolish good-nature towards a man who has halloed on the Government against the people for the last three years, besides the inestimable advantage of proving to our miscreant judges that they are not altogether free from the possibility of punishment. Now that Smith is safe, I hope our press will use the topic to prove the disregard of the House to the Irish nation.

I could not reply to Peel³ last night but I will on another occasion. The rules of the House are, on this point, inconvenient.

... There is no doubt of the repeal of the clauses in the Stamp Act;⁴ not the least.

Hurrah for the Repeal!!!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 410-411

1 See letter 2037 n6.

2 O'Connell's recent successful motion (see letter 2037 n4) was on 20 February negated by a motion of Sir Edward Knatchbull which was carried

by 161 to 155. Graham had warned Grey that he would resign if the Commons' vote in favour of O'Connell's motion were not rescinded (Parker, *Graham*, I, 184-6).

3 On 21 February Peel delivered a long speech in defense of Smith. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 740-50).

4 See letter 2039 n2.

2043

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Monday, 24 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Give Nic[hola]s Maher the £50 for [the] Dungarvan election. It is said that the Irish government supplied Barron¹ with the money to contest that town. Is this possible!!!²

If we could trace it, there could not occur a more fortunate blow.

I forgot at home the two quarto vols. of Barrington's *History of the Union*,³ and his abbreviation of the same work on the rise and fall of Ireland in one vol.⁴ The fact is, I thought they were left out for packing but they have not come.

Go to my house and search my study and the book rooms in the back building and also the drawing room. If you do not find them there, in the back drawing room there is a bookcase, which get a smith to open, and search it. In short, search until you find them and then carefully pack them and transmit them to me by coach. There are some loose numbers of the work in my study but I do not want these. Do this for me as soon as you possibly can. Tell Staunton I will want him here for a few days before the great debate on the Repeal question.⁵

If the Government allow me tomorrow to bring in my Dublin Corporation Bill⁶ it will be a great blow to the adverse faction.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 411

1 Pierse G. Barron.

2 See letter 2106 n4.

3 Sir Jonah Barrington, *Historic Anecdotes and Secret Memoirs of the legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland* (G. Robinson, 1809-15).

4 Sir Jonah Barrington, *Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation, 1799-1800*, (Paris, 1833).

5 See letter 2062 n1.

6 O'Connell had prepared a bill for the regulation of the corporation of Dublin in August 1833, but had not presented it to the Commons (see letter 1987 n3). On 25 February 1834 he moved for leave to introduce a bill for this purpose with a lengthy speech. Littleton and Althorp replied

that action on the matter must await the report of the commissioners of inquiry into municipal corporations (see letter 1990 n6) which they claimed would shortly be published, and the government would then bring in a bill for the general regulation of all the Irish corporations. O'Connell withdrew his motion (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 764-76; *Commons Journal*, LXXXIX, 63).

2044

To John Primrose, Jr.

London, 24 February 1834

My dear John,

I *was* very angry with you for not giving me an exact history of the progress of cholera in Iveragh. It is not treating me well to keep from [me] facts of deep interest. It seems as if you took me for a mere dolt who was fit only to be deluded. Let me now know in what villages it appeared, how many have died of it. Have any of my tenants or any person I personally know? If it gets rife about Bahoss or about your place, it would be well if Kate¹ and her babe and Rickarda² and hers went to Derrynane, especially if that quarter be clear of the malady. I beg you will write or get someone to write to me three or four times a week. Do not mind apology for the past. I desired Morgan³ tell you to give £50 to Mr. Fitzgerald⁴ to assist the poorer victims. Pray contrive to do so as soon as you possibly can. Blessed be the holy will of God in everything. It is a strange visitation of his divine power and a sad memento how fragile we are.

We are here in excellent health and spirits all *working away*. The house of Commons have, as you must have seen, rescinded the committee against Baron Smith.⁵ This saves me all manner of trouble. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 His daughter, Kate.

2 Wife of John Primrose, Jr. and niece of Mary O'Connell.

3 His son.

4 Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, P.P., Cahirciveen.

5 See letter 2042 n2.

2045

From John M. Galwey

Duckspool [Dungarvan, Co. Waterford] 24 February 1834
My dear O'Connell,

I am obliged for your letter of the 21st¹ proposing that all differences between me and the people of Dungarvan should be made up and forgotten and to allow you to interfere in making such an arrangement.

In answer I beg to say were I to allow policy to take precedence of my judgement I would accept your offer but I cannot yet forget the contents of your letter of the 6th² describing Mr. P[ierse] George Barron as a cold-blooded aristocrat coming forward for the representation of Dungarvan on Tory principles.

Our ideas as to this good man and the description of person suited best to represent a trading town differ so widely I prefer leaving to time and cool reflection the adjustment of differences between me and my fellow-townsmen.

SOURCE: *Waterford News*, 17 January 1936

1 Letter 2041.

2 Unidentified.

2046

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 February 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Prevent any commentary in the *Register*¹ on any inaccuracy which may appear on the readiness of Barrett to take upon himself the liability of the prosecution.² His letter³ to O'Dwyer told powerfully. It is, perhaps, quite unnecessary for me to say anything on this subject but let *that matter* rest as it is.

There never, my good friend, was a more foolish falsehood than the statement that Fergus O'Connor meant to attack me. He is daily attacking all my enemies and there is not one of the Irish members more heartily cordial with me than he is. Attack me!!! I thought you should have better known the poor old daggerman⁴ than to believe one word from him.

The Ministry promise a Corporate Reform Bill⁵ but my opinion is that they merely intend to delude. *Nous verrons*. I would have done better last night and divided had I not been *crossed* by honest

Barron.⁶ Littleton, believe me, is not a friend to Ireland. It was he that originated the suppression of the *Pilot*.⁷

You see we had a glorious Repeal meeting here last Saturday.⁸ Believe me that the Repeal will soon be a popular measure amongst all the Radicals of England.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 412

1 The *Morning Register*.

2 See letters 1975a n1 and 2035 n1.

3 Unidentified.

4 Frederick William Conway, editor of the *Dublin Evening Post*.

5 See letter 2043 n6.

6 Henry Winston Barron supported the government against O'Connell's motion in favour of a bill to reform Dublin corporation (see letter 2043 n6). He accused O'Connell of needlessly occupying the time of the House. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 775).

7 See letter 2040 n1.

8 A meeting in London on 23 February. According to the *Sunday Observer* the crowd consisted of about 5,000, 'the majority . . . composed of labourers and respectable looking citizens, but on and about the platform . . . there was a considerable sprinkling of the better class of tradesmen.' (*Pilot*, 26 Feb. 1834, quoting the *Sunday Observer*). The *Pilot* stressed the respectability of the committee which had drawn up the resolutions, and which consisted chiefly of Englishmen. A petition to parliament in favour of repeal was adopted by the meeting, and a London Repeal Association established. O'Connell declared it was the largest English crowd he had ever addressed in favour of Repeal. (*Pilot*, 26 Feb. 1834).

2047

To John Primrose, Jr.

Saturday [London, very probably 1 March 1834]

My dear John,

Take immediate precautions¹ for the Derrynane district. Get a cow or two killed, one after the other, and distributed in broth and beef amongst the poorer classes of my tenants. It is the best precaution. Totally stop the sale of whiskey. John O'Connell² will help you. Bespeak Maurice O'Connor³ to come off there as soon as you perceive the smallest appearance of it. Send the necessary medicines to Derrynane House. In short, prepare for the worst there. May the great God be merciful as he is all powerful. Send at least £20 to Mr. O'Connell,⁴ the priest. Send two or three gallons of pure brandy to Derrynane. I would spend my last shilling rather than not have every possible precaution taken.

With tenderest love to Rickarda and her sweet babes.

Ever yours most affect[ionate]ly

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Papers of the Earl of Iveagh

- 1 To prevent the spread of cholera.
- 2 John Charles O'Connell, steward at Derrynane.
- 3 Dr. Maurice [O'] Connor.
- 4 Rev. Patrick O'Connell, a native of Abbeydorney, Co. Kerry; P.P. of Caherdaniel (western part of the parish of Kilcrohane) 1831-71. He died in 1879 aged 98.

2048

To John Primrose, Jr.

London, 3 March 1834

My dear John,

As far as I am concerned, spare no expense that can possibly alleviate the sufferings of the people. You had better at once get Maurice O'Connor from Tralee so as to have one medical man in Cahirciveen, and another to go to the country villages or single houses wherever the disorder¹ appears. If it breaks out at all about Derrynane, Dr. O'Connor should go there at once to give the people every possible assistance. I will pay him readily two guineas a day while he is in the country. Do not delay, my dear John. Everybody should live as full as possible, eating meat twice a day. Get meat for the poor as much as possible. I wish my poor people about Derrynane should begin a meat diet before the disorder arrives amongst them. Two, three, four beeves I would think nothing of. Coarse blankets also may be very useful if got for them promptly. Could you not get coals from Dingle? If not, get them from Cork. In short, if I could contribute to save one life I would deem it a great blessing at the expense of a year's income. I spoke to Mr. Roche.² He will write this day to Mr. Sullivan³ of Cove to give Father O'Connell £20 for that parish, particularly for Hartopp's⁴ tenants. But a physician is most wanting. Give me the fullest details, but above and before all things, *be prodigal* of relief out of my means — beef, bread, mutton, medicines, physician, everything you can think of. Write off to Father O'Connell to take every previous precaution — a Mass every possible day and getting the people to go to confession and communion, rosaries and other public prayers to avert the Divine Wrath.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 Cholera.
- 2 David Roche M.P.
- 3 Eugene [O'] Sullivan, Westcove, Caherdaniel, sub-agent to David Roche for Hartopp's estate in Co. Kerry.
- 4 Edward Bouchier Hartopp (1808-1884), Dalby House, Leicestershire.

2049

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 6 March 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Some days have elapsed since I wrote to you or to Barrett, for a reason you could not conjecture — merely a change in my hour of dining. I now dine at the hour I used to write but I will arrange to do *both* in future.

There is nothing like news which is not contained in the public prints. In fact, it is surprising with what apathy men look at the approaching events. It does seem certain that France is on the eve of a revolution and yet it excites neither apprehension nor even notice. This country, too, is in a most unsatisfactory state — great discontent, great folly, great carelessness.

I will send you a cheque for £100 to be applied to Barrett's expenses¹ so that, after he has got the 100 guineas, he may receive in future £10 per week, exclusive of paying for his rooms. I will continue that sum until his liberation and of course pay his fine.

I smile at your account of the triumph of my enemies in recent events. The fact is that my enemies are always claiming victories and yet you see I get on and am no worse in the end. There never was a man so often put down as I have been nor any who was so soon found on his legs again, blessed by the will of God!

The Government do not know what to do with or about Ireland. . . .

I was truly glad to hear your account of the prospect of prosperity. I hope it will not be a mere vision.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick *Corr.*, I, 413-14

1 In connection with Barrett's recent prosecution (see letter 1975a n1).

2050

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 7 March 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

There is a petition come in against Jacob.¹ What can be done to lighten the expense? I must give £50 more.

See Mr. O'Neill² and tell him that there are two or three of his fellow sufferers by the Custom House fire³ pressing me to bring

that matter before the House. He, however, has been and is so much more interested that I cannot do anything without his assent. It is a question of individual property and I must regulate my motions by the will of the persons principally concerned. It was, perhaps, discreet in the Chamber of Commerce, when discussing this subject in their late report,⁴ to forget my exertions and if so, nobody approves of such discretion more than I do. Why should I think of it for one moment? I am, at all events, as ready and as anxious to be of use to them, if I can, as if they had crowned me with laurels. . . .

If the Ministry had any notion of continuing Coercion laws⁵ for Ireland they will not have time. We are giving them plenty to do and some to spare. If anyone speaks to you of the local taxation of Dublin, give my explanation of inactivity — namely, that the Government have determined to leave the management of that concern to the reformed Corporation. This gives hope of a more speedy corporate reform than many imagine.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 415

- 1 A petition of ten electors of Dungarvan against the recent return of Ebenezer Jacob, the Repeal candidate, for the borough, was presented to the Commons on 7 March 1834, complaining of 'open and extensive bribery'. A committee was appointed on 22 April and on 28 April reported that Jacob was not duly elected. A writ was issued for a new election.
- 2 John O'Neill, 10 Fitzwilliam Square, Dublin, a Protestant. Pickle merchant; Volunteer of 1782.
- 3 See letters 2001 ns 5 & 6 and 2003 n2.
- 4 The report of the Dublin chamber of commerce, read at its annual meeting on 4 March 1834. It stated that the government had promised the merchants that their claims would be considered 'not with legal scrupulosity, nor as the subject of technical cavil, but on the broad . . . foundation of justice and equity. . . .' (*Pilot*, 5 Mar. 1834).
- 5 A renewal of the coercion act of 1833.

2051

To Edward Dwyer

London, 15 March 1834

My dear friend,

I wrote to you yesterday expressing my just indignation 'at the vile manner in which the Burial Committee' treated me.¹ They actually sent me without preface a vote of condemnation containing the most false charge imaginable. I was obliged to hurry so much with the letter I sent you yesterday, having actually to run after the bag of letters, that I probably was not sufficiently distinct.

I wish that you and my other real friends — alas, how few! — should distinctly understand the falsehood of the charges made against me.

First, it is the duty of every member to do the private Bill business of every constituent, whether he voted for him or not.

Second, the only way of getting rid of private bills is *in the committee*. It is very, very seldom the House allows a debate on a second reading. We had but one this session. The House never rejects a private Bill unless its principle be grossly wrong.

Third, apply these topics to the Dublin Cemetery Bill and you will find that it was impossible to defeat it at its first or second reading because its principle was perfectly right.

Fourth, the principle of the Bill was that this was a joint stock partnership which without parliamentary aid could not *sue* or be *sued*. Unless they got a Bill to sue or be sued in the name of their secretary, it would not be practical for them to recover money or property belonging to them. Nor would it be possible for any person to whom they may owe money to recover it from them; neither could they sue a defaulting member; that is, the practical difficulties are so great as to amount in reality to an impossibility.

Thus, therefore, for the protection of the public it was my duty to get them *a bill*, and I repeat it would have been impossible to throw out their Bill at the first or second reading.

Fifth. All the objections to this Bill are objections to be made *in the committee* when, of course, *it was* my intention to make them.

Sixth, but why should I take charge of a Bill nine-tenths of which I certainly disapprove of? My answer is, because that is the only way in which I could get rid of the objectionable parts without failure.²

If any other person but me were chairman of the Committee, Mahony or his friends might contrive to trick me. They might sit precisely at times when I could not possibly attend. I therefore took charge of the Bill that I may have it in my power.

Seventh, this is precisely what I did last year with the Kingstown Railway³ which I got the Committee to throw out. *This* bill I would also throw out in the Committee but for the necessity of giving the powers to sue and be sued which I have mentioned.

Show this letter to all *real* friends not as a vindication, because I have nothing to vindicate, but to show that Mr. John Redmond⁴ and his colleagues have vilely and untruly calumniated me.

Do not show it to Mr. Redmond or any of his party. I did not expect such usage at his hands.

This is the grossest instance of condemnation without trial

which ever occurred. I have done the best way for our Burial Ground Committee. I have secured that Mahony, active and managing as he is, shall *not* do them any harm. I have done the *best* thing *practicable*, and for this my friends — may I be protected from my friends! — vote me guilty at once.

This, you perceive, has annoyed me more than it ought. It is to find that men who ought to know me preferred to act from their own ignorance of forms and proceedings instead of confiding in my experience until they should hear from their deputy, Mr. O'Kelly.

It is long since I had any temptation to — but no, no; and I will take as much care to cut this Bill down as if I had been treated as I *ought* to be. Of course, when I took charge of the Bill, I told Mahony *how much* I intended to do for him. I practised no deception on him. It is, however, probable that his company will never act under the Bill which they are entitled to. I now dismiss this subject for ever. It has taught me to know mankind, alas! better than I did.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 417-19

- 1 On 17 February a petition from subscribers to the Dublin Cemetery Company was presented to the Commons, seeking permission to establish a general cemetery in the neighbourhood of Dublin. The petition was referred to a committee, headed by O'Connell, and on the committee's reporting on 28 February, O'Connell and Christopher Fitz-Simon were ordered to bring in a bill in compliance with the petition. On 10 March a petition against the proposed bill was presented from 'Members of the Committee for conducting the two Cemeteries situate at Golden Bridge and Prospect', near Dublin. The Goldenbridge cemetery at Inchicore was the first Catholic burial ground in Dublin, and was opened in October 1829 (Berry, *Glasnevin*, 3); John Redmond was a member of the committee drawing up this petition (*Pilot*, 19 Mar. 1834). The petitioners said they applied the profits from the cemeteries at Goldenbridge and Prospect to the education of the poor without religious distinction, and they objected to the proposed bill on the ground that it 'gives to a private company, incorporated on a money-lending speculation, the power of acquiring the loan of public money [from the Board of Works] which has been already denied to petitioners, who sought it not for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the poor of the city.' The petitioners stated their intention of establishing free burial grounds so soon as their funds should permit, and called on parliament to reject the proposed bill as 'unnecessary, and intended for private emolument to the detriment of a Charitable Institution' (*Pilot*, 19 Mar. 1834).
- 2 The Dublin cemetery bill received its second reading on 10 March, 1834 and passed the Commons on 12 May. After undergoing a number of amendments in the Lords it received the royal assent on 27 June. The bill does not appear to have been debated at any stage.
- 3 A bill for permitting the Dublin and Kingstown Railway Company to make a branch railway and enlarging and amending the provisions of the

act under which it was incorporated, received its second reading on 2 April 1833, and was then referred to a committee headed by O'Connell. On 6 June the committee reported its dissatisfaction with the bill which was not proceeded with that session.

- 4 John Redmond (c. 1768-1840), 35 Mountpleasant Terrace, Ranelagh, Dublin; a trustee of Rathmines Catholic church; commander of a division in the 1798 rebellion (see his obituary in the *Pilot* of 18 November 1840).

2052

To Edward J. Littleton

5 Park Street [London], Sunday [16 March 1834]

Sir,

I feel very unhappy at not being able to see you for one moment. I perceive that Baron Foster has left four men for execution at Limerick on Wednesday next the 19th inst.¹ It is sufficiently *obtuse* in point of feeling to slaughter so many human beings in one day. Two of these men are to be hanged for having committed a rape, not on the same woman (which might make a very aggravated case) but on distinct women.

Now I cannot rest without stating to you this, that from the frame of Baron Foster's mind, he considers anything as *proved* which is positively sworn to before him. This of course occurs in rape cases. He does not regard cross-examination — and it is next to impossible to have direct evidence for the defence in such a case. Besides, my experience on the Munster circuit enables me to assure you that nine charges of this kind out of ten on that circuit are made to compel *faithless lovers* to a marriage.

The conclusion I would fain bring you to is this, that these men ought not to be executed until the Irish Government, that is until you, could look into their cases and see whether transportation for life or lesser punishment than death — death — may not suit their real guilt.²

I should upon every account add that I know nothing of the parties or of their individual guilt. I write only respectfully and earnestly to caution you — if you will permit me to use a word not implying the slightest offence certainly — not to allow four fellow creatures to be put to death on the same day without being personally satisfied with their deserving that horrible punishment.

Indeed, indeed, you cannot safely devolve *this duty* upon the discrimination of Mr. Baron Foster.

I pray your kind indulgence to pardon this irregular intrusion. Unless my motives plead with you to forgive me I really cannot

make a sufficient apology for giving you this trouble. Unless you write this day, *Sunday*, to delay the execution your letter will arrive too late.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 The men were Daniel Dooly and Cornelius Ryan, condemned for burning the house of Redmond Connors at Keelogue, and Edmond Dwyer and Michael Knight, for rape (*Pilot*, 12 Mar. 1834).
- 2 Dooly and Dwyer were hanged together before the county gaol in Limerick on 19 March. Addressing the crowd from the scaffold, they declared 'they had neither hand, act, or part in the crimes for which they were about to suffer.' (*Pilot*, 24 Mar. 1834 quoting *Limerick Star*. The fate of the other two prisoners has not been ascertained (see further, letter 2053).

2053

From Edward J. Littleton

Copy

Grosvenor Place [London], 17 March 1834

Mr. Littleton presents his compliments to Mr. O'Connell and begs leave to assure him that, although his letter was not received by Mr. Littleton till 7 o'clock yesterday evening, it was sent after the mail from the General Post Office by an express and he has no doubt the Lord Lieutenant, whose sole province it is to deal with these cases, will receive tomorrow morning Mr. Littleton's communication enclosing Mr. O'Connell's representation on the subject of the intended execution.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

2054

To P. V. FitzPatrick

17 March 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am glad you are better; yet your headaches must give uneasiness to your friends. I do not think you earn them by any excess. Do not do anything for me which can in any way affect your health. I may say you are not aware how sincerely gratitude and esteem have attached me to you as one of my best of friends. . . .

Your account of the Brewery¹ is very cheering. I trust it will do all that I can wish for my son and for others. I will write myself,

the first leisure moment, to your brewer, Mr. D'Arcy.² I see that, if he can continue to give his attention and apply his skill, you must succeed. But if you do, I certainly will make it a point with my son that Mr. D'Arcy should participate in that success. This was the even plan by which Beamish and Crawford³ made their fortune. Everybody who participated in advancing their interests shared in the emoluments arising from the success of his exertions, and certainly Mr. D'Arcy seems by your account to be placing himself precisely in that situation in which, I trust, the result will be that wisdom will dictate that which generosity ought to be ready to suggest.

It is, however, perhaps too soon to anticipate sufficient success to make a percentage upon increased profits of any value to him. But recollect that you should keep this in your recollection and although the amount of such percentage may at first be small, yet it would open to the brewer a principle of action towards him which would give him the certainty that he would be benefitting himself as well as others by his attention to the economy and goodness of his brewing.

It was a percentage on profits, not on sales, which Beamish and Crawford gave. The distinction is obvious. It makes the brewer combine the utmost economy in point of expenditure with the utmost possible value of the liquor produced.

If I hear again so pleasing an account, I will write to Roger Hayes upon this point. It is one fit to be considered. But, perhaps, present appearances are only delusive. Let me hear of your health.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 420-21

- 1 The brewery of which O'Connell's son Daniel was a proprietor (see letter 1873 n1).
- 2 John D'Arcy (died c. 1864) a brewer in the O'Connell Brewery, Watling Street, Dublin. Alderman and lord mayor of Dublin 1852.
- 3 The brewing firm of South Main Street, Cork.

2055

To Archbishop MacHale

London, 22 March 1834

My ever-respected Lord,

I had the honour of receiving a letter from you some time ago promising a Repeal petition, and I wish to say the petition has not come to hands. I regret to be obliged to add that the number of Repeal petitions does not at all correspond with my hopes and

expectations.

I am the more sorry for this because I have the most intimate conviction that nothing of value can possibly be done for Ireland until we have a domestic Parliament. The faction which in all its ramifications bears so severely on our people and our country, can never be rendered innoxious whilst they can cling, even in idea, to support from the Government of this country.

It is a subject of serious but melancholy speculation to reflect upon the innate spirit of hatred of everything Irish which seems to be the animating principle of their existence. You certainly have two distinct specimens of the worthlessness of that existence in your County members.¹ Two such 'lubbers', as the seamen would call them, two such 'bostoons,' as we in Munster would denominate them, never yet figured on any stage, public or private.

One of the best of your Lordship's good works will be assisting to muster such a combination of electoral force in your County as will ensure the rejection of both at the next practical opportunity. I should be tempted to despair of Ireland if I could doubt of your success.

I read with deep and painful interest your published letters² to Lord Grey. What a scene of tyranny and heartless oppression on the one hand! — what a frightful view of wretchedness and misery on the other!

A man is neither a human being nor a Christian who does not devote all his energies to find a remedy for such grievances. But that remedy is not to be found in a British Parliament.

You will see by the papers that the Protestant Dissenters in this country are storming that citadel of intolerance and pride, the Established Church. The effect of such an attack can operate only for good in Ireland. This was the stronghold of the Irish establishment. As long as they had England at their back, they could laugh to scorn all attempts in Ireland to curb them; but I believe, firmly believe, their days are numbered, and hope that we shall see, but certainly not weep.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 421-2

1 James Daly, M.P. and Thomas B. Martin M.P. (Co. Galway).

2 O'Connell must have been referring to the two public letters which MacHale had recently addressed to Earl Grey. They were dated 24 February and 4 March (*FJ*, 27 Feb., 7 Mar. 1834).

2056

To a friend

[c. 1 April 1834]

I did not know the exact spot [in Canterbury Cathedral] where the saint [Thomas Becket] fell martyred but the verger showed it to me. I knelt down and kissed the stone which had received his life-blood. The verger in horror told me that he would be dismissed if the Dean saw that he allowed any 'Popish work' there. I, to console him, asked him his fee and he told me it was a shilling. I gave him half-a-crown, saying that the additional one and sixpence was for his fright. He thanked me and having carefully looked out into the grounds, he said, 'He's not there, Sir; you may kiss it again for nothing. When a real gentleman comes, I let him do as he likes for I am very liberal.' I think that he wanted another half-a-crown but, though I never was in office, I remained on that occasion under the crown.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 425n

2057

To P. V. FitzPatrick

[c. 1 April 1834]

My dear FitzPatrick,

... I have been under the necessity to put my Repeal motion¹ off to the later of my two days, the 22nd, as this vacation is not to terminate until the 14th,² and it would be too soon to have it come on the day after the recess. I should be jockeyed if I were to adhere to *that* day; the 22nd of April is therefore to be 'the great day,' big with the fate of Cato and Rome.

There are no news. The Administration is *toppling on*, all at sixes and sevens amongst themselves, without the least power in the Lords and detested by the people. They cannot go on in their present hopeless state.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 423

1 See letter 2062 n1.

2 Parliament was adjourned from 26 March until 14 April.

2057a

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 7 April 1834

My dear friend,

I spent last week travelling. I went to Canterbury, and thence by the coast to Brighton. A splendid coast occasionally, through a country daily gaining on the sea; but, except near Hastings and Brighton, which are *show* towns, a country manifestly fading and, as they say, *worsening*. The towns on the other parts of the coast are decaying, the farm houses showing a long interval since the last repair, and the picture exhibiting dark colours in a great extent of land.

At Canterbury the Cathedral excited all my attention. They are restoring its ancient architectural beauty but thereby showing more distinctly the nakedness of Protestant worship. But it is a splendid building. I kissed the stone stained with the blood of the holy Martyr of religion and liberty, the illustrious Saint Thomas a Becket, one of the most valuable of the patriots of England. What a gorgeous temple it must have been when the principal altar glistened with gold and jewels in the light of 500 wax candles!

But I should let my prose run mad if I was to indulge my heart and head with the *vision of glory* of seeing that church again devoted to its original purposes and heard the voice of the choir re-echoed through its majestic aisles and transepts.

I am now preparing for my display on the 22nd.¹ My materials have overcome me and I shall disappoint my friends and Ireland by a miserable display.

Could you get from the Distillery or Michael Maley a printed statement respecting the periods at which the Irish Distillers were, since the Union, prohibited from working? I want, in particular, the statement² respecting the stoppages in 1811. I want all the information which was printed on the subject of the Irish Distilleries; I mean the 'wrongs' of the Irish Distillers.

I wish you would see Mr. John McMullen and get from him *printed papers* and any facts he may favour me with respecting the linen trade and in particular, the manner in which the bounty on imported linen yarn operated to shift the trade from Ireland to Scotland.

You have no notion how my zeal for the Repeal has been augmented by my preparations. I repeat, however, my strong sense of my own incapacity to do them justice.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 424-6

- 1 The day for O'Connell's intended motion on repeal (see letter 2062 n1).
- 2 Unidentified. Distilling was frequently prohibited by the government in these years when bad harvests led to a shortage of grain.

2058

To Michael Staunton

London, 9 April 1834

My dear Staunton,

I never felt half *so nervous* about anything as I do about my Repeal effort.¹ It will be my worst. I sink beneath the load. My materials are confused and totally without arrangement. I wish you *could* come here and bring MacCabe.² I would readily be at the entire expense; but you should come without delay. In fact it is at the last moment I venture to write to you on this subject. I say venture, because I am convinced there will be nothing in my speech deserving recollection or any extraordinary exertion, by my friends. It is quite true that I have often desponded before a public exertion and afterwards succeeded, but this cannot now be the case. I feel for the first time *overpowered*. Well, can you come to me? Can you bring MacCabe? If I had in the Galleries here such a reporter as he is of my speeches, sinking the weak points and mending the best, I would stand high among orators. But it is in vain to dwell on minor points. Politics are at present most critical; the approach to a crisis is at least *apparent*. All the predisposing symptoms, as the Doctors say, appear; and yet I should be astonished unless they all evaporate in idle words and foolish menaces. The Trades Unions are in themselves, it is true, formidable but it is only their numbers which render them so, and then they are neutralized by the ignorance, perhaps dishonesty, certainly incapacity, of many of their leaders. I do think the present menacing appearances³ will blow over, and without⁴ considerable popular apathy, and much addition to ministerial power are likely to be the only permanent consequences of the present discontent. At all events, it is purely an English quarrel and the Irish deserve every species of misfortune if they are so foolish as to interpose.⁵ There is, indeed, only one thing certain, that nothing but the Repeal can be of any utility to Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 426-7

- 1 See letter 2062 n1.
- 2 William Bernard MacCabe (1801-1891), author and historian; a journalist

in Ireland from 1823-1835; joined the staff of the *Morning Chronicle* c. 1835; reporter for the *Dublin Morning Register* in 1834; published a Catholic History of England (3 vols.) 1847-54. See *DNB*.

- 3 This period had seen much labour unrest and trade union activity including the establishment in February 1834 of Robert Owen's Grand National Consolidated Trades Union. The labour movement was, however, hampered by lack of education among the workers, inadequate preparation, and disputes between its leaders. The government struck at the movement by making full use of the laws against certain types of trades union activity (Cole, *Short History of the British Working Class*, I, 123-30).
- 4 This word seems incorrect, perhaps due to an editing mistake on the part of W.J. FitzPatrick. The word 'that' (instead of 'without') would suit the meaning of the sentence.
- 5 Nevertheless O'Connell did interpose, as the principal speaker at a meeting in London on 18 April to petition the Commons in favour of the 'Tolpuddle Martyrs' (six farm labourers sentenced to seven years transportation for having administered unlawful oaths in forming a trades union branch). In his speech he accused the government of lacking the moral courage to mitigate the sentences. He said that he had been asked that day by a deputation of trade unionists to become their 'confidential and leading counsel'. He had replied that he would act in that capacity provided they would be led by his advice and would abstain from acting illegally (*DEP*, 22 Apr. 1834).

2059

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[c. 10 April 1834]

My dear FitzPatrick,

I feel lonely and somewhat surprised that I do not hear of or from you. I hope ill-health is not the cause.

Next Tuesday week is *the day* for the grand discussion.¹

I want *this* information:

First, *The History of the Rise and Downfall of the Irish Nation*,² one vol., by Sir Jonah Barrington. I lost mine; it was *borrowed*.

Second, Plowden's *History*,³ the first work and also the second. You will, I think, find the first in the small back study in my house at the Square.

Thirdly, I do not find the account of the dispersion of County meetings called by Sheriffs to petition against the Union. I recollect one dispersed at Maryborough. I want the exact dates and *a book* to quote them from. Another was dispersed at Clonmel.

Fourthly, I want the reports of the Irish Lords and Commons in 1797 and 1798.⁴ The first especially, to show that the Government were in possession of the meetings of the Colonels of the United Irishmen for more than a year before the Rebellion

exploded.

These *must* be sent to me by the first coach. No delay can I afford.

I wrote to Staunton to come to me. Think you can he come? I wrote also for MacCabe. If he comes, I will publish my speech as a pamphlet,⁵ with a preface, address, appendix and observations on any case in reply. He is the man for MY money.

But, after all, I can make but little, miserably little, of my subject. Would to God it were in abler hands!

The moment we are defeated I will reorganize the Repeal agitation on a new plan.

No news. Great *commercial* distress or at least manufacturing; of course agricultural. The Trades Union either going to sleep or to rebel;⁶ foolish in either case and wicked too.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 423-4

1 See letter 2062 n1.

2 See letter 2043 n4.

3 Francis Peter Plowden, *An Historical Review of the State of Ireland, from the invasion of that country under Henry II to its Union with Great Britain . . . 1801*, 2 vols., (London, 1803).

4 The reports of the secret committee of the Irish House of Lords in 1797 and 1798 are in *Irish Lords Journal*, VII, 580-81 (Dublin, 1799) and VIII, 138-64, 171-2 (Dublin, 1800). The reports of the secret committee of the Irish House of Commons are in *Irish Commons Journal*, XVII, appdx. CCLXXVIII-CCXC (Dublin, 1797) and appdx. DCCCCXXIX-DCCCCLIX (Dublin, 1798).

5 See letter 2081 n5.

6 See letter 2058.

2060

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[c. 12 April 1834]

My dear FitzPatrick,

Magee's memorial¹ shall be as *well* treated as I can promise it to be. On this subject you shall hear from me again. An accident prevented its going forward in a favourable shape sooner. But surely you and Mr. Magee both know that its coming through me is a disparagement.

This I endeavoured to obviate but I cannot and so must do the best I can. We have in all its details a rascally Government.

Could you get Staunton or Barrett to republish the speech² made by Boyton at the Conservative Club³ on the financial part of the Union?

Shall I make a quiet or a wicked speech?⁴ Wicked for ever — is it not so?

I got the Bishops' resolutions.⁵ I regret bitterly that the old love of Ireland does not predominate. We must in private expostulate with them *separately*. This I will endeavour to do, but *privately*, of all things.⁶

How anxious I am to know whether Staunton and MacCabe can come.⁷ MacCabe must have one or two to help him with my speech. We will arrange with the *Freeman*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 428-9

1 Unidentified.

2 This speech has not been identified. Neither Staunton (*Morning Register*) nor Barrett (*Pilot*) appears to have republished it.

3 The Irish Protestant Conservative Society.

4 That is, on introducing his motion in favour of Repeal (see letter 2062 n1).

5 Two resolutions which were unanimously adopted by the Irish Catholic hierarchy at their annual meeting in Dublin on 28 January 1834. The resolutions expressed the determination of the bishops in future to prevent chapels being used for the holding of political meetings, and their determination to recommend to the clergy of their respective dioceses to avoid alluding to politics from the altar and to refrain in the future from connecting themselves with political clubs or meetings (Broderick, *Holy See and Repeal*, 59.)

6 See letter 2072.

7 See letter 2058.

2061

From J. Michie¹ to Dublin redirected to Cahirciveen

Calcutta, 15 April 1834

Sir,

I avail myself of the departure of a steamer from hence to Suez to convey to you the expression of the gratitude I feel towards you in common with other Catholics of this country for your able and zealous exertions in behalf of our holy religion in these regions. I will not attempt to express my own feeling in regard to your conduct as words are inadequate to their expression. Your fame is over all the civilised world. Your very name conveys to the mind an idea of all that is great and dignified in human nature.

Former letters will have fully acquainted you with the anxiety of the Catholics of this place for Irish pastors. They have since learned with considerable apprehension that strenuous exertions are made by the Italian mission in Ava and Madras to have their jurisdiction extended over Bengal and that representations have

been secretly concocted, purporting to come from the people and to convey their sentiments, and forwarded to Rome.

All the objections which exist against the Portuguese priesthood are applicable to the Italians who have for the last 5 years fomented quarrels and encouraged rebellion among the priests with a view of getting the Church and its funds into their own possession.

Fredrica Cao, Bishop of Zama and Vicar Apostolic in Ava, has lately been here and proved himself a zealous partisan. His conduct has been alike weak and unworthy. At the instigation of the late Mr. Barretto, the Marquis of Wellesley, when Governor General here, obtained from the Ecclesiastical Authority at Goa permission for the Catholics of Calcutta to elect the Vicar of the principal church, and hence all the scandalous disputes and dissensions which have so long disgraced Catholicity and torn its professors in this country into factions. A general understanding however obtained that none were to vote at the election of Vicar or Wardens, who were so ignorant as not to be able sign their own name. In the case of the present Vicar who was elected by the suffrage of native seamen, this rule was violated. At the biennial election of wardens the principle of universal suffrage was contended for by one party and opposed by the other. . . . Catholic soldiers of H.M. 49th Regiment, who had been nearly 2 years in Calcutta, considered themselves eligible to vote. . . . [the Bishop objected to their voting and, on their refusing to leave, he left the meeting which "elected its own chairman and proceeded to ballot. The result was that 3 others and myself were elected wardens by a majority of about 150 votes independently of the soldiers of whom there were about 200 present." The Bishop protested to the Supreme Court and made false charges against the Irish soldiers as having ill-used and insulted him. "They know but little of the character of Irish Catholics who can believe that 200 Irishmen would agree to insult a bishop in the church and to drag him from his Chair."]. I mention these circumstances in order to show how little we should gain by having Italian instead of Portuguese priests especially as the Bishop has stated that he has applied to Rome to have his jurisdiction extended to Calcutta. . . . Universal suffrage is admitted. Every native seaman who knows nothing of his religion beyond the mere name is allowed to vote, and the same party oppose the right of soldiers to vote for no reason that I can discover unless it be that they are Irishmen and serve their country. If a soldier, as is often the case, has a Christian servant, the servant's right to vote is indisputable while his master's is questionable. Their late conduct however has done much good. As we were elected consequent on a decreetal Order of the Supreme Court we

will apply to it for confirmation. . . . The result will be hereafter made known to you.

The Government at home will endeavour to evade the fulfilment of the pledge made to you by Mr. Grant in the House of Commons.² It will try to cajole and deceive you by saying that general instructions have been sent to the local government. Whatever should be done, must be done at home, as nothing is to be expected in favour of the Catholic Faith from this Government. Indeed Lord Bentinck³ has distinctly stated in a public document that it is an object of this Government to abstain from giving any "Encouragement or countenance to the Romish Faith." The petitions of the Catholic soldiery for Irish priests would never have been sent home had not the Catholics of the Honourable Company's Artillery sent in a petition addressed to the Court of Directors which the Government was obliged to forward and which rendered the suppression of the other petitions impracticable.

[P.S.] As a member of the East India Committee,⁴ you can refer to the following documents which will fully convince you of the ill feeling of the local Government towards the Catholic Religion:

Cons. 26th of August 1831 Nos. 64 and 68.

Cons. 7th of October 1831 No. 5.

Cons. 13th of January 1832 No. 78.

Cons. 12th of March 1832 No. 21.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Michie (c. 1802-1847), a Catholic, examiner in the secret and political department of the East India Company at Calcutta. At his death he was deputy-register of the foreign department. In his will, dated 13 January 1847, he directed that his private papers be destroyed. He died in the camp of the governor general at Bootawallah and was buried at Ferozepore on 19 January 1847. (India Office Records Library, London).
- 2 The East India Company bill (see letter 1988 n10) provided for the establishment of two Anglican bishops in India in place of one. In the Commons on 19 July 1833 O'Connell asked for an undertaking that it was not the intention of the government to give the Anglican church any dominance over the Catholic and Presbyterian communities. He also asked that clergy who were British subjects be appointed as chaplains to army regiments in the service of the Company since most of the Catholics in these regiments were Irish. Charles Grant, President of the Board of Control and the sponsor of the bill, replied that the government had no intention of giving the Anglican church in India any domination over other Christian denominations, and he said he believed that Catholic soldiers there ought to be given chaplains who were British subjects. Althorp, the chancellor of the exchequer, made a statement to the same effect concerning the Anglican church. O'Connell expressed himself as entirely satisfied with the statements of the two ministers (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1833, III, 3168-72).
- 3 Lord William Henry Cavendish Bentinck (1774-1839), second son of the

3rd duke of Portland; governor-general of Bengal 1827; first governor-general of India 1833-35; M.P. Glasgow 1837-39. See *DNB*.

- 4 On 27/28 January 1832 the Commons appointed a select committee, of which O'Connell was a member, to consider the affairs of the East India Company and to inquire into the trade between Great Britain, the East Indies and China. The committee delivered its report to the Commons on 16 August 1832.

2062

To Edward Dwyer

[London], 24 April 1834

[Exerpt]

I knocked myself up after my five hours' speech¹ by going too soon into the night air without a cloak; but having confined myself to the house the entire of yesterday, I have got quite rid of sore throat and headache and am able to join again in the debate tonight.

I never felt more buoyant in spirits nor so strong in my hopes of Repeal, as at this moment. When an accurate report² of my speech appears, as it will without delay, from the notes of Mr. MacCabe, with the documentary illustrations, I *do* think it will make an impression in Ireland. I was unable to use a tenth part of the materials with which I am provided, and I exhausted half my speech in proving *the rights*.³ Up to this moment all is not only well but infinitely better than could have been expected, and nothing but keeping up religious dissensions in Ireland can possibly prevent us from becoming too powerful in moral influence to allow the *nation* to continue much longer in the condition of a province.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 429

- 1 On 22 April O'Connell introduced his long-awaited Repeal motion. He moved with a very long speech, 'That a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire and report on the means by which the Dissolution of the Parliament of Ireland was effected; on the effects of that measure upon Ireland, and upon the Labourers in Husbandry and Operatives in Manufactures in England; and on the probable consequences of continuing the Legislative Union between both Countries.' In the previous June O'Connell had persuaded his followers to postpone any attempt to introduce a Repeal motion (see letter 1984 n2), 'But . . . much against his will, was finally forced to maintain the unity of his party by promising a future discussion.' (MacIntyre, *The Liberator*, 126). After five days of debate, in the course of which fourteen Repeal M.P.'s spoke in support of O'Connell's motion, a division took place on 29 April, when the motion was defeated by 523 to 38. O'Connell never again brought a repeal motion into parliament.

- 2 The *Morning Register* of 28 April published a special account of the speech, and on 25 April the *Pilot* published the speech 'the first portion supplied by our own Reporter, the latter part collated from those of the English papers which came nearest to the spirit of the original.'
- 3 By this O'Connell meant the rights of Ireland which he alleged in his speech had been taken from her by the Act of Union.

2063

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, Friday, 25 April 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is going on exceedingly well.¹ Emerson Tennent² *printed* a long abusive speech of which he delivered as much as he could recollect. He was cut up exceedingly well by Feargus O'Connor who made an effective speech. Littleton was very poor; Barron³ not very great, as you would easily imagine. It is admitted in the House that my speech is altogether unanswered. In fact I took grounds of fact and history to which there could not be any reply save dissenting from the question and sophisticating on other facts or figures. The entire question, as debated, turns on these *two points*: first, did Ireland prosper after 1782 under her own parliament? The Government say, no. Has she prospered since the Union? The Government say, yes.

You, therefore, see at once how completely triumphant our case is with the People of Ireland. But I sat down principally to bid you be of good cheer. You may see in the *Morning Herald* of this day the admission that my speech was *very dexterous for its purposes*. I hope you will agree when you see the correct report. At all events, I can confidently assert it was totally unanswered.

See Barrett and tell him I will write to him tomorrow and give him 'private correspondence'⁴ regularly in future. This fact is not to be communicated to anybody but to Barrett himself.

Again I repeat that we Repealers have made great *moral* way in the opinion of the House. The members in their private conversations have but one opinion on the subject.

In the meantime, the discontents in this country are accumulating. The agricultural distress and the disaffection amongst the operatives, give them matter to think of at home.

Hurrah for the Repeal!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 429-30

- 1 In the debate on O'Connell's Repeal motion (see letter 2062 n1).

- 2 James Emerson Tennent (1804-1869), The Lodge, Co. Antrim; called to the bar 1831; M.P. for Belfast 1832-45; knighted 1845; created a baronet 1867. See *DNB*.
 3 Henry Winston Barron.
 4 See letter 1951 n5.

2064

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 29 April 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

... We close the debate¹ this night. I do not think we shall have one single English member with us.² Yet I congratulate you and the country on the result. Six days' debate on a question which we were told would be overwhelmed at once, and the result of the engagement, stripped of extraneous matter, decidedly with us. It indeed turns upon the single fact, whether or not Ireland has prospered by or since the Union. Rice³ *figures* Ireland into Prosperity. Is Ireland prosperous? Whoever thinks not refutes Rice's entire case and that of the Unionists. Whoever says 'Yes' gives Rice the victory.

This in one line is the state of the argument. I need not say how triumphant, alas! does the real misery of Ireland render our case. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 431

- 1 On O'Connell's Repeal motion (see letter 2062 n1).
 2 Only one member for a British constituency, James Kennedy, M.P. for Tiverton, voted for O'Connell's motion. On 7 May Kennedy explained that he was opposed to Repeal but had voted for the motion because he thought that the effect of the Union on Ireland was a subject worthy of examination (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, p. 1568). On 21 April Kennedy said he had no connection with Ireland and had never been there (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, p. 1156).
 3 Thomas Spring Rice, then secretary to the treasury. His speech in favour of the Union contained many statistics.

2065

To John Dower,¹ Dungarvan

London, 1 May 1834

My dear Sir,

I know your regard for me, and I am truly grateful for it. All I

will say to you is, that if you wish me to continue my political life, nay, if you value my personal health and peace of mind, you will return me and Jacob again for Dungarvan.² I won't say more to you save this, that if he be again returned, look to me for the performance, according to your own *interpretation*, of the promise³ we made you. Nay, whether he be returned or not, I take the thing on myself between you and me; and I now pledge myself to you unequivocally that you shall be satisfied in any event.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Dower, brewer.
- 2 The borough of Dungarvan returned only one member. By 'me' O'Connell meant his political cause. The election in February 1834 of Ebenezer Jacob, Repeal candidate for Dungarvan, was declared invalid. (see letter 2050 n1). He was reelected on 16 May 1834, defeating Pierce George Barron by 293 to 269 (FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 432). A petition against Jacob's return on this occasion complaining of bribery and other illegal means, was presented to the Commons on 4 June but on 7 July a select committee declared Jacob duly elected.
- 3 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, Dower was still claiming fulfilment of this promise in 1839 when 'he had been ruined in his business as a brewer by the temperance movement of Father Mathew.' The sum he claimed was £350 (FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 432).

2066

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 7 May 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

See Reynolds¹ for me and beg of him not to agitate for a Repeal meeting for the present.² This is a critical moment and I am endeavouring to make the most of it for Ireland. Either the Ministry will concede to me the Tithe question³ or they will not. If so, I lighten the burden of Tithes three-fifths and procure a share of the fund for Hospitals, Infirmarys, Dispensaries and Glebes. If, on the contrary, no concession is made, then I will be able to recommence the Repeal agitation with tenfold force after having given this fair and fortunate trial to the British Parliament.

You must not suppose that there is the least relaxation in my opinions on the subject of the Repeal. My conviction on that subject is really unalterable, but I will get *what I can* and use the Repeal *in terrorem* merely until it is wise and necessary to recommence the agitation. It is quite discreet not to give the Ministry

any excuse for further coercive measures or for continuing any part of the Coercion Bill.⁴ The house of commons would be ready enough to do anything against Ireland which the Ministry may ask. I will not give them any excuse. I will seek for practical benefits for Ireland in a tone and temper beyond reproach and until the Session terminates, I will not give the Ministers the least excuse for Algerine laws of any description. I will not publish my 'Hereditary bondsmen'⁵ letter until the Tithe Bill is decided. Lord John Russell was manly and determined last night⁶ and there are reasons to believe that I shall contribute to a great 'Tithe revolution' even before this Session closes. It is curious that I should, in spite of me, feel sorry that the Ministry should have the grace to yield to my demand; but even so, it would perhaps strengthen the Repeal demand by lessening the number of those who now oppose it from interested or bigoted motives. I must conclude. Take care that this letter does not get into print.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 432-3

1 Thomas Reynolds.

2 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, a note attached to this letter in P.V. FitzPatrick's handwriting declares 'The arrival of this letter prevented the publication of a formidable requisition for a meeting to renew the Repeal agitation. The requisition was actually in type, but the subscribers deferred at once to O'Connell's recommendation.' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 433).

3 On the previous day O'Connell had submitted to the Commons a plan originally proposed by David Roche, M.P. It proposed 'that one-fifth of the tithe composition, revalued, should be struck off altogether; that one-fifth should be paid out of the Consolidated Fund; one-fifth to be a charge, redeemable on the inheritance; and the remaining two-fifths to be paid by the occupiers' (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 299-300). O'Connell's proposals on this occasion were not accepted by the government.

4 See letter 1955a n1.

5 O'Connell was in the habit of heading his public addresses to the people of Ireland with the lines: 'Hereditary bondsmen, Know ye not Who would be free themselves must strike the blow.' It is taken from Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Canto II, Stanza LXXVI.

6 In the debate on the government's Irish tithes bill on 6 May Russell suddenly declared that, when parliament had settled the tithe question, he would be prepared to assert his opinion on the appropriation of the church's surplus revenues. He thus 'upset the coach', initiating a crisis which led to the resignation from the government on 27 May of Stanley, Graham, Richmond and Ripon (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 131). See letter 2073 n8.

2067

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 8 May 1834

Private

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write merely to say that you should see my friend Reynolds as speedily as possible, and give him in strict confidence my most anxious advice not to call any meeting *directly* or *indirectly* on the subject of the Repeal for some weeks.¹ He is not a man to yield to mere authority although I do believe he has some confidence in me, but he will yield to a just and sound reason. Now that reason is, that the parliament are ready to enact any law, however atrocious, to meet Repeal agitation. My game therefore is, and it ought to be that of every sound Repealer, to suspend any demonstration on our part until the session shall be so far advanced as not to leave time for any other Coercion Bill. Reynolds will see that I am not only taking this view but am actively engaged in looking for practical relief in the most *temperate* way from *this* parliament for Ireland. If, while I take this line on the one hand and Ireland is silent on the other, any further coercive attempt is made, see on what strong grounds I shall be able to oppose it, and what a Repeal reawaking speech I shall be able to make in that opposition! Put this view before Reynolds and other honest Repealers and I think they will be likely to concur with me in a short postponement of any meeting. I am working the Tithe question *well*. You have no idea, and I *cannot* tell you how far I have proceeded towards success. A Repeal meeting may *at present* thwart my purposes. I want either to get solid advantages for Ireland or to show that quietness, humility of deportment and irresistible argument are all put aside by the fell genius of despotic domination over our miserable country. You see what I gain in the one case and also in the other. Implore, then, of Reynolds and of the other honest Repealers to allow my experiment its full development. He may depend on it that the cause of Repeal will not, and *shall not*, suffer by a short postponement of *direct* agitation.

The Ministry is greatly *staggered*² on the tithe question. This is their time to make a great experiment for Ireland but they will let it pass — and *then* — Hurrah for Repeal!

In short, Reynolds will understand my plan and, *I believe*, act upon it.

You will take care not to allow this letter to get into the newspapers.

For myself, I am in perfect health and spirits, blessed be God! Now I laugh at the chuckling triumph³ of our silly and mercenary Irish Unionists. Poor creatures! they are like the Indian savages who occasionally in dark nights fear that the sun is extinguished for ever and will never rise again. Naboclish!!⁴ But do all you can to allow me to play off in full light the falsehood of the promise in the address to the King⁵ to remove all just subjects of complaint in Ireland. It is of precious importance that I should not be interrupted in that part *of my duty*.

How does Barrett bear his imprisonment?⁶

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 433-5

1 See letter 2066.

2 See letter 2066 n6.

3 A reference to the defeat of his Repeal motion (see letter 2062 n1).

4 A corruption of the Gaelic 'Na bac leis' (i.e. pay it no heed).

5 On 30 April following the defeat of O'Connell's Repeal motion (see letter 2062 n1), both houses of parliament presented a joint address to the king pledging 'our fixed determination to maintain unimpaired and undisturbed the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland, which we consider to be essential to the strength and stability of the empire, to the continuance of the connection between the two countries, and to the peace, security and happiness of all classes of your majesty's subjects.' At the same time it pledged 'that we shall persevere in applying our best attention to the removal of all just causes of complaint, and to the promotion of all well-considered measures of improvement' (*Annual Register*, 1834, 34-5).

6 See letter 1975a n1.

2068

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 10 May 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Magee's memorial¹ has not as yet been transmitted. I intended to have looked particularly to it so soon as the Repeal question terminated for this session. But although the Duke of Richmond² did not resign, yet he was 'a screw loose' for some time, and no prospect could be held out of particular attention to anything exclusively Irish. The moment a new postmaster-general³ is appointed I will, you may be sure, attend particularly to that memorial and if either Lords Durham or Radnor be appointed the thing shall be done.

As to Wexford, Sir Thomas Esmonde declines, although I urged him in the strongest manner.⁴ I wish you would at once see my friend John Power and get him to consent to stand, either himself

or his son.⁵ I urged Nich[olas] Fitz-Simon strongly on this point. But do you get a decision from the father at once. If either Power stands, then we will commence our canvass at once. If they refuse, suggest Sharman Crawford from me. He should not get a public invitation until we had sounded the constituency and were able to promise his return. I will write this day or tomorrow to an influential ecclesiastic who will tell me how the land lies.

Call on my friend Jeremiah Dunne⁶ and consult with him as to Kildare.⁷ Tell him my plan would be to support O'Ferrall if there had been a real concession made to Ireland on the Tithe question but that is not the case. On the contrary, the Bill⁸ is to be *very, very bad*, even with all its changes. And again, there is no pledge against renewing the Coercion Bill⁹ so that under existing circumstances I believe Mr. O'Ferrall will not resign his seat; but if he do resign his seat by accepting office, I cannot see how it is possible for the friends of Ireland not to oppose him. At least my inclination would be, under such circumstances, to give him all the opposition in my power. It turns on this: will the Ministry do anything *substantial* FOR Ireland? Will they declare that they will not do something more *against* Ireland? Unless we get a security, or rather securities, of these descriptions I am for opposing every man connected with the present ministry. I will do so reluctantly as regards O'Ferrall, who has some good points about him and would be better if he were not mixed up with the unsavoury Cloncurry Clique-*een* which, you *know*, is the [Gaelic] diminutive of Clique.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 435-6

1 Unidentified.

2 Charles (Lennox), 5th duke of Richmond (1791-1860), assumed the additional surname of Gordon in 1836; postmaster-general November 1830 - May 1834. See *DNB*. See letter 2066 n6.

3 Francis Nathaniel (Conyngham), 2nd Marquess Conyngham was appointed postmaster-general on 5 July 1834.

4 See letter 2082 n2.

5 James Power (1800-1877), only son of John Power, distiller of Dublin; M.P. for Co. Wexford 1835-47, 1865-68. Succeeded in 1855 as second baronet. See *Boase*.

6 Jeremiah Dunne, later town councillor for St. Andrew's Ward, Dublin; 14 Fitzwilliam Square, S., Dublin.

7 See letter 2075 n2.

8 See letter 2066

9 See letter 1955a n1.

2069

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Monday, 19 May 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

... Tell Barrett there is no news. A strong party making up¹ to compel the Ministry to yield to some common sense measures for Ireland; but it is believed that Lord Grey is personally too hostile to our unhappy country to accede to anything substantially useful. In the meantime, I am apt to think that the King is getting too mad to be any longer — or at least much longer — under control. It is said that he lately reviewed a regiment of the Guards more than once on the same day. Other stories are told of at least an equally equivocal character. But this is a subject which must, if at all, be touched on with the greatest delicacy and an expression of deep regret. It would not be right to allude to insanity at all or to talk of anything but the King's health not being as satisfactory as could be desired.

But all this is matter of great delicacy. It may, however, be right to have the public soon become acquainted with a distinct idea of the real fact. However, *not* for the present. In short, let Barrett use a cautious discretion.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 436-7

1 See letter 2071 n1.

2070

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 22 May 1834

Confidential

My dear FitzPatrick,

We are in such a state of suspense that I do not know how to write. My Tithe plan¹ is shaking the Cabinet. But there is so much rascality towards Ireland that they will make up between themselves in order to combine against us. I expect nothing from them but the most distinct proof of the necessity of renewing the Repeal cry, a renewal which is indeed inevitable but must be postponed as long as possible so as to take away all excuse from our enemies.

Tell Croker and Codd, with my compliments, that it is impossible

to get at the evidence² before Sir H. Parnell until Lord Althorp develops that mystical plan which he promised at the beginning of the session by which Ireland was, or is, to be relieved of much of the burdens without any diminution in what she pays in revenue.³ As soon, therefore, as possible I will endeavour to procure the evidence they wish for, if it ever be possible.

I am to have the ministerial determination,⁴ they say, on Saturday. No stone has been left unturned to arrange the Tithe question satisfactorily *to the people*. But I must conclude.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 437-8

1 See letter 2066 n3.

2 See letter 1976 n5.

3 Speaking on the budget on 14 February, O'Connell had declared 'the noble Lord [Althorp] . . . told them, that there was some plan in store for Ireland, but what it was he could not conjecture. All that the noble Lord had, with his usual clearness, permitted to be understood was, that Ireland was to pay as much money at present [in taxation] and still, that it was to be relieved. Relieved of what, he asked? No doubt of the balance. . . . They were to have Irish relief; to wit, nothing!! (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXI, 378).

4 Immediately after Russell's outburst (see letter 2066 n6) O'Connell informed the government through Sir Francis Burdett that if his own tithe plan (see letter 2066 n3) were adopted 'he would answer for quieting the whole country', and admitting that his position was a disagreeable one, virtually offered his services as Irish attorney-general. Grey was at first surprisingly favourable but eventually refused the offer (MacIntyre, *The Liberator*, 132-3).

2071

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 29 May 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

This is a moment when one should write if it were only to say that there are no news. I cannot exactly say *that* but yet there are but few facts actually known. It is, however, quite certain that the alteration in the Cabinet¹ will be all in favour of popular freedom. It is not known how far the changes are likely to extend but it is beyond any doubt that Lord Grey has the absolute power to appoint to the vacancies. The four Cabinet ministers named yesterday in the papers are the only persons whose resignations are accepted. Doubts are entertained whether Lord Lansdowne will remain. On the other hand, *no new appointment* has as yet been made. But I think I may assure you that Mr. Abercrombie, who

was agent in chief to the Duke of Devonshire, is to be *in the new cabinet*.² This is most propitious for Ireland. He voted against the Coercion Bill and is a man with whom *one* could have confidential communications. He thinks with me on the tithe question and, in short, he is the Cabinet minister who would be most useful to the people of Ireland. Stanley is irrevocably gone in public opinion and Sir James Graham is looked on as a political goose of the most foolish class. It is well to have the worst part of the Government thrown overboard.

As to myself, I have nothing new to tell you. Indeed, you are quite aware that I look for measures only. I would not, and indeed could not, do anything which may by any possibility implicate me with any party save one determined to do *full justice* to Ireland. However, we shall see by the end of the next forty-eight hours what is to be. I must conclude. Be of good cheer.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 438-9

- 1 The resignation on 27 May of Stanley, Graham, Richmond and Ripon (see letter 2066 n6).
- 2 James Abercromby was appointed master of the mint and a member of the cabinet on 1 July 1834.

2072

To Archbishop Michael Slattery

London, 29 May 1834

My respected Lord,

I beg to acknowledge the honour of your Grace's letter and to express my sincere regret that you should deem it necessary to make me any apology. I would hope that you, my respected Lord, would feel yourself entitled to command any services of mine without excuse or apology.

As to the question of law which you ask, the solution is this. The marriage between a Catholic and a person being or having been within the twelve months before the marriage a Protestant — if celebrated by a Catholic priest only — is still void, but the Catholic priest incurs no penalty and is not liable to any prosecution. The words underlined constitute the alteration of the law and the only alteration¹ in that law. Thus therefore all peril to the Catholic priest is at an end but the marriage is not the less void at law.

Now that I have this opportunity of addressing your Grace, permit me to offer my respectful and very cordial congratulations

upon your devotion to the high and sacred office you now fill. It is true it is one not only of great honour and dignity but of most *critical* importance in times like these. The Church has sustained persecution in Ireland and has passed through that furnace brighter and with more solidity. But alas the gentle gales of Castle favour may possibly have a greater tendency to separate the flock from the pastors and thus to leave them a prey, more especially if it came to be believed that the shutting up of our places of worship from the assemblies of the people² desirous of national regeneration was occasioned by any compliance with the wishes of a Government neither loved nor respected by that people. To you, my Lord, I do not hesitate to think on paper on this subject because I well know the confidence which is reposed in the high-minded integrity of your Grace as well in the cause of your long afflicted country as in the more solemn and sacred one of your religion and your God.

You are aware that the subject of procuring glebes and parochial houses for the Catholic clergy is a favourite of mine.³ I wish it could be done by voluntary contributions but I would also accept assistance from the state for that purpose. I however beg leave to say that if such a proposition is seriously contemplated with a *probability* of its being capable of execution I will take the liberty of laying before your Grace all the details of my plan before they are finally determined upon and will request the aid of your counsel and advice on the subject.

The Administration is as yet unformed⁴ but it is consolatory to think that it must assume a more liberal form. The reduction of the sinecure establishment of the Law Church in Ireland is now pretty nearly secure. The Ministry are endeavouring to consolidate their strength by getting the support of popular men but they must bid for such men by agreeing to popular measures. As to myself I am perhaps not worth *purchasing* but if they think I am, they can *buy* me only by doing justice, full justice to Catholic Ireland. All will be settled before Monday next. Nothing is as yet concluded.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 A reference to an act passed on 29 August 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 102) for the repeal of such parts of 6 Anne c. 1, 12 Geo. I c. 1, 23 Geo. II c. 1, and 12 and 33 Geo. III c. 1 'as contains any penal Enactment which exclusively affects a Roman Catholic Clergyman celebrating Marriage between any Persons knowing them or either of them at the time of such Marriage to be of the Protestant Religion. . . .'
- 2 See letter 2060 n5.
- 3 See letter 1597.
- 4 See letter 2066 n6.

2073

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 30 May 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

News, *unimportant* news that is, for the present. There never was a mountain in labour produced a more ridiculous mouse. Only think, with unlimited power to select an efficient Cabinet, Lords Grey and Brougham have taken pains to strike 'the brains' out of the Ministry and to substitute figures of straw — what Cobbett calls *Thee-boys* — to frighten away the crows from corn. They have not selected any one man of talent. In addition to their former gang, Lord Auckland¹ and Lord Carlisle² get seats in the Cabinet. So does Ellice, the only national man in it. Spring Rice goes to the Colonies if he can be returned again.³ He has gone down to canvass. Poulet Thompson⁴ succeeds Lord Auckland as actual President of the Board of Trade — that is, if the people of Manchester will return him again.⁵ The only one Irish man consulted was More O'Ferrall; he is to be a Lord of the Treasury.⁶ When I last knew Kildare it would have been hard for him to secure an election, although quite sure he did right to accept office, as his holding it is a brain blow to that Orange party which poor Lord Anglesey raised to a new vitality in Ireland. This Cabinet has come upon us by surprise. It is full of foolishness and drivelling. It will require new hands as well as heads and hearts to keep Lord Grey in power; but there is this advantage that they must, even by reason of their weakness, adopt useful measures. The temporalities of the Established Church in Ireland will get a sweeping blow on Monday.

Ward's⁷ motion will be carried by an immense majority⁸ and the future arrangements of the Tithe Bill will be liable to salutary alteration. It is no small comfort that Stanley is *hors de combat*. He was the worst of the bad in everything which relates to Ireland. It is no small matter to have him removed from the Government. Only think of that High Churchman, Lord Plunket, continuing in office⁹ after the present attack on the Church! but the money-pot retains him. It is clear that we are on the road to further changes and that they must be in the direction of the popular cause. At all events, the ascendancy party in Ireland has received a warning such as precedes inevitable dissolution. Oh, how I crow over the spring which the Ministers are giving to *the Repeal*!

They are annihilating the opposition to it which was alone formidable — that of the Clerical and Protestant party in Ireland.

If I had hired them expressly to play the game of the Repealers they would not do it half so well. They are disgusting and scattering the Orange party and they have not manliness to do substantial justice to the people at large.

Hurrah for the Repeal!

Of course I will not disturb the present calm until we have the Appropriation Clause secured and so long as there is a prospect of carrying into effect my Tithe scheme.¹⁰ Again I tell you to be of good cheer.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 439-41

- 1 George (Eden), 2nd Baron Auckland (1784-1849); president of the board of trade and master of the mint 1830-34; first lord of the admiralty June-November 1834, April-September 1835 and 1846-49; governor-general of India 1835-41; created earl of Auckland 1839. See *DNB*.
- 2 George (Howard), 6th earl of Carlisle (1773-1848), cabinet minister and lord privy seal July 1827 to January 1828 and June to July 1834; cabinet minister (without office) 1830-34. See *DNB*.
- 3 Rice was appointed secretary of state for war and the colonies on 5 July 1834. He carried his reelection for Cambridge, consequent to his appointment by only 25 votes over his opponent, Sir Edward Burtenshaw Sugden (*Annual Register*, 1834, 43).
- 4 Charles Edward Poulett Thomson (1799-1841), M.P. for Dover 1826-32, for Manchester 1832-39; vice president of the board of trade and treasurer of the navy 1830-34; president of the board of trade July to November 1834 and 1835-39; governor-general of Canada 1839-41; created Baron Sydenham in 1840. See *DNB*.
- 5 Charles Poulett Thomson was not obliged to seek reelection since as vice president of the board of trade he already held office.
- 6 See letter 2075 n2.
- 7 Henry George Ward (1797-1860), M.P. for St. Albans 1832-37; for Sheffield 1837-52; knighted 1849. See *DNB*.
- 8 On 27 May, Henry G. Ward moved 'that the Protestant Episcopal Establishment in Ireland exceeds the spiritual wants of the Protestant population; and that it being the right of the State to regulate the distribution of Church Property in such manner as Parliament may determine, it is the opinion of this House, that the temporal possessions of the Church of Ireland, as now established by law, ought to be reduced.' It was the introduction of this motion which precipitated the resignation of Stanley, Graham, Richmond and Ripon (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 163-4). The debate was adjourned to 2 June when Ward's motion was defeated by 396 to 120, the government opposing it as inappropriate. (*Ibid*, 168-9).
- 9 As lord chancellor of Ireland.
- 10 See letter 2066 n3.

2074

To Edward J. Littleton

Saturday afternoon, 31 May 1834

Confidential

My dear Sir,

I am quite uneasy least I should have in any way tended in our conversation this day to mislead you. What I fear I have not sufficiently pressed upon your attention is the utter *impossibility* of *managing* Ireland by the means of words, promises or even *enquiries*. The abortion of the Corporate enquiry¹ will have the effect of throwing an utter discredit on *any* other. You cannot be *served* with the Irish people without *actions*.

Excuse me for giving you this trouble but my anxiety is unfeigned for such measures as may enable *all the Irish* to rally round the Government and also for the present I see little hope of our being able to do *any* thing for you.

One sentence of yours struck me this day as *denoting* the continuance of the present system in Ireland. You said a certain person *there* would do anything to keep his place. You do not know that he has much legal patronage of his own — all working against your principles. You also do not know this trait in the Irish character. They care not half so much for the promotion of friends as they do for the removal of enemies.

Again I beg your pardon for these observations upon you but we are in a crisis and I would not be supposed to have left any impression on your mind inconsistent with the imperative, the *unavoidable* necessity of adopting *measures* to conciliate Ireland. I would almost become a parrot to cry 'Words won't do,' 'Promises won't do,' 'Pledges won't do,' 'Enquiries won't do.'

Facts — actions — deeds: these, or everything else is thrown away, absolutely thrown away.

SOURCE: Hatherton Papers, Staffordshire County Record Office

- 1 A commission to inquire into the corporations of England, Wales and Ireland was appointed in 1833 (see letter 1990 n6). The government promised in February 1834 when rejecting O'Connell's proposed bill for the reform of Dublin corporation (see letter 2043 n6) that the report of the commission would very soon be published. On 18 July, however, in reply to a question from Dominick Ronayne as to 'whether it was the intention of the government to lay the report of the commissioners before the house that session' Littleton declared 'that as soon as the report was made it would be laid before the house, but he did not expect that the report would be laid before his Majesty sooner than November next' (*Pilot*, 21 July 1834).

2075

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 3 June 1834

... I sincerely regret the death of my excellent and worthy old friend Andrew Ennis. I wanted to have him to be Lord Mayor of Dublin. May the great God be merciful to him!

The Ministry is, as you perceive, quite unformed.¹ All that is certain is that the Tories cannot come in and that Stanley has extinguished himself as a public man. The world will never go back to him, and he cannot advance to the state of the public mind. I do not believe that More O'Ferrall will accept office. I believe he is afraid of his county.² You perceive that I am still playing the proper game of conciliation but you will easily believe that I have not in thought word, or deed abandoned 'the Repeal', though I am endeavouring to do two things: first, to get all I can for Ireland in the interval; secondly, to cherish the hope that the Protestant faction will at length see that they can get nothing by their holding out against Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 441

1 See letter 2066 n6.

2 More O'Ferrall was M.P. for Co. Kildare. He did not take office at this time, and on 23 June the *Pilot* expressed satisfaction at his having opposed government on a recent motion for shortening the duration of parliament.

2076

To his brother James

London, 7 June 1834

I hate being *thus banished* from communication with my friends. How seldom can we sons of the same loved mother commune together! This often makes me heartsick. Enough of this.

These d'Etchegoyens¹ are I perceive grasping at everything.² I have hitherto parried them. I offered for peace sake the 2,000 francs and, afterwards Coutts³ money but in vain. I believe we must litigate with them for the money ultimately intended for our sons Dan and John but you told me at one time that there was in your hands another will made by the General⁴ exclusive of the letter we treated as a testamentary paper — and as I deem it of the utmost importance ... to be exactly apprized of ... all the particulars of that will, I beg of you to send me a perfect copy. ...

... I have *caught* some unpopularity for the present by endeavouring to shape a course of immediate and practical utility but the ministry will not yeild to anything which lessens the burden of tithes in Ireland. My own opinion however is that they will be driven to it. I am, it is true, *playing a part*, moderating my tone and manner in order to get as much as I can quietly and to leave no pretence for renewing the Coercion Bill but, after all, it will be found that our only resource is in the Repeal question.

Give my sincerest love to Jane⁵ and your boys. I hope to have a large and merry batch of them at Derrynane this summer.

SOURCE: Property of Mrs. Kathleen Armstrong

- 1 Count O'Connell's two step-daughters had married two brothers, the Barons d'Etchegoyen.
- 2 See letter 2078.
- 3 The London banking firm of Coutts & Co.
- 4 That is, Count O'Connell.
- 5 Wife of James O'Connell.

2077

To his son-in-law Nicholas Joseph Ffrench

London, 10 June 1834

My dearest Ffrench,

I enclose you the bill for £150 accepted. I have been so engaged that I could not send you the money sooner but you may rely on it that you shall have the £1,000 *long* before the 1st of July.

... I hope we will make Fortwilliam¹ our way to Kerry. How I could wish to see you, Betty and your babes at Derrynane. ... Your county members are behaving exceedingly well. O'Connor Don is really a high-minded gentleman. Fitz-Stephen Ffrench² is a little crotchety but has no fault in point of political integrity. At present there is no appearance of any change in the Ministry, at least none of any advance being made in the formation of a Tory ministry. My own opinion is that they must come to us Radicals at last. But without "the Repeal" nothing can be done for Ireland.

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

- 1 Home of Nicholas J. Ffrench in Co. Roscommon.
- 2 Fitz-Stephen French (1801-1873), Lough Erritt, Co. Roscommon, 5th and youngest son of Arthus French, Frenchpark and brother of 1st Baron de Freyne; M.P. for Co. Roscommon 1832-73. See *Boase*.

2078

From his brother James

Glentown[?] Cork, 11 June 1834

[States he has sent the will] . . . This will was the *only will* I knew the General¹ to execute exclusive of the letter of June last to me which we treated as a testamentary paper. . . .

I believe I informed you before, that in May 1831, the last time I saw our dear uncle the General, he told me he had placed in the hands of the Messrs. d'Etchegoyen funds to discharge all his funeral expenses and charitable bequests in France over and above several gifts of his to members of that family. I am convinced I have . . . letters [? of the] General . . . transmitting the several sums that accumulated to the amount now in my hands and containing instructions as to the disposal thereof. . . .

[P.S.] . . . the property of the General in my hands at his death amounted to about £2,800 as sworn to when administration was [*about one word illegible*] to me in Ireland from the d'Etchegoyens. . . .

SOURCE: Property of Mrs. Kathleen Armstrong

1 Count O'Connell.

2079

To Thomas Mooney,¹ 149 Francis St., Dublin

London, 13 June 1834

Dear Sir,

I return you the draft you sent me as a fee simply because the matter does not come before me in any *legal* form. There is no attorney, nor any queries requiring professional advice. If I had been required in *that shape* I would of course have given my opinion. As to the Bank to which you allude, namely, the 'Irish National Bank,' it is about to be formed under my auspices² if they be of any use. The more banks in Ireland the better,³ provided they be founded on a sound banking principle, and not merely got up by schemers or over-speculative persons. I have no doubt that the 'Irish National Bank' will be successful. You are however mistaken in supposing that it has any connection either in principle or practice with the Provincial Bank now existing.

SOURCE: Papers of National Bank Ltd., Old Broad St., London

- 1 Thomas Mooney, baker, 149 Francis Street, Dublin; wrote a *History of Ireland*; a founder and director of the National Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland. Emigrated to Australia c. 1841, and to the U.S.A. Started a 'mechanics bank' in San Francisco but later absconded with the funds (Malcolm Dillon, *Banking in Ireland*, Dublin, 1889, 78).
- 2 O'Connell and his son Maurice were members of the committee of the projected National Bank of Ireland, the prospectus of which was published in the *Pilot* of 2 July 1834. The prospectus stated that Irish banking was largely monopolised by the Bank of Ireland and the Irish Provincial Bank, which were 'without the ability, from the nature of the principles on which they are founded, to confer any decided advantages on Ireland. . . ' the Provincial Bank since its establishment in 1825 having extended to only 21 towns. The projected National Bank would seek to extend itself through a plan which 'includes a system of self-management, and a union with a large body of local proprietors where each Branch is founded upon a principle which will stimulate its exertion by increasing its direct interest in its own success.' The bank would be managed by a London board of directors (*Pilot*, 2 July 1834).
- 3 Mooney was at the same time working to establish the National Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland, and consulted O'Connell on the subject (FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 442, n8).

2080

From Comité Constitutionnel de Quebec

[Original in French]

Quebec, 14 June 1834

Sir,

I have the honour to send you the enclosed copy¹ of a resolution passed at a meeting of the Comité Constitutionnel de Quebec² held on the 12th inst.

I have the honour to be with the highest esteem, Sir,

Your very humble and obedient servant,

P. Laforce

President, Comité Constitutionnel

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Not extant.
- 2 'The support that O'Connell and his followers gave to the English radicals on all Canadian questions was one reason why the Whigs after 1833 had to avoid any measure which might offend the French [Canadian] party' (Helen Taft Manning, *The Revolt of French Canada 1800-35*, London, 1962, 206).

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 17 June 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Find out from Kildahl¹ whether his clients have any objection to postpone the Dungarvan petition-trial² till after the circuit or, in fact, to the first day of the next session. It would accommodate me very much, and he will tell you candidly if he intends to object. If he does not, I will get an order to that effect which I pledge myself will not, and cannot, injure his clients.

Well, this mean, dastard, rascally administration have determined to renew the Coercion Bill!³ The scoundrels!!! How glad I am that I made my experiment⁴ fully upon them. So even with them we go in the House and out of the House by all possible legitimate means. Only think of their falsehood and duplicity! Ellice, a Cabinet Minister, told me that there was no such decision. I did, therefore, deem it impossible.

Put this advertisement into the *Pilot*: 'Preparing for publication: the speech of Daniel O'Connell on the Repeal of the Union, reported by William MacCabe, Esq., and corrected by Mr. O'Connell himself, to which is prefixed an address to the Irish nation by Daniel O'Connell.'⁵

I will set about preparing it without delay. I have begun and will proceed with 'the Repeal'. My experiment has been perfectly successful. I have shown that the most energetic anxiety to conciliate the British Government and British Parliament is totally useless. We humbly ask for bread; they give us a stone. Well, can there be one wretch so base found as to consent to wait longer before he becomes a Repealer?

You perceive I am angry. I am so but I am not, therefore, devoid of hope. On the contrary, my hopes are only the higher because of this flagrant violation of every principle of justice and policy.

See Barrett. I will write to him tomorrow. But in the meantime you must ascertain the day on which he is entitled to his liberation.⁶ Pay his fine.⁷ Have his sureties passed before the day arrives. You must not put him to the trouble of getting more sureties. You *must* get them in my name; and surely some of my friends won't hesitate? It is only surety to *keep the peace*, and a libel has been decided not to be a *breach of the peace*, so that there is no real danger. Let everything be prepared so that Barrett may be out the first possible moment. I will preside, as soon as I

arrive, at a public dinner to him as 'the first martyr to Repeal'. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 442-3

- 1 Probably one of the firm of Sobieski, Kildahl & Son, attorneys, Dublin.
- 2 See letter 2065 n2. Kindahl was apparently agent for the party of Pierse George Barron.
- 3 On 16 June Althorp replied to a question on the subject from O'Connell in the Commons that it was the intention of the government to propose the renewal of the coercion bill with some alterations (*Pilot*, 18 June 1834; see further letter 2082 n1).
- 4 See letter 2067.
- 5 This advertisement appeared in the *Pilot* of 20 June 1834.
- 6 The *Morning Register* of 12 July 1834 announced Barrett's liberation. It remarked that though he had taken precaution to preserve his health in prison, 'it will require some relaxation and care before . . . [he] . . . can be fully restored to the bodily vigour he enjoyed at the commencement of his suffering.'
- 7 See letter 1975a n1.

2082

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 24 June 1834

Confidential

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have great pleasure in telling you that no part of the Coercion Bill is to be renewed but that which relates to 'predial agitation,' and even from that everything unconstitutional is to be omitted.¹ We must therefore soon bethink ourselves of returning to Dublin, and of arranging for political agitation. But this must not appear in *any* newspaper.

If it be necessary for you to go down to Wexford,² do you go down at once and secure me 'a Repealer'. It is essential to the liberties of Ireland that we should *thence* get an honest advocate of Repeal.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 445

- 1 By June 1834 Grey was reluctantly prepared to drop the courts martial clauses from the coercion bill about to be renewed, on the recommendation of the lord lieutenant, Wellesley. Grey was, however, determined to maintain the ban on public meetings. But on this issue 'the section of the Cabinet anxious to conciliate O'Connell were prepared to go to any lengths'. Wellesley, who up to 11 June had advised renewal of the meetings clauses, suddenly in response to an appeal from Littleton, recommended their abandonment on 21 June. Littleton, with Althorp's approval, now

saw O'Connell and 'left him with the strong and quite mistaken impression that the liberals in the cabinet had carried the day. As soon as it was clear that this was not so . . . O'Connell promptly and justifiably brought his own private transactions with Littleton before the Commons' (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 133-4). The upshot of this affair was the resignation of Grey and the reconstruction of the government with Melbourne as prime minister. Thereafter, the coercion bill, 'much modified and shorn of the meetings clauses, was passed without difficulty' (MacIntyre, *The Liberator*, 134).

- 2 A vacancy occurred in Co. Wexford at this time due to the elevation to the peerage of Robert Shapland Carew. On 20 June O'Connell published a letter to the electors of Co. Wexford in which he denounced the Whig government and called on them to elect Sir Thomas Esmonde as Repeal candidate (*Pilot*, 20 June 1834). That same day a deputation of electors asked Esmonde to stand 'but', according to the *Pilot*, 'at that time he was not aware, nor were the electors, of the letter which Mr. O'Connell had written in his favour' and he declined to stand (*Pilot*, 23 June 1834). On 22 June a meeting in Enniscorthy chose Cadwallader Waddy as Repeal candidate (*Pilot*, 23 June 1834). On 3 July Waddy was declared elected, defeating William Harvey by a small majority. (*Pilot*, 4 July 1834).

2083

To John Primrose, Jr.

London, 28 June 1834

My dear John,

There is only one thing *could* breed dissention between us. It is that you should in doing my business place yourself as to my property in such a situation as to have an interest adverse to mine. This would directly be the case were you to become tenant to the lot lately held by poor Jerry Mahony. I had heard that you were in treaty with him last summer and I took an opportunity to condemn any such agreement so distinctly in your presence that I thought you could not have misunderstood me. Indeed I could not think it possible from the reply you made. I always regretted the lease I made to Jerry. I did it to induce residence and the condition was not kept as you know but on the contrary an *unpleasant* class of tenantry was brought in upon me. The lease was a pure loss to me. When the times fell I was asked *for and gave an abatement* and their rise would have been of no value to me. There is another reason why I should keep the direct dominion of these lands, that they contain a long strand on which it may suit my convenience to give seaweed and landing rights to my other tenants, and all the other tenants would be sure to complain to me privately of your giving preferences according to your interest and would so complain even without any substantial cause.

I am sorry to find you made so bad a bargain about the arrears. Let me know the particulars and I will share the loss with you. I will take one half of it if it be serious on myself — the entire, if it be small but I should in the former case desire to see the particulars.

There is no part of my property on which my plans of improvement are more connected with my other lands than those held by Jerry Mahony. In short the principal point on which my decision rests is the utter impossibility of considering my interest secure if you made it clash on my lands with your own. I feel now unbounded confidence in you but that you *must* preserve by not interfering between me and my general plans for the benefit of all my tenants.

Believe me nothing but the particular situation in which you are placed would prevent me from complying with any reasonable request of yours.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

2084

To his daughter Kate, Bahoss, Cahirciveen, Co. Kerry

London, 3 July 1834

My own darling Catty,

This letter is for my dear Charles as well as for my beloved child Kate with whom I had always *a secret*.

My dearest children I want your assistance. I have placed my dear Charles in a position out of which I cannot extricate either him or myself. What am I to do? Your mother told me that dear Kate imagined I had put Charles to the expense of his coming to and remaining in London. Indeed, indeed, that was not my intention. I gave Charles whilst he was here £60 and if I thought that sum would not cover his expenses I certainly would have added to it. . . .

It is quite true that I want him over again. I very much want him. In fact I do not know how to do without him but my darling Kate must understand that I will not allow him to come unless he accepts of the surplus, if any, of his former expenses and *all* his present. I therefore write to know whether he can come here for one fortnight . . . only for *one* fortnight. . . . If he comes then I will write to Primrose to give my Kate £50 for his journey and whatever is expended by him over I will give him here. . . . You

may at the same time be assured that if I did not deem this of the utmost importance, of more importance than anything else, I would not urge his coming. The fact is the Government have tricked [? me in the] most disgraceful manner. They have told me lies of the most vile falsehood¹ and, having obtained their advantage, they now laugh me to scorn. It is therefore or, at least, it much assumes a character of a personal hostility to me and I want all my sons to rally round me, and I think no father could be more justly proud of his sons amongst whom my Kate may *possibly* admit that Charles is not the one I ought to be least proud of. Yes I *do* want my sons on this occasion and I apply to my darling Kate, who has ever held the warmest spot in her father's heart, to assist me. I will not say more.

At all events, let not Charles resign² without first giving me full time to consult with him. . . . Of course I will not feel one bit displeased with any determination that Charles may come to but I am sure he will indulge me by not resigning, at least until I have full time to confer with him. . . .

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

1 See letter 2082 n1.

2 Charles O'Connell did not resign as M.P. for Kerry until the general election of 1834-5, and did so then with O'Connell's reluctant approbation (see letter 2147). His place was taken by O'Connell's nephew, Morgan John O'Connell.

2085

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 8 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

It is half an age since I wrote to you, but it has been, as you may perceive, to me a period of turmoil and battle. I have the pleasure to tell you that my triumph over Littleton is admitted to be complete. Indeed, no man ever got so complete a fall as that unworthy gentleman.¹ In addition to all this we have the final triumph of Jacob over Galwey and Barron, and his being fixed for Dungarvan.² To crown all comes the Wexford victory: the victory of the honest and true men of Wexford.³

There has also been a bye-battle upon the subject of a new bank.⁴ This has been for a great while a subject of anxious speculation with me. I have sensibly felt the want of a counter-check to the rascality of the Bank of Ireland and of the Provincial Bank.

You know that they play into the hands of the Anti-Irish party. I want a *mutual friend* at the other side.

My plan has been, and is, to get *one million* subscribed in London. Until that is done no operations are to take place in Ireland. The million here is to be in aid of Irish subscriptions. Whenever a sum large enough to establish a branch bank in any locality is subscribed, the London managers will double the amount.

Of course we will require the utmost circumspection and vigilance, and it is of course that if we succeed it will be my anxious study that you, your brother⁵ and brother-in-law,⁶ should participate in that success. Of this we will talk when the time approaches.

There will be a bill of mine for £300 due the 27th inst. to Burke⁷ of Cork. He will renew any part of it you choose. I long to hear of Barrett's liberation⁸ and though I should be glad to save my £100, yet I would prefer that Barrett should not be under any compliment to that 'old foozle' of a scoundrel.

I have no news to tell you. Let the *Pilot* never publish a letter of mine until it has gone the round of other papers. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 448-50

1 See letter 2082 n1.

2 See letters 2065 n2 and 2038 n2.

3 See letter 2082 n2.

4 Probably the projected National Bank of Ireland (see letter 2079 n2). What the 'bye-battle' was has not been ascertained.

5 Hugh FitzPatrick (died 20 March 1835, aged 33) only brother of P.V. FitzPatrick.

6 Joseph C. Ayre.

7 John Bourke and Son, money brokers, assurance agents and wine merchants, 111 Patrick Street, Cork.

8 See letter 2081 n6.

2086

To Richard Barrett

London, Friday [c. 11 July 1834]

My dear Barrett,

I write to congratulate you on your regaining your liberty;¹ to thank you for having sacrificed that Liberty to me.² Believe me, I never can forget the generosity and the firmness with which you made that sacrifice nor shall it ever be less kindly felt until I have an opportunity — if I ever have an opportunity — of proving my gratitude by deeds, not by words.

There is little to be known as yet and still, before the post goes out, something will be *half decided*. It is sufficiently clear that neither Melbourne nor Brougham, nor both together, can make a Ministry. It is also quite certain that the present parliament will not endure a Tory Administration; and as to a dissolution, the most favourable view of its result would not give the Tories more than 200 members of the House of Commons, and with such a force — not one third of the House — it would be impossible to carry on the government.

The King wished Lord Melbourne to make up an Administration consisting of Brougham, Stanley and Peel, with their adherents but he has been distinctly informed 'that it was impossible.' It is now said that he sent for Peel. I cannot vouch for the truth but I am quite sure Peel cannot venture to form a Cabinet. If it were to be formed it should be so, simply on the principle '*that the Irish Church should be preserved in all its integrity of wealth and influence,*' and this principle would be an exceedingly dangerous one to stand on as a ground for hoping a successful result in the event of a dissolution of Parliament. It must also be recollected that the Appropriation Bills have not as yet been passed so that a Tory Administration would be totally unable to go on until there was a new parliament.

Upon the whole, my own opinion is that there will be no Ministry save one under the auspices of Lord Althorp, founded on much more liberal principles than the last. But even if the Tories came in they could not stand three months, and their discomfiture would give a still more Liberal Government.

In the meantime it is quite certain that the dexterity with which the Ministry endeavoured to deceive me has been their ruin.³ It was I, in fact, that turned out the Administration. I get this credit from everybody; and if the next be not better we will turn that out also. From the moment Littleton told me that Lord Wellesley and he himself were adverse to the Coercion Bill, the game was in my hands if I did not throw it away. Unless I gave personal cause to alter their determination, they could not possibly carry a Bill which on the 20th of June they communicated to me was in their judgement unnecessary. My victory is therefore admitted by everybody to be complete, and its ultimate results will, I think, be eminently useful to Ireland. We are on the way from a half Whig, half Tory Government to one half Radical, half Whig, without the slightest admixture of Toryism. The moment such a Ministry is formed there will be a famous *turning off* in Ireland. The Attorney-General will certainly be dismissed,⁴ and the entire Orange clique will go with him.

There is a powerfully signed address⁵ from members of parliament to Lord Althorp to encourage him to undertake the office of Prime Minister. If he did so, all would be well. He would take care to remove the Orangeists from power in Ireland, and it would be the most severe blow that faction ever got to have a Premier decided in his opposition to the continuance of unnecessary tithes; and, in short, to the whole system of misrule in Ireland. Besides, it was first Stanley and then Lord Grey who were the prominent supporters of the Orange faction in Ireland; Stanley from his own natural virulence and bigotry, and poor old Lord Grey from his foolish and envenomed prejudice against everything Irish. We should be in the highest spirits. It can only operate for good to the people of Ireland.

[P.S.] 6 o'clock. No further news; it is not true that the king sent for Peel. I myself believe that Lord Althorp will have the formation of the cabinet.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 450-52

1 See letter 2081 n6.

2 See letter 1975a n1.

3 See letter 2082 n1.

4 See letter 2106.

5 This address, dated 11 July 1834, was signed by 206 M.P.'s including O'Connell and all his relatives and several other members of the Repeal party (Le Marchant, *Althorp*, 576-8).

2087

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 16 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you a document¹ which I wish you to copy, and then give the original to Sheehan to read. Leave it with him if he asks you, but preserve the copy. I have thought this the best time to recommence a treaty for a reconciliation between Irishmen. If the Orange party be not quite blind they must see that they have not the slightest chance of returning into power: their day as a dominant party is at an end, and if they knew the proper time to make a satisfactory arrangement with their countrymen for obtaining the restoration of the Irish parliament they would see that this is the critical moment. It would probably have been too soon some time ago. It will, I fear, shortly be too late. Indeed, my

own opinion is fast forming that it is not possible to conciliate the Orangeists. But I feel it a duty to try. Tell Sheehan candidly what my notions on this subject are — that there are too many truculent persons of his party to expect that common sense or even a common interest should be available to produce a community of exertion. No, the Orangeists have been too long masters to expect that for the present generation they should submit willingly to an equality of rights; and yet they must submit perforce, for the Government of this country is now too democratic to allow the Irish ascendancy to remain in power any longer.

I write so fully to Barrett that I will say no more but that I am in great spirits.

I may just give *you* a summary.

1st. Ministry all arranged,

2d. Lord Duncannon *Home* Department.

3d. Lord Wellesley remains.

4th. Hobhouse, Woods and Forests.

5th. Decided change in the underlings in Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 452-3

- 1 Whether Sheehan ever received this document is not known (see letter 2091). It was headed, 'Basis of an Arrangement to combine Persons of all Persuasions in Ireland in Defence of their Common Country, and for the Repeal of Union.' It called for equality between Catholics and Protestants but with the rights and properties of Protestants secured; both Orange and Ribbon (Catholic agrarian secret) societies to be suppressed; disestablishment of the Church of Ireland but existing incumbents to retain their vested interests for life; each religious persuasion to maintain its own clergy; and legislation to insist on absentees spending part of their rents in Ireland (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 453-4).

2088

*To Benjamin Boothby, Jr.*¹

London, 17 July 1834

You did me the great honour to consult with me previous to the last election on the subject of the fitness of Lord Duncannon to represent your town.² I hope, therefore, you will not deem me presumptuous if I initiate — as the Americans say — the correspondence on the present occasion. The fact really is that we are now in a much more critical situation than we were at the former election. The Whigs have been such cruel *drags* on the wheels of rational improvement that many of their Cabinet have been compelled to yield to and fly before the force of public opinion, repressed as it

has been by a multitude of causes. But the remnant of that Cabinet want sufficient energy to meet the national exigencies or to give that substantial relief which would alleviate public distress and secure the enjoyment of popular rights against the perpetual spirit of invasion of a worthless aristocracy for whom alone these courtiers have hitherto been governed.

At such a moment it is the duty of every honest Radical reformer who is equally desirous to prevent any approach to a social revolution, as to carry into practical effect salutary changes and needful improvements in the political system, to come forward and send to Parliament men who are totally free from the bias of *personal* party and determined to do their duty to their country and to the cause of civil and religious liberty, fearlessly, perseveringly, and disinterestedly.

Will you allow me to say that if the town of Nottingham wants just such a person, you can easily find him in Mr. Eagle³ the barrister who I believe intends to offer himself on the approaching vacancy. His information, his talents, and above all his political integrity render him the fittest man I can think of to represent any honest and manly constituency. . . .

SOURCE: The John Rylands Library

- 1 Benjamin Boothby, Jr. (c. 1803-1868). Appointed 1853 a judge of the supreme court of South Australia. See *Boase*.
- 2 Nottingham. Duncannon had just resigned from its representation on being created a peer. In the ensuing by-election the Liberal Whig, John Cam Hobhouse, defeated the Radical, William Eagle, by 1925 to 566 votes. Boothby seconded Eagle's nomination. In an editorial the *Times* of 25 July described the election as being conducted in 'a fury almost unparalleled in English elections.' A report from Nottingham in the *Times* of 29 July made a hostile reference to Eagle as 'backed by the influence of Mr. O'Connell.'
- 3 William Eagle, born c. 1789, educated Trinity College, Cambridge; called to the bar 1817.

2089

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 17 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Nothing further as to the Ministry, nor is there to be. All is closed. We shall see what Lord Duncannon will do in *clearing out* in Ireland.¹ To this I direct my immediate attention. I will see

Lord D[uncannon] as soon as possible and if a spoke be not put in Master Blackburne's wheel, it will not be my fault.²

I have not been in the way of hearing details but *I believe* Mr. Bonham Carter has refused the Secretaryship of Ireland. This would confirm the notion of Littleton's promotion to the peerage.³ At all events we have made a distinct step in advance and left Toryism behind. You may rely on it that I will make the best use I can for Ireland of the present conjunction and if possible, pledge the *present* Ministry to a lay appropriation of any funds to be raised *in lieu* of Tithes. This, you know, will be a declaration that there shall be no more parsons paid where there are not Protestants to constitute a flock — and this will be the first great step to liberate Ireland from supporting a Church *not* of the people. . . .

I am decided for giving a public dinner to Barrett. It is merely a question of time. Do not hurry it. I ought to be in the chair, and it should be so arranged as to give a fillip to the *Pilot*. Let me know when you think it ought to be.

The reports here are that the cholera is again very violent in Dublin. Let me know without disguise the real state of things.

Since I began writing this letter I learn that Littleton is to remain in office until the close of this session. You will see everything else which can be known in the second editions of the evening papers. It is well to be rid of Lord Grey as Premier, he never would consent to do any good to Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 454-455

1 Melbourne appointed Duncannon home secretary on 19 July 1834.

2 See letter 2106.

3 Littleton remained as Irish chief secretary until the break-up of Melbourne's first ministry in November 1834. He was created a peer as Baron Hatherton on 11 May 1835.

2090

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 19 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . The papers contain all that we know. It is a bad symptom that both Lord Wellesley and Littleton remain in office.¹ The truth is that the English Ministry cannot do justice to Ireland. I will, notwithstanding what has occurred last night,² give Blackburne a *shove* yet.

The Coercion Bill, as the ministers bring it in, is free from

political defects. It will leave us to act as we please in *undisturbed* districts. That is, all political unions can take place again. We will, I suppose, have some men silly enough to attempt to revive the 'Trades Political Union,'³ but if so, I certainly will oppose its revival, if it were to do me the greatest possible mischief personally to take that course. I care not, because I am convinced that Union can do nothing but mischief to the public cause.

I made a sensation⁴ last night — much greater than one could suppose from the papers. A good report, however, could be made out by mixing up that in the *Times* with that in the *Chronicle*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 455-6

1 As lord lieutenant and Irish chief secretary, respectively.

2 A reference to the Commons' debate on the renewal of the coercion act.

3 See letter 1710 n1.

4 Presumably in his speech on the renewal of the coercion act.

2091

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 22 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

No news at present. The ministry working on without much energy, but I still hope for better days and better things.

Inquire at the Chamber of Commerce whether they get regularly the parliamentary papers I send them. It is impossible at present to get them in any other way save in the name of a member but it has the advantage that it costs them nothing.

You *must* give Barrett £50 which I got for him from Philadelphia. If he intends to come over let him come at once as the session draws to a close. The Coercion Bill is clear of all interference with political meetings save in 'disturbed', that is, *proclaimed* districts. I divided against its second reading last night on account of two harsh clauses but which relate only to disturbed districts. The bill will be got through with all convenient speed. I have then only the Tithe Bill¹ to detain me here. I want a couple of months in Iveragh, and then for *quiet* and *determined* agitation again. More of this hereafter.

How can D[ixon]² countenance the wild scheme of 'the Agricultural' Bank, especially in that wicked humbug that it can limit individual liability?³ It would be a gross deception on the public even if *that* were true because it might throw 3 millions of notes

in circulation after £25 per cent. were paid up and then, according to their notion, there would be no funds for payment of one single note.

Hart⁴ is totally unmanageable. He has thrown away an opportunity of having a provision made for him. I cannot help him, and you may pledge yourself that I can show that the fault is exclusively his own.

Young Stanley⁵ of Cheshire, who is Under-Secretary to Lord Duncannon, is a friend of mine and does not participate in the politics of his namesake. He will, I think, be useful to Ireland.

I am sorry you did not communicate with Sheehan as I asked you.⁶ The time presses for my declaring that *there can be no more treaty with that IRRECONCILEABLE party*. Why, then, did you delay my communication? I do not want or care for secrecy although I should not desire publication. If it comes, let it come from him. At the same time I would have you tell him that on our parts we bind ourselves to secrecy as long as he or his friends may desire. INDEED, I am sorry you delayed my communication.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 456-7

1 See letter 2093 n2.

2 Thomas Dixon, Abilene, Newtownpark, Co. Dublin, managing director of the Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland.

3 On 19 July a meeting took place in Dublin of subscribers to shares in the proposed National Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland, (the word *National* in the title was later omitted), under the chairmanship of Thomas Dixon. It was suggested to the meeting that there be added to the prospectus 'a clause which has been unanimously adopted by the Northern and Central Bank of England, viz., to limit the responsibility of shareholders, it is proposed that should twenty-five per cent of the capital advanced be ever lost, the company shall by such loss, be, *ipso facto*, dissolved, unless a majority of three-fourths of the voters . . . shall decide to the contrary' (*Pilot*, 21 July 1834). The new bank was conducted inefficiently, and it suspended payment in November 1836 though all its note-holders and depositors were eventually paid in full (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 158-61; see also letter 2383 n7). In a public letter on 16 August 1834 O'Connell described the bank's plan to limit the liability of its shareholders as a 'wild scheme' and a 'delusion' (O'Connell to John Reynolds, *Pilot*, 20 Aug. 1834).

4 William S. Hart, attorney. The lost opportunity has not been identified.

5 Hon. Edward John Stanley (1802-1869), eldest son of 1st Baron Stanley; M.P. for Hirdon 1831-32; for North Cheshire 1832-41, 1847-48; under-secretary for the home department July 1834 to January 1835; secretary to the treasury 1835-41; paymaster-general June to September 1841; under-secretary for foreign affairs 1846-52; chief whip of the Whig party 1835-1841; succeeded as 2nd Baron Stanley in 1850. See *DNB*.

6 See letter 2087 n1.

2092

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 July 1834

... I have the pleasure to tell you that at present there appears to be the strongest reasons to hope that Orangeism will be swept clean out of the Castle and its precincts. Do not let this get into the newspapers, but expect better times.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 457

2093

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 31 July 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

And we'll plant a laurel tree,
And we'll call it 'Victory',
Said the Shan Van Vocht.¹

You will have read with some pleasure that I have achieved two victories — the first, in abolishing the claims of the parsons for *all arrears*; the second, striking off at one fell blow £268,000 a year from the tithe burden — that is, $2/5$ ths of the entire² — 'pour commencer,' as they say at Paris. And I see no reason why more of the same dose may not be useful for the next *draft*. I think we may thus indeed wait awhile.

I want to be out of this as rapidly as I possibly can, and only await a remittance from you. I would be glad of as much as £400. If you deem it necessary, send me a stamp for the money and I will send you my name and so raise the money at three or four months but I will want the £400 NET. Do not delay to let me hear from you. Write on Saturday without fail. I believe I have little cause of delay besides hearing from you. This is a good winding up of the session. If I can help it I will go at once to Derrynane and address my constituents thence, that is, I will go by Waterford, but do not speak of this. I must close.

[P.S.] Barrett's dinner³ will do better when I come back to Dublin.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 457-8

1 The 'Sean Bhean Bhocht' ('Poor Old Woman', personifying Ireland). This

was a rebel song said to have been composed in 1796 when Wolfe Tone's French expeditionary force was in Bantry Bay.

- 2 On 29-30 July O'Connell proposed and carried two important amendments to Littleton's tithe bill (see letter 2066 n3). He proposed firstly that the ministry should give up all existing tithe arrears, thus enabling the proposed bill to come into operation at once, rather than, as had been contemplated, after a lapse of five years. He also proposed that 'in place of all the tithes now claimed under the composition there should be substituted three-fifths of the whole amount' the remaining two-fifths to be met from the consolidated fund and Church Temporality Fund (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXV, 757-8, 771; *Commons Journal*, LXXXIX, 540). The bill was rejected in the Lords on 11 August 1834.
- 3 See letter 2095.

2094

From P. V. FitzPatrick

27 Eccles St. [Dublin], Tuesday [c. August 1834]

My dear Sir,

... How shall I thank you for your constant acts of kindness and courtesy towards me? ...

The Annuity Account¹ stands up to the last letter had from me in round numbers thus: £10,400

Amounts independent of foreign remittances:

Your acceptances paid by Trustees March 20th and lodged in Hibernian Bank	£255
Lodged to your Private Acct. Apr. 11	2,500
do do do May 5	3,500
Your acceptances and orders paid by me for which the vouchers lie in my hands	798
Cash given Robert White as per your instructions	500
Remitted to London to your order May 28	300
Charges as far as yet can be judged	400
Lodged in country Banks and otherwise not yet available etc.	230
For my account as per your letter June 22d	350
Cash Bank Orders half notes etc. on my hands	533
Balance in Hibernian Bank	1,034
	<u>£10,400</u>

I do not include the Calcutta nor Newfoundland monies neither of which has yet been received. They amount in round numbers together to £450. The *first* sum will be remitted to the Trustees in the course of the next month. The latter must await a communication from the contributors before it can be passed to the general

account. You will perceive by the statement that £1,200 can be given at any time but I will take the liberty of impressing the necessity of postponing any further draft as long as possible. It is *very* valuable to show that a balance still remains to the credit of the Annuity. The more so as I have hopes of gleaning something respectable even yet from the *unreported* parishes, which are much more numerous than I could have supposed and I am at this moment preparing a new circular to the residents in those districts for that purpose. This I intend to dispatch to them post free. Your acceptance for £284.12.5 due this day will be paid by Mr. Geraghty² where £502 of your private money will still stand to your credit. This it will be judicious to apply to the payment of your acceptance for £500 (the balance of Dan's capital)³ still outstanding. Your letter on the subject of the [Newry] *Examiner*⁴ is most excellent and cannot fail to do good to a great extent in the North. Our meeting takes place tomorrow when it shall be turned to account and I will at the recommendation of those whom I consulted take leave to give £10 as your contribution. It will be felt as a compliment by *the whole Province* of Ulster. I will also presume to make a verbal alteration or two in your letter to guard *against* the jealousy of others of the press. Always prepared to act by your instructions, I remain,

Dear Sir,

Most gratefully yours,
P.V. FitzPatrick

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 The O'Connell tribute.

2 Unidentified.

3 See letter 1873 n1.

4 O'Connell to the editors of the *Newry Examiner*. 29 July 1834 (*Pilot*, 4 Aug. 1834). The *Newry Examiner* had criticised O'Connell for leaving the Commons on 18 July without voting against Althorp's motion for leave to bring in an amended coercion bill (see letter 2090 n2) from which, the *Examiner* asserted, the objectionable clauses had not been expunged. In his letter O'Connell declared that, at the time there was as yet no definite measure before the House to which he could object. When it afterwards transpired that there were objectionable clauses, he opposed many clauses and divided against them on several occasions.

2095

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 4 August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I got your letter this morning, showing your usual promptitude and attention. I never was disappointed in you. The draft for £400 has come in most convenient time. I enclose you two bills on Maurice as you desire — £250 and £400. He is gone off yesterday for his father-in-law's¹ in the County of Clare. Write to him, enclosing these bills for his acceptance. Seal the letter both with wafer and wax so that it may not be surreptitiously opened. This precaution may be unnecessary but must be harmless.

If the dinner to Barrett could be effectually got up for Monday² I would gladly preside at it on that day, but if you find any difficulty in getting it up *as it ought to be* in so short a period as from Wednesday, you will allow it to lie over till November³ as I must leave Dublin on Tuesday. The Custom House burning³ is in abeyance, that is, we are waiting for more documents which have been promised at the Treasury and are to decide our course. The Government offer to try the question with us on the point of whether Donlevy⁴ or Wallace⁵ were guilty of wilful neglect of duty by which any goods were lost. I confess it appears to me that, as to Donlevy, his wilful neglect is beyond any doubt. If we get a verdict on this point, the Government will make good the full loss. In short, tomorrow will decide and I certainly entertain the strongest hope that every shilling will be repaid the sufferers. I, indeed, would give up my profession for ever if an honest jury did not give me a verdict, the point appears to me so clear. It will be tried in the King's Bench in November. I am quite ready to be counsel in the cause and in the meantime I am doing all I can in my parliamentary function.

I entertain strong hopes still of a change of officials in Ireland.

Direct to Maurice at the house of Bindon Scott, Esq., Cahircon, near Kildysart, Co. Clare.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 458-9

1 Cahircon, Kildysert, Co. Clare home of Bindon Scott.

2 The proposed dinner to Barrett was postponed since O'Connell had to remain in London because of the tithe bill (see letter 2096). On 13 August, the *Pilot* announced that though O'Connell had intended passing through Dublin solely to preside at Barrett's proposed dinner, 'Mr. Barrett and his friends considered it better to postpone the banquet.'

3 See letter 2001 n5.

4 Unidentified.

5 Robert Wallace, warehouse-keeper, Customs House, Dublin.

2096

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 5 August 1834

I am sorry to tell you that I cannot leave London until we ascertain what the Lords will do with my Tithe Bill.¹ Indeed, it has been communicated to me that it was expected that I should remain. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 460

1 See letter 2093 n2.

2097

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 6 August 1834

My dear FtizPatrick,

I write merely to say that I have nothing to tell. I remain until it is decided whether or not the scoundrel Lords will dare to throw out or castrate *my* glorious Tithe Bill.¹

I succeeded last night for the distillers in taking off the duty from the 1st of September instead of the 10th of October.²

I write from the House, and in a great hurry and in great spirits. I made two very successful speeches³ last night. I will write to you every day until I can set off. Ask Barrett will he come down to see a mountain hunt again before the close of this month.

[P.S.] Tell Barrett that *the comfort* of Derrynane is only when the lady is there, as she intends this season.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 460

1 See letter 2093 n2.

2 A bill 'to repeal the duties on spirits made in Ireland, and to impose other duties in lieu thereof, and to impose additional duties on licences to retailers of spirits in the United Kingdom' was introduced on 1 August and received its second reading three days later. At the committee stage on 5 August O'Connell moved that the proposed reduction of duties in Ireland should commence on 1 September instead of 10 October. The chancellor of

the exchequer agreed to this amendment (*Pilot*, 8 Aug. 1834). The bill containing the amendment was enacted on 14 August as 4 & 5 Will. IV c. 75.

- 3 O'Connell spoke vigorously on 5 August in defence of his recent amendments to the tithe bill (see letter 2093 n2). He spoke briefly on a number of other subjects (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, IV, 3236, 3244-9).

2098

To Lord Duncannon

22 Parliament Street [London], [7 August 1834]

Private

My dear lord,

I must go off for Dublin early tomorrow (Friday) and earnestly beg of you to give me five minutes' conversation this evening in the House. I will be there from four until seven.

Surely, surely the Attorney-General is not to be allowed to drive the people into rebellion for the benefit of his clients? This, really, is going too far, to allow a counsel to aid his clients by means of his official station. Ireland had, I thought, suffered every degradation that unjust power could hitherto invent but there remained, it seems, this one — the lending her armed force to a Counsel that his fees as a professional man might abound.¹

Pardon me for thus expressing my indignation. I would not do so if I were not most unaffectedly desirous of assisting, as far as I could to give the Ministry to which you belong the most effectual support in my poor power in Ireland. I want to stand excused at least in your candid judgement for the course I must take if the Irish Government continues to disgust its friends, to support its enemies and to withhold any relief from the people.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 482-3

- 1 What exactly O'Connell was alluding to has not been identified.

2099

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Friday, 8 August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I believe my plans are settled. I have fixed to go off tomorrow morning and to sleep at Oxford. *Thus* I will not be able to reach Dublin¹ before Wednesday.

I enclose you the memorandum which Mr. Haliday gave me from the Chamber of Commerce to make up their set of parliamentary papers. I submitted it to the speaker who wrote in pencil the words at foot. Lest they should be obliterated I copy them: *If the gentlemen would name by numbers the papers they wish for I shall be ready to attend to their wishes as far as I am able.* — C.M.S.²

There is as yet no intelligence as to what the lords will do. I have made up my mind not to trouble myself about the decision³ of the scoundrels. I will not vote more money to parsons. I have done more for them than any other member and now I leave the Ministry and the Lords to battle as they please. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 460-61

- 1 O'Connell crossed to Dunmore, Co. Waterford, not to Dublin (MR, 18 Aug. 1834).
- 2 Charles Manners Sutton.
- 3 See letter 2093 n2.

2100

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Oxford, 9 August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have arrived here from London this day on my way to Ireland. The fact of Barrett's dinner being postponed¹ makes me indifferent as to going to Dublin, and the state of cholera in that town, as represented in your letter, makes me unwilling to go there. My present intention is to go by Milford and Waterford. . . .

How little you know of me, either you or Barrett, when you think that any public meeting *could* embarrass me! The fact is, the ministry are not entitled in any shape to any support from me but such as they may merit on grounds universally public. I failed in persuading them to turn away Blackburne² and I, therefore, for the present leave them to themselves. But for me, the reversions in the Crown would not have been given up.³ I had a hard battle for it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 461

- 1 See letter 2095 n2.
- 2 See letter 2089.
- 3 This was the voluntary surrender by the crown of reversions and remainders in Irish estates due to attainder. The surrender was announced in the

Commons by Lord Althorp on 7 August. O'Connell praised the king for action both generous and useful since he knew as a lawyer of the difficulty experienced in making out titles to Irish estates because of the large number of attainders in the past: 'Some remedy has long been desired and anxiously looked for by the landed proprietors of Ireland' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, IV, 3271).

2101

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Oxford, 10 August 1834

I have been so convinced by your letter of the unhappy state of Dublin¹ that having no political business there, I have determined to take my family by Cheltenham and Waterford. I go to Cheltenham this day. We have heard Mass here.

See Barrett and beg of him to come down to me as early as he can, I hope, next week as I intend to be in Derrynane this day week. The sooner he comes to me the better, as I want to talk to him about politics. . . . I will publish a manifesto immediately after my arrival and will make all my arrangements for quiet steady agitation immediately.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 461-2

1 Due to cholera.

2102

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Waterford, 18 [*recte* 15] August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Here I am after a slow but not unpleasant journey. I remain here to a public dinner¹ this day. My intention is to go on tomorrow to Cork; on Sunday to Killarney; to my mountains on Monday. . . . All is going politically well. What an example of agitation the Conservatives are showing us!² How grateful ought I not be to the House of Lords!³ I was their theme and only argument. But that rascal the Marquis of Downshire,⁴ what a fellow he was to attend such a meeting! Bravo! they have set us the example which I do believe we will follow.

My letter on the National Bank⁵ will appear in the *Pilot* on Monday and I intend to have at least one letter a week in that

paper until I go up in November.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 462

- 1 O'Connell, accompanied by his wife, made a triumphal entry into Waterford on 14 August. He was guest of honour at a public dinner on 15 August presided over by Alexander Sherlock of Killaspy House, and attended by some 150 persons. Patrick Power of Bellevue and James Esmonde acted as vice presidents (*Morning Register*, 19 Aug. 1834 quoting *Waterford Chronicle*).
- 2 A great Conservative meeting attended (according to the hostile *Pilot*) by 2,000 – 3,000 persons took place at the Mansion House, Dublin on 14 August. The meeting was presided over by the lord mayor, Sir George Whiteford, and attended by fourteen lords and about six M.P.'s. It passed resolutions promising to uphold Protestant ascendancy, condemning the ministry's tithe policy, and expressing thanks to the House of Lords for its rejection of the recent tithe bill (see letter 2093 n2). An address to the king was agreed on, calling on him to support Protestant ascendancy, and steps were taken to influence the English electorate along similar lines (*DEM, Pilot*, 15 Aug. 1834).
- 3 That is, for their rejection of the tithe bill (see letter 2093 n2).
- 4 Arthur Blundell Sandys Trumbull (Hill), 3rd Marquis of Downshire (1788–1845).
- 5 O'Connell to John Reynolds, Agent and Secretary, National Bank 16 August 1834 published in the *Pilot* of 20 August 1834. See letter 2091 n3.

2103

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 20 August 1834

My Dear Sir,

I have put everything in train for furnishing you with the tithe acts etc. by tomorrow's coach. Mr. Pigot took particular pains in making out as complete a list as possible of the books you may be likely to want. I am glad you intend to push the tithe question so promptly and vigorously. You will have "universal Ireland" with you in this operation, and the most important intimation I have this day to give you is the intention of the Trades Union¹ people to begin to move, as I understand they will commence doing tomorrow evening, when (according to Tom Reynolds) a preparatory meeting is to be held to consider the propriety of reorganising.² Reynolds says that should they determine on a *resurrection* he will again become a Member but he is anxious to know your feelings on the subject before he takes any further active step. In this tone of mind he will avoid attending the meeting of tomorrow. I am not ignorant of your objections to the revival of the "Trades"

but am for many reasons obliged to stand clear of a matter which *may* be productive of misunderstanding. In my *very* humble opinion and on the principle that "*prevention is better than cure*" your most judicious course would be to address the *quondam* Trades at once exhorting them not to give a chance to their enemies and those of the *tithe payers* (which latter are not *tradesmen* but *farmers* and *peasants*) by renewing a description of agitation inapplicable to the crisis and the objects of the country. This if done without delay would probably effect all your purposes sanctioned as your recommendation would unquestionably be by the great body of citizens of every grade.

Your pecuniary arrangements are perfectly satisfactory. I will be able to meet everything mentioned by me in my letter addressed to you at Cork and I expect to move in to the country about the 28th inst. leaving Joseph Ayre to attend to your commissions during my absence. I rejoice to hear such promising account of Dan's³ progress as a brewer. He will find in Mr. D'Arcy (of his *own* concern) a most capable *artist* and it is delightful to be able to say that our brewery continues to proceed as well as could be expected. It *will* be worthy of the name it bears.

[P.S.] Please *not* to write to the Trades Unions through *me*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The National Trades Political Union (see letter 1710 n1).
- 2 The Trades Union did not reorganise at this time. The proposed meeting does not appear to have taken place.
- 3 O'Connell's youngest son. See letter 1873 n1.

2104

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, Sunday night,¹ 25 August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I send off an express for Cahirciveen to put this and five letters for the *Pilot* into the office so as to reach Dublin on Wednesday. I beg of you, as Barrett will be out of town, to *read the proof* yourself and to take the greatest care to have my letter² accurately printed. You will see that I spurn the idea of conciliating the Orange faction.³

The porter arrived *before* me and is the very best Irish porter I ever tasted. Your brewer is admirable; I hope to live to see you able to take him into partnership in the *first* porter brewery⁴ in

Ireland for such yours ought to be. The only thing I fear is your not being able to afford such porter at selling prices. It is really superlative.

I have a difficult card to play but I believe I can play it. The Repealers will, I hope, see the propriety of allowing the Tithe question to take precedence.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 462-3

- 1 Sunday was 24 August.
- 2 O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 25 August 1834, *Pilot*, 27 August 1834.
- 3 In his letter, above, O'Connell said: 'For a long time I cherished a faint hope that the Orange faction might be conciliated to Ireland and I have . . . acted on the plan of conciliation. . . . I, however, scarcely deceived myself by my hopes, and I am now — and forever — convinced that Orangeism must be put down.'
- 4 See letter 1873 n1.

2105

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 27 August 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

There is something in the *contentiousness* of last year more stimulant than in the acquiescence of the present; and perhaps general approbation may be followed by neglect. We shall see and yet it would be a pity that Ireland did not afford me one more opportunity to be of service.

I got the Tithe Acts and will soon publish at length the details of the DEFECTS in the present legal power of the parsons. I am afraid to do so until near the 1st of November, for legal reasons.¹

There is no doubt that if the people generally and in particular the Presbyterians of the North, resist the payment of tithes this year generally, they will be abolished or much reduced in the next session. The Bill² rejected by the Lords will certainly pass unless there be an acquiescence in the payment. I am deeply anxious to know how the people will act. You know, however, that it is criminal to *advise* people not to pay tithes or to *combine* for non-payment but each man separately and by himself may refuse to pay and not be liable criminally to any prosecution.

The power of distraining for tithes is now very limited. *The land* occupied by any tenant from year to year or by any lessee by a lease made since the 16th of August, 1832, cannot be distrained

no matter whether the cattle or goods belong to such tenant or not. Thus there are secure spots from distraint in abundance. Neither can any person be distrained for more than one year's composition even if the person seized in fee and liable to the tithes holds the lands in his own occupation.

But the impulse should be given by the establishment of County Liberal clubs and Liberal clubs in every town. Parochial meetings to get up petitions for the abolition of tithes should also be held as speedily and as numerous as possible. It is of vital importance that a great stir should be made as soon as possible to show the determination of the people universally to get rid of the blood-stained impost of tithes. I am greatly inclined to confine the agitation as much as can be to the tithe question. If we could but get an universal expression of detestation of tithes, it would secure our victory in the next session.

The Corporate Reform will be the first measure of that session. The present Ministry *must* carry that measure; and what a blow it will be to the late ascendant party! Believe me that, if I can manage the Irish people during the present vacation, we will be able to defeat the Conservative party in the Lords and to advance *all* the interests of the Irish people. Every man will be at liberty to contribute to the support of any religion he chooses, without being compelled to contribute to one which he does not choose. In short, I never could entertain strong hopes for Ireland until now and now, blessed be God! I am buoyant with the expectation of crushing faction and producing solid advantages for the people of Ireland.

Let me hear from you regularly on your tour.³ I know you will be an accurate reporter of all you see and hear. I would be glad to know particularly the private opinion of the Catholic clergy on the subject of Glebes and Manses.⁴ In short, I desire to know the state of the public mind as it really is.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 463-4

- 1 The 1 November marked the commencement of Michaelmas law term, when actions for tithes would be tried. O'Connell apparently found that premature publication of his advice to the people would benefit the tithe-owners in their litigation.
- 2 See letter 2093 n2.
- 3 FitzPatrick was, apparently, setting out to begin the organisation of the O'Connell Tribute for 1834.
- 4 See letter 2072.

To Lord Duncannon

Derrynane, 2 September 1834

Private

My lord,

I left London nearly in despair of the present Administration doing anything for Ireland although, as you are in a position in which the same persons are your enemies as well as ours, I have endeavoured since my return to this country to put the best face I could upon your intentions and to keep the popular party as much as possible from embarrassing your Government.

The matter on which I most despair is, however, one of the most pressing necessity — the changing the agency by which the Whigs have hitherto conducted the Irish branch of their administration. When I saw you last,¹ you did not give me the least reason to hope for such a change. The coldness and apparent apathy with which you received the opinions I pressed on you upon this subject make me fear, very much fear, that your colleagues are not prepared to make those alterations amongst their Irish subalterns without which it would be vain to expect for the present Ministry the support of the Irish people or the absence of every species of political annoyance and embarrassment. I am doing all I can to give that Ministry the fullest opportunity to redeem itself with the people of Ireland, but I must say I am doing it with a conviction that Lord Melbourne and Lord Lansdowne are inclined to countenance the Ascendancy Party amongst us if they could only mitigate the hostility of that party; and that the greater part of the remainder of the Cabinet are not sufficiently awake to the importance of taking a decided part against their Orange enemies in Ireland or of at length forming a Government party in this country, for you well know that the Government has not an Irish party even amongst its own paid servants.

I do pray you to excuse me for giving you this trouble. But there is now so fine an opportunity of disembarassing the Ministry from one great difficulty that I cannot avoid obtruding my advice. The death of Judge Jebb² gives the Ministry an opportunity to prove itself. It will be vain to ask the popular party to tolerate you if you throw away this lucky chance.

It enables you to get rid of Blackburne. You can at once disembarass yourselves of him. An arrangement could be made to shift a judge from the Common Pleas into the King's Bench and to put Blackburne into the Common Pleas where his talents as a

lawyer would be useful in that otherwise miserable court. If he refuses to take the office of puisne judge you would have a palpable reason for dismissing him as Attorney-General, and while he fills that office you continue under the reproach of being vilified and defeated by the Orangemen and yet keeping their prime patron as your first law-officer. Even if you had only the seat in the King's Bench to offer Blackburne yet he could do much less mischief as a judge of that court than he does to Ireland and to you as Attorney-General.

If the Ministry do not dispose of Blackburne in this way the next person for the vacant seat would be Crampton³ if he were fit for it, but he is not. It will be a disgrace, an irretrievable disgrace to the Ministry to put on the Bench so incompetent a man. The £500 sent from the Castle to assist the Dungarvan election⁴ will, if Crampton be made a judge, all come out next session and then his promotion would really be making the Bench a family coterie. The Chancellor's son⁵ is married to the daughter of the Chief Justice of the King's Bench who in his turn is a near connection of the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas,⁶ who in his turn is connected with the new justice Crampton. Thus these judges, instead of being free to correct the errors the one of the others, will have family reasons and propensities to conceal and cover mutually their mistakes or misjudgements. I may not have accurately traced the connection between these four judges, that is, if Crampton is to be a judge but, if he shall be one, there certainly will be the *partie quarrée* of four judges nearly connected with one another on the Irish Bench, a thing which would not be tolerated in England.

But the more decisive objection, as I hope, is that Crampton really is unfit for the office. He has no character for high-mindedness or public integrity; his conduct at the Bar is sneered at, his legal knowledge by no means adequate; and if you inquire from dispassionate persons as to his conduct on the last Munster Circuit you will find an almost total want of judicial qualities. In short, it is my painful duty to warn you of the utter discredit you will fall into if you make Crampton a judge. A Mastership in Chancery *might* be procured for him and he would there be less liable to do injury and have only such points come before him as could be elucidated for him by any skilful accountant.

Supposing that the office should not be given to either Crampton or Blackburne, I will, in consequence of the permission you gave me, mention the names of the liberal barristers fit for that office.

First, Mr. Holmes, advanced in life, but an excellent strong-minded lawyer. A Presbyterian.

Second, Sergeant O'Loghlen, an excellent lawyer, a most

amiable intelligent man. A Catholic.

Third, Sergeant Perrin possesses the judicial qualities in a very high degree. A Protestant.

Fourth, Mr. Richards,⁷ practises at the Chancery Bar, an excellent lawyer and man. A Protestant.

Fifth, Mr. Richard Keating,⁸ a very good lawyer; a liberal at all times, neglected by the present Government, persecuted by the last. A Protestant.

Sixth, Mr. Pigot, a young man but of great, very great legal knowledge. One of the most excellent men living. Would be, I trust will be one day, an ornament to the Bench. A Catholic.

There is a list of six, the appointment of any of whom would give great satisfaction. But if emancipation is not to continue to be a dead letter, you will not pass over Sergeant O'Loughlen. There is not one man of any party that could deny his fitness to be a judge. This list will also serve you, as far as any suggestions of mine can serve you, in the selection of an Attorney or Solicitor-General, should either office be vacant or, what is much more likely, my suggestions will, as perhaps after all they ought to be, totally disregarded. That, of course, will not at all surprise me nor give me any kind of cause for reproach. I would not write if you were not as free to reject as I feel myself to suggest.

I saw with affright a paragraph in the *Globe*, throwing cold water on 'Corporate Reform' in Ireland. Knowing that paper to speak the sentiments of a segment of the Cabinet, I regret to see this damper put on the hopes held out by the King's concluding speech.⁹ Would to heaven you were all combined in a determination to carry into effect the practical measures necessarily expectant on the Reform Bill. It would be easy now to satisfy the British — aye, and the Irish public. Presently the time for half measures and gradual improvements will have passed, perhaps for ever.

I know the Ministry are losing time and opportunity in Ireland. You are going on with your Orangeists at the Castle, at the Bar, in the shrievalties, in the magistracies — in all places and offices, especially in the police, and then you blame the Irish people, sore from centuries of Orange oppressions, because they refuse to believe in the good intentions of a Ministry who appoint or continue their own and the people's enemies in all stations of honour and emolument.

How shall I apologise for this lengthened trespass? You would be spared the trouble of reading it if I was not convinced of the patriotism and purity of your disposition to serve Ireland and of your wish to receive information from every quarter to enable you

the better to carry your intentions into effect.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 473-7

- 1 See letter 2098.
- 2 Richard Jebb (1766-1834), eldest son of John Jebb, Leixlip, Co. Kildare; K.C. 1806, 3rd sergeant 1816, 2nd sergeant 1817; justice of the king's bench 1818 (see letter 2108).
- 3 Philip Cecil Crampton (1782-1862), 4th son of Rev. Cecil Crampton, rector of Headford, Co. Galway; solicitor general for Ireland 23 December 1830 – 21 October 1834; judge of the court of king's bench 1834-59; M.P. for Milborne July 1831-32. See *Boase*.
- 4 The election of 15 February 1834 when Ebenezer Jacob was elected, defeating Pierse G. Barron. Philip Crampton was a candidate but withdrew before the polling (*MR*, 14 Feb. 1834; election petition presented to Commons on 7 March 1834 against Jacob's return). See also letter 2043 n2.
- 5 Hon. John Span Plunket (1793-1871), second son of first Baron Plunket, lord chancellor of Ireland. Married 1824 Charlotte, daughter of Charles Kendal Bushe; crown prosecutor on the Munster circuit and sometime assistant barrister, Co. Meath. Succeeded his brother as third Baron Plunket 1866.
- 6 John Doherty.
- 7 John Richards (1790-1872), 28 Upper Merrion St., Dublin, second son of John Richards, attorney, Dublin and Hermitage, Co. Wexford; K.C. 1830; solicitor-general 1835-36; attorney-general 10 Nov. 1836 - 3 Feb. 1837; a baron of the exchequer 1837-49.
- 8 Richard Keatinge (1793-1876), 37 Upper Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin, 2nd son of Maurice Keatinge, a Dublin barrister; K.C. 1835; queen's sergeant 1842; judge of the prerogative court 1843; judge of the probate court 1858-68. See *Boase*.
- 9 The King's speech on the prorogation of parliament on 15 August included the statement: 'To the important subjects of our jurisprudence and of our municipal corporations your attention will naturally be directed early in the next session.'

2107

To Edward Ellice

Derrynane, 3 September 1834

Dear Sir,

[Seeks Ellice's aid in procuring a pension for the widow of a relative, Jeremiah (Darby) Mahony, on half-pay from the 16th Foot.]

Private

I cannot avoid imploring your attention to the conduct of your Government in Ireland. You have, you may believe *me*, the most favourable opportunity of conciliating the popular party, tranquillising the country and making it part of your strength in the

now inevitable collision with the Lords.¹ The Orangemen are doing you excellent service with the people and as I am decidedly with you in the struggle with the house of peers, I avail myself of the popular detestation of Orangeism so as to embarrass your Government as little as possible and to give it all the aid I consistently can. The people are heart and hand with me at present but *you* (I mean the ministry) are doing all you can to counteract me. You have not as yet removed one single Orange instrument of your Government. Gossett and the Castle are all Orange, Darley and the town police, Warburton² and the general county police are all Orange. The Attorney-General³ is high Orange, so are the crown solicitors in Leinster⁴ and almost all the crown prosecuting counsel. Much of the patronage of the Irish Bar has always been with the Attorney-General and he uses it to promote the Orange party. The greater number of your lord lieutenants of counties are Orange. Almost all the sheriffs, the deputy-lieutenants and the magistrates are Orange. In short you have scarcely any instruments of your Government in Ireland but such as belong decidedly and undisguisedly to the Orange faction which you have not conciliated in the least by all this truckling. You know that the arms which the Orange Yeomanry would if they dare use against you were given them by Lord Anglesey. How often have your friends abused the popular party in Ireland because we would not confide in your good intentions. What signify good intentions when the practical part of the Government is more effectively and insultingly Orange than it was in the time of Peel and Goulburn! Believe me that as long as you have the *rankest* Tory in the British dominions, Blackburne, at the head of the law, Gossett at the head of the working men at the Castle, Warburton and Tandy⁵ at the head of the county police, you never can or ought indeed expect to be able to conciliate the people. I may procure you a lull but I cannot procure you a permanent calm.

I should not trouble you with this letter but that I am convinced of the honesty and straightforwardness of your views respecting the mismanagement of Ireland. When will you begin to manage matters better! Would it not be time to take the first step for the very first step *has* as yet *to be* taken.

There is Judge Jebb dead.⁶ There is an opportunity to get rid of the Attorney-General. It would be infinitely preferable to have Blackburne a judge than to continue him as Attorney-General. The Solicitor-General, Crampton, is totally unfit to be made a judge and you will bring great discredit on the Administration if you appoint him. Do you recollect the ludicrous and deplorable figure he made in the House during the discussion on the Reform Bills?⁷

But I weary you. I only beg of you to believe that I am most unfeignedly desirous to strengthen the present Ministry as much as I can for the coming contest. You will certainly succeed in that contest if you conciliate the people and are combined and firm amongst yourselves and that Lord Brougham does not indulge⁸ in more of his extravagant vagaries.⁹

SOURCE: Ellice Papers

- 1 On Irish tithes (see letter 2093 n2).
- 2 Major George Warburton, J.P., Aughrim, Co. Galway, inspector general of police for Connaught.
- 3 Francis Blackburne.
- 4 William Kemmis, (1777-1864) Kildare Street and Piers Geale, Mountjoy Square.
- 5 Major James Tandy, Millbank, Naas, Co. Kildare, resident constabulary magistrate for Co. Kildare since 1819.
- 6 See letter 2106 n2.
- 7 See letter 2108 n7.
- 8 See letter 2108 n2.
- 9 This letter is marked: 'Mr. O'Connell September 3/34. Answered. Enclosed 16/34 and Lord Melbourne's letter relating to it.'

2108

To Charles Phillips

Derrynane, 5 September 1834

Private

My dear Charles,

I am anxious to know whether anything has been done for you. The Metropolitan Criminal Court Bill¹ has passed. Surely they do not think of working it without a prosecuting counsel responsible to the government and the country that no unfit case shall go to trial nor any fit case be left unprosecuted. I thought Lord Brougham would be glad to commence the system of responsibility in prosecutions so as to terminate the ancient and existing anomaly of leaving to the caprice, the malignity or the folly of private individuals whether or not crimes against the public shall be punished. Let me hear whether commonsense so far prospers as to dictate the commencement in your person of a better and more reasonable plan.

Were you not filled with regret that Lord Brougham should have closed the session with a panegyric on 'the Lords'.² These very Lords who would eat him as Pat eats his potatoes — without a grain of salt. Well, well, what egregious mistakes men of transcend-

ent talents will fall into. But perhaps it is the privilege of such talents to err when they go about it immoderately. It is a small consolation however that

The light which lead astray
Was light from Heaven.³

In sober sadness, my dear Phillips, *his Lordship* must spare his friends the pain and his enemies the triumph of these *coruscations*.

You see what a glorious opportunity this Ministry now have of showing that they are inclined to do something to conciliate the people of Ireland especially as I can tell you I have the popular party quite in humour to add to the strength instead of being part of the weakness of the *present* Ministry. There is Jebb dead and a seat vacant in the King's Bench.⁴ A more decided Orange partisan never lived. He was a frightful judge such as no country but one in the convulsed and volcanic state of Ireland could have produced. Alas, alas, how many more wretched specimens does not our bench afford! But to return, Jebb is dead. He did not die of cholera but of apoplexy to which his family is subject. Now for the Ministry. They *might* easily disembarass themselves of Blackburne. They could transfer Moore⁵ or Johnson⁶ from the Common Pleas to the King's Bench and offer Blackburne the seat in the Common Pleas. If he accepts it, well, the Government are happily rid of him and he can do them or their friends little mischief in the Common Pleas where, by the bye, as a hardheaded lawyer he would be wanting. Whereas, as Attorney-General, he makes them odious and detestable. If he refuses, it will be an insult to the Government and then they have a just reason to dismiss him.

If Blackburne be not the judge, it is said Crampton is but one would feign hope that so flagrant an absurdity will not be committed. It would disgrace the Ministry for ever to appoint so inefficient a man but you know him and therefore you can easily imagine with what disgust his appointment would be looked to. It would be conclusively believed that nothing useful or conciliatory could possibly emanate from a Ministry so unwise as to give him a seat upon the Bench, especially after the miserably ridiculous figure he cut in the House of Commons when Wetherell blew up his 'prerogative' law and that Lord Althorp threw him overboard.⁷ What a pretty family party the Irish Bench would present with the four relatives — Plunket, Bushe, Doherty and Crampton upon it, for you know they are all in a very close degree of relationship or affinity. If the ministry have any commonsense they will give the office either to Blackburne to get rid of him or they will give it to O'Loghlen who is admitted by all parties to be the fittest man

possible for a judicial situation. I should say, station.

I am happy to tell you my family are well and merry, enjoying these wild and stupendous scenes where nature outpaints poetry, and fiction could not fabricate the majestic heavings upward of the ancient antideluvian world. I wish I could show you nine couple and a half of my culled beagles — the odd numbers being the only lucky ones in sporting, and see you listening to the millions of echoes which they arouse in one of our sequestered mountain glens. I solemnly assure you that they resemble *accurately* the pealing of a mighty organ which imagination would easily suppose to equal *a bend* of the majestic mountains themselves. You may laugh at me, Charles, but I speak *the words of sobriety*. How I delight in this place!

[P.S.] I write the memorandum at the other side merely that this letter should not get into your English neighbours' hands by accident — D. O'Connell.⁸

SOURCE: Brougham MSS

- 1 'An Act for Establishing a New Court for the Trial of offences committed in the Metropolis, and Parts adjoining' was enacted on 25 July (4 & 5 Will. IV c. 36). Phillips was shortly afterwards appointed by Brougham public prosecutor under this act, a post worth £2,000 per annum (*MR*, 16 Oct. 1834)
- 2 On 14 August Brougham had praised the House of Lords in a speech which included the passage: 'No impartial man who had watched the proceedings of the last two years could have failed to perceive that if there had been no House of Lords, the House of Commons must have stopped its legislation or if it had worked on it would have been covered with blunders and absurdities' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXV, 1259-60).
- 3 A slightly inaccurate rendering of two lines from William Wordsworth's poem, *To the Sons of Burns*.
- 4 See letter 2106 n2.
- 5 Arthur Moore.
- 6 William Johnson (1760-1845), fifth son of Thomas Johnson, Dublin, apothecary; justice of the common pleas 1817-41 when he resigned.
- 7 Speaking in support of the second reform bill on 21 September 1831, Crampton asserted that the king by exercise of his royal prerogative was entitled to order the suspension of writs to the boroughs which the government proposed to disfranchise (*Hansard*, 3rd ser., VII, 378-9). Sir Charles Wetherell moved that the debate on the reform bill be adjourned 'unless Ministers thought fit to disavow the illegal, unconstitutional and monstrous doctrine put forth by the . . . Solicitor General for Ireland [Crampton].' On behalf of the government Althorp said 'he should not . . . be induced to adopt or assent to the doctrine which . . . [Crampton] was understood to have propounded; nor did he think such a course strictly in unison with the practice of the Constitution.' Wetherell upon this agreed to withdraw his motion (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., VII, 386-92).
- 8 The letter is noted by O'Connell, 'For Charles Phillips, *the celebrated Irish barrister* and not for any one else.'

To James Abercromby

Derrynane, 5 September 1834

Private

My dear Sir,

Of course I do not know how far you interfere with Irish concerns but I was one of those who rejoiced at your getting a seat in the cabinet because you had so many opportunities of being acquainted with the state of Ireland that I was thoroughly convinced you could not be so long a Cabinet Minister as you now have been without insisting upon and procuring some change of system in the management of this ill-fated country. But I deeply regret to be obliged to declare that you have yet to begin. Your Ministry has as yet to take the first step towards conciliating the people of Ireland. You have not removed one single Orange functionary. You have not made one single popular appointment. To any dispassionate person how strange it must appear *that* 'the Whigs' should have been in power four years without having any party or partisans in Ireland, *that* they should give the powers, honours and emoluments of the state into the hands exclusively of their and the country's bitterest enemies. It is melancholy as well as ridiculous but surely it is also highly criminal. Is it not so?

I do trust you will pardon the liberty I take by reason of the motives which [*? inspire*] me. I have both publicly and privately avowed my anxiety to strengthen the hand of the present Ministry for their coming conflict. The peers must displace you or you must overcome them — if that be practicable after Lord Brougham's concluding speech of praise.¹ I do verily believe that my apprehensions are realised and that a period of insanity has arrived such as seems generally to precede the downfall of empires. Praising the peers just after their contemptuous kicking out of the Ministerial [*sic*] by the Bill!² But this insanity seems to me to come nearer home when you look at the situation of Ireland.

There is now an opportunity of conciliating the popular party. The Orangemen have created this opportunity for you, and I myself am ready to assist in making it available for your purposes. But you will not stir one step to enable your friends to serve you or to weaken your enemies. You cannot conciliate them without restoring Protestant Ascendancy in its pristine vigour — a thing just impossible.

There is now another opportunity afforded to convince the people that you have some intention to carry into practical effect

your own principles. The office of judge is vacant.³ . . . I would suggest first that a judge should be removed from the Common Pleas to the King's Bench in the room of Jebb — either Moore or Johnson — not Torrens who is a narrow-minded inveterate Orangist. Second, to give Blackburne the vacant seat thus created in the Common Pleas. His legal knowledge would be of use in that court which is deplorably deficient. Third, if these suggestions be not attended to then I do implore of you not to make the Solicitor-General a judge. He is utterly unfit for it. He has neither character, knowledge nor firmness for that situation. You will be disgraced in the eyes of every rational man in Ireland if you make so incompetent and unprincipled a man as Crampton a judge. His *coup d'essai* on the last Munster Circuit was most unfortunate. The account I got of him was that he was as bad as Baron Foster, and it is impossible to be worse. Besides there are three judges already forming a family party on the Bench. Lord Plunket who is closely connected with Chief Justice Bushe, and Bushe with Chief Justice Doherty, and Crampton with one or both the latter. There would if Crampton be made a judge be four judges of a family — that is, having family connections to stimulate them to protect and shield or to conceal each other's errors instead of being vigilant for the public good to correct and judicially as well as judiciously expose the mistakes and misconduct towards the suitors of one another.

If you appoint Blackburne you take out of the office of Attorney-General the most decided Orange Tory that ever filled that office. If he refuse to accept the situation you may then dismiss him without reproach. Reproach or no reproach you ought to discontinue him as Attorney-General. It is impossible for you to conciliate Ireland whilst he is the leading law officer of the Crown. If the vacant seat be not filled either by Blackburne or Crampton, it ought not to go beyond Serjeant O'Loughlen. He is a Catholic and his appointment would show that it was not intended to allow Emancipation to continue a dead letter. Besides, all parties admit his perfect capability.

Let me once again apologise for obtruding this letter upon you but my earnest desire to see the *new system* commence and my conviction that the people of Ireland will not and ought not to be contented with mere words especially as you have now an opportunity of acting. You are aware that almost all the functionaries who *serve* under the present Administration in Ireland are of the deepest Orange tinge. I merely submit to you that this ought not to continue.⁴

SOURCE: BM Add. Mss. 38080, ff. 64-7

1 See letter 2108 n2.

2 The tithe bill (see letter 2093 n2).

3 On Jebb's death.

4 Abercromby forwarded this letter to Melbourne with a letter of his own expressing a marked degree of support for O'Connell's requests (Walpole, *Russell*, I, 207).

2110

Letter withdrawn. Public letter to Lord Duncannon, 6 September 1834, published in the *Freeman's Journal*, 11 September 1834.

2111

From Lord Duncannon

Bessborough [Co. Kilkenny], 8 September 1834

Private

My dear Sir,

It is unjust in you to say I received any suggestions you made in London coldly¹ and without the intention of profiting by them but I told you then, and I must now repeat to you that I should be acting unfairly by them — those with whom I am particularly connected — if I made promises or gave assurances that it did not depend on me to perform. You know my opinion on matters connected with this country and you know also how happy I am to receive your suggestions. I am very much obliged to you for the names you mention of persons at the bar whose talents and station entitle them to preferment. Serjeant O'Loughlen, I know, is one eminently qualified for employment and justly popular. I have no right to complain, in the situation I hold, of a public letter² being addressed to me. If I made any complaint it might perhaps be that you blame the appointment of my private secretary, which is the first time such an appointment has been remarked on.³ General Macdonald has been a friend of mine and of all my family for many years and is it not natural that I should appoint his son⁴ to a situation quite unconnected with politics? I think also that you will, on consideration, see that you have allowed me a very long time when you name my appointment as two months old.⁵

I have not read the article in the *Globe*⁶ to which you allude but you may be assured that the Government are as anxious as you can be to forward the Corporation business and the Editor

must be mistaken in what he has written and he actually writes without authority. Pray never apologise for your private letters.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 481-2

- 1 See letter 2106.
- 2 O'Connell to Duncannon, 30 August 1834, *DEM*, 5 September 1834. This was the first of a series of four public letters addressed by O'Connell to Duncannon at this time. The other three dated 6, 12 September and 11 October, are published in *DEM*, 12, 19 September, *MR*, 18 October 1834.
- 3 In his public letter, above, to Duncannon, O'Connell declared 'It is . . . given out that you have yourself chosen for your *private* secretary a rank and inveterate Tory. Alas . . . for poor Ireland!'
- 4 Norman Hilton MacDonald (1807-1857), only son of Sir John MacDonald, K.C.B., adjutant-general at the Horse Guards (died 1850); private secretary to Lord Duncannon 1834-5; private secretary to Lord Morpeth 1836-40; under-secretary for Ireland 1840-41.
- 5 In his public letter, above, to Duncannon, O'Connell declared 'You, my Lord, are two months — two long months — in office, and you have not taken one step to redeem all or any of your pledges. . . .' Duncannon had been appointed home secretary on 19 July.
- 6 See letter 2106.

2112

From James Salmon¹ to Derrynane

Mullingar, 8 September 1834

Sir,

I take the liberty of submitting to your consideration the result of a memorial² forwarded from the spirit retailers of this town to the Lords of the Treasury respecting a drawback which they claimed on their stock of spirits on hands duty paid on the 1st September. [Salmon adds that this regulation is an injustice to many of the dealers. He encloses a copy of the memorial and the reply³ which states that the Irish MPs had accepted the fixing of the date as September 1st as being fair. Salmon asks O'Connell to attempt to have the injustice remedied.]

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 James Salmon, wine and spirit merchant.
- 2 On 9 August the *Morning Register* stated that 'In consequence of the announcement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer . . . that the reduction of the duty on whiskey in Ireland should take place on the 1st of September, instead of the 10th of October, as originally arranged (see letter 2097 n2) a memorial numerously signed was yesterday forwarded to the Lords of the Treasury, praying that the drawback should also commence on the

1st of September . . . ' (MR, 9 Aug. 1834). Presumably this was a memorial similar in tenor to that presented from the spirit retailers of Mullingar.

3 The memorial and reply are not extant.

2113

Letter withdrawn. Public letter to Edward Dwyer, 11 September 1834 published in the *Pilot*, 15 September 1834.

2114

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 12 September 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have only to wish that you may not be over-sanguine in your expectations. One year more of struggle will bring us to the end of our anxieties. The battle of Ireland is being well fought. It is one great step to have Blackburne out and Perrin in as Attorney-General.¹ The Orangeists will not act with or for the latter as they did for the former, and Lord Anglesey would not have been able, without Blackburne, to make the unpopular fight he did in his attacks on the press.² Blackburne was the mainstay of Orangeism at the Castle.

I abandon for the present all idea of 'Manses and Glebes',³ but I trust the day is not distant when the subject may be revived with better temper.

Barrett is here, enjoying the mountain breezes. We have just come in from hunting and killing in high style a brace of hares.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 483

1 O'Connell was mistaken. Blackburne remained attorney-general until April 1835. There was however a rumour at this time that Perrin had succeeded Blackburne in that position (*Waterford Chronicle*, quoted in the *Pilot*, 3 Oct. 1834).

2 O'Connell was probably referring in particular to Blackburne's prosecution of Barrett (see letter 1975a n1).

3 See letter 2105 n4.

2115

*From Edward Ellice**Copy*

Edinburgh, 16 September 1834

Private

Dear Sir,

[Acknowledges O'Connell's letter of the 3rd inst.¹ which he only received yesterday. He will do all he can to meet O'Connell's request concerning the pension claim of Mahony's widow. 'Although in principle as great an economist as either our friend Joseph [Hume?] or Sir. H. Parnell, I am no advocate for saving public money at the expense of meritorious officers . . . or of their helpless families. . . .']

I am obliged by the candour and frankness of your private communication on the present state of Irish affairs and politics. It is a long, a difficult and a dangerous chapter for a person in my position to enter into a discussion in correspondence with you upon, at the present crisis. As in this country it is expected that the abuses and neglects of a Tory reign of half a century should be remedied in a couple of sessions of Parliament, so in Ireland . . . a part of the Empire oppressed and treated almost as a conquered province for several centuries, an immediate, a general reform . . . of that almost incurable cancer . . . the division of society into two bitter and hostile factions, the one infuriated by the prospect of losing the power they have too long abused, and the other eager to avail themselves in their turn of the ascendancy which their numbers and a happy change of circumstances give them the prospect of establishing. . . . No administration in this country can be long popular with your party . . . which does not exclusively adopt these views and objects. In saying this however I do not mean to express an opinion in favour of the employment of adverse or unwilling instruments in the direction and execution of liberal measures. On this point I have long entertained sentiments not dissimilar from those you express and Ireland is not the only country, or the administration of her affairs the only department in which the Whig Government have suffered serious inconvenience and injury from a policy for which too much respect for the feelings and interests of individuals and an accession to power after fifty years' exclusion are the best excuse. . . . You have in the appointment as Home Secretary of Lord Duncannon the best assurance that any representation from the liberal party in Ireland with respect to appointments connected with that country will be

attended to with consideration and a disposition to satisfy their just claims and expectations.

The madness and infatuation of the Orange party . . . will work rather good than mischief if your friends continue to avoid their example and raise themselves in the opinion of the public of this country by courses of moderation and prudence. . . . You will I am sure admit that their best and safest reliance must be on the support of the Reformed House of Commons to measures founded on principles of moderation and prudence and calculated to inspire confidence and protection and to remove distrust and apprehensions of security from the minds of *all classes* in Ireland. I have frequently told you that the cause of freedom and liberality in that country can only be endangered by creating an impression on the public mind in this, that a disposition and intention exists in some quarters to oppress the Protestant part of the population or to shake the security of Protestant interests; and be assured, if that feeling is once excited, the more popular the Government may become, the more severely will its effects be felt in your unhappy country. . . .

SOURCE: Ellice Papers

1 Letter 2107.

2116

To William Sharman Crawford

Derrynane, 17 September 1834

Private

My dear Sir,

Your letter of the 31st of August¹ has remained to this period unanswered only because the topics it contained were too important to be disposed of flippantly or without more of consideration than I could give it during *the course* of my letters² to Lord Duncannon. I will now suspend those letters until I have publicly answered the objections you so justly raise to *any* system of abolition of tithes. The difficulty is great, perhaps insurmountable, to the giving the landlords the exclusive benefit of the reduction of that charge upon the land.³ I mean that I do not see my way in the present state of the social system in Ireland how completely to prevent the landlord from getting the benefit of the 'extinction of tithes.' I will however do the best I can to point out how that mischief may in my opinion be alleviated and diminished as much

as possible but, instead of doing it confidentially to you, I will do it by my public letter,⁴ requesting your strictest criticism of that letter either by public reply or private communication. I know you will at once perceive that instead of construing this mode of proceeding into anything of disrespect, you will receive it, as it is really intended, for another proof of the high estimate I form of your judgement and of your warmhearted yet cool and discreet patriotism.

You are one of the few who appreciate the crisis at which we are arrived. The times we live in are those in which a transition ought to be made from the factious misrule of centuries to the sway of a paternal and protective government, a government which will leave to each human being the responsibility of selecting truth in religious matters unswayed by political ascendancy or degradation. A government which, leaving to the people the free and *protected* choice of local magistracies, will remove at one blow nine tenths of the causes of irritation and oppression; a government which will render law clear and simple in its enactments and justice cheap and expeditious. These are the objects of *our* ambition and I believe that they are all attainable. The virulence of sectarian animosity is certainly our greatest obstacle and I am firmly convinced that we have not the least chance of success until the Orange faction is rendered impotent by the loss of governmental and ecclesiastical patronage. The Orangemen would be as feeble as bullrushes if we had a government which would mildly but firmly execute the existing laws against them and, at the same time, weed out every individual of that faction from public pay or power. If that faction became powerless the course would be free to canvass and to obtain all the advantages of a local Legislature, a measure which it is my first and chiefest object to obtain, and one to which I unremittingly tried whether in the bustle of active agitation [remainder of letter missing]

SOURCE: Sharman Crawford Papers, Public Record Office, Belfast

1 Unidentified.

2 See letter 2111 n2.

3 The government's tithe bill of 1834 'offered substantial inducements to Irish landlords to co-operate.' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 190). These inducements consisted of a premium to which it was intended the landlord who consented to convert the tithe into a voluntary rent-charge should become entitled. For details of the scheme see O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 471 n6.

4 O'Connell to Crawford, 27 September 1834, *Morning Register*, 2 October 1834. The letter which runs the length of six columns of newsprint, sets out to answer Crawford's main objection to the recent tithe bill — that is, that it would involve 'a destruction of public property which, though it

were taken away from the parsons, ought to be preserved for public purposes, and not bestowed in pure bounty to the exclusive use of the Irish landlord' (see above n3). O'Connell says he had accepted the recent bill because he considered it provided a partial abolition of tithes. He enters into elaborate details of the legal restrictions imposed on clergymen attempting to levy tithes hereafter. He argues that even under the late scheme, tenants would have derived substantial advantages. He concludes by propounding a new scheme of his own which would impose a tax on rents in lieu of tithes and allow for buying out the tithe owners at twelve years' purchase.

2117

To Richard Barrett, Pilot Office, Suffolk St., Dublin

Derrynane, 2 October 1834

My dear Barrett,

I return you the bill for Forde accepted. Will you take the trouble to make an entry of its particulars and hand them to Fitz-Patrick on his return to Dublin.

Tell Staunton I got his letter and will readily preside at a dinner for the monks of La Trappe.¹ But it is not possible for me to fix the time as the period of my return to Dublin depends on the *Custom House Trial*² which as far as I can see is *not* likely to come on.

Cobbett is bothered upon Poor Laws. He says they were not complained of as producing mischief for near 300 years.³ He is quite ignorant. They have been complained of for near half that time and the 'Great Rebellion,' as Cromwell's wars are called, rendered the effects of the Poor Laws almost imperceptible for near 50 years more. Cobbett advocates the very worst part of the system, that which interferes with the rate of wages. He says that Poor Laws, English Poor Laws, exist in America without complaint.⁴ Ignorance again. They are most loudly complained of in America and are producing the most mischievous effects notwithstanding the far greater demand for labour there than in any European country.

Cobbett as an Englishman would not be sorry to put the Irish on the wrong scent and to prevent them from discussing the Repeal.

I mean to send you by the post of Saturday another and a short letter⁵ to Mr. Crawford to conclude what I have to say on the subject of tithes. You *must* insert it on Monday to make room for my fourth letter to Lord Duncannon.

I like much your style of attack on Cobbett. Be as civil as possible and merely protest against the taking off of attention from the *Repeal*, that is, impute *no motives* but argue as much as you please.

There is nothing certain with respect to law changes,⁶ nothing at all. I have this from excellent authority. Perrin *between you and me* has *as yet*, that is, two days ago had no communication on the subject of any kind whatsoever.

SOURCE: A. Guinness Son & Co. (Dublin) Ltd.

1 That is, the monks of Mount Melleray, Co. Waterford.

2 In connection with the Customs House fire (see letter 2001).

3 On 25 September William Cobbett delivered a lecture on poor laws in Dublin in the course of which he declared that although a poor law had existed in England for two hundred and forty years it was only now 'for the first time decided that it produced laziness, idleness and living upon the industry of others.' (*MR*, 26 Sept. 1834).

4 In his lecture, above, Cobett declared from the experience of his recent visit to the U.S.A. that the English system of poor laws was in operation there 'fully, fairly and effectually . . . for every one of its excellent purposes.' He added that any attempt to undermine poor laws in America would cause another revolution there.

5 O'Connell to William Sharman Crawford, 1 October 1834, containing a further outline of O'Connell's plans with regard to the abolition of tithes (*MR*, 7 Oct. 1834).

6 See letter 2114.

2118

To Lord Duncannon

Derrynane, 2 October 1834

My Lord,

The enclosed letter,¹ signed by a person of the name of Monteith,² is upon so interesting a subject as the life of a human being and, although I know nothing of the case³ or of the writer, I yet feel myself bound to submit that letter for your consideration. This is certainly the most painful and the most awful part of your public duty but may I be allowed to conjecture that you never will regret having advised the milder course. One mistake on the other side is not easily forgotten.

The public sentiment is very strong for the abolition of Capital punishment save in cases of *wilful* murder. And, indeed, transportation for life is no trivial punishment for any crime devoid of the greatest atrocity. The Scotch judges, I believe, are far from entering into these sentiments.

I avail myself of this opportunity to return you my very sincere thanks for your kind letter.⁴ The tone of that letter places me under great obligation to you, and makes me doubly regret having introduced anything into my publications relative to your private secretary.⁵ Surely I must have seen the same sentiment expressed in some newspaper, else I could not have known anything about the matter. But at all events I am sincerely sorry for having alluded to it, and I hope you will pardon it as I certainly did not intend to exceed the license fairly allowed to a public writer.

The Irish public are of course waiting with impatience to know when you will *begin* to do anything for Ireland. You perceive that *as yet* the Irish are in no degree the better for the recent changes. The Orange is as predominant in all official situations as ever it was. The seat on the bench remains to be filled.⁶ Now I fear *for* the mode in which it *will* be filled. At all events you have as yet done nothing that the public do or can know, and another *long* month is now to be added to the former two.⁷ I for my part can conjecture only one difficulty. Your colleagues are afraid to do justice to Ireland. They fear that if justice were done the faction which to a certain extent favours the British to the exclusion of Irish power would desert that post and thus give additional strength to the Repeal party; whereas the fact is that the strength of the Repeal party consists in the torpor, the apathy or, worse, the hostility of the Government evinced towards the People of Ireland.

See how all the Orange party are acting. See how well the popular party are conducting themselves. I have got the political unions to remain quiescent.⁸ I have by the promise of a future liberal club prevented the present formation of *that* or more active public bodies. You *may* still conciliate the Irish people, but certainly not by *doing nothing* towards that object. Do not flatter yourselves that the dismissal of Mr. Cross will be accepted as any part of the payment of the debt you owe the Irish nation.⁹ No, you *must* discard plentifully or you do nothing.

It is worthy of remark that 'the Popular party' require nothing for themselves. They only ask the discountenancing of your enemies as well as of them. Look at any county in Ireland, and I defy you to point out any one in which the Orange Tories are not in everything the favoured, caressed and courted of the Irish government. It is so in Kerry; it is so in every other county. And then the batch of Parson-justices of the peace. But if you were to begin in Dublin, if you were to get rid of Blackburne — on the Bench or off, if you were once rid of him, then indeed you would begin to inspire your friends with hope, your enemies with despair.

I had no notion that I could so long keep down active agitation by the popular party. But I perceive that there is more of tact in the public than I could have believed. They see, as I do, that our business is to allow the Orange faction to display its hostility to the Government, and to be able hereafter either to praise the Government for suppressing that faction or to triumph over the Government in the estimation of all rational men by showing that the Ministry have not the courage to discountenance their enemies even whilst they were insulted by that enemy.

Chief Justice Bushe attributed the Union to an intolerance on the part of Britain of Irish prosperity. I begin to fancy that the sentiment still prevails. Lord Grey and Stanley acted as if they were animated by it without themselves being conscious that they were so. I fear that Lord Melbourne and Lord Lansdowne (his Irish estates notwithstanding) are actuated by similar motives.

But conjectures are wearisome and useless; facts are alone to be relied on. And it is a fact that the popular party in Ireland have not, since *this* Ministry was formed, done one act to embarrass them; that the Orange faction in Ireland has done everything to embarrass the ministry and disturb the country; and oh, most strange and disheartening conclusion, that the popular party are everywhere discountenanced, and the Orange party are everywhere countenanced, encouraged, promoted and *stuffed* into every official situation.

I do not presume to ask you in your official capacity but I implore you to ask yourself is this system ever to be changed and if it be, why should not a beginning, a demonstration be made of such change? But with all your excellent intentions I ask in vain. Lord Anglesey changed little or nothing of the old system except the acting upon that system with rather more vigour than his predecessors. Your Ministry have taken up and continued all the errors of Lord Anglesey's government, and there is as little appearance now of any amelioration as if Peel and Goulburn were still in management of this country.

I write in no spirit of hostility but in great and bitter regret.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 483-6

1 Unidentified.

2 William Monteith, Glasgow.

3 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, the case was that of Richard Hill, a convict under sentence of death. In consequence of influential representations to Lord Duncannon, and the production of further evidence, the sentence was commuted to transportation for life (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 483 n2). It was apparently a Scottish case.

4 Letter 2111.

5 See letter 2111 n3.

6 The vacancy caused by the death of Judge Jebb.

7 See letter 2111 n5.

8 See letter 2103.

9 On 20 September Philip Cross, Shandyhall, Coachford, Co. Cork, a magistrate, was fined £10 and sentenced to one month's imprisonment for an assault on a farmer's son named Timothy O'Brien. Cross was acting as tithe agent for Rev. William Beresford, rector of Inniscarra, Co. Cork, who had agreed to allow Cross 25 per cent of all tithes he should recover. Cross went on to O'Brien's father's farm, and on being remonstrated with by O'Brien for damaging a field of corn, he is alleged to have replied that 'as a magistrate, he could do as he pleased,' and then attempted with violence to arrest O'Brien (*MR*, 25 Sept. 1834). Shortly afterwards Cross published a statement from prison to the effect that he had been framed on these charges (*MR*, 14 Oct. 1834).

2119

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 11 October 1834

Private

My dear Barrett,

I entirely agree with your view of the recent changes.¹ How much better would it have been if O'Loughlen had also refused to act² under Blackburne. But I am not surprised that he took the office and although I wish he had avoided it, I cannot, strange as it may appear, feel sorry that he has the situation of solicitor-general. Perrin behaved nobly. I wrote to him tendering any support in my power in case he should want a re-election.³ The conduct of Lord Duncannon in consenting to have Blackburne continued is actually atrocious and demonstrates that we have nothing to expect from him. Perhaps *it is* — nay, I am convinced *it is* all for the better. The Repeal gains by it.

I had written the far greater part of my fourth letter⁴ when the news of the legal appointments reached me. I do not know when I felt more of political disgust than I did with the present Ministry. Nothing could be more foolish than their conduct. To make Crampton, with all his inefficiencies and total lack of principle, a judge, is terrific; to continue Blackburne in the office of Attorney-General, to nominate Green to the serjeantcy — all — all are in the very worst spirit. Who is it that is honest and will not allow that it is utterly impossible to do anything for Ireland without a domestic Legislature?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 488

- 1 On 4 October it was officially announced that Blackburne was to continue as attorney-general; Crampton to be made a judge; O'Loughlen to be solicitor-general; and Greene to be serjeant (in place of O'Loughlen). (*MR*, 6 Oct. 1834).
- 2 The death of Richard Jebb having created a vacancy in the king's bench, Blackburne was offered it. He agreed to accept it but Perrin refused to serve as solicitor-general if Crampton were promoted to the position of attorney-general. The government then requested Blackburne to remain as attorney-general (Blackburne, *Blackburne*, 188-91; *MR*, 6 Oct. 1834). O'Loughlen was then made solicitor-general while Crampton became a justice of the king's bench.
- 3 Louis Perrin was at this time M.P. for Co. Monaghan. Had he accepted the post of solicitor-general he would have been obliged to stand for re-election.
- 4 O'Connell to Duncannon, 11 October 1834, *MR*, 18 Oct. 1834. The letter as finally published contained a lengthy denunciation of Whig administration in Ireland, condemning them especially for retaining Blackburne in office and appointing Crampton a judge and Greene a serjeant. He said of Melbourne, 'it is lamentable to think that the destinies of the Irish people should depend in any degree on so inefficient a person.' He concluded by stating that Irish hopes would for the future centre on Lord Durham who 'is a real, not a sham reformer. . . .'

2120

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 11 October 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I do not exactly know what to do with myself. I greatly fear you overrate the public sentiment on my behalf, and rely too much on the dexterity of your arrangements¹ which, although in themselves admirable, cannot supply the want which I fear exists in the 'public heart.' It seems to me that your letters since your recent trip have less of the confidence of success than formerly. Am I mistaken?

Look out for a person of the name of John Holmes,² living at 47 Bolton Street, and give him five guineas I owe him. It was a fee which I did not earn. . . .

The law appointments³ are quite characteristic of the scoundrel Whigs. They could not have done worse, else they would contrive to do so, I warrant them. It is frightful to think of their putting Crampton on the Bench. I could wish that O'Loughlen had refused the office *under* Blackburne, although I am not sorry to see him Solicitor-General. Perrin has behaved as became him. I wrote to

Perrin to offer him any aid in my power on his becoming Attorney General, to have him returned for Monaghan.

Send me, pray, by return, *Tait* for October, the *Catholic Magazine* and the *Westminster Review*.

I am arranging my *Agitation Plans*, so as to baffle the present mean and miserable Administration. But at present the Orange faction is really doing our business.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 492-3

1 In collecting the O'Connell Tribute for 1834.

2 Wholesale hosiery and worsted warehouse proprietor.

3 See letter 2119.

2121

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 17 October 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

Your letter of last night was truly gratifying. What should I have been able to achieve but for you? I must have retired from the struggle for Ireland and sunk into a mere professional drudge. May God bless *you*, and direct *me*! . . .

I am sure Barrett will not be such a blockhead as to take any notice of the rascally abuse in the *Freeman*.¹ He never would hear an end of their ruffianism if he did. It will ruin the paper with the public. Tell him I have written eight pages of my first letter² to Lord Durham and hope to send him some by Sunday's post. I will be able to do so unless tomorrow be a very fine day for hunting. Tell him also that he is quite mistaken — 'the Angler in Ireland' is not the English barrister Allen, whom I never saw, but a parson of the name of Belton. Indeed, if he had looked to the dates, he would have seen that 'Belton's' visit here was last year, and Allen came to the country only in the present. This vagabond parson imagines he was so important a personage that *I* was playing off to court his high and mighty smiles.³ Bah! I will hit the *Observer* for his tale⁴ of O'Gorman Mahon. It is indeed quite foolish, as a mode of sustaining his reason for my hating Gossett, that I was guilty of perfidy and that Gossett *detected* me. Besides, if I offered Gossett to procure informations against any man in the community and he refused to have them received, he would give me a direct opportunity to impeach his conduct. The whole story is a mere colour given to the fact that several freeholders who promised to vote for

Maurice were visited in the night by Terry Alts or persons pretending so to be, and *sworn* not to vote for him, and of my undisguised efforts to procure legal evidence against the perpetrators.

P.S. Mahon was named in my correspondence⁵ with Stanley. Let nobody deny this.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 493-4

- 1 The *Pilot* and *Freeman's Journal* were at this time engaged in a war of invective. Subjects at issue included the *Freeman's* charge that Perrin was an opponent of Repeal and that Barrett, the editor of the *Pilot*, lacked political principle.
- 2 O'Connell to Durham, 21 October 1834, *MR*, 25 October 1834. The letter, which runs to some four columns of newsprint, appeals to Durham as a well-known radical to procure the implementation of reform in Ireland.
- 3 In the *Dublin Evening Post*, 14 October 1834, there appears a review of *The Angler in Ireland: or an Englishman's Ramble through Connaught and Munster during the Summer of 1833*, (2 vols., London, 1834), by W. Belton. This work appears to include oblique comment on political affairs. A sketch of Derrynane appears in the second volume.
- 4 On 14 September 1834 the London *Observer* stated that Sir William Gossett 'detected Mr. O'Connell in one of the most extraordinary attempts ever perhaps made by artfully contrived falsehoods to convert an official man into an instrument for the promotion of selfish objects and the gratification of personal malignity' (quoted in the *Cork Southern Reporter* of 25 September 1834). In a letter to the *Southern Reporter* on 30 September O'Connell denounced the *Observer's* statement as a lie, and challenged it to furnish more explicit information (*Southern Reporter*, 4 Oct. 1834). On 12 October the *Observer* (quoted in *Southern Reporter* of 16 October 1834) gave the information demanded by O'Connell. It stated that just before the general election of 1831 O'Connell in an interview with Gossett offered to supply the government with information that would convict O'Gorman Mahon of Terry Alt (Whiteboy) activities. It attributed O'Connell's motive to a desire to have his son Maurice elected M.P. for Co. Clare in place of O'Gorman Mahon. O'Connell did offer to procure information against O'Gorman Mahon in May 1831 in a letter to Stanley, then chief secretary (see letter 1809 and 2123). See further letter 2122.
- 5 See note 4 above.

2122

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 17 October 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I wrote to you this morning a letter containing a statement with reference to the *Observer's* charge¹ against O'Gorman Mahon. I

have seen that charge since, and now write to beg of you not to mention to anyone the contents of my letter relative to that subject. The story in the *Observer* is a perfect lie but say nothing that can get into print on this subject as the *Reporter* is the paper in which I will publish my contradiction of the story.²

Tell Barrett from me to spare that poor creature Malachy Fallon.³ He has a wife and probably a family and nothing to eat. I beg of Barrett to spare him for my sake, and I make it a point that he and you will conceal that this forbearance is at my request. It would look like hypocrisy if it were known that I interfered. I do therefore make it a point that you and Barrett will literally comply with what I ask. I will take it as a proof of real kindness.⁴

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 494-5

1 See letter 2121.

2 See letter 2123.

3 Malachi Fallon (c. 1802-1841), eldest son of Patrick K. Fallon, decd. late of Cloona, Co. Roscommon; called to the bar 1825; appointed assistant barrister 21 November 1834.

4 The *Pilot* apparently made an attack on Fallon for which it was taken to task by the *Courier*. The *Pilot* accused Fallon of being the Irish correspondent of the *Courier* and of having viciously traduced O'Connell. At the same time it stressed that O'Connell had not inspired its abuse of Fallon, towards whom, it claimed O'Connell had in fact, 'kindly and merciful feelings' (*Pilot*, 22 October 1834). The *Courier* shortly afterwards denied that it had Fallon for a correspondent (*Pilot*, 22 Oct. 1834, quoting the *Courier*).

2123

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 21(?) October 1834

Private

My dear Barrett,

I feel the dilemma in which the scoundrel in the *Observer* has thrown your case with Mahon. But the story¹ itself, as told by him, is a lie. The fellow, however, has sources of discovering all the facts as he is an élève of Stanley with whom I was in correspondence about the Clare election and the conduct of the arch-miscreant. I have, of course, found it necessary to put in an answer² through the *Southern Reporter* but in my letter I have treated the matter contemptuously. But take care to say enough to satisfy Mahon's friends of the falsehood. I have then, with professional tact — or call it artifice — made a violent attack on the *Courier* for

another lie³ and thrown off as much as possible the public attention to the other *scent*.

Your play is to assail the *Courier* also, just discreetly talking of the falsehood of my accusing Mahon to Gossett. But be discreet in *that*.

I entirely agree with Pigot on the subject of agitation. We are not strong enough yet nor can we be whilst the Orange fury keeps together so large a portion of the upper classes in virulent hostility.⁴ It is best to allow that candle to burn itself out a little more before we attempt to outshine it. The Government is essentially Orange and would readily put on that cockade if it durst. At all events, it gives all sorts of countenance to that party. Time, however, is working for us; men are daily becoming less and less scared at the Repeal and I do confidently expect a superior class of Repealers will soon join the people.

I do not intend to go to Dublin for at least another fortnight. I will then consider of my plans and, you may be sure, expose as little point to the enemy as I can.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 495-6

1 See letter 2121 n4.

2 Presumably this was the letter from O'Connell to the *Southern Reporter*, 23 October 1834 (*Southern Reporter*, 28 Oct. 1834). W.J. FitzPatrick must have given an incorrect date to letter 2123 since in it O'Connell refers to his letter of 23 October in the past tense. In this letter O'Connell denied having ever communicated with Gossett concerning O'Gorman Mahon. See letter 2121 n4.

3 O'Connell devoted the greater part of the letter (see above note 2) to an attack on the *Courier* for having stated that he had once been convicted of sedition. He denied that this was so and described at length what had happened in the early months of 1831 when indicted (see letter 1751a n1).

4 As shown in particular by the Protestant meeting of 14 August (see letter 2102 n2). Additional Protestant meetings were held in many parts of the country at this time.

2124

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 28 October 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am very glad Barrett has married, as you tell me he has married, a sensible woman.¹ That is all he wanted. It will make him give up those small boyishnesses which alone stood in his way. Give him my affectionate congratulations. How I long to see him a leading conductor of the popular press! Wait a while. I do think all

is progressing well.

I expect to be in Dublin on the 20th of November. I cannot longer defer my journey there, and I am not sorry for it. With the sway which I think I have over the public mind I do imagine confidently that I need not be afraid of anybody being able to mislead any part of the mass of agitation. We must be discreet but not acquiescent. There is a tone of great utility if we can keep it in chime. But the truth is — in my judgement at least it is the truth — that events are working for us of themselves and are creating a more universal spirit of Irishism than could be produced by the most energetic and skilful agitation.

As to Mr. D[ixon] and his Bank, it is a bubble which must necessarily burst and D[ixon] will just draw his hand out of it in time to devolve the ruin on others if he possibly can. He, however, may be mistaken. Recollect I tell you his bank must necessarily break.² It is as inevitable as the rising of tomorrow's sun. Nothing but self-interested superintendence of the most vigilant kind can possibly sustain such a bank, and where can that be had in their scheme?

Call on Rev. Mr. Whelan³ in Clarendon Street and tell him I bid you give him any money he requires without asking for what. Merely take his voucher for it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 498-9

- 1 For some amusing anecdotes of Barrett's married life, see FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 499-501.
- 2 A reference to the Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland (see letter 2091 n3).
- 3 Rev. William J. Whelan, Provincial of the Discalced Carmelites, Clarendon Street, Dublin; consecrated bishop of Aureliopolis and vicar apostolic of Bombay in Dublin 1842.

2125

To William Cobbett

Derrynane, 2 November 1834

My Dear Sir,

The delay between the writing of your letter on the 30th of October¹ and the receipt of this reply may induce you to accuse me of neglect but I am not guilty. I write as soon as it is possible according to the course of our post and indeed I am incapable of such ingratitude as to postpone answering your interesting letter.

I am incapable also of returning you adequate thanks for your

powerful answer² to the 'bloody old *Times*.' It is an able composition and kind-hearted in the highest degree. Believe me, I will ever retain a lively sense of that kindness — I am unable to gratify myself and serve my country by going up to town to you at once. I had unfortunately fixed on the 19th for the day of my arrival in Dublin and arranged with the Citizens of Cork to attend a public dinner there on the 17th. All my other arrangements depend upon that. Thus, therefore, I lose the opportunity of consulting with you on the fittest use of the material in your power. Could I even give you any suggestions in the way of advice? May not *something* be done by letter? But I agree with you that one conversation would be worth a volume of letters. Besides I have no right to trespass on your time in that way. I can, therefore, only answer your enquiry by mentioning the 19th as the earliest day on which I can be in Dublin.

These certainly are, as you say, times to try men's souls but my anticipations of the future are far from being gloomy. Your journey to Ireland must be attended with the most beneficial effects. You have done great good already by the straightforward expression of your sentiments. You know I differ with you as to Poor Laws — at least to a certain extent I differ — but still even your lectures³ on that subject can do nothing but good. I heartily thank you for the manner as well as the matter of these lectures. But your collection of facts will necessarily be of the utmost value, especially in the hands of one who knows so well how to use them. I however think it not unlikely that if I could converse with you on both our plans for the ensuing political campaign it would be most useful that we should do so. It is therefore with poignant regret that I find myself unable to go to you at once as I assure you I would do but for my previous arrangements. I *must* be one day in Tralee, which town my eldest son⁴ represents, and one day at Killarney before I go to Cork — thus making it impossible for me to go to Dublin to talk with you before the Cork dinner of the 17th. I leave this place on the 11th. Let me hear from you before you leave Dublin, and if possible let me have some intimation of the plans you have in contemplation and of the advice you *would* give me to direct mine during the remainder of the recess.

Wishing you health to see our enemies prostrate, and prosperity to enjoy their defeat to which you have so powerfully contributed.

SOURCE: Melville, *Cobbett*, II, 255-7.

1 Unidentified.

2 Cobbett had replied to an editorial in the *Times* of 22 October 1834 attacking O'Connell. This editorial condemned O'Connell as an adventurer

without any redeeming qualities who employs violence to force the O'Connell Tribute from his starving followers; whose aims are to destroy the monarchy, the empire and the Irish propertied classes; and to establish a popish ascendancy.

- 3 Cobbett's lectures in Dublin on 24, 25, 26 September, which ranged over a wide variety of topics including poor laws, are reported in the *Morning Register* of 25, 26 and 27 September 1834. He also lectured on the necessity for poor laws in Waterford and Kilkenny and other parts of the south (*Pilot*, 8, 13 October 1834).
- 4 Maurice O'Connell.

2126

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 4 November 1834

My dear FitzPatrick,

This is a moment of considerable importance and yet I do not hear from you. Excuse my impatience. My course is this. I leave Cahirciveen say Friday, the 14th, and reach Cork by Monday, the 17th, thence to Dublin on the 19th. From that day till the 5th of December I will devote myself professionally to the preparation for the Custom House case.¹ I will then, please God, return to this country until it is time to go to parliament. I, however, do not mean to leave Dublin without organising 'agitation' in the most prudent and discreet manner and putting it into action. The great difficulty is to avoid strengthening the Orange faction by giving them and the rascally Government the same interest — that is, to oppose the Repeal. How I execrate that faction for their readiness to consent to any degradation of Ireland, provided they but share in the spoil! Enough of this, and more.

STRICTLY PRIVATE. Do you not think an advertisement or letter from you as secretary or from the Trustees would be necessary or useful to contradict the paragraph in the *Times* of the tribute being forced?² But I leave this to your own judgement.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 501

1 In connection with the Customs House fire (see letter 2001).

2 FitzPatrick apparently did not act on this suggestion.

2127

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 6 November 1834

Insert in a conspicuous part of the *Morning Register* an advertisement in these words: 'THE HALF-NOTE has been RECEIVED, 3rd November, 1834.' Say no more. It is, you will be glad to hear, privately another £100 from, or at least in, the same female handwriting.¹

I felt unpleasant at being more than a week without hearing from you. I take for granted that, if you had any pleasant news you would communicate them and that you are silent only because you do not wish to annoy me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 501-502

1 Apparently an anonymous contribution to the O'Connell Tribute. The insertion appeared on 11 November.

2128

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 11 November 1834

The Dublin post bag of Friday has not yet reached Cahirciveen. There must have been some blunder or some robbery somewhere. The English papers and letters, the Dublin papers and letters, leaving Dublin on Friday evening are all missing. This is no small inconvenience to me. Be so good as to call on the secretary of the post office and endeavour to have out what has become of *these*. Write to me to Cork the result. . . .

I got your letter of Saturday last night. It was consolatory to me after so long a silence.

My own opinion of politics is to the last degree favourable to Ireland. I do think we are approaching a great national triumph and that the Orange orgies¹ have done us immense good.

[P.S.] Take up the *Mail* of Friday and Monday, and keep it for me. That of Wednesday send to the Square.² The fact is 'my women' do not like to read abuse of me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 502

1 See letter 2102 n2. On 19 August the Protestant Conservative Society

resumed its meetings (*DEM*, 20 August 1834). It continued to meet weekly throughout the following months (see *DEM*, 12, 17, Sept., 1, 8, 15 Oct., 5, 12 Nov. 1834). In addition great Protestant meetings were held, at Cavan on 22 September (*DEM*, 24 Sept. 1834), Bandon, Co. Cork on 9 October (*DEM*, 10 Oct. 1834) and Hillsborough, Co. Down on 30 October (*DEM*, 31 Oct. 1834) at all of which anti-Catholic and pro-ascendancy resolutions were passed.

- 2 That is, to O'Connell's house in Merrion Square.

2129

To Rev. M. Collins, P.P.,¹ Shanagolden, Co. Limerick

Derrynane, 11 November 1834

Rev and dear Sir,

... According to the terms of your question, that is, supposing the marriage deed to be a *legal* assignment, the son is liable to the tithes under Stanley's Act,² and cannot resist a distress. But if the marriage deed was not prepared by counsel or at all events by a skilful attorney it would operate only in equity and in that case the son would not be liable to the tithe because he would *at law* be only tenant from year to year. ...

SOURCE: Library of the Franciscan Fathers, Killiney, Co. Dublin

- 1 Rev. Mortimer Collins (died 20 Jan. 1857), parish priest of Shanagolden, Co. Limerick from before 1834 till 1857.

- 2 See letter 1902 n6.

2130

To his wife, Derrynane

Tralee, Friday, 14 November 1834

My darling love,

Here I am, darling, after two lovely days. I arrived early yesterday at Grenagh where John¹ had a large party to meet me, the Bishop² and various others. ...

I was brought most comfortably in the carriage. It runs if possible smoother than your former carriage. ...

Now, my own darling love, write to me in spirits. Cheer up my own own darling heart. You know that there is not one woman young or old so tenderly, so ardently and so respectfully loved as you are, my *own own* sweetest Mary. ...

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 His brother who lived at Grenagh, Killarney.

2 Bishop Egan of Kerry.

2131

To his wife, Derrynane

Macroon [Co. Cork], Sunday, 16 November 1834

My darling love,

I hope I did not give you any uneasiness about your mother.¹ She is in perfect health but subject, Ellen Connor says, to occasional lowness of spirits from which we rallied her. I believe she longs to be living entirely with you and it would certainly be a great happiness to us both to have her with us. I love her at least as well, darling, as you do.

... I expect to hear of Maurice's² second daughter in Cork but she never can be such a pet as Fanny Fan Fan though a little cocked nose Mary *may* still find a soft place in my heart. Kate's babes are to me, darling, treasures. ... I have *as yet* no public news to give you. We are speculating who is to succeed Lord Althorp³ as Leader of the House of Commons. They certainly want a man for *that* purpose, more bad luck to them.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Ellen Blennerhassett.

2 His son.

3 On the death of his father, Lord Spencer, on 10 November, Althorp succeeded to the earldom. A new leader had then to be found for the Commons. For the upshot of this affair see letter 2132 n1.

2132

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Cork, 17 November 1834

I have just heard of the change of Ministry¹ and a thousand reports. It is well that we are rid of the humbuggers. *Nous verrons*. I am convinced all will be for the better.

I am — blessed be God — in excellent health and spirits. The Duke of Wellington would cheer the Orangeists but his reign cannot last. I find it idle, however, to speculate until I know more facts.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 503

- 1 The king, who strongly opposed the reforming tendencies of the Whigs, used the death of Lord Spencer (see letter 2131 n3) as an excuse to dismiss Melbourne's first ministry on 14 November. The king immediately invited Wellington to form a new ministry but the latter declined, claiming that Peel was best fitted for that task. Wellington however agreed to become home secretary, and conducted the government between that date and Peel's arrival from Italy on 9 December (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 193-6; Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 135-6; *Annual Register*, 1834, 335-6.

2133

To his wife, Derrynane

Cork, 18 November 1834

My darling heart,

We are out. The Whigs are out.¹ The King has literally kicked out Lord Melbourne with less of ceremony than you would dismiss Bolus or Tyter.² The Duke of Wellington is for the present minister. My own opinion is that he cannot continue. Nothing is known or was known in London when the last letters left it, beyond the mere fact that it was the King himself that turned out the Ministry and that he had determined if possible to make the Duke of Wellington Premier. All the details remain to be settled. Peel is on the Continent and cannot be heard of for some weeks. In the meantime it is likely that the Radicals of Great Britain will rally and recommence political unions and all manner of agitation. We, Repealers, must take a dignified station. I believe I will be able to give the proper tone, at least I think so. I am on the whole exceedingly pleased. I do believe that you never were so near being the wife of a Minister of State as you are. But God's will be done. Whether it be so or not, if Wellington does not succeed in forming a Ministry or if he be turned out, our time will come in either case.

The dinner here³ went off splendidly, nothing could be better, your husband the cock of the walk as usual. Morgan⁴ spoke late but with exquisite tact and proper brevity. Love, he is a great darling of mine. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 2132 n1.
- 2 Probably the names of dogs or other domestic animals. Bolus is a promontory in south-west Co. Kerry.
- 3 A dinner to O'Connell in Cork on 17 November attended by some 200

persons. It was presided over by Francis Bernard Beamish (*Southern Reporter*, 18 Nov. 1834).

4 His son.

2134

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 20 November 1834

My darling love,

Only think, darling, that it is now near five and I have not had one moment to myself during the day to pray or to write. The Tories are all triumphant;¹ the Chancellor, Plunket, resigned, Sugden is to be the Irish Chancellor, an excellent lawyer at all events. Neither Stanley nor Sir James Graham join the present Ministry. The ministers are all to be ultra Tories. So much the better. We shall of course have a dissolution and fresh elections. The *Times* newspaper has already gone over to the Tories and so has the *Courier*. What scoundrels these English and Scotch are! Here all is life and spirit. We are about to combine all classes of reformers. I have called² a meeting for tomorrow to begin the ball. The La Touches etc. will be hooked in and we shall make a rare show.

... I cannot but think of Maurice's wife³ who would never lie in if it were possible for her to refrain. ...

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 2132 n1.

2 An advertisement in the morning papers on 21 November declared 'Mr. O'Connell ... requests the attendance of such of his constituents as are sincere friends of reform on ... 21st of November ... to consider the best means of combining all the friends of political amelioration, in opposition to the supporters of oligarchy and monopoly in church and state' (*Pilot*, 24 Nov. 1834).

3 Frances Mary O'Connell.

2135

To William Cobbett

Merrion Square, 20 November 1834

My dear Sir,

You may imagine *how* I am surrounded but I am most desirous to see you. It, however, must (*for reasons*) be *here*. I want to

thank you most heartily for all the good, the unmixed good, you have done for Ireland and the still greater good your visit and your knowledge of the state of this country must produce. I will be at home all the evening and all the morning tomorrow and *all the time – anglicé* – any time you choose. Accept my warmest thanks in the name and on behalf of Ireland.

SOURCE: British Museum, Add. MSS 31002, f. 30

2136

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 21 November 1834

My own love,

I am just come in from a great meeting¹ where I made a great speech and got them unanimously to agree to postpone the agitation of the Repeal until we drive Wellington from the ministry.² I was greatly cheered. The news on the subject of the formation of the ministry are this favourable. The Duke is already hesitating and the Tories no longer feel the same confidence. I hope we may beat them *without a dissolution*. It would be unpleasant to have one just now. I give you the news of the favourable aspect of affairs as certain but there will be this advantage that the new Whig Administration will be more Liberal than that of Lord Melbourne. Tomorrow I hope to have more news for you. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 2134 n2.

2 The attendance at this meeting included two English and nine Irish M.P.'s. In his speech O'Connell attacked Wellington, 'the chance victor of a battle,' and said he would abandon Repeal temporarily until the Tory government was ousted (MR, 22 Nov. 1834).

2137

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 22 November 1834

My darling heart,

. . . The political news continue unfavourable to the formation

of a Tory ministry.¹ Nothing is done and nothing is doing. They say they are waiting for Peel but he has in my opinion too much shrewdness to attempt impossibilities. In the meantime, darling, I will let you know the *newest news*. If anything shall happen you shall know it. There are as yet no appointments but plenty of reports.

I am myself in rude health after having eaten a *herring and a half* yesterday which was the more fair trial as I was somewhat exhausted by a long speech. I really fear I have done *wrong* exceedingly wrong to eat meat on so many fasting days as it is quite clear that now at least I can do without it.

I went to catch part of a Mass this morning at the new chapel — church I should say — in Westland Row.² It is large and airy but not at all cold, not a single blast of cold air can get in whilst its size will keep it cool in summer. It is quite a blessing to have such a church near us, darling.

I am beginning my old agitation life again. We have this day arranged our Anti-Tory club and will hold another great meeting on Monday.³ The report of my speech which you will see in the *Register* is tolerably accurate as far as it goes but it does not contain half what I said. I hope the *Pilot* of Monday will carry you a more full account. If not, you at least will give credit to your husband for a more useful speech than that reported although *that one* is, I flatter myself, not bad.

My own dearest darling Mary, endeavour to love your old husband and take the greatest care of yourself for his sake for he loves you most tenderly and longs to return to you. . . . O'Gorman Mahon and his sisters-in-law have quarrelled, at least have separated. They have a house, No. 7, at this side of the Square.⁴ I wish⁵ — you may guess the rest. They have about forty thousand pounds each.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 2132 n1.

2 The newly erected St. Andrew's, the parish church for Merrion Square.

3 See letter 2139 n3.

4 The Misses O'Brien used to live at 12 Fitzwilliam Square, N.

5 O'Connell was obviously wishing that one of these wealthy ladies, the Misses O'Brien, might marry one of his sons.

2138

From John Morgan¹

Newry Examiner Office, 23 November 1834

Dear Sir,

A Mr. —, an attorney who lives at Tanderagee, has obtained a conditional order for a criminal information against the proprietors of the *Newry Examiner*, in consequence of our having copied from the *Dublin Evening Post* a report of the Orange meeting in Dublin in August last wherein Colonel Verner² is made to say that the late Government had dismissed from the Commission of the Peace a gentleman of the first respectability on 'the perjured evidence of a hedge schoolmaster and his son'.³ I am perfectly convinced that Mr. — is actuated by vindictive motives in selecting the *Newry Examiner* for prosecution. . . .

May I request that you will plead for us and get the conditional order set aside?⁴ . . . Your moving in the affair would, I am sure, quash the proceedings and, though I have no fear as to the result, I dread the annoyance and the costs of the Four Courts. . . .

I have just finished reading with delight the proceedings of the great Dublin meeting.⁵ I was at Dundalk on Wednesday. All at sea, in storm and confusion. Sharman Crawford has been written to. I know he'll refuse: unless Sir Patrick Bellew can be *driven* to the hustings — and it will require driving — the Orange party will have an easy victory. I wish you had time to give some advice to the Louthians. 'Twill be the first battle and it will be bad if it be lost . . .⁶

SOURCE: Irish Monthly, XIV, 229-30

1 Editor of the *Newry Examiner*.

2 Colonel William Verner (1782-1871), youngest son of James Verner, Church Hill, Dungannon, Co. Armagh; M.P. for Co. Armagh 1832-68; deputy grand-master of Orange Society 1837-71; created a baronet 1846. See *Boase*.

3 At the great Protestant meeting in Dublin on 14 August (see letter 2102 n2), 'in a humdrum kind of a speech' Verner accused the government of partiality — dismissing one magistrate in the north on the perjured evidence of a hedge-schoolmaster and his son; and not dismissing a magistrate in the south who violated his duty — by putting down Orange processions on the 12th of July, and by conniving at rebel processions on the 17th of March and 21st June (*DEP*, 16 Aug. 1834).

4 The outcome of this prosecution has not been ascertained.

5 See letter 2136 n2.

6 A reference to the expected general election. William Sharman Crawford with O'Connell's support was elected for Dundalk on 14 January 1835.

2139

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 24 November 1834

My own heart's love,

... Ellen¹ enjoys pretty good health although in the morning she looks yellowish. It wears off during the day. I have relieved her mind a good deal by bringing in her darling babes. I have them all here. ...

Darling, no news from England. They are waiting for Peel's return.² If he attempts to form an Administration we must have a dissolution and new elections. That would detain you still longer at Derrynane as we should fly to different parts of the country to canvass etc. I have just come in from a great meeting. We found [sic] an Anti-Tory Association³ and have already near 70 members in one day, paid. There was a glorious assemblage and I have with me *all* the Irish Reformers, the Cloncurry party etc.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 His daughter.

2 From Italy, to take over the premiership (see letter 2132 n1).

3 This organisation was founded at a meeting in Dublin on 24 November which followed on the meeting of 21 November (see letter 2136 n2). The attendance included eight M.P.'s (*MR*, 25 Nov. 1834). The association was dissolved at a meeting on 30 April 1835.

2140

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Tuesday, 25 November 1834

My own love,

This is the blank day from London and of course you cannot expect any political news. The new Association¹ is going on swimmingly. We have already 110 members, more in fact than we had after a year of the Catholic Association. We are preparing everywhere for battle. I suppose I shall have a contest in Dublin but that cannot now be helped. Kerry would have been quiet for me for life. I believe however that I am not in any great danger of being evicted. In the meantime all parties are loud in their commendation of me. I have for the second time forgiven the rascally Whigs. They would tomorrow be as ungrateful to me as ever they were if they got power again. We do not expect anything

like news for some days, in fact until Peel is heard from. The king, it is clear, precipitated the dissolution of the ministry² before *his own* party were ready.

Darling heart, Ellen³ looks much better this day. She is taking blue-pill and cannot stir out but she is now in excellent spirits and her appetite is improving. . . . I made all my grandsons members of the association. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 2139 n3.

2 See 2132 n1.

3 His daughter.

2141

From Charles Phillips

49 Chancery Lane [London], Sunday [Postmarked 25 November 1834]

My dear O'Connell,

As I am here at headquarters and have better means of judging than those at a distance, I think it right to say, for *your own guidance*, that I am perfectly satisfied the duke will not face the present house of commons and so I would advise you to prepare, and that instantly, for an election. You should strain every nerve to increase your parliamentary force in Ireland for, depend upon it, you are *personally* more interested in the issue of the pending struggle than any other man in the Empire. No matter at what risk, an effort will be made to crush *you*; the Tories are too vain and too furious to try conciliation and they know well they and you cannot coexist so crush you, if they can, they will. The struggle will be terrific — but it will be final, if the friends to reform succeed. The Duke must know this and therefore will exert all the energies of despair. Prepare, then, firmly and ardently and lose not a moment. I have reason to think one of the grand devices to divide Ireland and weaken *you* is a scheme to pay the Catholic priesthood after the matter of the *regium donum*. Do not treat this too lightly. That there is much apathy *here* is not to be denied and if this continues at the election, the Tories will have their reign renewed for some years at all events. As to the late men, they were dismissed¹ when they had not the least idea of it, and with less ceremony than you would dismiss a footman. That it was the result of a previous intrigue is *to me* clear. Do you think the

King would have attempted such a step had he not been personally assured that the Duke was ready? I am told you may expect the ministerial manifesto in a postscript to the *Quarterly Review* which comes out on Tuesday or Wednesday. Your stronghold is the Irish Church and tithes — the Duke's weak point lies there; there is a section of his own party who will not hear of his touching either and the great body of the people will not endure his toleration of them so he is between two fires. I much lament the ex-ministry; they were prepared to do more for Ireland than we are likely to see proposed even by any other. Why they did not go faster is now pretty clear — they could not. As it is, their intentions with respect to the Irish Church early next session sent them out, not very respectfully.

However, what is past cannot be recalled though I hope what is done may be undone. Much will undoubtedly depend on Ireland.

Remember me sincerely to Mrs. O'C. and all around you, and believe me

Your sincere friend,
C. Phillips

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 2132 n1.

2142

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Wednesday [26 November 1834]

My darling love,

First, as to politics. I have the pleasure to tell you that matters are daily looking better and better. I saw a letter this day from great authority confident that the Duke cannot possibly stand. In the meantime the London papers are loud in their applause of my conduct.¹ If we drive out the Duke you may be certain I shall have *my offers*. But that is not what I am looking for. We will have the Duke of Leinster etc. to join us without delay and we will send a host of anti-Tories to parliament.

... Fitz-Simon is gone to Wicklow on business. His reelection is quite certain and I do believe that there is no doubt that the Conservatives have no chance in his county. I tremble about Kerry but I will do my best to make matters secure there also. Kate² will not be sorry for the dissolution. I have not yet heard from Morgan. Neither Dan nor John ever write to me. So that it is only from you

that I hear of my children. I am glad to tell you that the trial³ which I came up to attend will be fixed tomorrow, that is, a day will then be appointed for it. I hope in a day or two to be able to name the day I will be with you, my own dearest darling Mary. I believe you will not be sorry to see me and that you will believe that it will delight my fond heart to press you in my arms, my own own darling Mary. How cruel it was of Mary O'C. to separate us thus!⁴ Surely she should have guessed better!

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 In attempting to form an anti-Tory alliance among Irish Repealers and Whigs (see letters 2136 n2 and 2139 n3).
- 2 His daughter.
- 3 Concerning the Customs House fire (see letter 2001).
- 4 Mary O'Connell had remained at Derrynane obviously to be with her daughter-in-law, Maurice's wife, who was in an advanced stage of pregnancy. O'Connell doubted whether she was really pregnant (see letters 2163, 2165 and 2168).

2143

*To Nicholas A. Vigors*¹

26 November 1834

My dear Vigors,

We are all bustle, preparing to fight the Tories in all the counties and boroughs. Carlow county interests you more immediately. Wallace and Blakeney² know they will not answer. The honest men then suggest Mr. Ponsonby,³ Lord Duncannon's son, and Mr. Raphael,⁴ the London sheriff. Will you call on Lord Duncannon on the business? I wrote to him to say I would ask you to do so. First, tomorrow you should see Mr. Raphael, and ascertain whether or not he would stand. We could secure him the county at an inconsiderable expense — say, for the very utmost, £3,000. You can tell him that I will be one of the guarantees of his success if he will thus come forward as the colleague of Mr. Ponsonby. Let me know, without delay, whether there will be any chance of effecting this plan.

SOURCE: *Hansard*, 3rd Series, XXXIII, 27

- 1 Nicholas Aylward Vigors (1785-1840), Old Leighlin, Co. Carlow, eldest son of Captain N.A. Aylward; M.P. for Carlow borough 1832-34 and Co. Carlow 1837-40.
- 2 Walter Blakeney (or Blackney), J.P., D.L., (died 1842) Ballyellen, Goresbridge, Co. Carlow; M.P. for Co. Carlow 1831-34.

- 3 John George Brabazon Ponsonby (1809-1880), eldest son of Lord Duncannon, later 4th earl of Bessborough; M.P. almost continually 1831-47; succeeded as 5th earl of Bessborough in 1847.
- 4 Alexander Raphael (1775-1850), a Roman Catholic convert from Judaism; sometime high sheriff of London. An immigrant from Madras, India, he made a large fortune in England. See *Encycl. Judaica*.

2144

From Nicholas Whitworth, Drogheda, 27 November 1834

He informs O'Connell that a meeting is being called for in Drogheda to petition the king to dismiss Wellington and ask Lord Durham to form a government. 'I am very anxious that the proceedings at this meeting should be in accordance with your views at this important crisis, and dreading that improper topics might be introduced into the address, I have presumed to trouble you on this occasion.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

2145

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Friday, 28 November 1834

My own darling love,

I was compelled to send you but a short letter yesterday because I was detained first in court¹ and next at the association.² It was one of my days of the old times but I had not you, my sweetest love, before me or your darling affection to make me happy after the bustle of the day. . . .

We get in turkies, beef, butter and bread in quantities from Glencullen. Fitz-Simon killed a beef there and I have not seen a finer piece of roast beef than it afforded us yesterday.

Now for politics. Everything is going on right well. We are preparing for elections in every quarter. I am afraid of Kerry. Charles however gets out of the scrape³ in which I placed him. I heard this day. It was a *private* letter from Mr. Ward, the member for St. Albans. He tells me that the duke is already beaten. I believe that the Tories are in despair. It is said in confidential quarters that Peel will not join Wellington and that Earl Spencer — Lord Althorp that was — has been sent for by the king. A few days will make this intelligence *certain* one way or the other but you

have in these facts the latest information. Add to it that all England and Scotland are rising to a man and the perseverance of the duke would lead to a revolution. Have you a mind to be Lady O'Connell, my own heart's darling love? Tomorrow you shall know more. Now I can only say I expect that this change will have the most fortunate results. . . .

[P.S.] Do not expect too much.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 In the case of *Roe and others - v - Donlevy*, relating to the liability of government to pay compensation to persons on account of the Customs House fire (see letter 2001). On 27 November O'Connell applied in this case to the court of king's bench, and 8th January 1835 was provisionally fixed for the trial (*Pilot*, 28 Nov. 1834; see further, letter 2155 n8).
- 2 The anti-Tory association (see letter 2139 n3).
- 3 What the 'scrape' was is not clear but may well have been some undertaking given by O'Connell that his son-in-law, Charles O'Connell, would again stand for parliament (see letter 2147).

2146

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Monday, 1 December 1834

My darling Love,

Nothing decisive as yet but every thing in the highest degree favourable. Hume is arrived in full health in London and is doing well in politics. I just heard from him and he is strongly convinced that the Duke cannot stand the public shock. There has been a great meeting at Birmingham¹ against the Duke and your husband was one of the promoters of it, under the rose. Atwood is behaving very ill. It is feared that he has *sold the pass*.² In short the upshot is this, that matters are still in doubt but it is not believed that the Duke can stand.

I delivered your message to Fitz-Simon and he instantly complied with it. . . .

Darling how delighted I am at your enjoying such health and taking such walks, but sweetest take care of your health for me my own darling love and do not risk cold. My dearest heart's darling I wish you were here with me. You do not know how my fond heart is wrapped in you, my own Mary. I wish I was saying *that* in your ear.

I cannot but admire Maurice's wife and her holding out. Perhaps

she may say with Ned McSweeny when a child — 'It is so fat I am you fool you.' Perhaps after all she is not with child at all. That would be the ludicrous part of it. What a prize my unfortunate Maurice drew for himself in the lottery of life. But he clearly has nobody to blame but himself, which after all is but a poor consolation. I got a letter from Watty Baldwin this day. He says that he had seen John and Dan and that both of them were quite well. I think he might have written more about them, but that is all he writes. I will send Dan money tomorrow, that you may rely on. I will also take care that the *Pilot* should be sent you regularly in future. I also send you daily the *Morning Chronicle*.

Give my kind regards to the Scotts. . . .

SOURCE: Office of Public Works, Dublin

- 1 A meeting of the electors of Birmingham on 28 November, convened to express their regret at the dismissal of the Whigs from office, and to appoint a committee to secure the return of reformers in the event of a general election. The meeting was attended by 'several influential Whigs' and members of the political unions. (*MR*, 2 Dec. 1834, quoting *Globe*; see further, letter 2153).
- 2 A reference to a letter from Thomas Attwood, excusing his absence from the meeting (see also letter 2153).

2147

To his wife, Derrynane

[Dublin, 2 December 1834]

My own love,

No packet, no news this day. Darling, I got a letter from Elmore containing the same statement you mention, and I confess it alarmed me as to Dan's remaining in London. It said nothing of his intended visit to Southampton. I wrote yesterday to Elmore to send Dan to you, stating that I would this day transmit to him a cheque for £20 that Dan may pay off all he owes and be able to travel here. I wished to conceal from you his illness until I sent him down to you to nurse him which I do *believe* you would do. Fortunately the cheque is not gone off and I have this day written to Elmore in a letter covering the cheque to say that if Dan wishes to go to Southampton he may do so. You know, darling, I am easily frightened about any of our children but I do assure you solemnly that Elmore's account exactly tallies with that your letter contains. You know, darling, I do not deceive you. I enclose you the letter Morgan wrote me from Roscommon that you may

be pleased with his account of your grandchildren.¹

Darling, I mentioned Tralee in my report. I said that the present member was secure. I am sorry to see by your letter it is somewhat otherwise but as yet I do not despair. A letter I got from my brother John is favourable. He also thinks Maurice quite secure. Is it certain that his wife is with child at all for I have my doubts. She fell into such *fatness* which is a symptom of ceasing to breed. I hope I shall hear tomorrow from Maurice or Supple a cheering account. I will write to Youghal this day or tomorrow. My present prospects there are quite favourable.² But I will soon know more. We shall certainly have a contest in Dublin which is vexatious and would be even more so if it kept me from enjoying Derrynane. I am delighted to find Capt. Wm. Browne up for Kerry as it gives Charles³ a fit opportunity to retire without injury to the cause. I will instantly delight my Kate by making an arrangement to that effect. I intend to write this day. So that dissolution or not Charles and Kate can and shall be gratified.

Ellen is gone out in the carriage with her sons and daughters. She has a lovely flock and is daily improving, I hope, in her health. Give my best regards to the Scotts. . . .

SOURCE: Office of Public Works, Dublin

- 1 The children of their daughter, Betsey Ffrench.
- 2 A reference to the proposed reelection of his son John.
- 3 See letter 2145 note 3.

2148

*To Charles Pearson*¹

Merrion Square, 2 December 1834

My dear Sir,

I agree with you entirely, in thinking that it would be extremely desirable to have Mr. Raphael in Parliament. I had already been apprised that he intimated recently a desire to be so; and indeed I believe it the more readily because he some two or three years ago told me as much. Fortunately, as I hope, there is now quite a suitable opportunity: Carlow county is likely to be deserted by its present Members,² and we are threatened by two powerful Conservatives. You will be glad to hear that, even before I got your letter, I wrote to Mr. Vigors, suggesting Mr. Raphael as a likely person to coalesce with young Ponsonby, Lord Duncannon's son, and by that means secure the return of both, for both must

embark, if at all, on the same bottom. My present impression is, that with Ponsonby's popularity and our recommendation of Mr. Raphael, success is to the last degree probable. I wish you would see Mr. Vigors on this subject. He lives near the Botanic Gardens; you will find his address in the *Directory*. I will write again by this post to Carlow, and get an exact return of the constituency, divided into good, bad, and doubtful; and if I find that the good exceed the other two, then we will proceed. But money is necessary. About £3,000 — say £3,000 at the utmost, would cover all expenses. I will not have Mr. Raphael stand unless I can ensure two things for him: first, that the expenses shall not exceed that sum; and secondly, that he will certainly be returned. You may, of course, rely on it, that there shall be no speculation. At present, I believe that the return can be made certain, but I will not pledge myself without further information. Let me know how Mr. Raphael relishes my proposal to join Mr. Ponsonby, who has considerable local interest, and to go as far as £3,000 to carry the election. The principal expense will be to indemnify tenants who vote against their landlord's wishes. They may want from one year to half a-year's rent. The greater part will only be a loan, and will be repaid. It will not also be required till after the election, and will be unconnected with any previous stipulation. The tenants who vote for us thus will expect that the gentlemen who compose the local Committee, should prevent their landlords from ruining them by sudden demands, at periods when the Irish farmer has nothing to sell. But the entire of these advances and all other expenses not to exceed £3,000. I have mentioned in reply to your answer to this, [*sic*] I will give you precise and positive terms, and even then you shall be at liberty to retract.

SOURCE: *Hansard*, 3rd Series, XXXIII, 28-9

1 Charles Pearson (1794-1862), born London; admitted solicitor 1816; solicitor to the Irish Society 1839-62; city solicitor 1839-62; M.P. for Lambeth 1847-50. See *Boase*.

2 Walter Blakeney and Thomas Wallace.

2149

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Wednesday, 3 December 1834

My own love,

The packet is in and it is now clear that we shall know nothing more until Peel arrives.¹ There is a total cessation of any political

business until he decides the fate of the country. Wellington will neither resign nor make any appointment to office until Peel comes. So that I am not likely to be able to give you any more information than what the newspapers contain until the *great man* comes over the water. We are however getting on famously with our anti-Tory association² and hitherto carrying everything before us. I was delighted to hear this day from my brother John that Maurice³ is safe in Tralee and that Morgan John⁴ stands for the county of Kerry. So far all is safe. The Kenmares will not oppose and all their tenants will support him.⁵ But this I suppose is no news to you. Seriously, does John Scott think of standing at *this election* for Clare? If so, I fear I have gone too far in speaking of the present members. I fear I should have acted otherwise. There however is one thing quite certain that the parliament now to be chosen will be a short one. *That* must happen at all events. This is a peculiar election at which we are ready to allow every or almost every anti-Tory in possession to continue so. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 From Italy, to assume the premiership (see letter 2132 n1).

2 See letter 2139 n3.

3 His son Maurice who was M.P. for Tralee.

4 Morgan John O'Connell.

5 See letter 2198.

2150

From his son Morgan to Merrion Square

Fortwilliam [Co. Roscommon], Thursday [4 December 1834]
My dear Father,

I received yours of the 3d this morning and proceed at once to assure you that I place myself completely at your disposal with regard to the County of Meath and that, although I was justly very proud of the distinction, I resign without the slightest difficulty the honourable charge to make way for such a man as Sharman Crawford or any person whom you deem fitted for the trust. I have written to the Athlone priests and told them that I would call on them tomorrow but expressed in *general terms only* what the object of my visit was. I would have gone into Athlone today but as this is station time¹ Ffrench² thought it more advisable to let them know beforehand in order that I might not be disappointed of seeing them. Besides, it may give them a little time to think over the business as I mentioned to them that it was solely as

regarded the prospects of the conservative and liberal parties in the town in the event of a dissolution and new election that I was to consult with them. Ffrench seems to think that his cousin³ has no chance, none whatever as he can't over spend money. He does not think that Ennis⁴ has any great chance either and is inclined to think that I would carry the day but that there would be a severe contest as Lord Castlemaine⁵ is understood to have expressed his determination of fighting it to the last. However he can't form any decided opinion as he has been but in little communication with the Athlone people. . . .

[P.S.] What are the two other places should I not succeed in Athlone?

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 A reference to the custom of celebrating Mass in the private houses of parishioners attended by the people of the townland or district.
- 2 Nicholas J. Ffrench.
- 3 Fitz-Stephen French.
- 4 John Ennis, Ballinahown Court, Athlone, Co. Westmeath, son of Andrew Ennis; M.P. Athlone 1857-65 and 1868-74; high sheriff of Westmeath 1837 and Co. Dublin 1849. Created baronet 1866.
- 5 William (Handcock), 1st Viscount Castlemaine (1761-1839), Moydrum Castle, Co. Westmeath; constable of the Castle and Forts and governor of Athlone 1813-39.

2151

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Friday [5 December 1834]

My darling love,

No news *but* they say that the king is mad. I got a letter from Elmore¹ this morning. He gives me that account. . . .

I heard this day from Morgan,² all well. I hope Maurice³ has not left Tralee too soon. It would be better for him be there more frequently. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 John Richard Elmore, M.D. (died 26 August 1860), a native of England; he lived for many years near Clonakilty, Co. Cork: a member of the London Board of Directors of the National Bank.
- 2 Letter 2150.
- 3 His son.

2152

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Saturday [6 December 1834]

My darling love,

... No news from England, none of any value anywhere. It is certain Peel cannot be home for another week. We have a fortnight to prepare. Tell Maurice¹ I canvassed William Neligan for him. He will vote if necessary. Surely Maurice did not reckon on him as one of the 94 *Promises*! If so, and it would be wrong if he did, he in case of necessity makes 95. . . .

The great trial² comes on next Monday. My professional receipts amount to near £500 by this time. So much for my trip up here. Yet I hate it, darling. I would rather be with you and amongst my mountains. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 His son.

2 See letter 2145 n1.

2153

To Rev. Thomas W. McDonnell,¹ St. Peter's Place, Birmingham

Merrion Square, 7 December 1834

My dear and respected friend,

Many many thanks for your exertions at the Birmingham meeting.² I at once perceived how much of *our* success at that meeting was due to your energy and right mode of thinking.

I am sorry for Attwood but his letter,³ unless counteracted, was calculated to do infinite mischief. I cannot endure his vagrant humanity in Poland and in Turkey when by keeping it at home he might at once perceive that the new administration must be worse to Ireland than the miscreant Nicholas⁴ is to Poland. I really don't think it at all too much to expect that your English patriots should sympathise with us Irish rather than with the Turks. It is simply because they do not do so that I am so strongly convinced that we must have a parliament of our own. Aye and we *will too*, believe me. I have been in fact more irritated by Attwood's falling into the same category with Hunt and Cobbett than I can express. It is when a great occasion arises that a man of superior mind shows himself. He does right as if it were by instinct. Your lesser

souls inevitably go wrong and go wrong the more fatally as they are not without plausible excuses with which they delude many. This is Attwood's case. He has the plausible excuse of the many and the gross faults of the Whigs and therefore, mark I pray you, he does what? Why he actually strengthens the hands of the Tories, he becomes their ally, he attacks and weakens their enemy and thus actually, although indirectly but powerfully, assists the worse party that ever was inflicted upon a great nation, a party having in perfection, in bad perfection, all the faults of the Whigs and ten times more.

These opinions respecting Attwood makes it of course quite improbable that I should get any public dinner in Birmingham. When you wrote to me on that subject you were not aware that I should feel it my duty to characterise his letter a 'snivelling document'.⁵ I am sincerely sorry that it was my duty to do so. But until I see him quit Cobbett and Hunt and their patron, the Duke of Wellington, and take decisive steps against the last, I cannot alter one word I have said or written on this subject.

SOURCE: St. Kieran's College, Kilkenny

- 1 Rev. Thomas Michael McDonnell (1792-1869), younger son of Major McDonnell, R.M.M. and a native of Sussex; ordained 1817; chaplain to Lord Surrey 1818-24; appointed to St. Peter's, Birmingham 1824; established a Catholic Association branch in Birmingham 1825; a prominent member of the Birmingham Political Union; editor of the *Catholic Magazine* 1831-36 and the *Catholicon* 1836.
- 2 See letter 2146 n1. McDonnell addressed this meeting and condemned the Whigs, who, he claimed had leant on 'the rotten weed of aristocratic support' rather than relying on the people. He claimed that only Durham was fit to be prime minister.
- 3 Apparently the letter read to the above Birmingham meeting from Attwood. See below n5.
- 4 Nicholas I (1796-1855), czar of Russia from 1825.
- 5 Speaking at the anti-Tory association on 2 December, O'Connell declared 'This very Mr. Attwood, wrote to me at one time, and urged me not to go on with the Repeal question. . . . I never read a document which I was more disposed to blame than the letter of Mr. Attwood — it is a snivelling document.' (MR, 3 Dec. 1834).

2154

From his son John

442 Strand, London, Monday, 8 December 1834

My dear Father,

I am very sorry that my not having written to you until in want of money should have annoyed you. I would most certainly have written previously and would be always most happy to write to you but I imagined that you had more letters than you could conveniently read. The £10 note came perfectly safe.

Morgan John¹ has had a letter from his father today, leaving it at his own option to stand for Kerry or not. He has decided to stand and will write to his father to that effect tomorrow. He will leave town for Kerry the moment that a dissolution takes place. I would wish to know if I am to do so too. I have already, in consequence of what I saw you said of me at the Anti-Tory Association,² written over an address to my friends in Youghal. But I have doubted all along and still much doubt if there will be a dissolution for I cannot see how the Tories could gain by it. I think the Duke, if he really have an idea of dissolving Parliament, has lost his best opportunity in not dissolving it the moment he came into office and thus taking the country by surprise. Every person here however seems quite confident of an immediate dissolution.

Up to this hour, 5 p.m., there is no news in town of Peel's arrival. This morning I heard that a courier had arrived from Dover, with *no* account of, to use an old word of Dan's,³ the '*fugitive*'. . . . I am as I promised you and my mother, attending to my business here, but find it no easy matter after the idleness of four or five years.⁴ I hope however by perseverance to overcome the difficulties caused by my habits of indolence. Morgan John is of great use to me. He and I talk over those points, where Blackstone⁵ is careless or mistaken, and any knowledge he thinks may be of use to me he most readily imparts. . . .

Elmore is quite well. That poor fool Watty Baldwin has quarrelled with him, because he was outvoted, in trying to get Watty a situation in some society or Company the exact nature of which we have not heard.

I have kept this letter open to the latest moment . . . in hopes of hearing something of Peel but I find that even at the Club⁶ there is nothing that has the slightest shadow of foundation either about him or any of the political movements. The movements⁷ in Ireland appear to give great confidence to the Reformers here.

Before we heard of them there seemed to me a good deal of despondency here which is now everyday decreasing.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Morgan John O'Connell.
- 2 Referring to the anticipated general election in the anti-Tory association on 27 November, O'Connell informed the members that the borough of Youghal, represented by his son John, was perfectly safe. He declared that John O'Connell's constituents were 'abundantly satisfied with him. No constituents could have a representative more decidedly determined to attend to all their business in parliament.' 'Cobbett', he added, 'speaks highly of him' (*MR*, 28 Nov. 1834).
- 3 His youngest brother.
- 4 As a law student. He had been admitted to Grey's Inn on 9 May 1832. He was called to the Irish bar in 1837. Morgan John O'Connell was admitted to Gray's Inn on 4 May 1833.
- 5 Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 4 vols.
- 6 Probably Brookes's Club.
- 7 That is, the anti-Tory association (see letter 2139 n3).

2155

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Monday [8 December 1834]

My darling love,

He is looking ill, my love, our darling boy¹ is looking very ill. He arrived very early yesterday morning [from London] . . . I was obliged to go to court before he rose this day. Betsey² tells me he eat a good beefsteak breakfast. . . . He will, please God, go down to Limerick in the day coach on Thursday and next day by the mail to Killarney. On Saturday he expects to reach Derrynane. Have horses for him at Cahirciveen and I will write to Primrose or, rather, do you, to have his covered car ready in case the evening should be wet. . . . I trust under God that your care and attention will restore our lovely and loved child to us. His lungs are not at all affected. . . .

Tell Maurice³ it is not possible to do anything for Scott in Kerry.⁴ He may be assured it would delight me to be able to put him forward. There is one consolation which is that the present parliament will necessarily be shortlived and I will make my arrangements beforehand for him before a new election. Tell Maurice to excuse me in the kindest manner and in terms of unaffected regret but Mullins is now taken up by my brother John and *rightly* so. We really want him to carry the County and he

comes within the terms of the general amnesty.⁵

Tell Maurice also to write to both Gronow⁶ and Jeffcott.⁷ Let him excuse me for not answering their letters personally and next for not answering their letters through Maurice sooner. I waited to be able to ascertain whether anything could be done for either of them in the way they wished. I find it impossible under existing circumstances. Let him express my regret in terms of great personal kindness to them respectively. I hope he will write such letters as will do him and me credit, and disarm any resentment at the delay.

I have been doing business all day in court. The great trial⁸ is put off until the 13th or 14th of January. I could go down to you along with Dan but for the present aspect of public affairs. . . .

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 15540

1 Daniel.

2 His daughter.

3 His son.

4 John Bindon Scott. He was not a candidate in the general election.

5 It was the policy of the anti-Tory Association that no sitting Whig member should be opposed. For information concerning Mullins see letter 2174.

6 Rees Howell Gronow (1794-1865), M.P. for Stafford borough 1832-34; a celebrated dandy in London. See *Boase*.

7 Possibly William Jeffcott (1800-1855), son of William Jeffcott, Tralee; called to the Irish bar 1828; later a judge of the supreme court, New South Wales. See *Boase*.

8 The Customs House fire trial.

2156

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 8 December 1834

My Dear Friend,

To secure unanimity here I have made up my mind to support Barron¹ and Wyse at the election. I have not as yet publicly announced this intention on my part. But I assure you that in doing so, I make a very great sacrifice of feeling. For Wyse's sense I have the poorest possible opinion. No man but a fool could in times like the present have a contempt for the people such as he has manifested. In Barron's honesty I have very little confidence. He would forget the most solemn promises for one smile or courteous salute from a *great one*. His vanity and egotism are his predominant sins and I am afraid he will never make any efforts to correct them. However as the cause of reform requires that we should take them I am satisfied to do so. However I am not with-

out my apprehensions that Wyse will throw obstacles in the way for I have heard that he will not come forward unless the people supplicate him to do so. He wants to trample on the majesty of the people. He wants to have some act performed by them that will argue an acknowledgement of error on their part in rejecting him before. Now if it come to this, I shall proclaim war against him. I have consulted with one of his best friends. I have pledged myself to wield the democracy in his favour provided he only address the constituency as an anti-Tory. His friend says he could not require more and if George Wyse,² who is in the neighbourhood, only act with common sense his brother is safe. The friend with whom I consulted arranged to call on him today.

Will you write to P. Power³ of Bellvue to stand for the County? His brother Nicholas is anxious that he would. He will support himself and Captain Stuart,⁴ a thorough going anti-Tory. Perhaps you could find time to write to Nicholas and to urge his interference with his brother. Galwey, the rascal, is spreading all manner of falsehood in this quarter. Oh if the spirit of Kelly⁵ were still in high quarters! MacHale seems to have caught it.⁶ You will perceive by this letter that I have forgiven you. Every preparation is being made here to meet the crisis. I have heard that Christmas⁷ is also on the alert. I know several who voted before for him who will now oppose him.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Henry W. Barron.

2 George Wyse (1793-1867), second son of Thomas Wyse, The Manor of St. John, Waterford; called to the bar 1832. Brother of Thomas Wyse, M.P. See *Boase*.

3 Patrick Power, J.P., (c. 1786-1835), elder son of Nicholas Power of Faithlegg, Co. Waterford and Snowhill, Co. Kilkenny; M.P. for Co. Waterford January-September 1835.

4 Captain William Villiers Stuart (1804-1873), 2nd son of Lord Henry Stuart de Decies; captain 12th Lancers from 1826; M.P. Co. Waterford September 1835-1847. He was proposed as a candidate for Co. Waterford constituency in January 1835 but not adopted then.

5 The late Bishop Kelly.

6 MacHale had recently been appointed archbishop of Tuam, and was known to be sympathetic to Repeal (*Pilot*, 20 Oct. 1834).

7 William Christmas, J.P., D.L., Tramore, Co. Waterford; M.P. Waterford city 1832-34.

2157

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 9 December 1834

My darling love,

. . . I have not missed a post day since I arrived in Dublin and if I should be prevented from writing I will get somebody else to write to you.

Darling, I assured you it was absolutely necessary for Dan to come home. He *was* very ill. His looks were very much affected, his voice weak, his person emaciated. In short, I should fear the worst for my beloved child if he remained in England. But his journey has done him good. . . . He was not pleased at Mrs. Henry¹ taking credit for having got him to give up smoking. He says he had himself good sense to do it without her advice.

John² has addressed Youghal and done it well. I wrote there and have very favourable accounts from that quarter. He will not have even a contest unless the Duke of Devonshire's agent³ takes part against him which I believe I have prevented.

Darling heart, but for these scoundrel elections I would go down with Dan but you know I am not at liberty to desert my post at such a period as this. Indeed, such is the cruel apathy in matters of business in this country that, if I was not here, no steps would be taken towards the management of my own election until the writs had actually issued. *I* intend to have everything ready so as not to think of Dublin during the contest. I do not after all imagine I could reckon on a majority of more than five hundred, that is, pretty well. Last time I had fifteen hundred and fifty majority. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Apparently Daniel, Jr.'s landlady in London.

2 His son.

3 Colonel William Samuel Currey.

2158

To Archbishop MacHale

Merrion Square, 10 December 1834

My revered Lord,

There have been many letters of congratulation¹ addressed to your Grace but none I will venture to say so cordial as mine,

because I not only congratulate you as a gentleman whom, even as a private individual, I highly respect but congratulate you in the name of Ireland and for her sake and above all, for the sake of that faith whose sacred deposit has been preserved by your predecessors and will be preserved unblemished and indeed with increased lustre by your Grace. Indeed, I venture to hope that there are times coming when the period of the oppression of the Church in Ireland, destined by God in his adorable dispensations to arrive, will have arrived. I *do*, I *confess*, venture to augur favourably from your nomination by his holiness the Pope, you who had proved yourself too honest an Irishman not to be obnoxious to the British Administration. It seems to me to be the brilliant dawn of a noonday in which the light of Rome will no longer be obscured by the clouds of English influence.² I often sighed at the delusion created in the political circles at Rome on the subject of the English Government. They thought, good souls, that England *favoured* the Catholics when she only *yielded* to our claims, not knowing that the secret animosity to Catholicity was as envenomed as ever it was.

The present Pope³ — may God protect his Holiness! — has seen through that delusion, and you are a proof that it will no longer be a cause of misconception to be as true to the political interests as to the spiritual wants of the people of Ireland. I am delighted at this new era. No man can be more devoted to the spiritual authority of his Holiness. I have always detested what were called the *liberties* of the 'Church in France'. I am convinced that the more direct and unequivocal is that authority according to the canons the more easy will it be to preserve the unity of the faith.

I need not add that there does not live a human being more submissive, *in omnibus*, to the Church than I am from the most unchangeable conviction. I have only to add that, if your Grace could have any occasion for *any* exertions of mine in support of *any* candidate in any county in Connaught, I shall have the greatest pleasure in receiving your suggestions as cherished commands.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 509-510

1 On his recent elevation to the archbishopric of Tuam.

2 Intense pressure had been brought to bear on the pope by the British government in order to prevent MacHale's appointment, (Broderick, *Holy See and Repeal*, 83-94).

3 Gregory XVI (1765-1846), elected pope in 1831.

2159

To his brother John

Merrion Square, 10 December 1834

My dearest John,

If your Morgan be driven to a contest I will subscribe £100 to his expenses. I will send you my address to the Men of Kerry tomorrow or the day after. I will write to Gallwey¹ and Cronin² but this is a secret.

You will find me entirely devoted to the Kerry election the moment I can disengage myself from my own and at all events you shall have my heart, head, purse and pen. I am decidedly favourable to Mullins being continued. He clearly comes within the principle³ upon which we have been acting and the Ventry tenants will also be a considerable reinforcement.⁴

The packet is in — reports that Peel had arrived — but it was not known as a fact at the Club⁵ at half after six so I do not believe it but a day or two will bring him. We shall then know what we have to depend on. Continue your canvass activity. I will please God write to you again tomorrow. Write to the clergy my opinion of Mullins being now necessary to be brought in. . . .

SOURCE: NLI MSS 5759

1 Christopher (Kit) Gallwey, land agent to the earl of Kenmare.

2 Daniel Cronin.

3 Of not opposing sitting Whig candidates.

4 Contrary to O'Connell's expectations Mullins was opposed by his cousin, Lord Ventry, and by the landlords of Kerry in general (see Gerard J. Lyne, 'Daniel O'Connell, Intimidation and the Kerry Elections of 1835,' *Journal of the Kerry Archaeological and Historical Society*, No.4, 1971, 79-80; see further letter 2174).

5 Probably Brooks's Club in London (see letter 2154).

2160

To John O'Brien,¹ Cashel

Merrion Square, 12 December 1834

Strictly confidential

My dear Sir,

I received at the committee² your letter to Mr. Power. I write to you one word in the strictest confidence. It would enable me to achieve a great public object if I could give up Youghal to a

decided liberal highly connected but then my son³ who represents that borough ought I think be in parliament. Would it, first, be right for me to propose him to Cashel? Secondly, would *he* be certain to succeed? He has talents, diligence and true Irish integrity. He is a Repealer but for the present confines his canvass to Anti-Toryism.

Write to me your mind candidly. I would not think of opposing him directly or indirectly to your honest representative, James Roe,⁴ one of the honestest men Ireland ever sent to Parliament but, if he will not stand, I should be proud to have a son of mine representing that city which is an epitome of Irish history, once the seat of splendour and wealth, now the neglected site of almost useless industry and unrequited talent.

Of course I write also in the strictest confidence. I will not be in any degree mortified to find that you deem my proposal unreasonable. All I want is perfect candour which I am sure to meet with from you.

There is an Englishman of the name of Dixon⁵ thinking of Cashel. He is not to be thought of for one moment. In haste.

[P.S.] Pray reply as speedily as possible. I have another plan⁶ in my eye for Perrin.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 4598

1 John O'Brien, medical doctor, Cashel, Co. Tipperary; secretary to the Irish Catholic League.

2 The election committee set up by the anti-Tory association on 25 November (*MR*, 26 Nov. 1834).

3 John.

4 James Roe, J.P., Roesborough, Co. Tipperary; M.P. for Cashel 1832-34; Catholic; small landowner.

5 Unidentified.

6 See letter 2167.

2161

*From Edward Rahilly, Cashel, Co. Tipperary, 12 December 1834,
to Derrynane*

States he is a son of Tom Rahilly of Cahirciveen and has been teaching school with the approbation of Fr. M. Quinlan, P.P.,¹ of Golden near Cashel. He instituted legal proceedings to recover part of pupils' fees before the magistrates, Mr. Creagh, Sen.,² of Golden and Dr. Fitzgerald of Cashel, but the latter dismissed him for not

being a registered teacher. Counsellor Manger of Cashel told the writer that the penal law requiring Catholic teachers to be licensed was repealed by the Emancipation and Reform acts but Dr. Fitzgerald won't agree. He asks O'Connell to take up the matter as a public issue, and write to him care of James O'Sullivan, student at Fitzsimon's school, Cashel.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Rev. Michael Quinlan (died 3 March 1846), parish priest of Golden, Co. Tipperary from before 1836 till his death.
- 2 Richard Creagh, J.P., D.L., Castlepark, Golden, Co. Tipperary.

2162

From John Bindon Scott to Merrion Square

Derrynane, 12 December 1834

My dear Sir,

I am exceedingly obliged to you for taking so lively an interest in my business which Mrs. O'Connell communicated to you about, viz., the representation of Kerry. She read to me your answer¹ to her and I can only say I will entirely be guided by you. I think my father² would not object now though he did before, when you kindly offered to accompany me through Clare. Should you want a person to represent the feelings of the people in any place where you think my services would be required, I shall be most happy to come forward.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Letter 2155.
- 2 Bindon Scott.

2163

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 13 December 1834

My darling love,

You must not scold *us* or any of *us* when you do not hear from Dublin. It is all the fault of the post office and this last *delay* convinces me that I must make a complaint. I am sorry to say that I am utterly unable to tell you what prospect if any there is of my

escaping out of Dublin. The Cabinet ought indeed to be formed by Monday, that is, in time for my hearing something by the post which will arrive on Monday as Stanley's determination¹ will be known by that time. I hope the vagabond will not be so mean as to join Peel. If he do, he is a shabby dog and will get a noble dressing but *that* is small revenge. The last letter I got from Hume was written in excellent spirits. He certainly does not expect the Peelers can stand. The Parliament has been prorogued to the 15th of January but it is not said to meet for *dispatch of business*. It is therefore clear that we will have another prorogation until early in February if *this* House is to meet at all again.

It is cruel to us both that Mary O'Connell should thus separate us. I believe the silly woman is not with child at all. You have not answered this observation of mine. She could not mistake by so many months and her excessive corpulence and great appetite favour my opinion. Tell me then, darling, are you certain she is with child at all?

You have now had Dan with you long enough to form an opinion yourself about him. My fears are, I own, great. He had those consumptive symptoms which I so much dread though his lungs were not affected. It certainly is not pulmonary consumption. . . .

[P.S.] I go this evening to Glencullen.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 That is, as to whether or not to join the new ministry. He ultimately decided to hold aloof from it (Saintsbury, *Derby*, 43-4).

2164

From Lord Rossmore to Dublin

Rome, 13 December 1834

My Dear Sir,

You will, I am sure, excuse my troubling you at so great a distance, but the return to power of the Tories and my anxiety for Ireland authorises me; and having strongly advocated your motives at the British Catholic Association and at Mullingar, I am confident you will not consider that I take too great a liberty.

When I reflect upon the indiscreet words put forth by a northern peer last session, 'let the loyal yeomanry tranquillize Ireland' and that he was loudly cheered by the Duke who is now, I suppose,

Premier, I am justified in the apprehension I entertain for Ireland. All you want to make you irresistible in the House, is to be a Protestant. As that cannot be, Protestant evidence becomes the more necessary there. The strongest and most successful argument the enemies of Ireland use, is, that 'the party who support you in the house, are almost to a man Catholic.' It is probable, in the event of a dissolution of Parliament, that two of my sons will be returned for Monaghan and the King's County. On them Ireland may depend to the last spark, as she may on my friend, Sharman Crawford. Why not return him? The times require the assistance of Leader and Wyse. You would gain great credit in public estimation by getting the latter returned and the English members have an opinion of Leader's integrity. I will not take up more of your time and I have only to regret I cannot be at your right hand in either House to take my proper post.

Peel left this two or three days ago on his return. He was just starting for Naples. Lords Anglesey and Shrewsbury are here. I fear Ireland will receive but little support from the Roman Catholic aristocracy.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

2165

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Monday, 15 December 1834

My own love,

I have nothing decisive to tell you on politics but the reports are most favourable to the Tories totally failing, bitter bad luck to them. Hume wrote to me yesterday and John¹ just as the post was leaving London on Saturday. No person has joined the Tories, not one of the old whigs. Stanley, Sir Jas. Graham etc. have all refused, and John says that the report was that they were breaking up. We shall therefore expect by Wednesday to hear of their complete dissolution. They cannot get on. I am in great political spirits but very angry at being kept away from you and from my family. Darling, I have really no patience with Maurice's wife. What to mistake three months!² It is impossible. I fear she intended to play a trick upon us. Darling, ought I not be melancholy when I think how Maurice sacrifices himself. If even he would become temperate but I will not annoy you with my complaints. . . .

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 His son.

2 See letter 2142 n4.

2166

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 16 December 1834

My darling Love,

I beg of you to begin every letter of yours with an account of our sweet boy [Danny]. I am really alarmed about him. . . .

There are of course no news this day nor anything like news. We will be all impatient for tomorrow which ought to decide something. One only thing is clear, that nobody but a desperate Tory will belong to the present Ministry. I expected to be with you before Christmas Day. Are you aware that my uncle was in the habit of killing a cow at Christmas and distributing the meat amongst the poor? I am sure I need not suggest to you to do at least *as much*. You cannot, sweetest, do too much for our poor people. May the great God bless you, my own darling love, my own dearest Mary. How I regret that I do not see you enjoying such good health as you do my own, own love. . . . Darling, each day I promise myself that the next will enable me to say something decisive as to the course I shall have to take. How I wish I could tomorrow hear that the Tory Administration was broken up root and branch but perhaps we shall have it established in full vigour.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

2167

To John O'Brien, Cashel

Merrion Square, 16 December 1834

My dear Sir,

Many thanks for your very kind letter. I also heard from Mr. Roe who referred me to you for more accurate information. I strongly suspect Mr. Roe would not retire¹ but for your *internal* division. What an unhappy country ours is in which men will make any sacrifice *save of passion or prejudice* to the public good.

I have since learned that Perrin has accepted your invitation.² You certainly could not have a better or more useful man. I highly approve of your choice. Having made it and being unanimous you should persevere and I repeat you could *not possibly* under present circumstances have a better representative than my friend Perrin.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 4598

1 As member for Cashel.

2 Louis Perrin was elected for Cashel on 14 January 1835.

2168

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 17 December 1834

My own Love,

Your letter about Dan was full of consolation. His disorder was in his stomach and, if his appetite returns to its natural action, all is well. Blessed be the great and good God in his infinite mercy.

The new ministry is formed as you will see by the newspapers. All Tories of the worst description but so much better for the popular cause. They insult the Irish Catholics and the English Protestant Dissenters, being equal enemies to both but neither the papers nor the private letters say one word of a dissolution. Tomorrow however will give us some insight into the matter or the day after at the very latest. . . . What are we to do with Mary O'Connell and her eternal pregnancy?¹ I do not indeed believe the foolish woman is with child at all, and you do not tell me positively that she is. I much fear her husband has lost Tralee. At least the letters I got from John Primrose, Sr. and from Supple² make me very desponding. He is *not a lucky young man*.

. . . I have a strong notion that I will start from this on Friday week and be down with you the ensuing Sunday to make all our family arrangements. I could then personally canvass Tralee and Kerry and see how my unfortunate son stands. I now believe that John is sufficiently safe in Youghal and Morgan quite so in Meath. As to myself I have no fears for Dublin City nor for Fitz-Simon in the County. But all these speculations are annoying me not a little. I am as busy as possible and have to deal with so many stupid and so many selfish persons that I do not know how I can manage them all.

Darling, your old husband loves you with the sincerest tenderness. Indeed, darling, I do. How delighted I am that your health is so good.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 2142 n4.
- 2 Daniel Supple was election agent for Maurice O'Connell in the ensuing general election.

2169

From De Lacy Evans

London, 17 December [1834]

My dear Sir,

My brother Col. R.L. Evans¹ will have the pleasure of presenting you this note and I beg leave to introduce him to you and shall feel much obliged if he may have the benefit of your advice regarding his intention of standing for some place in Ireland if a probable opening should appear. Dundalk has been mentioned to him by our friend, Col. Hodges.² . . . I believe his political principles are the same as mine. If he comes in at all it would be as a staunch independent liberal, and above all things determined to advocate the rights of Ireland – regarding tithes, the Church of Ireland, and corporate abuses especially. The general idea is that the 26th inst. will be the day of our dissolution. I cannot understand how the Tories can have more than one quarter day's salary.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Richard Lacy Evans, son of George Evans, a small landed proprietor of Moig, Co. Limerick.
- 2 Colonel George Lloyd Hodges (1792-1862), son of George Thomas Hodges, Old Abbey, Limerick; half-pay officer 1830; commanded British and Foreign Legion in Portugal under Dom Pedro 1832; Morgan O'Connell's second in the duel with Alvanley. See *Boase*.

2170

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 18 December 1834

My own sweetest Love,

I got *this* post Maurice's letter announcing my sweet *little* Mary. She is welcome. May the great God of heaven bless and preserve her. Get her christened as speedily as possible. Let her not be subject one day to the awful effects of any accident whilst unbaptised. I am glad, sincerely glad, to hear that Mary is so well. I hope Maurice is gone to Tralee. I will be exceedingly annoyed if he be not. . . .

We had a great meeting¹ this day. I had nothing to do (being otherwise engaged) with the arrangements. They allowed a group of Orange ruffians to preoccupy the precincts of the chair. We had noble confusion but we beat the rascals heartily. We had 50 to 1 at least over them, and our people shoved them out quietly but in great style. It was a most uproarious scene and I enjoyed it greatly but the Orange gang were quite discomfited. They were led on by Johnny McCrea, the Dissenting preacher.

O'Loghlen starts for Dungarvan, Woulfe for the County of Carlow, all safe in both points. Lefroy is the new Attorney-General, Jackson² is the new Solicitor-General,³ he of Kildare Place Society, so that the Catholics schools will again be deprived of their emoluments arising from the Government fund. This will rouse all the Catholic clergy from the highest bishop to the lowest curate. Hurrah for agitation! It quite puts me in spirits and makes me young again.

Darling, I wish the scoundrels would allow me to go to you. Now that Mary is safe with her babe we will, please God, soon meet one way or the other but how I long even for a week at Derrynane!

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 An anti-Tory aggregate meeting in Dublin. It was attended by seven M.P.'s, and letters regretting inability to attend were received from the duke of Leinster and seven other peers. Resolutions supporting various reforms, including total extinction of tithes, and expressing opposition to the Tory government, were passed. The meeting also adopted an address to the king expressing their concern at the dismissal of the Whig government (*MR*, 19 Dec. 1834).
- 2 Joseph Devonsher Jackson (1783-1857), eldest son of Strettell Jackson, Petersborough, Co. Cork; honorary secretary Kildare Place Society 1811-

30; assistant-barrister Co. Londonderry 1830-34; solicitor-general 1841-42; judge of common pleas 1842-57; M.P. for Bandon 1835-42, Dublin University 1842-3. See *Boase*.

3 O'Connell was mistaken. These appointments were not made.

2171

From Joseph Hume, M.P.

Extract

Middlesex, 18 December 1834

If the House of the people submit to what Peel proposes, they will deserve the execration of the world. I hear of not a sufficient number of changes to induce me to think that they can carry one vote in the House, and I therefore anticipate a short reign. I hope you or some person with authority and knowledge of past events will answer Sir Robert's address,¹ paragraph by paragraph, and expose the Jesuitical performance so that it may react against him.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 503n

1 Peel's address to his constituents known in history as the Tamworth Manifesto.

2172

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 19 December 1834

My darling Love,

... The news however, as far as they go, are good. The 'Peelers' are meeting rejections. They sent for Lord *de Grey*¹ to offer him the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. He totally refused. They offered Lord Haddington office — he was Lord Binning and was a Cabinet Minister with Canning, is a man of some consideration. He also refused, and the private report is that we are not to have a dissolution. *Thus* we stand at present but each day promises something decisive. Yet each day renews the promise for tomorrow. However, come it will *soon* the one way or the other.

As to Kerry I am miserable that Maurice is not in Tralee. If he loses the election it will be by reason of his most foolish and almost idiotical delay in going there. I am doing *everything* for him and he will do nothing of himself.

I am delighted to hear so good an account of Mary and her

little Mary who I hope is a Christian before now.² Why should any risk be run in so vitally important an affair! . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Thomas Philip (de Grey), 2nd Earl de Grey (1781-1859); first lord of the admiralty December 1834 to April 1835; lord lieutenant of Ireland 1841-44. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 2170.

2173

To William Brett,¹ Dundalk

Merrion Square, 19 December 1834

My dear Sir,

I wrote to you last night by Mr. McKenna,² respecting Mr. Corley.³ I am sorry to see by this day's letter that you do not imagine he can succeed. I hope it may be otherwise. The appearance of Toby Glasscock⁴ and his possession of money is a strong proof that he has been sent down by the Roden party. He was sent to Ennis to oppose me when I was candidate for Clare. He then sported Orange principles and, if he be anything, he is an Orangeman but, really, any person who voted for him would be a greater maniac than the poor fellow ever was himself. I do not know how I came to mistake Corley about Mr. Mahon. I suppose, however, I must have mistaken him as far as regards your being the person who told him O'Gorman Mahon would start.⁵ He certainly said he was told so, and my notion was that he said it was by you. However that, I should now presume, was a mistake of mine. I have another candidate for you — Col. Evans, brother to Col. De Lacy Evans, member for Westminster. He would deposit £400 to defray all legal expenses — would not bribe and is a thorough radical. It is indeed time that you should determine upon somebody. Perrin is fixed elsewhere. You must put him out of court. I implore of you and Mr. McAlister⁶ to get together as many right thinking persons like yourselves and come to a speedy decision. Do not hesitate or you will lose Dundalk.

SOURCE: William Brett, *Reminiscences of Louth*, 33

- 1 William Brett formerly secretary of the Catholic Association in Co. Louth; proprietor and editor of the *Louth Free Press* from 1829; author of *Reminiscences of Louth*.
- 2 Probably William McKenna.
- 3 Unidentified.

- 4 Talbot (Toby) Glasscock 'arrived from Dublin and made a speech' but did not contest the seat there. (John D'Alton and James Roderick O'Flanagan, *The History of Dundalk and its Environs*, Dublin, Hodges, 1864).
- 5 No information has been traced to elucidate this reference.
- 6 Probably James McAlister, Cambrickville, Dundalk, a brewer and member of a wealthy mercantile family.

2174

From C. Fitzmaurice¹ to Merrion Square

Killarney, 19 December 1834

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

... With respect to Mr. Mullins I am, and had been from the commencement, of your opinion. I stated that opinion to your brother. I think however he has erred in the mode of proceeding but in nothing else. It is unnecessary to say a word of Mullins. His conduct in private life exceeds in turpitude his political recreancy,² and in Killarney he is regarded as the most perfect exemplification of everything that is dishonourable and mean. Hence the freeholders were determined to spurn him with indignant scorn. Such being the case, it is my opinion that there should have been a meeting held in Tralee in order to consider the state of the County and I have no doubt but the liberal men of Kerry would agree with you that for the purpose of defeating the enemy it is advisable to support Mr. Mullins at the approaching election. Instead of doing so,³ Mr. J. O'Connell⁴ commenced canvassing in his favour. This produced general astonishment particularly as he had recently declared against him. In these days of liberty, men like to be consulted, and the enemies of the O'Connell name did not fail to term his conduct as an unwarranted dictation. In fact in this wretched town there are not wanted persons to seize every opportunity of reviling him and you, and misrepresenting all your actions and motives.

This error, I hope, will be corrected by referring to the people. The meeting should be held in Tralee.⁵ In Killarney nothing of the kind should be originated, but if the thing be sanctioned in Tralee the independent men here will acquiesce. The rumour now goes that Capt. Herbert will start.⁶

So much for County business. With respect to Tralee you may be sure that canvassing for Mullins had no unfavourable effect on the freeholders. No, the danger in Tralee arises from bribery and I regret to say that owing to bribery the present worthy represent-

ative⁷ runs a great risk of being defeated.⁸ The want of agitation is the great evil in Kerry. Agitation inspires people with resolution. From it they learn their rights and become ashamed to betray that cause. If people are left to themselves they consult their private interests; when dragged before the public, to avoid disgrace they do their duty. A letter to the priests would be of service.⁹ My nephew, one of the curates, must be 'up and doing.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Mullins' unpopularity seems to have sprung in part from his being a tithe-owner, and from his failing to oppose the coercion bill of 1833 (see Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 77-80).
- 3 That is, instead of calling a county meeting.
- 4 O'Connell's brother John. See letter 2159.
- 5 A meeting of electors in support of the Liberal candidates was held in Tralee on 1 January 1835 and was addressed by O'Connell (see Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 85).
- 6 Herbert did not come forward as a candidate.
- 7 O'Connell's son Maurice.
- 8 It was alleged that the Conservatives had offered bribes of from £20 to £50 a vote in favour of William Denny (Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 96).
- 9 In response to appeals from O'Connell the Catholic bishop and clergy exerted themselves vigorously in the elections in favour of the Liberal candidates (see Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 87-8, 92-5).

2175

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 20 December 1834

My darling Love,

I am just come in from a brilliant day at the Association. I made one of the most *applauded* speeches I ever pronounced. . . .¹

No political news. Peel's declaration of *principles* is published, the most hypocritical, *Jesuitical* piece of composition I ever read. It is the most atrocious too as relates to this country. In the meantime *eleven* men have been murdered in a tithe fray in the south of Ireland. . . .²

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 At a meeting of the anti-Tory association on this day O'Connell delivered a speech which took up over six columns of newsprint. The speech was concerned largely with electoral topics, but also contained a strong criticism of Peel's Tamworth Manifesto (see letter 2171 n1), a condemnation of

recent government appointments and of the police and military for the tithe killings at Rathcormac (see below n2). O'Connell appealed to the Dissenters to oppose the new government, and appealed to the bar to do so also in the name of John Philpot Curran. The speech was received with 'long-continued cheering for several minutes' (*MR*, 22 Dec. 1834).

- 2 A reference to the 'Massacre of Rathcormac', which took place on 18 December. A determined effort was made to prevent the tithe being collected by Archdeacon William Ryder, who was accompanied by military, from a widow living on the outskirts of the village of Gortroe near Rathcormac, Co. Cork. Having met with resistance, the military opened fire, killing twelve persons and wounding forty-two. A coroner's inquest lasting thirteen days resulted on 6 January in a mixed verdict, 13 jurors deciding for wilful murder, 2 for manslaughter, and 8 for justifiable homicide (O'Brien *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 480-6; *DEP*, 10 Jan. 1835).

2176

From Henry Warburton

Bridport, 20 December 1834

My Dear Sir,

I am sorry that my being here occasions delay in our correspondence. I cannot well quit this place for London at present as my colleague, John Romilly,¹ will be somewhat hard run.

Lord Kenmare has answered that he does not believe the sitting members will be disturbed.² I must endeavour to reinforce the application.

A.B.³ writes me word: 'Who are the candidates for Kerry and Wicklow that Mr. O'Connell wishes to have supported? I may do harm to their cause, if I ask such and such a peer to aid them as Mr. O'Connell's friends. But name the candidates and I can ask his Lordship to support the individuals.'

Now the way in which I put the case was this. That if they would name their Whig candidates and such Whig candidates would pledge themselves to oppose the Tories, your friends would cooperate with theirs at the elections for Kerry and Wicklow in returning those Whig candidates. I have written to inform A.B. that such I believe to have been your meaning at the time you wrote to me, and that I conceive it is for them, not for you, to name their candidates; that I know not how circumstances stand at present in those counties but that I strongly urge them to open a negotiation on that footing without loss of time, if indeed the matter is still open for negotiation.

[P.S.] Write to me, but to save time, write also to Lord Duncannon

and to Hume.

Mr Littleton wrote straightforward⁴ as I desired him. This you will consider as private information.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 John Romilly (1802-1874), 2nd son of Sir Samuel Romilly; M.P. Bridport 1832-35, March 1846-47; Devonport 1847-52; solicitor-general (England) 1848-50; attorney-general (England) 1850-51; master of the rolls 1851-73. See *DNB*.
- 2 For Kerry. See also letter 2198.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 See letter 2203.

2177

To his wife, Derrynane

[Dublin], 23 December 1834

My darling Love,

I did not write to you yesterday because I was detained in court so late as to be unable to reach home in time to write to you. If I had written to you yesterday I should omit it this day as I am convinced I will be kept here too late. I write as you may perceive in court. . . .

My plan is to take a few days at Derrynane and then that *we all* should come to Tralee or Killarney and then come round by Youghal. I have written to John¹ to come over and we must all prepare for the fight. The Knight of Kerry is up for the County. He is appointed one of the Lords of the Admiralty. We must give him battle vigorously. This is an excellent period for a struggle. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 His son.

2178

From Daniel Supple Jr.

Tralee, 23 December 1834

My Dear Sir,

The Knight's friends have at length avowed his intention to come forward¹ and have so declared this day (agents are retained, I had it from one of them, Mr. Huggard).² It is also rumoured that

Captain Herbert will come forward for the purpose of deciding his interest in favour of the Knight.

... I have circulated your address³ through the Tralee district and forwarded a [one word illegible] to be distributed in the Killarney district. I have no doubt it will have the desired effect.

[P.S.] Please say when we may expect you here.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 As a candidate for Co. Kerry.

2 Unidentified.

3 Unidentified.

2179

From Thomas Cloney

Graig, 24 December 1834

My dear Sir,

Although I should receive no reply I must comply with my duty to my country. Several of the Co. Carlow priests requested me to ask you if you could recommend an eligible candidate for that County who would not be *too* close fisted. Mr. Wolfe has been talked of. Are you aware of this or can you favour us with any advice or information? A wish is expressed that Mr. Robert Archbold¹ would come forward to secure the representation for young Kavanagh² who, it is said, has expressed his intention of coming forward on Liberal Principles, the first open after he is of age. We are to have a great meeting in St. Mollins Parish next *Sunday*. Your advice and opinion as to Carlow will be most anxiously looked for and if my being the correspondent does not hinder you, I hope you will not neglect writing by Friday or *Saturday* at furthest.

P.S. . . . We had an important meeting³ on Monday near Borris where we, I think, gave a deathblow to Newton's⁴ pretensions. The County is neglected. The town too is in jeopardy. *Don't be too confident*. I wish to God you could come into the County for even one day. *Do if possible*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Robert Archbold (died 9 March 1855), Davidstown, Castledermot Co. Kildare; M.P. Co. Kildare 1837-47.

- 2 Walter Kavanagh (1814-1836), Borris, Co. Carlow only son of Thomas Kavanagh by his first wife.
- 3 No account of this meeting has been traced.
- 4 Walter Newton J.P. (died 1853), Dunleckney, Bagenalstown, Co. Carlow.

2180

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Christmas Day [1834]

My darling heart's Love,

I wish you, darling, with all my heart many and many a happy Christmas and may He who on this day united His divinity to man's flesh to make us *eternally* happy, pour his *choicest choicest* blessings on the best of mothers and the most tender of wives, my own darling Mary. I send the same wishes to all under your roof, to my Kate, her husband and her babes, to Mary, Maurice and their babes, and to the girls. I mix the same prayer with my respectful congratulations to the Scotts and to Miss Joyce.

Darling, I was unfortunately speaking from half after four until rather more than half after six. I was therefore unable to write to you, darling, and it is to me a small consolation that I made a successful speech, one of my most successful. The opinion was before I spoke that there may be a verdict for about from three to five hundred pounds. I got a verdict for three thousand.¹ At least my client and the public attribute it to me. I was most vehemently cheered and even the judge did not interfere to prevent it, that is, the continued cheers. Darling, I indulge my vanity that you may share in it.

Sweetest, my plan is to leave this early, please God, on Saturday morning so as at all events to get that night to Limerick, perhaps to Rathkeale, and to be able to go after I have heard Mass to Tralee on Sunday. I will remain but a short time there and hope to be with you certainly after no longer a delay in Tralee than two days.

[P.S.] All the English letters this day are in excellent spirits and hopes.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell appeared on 22, 23 and 24 December in the court of exchequer on behalf of Thomas Hodgens, plaintiff in a claim for damages against Dr. D. Mahon, a surgeon in the artillery. Hodgens accused Mahon of having

seduced his wife, and claimed £10,000 damages. O'Connell succeeded in preventing a postponement of the case, and a verdict was found for Hodgins awarding him £3,000 damages and 6d. costs (*MR*, 23, 24, Dec. 1834; *DEP*, 24, 27 Dec. 1834).

2181

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, 26 December 1834

My own darling Love,

I have but just come in from the Association¹ and brought Nell and Fitz-Simon with me. I have but two minutes to write and all about myself. You however will not be sorry to hear that I have arranged my affairs so as to leave town tomorrow. I will write to you the moment I reach Tralee and expect to embrace you on Wednesday next. Read the short abstract of my speech² in the *Freeman* and say whence I took some of my pictures.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 The anti-Tory Association.

2 In summing up for his client in the case *Hodgens - v - Mahon* (see letter 2180 n1) on 24 December. The *Freeman's Journal* of 26 December 1834 states: 'The unrivalled advocate [O'Connell], in the progress of his splendid address, drew beautiful and affecting pictures of wedded happiness — of the sacredness and sanctity of the domestic hearth — of the wife and husband clinging to each other with a passionate and devoted fondness, until the adulterer came to dissolve the dream — to dissipate all the blessed happiness and security of that home — to rob the husband of his wife, and the children of their mother. . . . While Mr. O'Connell was delivering some of the fine and affecting passages of his speech, the tears might be seen rolling down the cheeks of the venerable judge.'

2182

To his wife, Derrynane

Tralee, Monday night, 29 December 1834

My darling Love,

Here I am, darling, having left Dublin at one yesterday. I slept at Roscrea at Smallman's¹ in a good bed and a cold room. I left long before day, remained an hour in Limerick and, I hope, settled the County and City elections.

Darling, I have just got your *two* letters, one by Maurice, the

other by post. I intend to be with you on Wednesday but I am told I must stay here that day. However Dan² is not even to think that when I leave this I would stop short of Derrynane, and it surely would be too late to hunt after I had travelled from this to the hunting ground on a winter's day. You will be surprised but not sorry to hear that I am no more fatigued than I was leaving Dublin yesterday. . . .

Darling, the Parliament will be dissolved in London tomorrow. We must hasten up but you are never in a hurry. We will stay at Derrynane between you and me as long as I can. I love Derrynane for one thousand reasons. How I long to see you and all the *villains*. Tell Kate I do doat of her and of her babes. Give my tenderest love to *all*.

[P.S.] I will write tomorrow if I do not go on Wednesday.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The White Hart Hotel in Church Street of which Smallman was the proprietor.
- 2 His son.

2183

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Tralee, 1 January 1835

I have been kept here these three days in *hot water*. The county is organised and safe. The knight has not the slightest chance. The town is,¹ I am told, safe but in these close constituencies three or four turn the scale and that creates bribery. The temptation is really too formidable. I go on tomorrow to Derrynane Abbey. I am not a little annoyed that no human being wrote to me from Dublin.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 510

- 1 Tralee, for which O'Connell's son Maurice was standing.

2183a

*To John Primrose, Jr.*¹

Derrynane, Sunday [probably 4 January 1835]

My dear John,

The writs being out I must be off on Tuesday to Killarney. Send an express there. Let him go part of the way — say — to Glanbegh this evening or night so as to be early tomorrow in Killarney. Write to Finn² to have his four horses at Wales³ tomorrow night. Send me your horse here tomorrow. Get a couple of car horses to be ready to take my carriage to Wales. Have a jaunting car to take me from your house to Wales. My luggage will be at your house with my servant by eight on Tuesday morning. Get Sullivan (Charles's⁴ man) to be ready to go with my carriage and see it safe to Wales.

Take all this trouble for me and do it so that there may be *no mistake*.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 The letter has the words, 'sent by hand and marked "Immediate."'

2 Thomas Finn, proprietor of the Kenmare Arms Hotel, Killarney.

3 An inn at Glenbeigh, near Killorglin, Co. Kerry, the owner's surname being Wales.

4 O'Connell's son-in-law, Charles O'Connell.

2184

To his brother John

Derrynane, Sunday night [4 January 1835]

My dearest John,

Who could be the stupidest of the stupid who told you I said nothing about the County Election in my address? Look at the resolution¹ with which I prefaced my speech and if there be a shadow of report of what I said, you will see that the entire aim of my argument went to rouse every man who heard me against the two supporters of the present Ministry. My principal topic was *tithes* and there was not a word directed to rouse the farmers against the Knight and in the first instance I required *them* to come in to influence Tralee.² What a *silly, silly* wretch it must be that gave you the uneasiness of thinking I did not speak to both elections — not equally, because the far greater part of what I said was applicable and directed to the County election. I never felt so annoyed as at the foolish falsehood which was thus conveyed to you.

So far from that impression being made [on] those who surrounded me, on the contrary, they declared the impression I made decisive of the Knight. It may be that I did not speak of the candidates. I certainly said nothing of my own son principally because I had the people in tears upon the topic of the Rathcormac murders.³ To suppose, as your informant supposed, what I said encouraged the Conservatives, is, you would admit if you heard me, the height of madness. My plan was to attack the knight.

I will be in Killarney on Tuesday evening and, if you desire, give one other written address. Dublin election is to be *early* so that I have no doubt of being with my dear Morgan⁴ before the Kerry contest can commence.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 515-6

- 1 Two of these resolutions at the Tralee meeting (see letter 2174 n5) attacked the knight of Kerry and William Denny explicitly (see evidence of Sub-Inspector Henry John Brownrigg in 'Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider . . . Bribery, Corruption and Intimidation in the Election of Members to . . . Parliament' in *Parl. Papers*, 1835, VIII).
- 2 This sentence is puzzling: it may have been copied inaccurately by W.J. FitzPatrick. O'Connell seems to have been referring to his published address to the electors of Kerry, dated 18 December 1834, in which he urged the farmers around Tralee to 'come in' and canvass the shopkeepers of the town in favour of his son Maurice (see Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 85). His speech in Tralee on 1 January (see letter 2174 n5), as reported in the *Pilot* of 7 January 1835, was concerned solely with the election for Tralee and made no reference to the county contest.
- 3 According to a press report, 'a thrill of horror ran through the entire meeting and the tears glistened in every eye' when O'Connell spoke about Rathcormac (*Pilot*, 7 Jan. 1835, quoting the *Tralee Mercury*).
- 4 Morgan John O'Connell.

2185

To Edward M. FitzGerald,¹ Carlow

Derrynane, 4 January 1835

Confidential

My dear FitzGerald,

I wish I could get to Carlow. I am most anxious to be in Carlow. Will you see his lordship the Bishop² and submit to him my plan?³ If you cannot get anybody else, I will lodge £500 or, if necessary, £1,000 for my eldest son Maurice and set him up for the County. Maurice can and will be elected for Tralee but he could afterwards elect to sit for Carlow County and leave Tralee for a second choice. I say this only on the understanding that nobody else can be got;

in that case I will make the sacrifice I mention to prevent a Tory getting in for the county. You will, however, recollect that I do this merely to prevent a Tory from being your member, and for no other purpose though, to be perfectly candid, I would rather have Maurice represent a county than a borough; but beyond that preference, there is nothing else. I am, however, ready to make a personal sacrifice of from £500 to £1,000 for that purpose. I go to Killarney on Tuesday, the 6th; on Wednesday, the 7th, to Cork. . .

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 429-30

- 1 Edward Michael Fitzgerald, secretary of Carlow Liberal Club.
- 2 Edward Nolan (1793-1837); educated at Carlow and Maynooth; ordained 1819; taught at Carlow College 1820-34; coadjutor Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin April to October 1834; bishop of Kildare and Leighlin 1834; died of typhus fever 1837.
- 3 Presumably the same plan of obtaining a candidate to contest the county in the Liberal interest which O'Connell was later to implement through Raphael. Shortly after this Bishop Nolan issued a circular addressed to the priests of his diocese urging them to participate actively in the forthcoming election in order to secure the return of Liberal members for the county and borough of Carlow (*DEP*, 13 Jan. 1835).

2186

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 5 January 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Dublin city is a county in itself, and cannot have its election, I take it, sooner than tomorrow week. You seem to suppose that my friend Maley has made a great discovery as to the paving, etc., cess. I am surprised you did not recollect that there were others with heads on their shoulders as well as Maley. We have, of course, been acting on the conviction of the accuracy of the opinions which he gave you; but see, between you and me, how much more kind it would be of him to go and give the benefit of his knowledge to the election committees sitting in Dublin for me and my late colleague¹ than sending the fact to me 200 miles distant. It is, indeed, known already but every fresh announcement would be a stimulant to the voters to pay up their taxes.² They have until the moment of polling to pay. No question arises as to the vote but the voter may be required before he votes to swear in these words: 'That not more than one half-year's grand jury or municipal cesses, rates, or taxes are now due and payable *by me* in respect to the

premises in this certificate mentioned.' Now whoever is not personally liable to the cesses, such as persons registered out of shops, warehouses, etc., can at once take this oath.

And, between you and me, so can any man who does not owe more than one half-year's grand jury cesses and has brought any *one* of the municipal cesses to one half-year; for supposing the grand jury cesses out of the question, then the words are clear, *I do not owe more than one half-year of my municipal cesses*; that is clearly *all* the cesses taken in the aggregate, not of any one cess taken by itself. The oath is not, 'I do not owe the amount of more than one half-year of *any* municipal cess;' the oath is, 'I do not owe more than the amount of one half-year of my municipal *cesses*,' in the plural, which is strictly and critically true if he has cleared off any one cess. Remember the oath negatives the plural only, the plural conjointly; it does not negative any singular or particular. If you pay one municipal cess, you owe only some of your cesses, not all. This will be clearer still if you suppose *four* municipal cesses. You pay three off, you owe one. You can most safely swear you do not owe municipal *cesses*. Keep this distinction from getting into any newspaper until we present Pigot's opinion³ to the voters, and keep it to yourself, lest it should discourage people from or rather induce them to omit paying all cesses. What we are striving to do before we announce this construction of the oath is to get as many voters as possible to pay all, especially the paving, etc., tax. Some of their freemen will be hard set to take the oath with truth for an opponent.

Send all the Dublin newspapers to Derrynane.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 513-4

1 Edward S. Ruthven.

2 On 6 January the *Dublin Evening Post* informed the householders of Dublin that under the reform act, 'no Householder in arrears of his Taxes for six months has the privilege of voting. . . . It therefore becomes every-one so circumstanced to call on the Tax Collector, and pay up'. On 9 January it further listed the taxes which would-be voters must pay. These included, firstly, the grand jury cess 'that was apportioned at the last *Easter Term*, 1834'; secondly, the Wide Street Tax, collectable with the above; thirdly, the Paving and Lighting tax, in advance to 5 January 1836, being payable on 5 January 1835; fourthly, the Watch tax, to 25 March 1834; fifthly, the Pipe Water rent, to 24 June 1835.

3 David R. Pigot's 'Synoptical Guide for Registry of Electors on a single large sheet', (Dublin, 1835), no copy of which has been traced. It is advertised in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 6 January 1835. At a meeting of the anti-Tory association on 6 January Marcus Costello gave virtually the same advice to the public as that given by O'Connell in this letter. Costello gave Michael O'Loughlen as his authority (*FJ*, 7 Jan. 1835).

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 5 January 1835

Extract

A good deal of uneasiness continues to be expressed at your absence from Dublin. There is every reason to believe the City election will take place on Monday and every chicane will doubtless be resorted to against the popular party. I understand the assessor to be West¹ who is, I believe, son of the Alderman. He has been in all parts of town throughout the week in company with Boyton. Your presence appears indispensable to check to some extent the system of trick which the Corporators know so well how to practise, and you will probably receive letters from other quarters by this night's post urging your immediate return. Alderman Smyth, etc., continue to promulge that payment in advance, and for the year in full, of the Paving and Lighting Tax² is requisite to qualify the householders under £50. O'Loughlen got the Paving Act³ from Maley last night, and Sausse⁴ has just told me he will write his opinion tonight for the guidance of the Committee.⁵ It would seem as if he thought it unnecessary to make the payment in advance. Some persons suggest that, where the means of the people do not enable them to pay the whole year's tax at once, half the sum should be tendered, and it would probably be received, from the exhausted state of the treasury of the department. This is, of course, contemplating the necessity of making the payment previously to coming up to vote, and the persons to whom I allude wished me to see Hickman Kearney, the Paving Commissioner, privately to get him to afford every facility in his power to the defaulters in this or any other way. Do you think this requisite?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 510-11

- 1 Henry West (1808-1881), son of Alderman Jacob West; called to the bar 1833; Q.C. 1852. See *Boase*.
- 2 See letter 2186 n2.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 Matthew Richard Sausse (1809-1867), second son of Richard Sausse, Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary; Q.C. 1849; assistant barrister Co. Wexford 1851-56; colonial judge (Bombay) 1856; chief justice Bombay 1859. Died at Kenmare House and is buried in Killarney. See *Boase*.
- 5 A committee of some 50 members appointed on 30 December 1834 by the anti-Tory Association to manage the Dublin city election (*Pilot*, 5 Jan. 1835). A corresponding committee of some 40 persons was appointed on the same day to deal with the provincial constituencies (*Pilot*, 5 Jan. 1835).

2188

*From Rev. John Sheehan to care of John O'Connell, Youghal,
Co. Cork*

Waterford, 7 January 1835

My Dear Friend,

O'Loghlen is here with Dr. Foran and will make a triumphal entry into Dungarvan tomorrow. He will be returned without opposition¹ and there will be a public dinner given to him tomorrow at Dungarvan. If you can attend they will be delighted to meet you there. Do not, I pray you, recommend a coalition between Galwey and Power.² If a Beresford started, Power would have immense difficulty in carrying Galwey through. In such case you need not fear. But I tell you that it would be no harm whatever to get rid of your fat friend. However if needs must we shall take him.³

[P.S.] Dr. Foran has written to Col. Currey about his improper and indifferent conduct about Youghal.⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 O'Loghlen was returned for Dungarvan without opposition on 12 January 1835.
- 2 Patrick Power of Bellvue.
- 3 At a meeting in Waterford on 18 January to select candidates for the county, Galwey's candidature was proposed by Henry W. Barron and seconded by William O'Donnell of Carrick. The meeting, however, selected as candidates Sir Richard Musgrave and Patrick Power. After some attempts to demand a poll, Galwey withdrew. No Beresford candidate appeared. Musgrave and Power were declared elected on the show of hands (*Pilot*, 21 Jan. 1835).
- 4 O'Connell's son John was candidate for Youghal, where the Whig duke of Devonshire possessed a powerful interest. The *Pilot* reported that Devonshire's agent, Colonel William S. Currey, 'acting upon the letter, and not the spirit of his instructions has declined taking such a part [in support of O'Connell's son John] as would prevent a contest' (*Pilot*, 12 Jan. 1835).

To his wife, Derrynane

Cork, 8 January 1835

My own darling Love,

Much as I am hurried I have been obliged to remain here all day regulating John's qualification.¹ I send an express with the deeds for Charles'² execution. If my brother James had not been as *crotchety* as he is he would spare me all this trouble. Do you know, love, that I never felt more anxiety in my life than I do at the *danger* of Charles not executing this deed and surely there is no *danger* of his refusing me a request which cannot possibly do him the least mischief and which I will very shortly completely take off his property. I am ashamed at the uneasiness I feel least Charles should hesitate though surely I know he will not but did you ever hear of rascally folly like mine in delaying so long this arrangement?

Darling, my plan is to go to Youghal tomorrow, to go thence to Fermoy to sleep and to make a bold push for Dublin on Saturday. Leaving Fermoy at half after six I would have 17 hours and a half for travelling, before twelve at night. I suppose my bed is ready for me. It would be the greatest object to me to be in Dublin on Saturday. That however would prevent me from writing to you before Monday, on which day it appears that our election commences. The opposing candidates are Lord Ingestre and Mr. West,³ commonly called *Sou-West*, at least that is a pun of Con Lyne's who is just gone off for Dublin to vote for me and Ruthven. I cannot write or think of anything but these elections but may God's holy will be done respecting them. May they terminate in the way most conducive to His glory and our salvation.⁴ Darling, that prayer eases my heart. May *His* holy will be done.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The law for England, Wales and Ireland required that county members should have an income from real property of £600 a year, and borough members a similar income of £300 a year, in order to sit in parliament. No property qualifications were required for members for Scottish constituencies after 1832. The qualifications were not rigidly enforced and 'there were various familiar ways of evading the spirit of the rule. It was common . . . for members to make friendly agreements with relatives and acquaintances, conferring artificial qualifications on themselves during the election' (Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 105). O'Connell was here engaged in some such transaction on behalf of his son John.
- 2 His son-in-law, Charles O'Connell.

- 3 John Beatty West (1791-1841), son of Francis West; Q.C. 1840; M.P. for Dublin city 1835-37, 1841. Died at his country residence, Mount Anville, Co. Dublin 27 December 1841.
- 4 According to Angus Macintyre's computation, the elections of 1835 reflect a decline in Repeal and Liberal strength, and an increase in that of the Conservatives. The figures were 34 Repealers returned (as compared with 39 in 1832); 33 Liberals (as compared with 36 in 1832); and 38 Conservatives (as compared with 29 in 1832. Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 299, Appendix A). O'Connell's fears were thus not unfounded.

2190

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Cork, Thursday [8 January 1835]

Private

Dear John,

There is a hitch in John's return for Youghal.¹ My brother [?James] refused to exchange an annuity [?on] his freehold for one on all my chattels, College lands etc. — the annuity £305 a year. I thought he would not refuse so simple a request. No matter. I have now no other resource but Charles.² I write to him by this post. You will have by the [1 word illegible] on Saturday a messenger with the necessary deeds. Be prepared to forward them to Derrynane if Charles be there.

I cannot write more as the post leaves.

[P.S.] John is otherwise quite safe. Be prepared if Charles be in Cahirciveen before my messenger to send him back by *that* evening's car. Forward my letter to Charles if he be at Derrynane.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2189 n1.

2 His son-in-law, Charles O'Connell.

2190a

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove, to be opened by whoever is at home and acted on

Cork, Thursday [8 January 1835]

My dear John,

I send the bearer express with the deeds for Charles O'Connell's execution.¹ I never felt any anxiety so great as that of having

them back here again. If Charles O'Connell be not at Cahirciveen side send after him wherever he be and give him the deeds executed by me. The moment they are executed send back to Killarney the messenger. Let him be there in time to hear Mass and come in the Sunday coach to Cork. Do not neglect this. I do not care for the expence in comparison with having the thing done.

[P.S.] To secure against the strictest scrutiny it is essential the deed should be executed on *Saturday*. Go with it, my dear John, yourself to Derrynane if Charles be there. See it executed before twelve on Saturday night. There should be two witnesses to the execution of the deed.

[P.P.S.] Let the deed be executed on Sunday if it *can not* be on Saturday and even on Monday if it be impossible to have it done sooner.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2189.

2191

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Cork, Thursday night, 8 January 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Your letter is the first symptom of defeat in Dublin which I have seen. Surely every human being who *will* pay his taxes at any time *may* as well pay them now. At least all reasonably solvent persons understand the thing. There is no objection to be discussed about taxes. All that can be done is to require the voter's oath. Now no voter of ours shall, if we know it, perjure himself. I am decidedly of opinion that it will not be perjury if the voter shall have paid any one of the municipal cesses in full, that is, to the last half-yearly payment. If there be one cess reduced to the last half-yearly payment, then the oath is true and can be taken with perfect safety.¹ The question would at the worst be for a committee of the House of Commons.

But all trouble would be got over if every voter went on Monday morning, or on Saturday to prefer, and paid the paving, etc., tax; that is the heaviest, and the one most easily shown to be in arrears. It is the *householders* alone who are liable to this payment.² All

other voters can pass without taking this oath. You say my counsel is wanting. I have been repeating these two months — *pay your taxes, pay your taxes, pay your taxes!* It is, I see, vain and Dublin is lost. God's holy will be done!

I intend to sleep in Fermoy tomorrow night, and to reach Dublin in *all* Saturday, that is, by twelve at night. I will then have the afternoon of Sunday to repeat my parrot cry.

This county is perfectly safe.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 514-5

1 See letter 2186.

2 According to the *Dublin Evening Post* of 9 January 1835 leaseholders and certain classes of shopkeepers who had agreed with their landlords for payment of the taxes by the latter, were entitled to vote without making payment.

3 The Repealer, Feargus O'Connor, and the Liberal, Garrett Standish Barry, were returned for Co. Cork on 24 January 1835.

2192

To his wife, Derryane

Cork, 9 January 1835

My darling Love,

I am going immediately to Youghal. I write one line merely to say that I have sent an express to Charles to execute a deed¹ to John and have sent him a most abundant indemnity. I look with the greatest anxiety for the execution of those deeds and would not wish that they should get any delay for the world. But it would be an injustice to Charles to doubt for one moment his executing them. They must be executed before noon on Monday at the very latest. Tell Charles I will do anything else he requires. I know perfectly well how he is circumstanced. Darling, I must conclude.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 See letter 2189 n1.

2193

From his son Morgan to Merrion Square

Ballyboy, Athboy [Co. Meath], 10 January 1835

My dear Father,

As I see by the papers you are expected in town tonight I write to say *we* are *quite secure* here even should Randal Plunkett¹ come to the poll, which is much doubted. There is no second conservative candidate in the field. I suppose my mother is not with you as from a letter I had from Kate I drew the conclusion that she would not leave the Abbey [Derrynane] so soon. I am just off to Kells to meet Grattan.

[P.S.] Our majority will exceed Randal's poll by hundreds.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Hon. Randall Edward Plunkett (1804-1852), eldest son of Edward Wadding (Plunkett), 14th Baron Dunsany; M.P. for Drogheda 1835-37; succeeded as 15th Baron Dunsany in 1848.
- 2 O'Connell's son Morgan and Henry Grattan were elected for Co. Meath on 23 January. Their opponents were Hon. Randall Plunkett and Gustavus Lambart. The final count was: Grattan 495; O'Connell 494; Plunkett 372; and Lambart 315.

2194

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Monday [12 January 1835]

My darling Love,

The only news of the election I can give you is that we had no polling this day. I made a *famous* speech, was exceedingly well received even by the Orangemen.¹ We passed the day in perfect good humour and merriment, no riot, no disturbance, not the smallest symptom of any kind of violence. My opinion is that the election will pass off in the most peaceable manner. Then, darling, as to success. Why you know that it is the habit everywhere to say that success is certain. You know also that in those things I am naturally desponding. Between the two I really do not know what to say to you only that, while my friends tell me my return is *certain*, I myself do not find them by any means sufficiently prepared for the contest. The arrangements are bad. In short, darling, I have much reason to feel discouraged but God's holy will

be done. I will not repine whatever the event may be. I am prepared for the worst and I confess that the success of Maurice in Tralee² has put me in such spirits that I am the better able to bear disappointment. My poor Maurice sent me a *frank* which was charged postage, he having dated it 1834, a natural mistake enough. I was quite sure Tralee was lost. As to Youghal,³ darling, I went there on Friday and after leaving, as I am convinced, all perfectly well there, I proceeded to Clogheen. I breakfasted and made a speech⁴ at Clonmel where I left Ronayne, I hope secure.⁵ Yet it would be curious if being certain of Youghal and doubting Tralee to despair, I should be defeated in the former and successful as we have been in the latter. You see how I make uneasiness for myself. But when I left my dear John in Youghal I had no kind of doubt of his success. I will know *the fact* not before Wednesday or perhaps Thursday. May the great God bless you all. Fitz-Simon is certainly safe in the county.⁶ Indeed the contest is not with him *at all*. Jerry McCarthy was therefore much mistaken in saying that Fitz-Simon was in any danger. Darling, by this hour tomorrow I will have news for you, the one way or the other.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The Dublin city election commenced on this day. On rising to speak O'Connell was met with hisses from the Orangemen, but according to the *Pilot* the hisses soon subsided and the applause became universal. Having talked on many subjects he said that if returned to parliament, he would go there as the representative of all — 'Orangemen, Protestants and Dissenters' (*Pilot*, 14 Jan. 1835).
- 2 O'Connell's son Maurice was returned for Tralee on 10 January by 85 votes to 81 for his opponent, William Denny (*MR*, 13 Jan. 1835).
- 3 Where his son John was candidate.
- 4 No report of this speech has been traced.
- 5 Dominick Ronayne was returned for Clonmel on 16 January 1835, by 262 votes to 252 for his opponent, John Bagwell (*Pilot*, 19 Jan. 1835).
- 6 O'Connell's son-in-law Christopher Fitz-Simon was with George Evans candidate for Dublin county. Lack of co-operation between them was reported to be splitting the Liberal vote (*Pilot*, 16 Jan. 1835). They were, however, elected on 17 January, the final count being Fitz-Simon 878, Evans 825; James Hans Hamilton, 764 (*FJ*, 19 Jan. 1835).

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Tuesday 3 o'clock [13 January 1835]

My dearest Love,

I sit down to write to you a good deal out of spirits. I feel feverish and uneasy but I trust altogether resigned. I have had complaints of unpreparedness instead of congratulation during the day. I have felt unable to give assistance by reason of a *lazy* uneasiness as to the result of which I ought to be heartily ashamed but I cannot get over. I do not, I hope, repine at whatever may be the will of God and therefore I do not anticipate any unhappiness in the event of a defeat. I do not know the numbers polled but conjecture from what I heard that they are a couple of hundreds ahead. I however do not think this day will be at all decisive even should there be a majority against us of a pretty considerable amount. Before I close this I will be able to give you some idea of the numbers.¹ Tomorrow I will hear from our John — probably the fate of his election. I confess that though as usual I have my fears yet my expectations are very favourable. John *ought* to succeed. O'Loghlen has been returned for Dungarvan without a contest and between you and me if I am thrown out for Dublin I will fall back on Waterford county.

Since I wrote the above — it is *now* near five — I have heard that they were at two o'clock near 200 above us. Oh! Ruthven fought a duel this morning with the Lord Mayor.² All safe. Ruthven gave him the lie yesterday. They fired two shots each. They are *all safe*, that is certain.³ The second report I got was that their majority was reduced to 41, then to 17, and lastly that I have a majority of 6. Here comes more news but no — a visitor for Ellen.⁴ What a rascally hour to visit — at five!!! I will not close this until I get something more accurate and yet, love, I fear it will not be in my power to be certain before post hour. However there have been two barristers here cheering me, telling me all was quite safe. The Orangeists delayed the poll all day as much as they possibly could which is always a sign of weakness. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Polling in the Dublin city election commenced on this day.

2 Arthur Perrin, lord mayor of Dublin 1834-35; elected alderman 1824.

3 The duel arose out of a placard, signed by the lord mayor, which was posted round the city, couched in offensive language, and declaring Ruthven to be lacking in the property qualification for a member of

parliament. On 12 January Ruthven replied to the placard on the hustings, and accused Perrin of endorsing a lie. This led to Perrin's challenging Ruthven (*FJ*, 14 Jan. 1835).

4 His daughter.

2196

To his wife, Derrynane

Merrion Square, Wednesday [14 January 1835]

My darling Love,

You will not be prepared for the bad news that I am beaten, heartily beaten on this day's poll, probably by 120. I really think we have now no prospect of success. You would smile with contempt on promises and declarations if you knew how I was all day lulled into security until the thunderclap burst upon me. Darling, I cannot do more than bid you join with me in submitting to the divine will. The gross majority over me I now find is 48.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

2197

From Rev. John Sheehan to Merrion Square

Waterford, 14 January 1835

My Dear Friend,

Your letter saddened me in the extreme but I was glad to learn that you pulled up. Were you not ahead of all when the poll closed last night?¹ At all events I am prepared to act² and *coute qui coute* you must be in Parliament. There will be a meeting at Dungarvan tomorrow to select a fit associate for Pat Power in the contest with a Beresford who intends standing for the County and who now is actually canvassing.³ If your letter, which I shall receive tomorrow, be of a desponding nature, *quod Deus avertat*, I shall start for the place to do the needful. You know what I mean by that. The County you may rest assured is safe from the bondage of a Beresford. I think I may also assure you that the city is equally safe. The Liberals and amongst them are some worthy Quakers are doing their duty nobly. At two o'clock today Barron and Wyse were on the gross poll 120 ahead of Christmas.⁴ The constituency does not exceed 1750. The Bishop⁵ is really most

heartily with us. He has written circulars to all the P.P.s to do their duty against the Beresfords. Talbot⁶ of Ross was declared elected⁷ today. He had just the same majority as Maurice in Tralee. But there were not more than 95 electors. Dominick is safe in Clonmel.⁸ The huzza for old Ireland. I think the late change of ministry⁹ was the most fortunate thing that ever happened for the country.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 O'Connell was 22 votes over his nearest Tory rival, West, 886 to 864 (*FJ*, 14 Jan. 1835).
- 2 That is, to secure O'Connell's return for Co. Waterford in the event of his being defeated in Dublin (see letter 2195).
- 3 Major William Beresford (1797-1883) younger son of Marcus Beresford; M.P. for Harwich 1841-47; North Essex 1847-65; secretary at war February to December 1852. See *Boase*.
- 4 Henry Winston Barron, Thomas Wyse and William Christmas were standing for Waterford City. Barron and Wyse were declared elected on 17 January, the final count being Wyse 579, Barron 555 and Christmas 436 (*DEP*, 17 Jan. 1835).
- 5 William Abraham.
- 6 John Hyacinth Talbot (born c. 1790), Talbot Hall, New Ross, Co. Wexford; son of Mathew Talbot; M.P. for New Ross 1832-41, 1847-52; high sheriff Co. Wexford 1855. A Catholic.
- 7 John H. Talbot was elected for New Ross, Co. Wexford on 14 January. According to the *Morning Register* of 15 January, his majority was 13.
- 8 See letter 2194 n5.
- 9 The coming to power of the Tories in the previous November.

2198

To his brother John

Merrion Square, 15 January 1835

My dearest John,

I enclose you a letter I got this day from Lord Duncannon. It will show you that Lord Kenmare is strongly solicited by the Whigs, *from whom he accepted obligations*,¹ not to persevere in supporting the Knight.² Do not publish this letter or make any public use of Lord Duncannon's name. I give it to you to show the tenants that they have, and will probably find, powerful and influential advocates with Lord Kenmare in the event of their voting against the knight.

I am sorry to tell you that my election here is in the scale. I am bid not to despond but after bringing up voters as we did last night, I myself was not prepared to have them run up a great

majority on this day's poll. When I heard last, it was 111 over us, making on the gross poll 890. It is quite true that we met with every obstacle in getting our men polled; all the oaths that can be put are put to each man, and thus a number of our people remain waiting hours for their turn.

I am naturally of a desponding disposition when anything goes against me. I am the spoiled child of fortune, and fall naturally into despair when I meet an unexpected reverse though it were only in appearance; however, tomorrow will decide our fate.

Wishing my dearest Morgan³ and the cause all manner of success.

Believe me always your most affectionate brother.

P.S. The gross majority against me is 48.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I 516-7

- 1 The Whigs had made Kenmare lord lieutenant of Kerry in 1831, and an Irish privy councillor on 7 November 1834.
- 2 Kenmare subsequently supported the knight. He appears to have been alarmed by O'Connell's recommending in the course of the election campaign that a skull and cross-bones should be painted on the door of any Kerry elector who should vote against the Liberal candidates. O'Connell afterwards admitted having made this recommendation but claimed that he intended it to be taken only metaphorically (Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 85-7).
- 3 Morgan John O'Connell.

2199

To his wife, Derrynane

[Dublin] Thursday [15 January 1835]

My darling Love,

This day, blessed be *His* holy name, we have done better, a good deal better and at the close of the poll we shall be in a majority. It looks well.

There is a report in town that John is returned¹ for Youghal but I must be left in suspense and uncertainty until tomorrow.

In everything may *His* holy will be done. I will write a second letter if I get the particulars of this day's poll. I am too anxious to write more. We were yesterday in a minority of 45. We will this day, I am pretty confident, be in a majority of about 50.²

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 On 16 January O'Connell's son John was returned for Youghal defeating the conservative candidate, Thomas Berry Cusac Smith by 137 to 130 (*MR*, 19 Jan. 1835).
- 2 When the poll closed on 15 January the count was O'Connell, 2234; Edward S. Ruthven 2200; John Beatty West 2157; George Alexander Hamilton 2162 (*Pilot*, 16 Jan. 1835).

2200

To Archbishop MacHale, Tuam

Committee Room, 15 January 1835

My ever dear Lord,

We are *now* getting on well. I begin to believe that I will beat them here. But Vigors loses Carlow¹ — honest, independent Vigors! He has money enough for your legitimate purposes, and I wrote to recommend him as the second man for Mayo, should I not want it myself.² I will write to your Grace again tomorrow. I will then know the best or the worst. Waterford city turns out the Conservative,³ and returns Wyse and Barron.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 615

- 1 Nicholas Aylward Vigors was defeated for Carlow borough by the Tory, Francis Bruen, who was declared elected on 16 January. The final count was 150 to 134 (*DEP*, 20 Jan. 1835).
- 2 Neither Vigors nor O'Connell stood as candidate for Mayo.
- 3 See letter 2197 n4.

2201

To his wife, Derrynane

[Dublin] Friday [16 January 1835]

My darling Love,

Blessed be God, things look better again this day. I am beginning to believe that my return is secure as well as that of Ruthven. However it is not possible to be certain. The majority on the gross poll for me yesterday was 72 and when I left court at four we had *this day* an additional majority of 62. Both together would make 134 but I think you may reckon on at least 100 at the close this night and it really does not appear probable that the Orangists can beat down that number tomorrow when the poll must finally

close.¹ I heard from John this day but will not know his fate² until tomorrow. Strange to say he does not give me his own conjecture of the result. I ought therefore to expect it to be to the last degree unfavourable.

Tell Maurice³ immediately, that is, without one hour's delay, to execute the deed I sent him and to send it to me directed here without any delay. If he has not got the deed let him send me a letter stating that he will execute any deed of confirmation for securing Morgan's annuity on the terms of my giving Maurice the County of Cork property⁴ as an indemnity to enable him to buy off Morgan's claims or rather to indemnify himself from them. Let this letter be written *before* nine on Monday morning at the latest and sent off to the post. How I hope that tomorrow's letter will be a frank.⁵

[P.S.] 64

72

136 are my majority. I believe this will do. Fitz-Simon heads the poll in the county.⁶ He is quite safe. I believe I am nearly so.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The Dublin city election did not close until 17 January, when O'Connell and Ruthven were declared elected. The final count was O'Connell 2678; Ruthven 2630; Hamilton 2461; West 2455 (*MR*, 19 Jan. 1835).
- 2 See letter 2199 n1.
- 3 His son.
- 4 See letter 2189 n1.
- 5 That is, that he himself will be elected for Dublin city (see letter 2202).
- 6 See letter 2194 n6.

2202

To Archbishop MacHale

Merrion Square, 17 January 1835

My ever respected Lord,

You will, I know, be glad to see my frank. Blessed be God, all is at last well here. I find from the papers that Hume is in danger in Middlesex.¹ What a glorious opportunity if *we* could return him for Mayo with Brabazon. I would guarantee the payment of £1,000 *if he were certainly returned*, that is, I have no more doubt of that money than I have of my existence. Pardon me for obtruding on your Grace at this moment but it would be a high honour

to Ireland to have such a representative. I write in haste and some confusion, but the fact is that time presses.

I am compelled to go to Meath² to my son Morgan, and thence unhappily to Kerry.³

SOURCE : Cusack, *Liberator*, 616

1 Joseph Hume retained the representation of Middlesex with a small majority (*Times*, 20 Jan. 1835).

2 See letter 2193 n2.

3 For the Kerry election.

2203

From Henry Warburton

45 Cadogan Place [London], 20 January 1835

My Dear Sir,

Will you hand the enclosed cover to your son, Mr. John O'Connell, and thus inform him that it was from the accident of his letter being misdirected that I did not reply to him. Your letter of the 18th of December, relating also to Dungarvan, was not forwarded to me at Bridport, and I did not know of your wishes until it was too late to apply to the Duke of D. But you probably had Mr. Hume to do you the required service.¹

I now write to enquire of you (and I shall report your answer to the Whigs) whom you feel disposed to support as Speaker.² All on this side of the water agree in thinking Abercromby the fit man; and that he must be forced to consent to take the chair. But in case he would not consent, whom would your friends agree to support? Spring Rice, Cutlar Ferguson,³ Bernal,⁴ Sir James Graham? or whom?

We shall lose it, I fear, unless Abercromby can be prevailed upon to take it, whosoever may be proposed.

Very much of our success in turning out the Tories will depend on playing the cards with discretion. The Tories are calculating on dividing us. It appears to me therefore as it is scarcely to be expected that the different sections of the opposition will place confidence in and agree to act under a Whig leader, it appears to me advisable (and to many of my friends) that the Whigs, the Radicals and the Irish party should severally associate and appoint each a leader; and that the leaders of the three parties should meet from time to time to consider of the course to be pursued. It will be impossible, of course, entirely to prevent individual indiscretion

but the course I suggest appears to me the most likely to confine those indiscretions within bounds. What observations have you to offer upon such a plan? New arrangements would of course be made as soon as the common enemy had been forced to yield.

To Mr. Littleton's name I ought to add that of Mr. Abercromby and Sir John Hobhouse as exerting themselves respecting Kerry and Wicklow counties.

Pray write to me concerning the Speaker and urge all your friends to attend the first day of the session.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 In obtaining the political support of the duke of Devonshire who was the principal landlord in Youghal and Dungarvan boroughs. See also letters 2157 and 2188 n4.
- 2 The Whigs wished to oust the Tory, Charles Manners-Sutton, from the speakership. The question of his replacement provided the first step in the drawing together of the Whigs, Radicals and O'Connell's following which culminated in the so-called Lichfield House Compact. The man chosen by the Whigs to replace Manners-Sutton was James Abercromby, who, with O'Connell's support, was elected speaker on 19 February (See A.H. Graham, 'The Lichfield House Compact, 1835', in *I.H.S.*, XII, No. 47, March, 1961, 213-20; also, Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 140).
- 3 Robert Cutlar Ferguson (1768-1838), barrister; M.P. for Kirkcudbright Stewartry 1826-38; judge advocate-general July 1834-38; fined and imprisoned (1799) for his alleged part in the attempted rescue of Arthur O'Connor from the dock at Maidstone 1798. See *Boase*.
- 4 Ralph Bernal (died 1854), M.P. continually 1818-52. See *DNB*.

2204

To his wife

Tralee, Wednesday, 21 January 1835

M.J. O'Connell 268

The knight 172

Mullins 167

My darling love,

Though the Knight is at the head of the poll as between him and Mullins yet, darling, he is beaten — beaten like a common hack. He polled all his strength this day. I came here in no small despondency and found everything right. The Knight will be exhausted before the close tomorrow.¹

When I went to Meath I was quite certain of our darling Morgan's return. I have left it without being by any means so con-

fidant. I, however, hope he will be returned. I will know tolerably well tomorrow night.

Darling, I went to Kildalky, beyond Trim, on Saturday. I remained on Sunday at the house — a very good one — of the priest,² a namesake of ours. I harangued a great multitude. On Monday we spent the day speechifying. I came that night to Dublin. Yesterday to Nenagh, and thence this day. . . .

I am weary, darling, and must go to bed. I will write tomorrow to tell you when I *will* be with you; but, darling, we must be in Dublin as soon as possible.

I enclose a letter for darling Kate. Give her my tenderest love and to her sweet Mary and a kiss to dearest Tessy.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Polling in the Kerry election began on 21 January, the Liberal candidates being O'Connell's nephew Morgan John O'Connell and Frederick William Mullins; the Conservatives being the knight of Kerry and Thomas Carrique Ponsonby (*DEP*, 24 Jan. 1835). O'Connell and Mullins were declared elected on 24 January, the final count being: O'Connell 818, Mullins 596, the knight 384 and Ponsonby 63 (*Pilot*, 26, 28 Jan. 1835).
- 2 Rev. John O'Connell (died 29 Aug. 1863), parish priest of Kildalky since before 1834; later parish priest of Trim until his death.

2205

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Tralee, Wednesday night, 21 January 1835

I came in from Nenagh; found my nephew¹ with almost every vote — 268; the Knight, 172; Mullins, 167. The Knight nearly exhausted — Mullins strong in *one* strength. There is no chance for the Knight. He has not half a day more in him.

What idle stories you pick up about the petition² in Dublin! No enquiry at the residences of the voters can do us any injury. The only question can come upon those *for* whom the landlords are liable to the taxes.³ That is a question of law affecting some sixty votes or at the utmost eighty, even if decided against us; but we should on our parts prepare for the scrutiny of the adverse votes. I will write more at large tomorrow when I think I will have to announce the retreat of the Knight's friends. He is not here himself, being confined in London by illness.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 518

1 Morgan John O'Connell.

2 Against O'Connell's and Ruthven's return for Dublin City (see letter 2216).

3 See letter 2191 n2.

2206

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Tralee, 22 January 1835

	2d Day		
M.J. O'Connell	534	Majority	212
Mullins	346	"	24
The Knight	322		

My dear FitzPatrick,

The above shows you that what I wrote yesterday is likely to be verified — nay, is verified. The majority would be much greater but that there are only three *booths*, and the accustomed modes of delay were resorted to such as putting oaths to their own voters. The election has lost all animation as the event is not in the slightest degree doubtful.¹ It is consolatory to see that there is another Lord of the Admiralty completely at sea,² without the possibility of getting a seat. I begin to expect that we shall kick out the present vile Administration root and branch but my uneasiness for Meath³ was, I confess, exceedingly great until I got Morgan's letter and yours. I take it that his success the first day⁴ is almost decisive of ultimate victory. There have been in this county 680 voters polled and I do not think there are 200 more to poll.⁵ Of these 49 in *one book* are decidedly ours, and 70 in another. In the third the majority is also distinctly ours. In short, I consume your time quite uselessly in giving the details of a success which was not doubtful after the first three hours.

I intend to send you the close of the poll tomorrow.

You may communicate the Kerry poll to Conway as well as to Staunton and the *Freeman*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 519

1 See letter 2204 n1.

2 Speaking in the anti-Tory association on 26 December 1834, O'Connell declared 'I go tomorrow down to the country to oppose the knight of Kerry, who has been made a Lord of the Admiralty! What a man that is to be put over admirals! He has a ferry . . . to the island of Valentia . . . about

three hundred yards across, and except as proprietor of the ferry, he has no opportunity of being acquainted with naval affairs. . . .' (*MR*, 27 Dec. 1835).

3 See letter 2193 n2.

4 The count after the first day's poll in the Meath election was Grattan 227; Morgan O'Connell 226; Plunkett 203; Lambart 199 (*DEP*, 22 Jan. 1835).

5 In fact, over 300 voters were yet to poll. According to the official statistics 989 voters polled out of a registered county electorate of 1,112 (Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 89n, 98).

2207

From Henry Warburton

45 Cadogan Place [London], 30 January 1835

My dear Sir,

Abercromby, according to my anticipation, has consented to be put in nomination as Speaker, and I rely on your sending notice thereof to all the Members over whom you have any influence. As fast as promises to support him are communicated to you, pray inform me, that I may forward the information to his more immediate supporters or Committee. So much for that.

Concert and co-operation are now above all things necessary. The body of the Liberals will not unite cordially under a Whig Leader. What is the other alternative? That the three principal sections of Liberals, viz. the Irish party, the Whigs and the Radicals or Radical-Whigs, should each have their meetings and their chairman. This is what Mr. Grote,¹ myself, Mr. Clay,² Mr. Ward, Mr. Hume, etc., are endeavouring to effect by forming a Radical Brigade with a chairman or head to communicate with the Whig Leader and yourself so as to secure cooperation for common public objects. Our party cares not to swell its members by inducing members to come to them who would rather join the Whigs or the Irish party; but their object is to prevent that total disorganization which we have witnessed during the last two sessions. Until the Tories are turned out, I do not see what is to prevent these three sections drawing very much together on most questions.

Can you inform me which of the Irish Anti-Tories are likely to join us, rather than your party or that of the Whigs, as I wish to make application to any such to become of our crew?

Sir John Hobhouse is desirous that Members should be here by the 15th.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 520

- 1 George Grote (1794-1871), needle maker; M.P. City of London 1832-41. See *DNB*.
- 2 William Clay (1791-1869), merchant in London; M.P. for Tower Hamlets 1832-57; created a baronet 1841; published political pamphlets 1834-56. See *DNB*.

2208

From Henry Warburton

3 February 1835

My Dear Sir,

Some sort of rumour is current that your Irish Members expect to be written to individually by Lord John Russell about the Speakership.¹ I doubt if this would be proper; or if Lord John would be induced to write such letters. But if there is any individual absurd enough to require it, give me a hint on the subject, and I will take care that a letter shall come from the proper quarter.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Warburton was conveying to O'Connell Hobhouse's opinion that it would not be in order for Russell to write personally to the Irish members inviting them to attend at Lichfield House on 18 February. It was arranged instead that the whips should simply send out circulars for that purpose in Russell's name. Warburton sent a bundle of these circulars to O'Connell with a note requesting him to put the addresses on and post them. As Hobhouse wrote to Russell on 3 February '... I have taken care that it should be known (through Warburton) that the circulars are considered a sufficient notification and that no slight or disrespect was intended' (Graham, 'The Lichfield House Compact', *IHS*, XII, No. 47, March, 1961, 217-8; see further letter 2211).

2209

To William Cobbett

Merrion Square, 10 February 1835

Private

My dear Sir,

There are two mistakes in your last *Register*¹ of matters of fact upon which you may as well be set right. The article containing these mistakes is headed '*Intense Banks*' at page 356.

1st. You suppose that the scheme you powerfully opposed in Dublin was *mine* and that the projector who so inadequately replied to you, his name is Dickson, was one of the projectors of *my* scheme.²

The fact is not so. My scheme is different from that you opposed, perhaps liable to some of the objections you stated, but it was the plan and details of quite a different company you assailed and '*the Projector*' – Dickson – had no kind of connection with me or mine.

2ndly. You state that the bank has failed. Now the fact is not so. It is not true either of Dickson's bank or mine. His has been some time in operation, mine has only just commenced. I believe his has not failed – mine certainly has not. Another bank³ totally unconnected with either and the existence of which was scarcely known has failed. This probably was the origin of your mistake.

It is hardly worth giving you the trouble of learning the truth upon subjects of such little interest to you or the public especially when the all absorbing question of the existence of the present ministry fills the public mind.

There never was a ministry so hateful to Ireland – inimical to the Irish people. It is impossible to describe to you the wretched state of the different public departments in this country under the present iron rule. Orangism in its most insulting as well as oppressive form is quite triumphant. Every old abuse is in full activity. Every new instrument of oppression put in motion.

Alas, I feel disposed to declaim because it is impossible adequately to describe the state of misery which this Government produces and seeks to perpetuate.

You often told me that the evils of Ireland were due to the British Government, not to the British people – and yet how many of the English people look on with apathy and acquiescence at this renewal of all the horrors of the old system of misrule. Nay, my dear Sir, what after all are we to expect even from *you* – you to whom the people of Ireland would *now* be so much disposed to look up [to] as a friend and a protector? What *will* you do on *this* occasion?

SOURCE: British Museum, Add. MSS 31022, f. 32

1 Cobbett's weekly *Political Register*.

2 O'Connell's 'scheme' was the National Bank of Ireland (see letter 2079 n2) not to be confused with the National Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland (see letter 2091 n3) to which O'Connell was opposed.

3 The private bank of Messrs. De La Cour and Co. of Mallow, Co. Cork (Gilbart, *Banking in Ireland*, 235).

2210

From Henry Warburton

Cadogan Place [London], 10 February 1835

My Dear Sir,

The speakership will turn on a very small number of votes.¹ The Tories, it is calculated, will bring up 280 votes. We, with great exertion perhaps 300. This supposes Ireland to furnish a quota of about 60. I see that you have put on the steam power for this purpose.² Acknowledging this, I let you know how necessary it is to apply high pressure.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2212.

2 On 3 February O'Connell urged the anti-Tory association to pass a resolution (which they seem to have done) calling on the liberal constituencies to bring pressure to bear on their representatives to present themselves in London in order to vote with the ministry on the speakership. He added, 'Any man who is not in London on the 18th of the month, forfeits all claim upon his constituents' and that such a person would be 'a man that the people of Ireland have a right to look upon as a traitor' (*Pilot*, 4 Feb. 1835).

2211

To Lord John Russell

Merrion Square, 13 February 1835

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your circular¹ on the subject of the Speaker, and the accompanying private note. I have transmitted the letters to most of the Irish members. I reckon with a good deal of confidence on sixty-two Irish members on the vote for Mr. Abercromby. I should think there *cannot* be less than sixty at the very lowest.²

I enter very cordially into the views which I understand are entertained by your Lordship for the ensuing campaign. I think I may venture to promise that the Irish members of the popular party will avoid all topics on which they may differ with you and your friends, *until the Tories are routed*, and that you will find us perfectly ready to cooperate in any plan which your friends may deem most advisable to effect that purpose. In short, we *will be* steady allies without any mutiny in your camp. Indeed this after

all is pure selfishness because we see clearly that, if the present Administration remain in office, a civil war with all the horrors of religious, I should say sectarian, rancour must be the inevitable consequence. They are already letting slip the sanguinary Orange gang. Who shall succeed — Orangists or Catholics — is not of much importance; but my opinion certainly is that the Catholic party will triumph but triumph amidst the desolation of the country and its ultimate loss to British connection. We Irish are therefore directly and personally interested in the defeat of the present Ministry. I know Ireland well and am convinced that the lives of the Catholics in part of one province and of the Protestants in the rest of the island depend upon such a change of men as shall ensure the repression instead of the excitement and encouragement of the Orange faction. They will, if they come to blows, be defeated with more facility than you may imagine. But what a horrible alternative — submission to insult, injustice and murder on the one hand or *bellum plus quam civile* on the other! And yet in sober sadness I do say that upon this alternative the present Government fling Ireland.

I leave town with my family tomorrow evening by Holyhead so as to be in London by the 17th without fail. I hope to assist in mustering a large Irish force in St. James's Square on Wednesday.

SOURCE: Walpole, *Russell*, I, 220

1 See letter 2208 n1.

2 In fact sixty Irish M.P.'s voted for Abercromby (*MR*, 23 Feb. 1835).

2212

To P. V. FitzPatrick

19 February 1835

My dear Fitz,

Victory! I write on my knee in a crowded room. Victory, victory!¹ The Tories are down, and for ever. There must be a change of Administration.

Abercromby	316
Sutton	306
Majority	10

Total voters	622
2 Tellers	<u>2</u>
	624

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 521

1 Abercromby had just been elected speaker of the House of Commons.

2213

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 20 February 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I wrote you a triumphant note¹ yesterday from the crowded library — obliged to kneel in order to be able to write. Matters are looking well. It is not possible for this Ministry to stand. There are no less than 316 pledged, and *pledged* in the most unequivocal way, against this Ministry. There were many who voted against us out of personal regard to the late speaker,² many by reason of having been entrapped into premature promises. In short, we must have fifty more on the next division, be it what it may. It is, however, plain that no ministry can do their work without a majority of from 80 to 100 at their side. Now it is utterly beyond any question that Peel cannot command *any* majority. How, then, is he to work the machine? There is another comfort: the Tories boasted that they had a resource in the Stanley party³ upon whom they could, in case of defeat, fall back. Well, they had the full benefit of that party and still they have been signally defeated. There is indeed a comfort in all this.

The next division will be on the Address.⁴ If Peel remains in office till then, we will beat him on that address, and again on the Corporate Reform question, and again on the Irish Church question. In short, consider his Ministry as virtually annihilated. This is good news for Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 522

1 Letter 2212.

2 Charles Manners-Sutton.

3 Following his resignation from the Whig cabinet in May 1834, Stanley had 'formed a considerable party, consisting . . . mainly of men who in the break-up of parties and break-down of ministries "did not know what to make of it"', rather than of the adherents of any political creed. At their best they mustered some fifty members (Saintsbury, *Derby*, 44-5). Stanley's party had up to this generally voted with the Whigs, beside

whom they sat in the House until 1 July 1835. Following the Lichfield House Compact they rapidly disintegrated, their leaders gravitating towards the Conservatives, while many of their followers straggled back into Whiggism (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 145; see also D.W.J. Johnson, 'Sir James Graham and the "Derby Dilly"', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, IV, 1953-4, 66-80; and letter 2216 n4).

4 See letter 2216 n1.

2214

From Lord John Russell

Draft

Queen Street [London], 20 February 1835

Sir,

I am much obliged to you for your letter¹ from Dublin of the [13th] inst. I know now what may have been the communications made to you of my views² for the ensuing campaign but I am ready to acknowledge that the declaration of your intention to avoid all topics of difference and to cooperate generally until the Tory Ministers are defeated, is very frank and explicit. Acting in the same spirit, I think it necessary to explain that while I do not ask you to give up any of your opinions on public questions, you will of course understand that I do not renounce any of mine.

You say that not only the ultimate safety but the immediate tranquillity of Ireland depend upon such a change of men as shall cause a change of the policy pursued in that country. I am convinced that it is as necessary, although not perhaps so urgent, for England to remove from power ministers who do not possess and, as I believe, never can obtain the confidence of the country.

SOURCE: Walpole, *Russell*, I, 221-2

1 Letter 2211.

2 Russell had drafted a less cooperative letter to O'Connell than this but Duncannon suggested that one written in a more cooperative spirit would be necessary if he wished to conciliate O'Connell (Walpole, *Russell*, I, 221-23).

2215

To Richard Barrett, Pilot Office, Suffolk St., Dublin

London, Saturday [21 February 1835]

Private

My dear Barrett,

I did not get the *Pilot* of Wednesday. Your people have not sworn to neglect me, nor need they because they do it more effectually than if they swore it. . . . I am weary of complaining every day in Dublin, in the country and, now, in London. . . .

In my last I communicated to you my fears on the question of the election of the Speaker. I was happily mistaken, and the reports of others were more accurate than my anxiety lead me to imagine. It is all for the best. The Ministry certainly had most formidable advantages on the first division.¹ They had with them all the personal friends of Manners Sutton amongst the Whigs; next, all those who were dexterously procured to promise him before the importance of the question was known; next, all the waiverers were carried over to the Ministry by the confident promises of success held out by the vile Tory press. Next, all the good feeling of the House, as far as it could be allowed to operate, was in favour of Manners Sutton as a calumniated person. Next, Lord Stanley and *all his influence*² was thrown into the ministerial scale. Yet this, all this, was ineffectual and the Tory Ministry were miserably defeated.

This is the strongest proof of the real strength of the Reformers, that having all these disadvantages against them yet they were altogether successful. It was indeed taking the bull by the horns, and fortunately *the brute* has been laid low. There is another delightful reflection. It is that Stanley shot his bolt and shot it in vain. He was the resource upon which the Tories said they could and would fall back. Luckily for the country he has exhausted that resource in the first instance and practically proved it to be of no value.

Nothing could be in worse taste either as to matter or manner than Lord Stanley's speech.³ It was in his true thimblery style of bitter but pointless sarcasm. He was as vindictive and as spiteful as it was possible and as he looks ill, there could not well be seen a countenance with less of the milk of human kindness about it than his visage did, as I am told; display. He had fallen before but he may now be considered as politically defunct.

. . . The Tories are endeavouring to speak big but they have received their death blow. Hark what I say to you. *They must go*

out. Their reign is over. . . . It would require a majority of eighty to carry on a government. . . .

There is, however, a dispute in the Cabinet about resigning. The Duke of Wellington insists upon attempting to go on but Peel has too much prudence to persevere in an attempt so utterly hopeless. In the meantime they talk of a dissolution which would be a desirable thing to the friends of liberty because it would increase the public feeling to a pitch which would make it dangerous for the Whigs to stop short of the most radical reforms and impossible to keep them out of power longer.

SOURCE: Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge

- 1 This was the division on 19 February which negated the appointment of Sutton as speaker of the Commons by 316 to 306. Immediately afterwards the motion to appoint Abercromby was proposed and was passed without a division.
- 2 See letter 2213 n3.
- 3 In the debate on the choice of a speaker (see letters 2203 n2, 2212). In his speech Stanley agreed to support Abercromby solely on public grounds, but expressed his preference for Thomas Spring Rice (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVI, 27-35).

2216

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 February 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

The second defeat¹ of the Ministry was more signal than the first because it was after Stanley had withdrawn from our party all that he would withdraw. It is, therefore, clear that this ministry cannot possibly stand. To be sure, Stanley is the 'calamity' of every party to which he belongs or belonged. He was the author of the Coercion Bill and the ruin of the character of his colleagues.

The Committee upon my election² is to be balloted for on the 19th March, and the lists etc. must be delivered in the next day. The hopes of success on the part of the Conservatives is small indeed compared with the certain gratification of creating great expense. I fear the subscription at our side will be but small as most people imagine that so futile a petition will not be persevered in but that is an error, I would say, a *fatal error*. The enemy will persevere merely in the view of putting *me* to expense. This you will urge upon the mind of every friend of mine.

You will perceive that I have offered my terms of support to

the Whig Ministry when they shall be formed again.³ They are these:

First, as good and extensive a Reform Bill for Ireland as the English people may have. In other words, the same measure of reform for both countries.

Second, the reduction of the establishment to the extent of the wants of the Protestants, and a proper application of the surplus.

Third, a complete Corporate Reform.

Upon getting these terms I am ready to give a full and fair trial of their efficiency. I would give that trial to show whether *they* could produce good government in Ireland, and if that experiment failed, I would come back with tenfold force to 'the Repeal'.

I hope my offer of support will facilitate the return to office of the Whigs.

[P.S.] The papers give a most inadequate idea of the success of my ridicule of the Stanley party.⁴

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 522-3

- 1 In the division on the address on 27 February. An amendment, which was an implied censure of the government, had been moved by Morpeth on 24 February. After three days of debate it was passed on the early morning of 27 February by 309 to 302.
- 2 Two petitions against O'Connell's and Ruthven's return for Dublin city were presented in the Commons on 25 February and 5 March respectively, claiming that return to have been secured by fraudulent votes. The petitions were not decided on until 16 May 1836 (*Commons Journal*, XCI, (1836), 363-4).
- 3 Toward the end of the debate on the address on 26 February O'Connell stated his three terms of support essentially as he states them in this letter. He then added: 'If I am asked if I give up the repeal of the Legislative Union, my answer is, that I suspend it. But for what? To give time for carrying into full operation the three measures I have described; to give them a fair trial, to see if they will amend the condition of Ireland, and if they fail, then again to resort to repeal; but if they succeed, then to give it up for ever.' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1835, I, 121).
- 4 See letter 2213 n3. It was in the course of his speech (see above note 3) that O'Connell described Stanley's party by the couplet: 'Adown thy hill, romantic Ashbourne, glides The Derby dilly, with its six insides.' Quoting John Philpot Curran, he said Stanley's smile resembled 'a silver plate on a coffin'. 'It is not a party', he declared, 'it is not a faction. . . . We ought to call it the tail' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVI, 397-8). The couplet on the Derby dilly was a modification of one written in 1798 by George Canning, the future prime minister, in the poem, *The Loves of the Triangles* (Canto I, lines 178-9). Dilly was an abbreviated form of the word diligence which was a public stage-coach.

2217

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Friday, 6 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I could not but smile at your notions — *first*, that I should hesitate to put down my name for £100 for the expenses of the petition.¹ Believe me that anything I save of £1,000 in the defence, I will consider it so much actually gained. I have indeed already expended near £90 in the preliminary arrangements. This includes £50 which I gave Sir R. Sidney² for all his own services and the use of all his clerks and his office. I thought this a great bargain.

Secondly, it seems to me that you offer me only the hope of a mouthful of moonshine when you talk of some refuse sum left after some club³ which has been dissolved. You call it £200. Murphy⁴ wrote to me that it was £150. Perhaps £50 will turn out to be the ultimate produce. But at all events I will go on. Heaven knows that I am bound to every exertion whether I get assistance from others or not. Do not therefore imagine that I repine at the unwillingness exhibited to collect funds for the purposes of defence. It, indeed, sometimes comes on me with a sensation of sorrow that I have left Kerry where I was always secure.⁵ But I do not repine. Why, after all, should I?

I wish you to communicate these sentiments of mine to Redmond, Le Fanu,⁶ etc. I do not wish you should by any means take any personal part in this matter — I mean in collection of funds.

The point on which the present Ministry are divided is the mission of Lord Londonderry to St. Petersburg.⁷ The Duke, it is supposed, got Peel to accede to his limited views⁸ on Corporate Reform by threatening to resign, and that he is playing the same game again as to the Petersburg embassy. It is not so clear that he will succeed on the present occasion by a mere threat; if not, he resigns and this Ministry is knocked up. Indeed, I do not see how it can possibly carry on the public business.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 524-5

1 See letter 2216 n2.

2 Sir William Robert Sydney (1799-1866), 5th son of John Sydney of the Court Lodge, Yalding, Kent; knighted 1827; a parliamentary agent.

3 Unidentified.

4 Probably John Joseph Murphy, attorney, of Murphy and Ruthven, solicitors, 13 College Green, Dublin.

- 5 As M.P. for Co. Kerry.
- 6 Unidentified.
- 7 At the beginning of Peel's ministry, Charles William (Vane), 3rd Marquis of Londonderry (1778-1865), was appointed ambassador to Russia. The appointment, which was unpopular, was attacked in the Commons and despite Peel's attempt to defend him, Londonderry was compelled on 16 March to resign. (Kitson-Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 242).
- 8 Peel and the duke of Wellington had substantially the same views on the reform of municipal corporations (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 263).

2218

To P.V. FitzPatrick

National Bank of Ireland, 39 Old Broad Street, London,
7 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I do not think I ever felt more of the approach of disgust than at the contents of your letter verifying, as it does, my prophecy of yesterday, that the refuse club fund¹ you spoke of would not realise more than £50; but it verified it differently from what I imagined. I thought the refuse fund would not in itself amount to more than that sum but I did not imagine that there would be any difficulty in giving *all* that thus lay by. But you see it is not so. They think it would be too magnificent to give the entire and therefore they gave the smaller sum. I have no right to complain *on my own account*, neither do I.

There, however, never was such total desertion of a great contest. Murphy wants aid. Of course he does, and the £50 given by the old club will just pay his coadjutor, Terence T. Dolan, who, as he is a paid agent, charges but a very small sum. The result, however, will be this. I shall be put in for from £1,000 to £1,500 for the Dublin election petition, from £500 to £1,000 for the Tralee election petition,² a like sum for the Youghal petition,³ a like sum for my half of the Meath election petition,⁴ and you perceive how little prospect I have of any species of assistance.

Again, it appears to me that there has not been any one tangible point advanced in point of information or evidence. One day I get a letter full of great and sounding promises; the next day another showing that not one halfpenny worth has been done but, I own, the paltry shrinking from contributing the *entire* club money indicates so much coldness and indifference that if anything could possibly induce me to abandon the contest, it would be such

conduct. I repeat, however, my determination to go on. I wish I could write the letter⁵ for Dr. Carroll but I must confess that the total abandonment of the popular party in Dublin disables me from the exertion. Why, I am told David Lynch got into a passion for receiving one of our circulars! It is certain that he is doing nothing and he lost his vote by neglecting to pay his pipe-water tax.⁶ But I do not complain of anything save the vapouring letters I receive.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 525-6

1 Unidentified.

2 A petition of William Denny against the return of O'Connell's son Maurice for Tralee was presented in the Commons on 10 March. It was abandoned on 17 June.

3 A petition against the return of O'Connell's son John for Youghal was presented on 10 March. On 2 June the election committee declared him duly elected.

4 A petition was presented on 9 March against the return of O'Connell's son Morgan and Henry Grattan for Meath. On 24 March the petitioners not having entered into a recognisance, the order to consider it was discharged.

5 Unidentified.

6 See letter 2186 n2.

2219

To P.V. FitzPatrick

9 Clarges St. [London], 9 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Tell Barrett I cannot write to him this day nor have I anything to write about. Every political event is in such obscurity that it is in vain to prophesy and hope becomes sick by the delays which have occurred. Lord Chandos¹ is already deserted by many of his supporters on the Malt tax;² and the motion on Friday to stop the supplies or rather to limit them to six months, has not been decided on sufficiently early to promise success.³ It is, I believe, certain that Stanley has had an hour's conversation with the King but it has been without results. I would, however, add my decided opinion that the present Ministry cannot possibly stand.

So much for politics; now for the petitions against *me*. There are now in progress of presentation three petitions against my three sons besides that against myself.⁴ The Orange enemy is resolved to run me down if he possibly can. I complain only of the Dublin expenses. It is too bad to have them all thrown on me. You perceive there is more sympathy for me in England⁵ than in

Dublin. Am I not supporting the rights of every voter? How ridiculous is it, therefore, to rejoice in the services of Dolan or anybody else who, although wretchedly paid, necessarily takes away the entire of our fund — namely, the boasted club money.⁶ I will, however, fight all the enemies of the country whilst I have one guinea.

That will not be long, it seems, for there were not funds ready for my £400 draft to the College Bursar; if not, it would account for the deficiency; but then you should have written to him and required him to carry into effect our arrangement.⁷

It is exceedingly ludicrous to see the grave letters I get from Dublin relying on my 'proverbial good fortune', just as if it were a matter of chances. The doctrine of chances would not be against any man whose dice were more than once favourable. But it is not so. I have been fortunate hitherto simply because of the invaluable assistance I get from other quarters and other persons. It was because I was directed and aided by a wisdom and by exertions not my own that such success took place, and I will now fail for the opposite reason.

Go to my house and search in my study for a deed engrossed on parchment executed by me and my son Maurice to my son Morgan just before the Meath election.⁸

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 526-7

- 1 Richard (Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville), styled Lord Chandos 1822-39, (1797-1861); M.P. Buckinghamshire 1818-39; succeeded as 2nd duke of Buckingham and Chandos in 1839. See *DNB*.
- 2 On 10 March Chandos, a prominent representative of the agricultural interest in the Conservative party, brought forward a motion in favour of abolishing the malt tax. Peel opposed the motion. It was defeated by 350 to 192. O'Connell almost certainly voted for the motion (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 239-41; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVI, 835).
- 3 Hume had put down a motion to grant the naval supplies for three months only, as a vote of censure on the government. At a meeting of the opposition in Lichfield House on 12 March, Hume was persuaded to withdraw his motion on the understanding that, should the ministry be beaten on Russell's impending appropriation motion, the whole opposition should combine in a motion of no confidence (Graham, 'The Lichfield House Compact', *IHS*, XII, No. 47, March, 1961, 221-2).
- 4 See letters 2216 n2 and 2218 notes 2, 3 and 4.
- 5 Probably a reference to the fact that one English reformer, John Easthope, of the (London) *Morning Chronicle*, had recently forwarded O'Connell £50 to meet the expense of opposing the petition against his return for Dublin. (*Pilot*, 6 Mar. 1835). The *Pilot* meanwhile was urgently appealing for subscriptions to the fund for O'Connell's defence (*Pilot*, 4 Mar. 1835). See letter 2229 n5.
- 6 Unidentified.

- 7 Presumably in connection with the payment to Trinity College, Dublin as rent for lands in Kerry in which O'Connell held a middle interest.
- 8 Probably in connection with Morgan's property qualification as a member of the House of Commons.

2220

*To T.M. Ray*¹

London, 10 March 1835

My dear Ray,

The report² about Westminster is absurd. It is one of those things which the newspapers take up without authority and thus create alarm without a cause. I would not abandon my Dublin constituency without at least consulting their wishes.

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 475

- 1 Thomas Mathew Ray (1801-1881), eldest son of Mathew Ray, Dublin; secretary of the National Trades Political Union, Dublin; secretary of the Precursor Society, 1838-40; secretary of the Repeal Association from 15 April 1840; charged with O'Connell and sentenced to imprisonment 30 May 1844, but the decision was reversed on appeal to the House of Lords, 4 September 1844; assistant secretary of deeds 1865-80. See *Boase*.
- 2 Apparently a report that O'Connell would seek the seat for Westminster if Sir Francis Burdett should retire. Two deputations of his (Burdett's) constituents had protested because he had absented himself from the divisions on the election of a speaker (see letter 2215 n1) and on Morpeth's amendment to the address (see letter 2216 n1). (M.W. Patterson, *Sir Francis Burdett and his Times*, London, 1931, II, 635-6).

2221

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 11 March 1835

My dear Mullen,

Many thanks for your kind and satisfactory communication. The Orange party hate me with a most malignant hatred. They have involved me in the expenses of four petitions.¹ I have no chance of mitigating their hatred, so I continue firm in my determination to deserve more of it. I am cheered to find those persons rallying with me with whom upon matters of detail I might have had differences, and to see that the violence of the common enemy is wisely met by our becoming common friends.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 527

1 See letters 2216 n2 and 2218 notes 2, 3, 4.

2222

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 13 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I perceive distinctly enough that we shall get but little money from Dublin to defray the expenses of the petition. I see I must ruin myself in these expenses and I *will*. Come what may, I will see the matter through. It is the severest strife I have had for Ireland as far as I am personally concerned but it certainly is not for me to shrink. Enough of this.

Send me a copy of the deed¹ without the least delay. Send one copy on Monday and another on Tuesday. Keep the deed itself until Forde is coming over for the Meath election petition. Be sure to state the witnesses' names at full length in each copy. The most material things are the names of the parties, the names of the witnesses and the consideration stated in the deed.

I rely most strongly on your furnishing me with these materials at once. . . .

I think of nothing — I dream of nothing — I speak of nothing but the petition.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 528

1 Concerning parliamentary qualification for his son Morgan (see letters 2219 and 2189 n1).

2 The Dublin city election petition.

2222a

*To Lawrence Finn*¹

London, 14 March 1835

Private

My dear friend,

I write to indulge my heart in returning you my most cordial and affectionate thanks for your kind and constant attention to my interests on every occasion but especially as regards the present petition.² If a few would act as you do I might escape ruin

but if I am refused a commission³ I see nothing but ruin staring me in the face. I can not have one witness over here at less than £30 — a *gentleman*, that is any of that class will cost me £40 — and thus the entire of my property will be exhausted for I will not strike while I am worth one shilling. How grateful then should I not be to you who have done all in your power to save me from this ruin. The Orange party have presented petitions against every one of my sons⁴ — all all to run me down — after having put me to the expense of five contested elections — and these are followed up by five petitions.⁵ I do not complain but in proportion to the neglect of others I do feel your kindness and friendship and from my heart thank you.

SOURCE: *The Brookes Collection* belonging to the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle upon Tyne deposited in the Northumberland Record Office.

- 1 Laurence Finn, the brewery, 22 Bishop Street, Dublin. The letter is written on the stationery of the National Bank of Ireland, 39 Old Broad Street, London.
- 2 The Dublin city election petition.
- 3 See letter 2224, note 1.
- 4 See letter 2218, notes 2, 3 and 4.
- 5 See letters 2223, note 2 and 2225, note 1.

2223

To ?

London, 16 March 1835

My respected friend,

[apologises for not attending to the recipient's affair owing to exceptional pressure of business.] Even my health and strength are leaving me. The whole burden of the city of Dublin petition in all its arrangements, the whole expence of that and four other petitions¹ are thrown upon me after having sustained the expenses of five contested elections.² The Orangemen are determined to crush me and only think the subscription in Dublin to sustain the election is not sufficient to pay the local expenses there — that is — the expenses of clerks, attornies, porters, printing and stationery. . . . For the first time in my life I am disposed to feel heartbroken but God's holy will be done. . . .

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 Those of Youghal, Meath, Kerry and Tralee.

- 2 Presumably those of Dublin city, Youghal, Meath, Tralee and perhaps Kerry though O'Connell's brother John would probably have paid the expenses of his son Morgan John in the Kerry election. This was probably the election on which O'Connell's brother John is said to have spent £9,000 (O'Connell, *Last Colonel*, II, 307).

2224

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 23 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

They have been on two wrong scents — the one, the petition for a commission which *cannot* be used;¹ the second, the investigations into the solvency of the sureties after they have passed.²

I will want money shortly. I have given about £130 towards the fees to counsel and will have to give as much more next week.

There is one point I want you to exert yourself about. You recollect that it was by means of a communication through you from Lyons³ of Cork that I interposed⁴ for Sullivan of Kilkenny, and saved him the expense of a contest. Only just think of the fellow. My ballot⁵ is to be on Thursday. One vote may decide my fate.⁶ Well, off goes worthy Mr. Sullivan this fine morning on private business to Manchester. I have written after him but of course in vain. Now you must set a watch on the Dublin hotels and when he gets to Dublin, let him know he has but one way of atoning for his treachery to me and that is by being back here for the 30th, for Lord John Russell's motion.⁷

Private business cannot be an excuse for the absence of a man who sought for and, with my aid, forced himself on the constituency.⁸ Dominick Ronayne also is absent. Well! well! well!!!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 528-529

- 1 In the matter of the petitions against O'Connell's and Ruthven's return for Dublin city. On 13 March the *Pilot* published a draft petition which it appealed to the citizens of Dublin to sign, praying parliament that a commission to examine witnesses be appointed to sit in Dublin, thus cutting down on the crippling expense of bringing witnesses to London. Despite O'Connell's scepticism this commission was appointed. According to Fagan, some seven hundred witnesses were examined by it (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 370). See letter 2226. Two petitions from Dublin, shorter but essentially the same as the draft in the *Pilot*, were presented to the Commons on 23 March.
- 2 On 24 March a petition of 'several electors' of Dublin city was presented to the Commons praying that the solvency of the sureties in connection with the election petition be investigated.

- 3 Thomas Lyons (born c. 1791), woollen merchant, son of William Lyons, Cork and brother of Sir William Lyons, Kt; mayor of Cork 1842.
- 4 On the hustings at the election for Kilkenny city on 9 January, the supporters of William Fletcher, Sullivan's opponent, were said to have stated that O'Connell was opposed to Sullivan. Sullivan thereupon read a letter from O'Connell expressing support and stating his desire to have Sullivan spared the expense of a contest. On 10 January Sullivan was declared elected after a brief poll (*Kilkenny Journal*, 14 Jan. 1835).
- 5 That is the ballot to select a committee to try the Dublin city election petition.
- 6 No division took place on the setting up of this election committee.
- 7 On 30 March Russell introduced the first of a series of motions in favour of lay appropriation of part of the property of the Church of Ireland. The ministry were defeated on motions connected with this appropriation on 3, 4 and 5 April. Finally, on 7 May, Russell proposed the resolution that without appropriation of the Irish church's surplus revenues, no Irish tithe bill could be satisfactory. This was carried by 285 to 258. On 8 May, Peel resigned (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 251-2).
- 8 That is, Richard Sullivan in Kilkenny city (see above note 4).

2225

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 25 March 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I suffered much mental agony respecting the elections and these petitions¹ and still think that they are calculated, as they were intended certainly, to ruin me. But my mind has, thank God, recovered its tone and energy and having made all my preparations and finished all preliminary arrangements, I await the result in perfect tranquillity and, I hope, in entire submission. I had my first consultation of counsel last night and have put them into possession of my views of the defence. I am, therefore, enabled to promise that, as *one* of the counsel, I will be able to do my business perhaps as coolly as if I was not myself concerned at all. I think I will be able to do my duty. Our statement and lists of objections are made out completely and everything now turns on the persons who shall compose the Committee. If it be a Tory Committee they will refuse to do me justice; if I get a fair Committee I must succeed. All, therefore, depends on the Committee.² In the selection of it there is nothing but pure chance — as fair a chance as can be and as much chance as any casual incident in human life. I am quite resigned to the result. I am also resigned to the desertion of my defence by the Citizens of Dublin in point of pecuniary means. I have given another £100 for

lawyers' fees and will on Monday have to give a similar sum. If I am defeated I must look out for another seat. It can be procured by more than one voluntary resignation. I have more than a month to prepare for my son's petition.³ By that time my mind will be disengaged altogether from my own affair. The great annoyance I feel from this petition is that it absorbs my time from other matters.

It seems that there is no doubt but we will beat the Ministry heartily on Monday⁴ and, indeed, I venture to believe that they will have resigned by this day week. Such expectations are strongly entertained, and even the triumph of last night⁵ will contribute and does contribute to their weakness.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 529-530

- 1 On the Dublin city, Youghal, Meath, Kerry and Tralee elections. Two petitions against the return for Co. Kerry of O'Connell's nephew, Morgan John O'Connell, and Frederick William Mullins, were presented in the Commons on 10 March. They were abandoned on 26 March and 11 June respectively.
- 2 See letter 2226.
- 3 That against John O'Connell for Youghal (see letter 2218 n3).
- 4 On Russell's motion (see letter 2224 n7).
- 5 A reference to the motion to appoint a committee to inquire into the election of Sir John Poo Beresford for Chatham. The motion was carried against the government by 161 to 130, O'Connell voting with the majority (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVII, 204-13).

2226

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[26 March 1835]

My dear FitzPatrick,

I deeply deplore your calamity,¹ but recollect how frail we all are and that submission to the will of God is our first duty.

Blessed be His holy name! The Committee in my case² is struck favourably. There are no less than eight Reformers to three Tories so that beyond any reasonable doubt we shall succeed. This is the more important as it secures us the commission³ in Dublin. My mind is now altogether at ease. Dominick Ronayne arrived in time to be drawn on the general list and so cost the enemy one of their challenges. I can write no more today. As far as politics can cheer you, here is a ray of hope.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 530-531

- 1 A reference to the death of FitzPatrick's only brother, Hugh, which occurred in Glasgow on 20 March (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, I, 530 n3).
- 2 On the Dublin city election petition.
- 3 See letter 2224 n1.

2227

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Friday, 27 March 1835

Private

My dear FitzPatrick,

I was going to write to Barrett but recollected this was not his day. Nothing done in my Committee¹ but changing lists.

The scoundrels² are, I believe, in point of fact, *out certainly* — aye, *certainly* on the verge of being so. I had it from an intelligent Tory member besides being confirmed by our friends. Blessed be the great God for this prospect! Before Tuesday evening you will hear of them being quite gone. It is joyful to think that the iron rule of Orangeism is so nearly at an end. The division last night³ literally bothered the rulers of the Cabinet. The trimmers and waverers deserted them. Expect, therefore, the best of news. I would give a pound for an attested copy of Shaw's visage as he went just now into the House. I cannot describe my delight.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, I, 531

- 1 The Dublin city election committee.
- 2 The Tory government.
- 3 On a motion in favour of incorporating the new University of London. Despite a government attempt to amend it, this motion was carried by 246 to 136, O'Connell voting with the majority (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVII, 279-303).

2228

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Friday, near 6 p.m., 10 April 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

No final arrangement as yet made. Lord Grey has positively declined to be Premier, and Lord Melbourne is forming the Administration. As yet no difficulty occurs, save as far as relates

to Irish affairs, the old stumbling-block to British Ministers. Lord Melbourne has been for hours upon hours with the King, and everything progresses. There is no doubt of Blackburne¹ being immediately dismissed, nor of *liberal* measures being adopted towards Ireland. At all events, this is a brain blow to the Orange faction. I do not like speculating on what is to be positively known so very soon as tomorrow, by which time I should hope the project of the new Administration will be complete in all its English details. You may be convinced that I will not accept offers of any kind without distinct pledges. Nor is there any office I should accept save Attorney-General or Secretary for Ireland. But there may be objections in the prejudices of the King against me which may render it unwise to have me named to any situation.² The result, however, will be that the less of personal advantage I acquire the more of national benefit shall I stipulate for. I do believe I will possess much of the confidence of the new Ministry and my hopes are high for Ireland.

My Committee are arranging the terms of the Commission³ with a perseverance and *botheration* unequalled. The results, however, are satisfactory and every hour convinces me that I approach to the close of the struggle. I have been unable to write hitherto since the Committee began but I see my way now and will write to somebody every day. In the meantime be in good spirits about Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 10-11

1 The attorney-general for Ireland.

2 O'Connell's expectation of office was not fulfilled. Melbourne had decided long before to have nothing to do with him, Brougham, or Durham. For a time however, O'Connell held the government's future in his hands, and Russell was ready to resign if O'Connell thought his exclusion an injustice. But O'Connell made no difficulties. Rumours that he waived office on condition of being allowed nominate the Irish attorney and solicitor general, and have a veto on the lord lieutenant, were largely unfounded. The Whigs were, however, at least careful not to appoint anyone of whom O'Connell disapproved (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 146; see also letter 2229).

3 See letter 2224 n1.

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Tuesday, 14 April 1835

Private

My dear Fitz,

It is not wise to be so uneasy about the Commissioners.¹ They have no discretion to reject evidence. They can only declare their reasons for not thinking it admissible but they must put it on their file. In short, they are to decide *nothing* — with the prospect of a year's constant work at the least. Pray quiet the minds of our friends on this point. It really is not worth one moment's thought.

With respect to myself, most of the facts never *oozed out*. I was offered the Rolls, which I at once rejected. I understand the King made a personal objection to my being in power. Heaven help the worthy old gentleman! As if the way to give me power was not to keep me out of office! You are aware that I did at once disclaim taking any office and freed the new Ministry from any embarrassment arising from their *want of me*. I have been most highly flattered and thanked etc. for my conduct, and yet it would be not only folly but guilt in me to accept any office until *I had seen* how the new Ministry works. My policy is obvious — to keep what control I possibly can *over* the new Government instead of being under *their* control. I will also be more useful by influencing the appointment of others than by submitting to take an appointment myself. I confess I never in my life ever supposed I could become so obdurate towards the Corporation and Orange factions as I am. Do not believe one word of any story of my relaxing on these points. *Delenda est Carthago* is my device as opposed to *that* horde. I will not support the Ministry if they leave in place or power one of them. They *must* ALL go. Not one of them can be tolerated as an instrument of government. As to Blackburne, Martley,² and that gang, out they go! Do not credit the possibility of any one of them remaining in office. In short, all the *Shawites*³ must meet a rigid exclusion.

For the rest, the details of the new Administration are not as yet completed, and nothing is known beyond what I wrote in a letter⁴ to Dublin yesterday, but the arrangements are going on most satisfactorily. It requires time to complete them but they will be ready for announcement by Thursday. Not only is there no appearance of a Tory reaction, but it is believed that Peel has actually declared that *he* gives up that party for ever. There is some truth in the report. The party are down I do believe for ever

but they must be excluded rigidly in Ireland or nothing is done.

It is curious enough that my political education has been *perfected* by the conduct of the faction towards myself and my family. The unrelenting hatred with which they came out against me and my family after my five years of conciliation has surely taught me that it is a faction which may be beaten, but cannot possibly be otherwise conciliated or even mitigated. I am therefore for depriving them of all power to do mischief. I am determined never again to enter into any compromise with *the scoundrels*.

The expenses of the election petition⁵ for Dublin have *all* fallen on me. They are frightful, although certainly not more than a fifth of the costs incurred by the petitioners. Their expenses must be *enormous*, but that is small comfort to me who have the Youghal and Tralee petitions yet to combat at my own expense for I cannot expect one shilling from either of these places. No wonder that my heart should sometimes sink within me. I must draw two more bills like the last but I will defer them as long as I can. I hope to be in Dublin next week to get up personally the mode of conducting the evidence before the Commission, and also to make my arrangements for the defence of the Youghal petition, which is to be heard on the 5th of May. I sometimes hope it may be abandoned⁶ as no counsel have as yet been retained for the petitioners but the Orange faction hate me so much that they will certainly put me to the expense of the petition in its fullest measure of costs. How idle to suppose that I can compromise with such a party! I may forgive them, as I ought for myself, but I should be a villain if I did or could forgive them for Ireland — that is, if I consented to leave them the power to injure Ireland.

Banish, therefore, from the minds of my friends every idea of my being any party to the remaining in power of *any one* of the Orange faction, great or small.

The Cork election petition⁷ will be over probably tomorrow. The petitioners will be seated — Callaghan and Baldwin. It is hoped the Cork Sheriffs will be sent to Newgate.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 11-13

1 See letter 2224 n1.

2 John Martley, K.C., 9 Rutland Square, E., Dublin, Assistant barrister for east riding of Co. Cork.

3 Those associated with Frederick Shaw the recorder of Dublin, a strong 'Orangeist'.

4 Almost certainly a letter to Barrett or Staunton and published anonymously in the *Pilot* and *Morning Register* of 15 April under the heading 'Private Correspondence'. It expressed the firm belief that Mulgrave would be the

new lord lieutenant, Morpeth the chief secretary, Brougham the new lord chancellor (for England) and that Blackburne would be dismissed.

- 5 The total cost of contesting the Dublin city and Youghal election seems to have been as much as £12,500. He was saved from ruin only by a fund of some eight or nine thousand pounds raised for him in England by Hume and Warburton in 1837 (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 124-5).
- 6 It was not abandoned (see letter 2218 n3).
- 7 Presented to the Commons on 27 February from Daniel Callaghan and Herbert Baldwin against the return of James Charles Chatterton and Joseph Leycester for Cork city. The petitioners accused the returning officers, Sheriffs George Foot and William White of illegal practices. A second petition, to the same purpose, was presented on 12 March. On 18 April the return was amended in favour of Callaghan and Baldwin.

2230

To Edward Ellice

9 Clarges St., Piccadilly, 14 April 1835

Private

My dear Sir,

You allow me to give you any hint I please. You will treat it with just as much weight as *you think* it deserves.

I am sorry to see that it is likely *you* will offend a friend, O'Loghlen, your late Solicitor-General in Ireland, by putting Serjeant Perrin over his head.¹ O'Loghlen was senior serjeant to Perrin before he became solicitor-general. Why should the latter — Perrin — be now put over the head of O'Loghlen? I do not think this injustice a *wise* act. I submit to you that it is a good deal otherwise. Deal with this matter as you think fit.

Let me give you another hint. There is Whittle Harvey, one of the cleverest men in or out of the House. Ought *you* not to secure him for your interests? I know his weight with the Dissenters and with many of the popular party. Deal with this hint also as you think fit. It is for your sake I express myself so strongly about him. I should delight to see you have him *serving under you*.²

Do not send me a written answer. You need not even give me a verbal one. If you deem either suggestion of value you will use it. Otherwise, forget it.

SOURCE: Ellice Papers, NLS

- 1 Perrin had already been promised the attorney-generalship and despite O'Connell's letter, O'Loghlen had to be content with his old post (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 146).
- 2 Harvey received no appointment from the government.

2231

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, Thursday [16 April 1835]

My dear friend,

I have waited until the last moment in order to be able to give you authentic information. You will see by the papers that the House is again adjourned.¹ All the interior arrangements for the new Ministry are, I may say, quite complete, but the king is giving every possible delay. The basis of the new Government is therefore not acceded to. Lord Melbourne very properly refuses to be united.² The King has been driven from point to point and now takes his stand on the Horse Guards, insisting that Lord Hill shall not be removed.³ On this topic the negotiation rests. The King would persevere if he could but Peel has too much at stake in his princely fortune to consent to a new dissolution which might convulse the social frame and without a dissolution no Tory Ministry has the least chance to stand a month. I do, therefore, from all I hear and see, most confidently expect that the post of Saturday will carry the gratifying tidings that the new Ministry is finally arranged. I heard from the very best authority this expectation expressed and do not myself see how it can be otherwise. Let me then promise you that my letter of Saturday *will* contain a list of the new Ministers.

The volume of the Dublin Commission⁴ goes over by this post.

The Cork Committee⁵ spent the day striking off — of the majority of the popular party — one, just one. There remain 168.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 14-15

1 On 16 April the Commons adjourned for two days to 18 April.

2 That is, to form a coalition government.

3 From his position as commander-in-chief, the position he continued to hold until his resignation in 1842.

4 See letter 2224 n1.

5 See letter 2229 n7.

2232

To P.V. FitzPatrick

9 Clarges Street, London, 17 April 1835

My dear friend,

I am happy to be able to tell you that *all* is arranged. The King comes to town tomorrow at one to swear in the new Ministry. I am not apprised of the details but this intelligence, *that all is settled*, I have from two sources of the highest authority, the one belonging to the Royal *staff*, the other to the new Ministry. Blessed be God! we have had a great escape. Lord Melbourne went down to Windsor this morning. The council to swear in the new Ministers is to be held at one, and shortly after four the new writs are to be moved for. I will write, of course, after the House rises. Again I say, blessed be God! who delivers us from the Orange insulting oppressors.

I could write a volume of reports about offices but my spirits are too *buoyant*. They *say* that it is the Duke of Devonshire who is to shine as Lord Lieut[enant] of Ireland. They say Brougham is to be propitiated by being made chairman of the Lords;¹ but what signifies all these sayings? It is *certain that the new Ministry is framed and will be officially published tomorrow*.

The news did not arrive until after the publication of the evening papers.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 15-16

- 1 That is lord chancellor. In fact, Brougham did not receive any place in the new government.

2233

To P.V. FitzPatrick

National Bank of Ireland, 39 Old Broad St., London,
21 April 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

In the first place, see my friend Mr. O'Neill and tell him I was this day at the Treasury to enquire when and how he was to be paid¹ and I am glad to say I found the best dispositions in that quarter. Sir Robert Peel had indeed left a favourable memorandum, showing that he was determined to act on the spirit of Lord Althorp's agreement² and I find that, although nothing definite

can be done until after Mr. Rice is returned for Cambridge, yet that the present Government is quite prepared to *interpose no formal or technical* difficulties in our way, but to act honestly and fairly on the spirit and intention of the agreement and verdict had in consequence. On my return here by the 11th of May I have every reason to expect that the final arrangement will be made very satisfactorily for my friends, and indeed for some of my bitter enemies, such as [] etc. but no matter. I will, I trust, be useful to them all. I can now entertain no doubt of obtaining payment.

I will remain in Dublin during the greater part of the vacation. I have to organise the working of the Commission³ should my foolish enemies persevere, and, at all events, I have much business with the Irish government to transact for the benefit of the people. You will have a clean sweep at the Castle and in the offices. I have not yet heard who is to succeed Sir William Gossett; indeed, the fault *is* mine, as I did not ask; but no matter. We have an excellent man in Lord Mulgrave,⁴ the new Lord-Lieutenant. I tell you there cannot be better. Lord Morpeth,⁵ too, is excellent. Then the law officers are admirable. We shall have a new Registry Bill and the Corporate Reform Bill for the great towns brought in at once, and pass the House of Commons as rapidly as possible. Let the Lords dispose of them as they choose — perhaps I may say as they dare. It is reported, I believe with truth, that the vacant serjeantcy will be offered to Holmes, then to Richards, and I believe it quite certain that Serjeant Greene will be deprived of the office of Law Adviser to the Castle, which place, it is said, will be given to Woulfe.⁶ Every exertion will be made to bring forward the Liberal part of the Bar and in every department the enemies of the country will be discountenanced. I hope we shall have some valuable changes in the different Dublin establishments, especially in the Paving Board. If my Commission goes on, a dismissal or two will be quite certain. But of this, more when we meet. There is a fixed determination to do justice to Ireland and Lord Mulgrave is a man not to be baffled or deluded. Some strong blows will be struck on the Orange system. We are, I believe, on the verge of better times. I cannot tell you all my reasons for being satisfied, but I have abundant reasons for hope, nay, certainty.

You must not allow the contents of this letter to get directly or indirectly into the newspapers. I will write again, please God, tomorrow from my resting place.⁷

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 16-18

1 In compensation for property destroyed in the Customs House warehouse

fire in 1833. The compensation was granted in 1835 (see letter 2269 n1).

2 See letters 2003 and 2050.

3 See 2224 n1.

4 Constantine Henry (Phipps), 2nd earl of Mulgrave (1797-1863); M.P. almost continually 1818-30; governor of Jamaica 1832-34; lord privy seal July-December 1834; lord lieutenant of Ireland 23 April 1835 to 3 April 1839; created Marquis of Normanby 1838; secretary of state for war and the colonies 20 February to 30 August 1839; secretary of state for the home department 30 August 1839 — 6 September 1841; ambassador to Paris 1846-52. See *DNB*.

5 George William Frederick (Howard), styled Lord Morpeth, (1802-1864); chief secretary of Ireland April 1835 to September 1841; M.P. almost continually 1826-48; held a seat in the cabinet from 1839; succeeded as 7th earl of Carlisle in 1848; lord lieutenant of Ireland 1855-58 and 1859-64. See *DNB*.

6 O'Connell's prognostications were not very accurate. The vacant (first) serjeantcy went to Richard Wilson Greene; Greene's place (the record serjeantcy) to Joseph Devonsher Jackson, a Tory; and Jackson's place (third serjeantcy) to Woulfe.

7 On the journey to Ireland. He was due to leave London for Ireland on the following day (*Pilot*, 22 Apr. 1835).

2234

*From Lord Alvanley*¹

[21 April 1835]

Sir,

In the remarks you made on Monday last on a question which I had put on the previous Saturday to Lord Melbourne — a question of purely a political nature — you used language which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed. I am aware that you assume to yourself a right to insult with impunity, and I can hardly hope that you will make an exception in my favour by doing what any other gentleman would do, and giving satisfaction where you have offered insult. I, however, give you the option of doing so, and my friend Colonel Damer,² who will give you this note, will make the proper arrangements should you be inclined to avail yourself of my proposal.³

SOURCE: Irish Monthly, XV, 599-600

1 William (Arden), 2nd Baron Alvanley (1789-1849).

2 Colonel Hon. George Lionel Dawson Damer (1788-1856), Came House, Dorset and Iron Mills, Queen's Co. 3rd son of 1st earl of Portarlington. M.P. for Portarlington 1835-47; comptroller of the household 1841-47.

3 Alvanley questioned Melbourne in the Commons in a manner which insinuated that the Whigs in taking office had accepted certain terms from

O'Connell (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVII, 997-1005). In the Commons on 20 April O'Connell referred to Alvanley as a 'bloated buffoon' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXVII, 1008-9). For O'Connell's refusal of Alvanley's challenge and the grounds of his refusal see letter 2240. His son Morgan took up the challenge and exchanged shots ineffectively with Alvanley near Regent's Park on 4 May (for a full account of this affair see Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 373-88).

2235

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Dunstable [Bedfordshire], 22 April 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Here I am with Mrs. O'Connell on our way to the Head¹ which we will reach, God willing, on Friday night.

I left everything quite satisfactory on my departure from London. The new Ministers do not apprehend being rejected by any of their constituencies and the spirit favourable to Ireland continues to increase, I hope, in intensity. Sir Wm. Gossett leaves the Castle without delay and I heard of an excellent man — Mr. Drummond² — as his successor. There is also another worthy, a Mr. Rich,³ in nomination.

You seem to wish that I should shrink from public meetings or exhibitions. I totally disagree with you. I have no apprehension of unruly Repealers. I should desire to give them a public opportunity of discussing their views in contrast with mine. I am as much a Repealer as ever I was but I see the absolute necessity of confuting those who say we prevented the Union from having a fair trial in the hands of a friendly Ministry, and also of giving a decisive check to Orangeism. The scoundrel Orangemen — always enemies to Ireland — now place all their claims to English and government support on their being the real opponents to the Repeal, which they call 'the dismemberment of the Empire'. I have two objects — to overthrow the Orange system and to convince the most sceptical that nothing but a domestic parliament will do Ireland justice. With these views of the present aspect of affairs, the sooner I come before the Irish public the better. I know the magic of being right. I never saw that which was founded on commonsense defeated at a public meeting. Commonsense sanctions and directs my present course — the experiment I am making to confound the Orange party and to give a fair trial to the measures

of those who declare themselves our friends. I will therefore attend every public meeting and every public dinner I possibly can.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 19-20

1 Holyhead.

2 Thomas Drummond (1797-15 April 1840), under-secretary for Ireland 1835-40. See *DNB*.

3 Henry Rich (1803-1869), youngest son of Admiral Sir Thomas Rich; M.P. for Knaresborough 1837-41; Richmond 1846-61; a lord of the treasury 1846-52; created baronet 1863. See *Boase*.

2236

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Wolverhampton [Staffordshire], Thursday, 23 April 1835

I foolishly left London so late yesterday that I have not been able to bring Mrs. O'Connell beyond this town tonight, and as there are 140 miles to Holyhead, I feel she cannot reach there tomorrow. I must therefore change my plan and go tomorrow only to Llangollen, and on Saturday to Bangor where we can hear Mass on Sunday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 20

2237

From W.R. Sydney to Merrion Square

Palace Yard [London], 24 April 1835

My dear Sir,

If you should require any books or other papers for the conducting of your case before the Commissioners,¹ your wishes will meet with the most prompt attention from me.

I . . . find the accounts of the officers of the House of Commons on my table, relative to the portion of the fight which we sustained before the committee.² It is considerably more than I had anticipated and I have thought it right that you should be immediately apprised of the amount in order that the papers may be laid before your subscription committee or general committee of management. . . .³

The retainers to counsel which I have paid in the Youghal, Tralee and Kerry matters,⁴ are not of course included in these accounts. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letter 2224 n1.
- 2 On the Dublin election petition. For an account of proceedings before the committee in London up to this time, see *Pilot* 10, 13, 15, 17 Apr. 1835.
- 3 The appointment of such a committee has not been traced.
- 4 Concerning the election petitions of these constituencies.

2238

From Daniel Supple, Jr., Tralee, 27 April 1835

Congratulates O'Connell on his great victory over the Tories. He encloses a copy of a memorial¹ which he sends this night to Dublin Castle, the charges in which he can sustain.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified but presumably connected with the Tralee election petition. Supple was Maurice O'Connell's agent for that election.

2239

From Margracia Loudon¹ to Dublin

30 April 1835

Dr. Sir,

I shall offer no apology for availing myself of your kind permission by sending you some of the Prospectuses of my Work.²

I shall be *excommunicated* by the Tories of course but I trust the approval and support of the friends of the good cause will render me 'Excommunication proof.'

The M.S. of the work has been read by Mr. Hume³ and Col. Thomson⁴ and they are in consequence as anxious for its wide circulation as I can be. . . . [She is sure that if O'Connell finds time to read the work he will become its most ardent supporter].

The wide circulation of those liberal opinions, which I hold to be the truth, being my object, not pecuniary advantage; I have instructed my publisher to make the price of the book as low as possible. . . .

In short as there are so many who hate the very words Political

Economy, we who hope we are the friends of the poor, cannot do better than found a 'Philanthropic Economy' Association and lay claim to the friendship and services of all who are not prepared to proclaim themselves the *enemies* of humanity. Let us take up our position on this high ground and we shall be indeed 'Excommunication Proof.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Mrs. Margracia Loudon wrote several books.
- 2 *Philanthropic Economy, or the Philosophy of Happiness, practically applied to the social, political, and commercial relations of Great Britain* (London, E. Churton, 1835, price six shillings).
- 3 Joseph Hume, M.P.
- 4 Thomas Perronet Thompson.

2240

To Hon. George Dawson Damer

Merrion Square, 1 May 1835

Sir,

I have received three letters — two purporting to be written by you and one¹ by Lord Alvanley — but under circumstances of such a ludicrous nature that I can scarcely bring myself to believe them to be genuine. If not, I trust you will excuse me for giving you this trouble, and blame only the persons who used your name.

The first letter is, indeed, dated the 22nd of April but was not put into the London Post Office until the 27th and did not, and could not, reach me here before the 29th, Thursday. Your second letter is dated the 28th, Wednesday, and expresses surprise that I did not before then answer your first letter which I could not receive until the day after.

Again, Lord Alvanley's letter is nothing less than a challenge to fight;² to be delivered to me in London, as it would seem rather an inconvenient distance as the letter is dated at Clifden. But this letter assumes an air of more comicality when it turns out to be one sent by one person in Clifden to another person in London, to be transmitted thence to a third person in Dublin, to fight a duel at a truly long shot. This, as we say in Ireland, 'bangs Banagher.'

It is, however, after all but an unvalorous — I believe I have coined the proper word — absurdity in Lord Alvanley to send me a challenge when my sentiments on that subject have been so publicly and so frequently proclaimed.

But there is really a serious view of the subject, which it is, I do believe, my duty to take. It is this — that these letters are a distinct breach of privilege. It seems to me at present that I am bound to treat them as such and if I continue to think so, I will bring them to the attention of the House of Commons accordingly.

As to duelling, I have no hesitation to tell you that I treat it with the most sovereign contempt, as a practice inconsistent with common sense but, above all, as a violation, plain and palpable, of the divine law.

At the same time, I wish you distinctly to understand that, although I totally disclaim anything connected with duelling, yet I am most anxious on every occasion upon which any man can point out to me that I have anywhere or in any manner done him an injustice, to repair it to the utmost extent of his wishes. So, if I have, without a complete justification, offended any man, I am always perfectly ready to make the fullest atonement he can possibly desire; therefore neither Lord Alvanley nor any other man requires the absurd code of duelling with me. I would have the greatest alacrity to atone to any man who showed me that I had unjustifiably assailed him.

[P.S.] I now learn that this matter has already got into the London newspapers; I presume, indeed, that it is only calculated for that meridian.

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 377-8

1 See letter 2234.

2 See letter 2234 n3.

2241

From Richard L. Sheil

Brooks's [Club], 2 May [1835]

Private and confidential

My dear O'Connell,

You are not perhaps aware that a very few members of Brooks's Club have been prevailed upon to sign a requisition¹ relative to what you said with regard to Lord Alvanley. I am desired by three of the managers of the Club to write to you and mention that the proposition is scouted here. The Duke of Bedford,² on hearing of it, wrote last night to Lord Tavistock³ to say that, although ill and confined to his bed, he will come down to Brooks's in order

indignantly to oppose what he thinks deserves the most unqualified condemnation. I assure you that the very strongest feeling is expressed in your favour. Look at the *Courier*. The article⁴ evidently comes from a member of the Club and expresses exactly the note of feeling here in your regard. The Duke of Norfolk has by some means or other been induced to sign this requisition. He has been strongly remonstrated with and his eyes are now open to the peculiar reasons which ought to have forbidden him of all men to take any part in such a business. He says that he regrets more than anything that ever befell him his having attached his name to this document. Any comment on it is unnecessary.

I thought it right to mention to you the impression produced here by this endeavour to do you prejudice. You may rely on it that it will terminate in derision for those who have contrived this miserable device.

[P.S.] I do not exaggerate when I say that the sentiment in the Club is one of *indignation*. One of the managers told me he was convinced that they would not even receive⁵ the requisition.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 The requisition, directed to the managers of Brooks's Club and signed by twenty-two members requested a general meeting to consider O'Connell's affair with Lord Alvanley (see letter 2234). The managers, led by Duncannon and Ellice, declined calling the meeting on the ground that the club was not competent to deal with the private affairs of members (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 375-7).
- 2 John (Russell), 6th duke of Bedford (1766-1839). See *DNB*.
- 3 Francis (Russell), styled Lord Tavistock from 1788-1839 (1788-1861), eldest son of 6th duke of Bedford; M.P. for Peterborough 1809-12; Bedfordshire 1812-32; succeeded as 7th duke of Bedford in 1839.
- 4 The article expressed satisfaction at the failure of what it alleged was an attempt to disrupt the unity of the reformist party by separating O'Connell from his friends in Brooks's. It asserted that the duke of Norfolk had withdrawn his name from the requisition and that Lord Lichfield and the duke of Argyll had signed it only inadvertently (*MR*, 7 May 1835 quoting the *London Courier*).
- 5 See note 1 above.

2242

From George Dawson Damer to Merrion Square

5 May 1835

Sir,

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of May 1, and as you therein state that you consider it to be your duty to bring Lord Alvanley's letter to you of the 21st before the House of Commons as a breach of privilege, I have recommended him to wait the result of such a determination.¹

[Damer adds he wishes to investigate the reason why his letter to O'Connell which was mailed on April 22nd, took so long to reach O'Connell]

SOURCE : Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 379

1 O'Connell did not bring the matter before the Commons.

2243

From Richard Lalor Sheil

Brooks's, Thursday, six [o'clock], [7 May 1835]

My dear O'Connell,

I write to mention that the Duke of Norfolk has directed his name to be struck out of the list of requisitionists.¹ There is but one feeling on this subject amongst those whose opinions are of the least value.

I think Stanley and Graham have done themselves more injury by this step² than by any of their former proceedings.

[P.S.] Standish,³ Errington,⁴ two Catholics have signed.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2241.

2 E.G. Stanley and Sir James Graham were both signatories of the requisition.

3 Probably Charles Standish (1790-1863), Standish Hall, Wigan, Lancashire; eldest son of Thomas Strickland, Westmoreland who assumed the surname of Standish; M.P. for Wigan 1837-41 and 1842-47. See *Boase*.

4 Probably Rowland Errington (1809-1875), second son of Sir Thomas Stanley-Massey-Stanley, 9th Baronet; took surname of Errington by royal license 1820; succeeded his brother as 12th baronet 1863. See *Boase*.

2244

*To J. J. Murphy*¹

Merrion Square, 8 May 1835

My dear Murphy,

I appoint Stephen Woulfe, William Elliot Hudson,² Philip Fogarty, Matthew Sausse, David Richard Pigot, and J.S. Close,³ barristers-at-law, and any other persons you may deem it right to engage, my counsel in all matters relating to the pending petition⁴ against my return.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 24

1 Probably John Joseph Murphy.

2 William Elliot Hudson (1796-1853), son of Edward Hudson, Dublin; called to the bar 1818; appointed assistant barrister 16 June 1836; later taxing master. See *Boase*.

3 James Strathearne Close, eldest son of William Close, of Crumlin, Co. Antrim; called to the bar 1834; Q.C. 1850.

4 The Dublin city election petition.

2245

*To Edward Ellice, London**Private*

Shrewsbury, Monday, 11 May 1835

My dear Sir

I was so busy in Ireland¹ that I did not find it possible to answer your long and very satisfactory letter.² Accept now my very sincere thanks. I am glad Lord Duncannon has authorised me and that you permit me to communicate my thoughts to you on Irish affairs. I will do it fully and candidly and I know you will leave nothing undone to procure for us practical relief.

1st. Understand the state of Ireland. It is impossible for any British minister to know it without some such sources or all the sources of information which events and chances have placed in my power.

The restoration to power of the Orange faction under the late Peel administration was followed by such a virulent display and practical *exertion* of the worst and most sanguinary passions of the Orange faction that the country from one end to the other felt as if handed over to the most vexatious and insulting oppression. This is no exaggeration. Every individual Orange functionary did

in his own sphere as much mischief as he could. It would take volumes to describe the exacerbation of party spirit thus engendered and practised.

2nd. The Ribbonmen have naturally, I may say, necessarily much increased. They are all Catholics and almost without exception of the lowest grade in society but not the less formidable on that account. I never heard of their being so numerous or audacious in their modes of compelling all persons in their own class to enrol amongst them. Even in the streets of Dublin they actually recruit by telling the workmen that they *must* join. If the late ministry remained in power three weeks longer there would probably be an insurrection, certainly within six months. The Ribbonmen are quite ready to go to war with the Orangemen especially as they are ten to one.

Since the new [Whig] ministry was formed there is a sensible decline in this faction. The Catholic clergy are beginning to be listened to by many of the Ribbonmen and if the Orange party continues to be discountenanced by the Government, we shall be able *once again* to put down the spread and strength of Ribbonism without any legislative interference or much public display if any.

Keep I pray you these things in your mind.

3d. Local irritation is created in so many parts of Ireland by causes which are overlooked that I wish you to understand them and to help me to allay them. These irritations do, I assure you, contribute more to the unsatisfactory state of the population than those who do not know the country minutely can well imagine.

There are three especial causes of practical grievances:

- 1st. The power given the magistrates to try assaults without a jury.
- 2d. Similar power over what are called 'wilful trespasses.'
- 3d. The general jurisdiction exercised by magistrates at petty sessions.

To comprehend these mischiefs it is necessary to bear in mind the state of the magistracy of that unhappy country. Lord Anglesey and Stanley made many of the very worst men in the country lord lieutenants of counties. Even the better class of them have local connections that interfere with the due execution of the office of justice of the peace. In short the result is that all the *bad* men of the several counties are magistrates, and in latter times scarcely one good man can get the commission of the peace. This is a practical evil felt deeply from Kerry to Fermanagh. 'The material' of the Bench being excessively bad, they *first* try assaults.

Under the head of assaults they include what they choose to call riotous assemblies. They exceed their jurisdiction to protect

their friends and to punish those who are not their friends. The poor man has no remedy. Talk to him of bringing an action! Talk to him of paying the national debt!!

When they even confine themselves to the matters in their jurisdiction the grossest partiality prevails. Their friends are *never* wrong for if the case be so aggravated as to make a fine inevitable, they fine 6d or one shilling and ostentatiously pay the fine themselves.

Under the head of 'wilful trespass' all the rights of the poor are decided against them. A right to a footpath has existed time immemorial, highly convenient to the *walking poor*, inconvenient to the gentleman in whose lands the path lay. He at once brings it as a case of "wilful trespass" against the first poor man who goes that way. The man is fined and the path then closed. I have known horseways especially to strands used for drawing sea manure thus closed. I have known the right to sea-weed growing under the tide water thus decided, always decided *against* the poor. These were illegal decisions but the poor man in Ireland has not the means of setting them right. It would cost more money than he *ever saw* to afford him a chance of redress.

Will you have patience to read these *Irish groans*? Shall I be allowed to apply a remedy? I want that your administration should have the glory of quieting Ireland, a real *Hibernia pacata*. I will assist you. I do not intend to be fastidious towards you at all. I won't quarrel with you unless you begin *first*, aye and *second*, which you will call an Irish beginning.

I hope you think I did not do wrong to leave Lord Mulgrave the unmixed glory of the triumphant entry into Dublin.³ If I remained I should have been the principal figure in all the adverse newspapers. Upon the whole therefore I thought it better not remain to pay him my personal respects as the Tory papers would make a handle of my presence to attribute to me triumph, to Lord Mulgrave submission — both totally false but not the less certain to be alleged. Unfortunately I am detained here by Mrs. O'Connell's illness or instead of writing I should inflict all this and ten times more by *parole*. I expect to have the pleasure of speaking with you on Thursday. I will explain as fully as you permit the state of Ireland. But, my dear Sir, the agricultural interest there, is in a state of ruin. You are gone unless you cheapen the currency. The silver standard would leave you still a metallic basis, and I am convinced would add 15 per cent to the circulation. *Think of this*. It would make you friends in England and help you to tranquillise Ireland.

How can I expect you to read *all* this!

SOURCE: Ellice Papers

- 1 See letter 2233. On 9 May O'Connell left Dublin for London, travelling to Kingstown by rail in a group of carriages specially reserved for his party (*Pilot*, 11 May 1835).
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 Mulgrave, the new lord lieutenant, made his public entry into Dublin on 11 May. He was met in Merrion Square by Marcus Costello leading a deputation of the trades who joined his procession. (*Pilot*, 13 May 1835). While the Liberal press rejoiced at the size and splendour of Mulgrave's welcome, the *Dublin Evening Mail* described the procession as 'the most genuine and unalloyed riff-raffery we ever had the chance of seeing' and added that it did not include even 'a score of presentable carriages' (*DEM*, 13 May 1835).

2246

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 May 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

We are in great jeopardy as to Youghal.¹ Four votes of freemen were given on the 10th of January, being registered only on the 1st of the same month, and yet the Committee were yesterday of opinion that the vote was good.² It is, however, so monstrous, that it is under reconsideration and will be decided finally tomorrow. On it our fate depends, I fear.

I write from a committee room and only because I want the 'Ordo'³ for as many years last past as you can get me at Coyne's or otherwise. I want them thus. Mortimer O'Sullivan⁴ has produced the *Ordo* for this year which contains at the end topics of conference.⁵ The second page relates to questions touching property and its modes of enjoyment. He suggests that at this period such topics have a connection with the subversion of the acts of settlement.⁶ If, therefore, the *Ordo* has usually contained points for discussion at conference, as in the instance of this year, send me a batch of them containing the statements of the questions for conference.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 24-5

- 1 As a result of the Youghal election petition.
- 2 Under the Irish reform act (1832) six months had to elapse after registration before the elector was entitled to vote (*Report on the Election and Registration Laws of the United Kingdom . . .*, Belfast, 1840, 12).

- 3 The *Ordo Recitandi Divini Officii*, a Latin Catholic directory published annually in Dublin.
- 4 Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan (1791/2-1859), second son of a Catholic schoolmaster at Clonmel, Co. Tipperary; formerly a Catholic he became a champion of Protestantism and a preacher of polemics; prebendary of St. Patrick's Cathedral 1827-30; rector of Killyman, Co. Armagh from 1830; author of several works on religious topics. See *DNB*.
- 5 'Conferences' were meetings of the priests of each deanery held at regular intervals to discuss theological and general topics. The theological topics for discussion at these 'conferences' were set out in the *Ordo*.
- 6 The acts of 1662 and 1665 which provided for and gave legal recognition to the land settlement that emerged from the Cromwellian conquest and the Restoration.

2247

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], 29 May [1835]

My dear Sir,

I remained at home at some inconvenience until after the hour I mentioned. I was sorry I did not remain longer as you called shortly after; but as you left no letter or other indication of acceding to my proposal I take it for granted that you decline my offer¹ — be it so. I only add my belief that you will never again meet so safe a speculation. I am quite sure I never shall hear of one.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 On 27 May the Tory members for Co. Carlow, Bruen and Kavanagh, were unseated on a petition, and a new writ was issued for the county. On 28 May O'Connell called on Sherriff Raphael in London (according to Raphael's own account) and pressed him to become a candidate for the county, assuring him the only risk he would run would be in subscribing £1,000 to the cost of the contest. Raphael requested twenty-four hours to consider O'Connell's offer, and 'on the following day, at the exact hour appointed, I called at Mr. O'Connell's and was told by the servant he was not at home; in the evening I received the following note [letter 2247] in consequence of which an appointment was made for an interview between us, at his [O'Connell's] house for the 31st of May' (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 431-2, citing letter of Raphael; see further letter 2248 n1).

2248

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], 1 June [1835]

My dear Sir,

You having acceded to the terms proposed to you for the election of the County of Carlow,¹ viz. you are to pay before nomination £1,000 — say one thousand pounds — and a like sum after being returned,² the first to be paid absolutely and entirely for being nominated, the second to be paid only in the event of your having been returned, I hereby undertake to guarantee and save you harmless from any and every other expense whatsoever, whether of agents, carriages, counsel, petition against the return, or of any other description. I make this guarantee in the fullest sense of the honourable engagement that you shall not possibly be required to pay one shilling more in any event or upon any contingency whatsoever.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 25

- 1 According to Raphael, this letter was written by O'Connell at their interview, originally arranged for 31 May (see letter 2247 n1) and delivered by him on that occasion into Raphael's hands (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 432, citing a letter of Raphael).
- 2 O'Connell sent this £2,000 to Nicholas Aylward Vigors, Raphael's fellow-candidate and the election manager on the spot (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 123).
- 3 On 19 June Raphael and Vigors were returned. A petition was promptly presented against them, and on 19 August they were unseated, and the return amended in favour of their opponents, Henry Bruen and Thomas Kavanagh. O'Connell's agreement with Raphael collapsed when he was unable to procure for the latter a baronetcy which he had held out to him as possible solace (see letter 2270) and when in addition, Raphael was called on to meet the expense of the petition which unseated him (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 123; see also letter 2266). In 1836 the whole affair came before the Commons, when O'Connell was charged with having virtually sold a seat in parliament (a full account of the entire episode appears in Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 429-73). Ultimately a Commons' committee exonerated O'Connell from this charge but accused him of having behaved intemperately (see letter 2311 n1).

2249

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], 4 June [1835]

My dear Sir,

I have heard from Mr. Vigors this day, our prospects¹ are quite bright. I will arrange your address² for tomorrow's post, and my own³ for immediate publication. I, at present, entertain no doubt of success; you will hear again from me tomorrow. Who is Mr. Hamilton⁴ with whom you have deposited the £1,000?⁵ I do not know any person of that name in London. I hope I shall soon have the pleasure of sitting by your side in the House. Till tomorrow, I have the honour to be your faithful servant and friend.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 In the Co. Carlow election.
- 2 Raphael's address to the 'Honest and Independent Electors of Carlow' dated 8 June (*FJ*, 11 June 1835).
- 3 See letter 2251.
- 4 Thomas Hamilton, attorney, 2 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London.
- 5 See letter 2248.

2250

To Nicholas A. Vigors

London, 7 June 1835

My dear Vigors,

I am happy to inform you that the address¹ of Mr. Raphael to the electors of the County of Carlow will appear in the *Pilot* of Wednesday.

He has authorised me to purchase an estate for him in that county. Get all your friends to be on the alert to procure a desirable investment of that description.

Mr. Raphael's principles are all we can desire. He is a firm and consistent reformer, determined peaceably and quietly to work out the great principles of the Reform Bill, for the security of the throne and the liberty of the people. His opinions on the Corporation Reform and Tithe system are those which you and I cherish. He will go as far to promote the former and extinguish the latter, not in name merely, but in substance and reality, as any of his constituents can desire.

It will be to you, who are a liberal Protestant, no disparagement to Mr. Raphael that he is a strict and conscientious Catholic. You know that he is (as you are) a sincere friend to religious as well as civil freedom.

He marks strongly the contrast between English Protestant liberality and Irish Orange bigotry. The Protestant Corporation of London by an unanimous vote elected him sheriff of London and Middlesex. The vile Orange bigots of the base Corporation of Dublin have not admitted a single Catholic to the freedom, although they had forty years to do so.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 26

1 See letter 2249 n2. It appeared in the *Pilot* of 10 June 1835.

2251

To Alexander Raphael

London, 8 June [1835]

My dear Sir,

I sent off yesterday my letter to the electors of Carlow on your behalf;¹ all my accounts confirm my opinion of an easy victory; I doubt whether there will be more than a show of a contest, but I am assured, in any event, of success. . . . I also send you the draft of an address. I beg of you to peruse it and to return it to me with any corrections you may deem necessary or if you approve it, *then* with your signature. My wish is that you should alter it as little as you possibly can. I also send you a sealed letter from Mr. Vigors. . . . Let me know who the Mr. Hamilton is with whom you deposited the £1,000.² I expected that you would have lodged it at Mr. Wright's.³ It is time this were done.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

1 See letter 2249 n2.

2 See letters 2248 and 2249.

3 John Wright of Wright, Selby and Robinson, bankers, 5 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London.

2252

To Alexander Raphael

Wednesday [10 June 1835]

It is not my fault that Mr. Feargus O'Connor called on you. Refer him and every body else to *me*. I want part of the £1,000 to send over. How shall I communicate with Mr. Hamilton?

All well, quite well in Carlow.

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

2253

To T. Hamilton, 2 Henrietta St., London, 10 June 1835

Asks for payment of the £1,000 placed with him by Alexander Raphael.

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

2254

*To Alexander Raphael, 12/13 June 1835**Extract calendared*

Sure of success in Raphael's election for Co. Carlow. Has made all the financial arrangements.

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

2255

To Dr. John O'Brien

London, 16 June 1835

Strictly Private

My dear Sir,

Judge Vandeleur is dead¹ and I have every reason to be convinced that Perrin will be immediately promoted to the Bench.² This will give a vacancy for Cashel and I write to you to beg that you

will not fix upon any candidate until we can consult again on the subject. At present the man whom I should recommend is Sergeant Woulfe. He is a most excellent, honourable man of great talents and integrity and would be a most formidable assistant in the fight we are carrying on through the House against the vile and sanguinary Orange faction.³

I write to Woulfe by this post to know if he will stand and I begged of him to write to you if that was his intention. I pledge myself you could not get a better man.

The prospect of political affairs is good. We shall have an admirable corporate reform and I trust we shall have a *law braw pleasura*⁴ on the lands of Cashel when we legally evict the plundering Pennefathers and their bigotted gang.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 4598

- 1 Vandeleur's death occurred in Dublin on 14 June (*Pilot*, 15 June 1835).
- 2 Louis Perrin was appointed a justice of the king's bench in Ireland on 31 August 1835.
- 3 Woulfe was elected for Cashel in Perrin's place on 4 September 1835.
- 4 Gaelic. 'La Brea Pleisiura' (a fine sunny day).

2256

To Alexander Raphael

Wednesday [17 June 1835]

My dear Sir,

I send you Vigors' letter to me, just received. You see how secure we are. Return me this letter, as it vouches £800 *for me*; with that you have nothing to do, as of course, I stand between you and everybody.¹

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 See letter 2248.

2257

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 June 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I introduce to you two Belgian gentlemen — Mons. Dupetiaux and Mons. Veschers. These gentlemen are upon an inquiry, by

order of their Government, into the state of the poor and of charities amongst various civilized nations. They go to Ireland on this mission of humanity.

Procure for them, from all my friends, in every quarter, all the attention their respectability calls for, and all the facilities of research and information which may be required to attain objects of the deepest interest to the cause of benevolence.

In short, exert yourself that my friends in every quarter should receive these gentlemen in the manner most useful to the objects they have in view, and most consistent with the respect due to them personally.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 26-7

2258

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], half-past three [c. 20 June 1835]
My dear Sir,

Glorious news! Raphael and Vigors returned on Thursday. I do not know the exact majority¹ but I know the fact. I heartily congratulate you. My communication is from a Cabinet Minister but this is private. You can take your seat tomorrow.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 They were declared elected on Friday 19 June, not Thursday. The final figures were Vigors 627; Raphael 626; Kavanagh 572; Bruen 571 (*MR*, 2 June 1835).

2259

To Alexander Raphael, M.P.

[c. 21 June 1835]
Alexander Raphael, Esq., M.P., ultimate majority, 56. You are entitled to get your letters free¹ this day.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 The franking privilege accorded to M.P.'s.

2260

To his daughter Betsey

London, 23 June 1835

My own dearest Betty,

. . . Everything is looking well in the political world. I think the present Ministry will hold power and if they do, before one year more we will completely overcome the Orange faction in Ireland. There is a prospect of an appointment of commissioners to superintend the improvement of the Shannon at a salary of about £300 per annum and without much labour beyond vigilance and superintendence of the accounts. I fear they will not be appointed but, if they are, Fitz-Stephen Ffrench and I will I think be able to get Nicholas¹ named as one of them. . . . *We* are a great support to the Ministry so that I am as able I think, as I know I am willing, to be of use to him. . . . Never did father love a daughter better than I do, my own Betty, and never did daughter deserve to be so loved. . . .

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

1 Nicholas J. Ffrench.

2260a

To P. V. FitzPatrick

9 Clarges St. [London], Friday [probably 26 June 1835]

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have not time to write to you this day. I want to know:

First, what and how many vols. of 'Dens' theology¹ are read at Maynooth?²

Second, where I can get his treatise on heresy?

Third, is it read at Maynooth or is there any other and what work applicable to the points stated by Dens on heresy read at Maynooth?

You can perceive my object. I would wish to be able to apply to the book on heresy whether it be read at Maynooth or not. I suppose it relates to the duties of the civil power in respect to heresy.

I wish you would wait on Dr. Murray from me, and inform him in the most respectful manner that as representative for Dublin, I am most ready to make any statement he may deem advisable on

the subject of the late absurd calumnies; that is, unless he treats the matter with the contempt it merits, as I by no means think him called on to make any statement,³ leaving it altogether as a matter for himself to decide. I only mean to place myself at his command.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 65

- 1 The eight-volume *Theologia ad usum seminariorum et sacrae theologiae alumnorum* of Pierre Dens (1690-1775), published in Dublin by Richard Coyne in 1832.
- 2 At a meeting of the Protestant Association in Exeter Hall, London, on 20 June 1835, Rev. Robert McGhee declared that Dens' complete body of theology had since 1808 been adopted by the Irish Catholic hierarchy as the standard guide for their clergy. McGhee asserted that at a meeting that year the Irish bishops ordered the republication of 3,000 copies of the work. He went on to give a synopsis of Dens' teachings, to the effect that all Protestants are heretics, and that the Catholic church has a duty to exterminate Protestant rites and compel Protestants to conform to the church of Rome. Supported by Dr. Cooke he carried a resolution affirming the belief of the meeting that Dens' views on these matters represented those of the Irish Catholic church (for a full account of the proceedings, see *Authentic Report of the Great Protestant meeting . . . at Exeter Hall . . . on June 20, 1835. . . .* [Dublin, 1835], also, *Pilot*, 24 June 1835).
- 3 In a public letter to Melbourne on 2 July Archbishop Murray denied that he had ever sanctioned the publication or use of Dens' work, or appointed it a text-book for conferences of the clergy. He declared that publication of the work had originally been undertaken by a 'respectable book-seller' as a 'speculation in trade entirely at his own risk'. He stated that whilst much of Dens' work was of value, it expressed some obsolete opinions which no one would now think of defending, and he gave his solemn oath that he himself did not subscribe to these opinions. (*Pilot*, 3 July 1835).

2261

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 29 June 1835

Private

My dear Mullen,

I perceive by your letter of this day, which I thought I should not have had time to answer, that we are swamped by the expenses of the Dublin Commission.¹ I do not know what to do. It will cost me another £1,000 after it comes back here. Give me your advice. If three or four cool, deliberate men advise me to give up the seats for Dublin I will throw them to West and Hamilton² at once. There is no remedy else. The Committee cannot be called together until the Commissioners *report*. The Act of Parliament

does not allow it to be done. When you advise me on that subject, you see how inapplicable that advice is. Until the Commissioners report, I do repeat, *nothing can be done here*. Counsel me then as to what I should do.

The Liberal Party in Dublin have — that is, some of them have — come forward manfully but the far greater number have held back. What am I to do? There is but one alternative — to let the Commission run its course, or *to resign*. Which shall we do? I could not do the first without being supported by public opinion founded on the deliberate advice of friends of known character. An expense of £50 or thereabout a week is enormous, but it would be much more *per day* here. Say what am I to do. How bitterly do I regret that I was not left in my native county, Kerry.³ It is, however, idle to complain. I will be guided by the advice of those in whose intellect and integrity I have confidence; but it inflicts a deep pang on me to be obliged to yield the representation of our City to such vile vagabonds. Yet, after your letter, what can I do? £2,000 are as much as I ought to be required to expend on their struggle.

With regard to your former letter, believe me that I never will lose sight of the object until I have accomplished it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 29-30

1 The commission in connection with the Dublin city election petition.

2 George Alexander Hamilton (1802-1871), elder son of Rev. George Hamilton, Co. Down; M.P. Dublin city 1835-37; Dublin University 1843-59. See *Boase*.

3 As M.P. for Co. Kerry.

2262

To Thomas Russell, 154 High Street, Edinburgh

London, 7 July 1835

Sir,

I had the honour to receive your letter covering £25 for 'the children of the slain' in the bloody affray at Rathcormack,¹ one of the latest 'tithe massacres' in Ireland.

I have transmitted that sum to William O'Connell Esq. of Rathcormack who has had the humanity to act as treasurer of the fund for the widows and orphans of the persons murdered on that occasion.

It will be a consolation to those who have survived that slaughter to find that the humane and the good in Scotland are mindful of

their sorrows and disposed to relieve their sufferings. Alas that crimes such as those we deplore should be committed in the name and for *the support* of religion. How little do the abettors of such a system know that its effects are to bring into hatred and contempt the religion which it purports to sustain! Surely no person living in the vicarage of Rathcormack can be disposed to listen to any argument in favour of the Protestant established church which brings to his mind nothing but images of extortion and massacre. Thus does cruelty always defeat itself and the violence which is intended to maintain has the effect of injuring, nay of destroying, that religion in whose service it is exercised. When will men learn to be honest in their zeal for religion! When will they avow a truth, which everybody feels in his own case, that it is no less robbery to extort from a man money to pay a clergyman whom he does not want than it would be to take the same money from him to pay a physician whom he has not consulted but who has been employed by and for some other person.

The established church, as it is called in Ireland, never got fair play from its own votaries. Even if it were the true religion which you, a Presbyterian (as I suppose) and I, a Catholic, equally deny yet it never could make progress amongst a people whose first knowledge of it consisted in the levying of their money without value and the slaughtering of their persons without mercy.

Let us hope that better days are coming. To be sure, we are for the present surrounded by statesmen who combine all the baseness of hypocrisy with the fixed purpose of continuing every profitable abuse and of sustaining every lucrative oppression. Yet there is a better spirit abroad and I trust the day is not far distant when we shall see churchmen of every denomination supporting and maintaining each his own pastor and entering into a generous rivalry with each other in the promotion of mutual charity and universal kindness and Christian benevolence.

SOURCE: National Library of Scotland

1 The 'Rathcormac Massacre' (see letter 2175 n2).

2262a

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 10 July 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Send William O'Connell of Rathcormack £25 on my account which I received from Edinburgh for 'the children of the slain'.¹

I want very much a history by dates of the Emancipation Acts² passed by the states representatives of Maryland in North America. I had it in pamphlet shape sent me from America but I despair of finding that pamphlet. I, however, used its materials in a speech³ in which I gave the substance of the facts and the dates. Now, if the speech I allude to were hunted up, an abstract of it would serve all my present purposes. It was made at or during the time of the Catholic Association. I do entreat of you to get a search made for it. I want it without delay.

All is going on well here. Our Irish Corporation Bill⁴ will be in the House in two or three days. I expect it to be satisfactory.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 30-31

- 1 See letter 2262.
- 2 The two acts of the Maryland assembly of 1639 and 1649.
- 3 At a meeting of the Catholic Association on 8 November 1823 O'Connell said that 'the first example of the liberal spirit of toleration was set by a Catholic state, Maryland in America.' (*DEP*, 11 Nov. 1823). The other newspapers make equally brief references to the topic.
- 4 On 31 July this bill was introduced by Perrin, the Irish attorney-general, and in amended form was passed by the Commons on 17 August. It received its first reading in the Lords on 18 August but, according to Macintyre, was then dropped owing to the lateness of the session and to the preoccupation of the Lords with the English municipal reform bill (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 237).

2263

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], 17 July [1835]

My dear Sir,

Send to Mr. Baker¹ the particulars he wants of your qualification.² I will stand between you and him for all expenses. I promised you, and repeat distinctly my promise,³ that upon payment of the second £1,000, to which you are at all events engaged, no demand shall be made upon you for one additional

six-pence. Do, then, at once pay the other £1,000 into Messrs. Wright's to my credit. Confer with Mr. Baker as to his defence as much as he chooses. I am bound to indemnify you for all expenses beyond that £1,000, that is, the second sum.

SOURCE : *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 Thomas Baker, 29 Spring Gardens, London. The parliamentary agent employed by O'Connell for Raphael.
- 2 The qualification necessary for M.P.'s.
- 3 See letter 2248.

2263a

*To John Easthope*¹

Clarges Street [London], Saturday [7 March 1835]²

My dear Sir,

I spoke with Lord Chandos and Mr. Palmer.³ The former opposes the *enemys road*⁴ and has no objection to yours. Mr. Palmer is inclined with us. I am not satisfied as to its being successfully opposed on the second reading but it will depend on Lord Chandos. If he will head the opposition it will be likely to be successful. I collected from him that it was his intention to do so and I promised him my assistance, telling him the grounds of my preference of your plan. On the whole my advice to you is to make the best preparation you possibly can to throw out the bill but not to divide unless we feel confidence from the debate in our numbers.⁵

I hope your son has not sustained any serious injury by his fall.

I believe I must reserve my fire for the next attack on the Orange System. I do think we damaged the enemy *pretty considerably* last night.⁶

SOURCE : Duke University Library

- 1 John Easthope (1784-1865), M.P. for St. Albans 1826-30; Banbury 1831-32; Leicester 1837-47. Purchased the *Morning Chronicle* in 1834 for £16,500; created baronet 1841. See *DNB*.
- 2 This undated letter is out of place because its date was originally thought to be 18 July 1835.
- 3 Robert Palmer (1793-1872), M.P. for Berkshire 1825-59. See *Boase*.
- 4 The proposed route of the (English) Great Western Railway.
- 5 The Great Western Railway bill was read a second time and committed on 9 March. Chandos opposed its committal but was defeated by 162 votes to 2. O'Connell did not support Chandos on this occasion.

- 6 On 6 March the Commons passed an address, introduced by Richard Lalor Shiel, to have certain information concerning Orange lodges laid before the house. The address was passed without a division (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1835, I, 198-212).

2263b

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 July 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

I certainly gave the Maryland history in a speech,¹ not in a letter. I thank you for what you sent me but it is hard that I cannot get that which is certainly in existence.

If I had any chance of getting it, I would be very thankful for the report of what I said respecting the notes on the Rhemish testament. That, however, was many years ago, and in your father's lifetime. The date of Dr. Troy's disavowal of *the notes* will lead you to find out the speech.² It was before the time of that disavowal, probably some months before.³ I am annoyed that the speech in which I mentioned the Maryland laws was not discovered. Pray discover the speech which has been distorted by the Bishop of Exeter.⁴

There are no news. I believe the Ministry are quite secure. The reports are idle. Peel knows that this country cannot be governed by the Tories. Let Shaw be as bombastic as he pleases, I have a strong confidence that the Orange party are down for ever.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 31-2

1 See letter 2262a

2 This concerned a publication of the new testament by the English college of Rheims in 1582. Archbishop Troy had given his approval to a revised edition of this work published in Dublin in 1791. Subsequent printings were made by Richard Coyne, the Dublin printer, who was a Catholic. These bore the approval of Troy. In 1816 Coyne allowed his name to appear on an edition printed by a Protestant in Cork. Troy appears to have given his approval to this work in the belief that it was a copy of the edition printed in 1791. In fact it contained notes from much earlier editions of the work on the Church's attitude to heretics. These notes now created an uproar among Protestants (*Dublin Review*, I, No. 2, [July 1836], 499-548). On 24 October 1817 Troy stated publicly that he had not meant to approve of any edition of the work that was not identical with that of 1791; and that he condemned as false several of the doctrines enunciated in the notes to this new edition (*FJ*, 25 Oct. 1817). At the Catholic meetings of 1 and 4 December O'Connell also condemned these doctrines (*DEP*, 2, 6 Dec. 1817).

- 3 O'Connell's condemnation of the notes was made nearly six weeks *after* Troy had made his public statement.
- 4 Henry Philpotts, D.D. (1778-1869), bishop of Exeter 1830-69. See *DNB*. In the parliamentary session of 1835 Philpotts had repeatedly expressed strong criticism of the Catholic clergy and laity in Ireland particularly in regard to the state system of education. O'Connell's reference to him in this letter remains unexplained.

2264

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges Street [London], 25 July [1835]

My dear Sir,

You did not say to whom I was to apply for the second sum of £1,000 according to our arrangement.¹ It is necessary — *absolutely necessary* — it should be paid *this* day. Let me know at once who is to give it to me. I have a note from Vigors, to whom I am pledged, pressing me on this subject. I of course am bound to him for the money.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

1 See letter 2248.

2265

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 25 July 1835

My dear Friend,

I need not tell you that I made every exertion to succeed in procuring the nomination for you of the tide surveyorship. I got my final answer only yesterday. It is unfavourable. 'The appointment belongs to the Board of Customs. It goes by seniority amongst the officers of that Department. A new man cannot be brought in.'

I do believe, if the thing were possible, you would at this hour be the man. But there is as good fish in the sea as ever was caught. We will have a remodelling of the paving board and of the police magistracy within six months, and assuredly you shall be *one* if I live. I believe the Ministry is now perfectly secure. Peel admits that Toryism cannot manage the country. *Rely on me.*

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 32

2266

To Alexander Raphael

9 Clarges St. [London], 27 July [1835]

Sir,

I can hardly restrain my feelings at hearing that you shrink from performing your engagement¹ with me. Rely on it you are mistaken, if you suppose that I will submit to any deviation from our engagement. I say no more at present, in the hope that there may be some mistake which you will *instantly* do away. There can be no mistake on my part.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

- 1 That is payment of the second sum of £1,000 (see letter 2248). Raphael claimed that his understanding of that agreement exonerated him from payment of the second £1,000 (see letter 2268).

2267

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 28 July 1835

I am happy to tell you that the present Ministry appear to be perfectly secure. The lords may do their worst.¹ It is true the king is *all but* mad. This, of course, must not be said in public. But he has been playing all manner of insane pranks. I do not think it possible he should keep himself within bounds for another year.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 32-3

- 1 A reference to the protracted battle which the lords were waging against the English municipal reform bill.

2268

From Alexander Raphael

Great Stanhope St. [London], 28 July [1835]

Sir,

I deny most positively that I have in any way shrunk from performing my engagement¹ with you. On the other side you will find a copy of the letter you gave me (viz. that of June 1). You

must recollect the conversation we had prior to that being written. My understanding at that time was, and ever since has been, that I was to risk only £1,000 and that the other £1,000 was to be paid only in the event of the seat being secured. You, it seems, put a different construction upon it; and as I presume we both wish only what is right, I would suggest that the question should be decided by some mutual friend. In the meantime, to prevent all possibility of doubt as to good faith on my part, I have authorised Mr. Hamilton to pay the £1,000. In conclusion, it pains me to say that the tone of your letter was quite unwarranted by anything on my part.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

1 See letter 2266.

2269

To Charles Haliday

London, 30 July 1835

My dear Sir,

I hope that I am not blamed for not writing on the subject of the custom house fire claims.¹ I watched the question in the Treasury until there was a favourable decision at least as to goods the duty of which was not more than one week paid. I suppose if this had not been satisfactory I should have been informed of the contrary. At all events I can I think safely hope that my constituents and my opponents cannot attach any blame to me on this subject.

Now with respect to the Irish Lighthouses I do believe that I have taken sufficient precautions to ensure that they shall not be transferred to the Trinity House.² I will not only attend to the bill in its progress but speak strongly to Lord Morpeth on the subject. In short, I will leave no stone unturned to prevent the transfer and I have every reason to believe that I shall succeed.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 5759

- 1 That is, the claims of Dublin merchants for compensation for destruction of property caused by the Customs House warehouse fire of 1833 (see letter 2050). On 12 August 1835 a sum of £68,000 was finally granted by parliament to meet these claims (*Commons Journal*, LXXXX, 539).
- 2 Acting on the report of a recent committee of inquiry, Hume was given leave on 25 March to bring in a bill to place all the lighthouses of the United Kingdom under the control of Trinity House, London. The bill was withdrawn on 17 August.

2270

To Alexander Raphael

3 August 1835

Confidential

My dear Sir,

Tell me, in the strictest confidence, whether you have any wish to be a baronet.¹ Of course I do not ask you without a sufficient reason. One word is not to be communicated to anybody until I know your determination.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 27-8

1 See letter 2248 n3.

2271

To P. V. FitzPatrick

9 Clarges Street [London], 5 August 1835

All is going on well. The Ministry becoming daily stronger in popular support, the conflict with the Peers daily growing more vivid.¹ They must yield. The debate last night was crushing to the Orange faction.² Finn was excellent; the report miserable.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 33

1 See letter 2267 n1.

2 On 4 August, Hume moved eleven resolutions in the Commons, declaring Orangeism illegal and placing emphasis on its existence in the army. He also proposed an address to the king calling attention to the position of the duke of Cumberland as a field marshal and Orange grand master. Hume again moved his resolutions on 11 August (most of them being adopted), modified so as to avoid charging Cumberland with complicity in the formation of military lodges. A few days later the king promised a vigorous suppression of secret societies in the army (Senior, *Orangeism in Ireland and Britain*, 268).

3 Finn seconded Hume's resolutions and presented important information in support of their case (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1835, III, 2301-3). The report of Finn's speech in the press is quite inadequate.

2272

From Alexander Raphael

Great Stanhope St. [London], 5 August [1835]

My dear Sir,

I cannot express how deeply I feel in being left by you in the painful dilemma of either running away from the fight with a majority of 56 in our favour or to commence from tomorrow an expensive and uncertain contest without a single sixpence from my colleague.¹ I have however by the advice of my friends, determined to continue the contest for a day or two longer, reserving always to myself, if necessary for the vindication of my character towards my constituents of Carlow, any other mode of proceeding which I may be advised to adopt. I therefore once more call upon you, as an act of justice to me, to fulfill your engagement² as you must be convinced (and you have yesterday declared) that I have acted throughout the transaction in the most honourable manner towards you.

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 3 November 1835

1 Raphael had at this stage paid the second £1,000 (see letter 2268). According to Raphael's own account, he discovered on 4 August that the defence of the Carlow seats was being conducted solely at his expense. 'Consequently there was no alternative but for me after having already advanced £2,000 . . . either to fight the battle single-handed or to abandon at once all further opposition.' Relying on the assurance of O'Connell that his case was good, he determined to go on. He claimed that O'Connell 'thought it prudent not to reply to or take any notice of' his letter (above) of 5 August (Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 440-442).

2 See letters 2248 and 2268.

2273

To Lord Plunket

9 Clarges St. [London], 10 August 1835

My Lord,

The persons on whose behalf I apply for the Commission of the Peace for Kerry County are

First — for myself.

Second — for John Primrose Jr. of Hillgrove near Cahirciveen, Esq. I vouch for his respectability and the sufficiency of his property, also for his being a gentleman of very considerable information

and intelligence. He is married to a niece of mine.

Third — for Maurice Brennan of Sunday's Well near Killarney, Esq. He is a near relation of mine and I am therefore the better able to vouch for his intelligence and respectability. In point of property he is perfectly independent and can at once qualify for voting as a magistrate at *Road* sessions. I know he has a qualification more than sufficient for deputy lieut[enant].

I am thus minute because I know the inveterate hostility Lord Kenmare is pleased to entertain against him for no other reason than that he refused to vote for the Knight of Kerry at the last election.¹

SOURCE: Msgr. Arthur Connolly Autograph Collection

- 1 For supporting the O'Connellite candidates in the Kerry election in January 1835 Brennan lost the office of collector of grand jury cess for the barony of Magonihy, a post worth £200 a year (Lyne, 'Kerry Elections of 1835,' 96).

2274

To Lord Mulgrave

9 Clarges Street [London], 13 August 1835

My Lord,

Lord John Russell was so good as to show me the letter your Excellency was pleased to write on the subject of my request for my relative, Mr. Charles Brennan.

I beg that you, my Lord, will accept my most respectful and warm thanks.

I am certain that Mr. Brennan cannot hesitate to accept any office which is tendered to him in the manner and with the reasonable expectations of promotion which you, my Lord, have been pleased to create, expectations which I trust and believe his exertions to carry into effect the views of your Excellency's paternal Government with respect to the reform of the Police force in Ireland, will entitle him to have realised on the first suitable occasion.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

2275

To James Aytoun,¹ Edinburgh

London, 18 August 1835

Sir,

[Acknowledges Aytoun's letter of 15th instant accompanying the resolutions of a meeting of the inhabitants of Edinburgh. He accepts their invitation].

The language contained in the resolutions... proves how deeply impressed the persons who composed the meeting² must be with those sentiments of civil and religious freedom which have been the animating impulses of the entire of my political life. It demonstrates also how fervently you sympathise in the sufferings and how much you abhor the oppressions of the loved green isle of my birth.... But the spirit which presides over the councils of the Scottish people fills me with hope... [that soon] the combined exertions of the friends of rational liberty in England, Scotland and Ireland will succeed in destroying the principle of misrule in Ireland and in giving to her now wretched population a participation in British rights and in British prosperity.

In the meantime we must not lose sight of the impediments now thrown in the way of all amelioration of our institutions by a factious majority of the House of Lords.... Liberty is an empty name and constitutional rights are vile delusions if any two hundred men, no matter by what titles or denominations styled, can prevent every improvement in the social system and continue every abuse. If this power shall remain in any irresponsible body of men, free from any direct or efficacious control of public opinion we may as well write ourselves down slaves at once as bear about us the mockery of political rights.... [The invitation] is a testimonial of your concurrence with me in the duty of struggling to obtain for these countries the fruits of the Reform Bill in the abolition of municipal and other corrupt and enslaving abuses. Scotland... will heartily and fearlessly combine with the untired reformers of England and Ireland in the peaceful but certainly successful struggle to remove all permanent obstacles to good and cheap government.... I am indeed proud of the notice of so zealous and uncompromising a friend to... the principle of democratic liberty.

[As soon as I can I will] announce to you the day of my arrival in Edinburgh. It will be on the earliest day possible.

SOURCE: National Library of Scotland

- 1 James Aytoun, barrister.
- 2 A meeting of the inhabitants of Edinburgh, held under Aytoun's chairmanship on 12 August 1835. It was resolved to invite O'Connell to a public dinner in the city (*Pilot*, 19 Aug, 1835, quoting *Edinburgh Patriot*).

2276

To Lord Mulgrave

London, 19 August 1835

My Lord,

I hope you will pardon me for this intrusion. I cannot however write without respectfully expressing my strong sense of obligation which every Irishman ought to feel for the dignified impartiality and temper with which your Excellency has conducted the affairs of Ireland.

My object is to solicit the attention of your Excellency to the claims of Mr. Ronayne the present member for Clonmel. He is desirous to retire from parliamentary duty and to arrange so as to secure the election of a firm supporter of the present administration in his place. This *can* be effected.

Mr. Ronayne has himself supported the members of the present Administration upon principle and he is, I can assure your Excellency, perfectly qualified for the office which I now solicit on his behalf, that of a chairmanship of a county.¹

I certainly should not urge any claim on his behalf if I were not ready to pledge myself to his capacity as a man and to his information as a lawyer and to his honour, integrity and impartiality as a gentleman.

There is now a vacancy in Tipperary. There are two more prospective, that in Galway nearly certain, in the King's County probable. It is no objection that Tipperary is in Mr. Ronayne's circuit because the change of barristers from one county to another is very advisable. Another chairman could be removed to Tipperary and as it is *the best* county in Ireland there is no chairman that would not be happy to be removed to Tipperary.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 That is the position of assistant barrister.

2277

This letter is now part of letter 2280.

2278

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 4 September 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

My parliamentary career has been so much longer this year than any other that I am beginning to fear the people of Ireland may forget me, but I never will forget them or their rights or interests.

The prospect, however, begins to brighten for Ireland. My own conviction is that the present ministry are quite secure. I do not see the possibility of forming a Tory Administration. If, therefore, I am right, there are the best hopes to be entertained. I know of my own personal knowledge that the Government are determined to do all they can for Ireland. They are resolved to discountenance the Orange faction everywhere and in every respect. We have for the first time in near two centuries a Catholic Attorney-General¹ who, besides, is one of the most honest and straightforward persons living. His ears will be open to the complaints of the Catholic Clergy as well as of the Catholic laity upon every act of oppression and tyranny practised against the poorest of the people. Every care will be taken to give the Commission of the Peace to every liberal man qualified for it. The Attorney-General will not allow jurors to be packed against the people. And if the Orangemen or police commit any more murders, they will be prosecuted seriously and, if possible, effectually.

I may be blamed by some for supporting the present Administration instead of looking for the Repeal; but, in the first place, the cry for the Repeal would only give increased strength to the vile Orange faction, who are violent anti-Repealers, that they may have the appearance of being devoted to British connection. We must not strengthen their bonds. In the next place, I want to realise as much good for Ireland as I possibly can. At all events, and in every contingency, the Government is determined to get rid of the tithes as soon as may be, and to appropriate as much of the Church revenues as possibly can be spared to purposes of general education. If they go on another year, or perhaps sooner, I may join them, and I will at all events never forget my plan of glebes and glebe houses for the clergy of the people,² unconnected,

however, with any taint of government patronage.

The public mind in this country is ripening fast into a conviction that there must be a reform in the Lords. The moment *that* is attained, everything useful to Ireland follows as of course, and when the Orange faction ceases to have political existence there is *nothing* Ireland cannot command.

My hopes increase and my views expand. I clearly seem to see my way to solid and beneficial results for our poor country. If God spares my life, I do strongly hope, with His divine assistance, to make Ireland really and in truth what she ought to be —

Great, glorious, and free.

You know the rest, and you know I speak in sober seriousness. Should I live, I hope in God that my life will not be in vain for Ireland.

I stand exceedingly well with the present Ministry. They have but little patronage but that little will be disposed of only to sincere friends of the country. I have, indeed, been of some service to the government.

It is for all this the Orange faction hate me. They seem to think that if they could crush me, they would put down easily the Irish people. They are mistaken, of course. The people would find other, but not honester, leaders. But the Orange party pay me the compliment to think that they are doing mischief to Ireland when they oppress me. Accordingly they have inflicted on me six contested elections — my sons *three*, my own *four*, Fitz-Simon's and my nephew's make six in all.³ No one man ever before had to deal with the expenses of over five contests. They were conducted for me cheaper than for others, but they cost me an immense sum, or rather sums — ruinous sums altogether. Next they gave me five petitions.⁴ The Dublin cost me £2,000 and will cost me at least £2,000 more. The Youghal lasted fourteen days and its expenses will wind up to near £3,000.⁵

In short, no man was ever so persecuted by vexatious expenses nor reckoning my family expenditure here.

Really, I sometimes almost despair. I must, I think, mortgage perhaps all my family property but do not breathe a word of this to anyone. The people have hitherto behaved so well to me that I ought not to despair; but perhaps my popularity may fade and I may just at the moment of my greatest usefulness find myself unable to continue the strife, but I will spend my last shilling in the struggle. Besides, it is only now that the people of England are beginning to understand me. I am growing exceedingly popular and I am availing myself of my popularity to go about *preaching* up the wrongs, the sufferings, and the remedies of Ireland. I do

not think the people of this country will long bear to have the Irish nation charged with the expenses of a church which they do not want.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, Corr., II, 33-5

1 Michael O'Loughlen.

2 See letter 2072.

3 These were the Meath, Tralee, Youghal, Dublin city, Dublin county and Kerry elections.

4 The Meath, Tralee, Youghal, Dublin city and Kerry election petitions.

5 For the cost of these two petitions see letter 2229 n5.

2279

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Manchester, 11 September 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

You will be glad to hear that there never was anything more enthusiastic than my reception here.¹ The procession of the trades, notwithstanding the wetness of the day, exceeded thirty thousand. I made ten or twelve thousand hear me in a spurt of about an hour. The dinner took place at the more reasonable hour of half after five. The room contained some 300, and if it could hold three times as many it seems to me there would have been more than enough to fill it. I never was so well received in Ireland. It is a strong measure to say so and yet it is true. I was received admirably. I spoke for an hour and a half. You may imagine that I must have been encouraged by applause of an enthusiastic nature to go on or I would have sooner terminated. Indeed, it is impossible to give you in the compass of a letter any idea of the sensation I made. I, of course, made Ireland one prominent topic and the house of lords another.

The meeting was composed of Whigs, Radicals, Neutrals, and Tories and I venture to assert I carried them all. It is, indeed, most flattering to my miserable vanity to think of the manner of my reception. But I hope there is a better feeling in the hope and expectation that I have done good, much good. This I do most sincerely believe.

I go tomorrow to York where I remain only the morning of Sunday. I will, please God, go on to the vicinity of Newcastle next day and on Monday make my triumphant entry into Newcastle. The dinner there is fixed for the 14th, Monday next; that for Edinburgh on the 17th, Thursday; that for Glasgow for the 21st,

and then I am off for Dublin. So much for my route. Give me a sketch of yours directed to Edinburgh.

The prospects for Ireland brighten. I am beginning to think that I shall be a Cabinet Minister next session, with the rule of matters in Ireland officially committed to me. It is time they should act honestly by Ireland. But keep *this dream* to yourself, and remember that if the Orange faction were put down, the combination in Ireland would be too strong to permit any misgovernment. Indeed, indeed, I do anticipate better days for our country and our creed.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 37-8

- 1 The meeting and dinner took place on 11 September. This was the start of a campaign by O'Connell against the House of Lords in the north of England and in Scotland. Of this campaign the *Annual Register* of 1835 (p. 367) wrote: 'He received dinners, and preached his doctrines, at Manchester, Newcastle, Edinburgh and Glasgow. . . . Excepting those who were attracted by curiosity, all the respectable classes of society, even the middle ranks, kept aloof from his banquets and exhortations. Feasted and applauded by the ignorant rabble . . . his language was excellently well adapted to gratify their prejudices and inflame their passions, but instead of being fitted to convince and convert the rational and sober-minded, it only excited disgust and some degree of alarm.'

2280

*To his wife.*¹

Rushyford, near Durham, Sunday [13 September 1835]

My darling Love,

I wrote last night from York. We heard Mass here at half after eight this morning; I came in for a second immediately after the first. The morning was beautiful and we saw everything worth seeing in York. It is in a lovely situation, as great a contrast with Manchester as possible — clear air, green fields, gentle elevations, a large river of pure water, and everything looking as neat as a new pin. We left York at three and have travelled fifty-six miles in seven and a half hours with, of course, only a pair. We sleep here and go before eight to Durham, ten miles; thence to Newcastle-on-Tyne thirteen miles. In all the towns as I came along the people turned out to see me and shout for me. The dean of York,² who is married to a sister of Peel, introduced himself to me, and asked me to dine with him. It was very civil at all events.

I am, thank God, in excellent health, taking the best possible care of myself and it is not possible to do otherwise, Morgan is so

vigilant and attentive. The morning air a little sharp, so I have put on my worsted stockings and find myself the more comfortable for it. Darling, how I long to hear from you and all my children! I long to see sweet sonny again and his buttercup of a sister.* How I long to see my own Fanny Fan Fan and her duck of a sister! But you, my own Mary, do not know how I do love you in my heart of hearts. . . . You are as sweet as if you were only twenty and as neat as a bride. Your old husband loves you with all his youthful fondness. How I do long to hear of your safe arrival in Dublin and of your health being reestablished. . . .

Tomorrow I have a procession into Newcastle and a grand dinner.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 53 and Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 The first part of this letter (as far as the asterisk) is taken from FitzPatrick's *Correspondence*, the remainder from the Fitz-Simon Papers.
- 2 Rev. William Cockburn, D.D. (1773-1858), third son of Sir James Cockburn, sixth baronet. Married 1805 Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Robert Peel, first baronet; dean of York 1822-58; succeeded as ninth baronet in 1853.
- 3 On 14 September O'Connell addressed a public meeting in St. Nicholas's Square and spoke at a dinner in the Music Hall, Blackett Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne. About 340 men attended the dinner (*Times*, 18 Sept. 1835).

2281

*From John Childs*¹

Bungay [Suffolk], 26 September 1835

Sir,

I have troubled you once or twice before. . . .

Permit me to congratulate you on the triumph of our [about one word illegible] political opinion and the force you have given to them on your late glorious tour.²

It will gratify you to know that I, who am an independent Protestant Dissenter, and the Rev. J. Wilson,³ the Catholic priest in [about two words illegible] have each [about two words illegible] the happiness [about two words illegible] other friend, [about one word illegible] the annoyance of the whole horde of [about one word illegible] Church of England parsons who infest the neighbourhood. The two counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, on the borders of which we live here, contains 1300 political voting parsons while the Dissenting ministers and the Catholic priest are objected to as unfit persons and the objections sustained. Shall not this be altered?

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Childs (1783-1853), founder of John Childs & Sons, printers; issued cheap editions of standard authors and annotated bibles; refused to pay church rates 1836. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 2279 n1.
- 3 Dom Joseph Porter Wilson (1798-1890), ordained a Benedictine priest 1827; on parish work in Bungay 1828-36; author of French and English dictionary 1833. See *Boase*.

2282

From Unknown, Dungarvan, Co. Waterford, 4 October 1835

Because of damp this letter is only partly legible. The writer mentions 'the utter unfitness of [John Matthew] Galwey to represent our wishes in Parliament and under that conviction I was reluctantly induced to resist his pretentions. . . . His personal attack on yourself excited my feelings against the man.' The writer asks O'Connell's opinion as to whether legal action for libel could be taken against Galwey for his address¹ to the County of Waterford. A copy of the address, which is dated 31 August 1835, is enclosed. It consists of a strong attack on the priests of Co. Waterford for their interference in politics and intimidation of their congregations for the purpose of obtaining dues.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 A copy of Galwey's address is published in an article in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of 4 September 1835.

2283

From a kinsman

Tralee [c. October 1835]

Extract

This notice has been served for him [Nicholas Riordan]¹ three or four times but he has declined to register. I called on him yesterday, and urged by every means in my power to take out his franchise but in vain. It has occurred to me and others that a line from you to him on the subject would have the desired effect. As we cannot be too strong or too active against our enemies, one vote is of material import.

The removal of Freeman² from this county would be productive of the most substantial public advantages and the sooner the

better. The Government owe Ireland a large debt of justice and the Attorney-General³ cannot begin too soon to liquidate it. Brownrigg,⁴ who is certainly deeply infected with the Orange poison, remains yet amongst us. His absence from the county would be also most beneficial.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 38-9

- 1 FitzPatrick prefaces this letter: 'An influential kinsman of O'Connell's residing in Tralee, wrote to apprise him that there had been numerous entries for registry served by the Liberals in that borough, including one on Nicholas Riordan, a man of respectability and opulence' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 38; for O'Connell's reaction, see letter 2284).
- 2 William Deane Freeman (died 1852), 7 Clare Street, Dublin; called to the bar 1817; Q.C. 1841; assistant-barrister for Co. Kerry; removed from Kerry to Galway 24 December 1835.
- 3 Michael O'Loughlen.
- 4 Henry John Brownrigg, J.P. (1798-1873) eldest son of General Thomas Brownrigg; entered Irish constabulary 1826; sub-inspector of constabulary in Tralee 1834; knighted 1858. See *Boase*.

2284

To a kinsman in Kerry

Merrion Square, 6 October 1835

My dear —,

I will write to Nicholas Riordan. How cruel it is that men of independent property and respectability like him will not reflect that the good of the community is part of the conscientious duty of every honest man, and that, unless help be given to the strugglers for public good, no public man can succeed. Is there any private cause of offence given him? Let me know this in a line to meet me at Limerick. If not, surely a gentleman of his opulence and respectability will feel that he has a station to fill in public as well as in private and that it does not become him to neglect the one, as he would never do any act to disgrace the other. Pray do *your* best to induce him to give us his assistance.

I understand that after these approaching sessions in this month there is an intention to remove the assistant barristers in a certain rotation. If that be so, of course Mr. Freeman will not be exempt from the general lot. No man can deserve to be *exchanged* better than he does but nothing should be said on the subject until the thing is entirely done; but my belief of its being [sic] to be done is so strong that I would not risk any doubtful registration before,¹ as there is so strong a chance of having a more worthy and

impartial successor. He is in principle the most inveterate Orangeist I ever met with.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 39

- 1 The assistant barrister presided at registry sessions and adjudicated on the qualifications of claimants of the franchise.

2285

From Thomas Steele, 6 October 1835, to Merrion Square

Presents O'Connell with a number of a London scientific periodical containing a description of his invention.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

2285a

*From Rev. Charles McDermott*¹

Walsh's Hotel, 2 Bolton St. [Dublin], 7 October 1835

My dear Sir,

Allow me to express the pleasure and gratification I have felt, seeing you once more in the *apparent* enjoyment of health, amongst us, after your long and harassing fatigues.

I found it necessary to address you in London in consequence of the shameful conduct of those who manifested the most vindictive feelings towards a man whom I have no hesitation to call the steady and firm supporter of every measure tending to better the condition of our long oppressed country, I mean the Honble. Henry R. Westensra, M.P., Monaghan.

I know the feelings and the determination of many of the *professing friends* in Co. Monaghan. You of course will know them *too*.

One thing allow me to state to you. If you value the support of Harry Westensra — 'and in *the North*, it has its *value*' — *put down*, for you can do it, the opposition of a few individuals in Monaghan. Give expression occasionally to your feelings in his regard, and recommend him to the Monaghan people. If you don't do this you will see Col. Madden² or some other conservative returned in his stead to represent that unfortunate county, and the best interests of the people sacrificed.

Pardon me, I mean well and have had my share in the passing events.

Your most obt. and very humble servt.

Charles McDermott, P.P.

Truagh, Co. Monaghan

SOURCE: Clogher Diocesan Archives

- 1 Rev. Charles McDermott (died 25 August 1844), appointed to Errigal-Truagh parish of the diocese of Clogher. Appointed administrator 13 July 1825 and parish priest 10 September 1834. Took a prominent part in supporting H.R. Westenra in Co. Monaghan in 1826 general election.
- 2 John Madden (1782-8 July 1844), Hilton Park, Clones, Co. Monaghan. Colonel in Monaghan militia.

2286

From William Conyngham Plunket

Draft

Old Connaught, Bray [Co. Wicklow], 11 October 1835

Dear Sir,

Before I had the honour of your letter of yesterday I had given directions to my secretary to issue the warrants for your appointment and that of Mr. Primrose to the commission of the peace for the County of Kerry; and I directed him to write to you and to Mr. Primrose the usual letters announcing the appointment. I should have done so sooner but waited in order to ascertain whether it might be in my power at the same time to appoint the other gentleman¹ whom you had recommended. I have to regret that I cannot at present do so; and I am sensible of the polite terms in which you express your acquiescence in my decision whatever it may be.

I am aware of the many advantages to the public tranquillity and to the cause of good government which may be expected from the appointment of persons of the character and description which you (I doubt not very justly) apply to Mr. Brennan. However after the strong opinion expressed by the Lord Lieutenant of the county² on the subject I feel myself bound to make some further enquiries and communication on the subject, and it will afford me great satisfaction to find that there does not exist any well founded objection to placing that gentleman's name in the commission.

I beg you to accept my acknowledgement of the obliging manner in which you express yourself as to my personal share in the commissions.

SOURCE : Papers of Mrs. Nicholas Shorter

1 Maurice Brenan.

2 The earl of Kenmare.

2287

Public letter. Withdrawn.

2288

From Pierce Mahony to Limerick

43 Dame Street, Dublin, 22 October 1835

My dear O'Connell,

I have the pleasure to send you enclosed copies of letters¹ from Lord Morpeth which I received this day. You will observe that the government have done exactly what you and I requested of Lord Morpeth and all that remains for us now to do is to use every possible exertion to get funds subscribed and *paid* to the credit of the directors of the Dublin and Kingstown Railway Co. (the committee selected to superintend the survey etc.) to defray the expenses the government will be put to in examining the line of railway which we propose to make between Dublin and Valentia² [one line illegible] money for its own sake as myself and I therefore propose that you should set an example which I will follow of sending £50 instead of £20 to the railway directors and I wish you at the same time consider how you can most usefully excite the public mind in favour of our Valentia line. In my opinion you should forthwith call public meetings in Kerry, Cork, Limerick etc. to explain the project to the people and you should on receipt write a letter full of thanks to the Lord Lieutenant,³ Lord Morpeth etc. for their wise and encouraging conduct.

You never had a better opportunity of being essentially useful to Ireland, and the south of Ireland in particular, and I expect that you will put the whole force and power of your mind into action on this occasion. You have noble topics – employment for the people, making Ireland what she ought to be and what nature intended her, the connecting link between the old and the new world etc.

I have also to announce to you that Capt. Evans⁴ of the Royal Navy will be at Valentia on Monday or Tuesday next. He goes to survey that harbour and he proceeds from thence to survey such

of the other western harbours [half a line illegible]. He will not delay longer than *one day* at Valentia and I deem it most important that you should see him and that you should write in the most urgent terms to Lord Duncannon (now at Bessborough) in favour of Valentia and above all use your influence to counter-act Lord Clanrickarde's intrigues to have Galway selected.⁵ I learn that Mr. Bald⁶ is about to survey that line forthwith and he has stated that the government have abandoned Valentia and adopted Galway. Capt. Evans told me yesterday evening that within a month from this time the government will have selected a western harbour and as it is manifest that he is their confidential officer for the survey, I do not conceal from you my fears that he has already formed his opinion but what that is, I do not presume to say. You will perceive from all this that even to insure fair play to Munster and Valentia you must not sleep on your oars. I am confident as to the result if you will only come forward and act with me as I now suggest.

I never wished for a seat in parliament more anxiously than at this crisis. Upon such subjects as the one I write upon I feel that I could be of real benefit to my country, but more of this when we meet. . . .

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 Morpeth to the duke of Leinster, 20 Oct. 1835; Morpeth to Mahony, 21 October 1835 (published in the *Pilot*, 23 October 1835). From these it appears that a deputation headed by Leinster had recently attended at the Castle to inquire into the government's attitude to a proposal to set up a packet station on the west coast of Ireland. The government announced no final decision on the project at this interview, but permission was given the Board of Works to undertake a survey with a view to acquiring a suitable site.
- 2 On 3 August O'Connell presented to the Commons a petition from the National Trades Political Union of Dublin complaining of the extreme destitution prevailing in Ireland, and recommending the construction of a railway 'which would intersect Ireland, and open a direct communication from the Atlantic to Great Britain'. . . . It declared that 'the harbour of Valentia, in the County of Kerry, is capable of receiving and affording shelter to a vast number of ships, of any burden, and is naturally so formed as to afford the greatest facility of ingress and egress in any state of the weather, and during any period of the tide.' Amongst Valentia's advantages, the petitioners claimed, was that it lay within eight or ten days sail of America, and was the port most convenient for ships returning from southern Europe, the Mediterranean and the East Indies. The opening up of Valentia they claimed, would save heavy annual losses to shipping involved in the dangerous navigation of the English channel and Irish sea. The petitioners recommended a line of rail from Valentia through Cashel, Clonmel and Kilkenny, to Dublin, which they claimed would become the main link between the old world and the new (*Pilot*, 26 Aug. 1835; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXX, 1).

main link between the old world and the new (*Pilot*, 26 Aug. 1835; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXX, 1).

- 3 Lord Mulgrave.
- 4 Captain Evans had recently been appointed by government to a survey of the western coast (*Pilot*, 14 Oct. 1835 quoting *Connaught Tribune*).
- 5 At a meeting of the nobility and gentry of Connaught at Ballinasloe on 7 October, convened to consider steps for a proposed railway from Dublin to Galway, it was resolved pending the report of Capt. Evans 'to use every possible effort to have the railway between Dublin and Connaught, and not to the more . . . distant district of Valentia' (*Pilot*, 14 Oct. 1835).
- 6 Probably William Bald (died 1857), civil engineer; a native of Burnt Island, Fifeshire; made a territorial survey of Co. Mayo 1810; a draftsman at the Admiralty; See *Boase*.

2289

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 30 October 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Where are the notes you were to send me of Peel's votes? You promised me the day I left Dublin to send me a full list of all his *votes*, with a particular notice of his opposition to the agricultural interest. You cannot think how it annoys me to have been disappointed in the receipt of these materials for my grand attack upon Peel. I left you the *Parliamentary Debates*¹ in my study and you need only refer to the index at the end of each volume to find the pages of each speech Peel made. I implore of you not to neglect *this*.

My attention has been called to the 'Day Note' of about a month ago, in which there was an entry outward from Dublin of a cask of Italian wine, and a case of some other wine, with the fantastic description of 'Lachrymae Hibernicae'. The exporters, McDonnell & Co., shipped as for Derrynane Abbey, *via* Cork. Will you enquire whether or not this be a humbug?

I got some excellent hunting yesterday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 43

1 *Hansard*.

2290

*To Dr Armstrong*¹

Derrynane, 4 November 1835

My dear Sir,

Your letter gives me great pleasure. I am much pleased to receive a communication from a gentleman whom I esteem so much as yourself. I am delighted to find that so estimable a man as Dr. Montgomery is ready to forgive me any offensive language I might have used against him.² I am quite ready to make him any apology *you* under the circumstances think I ought as a Christian or a gentleman to do. . . . I am ready to conciliate *his* feelings in the manner most likely to leave no unpleasant recollection on his mind so that our future cooperation may be sincere and hearty. . . . I thank you much for sending me the interesting detail of the meeting at Geneva. . . . I could not however help smiling at the passage in the paper which states that civil and religious liberty were established at Geneva in 1535. Alas, alas, for the writer's chronology as well as his ignorance of facts. Calvin never was in Geneva until 1536 nor finally settled there till 1541, and the content of the present Christian liberality is only the more delightful because instead of religious liberty being established in 1535 it was in October 1553 that Servetus was roasted to death by Calvin's contrivances. Such is human nature when it over arrogates to itself the functions of the deity. I much fear your respected friend, Dr. Montgomery, would have come in at that period for a *slight toasting*. Let us then bless God that we live in days in which men of all persuasions discover that persecution is a crime and not a duty, that it disgraces the sect which use it and serves and propagates the opinions it was intended to destroy. Let us rally with us those who recollect that though there be 'faith and hope and charity' 'the greatest of these is *charity*.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 James Armstrong, D.D. (1780-1839), Unitarian minister; born at Ballynahinch, Co. Down; one of the founders of the Irish Unitarian Society, 1830 and of the Association of Irish non-subscribing Presbyterians, 1835. He represented the latter body at the celebration of the tercentenary of the Reformation at Geneva in August 1835.
- 2 In January 1831 O'Connell had attacked Montgomery (see letter 1774 n2).

2291

From George Dalrymple¹ to Dublin

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 17 November 1835

Sir,

The arduous and successful struggles which you have already made and are still making to extend the rights and privileges of the people and to improve their condition merits the gratitude of all. . . . You will feel gratified to find that liberal principles are even making some progress among the inhabitants of this obscure, remote and hitherto neglected portion of the British dominions. By these public documents which I have forwarded, you will also observe that, although on a very small *scale indeed*, that [I] have been employed in promoting here to the utmost of my power measures somewhat similar to those which have occupied so much of your time and attention on your side of the Atlantic [six lines illegible] within this province for the purpose of promoting the advancement of education. The shortening the duration of [the] Colonial Assembly from the space of seven years to that of four, together with several other popular measures all having the same tendency, viz., that of increasing the power and the influence of the people.

Sincerely wishing you, Sir, every success in carrying into effect those contemplated reformatations which you have so long and so ardently desired. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 George Dalrymple, lieutenant 1st Foot; Fort Adjutant, St. Lucia to 1835; Prince Edward Island from 1835.

2292

To John Hill Burton¹

Derrynane, 3 December 1835

My dear Sir,

Such a history of Ireland as you speak of would be of incalculable advantage to the cause of justice and truth but are there readers for it? You are aware that Moore is publishing *a history*.² Taylor of the *Morning Herald* has published *a history*.³ Lawless has published a thing he calls a history.⁴ There are others.

But this is not what I most fear. The ancient story of Ireland is

principally fabulous and the fable is one devoid of interest. I rely on the fragment of Gildus and on Bede for my notions of Ireland in the Dark Ages. That there was *all* the learning of the times, a high spirit of religious devotion, much ascetism, is perfectly true but what must be the state of civil policy when the lands were held not by individuals but by the clan, when the succession to the chief power and property was governed by no rule of descent but belonged to the nearest relation who was also the *bravest* man. That ingredient in the right had all its natural effects.

I am not writing an essay on Irish history but we will throw ancient history nearly overboard. From the time of the 2nd Henry till the wars of 1641 little of interest — barbaric feuds, barbaric manners. I have dwelt on these periods until I have been sickened with disgust. The hellish spirit of Queen Elizabeth alone throws a species of 'funereal glare' over part of that interval. From the reign of Elizabeth you *prepare* for 1641. Thence to the present hour Irish history is of interest.

I am running from your questions. Let me put my reply thus: 1st. I am ready to give you all the assistance in my power but that aid can be effectual I fear only in Dublin.

2d. That there is no person possessed of sufficient leisure and ability to be useful, at least, I know of no such person.

3d. That the principal aid you could get in Dublin would be the facility to examine state papers and the files of Irish newspapers for the last sixty or eighty years.

4th. You must not rely in the least on Mr. Wyse's history of the Catholic Association⁵ even for dates or facts. It is full of all kinds of errors.

In short the only clue to the modern history of Ireland is the volume of Irish newspapers. They give dates and facts but of course are not to be relied on for motives or speculations.

I will hopelessly try to get you aid in Dublin but if you could come there while I was in that town I would procure for you the documents I mention. I got the copy of Queen Mary's letters you were kind enough to leave me. Many thanks. Poor murdered Mary! But I owe you infinitely more for the pamphlets. They are indeed most kind.

Do you know anything of the writers of a publication in Edinburgh called the *Christian Instructor*? They have played one of the most shabby tricks that ever was perpetrated upon me, and have published a letter of mine manifestly not intended for publication and have added one of the most consummate pieces of ignorance and impudence I ever witnessed — as a reply to a letter intended to close a *private* correspondence.⁶

SOURCE: National Library of Scotland

- 1 John Hill Burton (1809-1881), Scottish historian and lawyer; born in Aberdeen; wrote elementary histories under the name of 'White'; contributor to *Edinburgh Review*; edited the works of Jeremy Bentham in conjunction with Sir John Bowring. See *DNB*.
- 2 Thomas Moore, *The History of Ireland*, 4 vols., London, 1835-46.
- 3 Unidentified. John S. Taylor was a prolific writer of newspaper articles.
- 4 John Lawless, *A Compendium of the history of Ireland, from the earliest period, to the reign of George I, Dublin*, (1814).
- 5 Thomas Wyse, *Historical Sketch of the Late Catholic Association of Ireland*, 2 vols., London, 1829.
- 6 The letter to which O'Connell refers was one dated 28 October 1835 which he addressed to 'Philo Liberal' and which was apparently published by the recipient in the *Edinburgh Christian Instructor*. In the letter he makes some hostile references to Protestant theological beliefs such as he would probably have refrained from making in a public letter.

2293

To P.V. FitzPatrick

[Derrynane], 4 December 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

... I cannot tell you how delighted I am by this trip to the country, notwithstanding the inclemency of the season.

My plate is at Hanlon's to have these words engraved on that which was presented to me by the Catholic Board:

The Catholic People of Ireland

to

DANIEL O'CONNELL

Voted day of 18 .

I do not know the day of the vote. It was in 1811 or 1812 or 1813, or thereabouts. Will you kindly get somebody to look it out in the newspapers.¹ The motion was made by John Finlay. He may be able to tell you.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 43-4

- 1 See letter 453. On 11 December 1813 the Catholic Board resolved 'That a service of plate, of the value of One Thousand Guineas, be presented to Dan. O'Connell, Esq., on the part of the Catholic people of Ireland, as a small tribute of their gratitude for the unshaken intrepidity, matchless ability, and unwearied perseverance with which, in despite of Power and Intolerance, he has uniformly asserted the Rights, and vindicated the calumniated Character of his Catholic Countrymen.' (*DEP*, 16 Dec. 1813). The date inscribed on the plate is 11 December 1813. This plate, or at least a substantial part of it, is extant and is on exhibition at Derrynane.

2294

To Lord Mulgrave

Derrynane, 4 December 1835

My Lord,

The permission your Excellency gave me in London to express my opinions to you on subjects of public importance emboldens me to direct respectfully your attention to the overwhelming importance of the approaching nomination of sheriffs. Your philosophic judgement will at once see laid bare one of the great causes of the alienation from Government of the Irish people in the partial administration of justice. We have party judges, we have still party sheriffs and of necessary consequence we must have partisan jurors. It really is the only thing to be wondered at, that the people are *so* patient, for really I have beheld scenes in our courts that would drive the most apathetic mad. As to the judges, you have begun exceedingly well and no person can doubt that your every choice will be in the same excellent class. The Mayor of Cork furnishes another most favourable instance of the firmness with which avowed partisans can be set aside.¹ But you have before you the great game — the all-important selection. One feels that the judges should be respected but, my Lord, the selection of juries is intended as a check to judicial depravity. What must the condition of the people be if the judges, instead of being checked by juries, find that they have sheriffs to aid them by giving juries who, instead of resisting, will favour party spirit, give party verdicts and enable the judges to distribute vengeance not to administer justice. The state of Ireland requires a firm hand of power to stem the torrent of oppression legal as well as practical.

Your Excellency has certainly one consolation, that the People of Ireland are quite prepared to believe that you will do all you possibly can to procure justice and impartiality for them.

I have stated to Lord Morpeth, my brother Mr. John O'Connell's claim, to be sheriff of Kerry the ensuing year. He lost that office last year by the change of administration.² He has been sixty-four times a grand juror of the County. In fact his claims are irresistible on the merits but I need not add that he will yield them at once and cheerfully to the wishes or convenience of the Government.

Permit me however to inform your Excellency that on the judges' list for the County of Kerry, the second person named, Mr. Samuel Murray Hickson,³ is the very worst person in the county to be sheriff.⁴ He is the most inveterate Tory, the most active enemy of the present ministry. He it was who created the contest⁵

in both county and borough (of Tralee) and the Knight of Kerry would not have stood at all but for him. He also signed the slanderous petition⁶ against the Catholic Bishop and clergy of this county. I do assure your Excellency that the reformers in the County of Kerry could not be injured more than by his appointment.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 A memorial was presented to the privy council from the city of Cork against the election of Robert Dean as lord mayor. It complained that his election was unconstitutional and that he was unfit to be mayor since he was a member of the Orange order. The election was set aside by the privy council and a new election ordered (*Pilot*, 25 Sept. 1835).
- 2 O'Connell's brother John was the first of the three candidates recommended to the lord lieutenant by the judges of assize for the position of high sheriff for 1835. (*Dublin Gazette*, 8 Nov. 1834). He was appointed high sheriff in 1838.
- 3 Samuel Murray Hickson (born c. 1783), second son of Robert Hickson, The Grove, Dingle; sometime J.P.
- 4 Hickson's name had just been placed second on the list of three candidates recommended to the lord lieutenant by the judges on assize for the position of high sheriff for 1836 (*Dublin Gazette*, 10 Nov. 1835). The appointment went to Hon. Thomas Browne, later third earl of Kenmare, who had not been among the three recommended by the judges.
- 5 In the general election of January 1835.
- 6 A petition presented in the Commons on 21 August by Robert C. Scarlett, member for Norwich, from freeholders of Co. Kerry, complaining of intimidation by the Catholic clergy in the course of the recent general election (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1835, III, 2666-7). O'Connell declared on the petition first being presented that 'a petitioner containing grosser or more scandalous falsehoods was perhaps never presented' (*Ibid*, 2668). The petitioners' request for a parliamentary inquiry into the matter was not granted.

2295

To Lord Mulgrave

Derrynane, 8 December 1835

My Lord,

I very reluctantly intrude upon your Excellency's time on the subject of the office of sheriff for Kerry. The claim of my brother, Mr. John O'Connell, I at once and altogether submitted to your Excellency's discretion, satisfied whatever way you should decide it.¹

But my Lord I am just informed that Mr. Stoughton² refuses that office. It is true he could be compelled to do the duty but by

so slow a process as to render an *ad interim* appointment necessary. . . . The second on the judges list is Mr. Samuel Murray Hickson, the most *offensive* person that could be proposed to the liberal interest in this county.³

Permit me to refer your Excellency for evidence of the truth of my strong assertion to the Report of the 'Intimidation Committee'⁴ of the last sessions. If you are pleased to refer to the evidence of Mr. Daniel Supple before that Committee, you will find proofs of *his* activity in favour of the Tory candidate for the borough amounting to a crime which may be tried in Kerry in the ensuing year. Your Excellency will find his letter arranging a conspiracy to keep away a voter from voting. The Borough of Tralee was carried after all by a majority of only three [*recte* four]. Mr. Hickson was not only there but in the county at large a most active partisan of the Tory candidate and in fact the man who created the two contests, the one in the borough, the other in the county. I only implore your Excellency's attention to the contumely he flings on the party attached to the present Government by the name of the 'O'Connell faction.'

Mr. Samuel Hickson besides is one of the most prominent of the petitioners who procured Mr. Scarlett⁵ to present a petition⁶ to parliament containing the grossest and most unfounded calumnies on the Catholic clergy of Kerry.

. . . Allow me to implore of your Excellency not to inflict on this county so decided an enemy of the Reform party and of the Catholic clergy and of the present ministry as Mr. Hickson. . . .

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

1 See letter 2294 n2.

2 Thomas Anthony Stoughton J.P., D.L., (died 8 January 1862), Ballyhorgan, Listowel, Co. Kerry and Owlpen, Gloucestershire. High sheriff for Co. Kerry 1839.

3 See letter 2294 n4.

4 This was a select committee set up by the Commons on 11 March 1835 to 'consider the most effective means of preventing bribery, corruption and Intimidation, in the election of members to serve in parliament.' Their report was presented to the Commons on 20 August and was printed (Parl. Papers, 1835, VIII). The evidence of Daniel Supple, Jr. is printed on pages 698-708.

5 Robert Campbell Scarlett (1794-1861), eldest son of Sir James Scarlett, created first Baron Abinger 1835; M.P. for Norwich 1835-38; Horsham 1841-44; succeeded as second Baron Abinger 1844.

6 See letter 2294 n6.

2296

*From Thomas Spring Rice**Copy*

Downing Street [London], 8 December 1835

Sir,

In reference to the Memorial I had the honour to receive from you on behalf of the Directors of the National Bank of Ireland, which prayed that directions should be given to the Collectors of the Revenue to receive the notes of the Bank in question in payment of the same, I have to acquaint you that the Collectors of the various branches of the Revenue accept bank notes in payment of duties at their own risk, and that it is not the practice of the Bd. of Treasury to give them any directions as to what notes they should receive or refuse.

SOURCE : Monteaule Papers, NLI 551

2297

To Lord Cloncurry

Derrynane, 14 December 1835

My Lord,

I thank you much for the sound views you gave me of the state of the tithe question; and upon full consideration I do not hesitate to say that I deem your Lordship's plan¹ the very best that can be suggested for arriving at a peaceable conclusion to the agitation which tithes have created and continued for near a century. But, alas! what prospect is there of realizing that or any other measure useful to Ireland? I wish I could be of any service in carrying it into effect. You should in that case command my very best exertions.

I regret to see that all my efforts appear insufficient to excite to the formation of a 'government party' of rank and fortune in Ireland. The odious Orange party rally at once round a Tory party. But see how difficult it is for you to get anything like an exertion for the liberal government. I would submit that a Reform Association, could and I think ought, to include peers. There are many peers belonging to the English Reform Association.² Indeed, more than one English peer has claimed to be allowed to register as a voter, and such claim has been allowed in more than one instance.

The cases have been of English peers *sitting* in the Lords. This fact may, I should hope, influence your judgement as to joining ACTIVELY in an Irish Reform Society.

SOURCE: Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*, 303

- 1 This was probably a proposal to substitute a land tax for tithes, mentioned in a letter from Lord Dacre to Cloncurry on 26 February 1834 (Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections*, 296-7).
- 2 For an account of the formation of the Reform Association, an amalgam of Whigs and Radicals (established in 1834 to combat the activities of the Tory Carlton Club), which functioned as a registration and election machine, see Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 403-8, 410, 420, 423-4). O'Connell was a member of this body.

2298

This letter is now numbered 1862a.

2299

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 31 December 1835

My dear FitzPatrick,

Many, many happy years! I *must* work the Commission¹ as long as a particle of evidence remains undisclosed. I cannot, as I stand with the City of Dublin, decline having the case fully proved, no matter what it costs me. This duty would be incumbent on me even if I were ruined by it. The entire case must therefore be gone into and the partners and clerks of Shaw's Bank² must be examined.

Tomorrow I begin agitation afresh. The last, after all, was a glorious year! One other such and the faction is down for ever. I am, blessed by God, in the best health and the highest spirits.

Goodnight, God bless you! The hunting has been superb but I must tear myself from it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 45

- 1 Arising from the Dublin city election petition (see letter 2224 n1).
- 2 The Dublin private banking firm of Sir Robert Shaw and Co. (formerly Shaw, Needham and Shaw) which was incorporated in 1836 as the Royal Bank of Ireland.

2300

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 4 January 1836

... The English corporation elections¹ have put me in the greatest spirits. It is most satisfactory at this eventful moment to have such a manifestation of public sentiment.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 45

- 1 The elections to the newly reformed municipal corporations of England and Wales in which the Conservatives suffered a general defeat. On 29 and 31 December 1835 the *Times* listed the results from forty-five boroughs. These lists showed an overwhelming majority for 'Reformers' over Tories.

2301

To Archbishop MacHale

Derrynane, 7 January 1836

My ever respected Lord,

I had the honour of receiving the letter of your Grace, dated the 4th this evening. Yesterday I got the Galway invitation;¹ and, of course, accepted it. Besides the flattering honour, I do think "a cheer" in the right tone useful just now in Connaught.

Unfortunately, I fixed the 18th for the dinner. . . . I have *to dine* in Tralee on the 14th, in Cork, *I fear*, on the 16th,² in Stradbally on the 20th and in Dublin on the 25th, and in Birmingham on the 28th. These are all public dinners.

... It is indeed a bitter disappointment to me to find that my unavoidable absence in Parliament precludes my having the benefit of laying before you my views of the present prospects of our country. There is much gloom but I think I perceive the coming light behind the political passing cloud. . . .

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 623

- 1 An invitation, numerously signed, from the county and town of Galway, for O'Connell to attend a public dinner there in his honour (*Pilot*, 11 Jan. 1836). O'Connell attended the dinner which took place in Tuam on 18 January. It was presided over by John James Bodkin, M.P. and was attended by Archbishop MacHale and Bishop Browne of Galway.
- 2 On 3 January O'Connell requested the postponement of the Cork dinner until after the forthcoming session of parliament (*Pilot*, 11 Jan. 1836).

2302

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Bahoss [Cahirciveen, Co. Kerry], 12 January 1836

... I am now, you perceive, on the wing for quiet agitation in my own way. I am glad the scoundrels have closed my Commission so abruptly and so illegally.¹ It is all for the best, besides stopping the expenses. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 46

- 1 The commission arising from the Dublin city election petition. On 7 January O'Connell's and Ruthven's law agent, John Joseph Murphy, handed in a formal protest to the chairmen of the commission, complaining against their agreeing to commence the case for the petitioners before that of the sitting members had been concluded (*Pilot*, 8 Jan. 1836). The *Dublin Evening Post* commented 'the commission is virtually defunct' (*DEP*, 7 Jan. 1836).

2303

To Unknown

Tralee, 15 January 1836

Sir,

I will be at your house about 2 o'clock on Sunday. Have four horses ready for me by 2 o'clock. Take care that the drivers hear Mass. I will not arrive until after the last Mass and will not allow any man to drive me who lost Mass.

SOURCE: Property of Leahy's Licensed Premises, Abbeyfeale

2304

To Archbishop MacHale

Tralee, 15 January 1836

My respected Lord,

I had the honour to receive your Grace's letter of the 13th this morning. I have so much to do here¹ that I fear I will not be able to go farther than Limerick on Sunday. I will, however, endeavour to meet [*sic*] at Ennis, I mean to travel thence to Gort, where there are horses engaged for me. I cannot, I presume, be disappointed of horses in Loughrea. I know not but I believe that

there is an intermedial stage between Loughrea and Tuam; and I fear no delay but that which may arise from the want of horses at that intermediate stage. At all events, I will start so early on Monday morning as to be certain of reaching Tuam in time for the dinner.²

I will feel truly happy to find myself a guest in 'the palace'³ of your Grace.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 623-4

- 1 On 14 January O'Connell attended a public dinner in Tralee in his honour. The Dublin newspapers do not report it but there is a hostile and jocose account of it published in the *Times* of 20 January 1836.
- 2 See letter 2301 n1.
- 3 O'Connell lunched with MacHale in the archbishop's palace on the day of the Tuam dinner (*Pilot*, 20 Jan. 1836).

2305

To his wife

Tralee, Friday [15 January 1836]

My own darling,

I am much afflicted at your loneliness and especially at not having got somebody to write to you last night. But, my own love, we will, please God, soon meet. . . . Four *good* horses, from Tralee strange to say, met us at Killorglin. There may be something in Tralee *occasionally*. We arrived soon after four. The dinner¹ went off admirably. Nothing could be better. It was the most crowded dinner ever *held* in Kerry.

. . . Darling, I am invited to a great dinner at Liverpool² but that shall not interfere with your or rather our plans.

The Connaught dinner³ is to be at Tuam, not Galway. I go off tomorrow evening, after post hour. . . . I go the next day, Tuesday, to Betty's and will, please God, be in Stradbally early the 21st which will be Thursday. Now, darling, if you remain at Lakeview on Tuesday, leave it on Wednesday for Limerick. Go next day to Monasterevan. I will, please God, join you at Monasterevan by ten o'clock on Friday morning and we will go to town together. Will not that be pleasant? To me at least, heart's darling love. It is also pleasing to me to tell you, my own darling, that the borough⁴ is quite secure.

. . . Stop at Crosbie's in Limerick. His hotel, I believe, is the best. It is in William Street. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 2304 n1.
- 2 A meeting of the reformers of Liverpool resolved to invite O'Connell to a public dinner there in his honour. They expressed their gratitude for the part he had played in winning parliamentary and municipal reform for England (*Pilot*, 18 Jan. 1836).
- 3 See letter 2301 n1.
- 4 Tralee, where his son Maurice had been elected in January 1835 by 85 votes to 81.

2306

To his wife, Derrynane

Tralee, 16 January 1836

My own darling Love,

... I have been occupied every instant of this day. I changed my mind as to sleeping here and am to have Mass at seven in the morning so as to reach Ennis tomorrow night. Darling, do not forget my request that you will be before me at Monasterevan on Friday morning. Write a line from Killarney directed to me at Stradbally.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

2307

Letter withdrawn. Unimportant.

2308

From Henry Warburton

22 January 1836

My Dear Sir,

If, on your way to London, you attend any public meetings at Birmingham or elsewhere, pray take the pains to explain fully to Englishmen what all the evils of an Irish Corporation are and inform your audience that bad as Liverpool or Leicester of old may have been, they are angelic creations as compared to the abominations of your municipalities in Ireland. Dwell upon this, fully explain it to them and take care that what you say is well

reported. I do not say this to you of my own accord but there are those who have desired me to give you the hint.

I suppose that you know that, in spite of his denial, Lord Brougham is universally believed by all who are well informed on what is passing in this world, to have been the author of the articles in the *Morning Advertiser*, having for their object to excite a prejudice against you in the minds of the English. That he is also believed to have written the articles on Reform in the House of Peers in the Leeds paper. I have no doubt that his treachery to his former party in writing the articles in the *Morning Advertiser* has done more than almost any of his former misdeeds to convince the Government of his utter faithlessness.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

2309

From Thomas Spring Rice, Dulwich, London, 31 January 1836

Copy

Explains why his son¹ will not stand for election for Clonmel.² The principal reason is that both he and his son are wholly unconnected with the town.

SOURCE: Monteagle Papers, NLI 553

- 1 Stephen Edmund Spring Rice (1814-1865), eldest son of Thomas Spring Rice.
- 2 Clonmel was vacant due to the death of Dominick Ronayne on 15 January (*Pilot*, 18 Jan. 1836). Nicholas Ball was returned unopposed for the borough on 20 February.

2310

*To William Woodlock*¹

London, 20 February 1836

My dear Woodlock,

You ought to be here² with Mr. Hutton³ as speedily as possible. I have written twice to Murphy accounting for my leaving him in Dublin.⁴ I write to him this day to come over if he still feels jealous, but *you must* come. I do most earnestly implore of you to come. I am ready to give up the petition — I mean its defence — if you do not come. I therefore put it upon *you*. If you refuse me

now that Murphy also comes, it would justify his jealousy, and place me in the most awkward of all possible predicaments. I therefore repeat my most earnest entreaty that you and Hutton will be here as soon as possible, whether Murphy comes or not.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 7325

- 1 William Woodlock (born 1801), attorney, 21 Lr. Ormond Quay, Dublin; son of William Woodlock, Dublin, merchant; educated Trinity College Dublin 1817-21.
- 2 To assist O'Connell in the proceedings before the committee on the Dublin election.
- 3 Robert Hutton (1785-1870), a Presbyterian coachbuilder and merchant; M.P. for Dublin city 1837-41. See *Boase*.
- 4 John Joseph Murphy was agent for O'Connell and Ruthven in the preliminary inquiry before the special commission in Dublin arising from the Dublin city election petition.

2311

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 29 February 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

All well in the Raphael case.¹ He has been examined partly but even on his direct [examination] has let in *all* my case.

Get at my house and send me all the bills and drafts for the Carlow money.² Send me also all the letters³ about Latouche.

[P.S.] In health and spirits.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 28

- 1 On 11 February John Hardy, moved for a parliamentary inquiry into allegations that O'Connell had sold a seat for Co. Carlow to Raphael at the election of June 1835. O'Connell declared the inquiry was necessary in order to clear him of the accusation (for the full debate, see *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXXI, 272-301). A committee of inquiry was appointed on 16 February when Hardy produced copies of correspondence between O'Connell and Raphael in connection with the election (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXXI, 445-96). The committee issued a report exonerating O'Connell from all charge of corruption, though it declared his activities in the affair to have been intemperate (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXXII, 192-3; FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 28-9). An attempt by Hardy on 21 and 22 April to have the House call the report of the committee into question, was defeated when Warburton carried a motion by 238 to 166 in favour of ending the debate (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXXII, 22-114; 122-9; Raphael was examined by the committee on 29 February (*Pilot*, 2 Mar. 1836).
- 2 See above note 1.
- 3 Unidentified.

2312

To Joseph D. Mullen

London, 9 March 1836

My dear Mullen,

The Taxes of 1835¹ have just been decided in our favour. I believe this makes us safe.

I will write to you *every day* until the business is settled. What a triumph last night!² Hurrah!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 47

- 1 On 9 March the Dublin City Election Committee ruled that before a voter could be disqualified for non-payment of the paving-tax, due on 10 January 1835 (see letter 2186 n2), he should be allowed six months credit (*Pilot*, 11 March 1836).
- 2 On the Irish municipal reform bill. On 8 March the Conservatives made a motion in the Commons for abolishing municipal corporations in Ireland and substituting for them direct government by the crown. The motion was defeated by 307 to 243. 'It was a severe defeat, and there was great joy among the ministers at the levée next day' (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 302-3).

2313

To Joseph Denis Mullen

10 March 1836

My dear Mullen,

This day consumed in mere argument.¹ We must therefore look to mere probabilities. What are we to do?

First, suppose *us* unseated. What is to be done? I will, of course, stand. Who is to be the second? Poor Rathven is very, very ill. There cannot be a more honest man. If I am to decide, I would say Ruthven again. But there should be somebody to share the expense with me. I would be satisfied with a La Touche, for I always forget bygone attacks.² I would like a Guinness, a Roe, or a Crosthwaite. But, above all, if William Murphy or John Power would stand, or my old friend Cornelius McLoughlin, then indeed a contest would be a pleasure.

Secondly, if West and Hamilton are seated? Then, *ought there* to be a petition to unseat them for bribery?³ Such a petition could not be presented until they are seated. The proof of bribery is complete. I will *subscribe* one, two, or three hundred pounds.

Canvass these things with the good men and true. It is true that, at present, I do not expect to be unseated. But I may be so, and the chances may be even. It is, however, right to recollect that the state of Ruthven's health is such that a second person may reasonably and without any indelicacy to him be *thought about*.⁴ I will write again tomorrow.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 47

1 In the Dublin city election committee.

2 Unidentified.

3 See letter 2323 n2.

4 See letter 2324 n1.

2314

To Richard Sullivan

London, 10 March 1836

My dear friend,

The decision of last night¹ leaves it in great doubt whether I shall be unseated or not. Nothing has occurred this day sufficiently distinct to confirm or to remove the doubt. What then shall I say to you save that another day must pass before I can positively declare my course. I will withhold your resignation² until in fact I hear from you again. The decision of yesterday governs a great deal of the case but is nothing *decisive*. I must therefore postpone you till tomorrow for the decision.

Write to me in the meantime again. I have not this day *as yet* been able to see Col. Butler but will, please God, in an hour or two. Of course you command my attention to everything in which Kilkenny *is* or you yourself *are* interested. I never can and never will forget your kindness. You have paid me one of the greatest compliments that one man could to another and it is greatly enhanced by the kind and most friendly manner in which you have done it.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

1 See letter 2312 n1.

2 On 16 May O'Connell was declared unseated for Dublin city. On the following day he was elected for Kilkenny city, the sitting member, Richard Sullivan, having vacated the representation.

2315

To Thomas Drummond

London, 16 March 1836

Confidential

My dear Sir,

[Asks for one of the two inspectorships of police to be appointed for Co. Galway for his son-in-law, Nicholas Joseph Ffrench of Frenchlawn, Co. Roscommon.¹ He has been a J.P. for several years for Cos. Roscommon and Galway. He resides in Co. Roscommon. The two M.P.'s for Co. Roscommon have solicited Lord Morpeth on Ffrench's behalf for the appointment.]

I now come to the point on which I want your friendly advice. Ought I to ask this favour myself of Lord Mulgrave or would it not be better *it should be granted* without my asking? It would be perhaps well to be able to say I asked for no such situation for anybody and if so the granting it without my asking would of course greatly enhance the personal favour and obligation. . . . Much as I desire the advantages of the appointment for my son-in-law, I much more desire not to be any impediment to the free exercise of Lord Mulgrave's judgement from which Ireland has derived already so many solid advantages and is likely to derive so many more.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

1 See letter 2322 n1.

2316

To Richard Sullivan

London, 16 March [1836]

My dear friend,

We understand each other perfectly. Unless I be not only unseated but West substituted I will not make use of your resignation.¹ If I be *so* unseated as to be shut out and another *fill* my place I will then take means to canvass you or rather to get you to canvass *for me* in Kilkenny. At present it seems to me that the Committee will unseat me. The thing has again taken an unfavourable turn and unseating appears certain — the question of substitution remains. . . .

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

1 See letter 2314 n2.

2317

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 17 March 1836

... The Ministry are daily becoming more secure. The Tories are quite out of spirits. The public mind set in strongly with our Corporation Bill. I believe we will carry it, even in the lords and with another year of this Administration there is nothing which we can require for Ireland that we *can* be refused. There are better days in store for our country.

I am sorry to tell you that poor Ruthven becomes daily worse. I think it is scarcely possible he should survive¹ many weeks, perhaps not many days. As to a candidate in his place I, for one, deem it my duty not to interfere. Lord Brabazon² would be very good, the best amongst the nobility, as Lord Cloncurry's son³ cannot be in the field. Rowe [sic]⁴ and Crosthwaite⁵ are both excellent. I confess I would prefer Cornelius McLoughlin, William Murphy, or John Power but I repeat, it is not for me to interfere. *You* must take the decision upon yourselves and that the rather as, in any event, I am convinced Ruthven will not outlive the session. Look to it, therefore, in time.

If anything likely to be decisive⁶ arises tomorrow I will write again. If you do not get a letter from me, be convinced that no *aid* to solve the doubt will have arisen during the day.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 48-9

1 See letter 2324 n1.

2 William (Brabazon), styled Lord Brabazon 1826-51 (1803-1887), M.P. for Co. Dublin 1830-32 and 1837-41; high sheriff Co. Dublin 1835, Co. Wicklow 1848; succeeded as 11th earl of Meath in 1851.

3 Edward Lawless (1816-1869), elder surviving son of 3rd Baron Cloncurry; succeeded as 4th Baron Cloncurry 1853.

4 George Roe (died 1863), member of the firm of distillers; lord mayor of Dublin 1843. See *Boase*.

5 Leland Crosthwaite, D.L. (Dublin city), Dollymount, Dublin of Leland Crosthwaite & Sons, merchants, 15 Cope Street, Dublin.

6 In connection with the committee on the Dublin city election petition.

2318

To Joseph Denis Mullen

17 March [1836]

They must still strike off at the least 141¹ before they touch me and there are several more of their own votes bad to swell their difficulties.

If the pipe-water tax² be decided for me they never can reach me. I believe, if it be decided against me, it will turn the election. There would remain the question of whether my adversaries were to be substituted or not. I hope they will not but you must not act on that hope. Prepare for the worst. Prepare your petition and your securities; *above all*, be ready with your securities.³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 49

1 The striking off of voters by the Dublin city election committee.

2 See letter 2186 n2.

3 See letters 2313 n3 and 2323 n2.

2319

To Thomas Lyons

London, 19 March 1836

My dear friend,

I received a few days ago a letter from Charles Sugrue on the same topic with yours — poor Ronayne's £100¹ — Alas, how little would it be necessary for either of you to write to me if I *could* do what you ask me to do. But only think how is it possible for me to go to the Treasury and ask for a £100 for him for any reason. I declare most solemnly I would prefer paying the money three times told myself. But if even I asked it I should be laughed at if not to my face at least the moment I turned my back. It would be said — but I will not worry you with that which is the idlest of idle notions. *My influence* at the Treasury! Do not they know at the Treasury as well as you do that I do not support the ministry for any love for Lord John Russell or for the Whigs but simply because they are standing between Ireland and the Orange faction and doing something to improve our condition. I *ought* never to give a mere Treasury vote.

... I cannot bind myself to any administration by the ties of pecuniary obligation. Indeed, indeed, my ever cherished friend, you must and *will*, I know, excuse me.

Of course Ronayne will think I act unkindly and will disregard me accordingly. That is what occurs to me every day and makes me disgusted with public life. Everybody from one end of the empire to the other writes to me or says to me '*use your influence at the Treasury and I must succeed.*' When I answer I *have not* and *would not* have influence I am disbelieved and I perceive I make an enemy of everybody whom I cannot serve.

Forgive me for writing to you at this length. Give me credit for my sincere anxiety to serve Richard Ronayne if I *could*. You will give me that credit, I am convinced, else I would retire from public life at once.

SOURCE : Papers of William Stanley Harrington

1 Unidentified.

2320

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 22 March 1836

I have been so annoyed with the Dublin Committee.¹ The expense and vexation are so great that I really am not competent to do any other business until this matter is closed. My own expectations are very gloomy. . . .

All other prospects are good, very good; the Ministry very strong. It is now believed that the Corporate Reform Bill² will pass the Lords. It is not as good as we could desire but it annihilates the present wretched system of pauper bigotry and gives a more, but not a sufficiently, extended field for selection.

[P.S.] I implore of you to get the CORN EXCHANGE³ off my hands. It is now useless to me.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 50

1 The Dublin city election petition committee.

2 The Irish municipal reform bill which was passed by the Commons on 28/29 March by 260 votes to 199. It was subsequently rejected by the Lords.

3 Meeting place of the Catholic Association, and various other O'Connellite organizations.

2321

Public letter. Withdrawn.

To Thomas Drummond

London, 24 March 1836

My dear Sir,

Many many thanks for your kind, your very kind letter. I have no doubt but my son-in-law will accept the kindness¹ intended for him. But on this subject I will write to you again and very speedily. . . .

The Dublin university, called Trinity College, has immense estates in Ireland, for example, more than one eighth of the county of Kerry belongs to them.

The present state of that property, or rather its mode of management, is this. It is let at rents in *most* instances, almost in *all* instances, less than a fair value giving or rather leaving a fair profit to the tenants. The College renew the leases annually or biennially upon a graduated scale of fines. The Board are anxious to have the renewals annual and it would also be the best plan for the tenants but for the stamps and expenses of renewal. The present plan is in its consequences most unsatisfactory to the tenants. An omission to renew either from neglect or pressure of pecuniary circumstances ends the tenure. There is a perpetual sense of insecurity of tenure. No person or at least very few risk the laying out of money in any solid or lasting improvements. You would in general know the College lands from other estates by the eye, they are visibly so far back of the others in cultivation. In general the tenants occupying the lands are of the poorest and most wretched description, and when there is an omission to renew them there comes a general turning out of the occupiers and the most frightful scenes of Whiteboyism. Agrarian disturbances, as they are called, ensue. In Kerry one of these instances was followed by many murders and countless executions.

The present plan is also very unsatisfactory to the Fellows for the time being. They have a large increase of income one year, a great diminution perhaps the next. A Senior Fellow who retires to a living may retire the *bad* year and thus lose a sum of money which another gets the moment of promotion. Again, when a tenant totally ceases to renew, all the existing Fellows may be removed before a new lease becomes necessary and thus they lose for ever a large sum which falls into the hands of men who perhaps were not even students when the payment of fines ceased.

Thus the present mode of management is unsatisfactory to all parties. The landlords — the Board — are in a state of uncertainty.

The individuals who *ought* to receive regular income often lose it and no man knows to a certainty what his income will be.

On the other hand the lands cannot be sufficiently cultivated. The tenants must be poor. There is a perpetually recurring danger of insurrectionary crimes. Expensive improvements cannot be made — no towns built, no demesnes created — no plantations — no expensive drainage — with many other mischiefs forbidding the residence of such a class of tenants as are most desirable and most wanting.

The proposal is:

1. That the *Board* should be enabled to make leases in perpetuity.
2. That there should be reserved upon such leases a rent composed of the present annual rent and of the annual fine so that the rent will taken together be as much as is at present paid as well during the existing term as for the reversionary title or term.

Thus perfect justice will be done to everybody, *landlords* and *tenants*.

I should observe that on the College estate there are very extensive tracts of bog and mountain, an immense quantity of which is very capable of cultivation. I believe some hundreds of thousands of acres could and would be brought into tillage if the proposed leases were executed.

This subject was taken up about two years ago by the Board, and Dr. Lefroy was directed by the *Provost* and *Bursar* to bring in a bill to carry the above plan into effect but I should tell you (*in secrecy*) that there was a jealousy amongst the Senior Fellows at not having been consulted. This jealousy prevented the bill being brought in. I believe all the Fellows are now agreed. Dr. Lefroy thinks it much to their advantage.

There has been a draft of the Bill handed to Lord Morpeth. It cannot pass or should not be brought in unless the members for the University are prepared to support. To ascertain this matter I take the liberty of enclosing a letter to Dr. Sandes, the Bursar, which I beg of you to read and then transmit to him. . . .

. . . I could myself locate *many families* upon what is now useless bog if I had such a tenure as *the Bill* would give me to enable me to lay out some hundreds of pounds on these bogs.

You will thus perceive as I intend you should that I am as tenant to the College personally interested in the subject matter. My opinion therefore must be taken with less of reliance than perhaps it would otherwise be entitled to but this circumstance renders me a more competent judge of the facts.

If you deemed it sufficiently important to have a communication with the provost and board, it would I think be of some import-

ance to ascertain "officially" whether they will consent to have the bill passed.²

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 See letter 2315. The 'kindness' was obviously his appointment to a stipendiary magistracy which was made on 10 August 1836.
- 2 Leave to bring in a bill to enable tenants of College lands under certain conditions, to acquire perpetuities in the same, was granted on 8 August 1836. The bill received its first reading on 12 August but was then dropped. (See further letter 2325).

2323

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 28 March 1836

My dear Mullen,

My majority is reduced to nine. I have sent Woodlock to see whether he could not find ten to whom 'the decisions'¹ apply, so that we may tomorrow bring the bribery cases before the Committee and get a decision whether or not the election is merely to be declared void.

You should have by return of post a petition² and the names of two sureties resident in London. The petition should confine itself to bribery — allegation of bribery. This will reduce the expense to a very narrow compass compared with any question of scrutiny, which are the *most* expensive, being exactly my case.

Pray let your *first* petition be here as speedily as possible. Ruthven still breathes³ but, alas! no more than breathes. May the great God be merciful to him! Get your new candidate as speedily as you can. It would be monstrous to seat our adversaries but it is only the more likely to be *so* decided.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 49

- 1 Presumably the decision concerning the payment of taxes (see letters 2186 n2 and 2312 n1).
- 2 Against the seating of West and Hamilton for Dublin city. Two such petitions were presented on 20 May, one of them by O'Connell. A debate as to whether or not to accept these petitions was postponed by Russell to 30 May on which date the attorney general ruled 'with very great reluctance' that they might not be received (*Commons Journal*, LXXXI, 397; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXXIII, 1119-30; 1142-52). On 1 June a further petition from the deputy of the clerk of the crown and hanaper in Ireland against the decisions of the Dublin election committee leading to O'Connell's and Ruthven's being unseated, was also rejected by the House.
- 3 See letter 2324 n1.

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 1 April, 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

The death¹ of poor Ruthven makes no difference in the progress of the petition. It is quite clear that *at the utmost* only one seat can be preserved, mine; and its preservation is still doubtful — very doubtful, to say the most.

You seem to think that Ruthven contributed to the expenses of the petition.² Indeed you say so. Why, my good friend, you are altogether mistaken. He did not contribute one shilling. I have paid all, except what was collected at Dublin; that and £500 of mine were expended on the Commission.³ The most expensive petition that ever was known is the present, because it is a scrutiny of from four to five hundred votes. My loss is enormous but, whilst I have one shilling, I will not allow a single elector to lose his franchise.

Close, instead of drawing the petition according to my directions,⁴ has, I see, been puzzling on the subject of the right to petition. He overlooks the fact that there are fourteen days after the return of any member to petition against his return. Now neither West nor Hamilton is as yet returned. Suppose them *seated*. It would be by this process — a report of the Committee that they were duly elected, and OUGHT *to be* returned. On that report the Clerk of the Crown, in whose custody the writs and returns are, is ordered to attend the House, and he produces the writ and return. He is then ordered to erase the former names and insert the names of the persons who *ought*, according to the report, to be in the return. They are then, on that day, for the first time *returned*, and there are fourteen days from that day to petition against them. And these are the only days on which they can be petitioned against. Let Close recollect that West and Hamilton are not petitioners *at present*. But, really, it is not pleasant that the petition should be delayed by reason of an objection which *we* must be fools if we did not get over if it really existed. Of this, perhaps, more than enough. Let there be two sets of petitions — the one against West and Hamilton, the other against Hamilton, as his *majority* was greater than West's over Ruthven. These petitions should be here before the House sits again. There is no man living to whom I am more indebted than to —⁵, and the independent interest in Dublin owes him the deepest obligation; but I do not want to shift the responsibility

of gratitude off myself. I certainly owe him a debt of gratitude which I never will be able sufficiently to repay, but which I never can forget.

The committee do not sit this day. I am *still* four ahead. The matter stands, I think, thus: the petitioners will probably be able to strike from forty to forty-five off my poll. I ought to be able to strike sixty off theirs. This is the present *rational* prospect; but irrational decisions may alter it totally. The stake may belong to either side of the game. I confess I entertain but small hope of the result.

I go off tomorrow to Northampton on my way to Nottingham where I DINE on the 4th; at Hull, on the 6th; at York, on the 7th; at Whitby, on the 9th. I then visit Gully⁶ at Pomfret, and so back to London by the 13th.

Who are you to have in the place of Ruthven? Let this be looked to; again I say this, and again.

What a foolish meeting about poor laws!⁷ How strange it is that men will commit themselves on so awful a subject without knowing anything of the details; and that most destructive of all experiments, employment for the able-bodied out of the poor rates!!! Just as if poor rates increased capital, when it only distributes it in a different and less economic and less sagacious mode. But it is so easy to be benevolent and humane at the expense of others.

A poor law we must have. We are come to it. We must have it as *the Repeal* slumbers. But not the 43d of Elizabeth,⁸ which directly led, as indeed a necessary consequence, to all the evils of English poor laws. Cobbett wilfully blundered on this point⁹ and he is parroted by our Irish philanthropists. We *must*, however, have a poor law and *poorhouses*, and much of moral degradation and of change in *the mode* of suffering. The cause is injured by the silly, silly course taken at the meeting. I must take an entire part in future to keep them to rights. The last poor law¹⁰ in England is a great improvement; of course not perfect, but giving *us* a model wide indeed of the 43d Eliz.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 50-53

1 Ruthven died on 31 March (*Pilot*, 4 Apr. 1836).

2 Against O'Connell's and Ruthven's return for Dublin city.

3 Arising from the Dublin city election petition.

4 See letter 2323 n2.

5 Very probably Hickman Kearney, a commissioner of the paving board. This conclusion is deduced from a hostile reference to Kearney in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of 17 October 1836, and more especially from letter 1399.

- 6 John Gully (1783-1863), prize-fighter, race horse owner and later colliery proprietor; M.P. for Pontefract 1832-37. See *DNB*. The name Pomfret is sometimes used for the town of Pontefract.
- 7 A meeting of the citizens of Dublin on 29 March under the chairmanship of the lord mayor. On a former letter of O'Connell's being read to the meeting, stating his objections to poor laws on the English system, Joseph Denis Mullen declared that O'Connell had written this letter at a time when Repeal was being agitated, but 'that question was now in abeyance, and he [O'Connell] was a warm supporter of the measure [of poor laws]. In drawing up a petition to parliament in favour of introducing poor laws to Ireland the meeting agreed that 'the gentlemen who were to be entrusted with the petitions should be written to previously to learn their sentiments on the matter' and that the petition would only be transmitted to them in the case of its meeting with their 'unqualified support' (*Pilot*, 30 Mar. 1836). The petition was presented to the Commons on 2 May by William Sharman Crawford (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1836, II, 1282).
- 8 This was the poor law of 1601 which was the basis for the poor law system until 1834 when the new poor law, that is, the poor law amendment act, was passed. The old system allowed for outdoor relief to able-bodied paupers whereas the new system of 1834 established workhouses for such poor.
- 9 See letter 2117.
- 10 That of 1834 (see above note 8).

2325

From Stephen C. Sandes

Trinity College, Dublin, 5 April 1836

My dear O'Connell,

On Thursday last I received from Mr. Drummond your letter of the 23rd of March¹ and on Saturday I consulted the Board on the subject of it and I was directed to report to you their decision against submitting to Parliament the regulation of the Income of the College.

The reasons assigned by the several members varied; but the one which to me appears to be the strongest is one derived from the treatment in the House of Commons of that income during the last session.

The reform bill² gave to the university a large non-resident constituency and enacted that each nonresident elector should pay to the College one pound. The members of the Board appropriated the fund thus created to the building of chambers and lecture halls which are much wanted.

A contract has been actually made for the erection of those buildings.

In the last session a clause³ was introduced at the suggestion of Mr. Shaw by which the income was to be reduced to its seventh part and that clause was adopted by the house. The Bill did not pass the Lords but we are this year threatened with a similar clause.⁴ The College had *not* consented to the introduction of that clause. Now, if this clause pass and the Bill become the law, we cannot feel secure that an arrangement made with our concurrence in one session may not be altered without our concurrence in the next.

Convinced that you are pleased at my promotion⁵ and that you think so favourably of me as to hope that I may be an instrument of good to my country, . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Apparently the letter which O'Connell enclosed with his letter (No.2322) to Drummond of 24 March 1836.
- 2 A reference to sections 60 and 61 of the Irish Reform Act of 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV c.88) which extended the parliamentary suffrage to all graduates with the degree of M.A. or a higher degree on the payment of an annual sum of one pound.
- 3 This referred to a registration of voters in Ireland bill which was passed by the Commons but rejected by the Lords in 1835. On 2 September a petition against the bill from the provost, fellows and scholars of Trinity College, Dublin was presented to the Lords. The clause to which the college objected was one which Frederick Shaw had announced on 19 August he would introduce in committee. It provided that those enjoying the university franchise should pay one pound every seven years instead of once each year (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1835, III, 2618).
- 4 A registration of voters in Ireland bill was introduced to the Commons on 10/11 March 1836 but eventually not proceeded with. The clause concerning Dublin University (see note above) was not part of it.
- 5 His appointment to the bishopric of Killaloe for which he was consecrated on 12 June.

2326

*To Richard Dowden*¹

London, 23 April 1836

My dear Sir,

Mr. Murphy,² the attorney, put into my hands in the lobby of the House a parcel containing, I suppose, the document alluded to in the letter I got from you this day. I beg of you to be quite certain that if I *could* accept such a charge from anyone I would do so at your request as it would give me the greatest pleasure to gratify you in any respect in my power but anything connected with legal proceedings must come to me through an attorney. I

have no attorney either in England or in Ireland, and it was all my life my general rule not to name one for parties as they are so apt to quarrel with their attornies. Indeed my good and esteemed friend the course is mistaken, altogether mistaken. A Scotch title to a Scotch property *ought* to be laid before a lawyer of the Scotch Bar. I am ignorant, very ignorant, of Scotch law. . . .

SOURCE: Dowden Papers

- 1 Richard Dowden, 12 Brown Street and Rathlee, Sunday's Well, Cork, vinegar agent. Mayor of Cork for 1845.
- 2 Probably John Joseph Murphy.

2327

To Archbishop MacHale

London, 28 April 1836

My ever respected Lord,

I of course have felt a deep interest in the fate of Mayo since it has been emancipated from the 'Brownists'¹ but, at the same time, I entertain the confident expectation that all *must* be well when under the eye of your Grace. The only reason I had to entertain the least apprehension was from seeing the published proceedings of Mr. O'Dowd² and others who, at this distance, appeared to me to be placing themselves in the attitude to do mischief.³ I candidly confess that I had hoped that Lord Dillon's son⁴ had been *well* advised to alter his address⁵ and to pledge himself so distinctly to popular principles. I had hoped he had been thus advised by your Grace. If that were the case, I should expect that he would not meet with any opposition from any of the popular party. . . .

Of course, I need not add that I would not give the slightest countenance to any person who had not your approbation. I got a letter this day from R.D. Brown,⁶ stating that he was the candidate who had '*the support of Dr MacHale.*'

If that be so, I most heartily wish him success. . . . You have been so instrumental in liberating the county last election that you ought to have that deference paid to your judgement independent of the many many other *rights* you have to public confidence.

If, therefore, my name can influence a single voter, you may use it in the most absolute and unlimited manner for him whom you deem the best man. I think at this distance that Mr. Dillon is that man. . . .⁷

I will avow anything you do. . . . The only thing I deem the

occasion to require is respectfully to implore of your Grace to take an *active* share in the struggle to prevent mischief and secure good....

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 624-5

- 1 A reference to the defeat of John Denis Browne, M.P. for Mayo, in the general election of 1835 by Dominick Browne (who was elevated to the peerage on 4 May 1836) and Sir William Brabazon.
- 2 James Klyne O'Dowd (1802-1879), eldest son of Roger O'Dowd, Castlebar, Co. Mayo; called to the bar 1832.
- 3 A vacancy was at this time pending in Mayo due to the elevation to the peerage on 4 May of Dominick Browne as Lord Oranmore and Browne. A meeting of the Mayo Independent Club was held on 20 April in Castlebar, under the chairmanship of James O'Dowd to choose between two candidates, Constantine Augustus Dillon and Robert Dillon Browne, who were seeking its support. The latter candidate was chosen. (*Pilot*, 27 Apr. 1836).
- 4 Constantine Augustus Dillon (1813-1853), fourth son of the late Viscount Dillon (died 1832) and brother of 14th Viscount Dillon.
- 5 To the electors of Mayo, dated 30 March 1836 (*Pilot*, 27 April 1836). In this Dillon declared himself a ministerialist.
- 6 Robert Dillon Browne (c. 1809-1850), Ellistron and Glencorrib, Co. Mayo; son of Arthur Browne; M.P. for Co. Mayo 1836-50.
- 7 Dillon Browne was elected on 6 May, defeating John Denis Browne, a former M.P. for Mayo.

2328

To Richard Sullivan

London, 7 May 1836

My dear friend,

I *will* be unseated¹ on Monday or at farthest on Tuesday. I have therefore availed myself of the more than kind sacrifice² you have made and the writ³ issues *this* day having been ordered last night. I have now to ask another favour and that is that you will gratify my best feelings by being the person to propose me. Indeed I should hesitate to stand for Kilkenny if you were to think it right to refuse me this favour. I will send you by this post my address⁴ for your perusal and will be very grateful if you see any omission that you will let me know what it is as I should desire to satisfy you in every particular....

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

- 1 O'Connell was declared unseated by the Commons on Monday 16 May.
- 2 See letter 2314 n2.

3 See letter 2314 n2.

4 O'Connell to the Electors of the Ancient City of Kilkenny, 7 May 1836 (*Times*, 14 May 1836).

2329

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 7 May 1836

My dear Mullen,

The absurd conduct of my Committee¹ leaves the case still undecided but takes from me all chance of ultimate success. I *am* up for Kilkenny² if my opponents be *seated, which I believe they will*. Yet, if they are not, I can stand for Dublin *also*, for I will not leave Dublin if I can avoid it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 53-4

1 The Dublin city election committee.

2 See letter 2314 n2.

2330

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 13 May 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

I *am* desirous to be in Parliament again before the recess, to attend to the Committees, especially the Drogheda railway,¹ which is a speculation of the utmost value if in nothing else in expending £400,000 in labour. . . .

The scrutiny is now closed on my election Committee and before this letter is closed I shall be declared disentitled to my seat. This decision is, of course, bitterly unpleasant to my feelings, but blessed be God, I can look at it without pain and have, on the contrary, the satisfaction to feel relieved, as if a load were taken off my breast. It has, indeed, been an awful load. You are aware that the Dublin part² of the business cost me £650, or thereabouts, exclusive of the sum subscribed in that town. I did not get one shilling assistance for the expenses in London, of the weight of which you may judge when I tell you that I had to pay counsel for 80 days, which you may estimate at the lowest at £75 per day;

that is, in fees to counsel, £6,000; add to that my expenses in Dublin and other expenses here and you will find me at the loss of full £8,000 at the lowest calculation.³ It has cost the opposite party four or perhaps five times that sum but what comfort is *that* to me?

Recollect that I had four other petitions⁴ in my family to defend and five contested elections.⁵ The Youghal Committee⁶ alone cost me more than £2,000.

This conspiracy against me is therefore nearly complete. Why am I thus attacked? It is a compliment the Orange faction pay to my utility.

This may be glorious but it is very vexatious. You, therefore, will see at once that the expenses of my large family here ———. But I am sick, heartily sick of thinking on this subject. There is nothing fictitious in the fury with which I am pursued and persecuted. The worst is that I have lost more than a year from active agitation. I felt, pending this petition, like a winged wild fowl. But my wing is now free. As member for Kilkenny I recommence agitation with an unencumbered energy though with heavily encumbered fortune.

But you know I never despair. My own opinion is that I have before me a field for greater activity in Ireland than any I have as yet gone over. We have struck down the Orange party. We are certain of putting down the Corporators.⁷

Believe me, believe me, Ireland will have many friends who were hitherto decided enemies. No one can foresee what may be made of the change. I am full of hope and, at all events, determined to renew with double activity my struggle.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 54-5

- 1 A petition for a bill for the purpose of making a railway between Dublin and Drogheda was presented on 29 February and referred to a committee headed by O'Connell. The committee reported in favour of the project on 10 March and O'Connell's son Maurice was with others instructed to bring in a bill. This bill was enacted in due course as 6 & 7 Will. IV (Local) c. 132.
- 2 See 2224 note 1.
- 3 See letter 2229 n5.
- 4 For Tralee, Youghal, Meath and Kerry.
- 5 Those for Co. Dublin, Tralee, Youghal, Meath and Kerry.
- 6 See letter 2218 n3.
- 7 The members of the unreformed municipal corporations in Ireland.

2331

To Richard Sullivan

London, Saturday, [14 May 1836]

My dear friend,

I am unseated, that is I will be so on Monday. On Tuesday you all will return me.¹

Tell the 'boys of Kilkenny' that it is my firm intention as long as I remain in parliament to solicit and I hope to merit their suffrages and theirs alone.

My qualification may be called for. Give in for me 'lands situate in the parishes of *Caherciveen, Glanbegh, Dromid, the Priory and Kilcrohan*' in the County of Kerry. The form will be found in any book on elections. It is not necessary to specify the names of the lands and therefore I do not send them. Unless required by an elector or candidate do not give any qualification in.

The parliamentary papers shall go to you as long as I represent Kilkenny.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

1 For Kilkenny city (see letter 2314 n2).

2332

To Rev. Eugene Mulholland

19 Langham Place [London], 15 May 1836

Revd. Sir,

I beg leave most respectfully to decline any interview with you. I mean you no offence whatsoever; I am incapable of intending it; but I decline to see you for the same reason that I decline to answer your letter.

First, your case¹ is not one in which Parliament can give any relief. The Parliament has not the least control over the discipline of the Catholic Church, any more than with its faith; and, with the blessing of God, never shall.

Second, I cannot but express in as strong terms as are consistent with my unfeigned respect for your reverent character, my disapprobation of the action you brought in the courts of law against another Catholic priest with whom all differences should be settled amicably or by a reference to spiritual superiors; and I think a clergyman ought rather submit to such a wrong than give

scandal by litigation. I do remember well that the action was a source of much scandal, and I cannot venture to differ in opinion with your Bishop as to the judgement he may have formed respecting you after having brought that action to trial.

Any attempt to bring the matter before Parliament would be only another cause of scandal and will only make it impossible for you to obtain the sanction of any Catholic prelate to your appointment to a parish. In my humble opinion there is but one proper course open for you, and that is unqualified submission to your spiritual superior, the distinction between civil and spiritual authority being, to my mind, quite plain. In civil matters every man may, and ought to, right himself according to the law; in spirituals, especially between clergymen, authority should be respected and no appeal made save from one spiritual superior to one in a higher degree until either justice be done or the higher authority appealed to in vain. Even if in vain, injustice in that respect is, in my judgement preferable to scandal which, after all, will afford no redress.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 55-6

- 1 Rev. Eugene Mulholland, D.D., was seeking reinstatement as curate in the parish of Termonfeckin, Co. Louth, in the diocese of Armagh. A quarrel with another priest seems to have been the origin of the affair. In his efforts to be reinstated Mulholland took a civil action, appealed to Rome, and had a petition presented to the Lords on 7 June 1836 and Commons on 29 June 1836 (*Pilot*, 10, 20, 22, 27 June, 3 August 1836; *Lords Journal* LXVIII, 273; *Commons Journal*, LXXXI, 584; *Mirror of Parliament*, 1836, II, 1734-9, 2136-8).

2333

To Joseph Denis Mullen

London, 24 May 1836

My dear Mullen,

All is over. No costs. West and Hamilton seated.¹ Two votes more would have served me; but let bygones be bygones and think no more of them. Whether or not the Committee will give leave to proceed for bribery against the now seated members is a question. My own opinion is that you are entitled *as of right* to do so. Send me a petition to that effect — that is, for bribery — so as to have the question discussed.² Your vagabond friend, George Howell,³ has been bothering me about the Poor Laws.⁴ His single vote made the entire difference — a difference of two on the scrutiny⁵ — and

they could not have struck off two more, I believe. My mind has not been at ease for the last fifteen months till now. The expense has been enormous. I now only rejoice that I have a representation⁶ which costs me nothing, and cannot be disputed with, nor by any petition.

I stood by my constituents to the last at an expense of much more than £6,000.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 59

- 1 See letter 2328 n1.
- 2 The petition was dispatched but was rejected by the Commons (see letter 2323 n2).
- 3 George Howell, J.P., Simmons Court Castle, Dublin; of Howell, Gilpin and Company, army clothiers, 33 Molesworth Street, Dublin.
- 4 Howell was a participant in the recent Dublin meeting in favour of poor laws (see letter 2324 n8).
- 5 The scrutiny of the list of voters by the Dublin city election committee ended in giving O'Connell's opponents, Hamilton and West, a majority of one (*Times*, 16 May 1836). Howell had voted against O'Connell (*Proceedings at the Election for the City of Dublin . . . to which is added a List of the Voters*, [Dublin, 1835], 95). Had he (or any other anti-O'Connell voter) voted for O'Connell, the result of the scrutiny would have been to confirm O'Connell in his seat.
- 6 As M.P. for Kilkenny city.

2334

To P. V. FitzPatrick

May 1836¹

I enclose you a quizzing letter I have just got. I showed it to Pierce Mahony who says the seal is so remarkable that our friend Pim will probably be able to trace the owner of it, and yet I scarcely think it worth while to take even that trouble.

I suppose I shall be unseated the day you receive this, principally by reason of the non-payment of a few shillings of pipe-water and wide-street tax.² So it is. It has, however, cost me enormously.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 60

- 1 This letter must have been written before 15 May since the Dublin city election committee declared O'Connell to be unseated on the 14th (*Times*, 16 May 1836). FitzPatrick erroneously gives the date as the 29th.
- 2 See letter 2186 n2.

2335

To his wife

London, 30 May 1836

My own darling Love,

Your letter of this morning gave me infinite delight. May the great God send that your improvement will continue. I intend to go down to you on Saturday if you can tell me how far from you is the nearest Mass. Find that out, darling.

I regret I can scarcely write you a line this day. I had a glorious journey, blessed be God. You can have no notion of how fond these English are grown of me, darling, nor how little I deserve *anybody* to be fond of me. Is not that so, sweetest? But I do doat of you, my own own Mary. I desire to obey your commands in everything, dearest love. Unfortunately your note was sent to me to Ipswich so that you could not have got Elmore's answer sooner. I trust it will go by this post.

I think, dearest, you had better remain at the Wells¹ as long as you find the waters agreeing with you. They are certainly the very best for your complaint. Do not, however agreeable it may be to me, give me a flattering account of your health. Tell me, darling, nothing but the truth.

. . . Fitz-Simon came in this morning and I gave him the nursery to sleep in. He looks very well and left the darlings and their dearest mother in excellent health. . . . John is not yet come.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Probably Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

2336

To his wife

London, 31 May 1836

[No salutation]

I expected, darling, to have heard from you today but I suppose you are angry at my not writing to you while I was in Suffolk.¹ Forgive me, dearest. I know you will after *punishing* me by one day's silence. I am indeed punished by not hearing from you in your present state. Elmore speaks to me cheerfully of your state of health. May the great God grant his anticipations may be realized. But do, I implore of you, write every day, one line if you

cannot write more but let me at all events have one line. I am sorry to tell you that I cannot go down next Saturday because on Sunday Mr. Magee's sermon will be preached *for the support* of his chapel.² I of course must make a prominent figure at the collection. You know, love, that I could not possibly refuse my friend Mr. Magee. But I will take care that nothing shall interfere with my going down to you the following Saturday. Say whether you receive the newspapers regularly and if you want money. I need not say how readily I will send it to you.

There are no news. The Ministry are in my opinion daily becoming stronger. I am pleased with the termination of the Dublin business³ as it leaves me free to attend to other business of every kind. I am writing to you in the chair of the Drogheda Rail Road Committee⁴ with a bad pen and worse paper. . . .

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 O'Connell addressed a public meeting and was entertained at a public dinner in Ipswich by the reformers of the borough on 27 May. (*Pilot*, 30 May 1836). On 28 May he was entertained at a similar dinner in Bungay, Suffolk (*Pilot*, 1 June 1836).
- 2 St. Mary's parish church, Romney Terrace, Marsham Street, Westminster.
- 3 His unseating on petition for Dublin city.
- 4 See letter 2330 n1.

2337

To Thomas Drummond, Dublin Castle

London, 20 June 1836

My dear Sir,

I beg leave to enclose you two letters which it seems to me merit to have the writers prosecuted. The first has lain by me some time partly from the pressure of public and private business and partly out of contempt for its writer. I have however seen in a recent paper that a person of the name of Roberts¹ has been promoted in the Irish Constabulary and, if it be the George Roberts who wrote to me, I must in that case respectfully but firmly claim his immediate removal. I of course did not answer the letter.

The second letter I have very recently received and I answer it by this post, telling the writer that I had transmitted it to you for prosecution.

I beg your early attention to these matters. It is really time to have persons of this description exposed. If however Roberts be

the person lately promoted and that he be dismissed I would not require further punishment. If also Langley² resigns the appointment he now has it may be a sufficient punishment. Yet in these respects I of course refer to the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown and to his excellency's pleasure. But if this be *the Roberts* he is clearly unfit for any situation under Government.³

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 A Capt. John Cramer Roberts, Armagh, of the Irish Constabulary was appointed inspector for Ulster on 11 June 1836.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 On the back of this letter is the following statement: 'I think it might be successfully contended that the writing such letters to a Member of Parliament was a misdemeanour indictable at Common Law. But the Statute 49 Geo. III c. 126 renders it perhaps unnecessary to consider that question as, in my opinion, the writers may be proceeded against for a misdemeanour under that act. The letters should be submitted to the Attorney-General for his opinion and directions. — M[aziere] Brady, 25 June 1836'. Brady was at this time law adviser to the chief secretary.

2338

To Lord Duncannon

Langham Place [London], 23 June 1836

My Lord,

Before I proceed to the object of this letter I beg leave to assure you that if I was asked who the person in the circle of my public or personal acquaintance is who would be most incapable of doing any act of duplicity or dishonour, I should not hesitate to name Lord Morpeth. It is, therefore, impossible that I should intend him any offence. I merely mean to assert myself. Under this impression I beg leave to place in your Lordship's hands a letter which I received from Lord Morpeth but which I cannot consent to retain in mine. I owe it to myself to refuse any species of compromise. I may be treated with indignity and trampled under foot. The administration has now the power to do so but I will be no party to any compromise.

The reason I take the liberty of giving your Lordship this trouble is because you were so good as to tell me that any communication I had to make to the government should be made through you or Mr. Ellice. He is out of the country.

I submit these facts to the Government:

First, when the Spirit License Bill¹ was brought in, deputations from the publicans and from the grocers came to London to

attend to their respective interests.

Second, to a certain extent these interests were identical; in other respects they were adverse.

Third, they appealed to me as their chief manager and supporter. I of course, accepted that offer. Most of them were my most active, useful and valuable constituents.

Fourth, I waited on Lord Morpeth *with* and *from* them and all the objections were fully discussed, some yielded to and others rejected.

Fifth, the bill was altered accordingly and finally settled.

Sixth, the grocers were perfectly satisfied with the bill as thus arranged by the government.

Seventh, the publicans were still somewhat dissatisfied but I overruled their objections.

Eighth, I sent both deputations home, telling them they had nothing more to fear or to attend to.

Under these circumstances the Bill was brought in; it passed through its stages. Fully confiding in the faith of Government I, of course, took no further trouble about it.

At the third reading two alterations² were made in it without the least intimation to me or to any of the persons interested.

The first of these is the recognition by law of 'the Friendly Brothers',³ a society always deeply Orange but now affording the full opportunity to reestablish Orange lodges, nay, the full Orange system under this name. I solemnly warn the Government of this obvious and, indeed, inevitable consequence and having done so, I have no more to say on that point.

Secondly, 'the power of selling spirits to be consumed on the premises' is taken away from the grocers. It was to resist this principally the deputation came here. They succeeded before on this point; confiding on [*sic*] the Government, I sent them home. I pledged myself that there could be no danger to their interests without their being heard in their defence. Yet without notice, without hearing, at the mere motion of Mr. Recorder Shaw, these worthy and excellent people are stripped of a valuable right and I am justly liable to the accusation of having deluded and betrayed them. They will, of course, proclaim my neglectful treachery.

I most respectfully but firmly insist that the Government is bound on the plainest principles of honour and integrity, to free me from this more than awkward situation. It can be done *only* by dropping or throwing out *that* Bill.⁴

I, indeed, scarce dare hope for this justice. I do anticipate that the government will trample on me, as they certainly now have the power to do, and as Lord Morpeth's letter intimates they will; for

I repeat, my lord, I cannot consent to compromise my integrity. I will not enter into any compromise. It would be quite unworthy of me.

Of course, your lordship will feel that I must be at liberty to state in the House and to the public the precise manner in which I have been — used, for I will not use a harsh word, as the last thing in the world I *could* mean would be to give offence; but having been made the instrument of a deception, however unintentional on Lord Morpeth's part, I must, in my own vindication, put the matter on its right footing. I must state the reasons I had to confide and the unhappy result.

Whilst this, allow me to call it insult, is unremoved it will be out of my power to hold any communication with the Government, although their general measures may command my support.

It is foolish, but I cannot help adding I do not think I deserved this indignity.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 60-62

- 1 Morpeth and O'Loughlen were ordered on 29 March to bring in a bill to amend the laws relating to excise licenses, and to the sale of wine, spirits, beer and cider by retail in Ireland. The bill was enacted on 28 July (6 & 7 Will. IV c. 38). See letters 2542 and 2630.
- 2 On the third reading Frederick Shaw carried, without a division, the insertion of a clause prohibiting grocers from retail sale of spirits to be consumed on their premises, and permitting the sale by them only of spirits in measures of not less than two quarts for consumption elsewhere. (Hansard, 3rd Ser., XXXIV, 665; *Commons Journal*, XCI, 524).
- 3 The Order of the Friendly Brothers of St. Patrick of which the Dublin house was at 14 (later numbered 15) Upper Sackville Street. The order was founded in the seventeenth century (see A. M. Frazer, 'The Friendly Brothers of St. Patrick,' *Dublin Historical Record*, XIV, 2 [August 1956], 34-40).
- 4 The bill was neither dropped nor amended. As enacted, it contained the prohibition on retail sale of spirits by grocers. A further clause, directed against illegal assemblies or assemblies of any body displaying 'arms, flags, colours, symbols, decorations or emblems' taking place in drinking-houses, excluded from the latter category Freemasons, and 'Members of the Society' called 'the Friendly Brothers'. 'This act caused serious inconvenience and loss to the grocers all over Ireland' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 63-4 n2; see further letters 2340 and 2341).

2339

To Viscount Morpeth

10 Langham Place [London], 24 June 1836

Mr. O'Connell owes it to himself to inform Lord Morpeth — and which he does without intending any disrespect — that some recommendations of persons to Lord Morpeth were signed by him before he received his Lordship's letter last night. He therefore begs Lord Morpeth will consider these recommendations as retracted as of course he could not direct any such to a government which deliberately perseveres in the — he must say — unmerited insult and dignity inflicted on him.¹

SOURCE : Castle Howard Papers

1 See letter 2338

2340

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 June 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

The clause¹ the grocers so justly complain of was passed without any intimation or the slightest idea that the Government would permit it to pass. I never was so shocked in my life. However, for the present, keep all our friends quiet. I have taken the most vigorous steps in my power to get rid of the clause or of the bill. Do not let this get into the newspapers but I am leaving no stone unturned to prevent the mischief and I think I must succeed. All the friends of the Government admit that we have been ill-treated. My hopes will, I trust, be realised before the post leaves this on Monday. If not, a deputation of the grocers must be ready to start the moment you receive my letter of Monday. I have already refused all compromise. Take care the grocers do not interfere with my plan by an offer of that kind, as I insist that the clause must be altogether expunged and the bill restored to what it was when the Irish Members agreed to it. You may read this letter to each of our friends in the trade, but do not give any copy of it or have it in print. It is impossible for any man to be more decided than I am to get this obnoxious clause put aside. My hopes, I repeat, are strong of success. Do not insert any private business in your letters on this subject. This caution relates to

your postscript.² I wish you had not inserted it. You could have written in on another paper, and then I could show your letter to the Ministry.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 63

1 See letter 2338.

2 FitzPatrick's letter is not extant.

2341

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Committee, Drogheda Railway, 27 June 1836

Confidential

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is, or will be right. The grocers may rest satisfied that *the law* will not be altered in their disfavour.¹ The precise mode of preserving their interests is not agreed upon but the fact that they *shall be* preserved is certain — I now say, quite certain. I have only to add that it is likely that this object will be *most* satisfactorily arranged by a deputation of the grocers coming here — one, two or three intelligent persons capable of showing *the mischiefs* which would accrue to the grocers from the proposed clause.

It is impossible for any man to regret more than Lord M[orpeth] does that the clause was allowed to pass. I repeat that I am CERTAIN that the clause will never be law but let the deputation come at once, and as *quietly* as possible.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 64

1 See letter 2338 n4.

2342

To Archbishop MacHale

National Bank of Ireland, 39 Old Broad St. London, 2 July 1836
My ever-respected Lord,

I have brought your Grace's letter *here* in order to have your recommendation complied with. There could be no difficulty in making out the appointment at once if you had been able to certify to Mr. Fitzgerald's¹ *knowledge of business*.

The situation of *manager* requires a familiar habit of keeping accounts of a complicated nature.

If Mr. Fitzgerald be *such a clerk*, his appointment as manager is certain; but if he be not, then we could and would instantly appoint him as *local director*. The salary of a *manager* would be about £200 a year, the director's salary £50 a year. The manager must give his entire time to the Bank. The director's attendance is not severe. It will be *now* for your Grace to say which office Mr. Fitzgerald is suited for, and *will accept*. I have only to add that his appointment can be made out the moment you please to *decide*.

For myself, I wish to tell you in strict confidence that I desire, very ardently, that all *good men* — all those we should desire to see *safe* — should, as speedily as they can, disembarass themselves from the Agricultural Bank.² I feel it a duty to tell you the fact that it is certain that until lately, if at all, there was no partnership deed executed.

I believe there is not a *real* company formed. They cannot, as I conceive, *endure* long. Their resources for capital must necessarily be small, their expenses great.

To me, who am become familiar with banking operations, I cannot conceive how it is possible that that Bank should *hold out*. I say this, my Lord, for your own guidance, if you should have to advise in confidence with any person on the subject, or if you felt any duty to give a private warning to any person.

Of course, I should most anxiously desire not to say any thing to *injure* the establishment of that Bank.

I speak merely *in fear*. I may, of course, be mistaken but my own opinion is that the Agricultural Bank will bring ruin on thousands.

You are, my Lord, aware of the political state of this country. I intend for Ireland to propose the revival of the Catholic Association in a new name and somewhat broader basis. It will bear the name of 'The General Association of Ireland',³ to be dissolved so soon as full corporate reform and a satisfactory adjustment of the tithe are obtained by law.

I intend to have the 'Irish rent'⁴ to replace the Catholic rent and to find a friend to indemnify *tithe victims*⁵ but this part of the arrangement will require discretion, tact, and some cautious management. You will see my plans fully developed in the *Pilot* of Wednesday.

The state of parties here is singular — as yet undefined in object. The Tories have not as yet flattered themselves with coming into power. The popular party have not as yet framed any plan. There is much indignation, much discontent fomenting.

As far as the English and Scotch towns are concerned, the

public mind is decidedly favourable to Ireland.

I, however, am upon the whole convinced that the rejection by the lords of *our Bill*⁶ will work for good. I will be leaving London in a few weeks.

The last *debate* this session will take place in Monday and after that I am determined to go to Ireland to organise the agitation.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 625

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 It suspended payment in November 1836. See letter 2091 n3.
- 3 See letter 2343 n3.
- 4 See letter 2343 n3.
- 5 A new tithe war was at this time in progress throughout Ireland. The Mulgrave administration had initially adopted the policy of withholding police and military assistance from persons attempting to collect tithe. In the autumn of 1835, however, a body entitled the 'Lay Association of Ireland for the protection of Church Property', backed by a large number of Tory peers, undertook to finance the parsons in litigation for the recovery of tithe arrears. The Association adopted the expedient of applying to the court of exchequer for decrees against tithe defaulters, and one of its lawyers, William Smith, persuaded that court to revive a writ, long obsolete, called a 'Writ of Rebellion', which enabled the court to virtually out-law persons ignoring its decrees, and oblige all citizens, police and military included, to assist in their apprehension on pain of themselves being arraigned. The court hired special 'Commissioners of Rebellion', provided with extensive powers of breaking and entry, to arrest recalcitrant defaulters, and in the spring of 1836 compelled the government to provide these officers with police and military protection in the performance of their duty. Throughout 1836-7 commissioners of rebellion succeeded in arresting and imprisoning a large number of tithe defaulters. The General Association undertook with some success to finance counter-litigation for the protection of tithe defaulters from such writs (see Gerard J. Lyne, 'The General Association of Ireland, 1836-7' unpublished M. A. thesis, University College, Dublin, 1968).
- 6 The Irish municipal reform bill.

2343

To David R. Pigot

London, 2 July 1836

My dear Pigot,

I attended to everything you wrote to me about upon political topics. The Registry Bill¹ will not pass this year. The Corporate Reform Bill was *amended*² by Lord John against my consent. I protested in private against the compromise but was driven in public to support *the party*; and it is now well I did so, as we have had the credit of moderation without being tied to any

restrictive enactments. The Lords *will* enact nothing for us.

We must have the *General Association of Ireland*³ to replace the Catholic. We must have an 'Irish Rent,' or rather 'The Rent for Ireland,' to replace the Catholic Rent. The General Association must not *link* itself to any other; it must confine its meetings to the members of the Association; and if it shall allow any stranger to enter, he must pay a shilling. I want half a dozen men to *work* this system. I will go over myself to set it on its legs. But it *must* and *shall* succeed. Prepare to have the first meeting held on Thursday, the day after my letter is published.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 423

- 1 The registration of voters in Ireland bill (see letter 2325 n4.) On 18 July it was killed by having its further consideration postponed for two months. The popular party in Ireland feared this bill would afford large advantages to the Tories on the registry (see Lyne, 'General Association').
- 2 On 18 May the Lords had virtually destroyed the Irish municipal reform bill with an amendment providing for the abolition of all the Irish municipal corporations. As a compromise Russell announced that the government would provide only the eleven largest cities and towns with corporations and would place the remaining towns under direct administration by the crown. The bill in its new form was rejected by the Lords on 27 June (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 244-6).
- 3 The General Association of Ireland (or, as it is sometimes called, the National Association) was founded in Dublin on this day (2 July). The members of an already existing petition committee (founded on 18 May 1836 for the purpose of getting up petitions to parliament in favour of municipal and tithe reform) constituted themselves a 'National Association for Municipal Reform and Settlement of the Tithe Question', and declared their sittings permanent pending the satisfactory adjustment of those questions. They agreed however to await O'Connell's advice for the further regulation of the new body. This advice was published a few days later (O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 4 July 1836, *Pilot*, 6 July 1836). O'Connell laid down that the association should agitate for a municipal reform commensurate with that already granted England and Scotland, and for a 'satisfactory' settlement of the tithe question, while at the same time rallying support for the ministry and preserving the peace in Ireland. The Association was to seek 'no profession of any principles save those of obtaining justice for Ireland through the instrumentality of the United Parliament', and was to be dissolved so soon as its objects should be achieved. During the period of its existence from July 1836 to November 1837 the association acted, among other things, as a centre for organising the liberal registry, playing an important part in the Liberal election successes of 1837, and also undertook the legal defence of tithe victims in the courts (see letter 2342 n5). It levied a 'Justice Rent' throughout the country, effected a working combination of Whigs, Liberals and Repealers and secured strong clerical backing (see Lyne, 'General Association').

2344

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 2 July 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

I had written thus far¹ to Pigot when I recollected that he will probably be in Ennis on the 5th and consequently out of Dublin when this letter arrives. Do you therefore get some good men and true to be ready with a requisition so as to put the new Association upon its legs at once. I will begin with £70 for my family and descendants. We must have a large fund to meet all exigencies. The Government will *not* discountenance us. Our organisation will be complete. Treasurers, Finance Committee, Committee for each Province, a person responsible for each county, Registry Committees *out* of Dublin. I will myself be in Dublin so soon as my loved Mary's health allows me. She is not so well this day as she was yesterday, but I will be with you as soon as I can.

Every man who subscribes one shilling will have his name enrolled. Every man who subscribes a pound to be a member, being proposed and seconded. In short, all and more than the Catholic Association has done. This is the precious moment to set to England one example more. I am determined that nothing shall prevent me from working out my plan. One way or the other, we must succeed in obtaining justice for Ireland.

I write to Barrett a letter, a short one for publication.² This is private, that is, not for the newspapers. Can you get me ten names of men who will work? If I had but *ten* real *working* men it would be quite enough. Surely ten such men can be found. The day of meeting must be *Thursday*, to give the weekly papers time to send the debates to the country.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 423

1 Letter 2343

2 O'Connell to Barrett, 2 July 1836, (*Pilot*, 4 July). In this letter O'Connell sketched his plans for the formation of the General Association.

2345

To Thomas Drummond

London, 9 July 1836

My dear Sir,

I return the letters and the Attorney-General's decision.¹ I am glad he came to that determination as I have done my part and shall have no more trouble about the matter.

Will you allow me to recommend to your attention Mr. Riley² of the Paving Board who acted in the most honourable and conscientious manner during the Dublin Commission. Could I ask of you to send for him at any leisure moment and to assure him that I had felt it my duty to recommend him as an honest and trustworthy public officer to the Government. He is in my opinion deserving of promotion in the event of a favourable opportunity.

You are all going on exceedingly well in Ireland. God grant you may be continued to us.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI MSS 2152

1 See letter 2337.

2 John Reily, secretary of the paving board.

2346

To William Woodlock

London, 9 July 1836

Confidential

My dear Woodlock,

Will you tell my friend O'Doherty¹ that it would give me the greatest pleasure to be of any use to him but I find it impossible to approach law patronage. Lord Plunket has stomach enough for ten times as much, and our friend the attorney-general² either cannot or will not assist. I believe he cannot, because I have too good an opinion of him to think the latter. The upshot is that I am unable at present to assist O'D[oherty] but especially because I am told there is to be no vacancy.

I beg of you to attend to my complaint³ against Alderman Smyth. You will get copies of the papers, and make out for me the evidence. Maley will help you in private; so will Reilly.⁴ Act in my name and for me. Stock⁵ the barrister is to be the person to enquire and report. Reilly has already sworn to the principal

fact. Examine Mr. [Mc] Kane⁶ the barrister as a witness. In short, follow it up with vigour. He is a man not entitled to anything save the hostility of every friend to truth and justice. One blow well struck upon him will render the rest of the gang tame as gelt cats. Of course I will pay cheerfully your costs.

[P.S.] Tell Mr Reilly in private that I have mentioned the propriety of his conduct⁷ to Mr. Drummond. Do not do this till after he is examined.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 7325

- 1 Very probably Charles O'Dougherty, attorney of 21 Lower Ormond Quay and Londonderry. William Woodlock was of the same Dublin address.
- 2 Michael O'Loughlen.
- 3 O'Connell succeeded in obtaining in October 1836 an inquiry into Smyth's conduct as chief commissioner of the Dublin paving board during the late election (for an account of the inquiry see *Pilot*, 14, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31 Oct., 2 Nov. 1836).
- 4 That is, John Reilly, secretary of the paving board.
- 5 Joseph Stock (1787-1855) 4th son of Joseph Stock, late bishop of Waterford (died 1813); K.C. 1835; judge of the court of admiralty of Ireland 1838-55; M.P. for Cashel 1838-46. See *Boase*.
- 6 Thomas McKane, called to the bar 1803; youngest son of William McKane of Dublin. Counsel to the paving board and to the police establishment.
- 7 In connection with the complaint against Alderman Smyth (see letter 2345).

2347

*To Bishop Thomas Griffiths*¹

Langham Place [London], Saturday night [16 July 1836]
My Lord,

Having had a complaint made to me that the Catholic paupers in St. Clement Danes' workhouse were prevented [from] going to Mass on Sundays, I thought it right to expostulate on the subject and have just received the accompanying documents.² . . . I should hope that a precedent may under the prudent management of your Lordship be established which may be cited in all other workhouses that may contain Catholic paupers. It is consolatory to see that the Government are anxious to give satisfaction on these points.

SOURCE: Wiseman Papers, Westminster Diocesan Archives

- 1 Thomas Griffiths (1791-1847), bishop of Olena *in partibus* and Vicar Apostolic 1836-47. See *DNB*.
- 2 The documents sent by Lord John Russell (see letter 2348).

2347a

*To John Easthope, 16 July 1836,
from 10 Langham Place, London*

Recommends 'my friend Mr. John Stevenson'¹ for the post of Irish correspondent for the *Morning Chronicle*. O'Connell states that Stevenson was 'sometime editor of an excellent popular newspaper in the north of Ireland'. On the back of the letter is noted: 'Ansd. July 21.'

SOURCE: Duke University Library

- 1 Sometime editor of the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*.

2348

From Lord John Russell

Whitehall [London], 16 July 1836

Sir,

I transmit herewith a letter of Mr. Frankland Lewis¹ and a report respecting the R.C. paupers in the parish of St. Clement Danes.

SOURCE: Wiseman Papers, Westminster Diocesan Archives

- 1 Thomas Frankland Lewis (1780-1855), M.P. continually 1812-35, Radnor Burghs 1847-55; chairman of poor law commission 1834-39. See *DNB*.

2349

To William Woodlock

London, 16 July 1836

My dear Woodlock,

I have time at length to answer you kind letter. I have no objection to avow myself the prosecutor of Smyth if it be re-

quisite to name me, but you must check Maley's disposition to attack any others of the commissioners.

I care but little for Morris,¹ but I would not for any consideration touch a hair of the head of Hickman Kearney. He once did me an *essential service*,² and I must not injure him for any consideration in the world. Keep this always in your mind. I would rather fail than risk any injury to Kearney. Besides, you will see a tangible point against Smyth in Reilly's evidence and in the evidence of Mr. [Mc]Kane, the counsel to the Board; but with this hint as to Kearney, I leave everything else to your own discretion. The rest of the Board, at worst, only followed Smyth.

I fear I shall not leave London before the close of another fortnight.

[P.S.] By being discreet in your communications, Maley will aid you powerfully.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 7325

- 1 Lt.-Col. George Morris (1774-1858), member of the paving board; second son of Col. Samuel Morris, Littleton, Co. Tipperary; knighted 1841. See *Boase*.
- 2 See letter 1399.

2349a

To Lord Palmerston

10 Langham Place [London], 3 August 1836

My Lord,

The Right Rev. Dr. England will hand you this letter. He is desirous to have the honour of a few moments conversation with your lordship. May I be permitted to request for him that favour?

SOURCE : Broadlands MSS

2350

To Lord Glenelg

Langham Place, London, 3 August 1836

My Lord,

Not being able to have the honour of presenting to your Lordship the Rt. Rev. Dr. Fleming,¹ the Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland, I take the liberty of introducing him to you now, he has come over on business of great importance to his diocese. I am sorry to be obliged to assure your Lordship that the Catholics, though the greater number, have much reason to complain of the treatment they received from the local authorities. No man has been worse used than the very exemplary prelate — Dr. Fleming — who takes you this letter. His zeal has been too successful in the erection of chapels and schools not to excite the resentment of persons of illiberal notions, and he has, therefore, been resisted and opposed where co-operation ought to have been given. He is ready and willing to enter into the fullest explanations, and he can, unfortunately, demonstrate the *unpleasant* spirit in which the local authorities deal with their fellow subjects — the Catholics of the colony. I feel that he has only to bring *the facts* before you to be certain of success.

SOURCE: *Irish World*, 22 June 1889

- 1 Michael Anthony Fleming, O.S.F. (1792-1850), Catholic bishop of Newfoundland 1829-50; born at Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Tipperary. Brought to Newfoundland as a missionary in 1823 by Bishop Scallan.

2351

From William Williams,¹ London, 6 August 1836

Encloses an invitation (not extant) from the reformers of Coventry to a public dinner, apparently planned in honour of O'Connell.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Williams (1789-1865), son of Thomas Williams, Wales; a Manchester warehouseman in Watling Street, London; M.P. for Coventry 1835-47; for Lambeth 1850-65. See *Boase*.

2352

To Lord Mulgrave

Derrynane, 24 August 1836

My Lord,

Tralee Harbour

I had the honour of receiving your Excellency's letter of the 15th of August on the subject of the Tralee Canal Harbour¹ and in the first instance, it is my pleasing duty to express the deep sense of gratitude which your active exertions to become acquainted with the utility to the public of the Tralee harbour and your continued attention to this object of public importance has excited in the mind of all those who are interested in the completion of that work. For my own part I can only express respectfully my surprise and admiration at witnessing that you are able to work out in detail the principle of government so calculated to pacify Ireland by convincing the people that their best interests are bound up with the stability of the existing authorities.

I take the liberty of sending with this letter a copy of the memorial of the Harbour Commissioners to the Treasury. The details of that memorial are these: *first*, the original estimate of expense made by the Government engineer and by the directions of the then lord lieutenant was £8,000; *second*, that one half and upwards, that is, exactly £4,800 were subscribed as a donation or free gift by private individuals; *third*, that afterwards *that* engineer, Mr. Griffiths,² altered the plan to an extent that required and still requires an outlay of about £6,000 so that the entire expense would be about £14,000; *fourth*, the work had been in progress long before these alterations were made; *fifth*, a *loan* has been obtained of £6,000; *sixth*, that it is now discovered that to complete the works altogether £15,500 must be expended, leaving a deficit of about £5,000.

Under these circumstances the works must be abandoned, the contractors totally ruined, the public deprived of all chance of a good harbour, one of the most rising towns in the British Empire stopped in its career of prosperity, unless a *grant* of, say £5,000 be obtained from the Board of Works. . . .

The defects in the plan as originally laid down and as altered are all attributable to the government engineer. . . .

You, my Lord, have taken the trouble to inspect the work and the state of the town. . . the miserable state of its natural harbour. . . .

I therefore beg leave earnestly to press these facts as creating a case for a grant or free gift of £5,000 to complete the harbour.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 A petition was presented to the Commons on 18 February 1836 by O'Connell's son Maurice, from the commissioners of Tralee harbour, for a bill to extend the time for completing the navigable canal authorised to be made by the act, 9 Geo. IV (Local) c. 118, 'from a point at or near the Black Rock in the Harbour of Tralee . . . to Croompanrickard, near the Town of Tralee . . .' The petition was referred to a committee which reported favourably, and on 4 March, Maurice and O'Connell's nephew, Morgan John O'Connell were ordered to bring in a bill. It was duly enacted on 4 July (6 & 7 Will. IV (Local) c. 114). The time for completion of the canal was by this act extended for five years.
- 2 Richard John Griffith (1784-1878), son of Richard Griffith of Millicent, Naas, Co. Kildare. Geologist and civil engineer; deputy chairman of Irish Board of Works 1846, chairman 1850. Commissioner of valuation 1828-68. See *DNB*.

2353

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 4 September 1836

Strictly confidential

My dear Barrett,

I got your letter this day and send you as warm an introduction to Mr. Drummond as I could write. I am spending a period of great agony. Maurice is in a very precarious state. I will act upon your hint and send him to a warmer climate for the winter. God help me! my ever beloved is in a state of much suffering and daily losing ground. I do most potently fear she cannot recover.¹ She may linger weeks. One week may--- Oh God help me---!

The purest spirit that ever dwelt in a human breast. She did not believe in the existence of evil. I am incompetent or too womanish and too weak to do my public duty and this is what she would condemn.² But I think I can rally.

She would advise me to devote my energies, even in misery, to Ireland. I need not smile for that would resemble a crime; but what am I writing! Only, after all, my great consolation will be a dogged and determined activity in the cause of Ireland.

Every moment can be devoted to my pen at least and that may do good service.

This is for your eye *exclusively*; not in words, but in reality, for you *solely*. Of course it is.

[P.S.] *Seal the enclosed.*³

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 74-5

- 1 O'Connell's wife died on 31 October 1836.
- 2 O'Connell's absence in Derrynane during September and October 1836 hindered the working of the General Association (see letter 2343 n3; also, Lyne, 'General Association').
- 3 Presumably the introduction to Drummond (letter 2354).

2354

To Thomas Drummond

Derrynane, 4 September 1836

My dear Sir,

Permit me to introduce to you Mr. Barrett, the proprietor of the *Pilot* newspaper. I wish you to know him as a friend of mine, to whose firmness and constancy I am deeply indebted. But I can with strict truth say more of him — beyond any comparison more. He is a man of the purest integrity and of the best principles — principles not adopted for periods of sunshine but tried in the worst of times. I do pledge myself that you cannot know a more *trustworthy* person in every respect.

He asked me only for an introduction but I could not avoid giving a description also. And I must add that you could not show *him* any kindness without making it doubly valuable to *me*. In short, I introduce him to you as one of the best and most deserving friends of rational but unequivocal freedom with whom I am acquainted and also as one of the public men of Ireland to whom I am most attached.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

2355

To Pierce Mahony

Derrynane, 6 September 1836

Private

My dear Mahony,

How could a fellow of your distinct understanding think for a moment that I would recommend our clerk, Reynolds,¹ for Drogheda.² Reynolds has, I believe, not a shilling save an enormous salary we give him and for which he is certainly bound to give us his entire time. But why should I dwell upon — pardon

me — such nonsense. I would be glad Brodigan³ was returned but I could not contribute to his return in any way without reviving jealousies which are only slumbering in their ashes. If Drogheda were going astray and that I could influence the election I would at once propose it to you but the truth is there are individuals of wealth and station connected with the town itself who have a most laudable ambition to represent that place, and there is not the least occasion to intervene as a Tory has no more chance there than any other pickpocket.

When I hear Mr. Wood⁴ is in Dublin I will write to him, that is, if, after an interview with him, you deem it useful that I should. Recollect that I am not a *Greyite*⁵ and I think the best way would be for a deputation of shareholders to wait upon him and ask him to judge of the spot⁶ with his own eyes. As there is a strong Whig interest against you⁷ the discreet way is to have the business with him emanate from persons concerned in the commercial speculation and thus seek his assistance at least in the first instance.

I have thought much and deeply on Kerry but at present do not see my way simply because young Herbert⁸ is playing, I believe, an insidious game without giving *us* the means of detecting him. I have however arranged a plan for bringing him out which will take some time to make it operate. When I see you I will be prepared, I hope, for more definitive projects. Could *you* procure the *active* co-operation of the Duke of Devonshire on your behalf in Youghal? If you could, you shall have my assistance with a certainty of success.⁹ This is, as you may perceive, perfectly confidential.

I need not say that you will meet here whenever you come a warm welcome though I do not regret that you postpone to better days your visit. But my domestic prospects are gloomy and becoming more dark.¹⁰ This is a subject not to be obtruded on others. Its pressure is alas mine own.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 Probably John Reynolds (1794-1868), son of Henry Reynolds of Nenagh; secretary in Ireland of the National Bank 1834-41; appointed managing director of the Land Investment Co. of Ireland in 1841; M.P. for Dublin city 1847-52; lord mayor of Dublin 1850.
- 2 The repealer Andrew Carew O'Dwyer had been unseated for Drogheda on petition on 29 June 1836, and his Tory opponent, Randal Plunkett, seated in his place. No election was at this juncture impending for Drogheda.
- 3 Probably Thomas Brodigan, J.P., Pilltown, Drogheda; a Catholic landowner.
- 4 Probably Charles Wood (1800-1885), son-in-law of second Earl Grey. M.P. for Grimsby 1826-31; for Wareham 1831-32; for Halifax 1832-65.

secretary to the admiralty 1835-39. Succeeded to baronetcy 1846; created Viscount Halifax in 1866; Chancellor of exchequer 1846-52. See *DNB*.

- 5 That is, one of the more conservative Whigs, of whom Lord Grey was the virtual leader.
- 6 Probably in connection with the proposed railway from Dublin to Valentia, Co. Kerry (see letter 2288 n2).
- 7 Probably a reference to Lord Clanricarde and the Whig gentry of Conn-aught (see letter 2388 n5)
- 8 Probably Henry Arthur Herbert (1815-66), eldest son of Charles John Herbert, Muckross Abbey, Killarney. High Sheriff of Co. Kerry, 1836; M.P. for Co. Kerry 1847-66. See *Boase*.
- 9 At that time Pierce Mahony was clearly seeking a seat in parliament.
- 10 Due to his wife's grave illness.

2356

To Richard Sullivan

Derrynane, 6 September 1836

My dear friend,

I enclose you the letter I got from Fitz-Simon about Mr. Egan your protégé. I am sincerely sorry we cannot do more for him. Believe me that if I could serve him either politically or in business your recommendation would be decisive with me — as *indeed indeed* it ought.

I will visit my constituents¹ the first moment *I possibly can* but my domestic prospects are not brightening.² My duty and inclination will lead me to you so soon as *I possibly can*.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

1 The electors of Kilkenny city.

2 See 2353.

2357

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 9 September 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

The aspect of affairs in my domestic circle is daily more gloomy.¹ Hope, which comes to all, comes not to me.

Call at Johnson's to know why he has discontinued 'L'ami de la religion.'² Send also some covers for letters like that in which this letter is enclosed. I have written a *special* letter to Mr. Drum-

mond for J. D. Mullen. Let him call at the Castle the day after you receive this.

I am now much alarmed about Maurice.³ These afflictions impair my public utility, as well as tear to pieces my private affections.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 76

1 See letter 2353.

2 A leading Gallican journal in France.

3 See letters 2361 and 2369.

2358

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 21 September 1836

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . I want Lord Francis Egerton's translation of Von Raumer's book on the 17th century;¹ also the Act of Parliament mentioned in Sharman Crawford's last attack² on me. . . ; now do not delay. If you take it to the castle, Mr. Drummond will give you a Treasury frank or rather a Castle frank for it.

Thirdly, after I presided at the meeting³ for Beaumont (the British subject convicted by the French House of Peers), there was an attack made on me in the *Morning Chronicle* for assailing in my speech Louis Philippe. It was signed by a Frenchman and was clearly genuine as the style was Anglo-Gallican. It contained a tirade against Ireland.⁴ Now look out for the meeting respecting Beaumont and then examine the file of the *Chronicle* for two or three weeks after and you will find it. . . .

Dr. Wiseman⁵ has just published in London a book⁶ on the Eucharist. Get it for me and send it here. . . .

My heart is sad and sore.⁷

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 76-7

1 Friedrich Ludwig Georg von Raumer, *The political history of England during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries*. The particular edition to which O'Connell refers has not been identified.

2 Crawford to the Liberal Constituency of Dundalk, 13 September 1836 (*Pilot*, 19 Sept. 1836). The act to which Crawford referred was 5 & 6 Will. IV c. 48 — 'the coercion act of 1835,' as he called it. Referring to this act, which permitted the lord lieutenant to proclaim districts, in which dusk to dawn curfew might be imposed and trial by jury suspended, Crawford declared 'it was passed with the approval of the Irish nation as indicated by the consent and support of their acknowledged

leader [O'Connell] and the great body of their representatives.'

- 3 At the Crown and Anchor tavern in London on 13 July 1836, O'Connell acting as chairman. It was decided to petition the Commons to obtain the release of Dr. Arthur James Beaumont who had been sentenced to transportation for being (according to O'Connell) a member of the Society of the Rights of Man (*Spectator*, 16 July 1836). The substantial charge seems to have been that he fomented insurrection in connection with the labour disturbances in Paris and Lyons in April 1834 (*MC*, 8 May 1835).
- 4 A letter from A. Moraux, London, in the *Morning Chronicle* of 23 July 1836. Moraux defends Louis-Philippe, and accuses the Irish of having at some time in the past murdered indiscriminately in attempting to redress their grievances.
- 5 Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman (1802-1865), son of James Wiseman, an Irish Catholic living in Spain. Consecrated bishop of Melipotamus *in partibus* in June 1840 and at the same time he was appointed president of Oscott. Created cardinal 1850. See *DNB*.
- 6 *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, proved from Scripture in eight lectures, delivered in the English College, Rome.*
- 7 See letter 2353. According to the *Pilot* of 19th September, Mary O'Connell was moved to the home of John Primrose, Jr. at Hillgrove, near Cahirciveen for the sake of her health.

2359

To Thomas Drummond

Derrynane, 13 October 1836

My dear Sir,

. . . It is said that there is a question of Mr. Sergeant Greene being promoted to the vacant place on the Bench. I however firmly believe that Lord Mulgrave would resign first — and for his honour I hope it.¹

I could wish he should know — if you can convey it to him respectfully — that the leading object of the Irish Reform Members in supporting the present Administration is to purify the administration of justice. The Tories have filled the Bench with men who distort justice on every occasion and they are multitudinous — where their party can be served by injustice. Particularly as the *bench judicial* as well as *magisterial* is the giant curse of the country, that country actually pants with impatience to have the place of Baron Smith filled by an honest intelligent and impartial man. If the Ministry place Mr. Greene there, they take away the mainspring of my attachment to them. Why should I suffer the obloquy of a moment in supporting a Government

treading on the most vital points in the foul footsteps of our and their enemies. I speak of myself of course as one of many, and supposing Greene a judge.

Lord Plunket is, I am quite convinced, 'the calamity' of the Irish Government. His conduct in leaving all the filth of the magistracy untouched is most melancholy and if it be him who suggests Greene, he should himself be separated from this administration.

This is the very touchstone of the ministerial *wishes* for Ireland.

Pardon me but it drives me almost mad to think of the cruelty to your friends of even hesitating about Greene who is in heart and conduct Orange and who besides is not of that competence in knowledge to entitle him by any means to the Bench.

I write this of course in confidence to you as indeed a duty I owe the first and only honest Lord Lieutenant I ever saw. . . .

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 Drummond has written on the letter: 'Recd. Oct. 17. Ansr'd by return of post. Never heard Serj. Greene mentioned for this or any other appointment. T.D. Oct. 17. Wrote again on the 20th after hearing his Ex's direction. See his Ex's direction.'

Mulgrave wrote to Drummond: 'I hope you will express to O'Connell as strongly as possible that I think he might have known me enough now, from everything I have done since I have been in Ireland, to feel very sure that nothing would have induced me to make a doubtful or fadical appointment upon this vacancy. I am too well aware of the importance of using every opportunity to make my government to the utmost of my power particularly beneficial to the Irish people, ever to have contemplated the possibility of making such a mistake.' (R. Barry O'Brien, *Thomas Drummond: Life and Letters* [London, 1889], 237, Mulgrave to Drummond, October 1836). The vacancy had arisen from the death on 21 August 1836 of William Cusac Smith, a baron of the exchequer. He was replaced by the Catholic and Liberal Michael O'Loghlen who was appointed on 5 November.

2360

From Lord Duncannon

19 October 1836

Private and Confidential

My dear Sir,

I was sorry in Dublin to hear that you had much cause for anxiety in you family,¹ and I should not trespass upon you with any observation of mine if I had not seen a letter² of yours to Mr. Drummond on the subject of the vacant judge. The difficulty in

filling up the vacancy has naturally given rise to all sorts of stories but I hope you have sufficient confidence in us to believe that such an appointment as you allude to never was in contemplation. I cannot now say that it is settled but I have every reason to think that it will go in the way most natural and so as to satisfy everybody. I will however say to you in confidence that my fear is more in respect to some future vacancy. Concerning our own friends, there are many in England who will cry out if there is an appearance of preference to Catholics and not look at the Bar and see the difficulty. There will certainly be a great objection made to the two law officers being Catholic,³ and yet on the next vacancy, it will be difficult to avoid it, and yet that is the very sort of question that would be the most improper in reference to England to risk a dissolution of Parliament. On the present occasion you may be assured there never was an idea of proposing any objectionable appointment, and that [which] you mention can only have been put forward for mischief sake.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2353.

2 Letter 2359

3 The two men who would apparently be in line for promotion to the positions of attorney-general and solicitor-general were both Catholics, Stephen Woulfe and Nicholas Ball, that is, presuming the government passed over the present first and second serjeants (Greene and Jackson) who were Protestants and Tories.

2361

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 26 October 1836

Expect me in Dublin on the 2nd of November.

Maurice has been confined to his bed by an *acute* attack on the lungs. He is better, thank God! I want to decide whether or not he is to go to a southern climate. I take up an exact statement of his case and intend to have a consultation of medical men — Crampton, Colles,¹ and White — on my arrival. Mrs. O'Connell is in that state that she will not perceive that I am away.² She may linger on week after week with nothing but despair of amelioration. Alas, alas! I cannot describe to you my own *mental* state.

But I must decide about Maurice. At his time of life it is the

saddest of the sad but I *must* think of something else. If he is to go southward for the winter, there is no time to be lost.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 77

- 1 Abraham Colles, M.D. (1773-1843), a native of Millmount, near Kilkenny; a well-known Dublin surgeon. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 2353. O'Connell set out for Dublin, and had only reached Killarney, when news was brought to him of her death. She was buried close to Derrynane, in Hunting-Cap's tomb in Abbey Island cemetery (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 581-5).

2362

*To William Howitt*¹

Merrion Square, 7 November 1836

My dear Sir,

The *Dublin Review*² could not possibly have an editor whose talents and integrity would more strongly justify my confidence. You are the person indeed of all others whose assistance I should deem most valuable on all political and literary topics, but there is a drawback and a most serious objection to your being able to fulfil the duties requisite for that *Review*. I state the objection with the candour and in the confidence you merit. It is this: the *Dublin Review* is a Catholic publication, emphatically Catholic, I should say rather — polemically so. This is quite consistent with its advocacy of the principles of civil as well as religious freedom — that is — the perfect freedom from penal laws, tests or legal restrictions, the separation, in short, of the Kingdom of God from the Kingdom of Caesar. But in point of religion it *must* advocate the truth of Catholic doctrines exclusively. I need not tell you that this is my own conviction. My firm belief is that the duty of every man is to be a Catholic whilst I abhor every attempt either by direct penalty or by any civil exclusion to bring the Law in any way in aid of my creed. I am indeed unequivocally *a voluntary*. I conceive it a crime to compel any man to contribute to the expenses of a worship which he condemns. I am thus explicit that if Dr. Wiseman, to whom I write by this post, should entertain the same opinion of your capacity and integrity that I do, you may have the acceptance or the refusal of our editorship. I will beg of him to communicate with you.

This is my *first* letter on business. *You* cannot be at a loss to estimate the poignancy of a husband's feeling on such an occasion.³ I obtrude not however my sorrows on you but I beg of you to

allow Mrs. Howitt⁴ to know that she made an impression on the mind of the most right-thinking woman *I ever knew* of which she might perhaps feel proud. It is however passed, and I only remain to recollect.

SOURCE: *Boston Public Library*, MS Eng. 144 (Whitney Fund, March 20, 1964, 031).

- 1 William Howitt (1792-1879), miscellaneous writer; chemist and druggist in Nottingham 1823-36; a spiritualist and contributor to *Spiritual Magazine*; part proprietor of *People's Journal* 1846; edited *Howitt's Journal* January 1847-48. See *DNB*.
- 2 A quarterly founded in 1836 by O'Connell, Michael J. Quin and Rev. Nicholas Wiseman as joint proprietors. It was designed to provide a platform for Catholic writers on general topics and religious polemics, as a Catholic counterpart to the two *de facto* Protestant quarterlies, the Whig *Edinburgh Review* and the Tory *Quarterly Review*. Quin was the editor of the first two numbers, May and July 1836 (See L. C. Casartelli, 'Our Diamond Jubilee' in *Dublin Review*, CXVIII, [April 1896], 245-71, republished as 'The First Sixty Years' in *CHC*, No. 397 [April, May, June, 1936], 192-220).
- 3 The death of his wife on 31 October.
- 4 Mary Howitt (1799-1888), miscellaneous writer, daughter of Samuel Botham and wife of William Howitt. See *DNB*.

2363

*To Nicholas Wiseman, care of Rt. Rev. Dr. Griffiths, Catholic Bishop
35 Golden Square, London*

Merrion Square, 7 November 1836

Rev. and respected Sir,

I enclose in this cover a letter I received from Mr Howitt. I have answered him in the terms which his talents and probity require and referred him for a final answer to you. I told him candidly that *ours*¹ was a Catholic publication and not only Catholic but polemically so. He would certainly be an acquisition to any literary publication but he would, even if his own opinions allowed him to engage with us, require a Catholic to revise every article. I could not well do it here. And besides I go farther than you would probably approve upon the topic of separation of the Church from the State. The time when that connection was useful has gone by. At present the Catholic rulers whether monarchs or liberals oppress the freedom of the Church when it is subject to their control. The infidel liberals are not more oppressive than the very Catholic monarchs but in a different shape. However as I think the hierarchy should be uncontrolled by either the one or

the other, I am unfit to be the censor of our press so as to have your confidence.

What can we do? Mr. Spooner² has also written to me. Him I also refer to you. I am ready to do anything you deem right. I do not understand what our friend Quin's object is in going abroad. He was at Derrynane with me and said nothing of any such intention. He was the fittest man we could possibly have, a sincere and well-informed Catholic. He also understood the mechanism of publication. I fear it is impossible for us to supply his place. There was a gentleman³ who translated Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*.⁴ He was a convert.⁵ Do you know anything of him? If so, he may supply Quin's place but as Quin quits us he should resign his share of the work. However I repeat I will in all things be directed by you. I wish to be useful and feel that I cannot be so in this respect without your active co-operation.

My domestic afflictions⁶ drive me to more political and literary exertions. But I fear I cannot look for any resource in the *Dublin Review* in the absence of our friend Quin.

SOURCE: St. John's Seminary Museum

- 1 The *Dublin Review*.
- 2 William Spooner, 377 Strand, London; first publisher of the *Dublin Review* in 1836.
- 3 James Burton Robertson (1800-1877), Catholic intellectual. Frequent contributor to the *Dublin Review*; professor of history in Newman's Catholic university in Dublin from its inception until his death. See *DNB*.
- 4 Frederick von Schlegel, *The Philosophy of History*, trans. by James Burton Robertson. This translation was first published in 1835 and had many later editions.
- 5 O'Connell was mistaken. Robertson was a born Catholic (*Tablet*, 24 Feb. 1877, 244).
- 6 His wife's death on 31 October.

2363a

From John R. Elmore

London, 8 November 1836

My dear Sir,

Very sincerely do I feel for you under the affliction you suffer. God in his infinite mercy grant you comfort and support under this trial.¹

I am happy to say our bank² affairs are improving and the directors have perfect confidence that in a few weeks we shall be

easy. Mr. Roskell's³ exertions added to his knowledge and personal influence are beyond all praise. The board have under his guidance taken decisive measures which, if not interfered with, will bring us all right.

They have unanimously established a finance and managing committee, Mr. Roskell at its head, which if continued with your sanction will shortly bring us back to safe and healthy state. Mr. Roskell's confidence is now restored, and in answer to my question he replied if he had not perfect confidence he would not have advanced £25,000 to us which he did yesterday. . . . [The writer blames Murray⁴ for opening too many new branches but the board have requested him to come over from Ireland immediately. The writer asks O'Connell to come over to London for the settlement of the matter. Nothing will be done by the Provincial Bank of Ireland 'to annoy or hurt us but would go with us in any measures in case the Agricultural Bank⁵ stopped which we hear is in a very bad state.']

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The death of Mary O'Connell.
- 2 The National Bank of Ireland.
- 3 J. Roskell, a member of the London board of directors of the National Bank.
- 4 T. Lamie Murray, managing director of the National Bank.
- 5 The Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland.

2363b

To Archbishop MacHale

Merrion Square, 9 November 1836¹

My ever respected and dear Lord,

I know you pity me, and afford me the relief of your prayers.² Tomorrow I begin to console my heart by agitation. I am *now* determined to leave every other consideration aside, and to agitate *really* — to agitate to the full extent the law sanctions. Command me now in everything. . . .

I believe we are safe in all the counties and towns in Connaught save Sligo and Athlone. I indeed believe the latter tolerably secure. Every nerve must be strained to increase the Irish majority in Parliament. My watchword is 'Irish or Repeal'. Indeed, I entertain strong hopes that we shall live to see the latter, 'a consumation most devoutly to be wished.'

Dr. England was with me yesterday. He gave me some strong

evidence of the hostility of the English Catholics to those of Ireland. He has promised to give it to me in writing, and I will send your grace a copy. He goes off to Haiti next week but purposes to return next year and then intends to suggest a place for a foreign missionary society in Ireland, should it meet with the approbation of the Irish prelates.

Irish priests are abundantly abused yet they are in demand by the religious and zealous Catholics all over the world.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 627-8.

- 1 This letter is erroneously dated 1837 by M.F. Cusack.
- 2 On the death of his wife.

2364

*Alexander Seton,¹ 4 Lr. Rutland St., Dublin,
17 November 1836*

Appeals to O'Connell for payment for attending the registry at election time in Dublin city, for attending many months of sessions, and for political work done in Co. Kildare for Edward Ruthven.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Eldest son of James Seton, Perrymount, Co. Tyrone; called to the bar 1795. Seton wrote several additional letters to O'Connell, in the O'Connell Papers in the National Library of Ireland, claiming payment for political work done. Some of these are not being published because too repetitious. According to Andrew Marsh ('Time was' in the *Evening Press*, Dublin, of 4 October 1971), Seton embezzled Dublin masonic funds earlier in his career.
- 2 Ballyfair, Co. Kildare, son of Edward Southwell Ruthven. M.P. for Co. Kildare 1832-37.

2365

From Archbishop MacHale

Tuam, [Co. Galway], 18 November 1836

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I would ere now have addressed you on the loss¹ you have sustained, but I was unwilling to obtrude too soon on your domestic sorrows [further expressions of sympathy].

The country here is thrown into great alarm in consequence of

the run on the Agricultural Banks. Their failure² at any period would be productive of much misery but coming together with a calamitous harvest, it would entail ruin upon thousands. I trust the National Banks are secure against any such panic. Were they to give away or lose public confidence the consequence would be that the Tory establishments would again become engines of political oppression and would wield their regained monopoly more fatally than before.

I am delighted to see that you are entering with renewed energies on a fresh career of agitation.³ The Lords must be made to awake from their folly⁴ and to exhibit the first symptoms of wisdom from the effects of a salutary terror. As long as they can stop with impunity the measures that pass the Commons, what practical benefit can the country reap from the reform of that body? Without a thorough reform or Repeal, no hopes of justice for Ireland. I agree with you perfectly that it is to her own energies Ireland must look for that consummation. Like Emancipation, that was so long contemptuously denied whilst it was asked as alms and given when extorted, the full measure of justice shall ever be refused until England is convinced that there may be more danger in the refusal than in the concession. . . .

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XI, 343-4.

- 1 The death of his wife on 31 October.
- 2 See letter 2091 n3. On 21 November the *Pilot* reported that £40,000 in gold had been dispatched from Dublin to the various branches of the Agricultural Bank in an effort to stop the run.
- 3 On 10 November O'Connell attended the General Association. Although he appeared to suffer 'great mental affliction', he declared 'I rose this morning with a determination to devote every moment of the rest of my existence to the cause of my country. I consider I have as yet done nothing, while so much remains to be done, and I trust I will not sink into the grave, which has now no terrors for me, till I see my country happy, and her injuries avenged by liberty' (*Pilot*, 11 Nov. 1836).
- 4 In having rejected the Irish Municipal reform bill (see letter 2343 n2).

2366

To Lord Mulgrave

Merrion Square, 24 November 1836

My Lord,

I hope your Excellency will pardon my presumption in addressing you on a subject which fills the public mind with feverish anxiety — I mean some rumoured appointments. You will not, I am sure, do me the injustice to suppose that any sentiment or

opinion of mine can have in my own estimation any title to the attention of your Excellency's government other than what may arise from my knowledge of the effect of such appointments upon the cordial and most grateful supporters of the present administration. Allow me then with the most profound respect to state to your Excellency the following facts on this most important subject.

1st. That the Irish people have derived no *legislative* advantage from the present administration, the fault lying with the Lords, and that the gratitude and tranquility of Ireland is due to the *manifest intention* to legislate usefully for us — and, above all and before all, to the rejections and appointments *made* by your Excellency since you came here. We are a morbidly sensitive people. We exaggerate evil and perhaps overrate good but our disposition to exaggerate evil is justified by the long continuance under former governments of insult and oppression. From you alone has the *good* been known in practice.

2nd. That it is rumoured that Sir William Lynar¹ is to be a stipendiary magistrate.² May I venture to implore your Excellency to pause before you make this appointment. He, Sir W. Lynar, has a testimonial of mine. I beg leave to withdraw it publicly as well as privately. I did not then know that he was a member of the Committee of the Grand Orange Lodge. His excuse on that subject is before the public and has been deemed most unsatisfactory. If he be appointed, all confidence will be lost in the public at large. I do not dare to state to your Excellency what the result will be. I only implore your forgiveness for telling you that it requires an experience of more than thirty years of the workings of the Irish mind to enable me to estimate the extent of its effect on everything near and dear to the friends of peace and good order.

3rdly. Another rumour is the intended appointment of Mr. Cannon³ to the County of Meath.

I venture once again to solicit a pause. Mr. Cannon will be upon investigation found to have *always* ranged at the side of the active enemies of the present Government. He is *believed* to have been an Orangeman, a belief for the accuracy of which I do not *in any degree vouch* but it would, I fear, exceedingly wound the interests of your Excellency's friends in the administration to have the public behold *him* in office.

4thly. There is an appointment talked of in the *legal* department which would create so much of feeling of utter hopelessness for *popular* barristers that I do not presume to suppose there is any intention whatsoever to make it. I only implore your Excell-

ency not to deprive the Government of the active exertions of men who can be eminently useful in the coming elections without at least the most deliberate investigation.

In conclusion I would hope that your Excellency will not deem me so obtrusive as to be indisposed to grant me two requests. The first is to allow me ten minutes of a private audience tomorrow. The second, that until after that interview you will suspend any final determination.

I wish I knew how to apologise for giving you this trouble and for venturing to say as much as I have done. My motives are certainly as pure as they are respectful.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 Sir William Wainwright Lynar, Kt., J.P. (died c. 1845/6), Birchfield, Kingstown, Co. Dublin; a sherriff's peer of the city of Dublin; knighted 1833; appointed a stipendiary magistrate in Leitrim 1 November 1837.
- 2 On 12 September the *Pilot* had devoted a long article to Lynar, accusing him of having been a prominant member of the Orange Order.
- 3 Thomas Cannon, J.P., D.L., appointed a stipendiary magistrate for Co. Galway on 7 February 1837.

2366a

To W. S. Hart

Merrion Square, 15 December 1836

Copy

My dear Hart,

I sincerely wish my attestation to your services in the cause of Ireland and *reform*, to your capacity, and intelligence, to your integrity and honour could be of any practical use to you. Believe me that if that attestation could be useful to you, I would give it with the greatest alacrity and with the *sincerest truth*. I have known you long and intimately, longer indeed than I have known any *other living politician* or *patriot*. I have known you to be the latter, actively and zealously when instead of reward or encouragement you met *reproach* and *persecution*. You forsook the bad politics of your friends, and nearest relations, of the men who would have aided your fortunes and increased your prosperity by their support and by the business which they would have preferred giving you, had your politics been congenial to theirs and inimical to Ireland. You have been the principal instrument of shaking the Tory dominion in the *City of Dublin* as well as the most efficient means of *destroying* it in the County of Dublin.

In short upon every occasion within the last forty years, for it is not less, you have been ready and active in *person*, and with your *purse*, to sustain and promote the cause of reform and of the amelioration of the condition of the Irish people. There could not be a more steady, energetic, disinterested and suffering friend to Ireland.

I deeply regret that you should be passed over and your services forgotten. *Believe me, believe me* that any assistance I can give you to place your claims in the proper point of view shall not be spared if you show me *how* I can serve you.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 17070

2367

From Henry Warburton

45 Cadogan Place [London], 17 December 1836

My dear Sir,

The Government will proceed, I am told, with only two questions of importance before Easter; one English question, that of the Church rates, and one Irish question, that of your municipal corporations. I approve of their beginning the session with those two measures which they are likely to carry with the largest majorities.

It is but tepid approbation that the Irish Church Bill¹ receives from any supporters of the Government, and we Radicals certainly regard it as intended to be a stay to the falling establishment. It is well therefore not to place that question in the van.

In the Irish Municipal Reform Bill last year you strongly insisted on giving the choice of the sheriffs to the town councils, rightly judging that, as there is still a contingent danger of Tory administrations, the way to passimize [*sic*] the choice of magistrates in Ireland is [not] to allow Orangemen to have any hand in the choice. You will propose a clause of course to give the choice to the town councils and I shall vote for your clause. The Tories will vote with the Government against your clause, and of course it will be lost. In that case I trust you will not throw out the Bill for, if you do, the Administration is dissolved.

It has been suggested to me that in order to deprive the Tories of the argument that Ireland is indifferent to municipal reform — “for see there are no petitions for it” — it would be of importance to have petitions for it from a sufficient number of places and

constituencies in Ireland. *I trust you will attend to this hint.*

I advise my Radical friends so to temper their zeal as not to subvert the Government. I do not approve of their proposing conditions to the Administration, saying, "the ballot and the peerage reform to be open questions or we cease to support you by our votes." The business of the Radical Party is to show itself to the people as distinct from the Whigs by continually agitating some of those leading questions which mark its position in advance. As it proceeds in making converts on these questions, it will give disquietude to Whig governments who will feel that, unless they go forward, their supporters will lose their seats at general elections. This steam pressure must be raised or moderated according to the magnitude of the objects to be attained and the circumstances of the time. Were the Radicals as a party strong enough to take the government and to carry their favourite measures while in power, I would say, let there be no damper to the flame of your opposition; but we know that they are but a minority; that the prejudices of the people of this country in favour of aristocratic rule are so strong as to make it impossible at present to form an administration with any considerable share of Radicals among them. Their business therefore is always to be taking up a position to cover the flank of the least illiberal of the other two parties and, relying on the people and the goodness of their cause for support, to be ever on the alert to turn passing circumstances to the best account.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 The Irish tithe bill.

2368

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 28 December 1836

I leave this on Tuesday for Tralee but will not be in Dublin until Monday week, the 9th; but on that day I am resolved, please God, to be there early in the day.

How mistaken you are as to the popularity of Poor Law! If you knew all I know!!!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 78

To Henry Warburton

Derrynane, 29 December 1836

Copy

My Dear Sir,

I thank you sincerely for sending me your view of the ministerial campaign. The plan appears to my humble judgement extremely judicious in all its aspects as I understand them.

The Church Rate (England) Abolition Bill and the Corporate Reform (Ireland) Bill afford ample and the best occupation until Easter. If both are satisfactory in their details and yet are rejected by the Lords, it may be the best grounds for a dissolution.

The Church Rate Bill *should* in my opinion throw the entire burden of the building and repairing of churches on the Protestants of the Establishment. There should not be any reference to the Consolidated Fund or to the general taxation.

The Irish Corporation Bill should be with few exceptions that *brought in* by the ministry last year. The exceptions to consist only in the leaving out of *a few* of the smaller towns.

As to the appointment of sheriffs in the towns being counties of themselves the Bill of last year as prepared by O'Loughlen and as twice read¹ did everything in this respect which I could desire. At present these corporations appoint the sheriffs subject to a negative by the Crown, a negative which has not for a century been exercised until Lord Mulgrave used it against the master of an Orange Lodge. The general practice in Ireland for sheriffs of counties at large is this. The existing sheriff at the summer assizes in each year *privately* presents a list of not less than three or more than twelve names of persons whom he deems eligible to the office. This list is presented to the judge who presides in the criminal court in the county. That judge transmits to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland three names which are supposed to be selected from the list presented to him by the sheriff but he frequently substitutes other names. From the three names sent in by the judge the Lord Lieutenant generally appoints the sheriff but our judges have for the two last years sent in the names of such virulent Tories that the Lord Lieutenant has flung aside the list altogether and named the sheriff of himself. You will at once understand that all this machinery of lists is merely a *practice* not a *law*. It is also a modern practice, not being of more than about 20 years in existence.

Now, what I want is this, that the list of three names should be

made out by the council for each town or city having at present a separate sheriff; that if the Lord Lieutenant did not approve of one of the three within ten days, then a second list of three should be sent in, and so "*toties quoties*" until the Lord Lieutenant approved of one.

Thus stood the bill as brought in last session.² I want to have it, in that shape. It does not, you see, give the council 'the appointment' as the present corporations have. Then it must be an *affirmative adoption* of one by the Government before he becomes sheriff in the new plan. This plan was abandoned as a concession to the Tories who made use of it as an argument against any new corporations in Ireland. They said 'you' the Government, 'concede that your councils in the new corporations would be unfit to be trusted with so trivial a function as sending in a list of names for sheriff. When you admit that, is it not a proof that they ought not to be trusted in the higher functions?' Thus the ministry tarnished their own plan and gave their and our enemies a triumph in argument without of course conciliating one single Tory.

I have dwelt on this point at the risk of being tedious, that you may see the reasonableness of what the Irish members require, being nothing but what Ministers brought into the House and printed and carried into committee last session. It really is too bad to give the Tories their only argument and in doing so to offer an insult to the men who *will* compose the new council.

I beg of you to assist me in arranging the matter *thus*. There is little policy in my adding — but I do add — that you wrong me in thinking that I would assist in throwing out *any* corporate bill brought in by this administration. At all events I will not do that. The peace of Ireland is too dear to me to risk, upon any point not involving a direct violation of my principles, the safety of the Government which is doing all it can honestly and zealously for this unhappy country.

I am happy to tell you that my son Maurice, for whom you so kindly enquire, is in a forward state of convalescence. His recovery is really little short of miraculous — Blessed be God. But he will not be able to go to parliament before Easter. I hope to get him a pair.³

Ireland will pour out myriads of petitions. I do think that the continuance of this Ministry for twelve months longer will put down Toryism in Ireland for ever. I will be glad to hear from you when you deem any subject of sufficient importance to be communicated. The other topics you allude to, peerage reform and the Ballot, are certainly of vital importance.

As to the first — peerage reform. You know that I am decidedly

favourable to that measure but I candidly confess I do not think it sufficiently ripe in the public mind to warrant the Ministry to make it an 'open question'. They should have express permission from Brighton⁴ to allow them to make it such, a permission not likely at present to be granted. But the Ballot is quite a different question. It is not an 'organic change.' It relates solely to the Commons House and it has become so pressingly and imperatively necessary to be considered in all its bearings that my opinion very decidedly is that the opposition to it should not be *ministerial*. In short, it should be an avowedly 'open question.' Besides its intrinsic merits, it would be a suitable concession to the Whig Radicals and would manifestly bring over that powerful and increasing body of men who think and act with our excellent friend, Sir William Molesworth.⁵

I intend to be at my post, the first hour of combat and I doubt not that the entire 'Irish Legion', invalids excepted, will be in the front of the battle. A good Church Rate Bill for the Dissenters and a good Corporation Bill for the Irish will make an excellent first plan of battle. Let us get so much before we are swamped in the difficult details of the 'Irish Tithe Bill' with its troublesome 'Appropriation Clause.' I wish with all my heart the Ministry were decently freed from that *Dilemma*. If there were a proper deduction from the burden of the tithes, there would for the present be no surplus; and it is really too bad to risk *on such* a point a ministry who are for the first time in history conquering the 'Anti-Saxon' spirit of Ireland and adding eight million to the King's subjects. Why should such a ministry risk its existence '*de Sana Copina?*'

SOURCE: Russell Papers, Public Record Office, London, P.R.O 30/22/2D

1 The Irish municipal reform bill of 1835.

2 1836.

3 That is, to find a member of opposing political views who would agree to absent himself from parliament while Maurice would be absent.

4 That is, the king.

5 Sir William Molesworth, eighth baronet (1810-1855). Pencarrow, Cornwall; M.P. for East Cornwall 1832-37; Leeds 1837-41; Southwark 1845. Started *London Review* 1835; first commissioner of the Board of Works 1853; colonial secretary 1855. See *DNB*.

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.

- A.B., 2176
 Abercromby, James, 2109: 2071, 2203, 2207, 2211-12, 2215
 Abraham, William, Catholic Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 2032, 2197
 Adelaide, Queen, 1987
 Agramont/Agramant 1972
 Allen, —, 2121
 Allen, John 1993
 Althorp, Viscount, *see* Spencer, John Charles
 Alvanley, 2nd Baron, *see* Arden, William
 Anglesey, 1st marquis of, *see* Paget, Henry William
 Anson, Thomas William, 1st earl of Lichfield, 2241
 Archbold, Robert, 2179
 Archer, George, 1961
 Arden, William, 2nd Baron Alvanley, 2234: 2169, 2240-42
 Argyll, 6th duke of, *see* Campbell, George William
 Armstrong, Rev. James, 2290
 Athlone Trades Political Union, *see* Hart, Thomas, Secretary of,
 Attwood, Thomas, 1975, 2146, 2153
 Auckland, 2nd Baron, *see* Eden, George
 Ayre, Joseph, 2085, 2103
 Aytoun, James 2275

 Bagwell, John, 2194
 Baker, Thomas, 2263
 Bald, William, 2288
 Baldwin, Henry, 1990
 Baldwin, Herbert, 1996, 2017, 2229
 Baldwin, Walter J., 2146, 2154
 Ball, Nicholas, 2309, 2360
 Barrett, Richard, 1975*a*, 1982, 1999, 2040, 2086, 2117, 2119, 2123, 2215, 2353: 1951, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980, 1983-84-85, 2009, 2011, 2019, 2035, 2039, 2040, 2046, 2049, 2060, 2063, 2067, 2069, 2081, 2085, 2087, 2089, 2091, 2093, 2095, 2097, 2100, 2101, 2104, 2106, 2114, 2121, 2122, 2124, 2219, 2227, 2229, 2344, 2354
 Barretto, Mr., 2061
 Barrington, Sir Jonah, 2043, 2059
 Barron, Henry Winston, 2032, 2046, 2063, 2155, 2188, 2197, 2200
 Barron, Piers George, 2036, 2038, 2043, 2045, 2065, 2085, 2106
 Barry, Garret Standish, 2017, 2191
 Beamish, Francis Bernard, 2133
 Beamish and Crawford, 2054
 Beaumont, Arthur James, 2358
 Becket, Saint Thomas, 2056, 2057*a*
 Bede, St., 2292
 Bedford, 6th duke of, *see* Russell, John
 Bellew, Sir Patrick, 7th Baronet, 2138
 Belton, W., 2121
 Bentham, Jeremy, 2292
 Bentinck, Lord William Henry Cavendish, 2061
 Beresford, a, 2188, 2197
 Beresford, Alderman John Claudius, 1961
 Beresford, Sir John Poo, 2225
 Beresford, William, 2197
 Beresford, Rev. William (Inniscarra), 2118
 Beresfords, the, 2197
 Bernal, Ralph, 2203
 Bessborough, 5th earl of, *see* Ponsonby, John George Brabazon
 Blackburne, Francis, 1975, 1993, 1994, 2001, 2010, 2012, 2086, 2089, 2090, 2097, 2100, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2114, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2228, 2229.
 Blackney, Walter, *see* Blakeney, Walter
 Blackstone, Sir William, 2154
 Blakeney (Blackney), Walter, 2143, 2148

- Blennerhassett, Ellen (formerly O'Connell), 2131
 Blood, Thomas, 1976
 Bodkin, John James, 2301
 Boothby, Benjamin, Jr., 2088
 Bourke and Son, John, 2085
 Bouverie, William Pleydell-, 3rd earl of Radnor, 2068
 Bowring, John, 2292
 Boyle, Henry, 2023
 Boyton, Rev. Charles, 1957, 1959, 1967, 1973, 1976, 2060, 2187
 Brabazon, William, *styled* Lord Brabazon, *later* 11th earl of Meath, 2317
 Brabazon, Sir William John, 2nd baronet, 2202, 2327
 Brady, Mazicre, 1990, 2338
 Brand, Thomas, 20th Baron Dacre, 2297
 Brenan, Maurice, 2273, 2274, 2286
 Brett, William, 2173
 Brodigan, Thomas, 2355
 Brophy, Peter, 1969
 Brougham, Henry Peter, *later* Lord Brougham, 1985, 2073, 2086, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2228-29, 2232, 2308
 Browne, Dominick, *later* 1st Baron Oranmore and Browne, 2327
 Browne, George Joseph, bishop of Galway, *later* bishop of Elphin, 2301
 Browne, John, 1968
 Browne, John Denis, 2327
 Browne, Robert Dillon, 2327
 Browne, Thomas, *later* 3rd earl of Kenmare, 2294
 Browne, Valentine, 2nd earl of Kenmare, 2176, 2198, 2273, 2286
 Browne, Hon. William, 2147
 Brownrigg, Henry John, 2184, 2283
 Bruen, Francis, 2200
 Bruen, Col. Henry, 2247, 2258
 Burdett, Sir Francis, 5th baronet, 1974, 2070, 2219
 Burke, Rev. John, P.P., 2038
 Burton, John Hill, 2292
 Bushe, Charles Kendal, 2108, 2109, 2118
 Butler, Col. the Hon. Pierce, 2314
 Callaghan, Daniel, 2017, 2229
 Calvin, John, 2290
 Campbell, George William, 6th duke of Argyll, 2241
 Canning, George, 2172, 2216
 Cannon, Thomas, 2366
 Cao, Bishop Fredica, 2061
 Carew, Robert Shapland, 2082
 Carey, Matthew, 2007
 Carlisle, 6th earl of, *see* Howard, George Carroll, Dr., 2218
 Carter, John Bonham, 1975, 2089
 Castlemaine, 1st Baron, *see* Handcock, William
 Cavendish, William George Spencer, 6th duke of Devonshire, 2031a, 2071, 2188, 2203, 2232, 2355
 Chandos, Lord, *see* Grenville, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-
 Chatterton, James Charles, 2229
 Childs, John, 2281
 Christmas, William, 2156, 2197
 Clanrickarde, 1st marquis of, *see* De Burgh, Ulick John
 Clay, William, 2207
 Cleary, James, 1965
 Cloncurry, 2nd Baron, *see* Lawless, Valentine Browne
 Cloney, Thomas, 2179
 Close, James Strathearne, 2244, 2324
 Cobbett, William, 2125, 2135, 2209: 2073, 2117, 2153, 2154, 2324
 Cockburn, Rev. William, 2280
 Codd, Francis, 1976
 Colhoun, John, 1990
 Colles, Abraham, M.D., 2361
 Collins, Rev. Mortimer, P.P., 2129
 Conner family, 1989
 Connor, Ellen, 2131
 Connor, Maurice, 2047, 2048
 Connor, Thomas, 1988
 Connors, Redmond, 2052
 Conway, Frederick William, 1989, 2046, 2206
 Cooke, Rev. Henry, 2025, 2260a
 Copley, Sir John Singleton, Kt., *later* 1st Baron Lyndhurst, 1985
 Corballis, John Richard, 1990
 Corley, Mr., 2173
 Costello, Marcus, 2186, 2245
 Costigan, Anne, 2002
 Coutts & Co., bankers, 2076
 Coyne, Richard (Capel Street), 2246, 2260a, 2263b
 Crampton, Surgeon Philip, 2361
 Crampton, Philip Cecil, 2106, 2108, 2109, 2119, 2120
 Crawford, William Sharman, 2116: 2117, 2138, 2150, 2164, 2324, 2358
 Creagh, Richard, 2161
 Crean, Gerald, 2016a
 Croker, Edward, 1976
 Croker, Codd & Co., 1976, 1978, 1984, 1985, 1990, 2070
 Cromwell, Oliver, 2117
 Cronin, Daniel (Killarney), 2159
 Crosbie's Hotel, 2305

- Cross, Philip, 2118
 Crosthwaite, Leland, 2317
 Cumberland, Ernest Augustus, duke of, 2271
 Curran, John Philpot, 2175, 2216
 Curry, Col. William Samuel, 2157, 2188
- Dacre, 20th Baron, *see* Brand, Thomas
 Dalrymple, George, 2291 291
 Daly, James (Dunsandle), 2055
 Damer, Hon. George L. Dawson, 2240, 2242: 2234
 D'Arcy, John, 2054, 2103
 Darley, Frederick, 2107
 Daunt, William Joseph O'Neill, 1970
 Dean, Robert, 2294
 De Burgh, Ulick John, 1st marquis of Clanrickarde, 2288, 2355
 De Grey, 2nd Earl, *see* Grey, Thomas Philip
 Denny, William, 2174, 2184, 2194, 2218
 Dens, Pierre, 2260a
 d'Etchegoyen family, 2076, 2078
 Devonshire, 6th duke of, *see* Cavendish, William George Spencer
 Dickson, Stephen Fox, 1977
 Dickson, *see* Dixon, Thomas
 Dillon, Constantine Augustus, 2327
 Dixon, —, 2160
 Dixon, Thomas, 2091, 2124, 2209
 Doagh Reform Committee, *see* Shaw, John, Junr., secretary of
 Dobbs, Conway Richard, 1971
 Doherty, John, 2016, 2106, 2108, 2109
 Dolan, Terence, 2218-19
 Donlevy, Mr., 2095
 Dooly, Daniel, 2052
 Dowden, Richard, 2326
 Dower, John, 2065
 Downshire, 3rd marquis of, *see* Hill, Arthur Blundell Sandys
 Doyle, Dominick, 1967
 Drummond, Thomas, 2322, 2337, 2345, 2354, 2359: 2235, 2325, 2346, 2353, 2357-58, 2360
 Dudgeon, Samuel, 2022
 Duncannon, Viscount, *see* Ponsonby, John William
 Dupetiaux, —, 2257
 Durham, 1st earl of, *see* Lambton, John George
 Dwyer, Edmond, 2052
 Dwyer, Edward, 2033, 2051, 2062: 1952, 1989, 2035
- Eagle, William, 2088
 Easthope, John, 2363a, 2347a: 2219
- Eden, George, 2nd Baron Auckland, 2073
 Egan, Mr., 2356
 Egan, Cornelius, bishop of Kerry, 2130
 Egerton, Lord Francis, *see* Gower, Lord Francis Leveson-
 Elizabeth, Queen, 2292
 Ellice, Edward, 2107, 2115, 2230, 2245: 2073, 2081, 2241, 2338
 Elmore, John Richard, 2363a: 2146, 2151, 2154, 2335-36
 England, Rev. John (bishop of Charleston), 2349a, 2363b
 Ennis, Andrew, 1947: 2075
 Ennis, John, 2150
 Errington, Rowland, 2243
 Esmonde, James, 2102
 Esmonde, Sir Thomas, 9th baronet, 2068, 2082
 Evans, Capt., 2288
 Evans, George de Lacy, 2169: 1974, 2173
 Evans, George Hampden, 1963, 2194
 Evans, Richard Lacy, 2169, 2173
- Fagan, William Trant, 2017: 2019
 Fallon, Malachy, 2122
 Fearon, Henry Johnson, 2038
 Ferguson, Robert Cutlar, 2203
 Ffrench, Betsey, *see also* O'Connell, Elizabeth Mary (Betsey) (daughter), 2260: 2077, 2147, 2155, 2305, 2315
 Ffrench, Fitz-Stephen, *see* French, Fitz-Stephen
 Ffrench, Nicholas Joseph, 2077: 2008, 2150, 2260
 Finlay, Mr., 2006, 2016
 Finlay, John, 2293
 Finn, Lawrence, 2222a
 Finn, Thomas (Killarney), 2183a
 Finn, William F., 1946, 2271
 Fitz-Clarence, George Augustus Frederick, earl of Munster, 1977
 Fitzgerald, Mr., 2342
 FitzGerald and Vesey, second baron, *see* FitzGerald, William Vesey
 FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick, 3rd duke of Leinster, 1954, 2142, 2170, 2288
 FitzGerald, Rev. Edward, P.P., 2044
 FitzGerald, Edward Michael, 2185
 FitzGerald, Gerald, M.D., 2161
 FitzGerald, Maurice, Knight of Kerry, 2177-78, 2183-84, 2198, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2273, 2294
 FitzGerald of Desmond, Baron, *see* FitzGerald, William Vesey
 FitzGerald, William Vesey, 2000

- Fitzgibbon, Hon. Richard Hobart, 1958
 Fitzmaurice, C., 2174
 FitzMaurice, Henry Petty, 3rd marquise of Lansdowne, 2071, 2106, 2118
 FitzPatrick, Hugh, Jr., 2085, 2226
 FitzPatrick, Hugh, Sr., 1982
 FitzPatrick, Patrick Vincent, 1948, 1952, 1954-54a, 1955a-1957, 1959, 1961-64, 1966-69, 1971-75, 1976, 1977-81, 1983-90, 1992-94, 1996-97, 2007-11, 2019, 2034-39, 2042-43, 2046, 2049-50, 2054, 2057-57a, 2059-60, 2063-64, 2066-71, 2073, 2075, 2081-82, 2085, 2087, 2089-97, 2099-2105, 2114, 2120-22, 2124, 2126-28, 2132, 2183, 2186-87, 2191, 2205-06, 2212-13, 2216-19, 2222, 2224-29, 2231-33, 2235-36, 2246, 2257, 2260a, 2262a, 2263b, 2267, 2271, 2278-79, 2289, 2293, 2299-2300, 2302, 2311, 2320, 2324, 2330, 2334, 2340-41, 2344, 2357-58, 2361, 2368: 2033, 2117
 Fitz-Simon, Christopher, 2013, 2051, 2142, 2145-46, 2167, 2181, 2194, 2201, 2278, 2335, 2356
 Fitz-Simon, Christopher O'Connell, 2013
 Fitz-Simon, Daniel O'Connell, 2013
 Fitz-Simon, Ellen, *see also* O'Connell, 2013: 2139, 2140, 2147, 2181, 2195, 2336
 Fitz-Simon, Henry O'Connell, 2013
 Fitz-Simon, Nicholas, 1948
 Fitzsimon's school, 2161
 Fleming, Michael Anthony, Catholic bishop of Newfoundland, 2350
 Fletcher, William, 2224
 Fogarty, Philip, 1990, 2244
 Foot, George, 2229
 Foran, Rev. Nicholas, 2188
 Ford, William, attorney, 2117, 2222
 Foster, John Leslie, 2052, 2109
 Freeling, Sir Francis, 1st baronet, 1953
 Freeman, William Deane, 2283-84
 French, Fitz-Stephen, 2077, 2150, 2260, 2315
 Gallwey, Christopher (Kit), 2159
 Galway, Anthony, 2020
 Galwey, John Mathew, 2031a, 2041, 2045: 2032, 2038, 2085, 2156, 2188, 2282
 Geale, Piers, 2107
 Geraghty, Mr., 2094
 Gildus, St., 2292
 Glasscock, Talbot (Toby), 2173
 Gleneig, 1st Baron, *see* Grant, Charles
 Gossett, Sir William, Kt., 1951, 2001, 2025, 2106, 2121, 2123, 2233, 2235
 Goulburn, Henry, 2107, 2118
 Gower, Lord Francis Leveson-, 2358
 Graham, Sir James Robert, 2nd baronet, 2042, 2066, 2071, 2073, 2134, 2165, 2203, 2243
 Grant, Charles, 1st Baron Gleneig, 2350: 2061
 Grattan, Henry, Jr., 2193, 2206, 2218
 Grattan, Henry, Sr., 1982
 Greene, Richard Wilson, 2119, 2233, 2359-60
 Gregg, Fortescue, 2015, 2016
 Gregory XVI, Pope, 2158
 Grenville, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-, styled Lord Chandos, 2219, 2263a
 Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl Grey, 1955a, 1973, 1979, 1980, 1988, 1996, 1999, 2042, 2055, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2073, 2082, 2086, 2089, 2118, 2228, 2355
 Grey, Thomas Philip, 2nd Earl de Grey, 2172
 Griffith, Richard John, 2352
 Griffiths, Bishop Thomas, 2347
 Gronow, Rees Howell, 2155
 Grote, George, 2207
 Gully, John, 2324
 Haddington, 9th earl of, *see* Hamilton, Thomas
 Haliday, Charles, 2269: 2099
 Hamilton, George Alexander, 2199, 2201, 2261, 2313, 2323-24, 2333
 Hamilton, James Hans, 2194
 Hamilton, Thomas (attorney), 2253: 2249, 2251-2, 2268
 Hamilton, Thomas, 9th earl of Haddington, 2172
 Handcock, William, 1st Baron Castlemaine, 2150
 Hanlon, William, 2293
 Hannah, William, 1990
 Hardy, John, 2311
 Harrowby, 1st earl of, *see* Ryder, Dudley
 Hart, John, deputy clerk of the crown and hanaper, 2323
 Hart, Thomas, 1960
 Hart, William Sterne, 2366a: 2091
 Hartopp, Edward Bouchier, 2048
 Harvey, Daniel Whittle, 1951, 2230
 Harvey, Sir John, Kt. 2001
 Harvey, William, 2082
 Hayes, Roger, 2054
 Henry, Mrs., 2156
 Henry II, King, 2292
 Herbert, Henry Arthur (Muckcross) (1815-66), 2355

- Herbert, Thomas, 2174, 2178
 Hickman, Edward S., 2022
 Hickson, Samuel Murray, 2294, 2295
 Hill, Arthur Blundell Sandys, 3rd marquis of Downshire, 2102
 Hill, Matthew Davenport, 2033, 2037
 Hill, Richard (convict), 2118
 Hill, Rowland, 1st Baron Hill, 2231
 Hilliard, Samuel, 2028
 Hilliard, William, 2028
 Hobhouse, Sir John Cam, 2nd baronet 1971, 1974, 2010, 2087, 2088, 2203, 2207, 2208
 Hodgens, Thomas, 2180, 2181
 Hodges, George Lloyd, 2169
 Holmes, John, 2120
 Holmes, Robert, 2106, 2233
 Howard, Bernard Edward, 12th duke of Norfolk, 2241, 2243
 Howard, George, 6th earl of Carlisle, 2073
 Howard, George William Frederick, *styled* Viscount Morpeth, 2339: 2111, 2219, 2229, 2233, 2269, 2288, 2294, 2315, 2322, 2338, 2341
 Howell, George, 2333
 Howitt, Mary, 2362
 Howitt, William, 2362: 2363
 Hudson, William Elliot, 1990, 2244
 Huggard, Mr., 2178
 Hume, Joseph, 2171: 2115, 2163, 2165, 2176, 2202, 2203, 2207, 2219, 2229, 2239, 2269, 2271
 Hume, William F., 1976a
 Hunt, Henry, 2153
 Hutton, Robert, 2310
- Ingestre, Viscount, *see* Talbot, Henry
 John Chetwynd-,
 Ingilby, Sir William, 1972
- Jackson, Joseph Devonsher, 2170, 2233, 2360
 Jacob, Ebenezer, 2036, 2038, 2050, 2065, 2085, 2106
 James, Sir John Kingston, 1st baronet, 1961
 Jameson, Thomas, 1974
 Jebb, Richard, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2118, 2119
 Jeffcot, William, 2155
 Jephson, Charles Denham Orlando, 1970
 Johnson, Rev. Philip, 2025
 Johnson, William, 2108, 2109
 Johnston, John Kent, 2357
 Joyce, Miss, 2180
- Kavanagh, Thomas, 2247, 2258
- Kavanagh, Walter, 2179
 Keane, Sir Richard, 2nd baronet, 1963
 Kearney, Hickman, 2187, 2324, 2349
 Keatinge, Richard, 2106
 Keegan Mr., 2015, 2016
 Kelly, Patrick, Catholic bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 2156
 Kemmis, William, 2107
 Kenmare, 2nd earl of, *see* Browne, Valentine
 Kenmare, 3rd earl of, *see* Browne, Thomas
 Kenmares, the (2nd earl of Kenmare and his family), 2149
 Kennedy, James, 2064
 Kernan, Edward, bishop of Clogher, 2016, 2018
 Kernan, Randal, 2016, 2018
 Kertland, William, 1951
 Key, Sir John, 1972
 Kiernan, James, 2014
 Kildahl, Mr., 2081
 King, Maurice (barrister), 1990
 Knatchbull, Sir Edward, 9th baronet, 2039, 2042
 Knight, Michael, 2052
- Laforce, P., 2080
 Lamb, William, 2nd Viscount Melbourne, 2082, 2086, 2089, 2106, 2107, 2109, 2118, 2119, 2132, 2133, 2136, 2228, 2231-32, 2234, 2260a
 Lambart, Gustavus, 2193, 2206
 Lambert, Henry, 1963, 1984
 Lambton, John George, 1st earl of Durham, 2068, 2119, 2121, 2144, 2228
 Langley, —, 2337
 Lansdowne, 3rd marquis of, *see* Fitz-Maurice, Henry Petty
 Latouche, John David, 2311
 Latouches, the, 2134
 Lavelle, Patrick M., 1951, 1982, 1985, 1989
 Lawless, Edward, *later* 4th Baron Cloncurry, 2317
 Lawless, John, 2292
 Lawless, Valentine Browne, 2nd Baron Cloncurry, 2297: 1954, 2035
 Lawlor, Mary Ann, 2014
 Leader, Nicholas Philpot, 2164
 Leary, Daniel John, 1991, 2016, 2018, 2027, 2030, 2031
 Leeson, Joseph, 4th earl of Milltown, 1967
 Le Fanu, —, 2217
 Lefroy, Thomas Langlois, 1973, 2170, 2322

- Leinster, 3rd duke of, *see* FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick
 Leland, Thomas, 2007
 Lennox, Charles, 5th duke of Richmond, 2066, 2068, 2071, 2073
 Leonard, Joseph Anthony, 1963
 Lewis, Thomas Frankland, 2348
 Leycester, Joseph, 2229
 Lichfield, 1st earl of, *see* Anson, Thomas William
 Littleton, Edward John, 1958, 1991, 1998, 2001, 2003-6, 2015-16, 2018, 2023-24, 2027, 2030-31, 2052-53, 2074: 1971, 1974, 1975, 1977, 1982, 1985, 1994, 1999, 2001, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2014, 2025, 2037, 2040, 2043, 2046, 2063, 2074, 2082, 2085, 2086, 2089, 2090, 2093, 2176, 2203
 Londonderry, 3rd marquis of, *see* Vane, Charles William
 Loudon, Margracia, 2239
 Louis-Philippe, King of the French, 2358
 Low, George Bond, 2016
 Lucas, Dr. Charles, 1963
 Luttrell, Henry, 2032
 Lyle, Acheson, 1990
 Lynar, Sir William Wainwright, kt., 2366
 Lynch, Andrew Henry, 1975
 Lynch, David, 1947: 1982, 2218
 Lyndhurst, 1st Baron, *see* Copley, John Singleton
 Lync, Cornelius (Con), 2189
 Lyons, Thomas, 2319: 2224

 McAlister, James, 2173
 MacCabe, William Bernard, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2062, 2081
 McCarthy, Jeremiah (Dawson Street, Dublin), 1990, 2194
 McClelland, James, 2025
 McCrea, Rev. John B., 2170
 McDermott, Rev. Charles, 2285a
 MacDonald, General Sir John, 2111
 MacDonald, Norman Hilton, 2111
 MacDonnell, Eneas, 1982
 MacDonnell/McDonnell, John or Myles 1974
 McDonnell, Rev. Thomas W. 2153
 McDonnell & Co. 2289
 McGhee, Rev. Robert, 2260a
 MacHale, John, Catholic archbishop of Tuam, 2055, 2158, 2200, 2202, 2301, 2304, 2327, 2342, 2363b, 2365: 2156
 McKane, Thomas, 2346, 2349
 McKenna, William, 2173
 MacLoughlin, Cornelius, 2313, 2317
 McMullen, John, 1961, 1964, 2057a
 McSwiney, Edward, 2146

 Madden, John, 2285a
 Magee, Rev. Anthony, 2336
 Magee, James, 2060, 2068
 Magee, John, 1982
 Maher, Nicholas, 2043
 Mahon, D. (surgeon) 2180-1,
 Mahon, James Patrick O'Gorman, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2137, 2173
 Mahon, The O'Gorman, *see* Mahon, James Patrick O'Gorman
 Mahony, Jeremiah (Jerry or Darby) 16th Foot, 2083, 2106, 2115
 Mahony, Pierce, 2012, 2288, 2355: 2051, 2334
 Maley, Michael, 1961, 1964, 2057a, 2186-7, 2346, 2349
 Manger, Counsellor, 2161
 Martin, Thomas Barnewall, 2055
 Martley, John, 2229
 Mary Stuart, Queen, 2292
 Mathew, Rev. Theobald, 2065
 Melbourne, 2nd Viscount, *see* Lamb, William
 Michie, John, 2061
 Milltown, 4th earl of, *see* Leeson, Joseph
 Molesworth, Sir William, baronet, 2369
 Monteith, William, 2118
 Montgomery, Henry, 2290
 Moody, James, 1990
 Mooney, Thomas, 2079
 Moore, Arthur, 2108, 2109
 Moore, Thomas, 2292
 Moraux, A., 2358
 Morgan, John, 2138
 Morpeth, Viscount, *see* Howard, George William Frederick
 Morris, George, 2349
 Mulgrave, 2nd earl of, *see* Phipps, Constantine Henry
 Mulholland, Rev. Eugene, 2332
 Mullen, Joseph D., 2221, 2261, 2265, 2312-13, 2317-18, 2323, 2329, 2333: 2324, 2329, 2357
 Mullins, Frederick, W., 2155, 2159, 2174, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2225
 Munster, earl of, *see* Fitz-Clarence, George Augustus Frederick
 Murphy, John Joseph, 2244: 2217-18, 2302, 2310, 2326
 Murphy, William (Smithfield), 1947: 2313, 2317
 Murray, Daniel. Catholic archbishop of Dublin, 2260a
 Murray, T. Lamic, 2363a
 Musgrave, Sir Richard, 3rd baronet, 2031a, 2188

 Neligan, William J., 2152

- Newton, Walter, 2179
 Nicholas I, Czar, 2153
 Nolan, Edward, bishop of Kildare & Leighlin, 2185
 Norfolk, 12th duke of, *see* Howard, Bernard Edward
 Nugent, Patrick, 2024

 O'Brien, the Misses, 2137
 O'Brien, John (Cashel), 2160, 2167, 2255
 O'Brien, Timothy, 2118
 O'Connell, Catherine (Kate) (daughter), 2084: 2044, 2131, 2142, 2147, 2180, 2182, 2193, 2204
 O'Connell, Charles (son-in-law), 2029: 2084, 2145, 2147, 2180, 2183a, 2189, 2190-91-92
 O'Connell, Daniel (nephew), 2076
 O'Connell, Daniel (son), 2054, 2094, 2103, 2142, 2146-47, 2154-55, 2157, 2163, 2166, 2168, 2182
 O'Connell, Lt. Gen. Daniel Charles, Count, 2076, 2078
 O'Connell, Frances (Fanny, granddaughter), 2131, 2280
 O'Connell, James, 2076, 2078: 2189-90
 O'Connell, Jane (née O'Donoghue) *see* also O'Donoghue, Jane, 2076
 O'Connell, John (brother), 2159, 2184, 2198: 2130, 2147, 2149, 2155, 2174, 2223, 2295
 O'Connell, John (son), 2154: 1953, 1976, 1977, 2076, 2142, 2146-47, 2157, 2160, 2165, 2168, 2177, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2192, 2194-95, 2199, 2201, 2203, 2218, 2222a, 2225, 2278, 2294, 2335
 O'Connell, Rev. John, 2204
 O'Connell, John Charles, 2047
 O'Connell, Mary (wife), 2002, 2130-31, 2133-34, 2136-37, 2139-40, 2142, 2145-47, 2149, 2151-52, 2155, 2157, 2163, 2165-66, 2168, 2170, 2172, 2175, 2177, 2180-82, 2189, 2192, 2194-96, 2199, 2201, 2204, 2280, 2305-6, 2335-36: 1989, 2000, 2084, 2097, 2102, 2141, 2162, 2193, 2235, 2236, 2245, 2344, 2353, 2355, 2358, 2361, 2362-63-63a-63b, 2365
 O'Connell, Mary (granddaughter, daughter of Kate O'Connell), 2204
 O'Connell, Mary (granddaughter, daughter of Maurice O'Connell), 2170, 2172, 2280
 O'Connell, Mary Frances (daughter-in-law), 2000, 2020, 2134, 2142, 2146-47, 2163, 2165, 2168, 2170, 2172, 2180
 O'Connell, Maurice (Hunting-Cap), 2166, 2361
 O'Connell, Maurice (son), 2021: 1946, 1953, 2000, 2020, 2021, 2036, 2039, 2079, 2095, 2121, 2125, 2131, 2134, 2142, 2146-47, 2149, 2151-52, 2155, 2165, 2168, 2170, 2172, 2174, 2180, 2182, 2183-84, 2185, 2194, 2197, 2201, 2218-19, 2222a, 2238, 2278, 2305, 2330, 2352, 2353, 2357, 2360, 2369
 O'Connell, Morgan John, 2084, 2149, 2154, 2159, 2184, 2198, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2225, 2278, 2352
 O'Connell, Morgan P. (son), 2150, 2193: 1953, 2002, 2044, 2133, 2142, 2147, 2151, 2168-69, 2201, 2202, 2204, 2206, 2218-19, 2222-22a, 2234, 2278, 2280
 O'Connell, Rev. Patrick, 2047, 2048
 O'Connell, Teresa (granddaughter, daughter of Kate O'Connell), 2204
 O'Connell, William (Rathcormack), 2262, 2262a
 O'Connor, Arthur, 2203
 O'Connor, Feargus Edward, 1980a, 1984, 1985, 1989, 1990, 2046, 2063, 2191, 2252
 O'Connor, Thomas, *see* Connor, Thomas
 O'Connor, William, 1946
 O'Conor, Denis, 2077, 2315
 O'Conor Don, *see* O'Conor, Denis
 O'Donnell, William, 2188
 O'Dougherty, Charles, 2346
 O'Dowd, James Klyne, 2327
 O'Dwyer, Andrew Carew, 1946, 2039, 2046, 2355
 O'Ferrall, Richard More, 2073, 2075
 O'Gorman, Nicholas Purcell, 2038
 O'Grady, C., 1958
 O'Higgins, Patrick, 1985, 1988
 O'Kelly, Mathias Joseph, 2051
 O'Loughlin, Michael, 2020, 2031a, 2039, 2106, 2108, 2109, 2111, 2119, 2120, 2170, 2186-7, 2188, 2195, 2230, 2278, 2283, 2338, 2345, 2346, 2359, 2369
 O'Mullane family, 2002
 O'Neill, John, 2050, 2233
 Oranmore and Browne, 1st baron, *see* Browne, Dominick
 O'Reilly, William, 1996
 O'Sullivan, Eugene, 2048
 O'Sullivan, James (student), 2161
 O'Sullivan, Rev. Mortimer, 2246
 Owen, Robert, 2058
 Oxmantown, Lord, *see* Parsons, William

- Paget, Henry William, 1st marquis of Anglesey, 1949, 1951, 1954, 1971, 1972, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1986, 1993, 1999, 2001, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2025, 2073, 2107, 2114, 2118, 2164, 2245
 Palmer, Robert, 2263a
 Palmerston, 3rd Viscount, *see* Temple, Henry John
 Parnell, Henry Brooke, 4th baronet, 1951, 2070, 2115
 Parsons, William, *styled* Lord Oxmantown, 1988
 Pearson, Charles, 2148
 Pedro, Dom, 2169
 Peel, Robert, 2nd baronet, 1956, 1999, 2042, 2086, 2107, 2118, 2132, 2133, 2137, 2139, 2140, 2145, 2149, 2152, 2154, 2159, 2163-64, 2171, 2175, 2213, 2215, 2217, 2219, 2224, 2229, 2231, 2233, 2245, 2263b, 2265, 2280, 2289
 Pemberton, Benjamin, 1961
 Pennefather, Richard, 2016, 2030, 2031
 Pennefather family, 2255
 Perrin, Arthur, 2195
 Perrin, Louis, 1975, 1990, 1994, 1999, 2039, 2106, 2114, 2117, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2160, 2167, 2173, 2230, 2255, 2262a
 Phillips, Charles, 2108, 2141
 Philpotts, Henry, D.D., 2363b
 Phipps, Constantine Henry, 2nd earl of Mulgrave (later 1st marquess of Normanby), 2274, 2276, 2294-95, 2352, 2366: 2229, 2233, 2245, 2288, 2359, 2369
 Pigot, David Richard, 2343: 1990, 2039, 2103, 2106, 2123, 2186, 2244, 2344
 Pim, James, Jr., 1947
 Plowden, Francis Peter, 2059
 Plunket (née Bushe), Charlotte, 2106
 Plunket, John Span, 2106
 Plunket, William Conyngham, 1st Baron Plunket, 2273, 2286: 2012, 2023, 2073, 2108, 2109, 2134, 2346, 2359
 Plunket family (family of William Conyngham Plunket), 2012
 Plunkett, Randal Edward, 2193, 2206, 2355
 Ponsonby, John George Brabazon, later 5th earl of Bessborough, 2143, 2148
 Ponsonby, John William, *styled* Viscount Duncannon, 1949, 2098, 2106, 2111, 2118, 2338, 2360: 2087, 2088, 2089, 2091, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2119, 2143, 2148, 2176, 2198, 2214, 2241, 2245, 2288
 Ponsonby, Thomas Carrique, 2204
 Power, Mr., 2160
 Power, John (distiller), 1947: 1948, 2068, 2313, 2317
 Power, Nicholas Mahon, 2156
 Power, Patrick, Bellevue, 2031a, 2102, 2156, 2188, 2197
 Primrose, John Jr., 2044, 2047-48, 2083, 2183a, 2190-90a: 2084, 2155, 2273, 2286, 2358
 Primrose, John, Sr., 2168
 Primrose, Rickarda (née Connor), 2044, 2047
 Quebec, Comité Constitutionnel de, *see* Laforce, P., president of
 Quin, Michael, J., 2362-63
 Quinlan, Rev. Michael, 2161
 Radnor, 3rd earl of, *see* Bouverie, William Pleydell
 Rahilly, Edward, 2161
 Rahilly, Tom, 2161
 Raphael, Alexander, 2247-49, 2251-52, 2254, 2256, 2258-59, 2263, 2264, 2266, 2268, 2270, 2272: 2143, 2148, 2185, 2247, 2250, 2253, 2258, 2311
 Raumer, Friedrich Ludwig Georg von, 2358
 Ray, Thomas M., 2220
 Redmond, John, 2051, 2217
 Reily, John, 2345, 2349
 Reynolds, John, 2091, 2102, 2355
 Reynolds, Thomas, 1985, 1988, 2066, 2067, 2103
 Rice, Stephen Edmund Spring, 2309
 Rice, Thomas Spring, 2296, 2309: 1951, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1984, 1985, 1990, 1996, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2064, 2073, 2097, 2203, 2215, 2233
 Rich, Henry, 2235
 Richards, John, 2106, 2233
 Richardson, Townley, 1950
 Richmond, 5th duke of, *see* Lennox, Charles
 Riordan, Nicholas, 2283-84
 Ripon, 1st earl of, *see* Robinson, Frederick John
 Roberts, George, 2337
 Roberts, John Cramer, 2337
 Robertson, James Burton, 2363
 Robinson, Frederick John, 1st earl of Ripon, 2066, 2071, 2073
 Roche, Sir Boyle, 1990
 Roche, David, 2048, 2066
 Roe, George, 2317
 Roe, James, 2160, 2167
 Roe, Robert, 1955a

- Roe and others-v-Donlevy, 2145
 Romilly, John, 2176
 Ronayne, Dominick, 2036, 2074, 2194, 2197, 2224, 2226, 2276, 2309
 Ronayne, Richard Power-, 2319
 Rooney, James, 1985, 1986
 Roose, Sir David C., Kt., 2038
 Roskell, J., 2363a
 Rossmore, 2nd Baron, *see* Westenra, Warner William
 Rowe, Hudson, 2026
 Russell, Francis, *styled* Lord Tavistock, 2241
 Russell, John, 6th duke of Bedford, 2241
 Russell, Lord John, 2211, 2214, 2348: 2066, 2070, 2208, 2219, 2224-25, 2228, 2274, 2319, 2323, 2343, 2347
 Russell, Thomas, 2262
 Ruthven, Edward, 2364
 Ruthven, Edward Southwell, 1960, 1987, 2035, 2186, 2189, 2195, 2199, 2201, 2205, 2216, 2224, 2302, 2310, 2313, 2317, 2323, 2324, 2364
 Ryan, Cornelius, 2052
 Ryder, Dudley, 1st earl of Harrowby, 1992
 Ryder, Dudley, *styled* Viscount Sandon, 1984
 Ryder, Rev. William, 2175
- Salmon, James, 2112
 Sandes, Stephen Creagh, D.D., 2325: 2322
 Sandon, Viscount, *see* Ryder, Dudley
 Saurin, William, 2016
 Sausse, Matthew Richard, 1990, 2187, 2244
 Scallan, Thomas, Catholic bishop of St. John's, Newfoundland, 2350
 Scarlett, Robert C., 2294-95
 Schlegel, Frederick von, 2363
 Scott, Bindon, 2000: 2020, 2095, 2162
 Scott, Edward William, 2016
 Scott, Frances Percy, 2022: 2020
 Scott, John Bindon, 2162: 2020, 2021, 2022, 2149, 2155
 Scott, Mary Jane (née Cockbourn), 2020, 2021, 2022
 Scott family (Cahircon), 2020, 2146-47, 2180
 Scovills, 2001, 2003
 Scully, Denys, 1982
 Scully, Joseph C., 2011
 Servetus, 2290
 Seton, Alexander, 2364
 Shannon, 3rd earl of, *see* Boyle, Henry
 Shaw, Frederick, 1973, 2227, 2229, 2263b, 2325, 2338
 Shaw, John, Junr., 2025
 Shaw and Co., Sir Robert, 2299
 Shaw, Needham and Shaw, 2299
 Sheas' case, 1998
 Sheehan, Rev. John, 2032, 2156, 2188, 2197
 Sheehan, Remigius, 1959, 1967, 1971, 1976, 2008, 2087, 2091
 Sheil, Richard Lalor, 2241, 2243: 2033, 2034, 2036, 2037, 2039, 2040, 2263a
 Sherlock, Alexander, 2032, 2102
 Shrewsbury, 16th earl of, *see* Talbot, John
 Sidney, Sir William Robert, Kt., 2217
 Slattery, Rev. Michael, P.P. *later* Catholic archbishop of Cashel, 2072
 Smallman's Hotel, 2182
 Smith, Thomas Berry Cusac, 2199
 Smith, William (lawyer), 2342
 Smith, Sir William Cusac, second baronet, 1994, 2034, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2042, 2044, 2359
 Smyth, Richard, 2187, 2346, 2349
 Sobieski, Kildahl & Son, 2081
 Spencer, 3rd earl, *see* Spencer, John Charles
 Spencer, John Charles, *styled* Viscount Althorp, later 3rd earl Spencer, 1955a, 1972, 2003, 2004, 2008, 2033, 2036, 2037, 2043, 2061, 2070, 2081, 2082, 2086, 2094, 2100, 2108, 2131, 2145, 2233
 Spooner, William, 2363
 Staines, Henry, 1961
 Standish, Charles, 2243
 Stanley, Edward Geoffrey Smith, 1955: 1949, 1954, 1971, 1974, 1984, 1988, 2010, 2037, 2066, 2071, 2073, 2075, 2086, 2118, 2121, 2123, 2129, 2134, 2163, 2165, 2213, 2215-16, 2219, 2243, 2245
 Stanley, Edward John, 2091
 Staunton, Michael, 1951, 2058: 1982, 2008, 2009, 2039, 2059, 2060, 2117, 2206, 2229
 Steele, Thomas, 2020, 2026, 2285
 Stevenson, John, 2347a
 Stock, Joseph, 2346
 Stoughton, Thomas Anthony, 2295
 Stuart, William Villiers, 2156
 Sugden, Sir Edward Burtenshaw, kt., 2073, 2134
 Sugrue, Charles (butter merchant), 2319
 Sullivan, 2183a
 Sullivan, Richard, 2314, 2328, 2331, 2356: 2019, 2224
 Supple, Daniel, Jr., 2178, 2238: 2147, 2168, 2295

- Sutton, Charles Manners-, 1976a: 1970, 1980, 1984, 1996, 2099, 2203, 2212-13, 2215
- Sutton, Thomas Manners, 1st Baron Manners, 2016
- Sydney, Sir William Robert, Kt, 2237
- Talbot, Henry John Chetwynd-, *styled* Viscount Ingestre, 1977, 2189
- Talbot, Hon. James, 1960
- Talbot, John, 16th earl of Shrewsbury, 2164
- Talbot, John H., 2197
- Talleyrand, Charles, 1979
- Tandy, James, 2107
- Tavistock, Lord, *see* Russell, Francis
- Taylor, John S., 2292
- Tierney, George, 1996
- Temple, Henry John, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, 2349a
- Templetown, 2nd Baron and 1st Viscount *see* Upton, John Henry
- Tennent, James Emerson, 2063
- Thompson, Poulet, *see* Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett
- Thompson, Col. Thomas Perronet, 2239
- Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett (later 1st Baron Sydenham) 2073
- Thomson, Col., *see* Thompson, Thomas Perronet
- Tone, Theobald Wolfe, 2093
- Torrens, Robert, 2109
- Tracy, Harding, 1982
- Troy, John Thomas, Catholic archbishop of Dublin, 2263b
- Tuam, Catholic archbishop of, *see* Kelly, Oliver; MacHale, John
- Unknown Correspondents, 2056, 2223, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2303
- Upton, John Henry, 2nd Baron and 1st Viscount Templetown, 2025
- Vance, James, 1964
- Vandeleur, Judge Thomas Burton, 2255
- Vane, Charles William, 3rd marquis of Londonderry, 2217
- Verner, William, 2138
- Veschors, —, 2257
- Vigors, Nicholas A., 2143, 2250: 2148, 2200, 2248, 2249, 2251, 2256, 2258, 2264, 2272
- Waddy, Cadwallader, 2082
- Wales (Glenbeigh), 2183a
- Walker, Charles Arthur, 2019
- Wallace, Robert, 2095
- Wallace, Thomas, K.C., 2143, 2148
- Walsh, John, 1975
- Warburton, George, 2107
- Warburton, Henry, 2176, 2203, 2207-08, 2210, 2308, 2367, 2369: 2229, 2311
- Ward, Henry George, 2073, 2145, 2207
- Wellesley, Arthur, 1st duke of Wellington, 1973, 1979, 1982, 1985, 1986, 1992, 2132, 2133, 2136, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2144-45-46, 2149, 2153-54, 2164, 2215, 2217
- Wellesley, Richard Colley, 1st Marquis Wellesley, 2008, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2027, 2030, 2031, 2053, 2061, 2082, 2086, 2087, 2090
- Wellington, 1st duke of, *see* Wellesley, Arthur
- West, Henry, 2187
- West, John Beatty, 2189, 2197, 2199, 2201, 2261, 2313, 2323-24, 2333
- Westenra, Henry Robert, 2164, 2285a
- Westenra, Hon. John Craven, 2164
- Westenra, Warner William, 2nd Baron Rossmore, 2164
- Wetherell, Sir Charles, Kt., 2108
- Whelan, Rev. William J., 2124
- White, Francis, 2361
- White, Robert (Fleet St., Dublin), 2094
- White, Robert (Sheriff's Peer), 1961, 1964
- White, William, 2229
- Whiteford, Sir George, 2102
- Whitworth, Nicholas, 2144
- William IV, King, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1985, 1986, 2069, 2086, 2100, 2132, 2133, 2140, 2145, 2151, 2218, 2228-29, 2231-32, 2267, 2271, 2369
- Williams, William, 2351
- Wilson, Dom Joseph Porter, 2281
- Windham, William, 1996
- Wiseman, Rev. Nicholas Patrick Stephen, 2363: 2358, 2362
- Wood, Charles, 2355
- Woodlock, William, 2310, 2346, 2349: 2323
- Woulfe, Stephen (1787-1840), 2170, 2179, 2233, 2244, 2255, 2360
- Wright, John, 2251
- Wright, Selby & Robinson, bankers, 2263
- Wyse, George, 2032, 2156
- Wyse, Thomas, 2032, 2155, 2164, 2197, 2200, 2292

