

THE  
CORRESPONDENCE  
OF  
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume VI

1837-1840







THE  
CORRESPONDENCE  
OF  
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume VI

1837-1840

The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell

Volume VI

1837-1840

 BLACKWATER, DUBLIN  
The Old Fish Market Company

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 VI

1837-1840

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



BLACKWATER DUBLIN

for the Irish Manuscripts Commission

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

DANIEL O'CONNELL  
*All forms of micro-publishing*  
© The Blackwater Press

187-149  
ISBN 0 905471 02 4

BLACKWATER PRESS  
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	
1837 (letters 2369a-2485b) . . . . .	1
1838 (letters 2486-2574) . . . . .	120
1839 (letters 2575-2671) . . . . .	201
1840 (letters 2672-2787) . . . . .	294
Index of Persons . . . . .	403

### Acknowledgment

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, Fredric, <i>Modern English Biography . . .</i>
<i>Cath. Ency.</i>	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i> (U.S.A.)
<i>Dict. Amer. Biog.</i>	<i>Dictionary of American Biography</i>
DNB	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
DEM	<i>Dublin Evening Mail</i>
DEP	<i>Dublin Evening Post</i>
FJ	<i>Freeman's Journal</i>
MC	<i>Morning Chronicle</i>
MR	<i>Morning Register</i>
NLI	National Library of Ireland
<i>Times</i>	The London <i>Times</i>
UCD	University College, Dublin

Sources not listed in Vol. I 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:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Bell, <i>British Folks and British India</i>         | Bell, John H. <i>British Folks and British India fifty years ago: Joseph Pease and his contemporaries.</i> London 1891.   |
| 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.        |
| Conroy, <i>Railways in Ireland</i>                   | Conroy, John C. <i>A History of Railways in Ireland.</i> London 1928.   |
| Fagan, <i>O'Connell</i>                              | Fagan, William. <i>Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell.</i> 2 vols. Cork 1848.   |
| FitzPatrick, <i>Correspondence</i>                   | 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.                                    |
| Greville, <i>Memoirs</i>                             | <i>The Greville Memoirs, Second Part: a journal of the reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852.</i> By Charles C.F. Greville. Henry Reeve, ed. 3 vols. London 1885. |
| 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.  |
| McDowell, <i>Irish Administration</i>                | McDowell, R.B. <i>The Irish Administration, 1801-1914.</i> London 1964.   |
| 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, *Economic History of Ireland* O'Brien, George. *Economic History of Ireland from the Union to the Famine*. London 1921.
- O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland* O'Brien, R.B. *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881*. 2 vols. London 1883.
- O'Keefe, *O'Connell* O'Keefe, Christopher Manus. *Life and times of Daniel O'Connell with sketches of his contemporaries*. 2 vols. Dublin 1872.
- Patterson, *Burdett* Patterson, M.W. *Sir Francis Burdett and his Times 1770-1844*. 2 vols. London 1931.
- Reid, *Durham* Reid, Stuart J. *Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham 1792-1840*. 2 vols, London 1906.
- Stanton, *Woman Suffrage* Stanton, E.C. and Others. *History of Woman Suffrage*. 2 vols. New York 1881-2.

*To a friend in Rome, 1837*<sup>1</sup>

[Excerpt]

I revere in all things the authority of the Holy See. I really believe (in so far as I know myself) that there is not a single person who pays more sincerely than I do, and with all my heart, that submission — in the widest sense of the word — to the Holy See which the Catholic Church demands of her children. I have never said and shall never say a single word which I would not subject to her authority with profound obedience. I am attached to the centre of unity with the most ardent desire never to separate myself from it either in thought or word or action, and if I should ever deceive myself in the opinions I express, I hope that they will be interpreted according to my sentiments because my submission to the authority of the Church is complete, whole and universal.

SOURCE: Gondon, *O'Connell*, 97

- 1 According to Gondon in this biography of O'Connell, unjust and calumnious press statements concerning O'Connell's religious orthodoxy had produced such an effect in Rome that the Pope, Gregory XVI, refused in 1837 to grant him the privilege of a portable altar which he had requested. The friend, who had been given the task of obtaining the privilege, did not dare tell O'Connell that it had been refused. Instead he wrote to him to say the newspapers had from time to time attributed such strange language to him that Rome did not know what to believe. The latter part of O'Connell's reply is published in the biography. Gondon adds that these lines were brought to the notice of the Pope by O'Connell's friend and, in consequence, Gregory granted the privilege sought. (Jules Gondon, *Biographie de Daniel O'Connell*, Paris, 1847, 96-97). On 23 September 1838 Gregory granted O'Connell the privilege, that is, the right to have Mass celebrated and the sacraments dispensed in his private apartment when away from home. On 17 March 1838 Gregory had granted O'Connell and his family two indulgences and, on 15 July 1838, one to any person who should pray in O'Connell's oratory at Derrynane. The indulgences would have been granted much more readily than the privilege of a portable altar which is normally only granted to laymen when they are heads of states. The Papal rescripts making these three grants are in the possession of the editor. O'Connell must have treated them as private since no writer except Gondon has mentioned any of them until after they had been made available in 1947. Jules Gondon (1812-73?), Catholic writer and journalist, dealt with English matters in *l'Univers*.

## 2369b

To a friend in Rome, 1837<sup>1</sup>

*Excerpt*

No, I have never lacked respect for the Spanish clergy. I was never guilty of that crime. . . . How could I be accused of having spoken of the ministers of God in that way? Such language resembles that of the pretended liberals in France who are enemies of religion rather than friends of liberty. . . .

I believe that few men are less disposed than me to attack, by injury or calumny, the priests of God. I have often told you my secrets on the sentiments of veneration which a priest inspires in me. You will laugh at me, perhaps, when I add that I push this respect to superstition but the fact is that I cannot defend myself from it. I have never known anyone, who has treated the ministers of the altar in a discourteous manner, to have prospered in the world. There is, even in this world, a curse on such people.

SOURCE: Gondon, *O'Connell*, 95

- 1 Translated from the French. The original was probably written in English. The recipient is the same as in Letter 2369a. Gondon states (p. 95) that O'Connell had learned from this friend (the recipient of the letter) that newspapers had accused him of saying discourteous things about the Spanish clergy.

## 2369 c

To John Easthope

16 Pall Mall [London], [probably early 1837]

*Strictly confidential*

My dear friend,

Mr. Elphinstone,<sup>1</sup> the member for Hastings, is about to retire from that borough. I think from the conversation we have had it would suit you. I mentioned your name and qualifications and the perfect *confidence* with which he could commune with you. He wishes to see you as soon as possible. He lives in Eaton Place. I really think from what he said that if you see him *at once* you will be [*sic*] find exactly what you want in Hastings. It will give me the most sincere pleasure to contribute to any desirable object of yours.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: Duke University Library

- 1 Howard Elphinstone. For his identification see letter 2435.
- 2 Easthope did not stand for Hastings. He was elected for Leicester borough on 26 July 1837.

### 2370

*From John Fenton, Crimble near Rochdale, Lancs.,  
2 January 1837 to Merrion Square redirected to Tralee*

Fearing that his letter to O'Connell of 10 December 1836 may have been lost in sea storms he writes again to send O'Connell the invitation of the Rochdale Reform Association of 9 December 1836 to attend a public dinner<sup>1</sup> in honour of his exertions "to obtain justice for Ireland and by his ardent advocacy of the principles of civil and religious liberty during the whole of his political career." A copy of the resolution inviting O'Connell is attached.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 In his reply, dated 17 January 1837, O'Connell declines the invitation due to pressure of business, and apologizes for the delay in replying (*Pilot*, 30 Jan. 1837). In this issue the *Pilot* denies a rumour that O'Connell refused to go to Rochdale unless £50 were paid to him for expenses.

### 2370a

*From Michael J. Quin*

25 Southampton Row, Russell Square [London], 2 January 1837  
My Dear Sir,

In obedience to your opinion, which to me is law, I have surrendered at once all claim upon the *Review* funds for any compensation whatever, and I present you with a corrected copy of my accounts as they stand at this moment.<sup>1</sup> I charge myself not only with the sums paid into the bank, but also with those which our London and Dublin publishers paid to me, and those which are still in the hands of the former. I state on the opposite side the sums which I have paid, the balance now in bank, and in Spooner's hands, and from the whole you will see that I am actually *out of pocket* £35. 8. 4. The vouchers shall be laid before you on your arrival in London. I shall send by this day's post a copy of these accounts also to Dr. Wiseman.

The question which now remains to be settled is this. In what mode is the *Review* to be henceforth continued? Its existence is a matter of great importance to religion, to Ireland, to the popular cause.

I think I can now say that I have given up my proposed expedition to Cuba. So many of my best friends have recently objected to my removal from this country — so many circumstances have occurred to alter my first impressions with respect to my Cuba expectations — that I begin to think that the same sense of duty to my family, which originally impelled me to accept the office I have mentioned, must soon induce me to decline it altogether. Assuming, then, that I stay in England, I ask in what mode the *Review* is to be conducted?

It is impossible that I should edit and write without being paid. A fund should be supplied, adequate to pay the editor a reasonable salary, and to remunerate contributors for their articles. Whence is this fund to proceed? This is a question necessary to be answered as soon as possible, in order that preparations should be made forthwith for the fourth number. I have no objection still to continue editor, if you wish it — but I cannot give any more of my time to the Journal without remuneration. In *writing* and in *cash* I have already advanced to the *Review* upwards of £300. Is it reasonable that I alone should be called upon to make such a sacrifice as this?<sup>2</sup>

I anxiously look for your opinion and advice upon these points.

[P.S.] You are aware that my accounts refer to the first and second numbers of the *Review*, and that I have had nothing whatever to do with the third number. Spooner's accounts will show the other receipts as well as the disbursements for advertising, etc.

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XXI, (1893), 138-9.

1 See Letter 2362 n2.

2 According to Thomas Chisholm Anstey, M.P. for Youghal, O'Connell seems to have contributed £380 to enable the *Review* to bring out its third number (October 1836) and seems also to have paid for the settlement of Quin's claims on the magazine (*Fagan, O'Connell*, II, 594-8).



2371

*From Alexander Seton, Lr. Rutland Street, Dublin,  
11 January 1837*

Seeks position in the administration, preferably as a police magistrate, which O'Connell, he says, had promised to obtain for him as a reward for political services. He supported liberal principles before it became fashionable to do so. He uses the salutation: 'My Dear O'Connell'.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

2372

*From Charles Clay,<sup>1</sup> Ashton-under-Lyne,  
12 January 1837 to Derryane*

Invites O'Connell to an extensive reform meeting and dinner which the committee, of which he is secretary, are preparing for 25 January.<sup>2</sup> His committee think that by coming O'Connell would assist his own immediate objects as well as the general principles of reform in 'our English boroughs'.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Charles Clay (1801-1893), senior medical officer, St. Mary's Hospital, Manchester; sometime editor of the *Ashton Reformer*. See *DNB*.
- 2 It has not been ascertained whether O'Connell accepted this invitation.

2373

*To Lord Mulgrave*

Merrion Square, 15 January 1837

My Lord,

Having been more instrumental than your Excellency can be aware of in inducing Mr., now Baron, O'Loghlen to accept that office<sup>1</sup> I venture to hope that you will not deem me presumptuous in respectfully urging the justice of his claims to the office of Master of the Rolls.<sup>2</sup> If he continued to be Attorney-General he would be entitled to it as of course. He gave up that office at the desire of your Excellency, having been most strongly advised

by me and other friends to place himself in your hands and at your disposal.

The Court of Chancery — I mean the chief court — is still an *exclusive* court. No Catholic can be Chancellor but, as Catholic property, Catholic rights and above all the sacred duty of educating our minor children belongs to that court, this therefore is a case where, as we cannot have *equality* we ought to have — *above all from you — participation*. You perceive even in the boldness of my phrase the not perhaps unpleasant inconvenience that the conviction of your desire to establish impartiality brings upon you.

Again, O'Loghlen has great merits. He expended his private fortune to a large amount in two contested elections<sup>3</sup> to secure the return of another reformer and of himself. He did honour in Parliament to the office of Attorney-General for Ireland. He is by the admission of the entire Bar the best *motion judge* (the peculiar office of the Master of the Rolls) on the Bench. He is a *tried* man and his reputation has always risen with the opportunities of evincing all the higher qualities of a great mind rendered still more attractive by the excellent good temper and sweet amiability of his manners.

If I am more urgent for him than I ought to be, I beg my excuse may be allowed. It arises from my sense of that work which the friendship of many years has given me the best opportunities of appreciating.

I believe Mr. Richard's *letters*<sup>4</sup> will show that *this* arrangement is one he ought to submit to. I do not mean to disparage him. He is indeed a most worthy honourable man of very high capacity and pure integrity. I would not for the world's work disparage that excellent gentleman and first-rate lawyer but I do with the greatest respect and the most deferential confidence lay claim to the offer for the Baron who cannot in his station act for himself.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers.

1 A baron of the exchequer.

2 O'Loghlen was appointed master of the rolls on 28 January 1837.

3 One of these occasions was the election for Dublin city in August 1831 when O'Loghlen and David Charles LaTouche were defeated by their Tory opponents.

4 Unidentified. Richards was attorney-general at this time.

2374

*From Lord Mulgrave*

[Dublin] Castle, 16 January 1837

*Copy*

My Dear Sir,

Mr. Fitz-Simon called upon me today with a letter<sup>1</sup> which you had written previous to leaving Dublin and added that you wished him to do so for the purpose of explaining that you did not expect any answer. But I cannot avoid noticing one phrase in your letter. I am perfectly aware of the value of your opinion upon these sort of points generally and am certainly not less disposed to attend to it than to that of any other parliamentary supporter of my Government, but as the question is here between two gentlemen with whom I have officially been so intimately connected, I must act with regard to them upon my own unbiased judgement, as I should not be fit to hold my present situation if I had not long since accurately studied every circumstance connected with either of their conflicting claims, in considering which, there will be certainly no disposition to overlook anything connected with the peculiar position of Baron O'Loughlen, all in relation to which is of course better known to me than to any other individual.

Under these circumstances, whilst on the one hand I assure you I fully appreciate the delicacy which has induced you generally to abstain from similar applications. I think the same frank spirit which, on almost the only former occasion, induced you in a goodhumoured figure of speech to apologize for the haste with which you had written, will incline you now to own that your zeal for your friend hurried you into an improper expression, which on reflection I have no doubt you will be glad to retract, when in addressing me, you use the phrase '*lay claim* to the office for the Baron'.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

1 Letter 2373.

2 See letter 2380.

2375

*To John Fenton*

Kilkenny, 17 January [1837]

[O'Connell regrets that he has had no time until now to answer Fenton's letter because of the pressure of his duties and that he is unable on that account to visit Rochdale] But alas; we have not received the same kind and grateful return from other English and self-styled Reformers which we have met with from the honest Reformers of Rochdale. The men on whom I have properly bestowed the denomination of 'Tory Radical' have placed themselves in an attitude of hostility towards us, and are working, by all the means in their power, to destroy an administration the first for six hundred years which has been honestly desirous to establish a system of impartiality and justice in Ireland. I regret this bitterly, as it seems to prove that former governments must have had popular sympathy and countenance in their career of reckless injustice to Ireland.

SOURCE: *Pilot*, 30 January 1837

2376

*To Joshua Walmsley*<sup>1</sup>

Kilkenny, 17 January 1837

Sir,

I deeply regret that it is totally out of my power to attend the dinner to be given by the Reformers of Liverpool to their distinguished representative, Mr. Ewart.<sup>2</sup> [He praises Ewart's work in the House of Commons.] He has already distinguished his parliamentary career by the important improvements he has been the chief instrument of effecting in the criminal law. . . . As an Irishman I feel the deepest debt of gratitude for his support of every measure calculated to procure justice for Ireland, a support which is in . . . contrast with the active and somewhat malignant hostility of his ungifted though *noble!!!* colleague. . . .<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: The John Rylands Library

- 1 Joshua Walmsley (1794-1871), corn merchant in Liverpool 1814; mayor of Liverpool 1838; knighted 1840; see *DNB*.
- 2 William Ewart (1798-1869), called to the bar 1827; M.P. intermittently from 1828-1868; M.P. for Liverpool 1831-37. See *DNB*.

- 3 Dudley Ryder (1798-1882), styled Viscount Sandon until 1847 when he succeeded his father as 2nd earl of Harrowby; M.P. for Tiverton 1819-31, for Liverpool 1831-47.

## 2376a

*To John Easthope, Morning Chronicle, 20 January 1837,  
From Dublin*

Recommends 'a young friend of mine, Mr. Connor'<sup>1</sup> who seeks employment in London as a reporter.

SOURCE: Duke University Library

- 1 Not identified.

## 2377

*From Christopher Fitz-Simon*

Dublin, 21 January [1837]

*Private*

My Dear Sir,

Mr. Drummond has just sent for me and made the following communication to me. He says they do not place any reliance on it but still he thought it right to let me know. The communication came to Col. Shaw Kennedy<sup>1</sup> who in case of necessity has taken all proper steps. The report came to him that a band of Orangemen intended to attack your carriage at a bridge in a close glen near Sligo, about 3 miles from the town. I think it is called Coll-oony or Ballisodare. Drummond was not certain of the name. Col. Kennedy has this night sent down to Sligo Sub-Inspector Tracey<sup>2</sup> with instructions. He is to have 100 men in Sligo and 30 military. He is to have his chief constable with 30 men near the bridge in question, not to be seen but to be ready to act at once if necessary and, if he finds any of the Orange party assembling, he is to bring the 100 out of Sligo. The 30 at the bridge have orders to follow at a short distance, so as not to be remarkable, after you have passed. Thus they have taken every precaution though they do not apprehend anything. Yet these Orangemen are such a set, it might if possible be well if you could avoid going to Sligo.<sup>3</sup>

P.S. A current report in town that old Kavanagh of Carlow died last night.<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 James Shaw Kennedy (1788-1865), 8 Pembroke Road, Dublin; eldest son of John Shaw, Ayrshire. Assumed additional surname of Kennedy in 1834. Inspector-general of Irish constabulary 1836-38. Knighted 1861. See *Boase*.
- 2 William Samuel Tracy, J.P. and sub-inspector of police, sligo.
- 3 O'Connell attended a public dinner in his honour in Sligo on 24 January 1837, under the chairmanship of the newly appointed high sheriff, Daniel Jones (*Pilot*, 27 Jan. 1837). No attempt on O'Connell's life is recorded as having taken place.
- 4 Thomas Kavanagh, M.P. for Co. Carlow died on 20 January.

2378

*From P. V. FitzPatrick to Athlone*

Dublin, 21 January 1837

My Dear Sir,

The *Lancet* which you wished to have cannot be obtained at the Dublin booksellers, all that arrived having been exhausted. I have ordered your papers etc. to Athlone for this day and tomorrow and shall have them sent to Castlebar on Monday and (say) Mullingar on Tuesday. The 'Leinster Declaration' managed by Shiel has now 28 peers and about 50 commoners attached to it. Six additional peers are expected on Monday and it will be published in the papers of the succeeding day.<sup>1</sup> *It is said* that Brewster has already started for Carlow in consequence of the death<sup>2</sup> of Kavanagh. Vigors' friends here however think the success<sup>3</sup> of the latter indubitable.

C. Fitz-Simon apprises you of the rumoured intention of the Orange party to assail you on your way to Sligo in the neighbourhood of Colloony.<sup>4</sup> I have mentioned the rumour in my letter to Mr. Martin Madden<sup>5</sup> of Sligo and you will probably receive a report direct from that town through his agency as to the truth or falsehood of the information. The Government have, I believe, taken all proper precautions to defeat the intention of the conspirators if the attack should in reality be attempted but I believe they attach little credit to the statement. It is however right that you should 'look out afore'. We know that the bloodthirsty villians are capable of any atrocity and to injure you they would perhaps freely put their own lives to hazard. *Cave.*

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 For the original Leinster Declaration, see letter 1721 nl. A great Orange meeting took place at the Mansion House, Dublin on 24 January 1837, under the chairmanship of the marquis of Downshire. The meeting passed anti-Catholic resolutions, anti-government in tone, specifically condemning O'Connell. Melbourne condemned the 'violence and prejudice' of the meeting, but refused to take the strong measures apparently advocated by Mulgrave against those taking part (*DEP*, 24, 26 Jan. 1837; *Annual Register*, 1837, 28; Lyne, 'General Association'). The day after the meeting a declaration was published, signed by 34 peers and 58 M.P.'s, condemning the meeting as being likely to disrupt the current tranquility of Ireland, and calculated to prejudice parliament during the forthcoming session against Irish reform measures (*Pilot*, 25 Jan. 1837). This is the 'declaration to which FitzPatrick refers.
2. See letter 2377 n4.
- 3 Vigers was elected on 18 February by 669 votes against 633 for his opponent, Thomas Bunbury (*DEM*, 20 Feb. 1837).
- 4 See letter 2377.
- 5 Martin Madden, merchant, Ratcliffe Street, Sligo; mayor of Sligo for 1843, the first elected after the establishment of the reformed corporation.

2379

*From Rev. John Sheehan to Merrion Square*

Waterford, 25 January 1837

My Dear Friend,

As you come to visit us at Easter I beg leave to remind you that your bed will be prepared for you at my house at Henrietta Street.

A cracked doctor of the name of Jones<sup>1</sup> has been recommended to the Lord Chancellor<sup>2</sup> as a fit person to be a magistrate in this city. The appointment will excite universal disgust. It will disgrace the Government if it take place. I suspect Barron for electioneering purposes has been doing this job. For God's sake, save Lord Mulgrave from the disgrace of this appointment. You may quote my authority. This Jones is the son of an old drunken Welsh captain. His mother until the other day kept a little shop in which she sold toys and worsted. He married lately in Glasgow an elderly Scotch lady and got some money but he is anti-Irish to the backbone. Will you enquire whether Major Rowan<sup>3</sup> of the Lunatic Asylum here is about to be promoted? If so, I take leave to ask your interest in getting the place for my brother, Dr. Sheehan. He has latterly had bad, very bad health and his friends all say he cannot with safety undertake night practice, and here it would

be fatal to the prospects of a physician to give up the practice of midwifery. This is the first time that I ever thought of asking a favour from the Government for anyone belonging to myself. I am sure that both the Stuarts would support the application. I would not ask Barron or Wyse for anything. If you think that I am unreasonable in this request, burn this letter and let no one even hear of it.<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Edward Jones, M.D., physician to the lunatic asylum, Waterford. Appointed a magistrate for Waterford city 1837.
- 2 W. C. Plunket.
- 3 Robert Rowan, manager of the Waterford lunatic asylum.
4. Sheehan's application on behalf of his brother appears still not to have been complied with in December 1837 (see letters 2482 and 2384).

2380

*To Lord Mulgrave*

Merrion Square, 26 January 1837

My Lord,

I am placed in an awkward predicament by having mistaken the cause of complaint in your Excellency's<sup>1</sup> letter to an expression of mine. I read the words thus 'long claim' and it would have been my duty respectfully to have solicited the honour of an audience in order that I should understand what there was in these words for which I ought to atone. I now discover that the words were 'laying claim' and I beg to assure your Excellency that in using these words I did not intend to say or insinuate that I had any valid claim or that I did thereby assert anything in the nature in the slightest degree of a right. The phrase I do assure your Excellency — amongst us Irish — means rather 'making a request' than anything like calling for or asserting 'a right.' At all events I would beg leave altogether to retract those words as they are capable of being mistaken and to assure your Excellency that it was not my intention to trespass in the slightest degree on the most perfect independence of your judgement and I have much regret that I should have fallen into even an involuntary error in my letter. I do request of your Excellency to pardon one unaccustomed to courtly phrase.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 See letter 2373.



2381

To Arthur French,<sup>1</sup> Secty. G[eneral] A[ssociation]

London, 7 February 1837

My dear Ffrench [*sic*],

I have the great pleasure to tell you that a committee<sup>2</sup> was last night appointed 'to inquire how far the intentions of the Reform bill<sup>3</sup> were defeated by creating and registering fictitious and improper votes in Ireland.' This lets us in at once and indeed is exactly framed to meet the case of the fraudulent freemen admitted by the Corporation of Dublin. All we want now is information.

1st. As to the Counties — as many cases as possible of Voters registered upon fraudulent leases such as leases with complicated Covenants putting the tenant constantly in the power of the Landlords. This I know is a constant Tory trick, and we will find abundant cases of this description.

2d. Cases where the Torys have registered voters on defective titles such as those where the Landlord has not a sufficient estate in the premises and grants a longer term than he has himself.

3d. The cases of fraudulent freemen. This opens up all the frauds in Dublin and in other corporations.

With respect to *undervalue*, each particular case will come on by itself and we will be able to produce as much evidence as may be requisite or useful to sustain the popular voters and to impeach the Tory voters. Upon this subject there is the advantage of giving that evidence before this committee without expence which would be most oppressively expensive to a private individual before an election Committee.

I think the association should at once appoint a subcommittee to look out for and arrange the cases and the evidence. I had made some progress with the trades political union on this subject. Send me the names of all persons who can give satisfactory evidence, especially in Dublin. It is impossible to have any thing occur more useful to Ireland than this Committee as it will necessarily bring distinctly before Parliament and the public the scandalous injustice done to the land by the framers of the reform bill and the still greater injustice which has been perpetrated by the Tory faction under colour of that bill. I confidently expect that it will be equally useful with the Orange Lodge Committee.<sup>4</sup> I pledge myself to attend every sitting of this committee unless prevented by illness or some other inevitable obstacle. I do feel it a most important duty to attend it.

I have not as yet received any petitions for presentation although many were signed and ready when I left Dublin. It is important that the petitions for 'the Ballot' should arrive as soon as possible and as numerously signed as may be.<sup>5</sup> I wish also for copies of the affidavits made in Prunty's case<sup>6</sup> to sustain the allegations in the petition intrusted to Mr. Grote. Also the names of such other persons of respectability as are ready to prove those allegations. Get this information for me without delay.

The political prospects here appear to me to be exceedingly good. The outrageous conduct of the 'great Protestant meeting'<sup>7</sup> in Dublin as it is ludicrously called has done much service. The Tories themselves must see that the rational part of the British nation is too much alive to the state of Ireland as to allow that party to govern that Country by or for 'the faction' and to risk the stability of the throne and the security of the connexion in order to gratify the bad passions of the Shaws, Lefroys *et hoc genus omne*.

[P.S.] Private. You may read this at the association.

SOURCE: St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N.Y.

- 1 Identified in letter 2405nl.
- 2 This select committee was formed by the House of Commons on the proposal of Frederick Shaw. It included O'Connell.
- 3 The Irish reform act of 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 88).
- 4 The select committee of the House of Commons established on 23 March 1835 to enquire 'into the nature, character, extent and tendency of Orange Lodges, Associations or Societies in Ireland.'
- 5 Between mid-February and mid-July 1837 nearly 300 petitions in favour of the ballot were presented to the Commons, most of them from Ireland.
- 6 Peter Prunty, Fardrummin, Killoe, Co. Longford, an illiterate Catholic farmer and registered voter for Co. Longford. He and his wife Bridget swore affidavits to the effect that he had been kidnapped and held prisoner in Carrickglass, Co. Longford, home of Thomas Lefroy, M.P., in an attempt to intimidate him into voting for Charles Fox, the Conservative candidate in the Co. Longford by-election (*MR*, 2 Jan. 1837). On being brought under guard to the poll in Longford on 29 December he passed his wife in the town, and she said to him: 'Oh! Prunty, remember your soul and liberty!' He voted for the Liberal (and successful) candidate, Luke White (*MR*, 31 Dec. 1836). From Tralee on 5 January O'Connell wrote a public letter to Arthur French, asking that the General Association 'testify their respectful admiration of the conduct of Mrs. Prunty, the wife of a Longford freeholder, by presenting her with some small token of their respect, such as a shawl, a cloak, or other suitable article' (*DEP*, 7 Jan. 1837). The Association had already resolved to pay a mark of respect to Peter and Bridget Prunty (*DEP*, 7 Jan. 1837).
- 7 The Protestant meeting in Dublin on 24 January 1837 (see letter 2378nl).

2382

*To P. V. Fitzpatrick*

London, 9 February 1837

I did not get the [*Dublin*] *Evening Post* due this day. I wrote myself to Barrett about the *Pilot*. These things are trifles yet they really fret me exceedingly.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 78

2383

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 18 February 1837

My Dear FitzPatrick,

I am not a little amused with the reports circulated by the Orange faction in Dublin. I have but one advice to give you — that is, just not to believe one word of them all from one end to the other. There is especially not the least truth in the report that the ministers are going to resign or that they will resign, even if the Irish Corporation Bill<sup>1</sup> and the English Church Rate Bill<sup>2</sup> were rejected by the lords, *without trying a dissolution*. They will give the people the advantage of a new parliament chosen under the auspices of a Reform Ministry. This is but common sense and, indeed, but common honesty as regards the Irish people, who deserve the protection of a Liberal Government in the exercise of their functions. I venture to tell you that you may rely on this account of the real intentions of the Ministry. This will raise the question distinctly between the Peers and the people — at least so far as *the people* are represented in Parliament. There is no doubt that the king will sanction the dissolution whenever his Ministers deem it necessary.

The Corporate Reform Bill for Ireland will be discussed on Monday. Heaven knows how long the debate may last. There is a story circulated here amongst persons who *ought* to be in the secret, that Peel's plan is this: either during the debate on Lord Francis Egerton's motion<sup>3</sup> or immediately after, to rise and offer the Ministers that if they will take the Tithe Bill at a reduction of thirty per cent., as they proposed last year, and gave [*sic*] up the appropriation clause,<sup>4</sup> on the ground that there is nothing to

appropriate, he (Peel) and his party will allow the Irish Municipal Reform Bill to pass *both Houses*. This last will be distinctly implied, though it cannot be distinctly said<sup>5</sup> in the House of Commons. It is believed that such offer will be made but its reception by the ministry is extremely doubtful. Should they accede, the Irish members will probably feel it their duty to protest against any compromise on the subject of the tithes and accept the deduction merely as an instalment.

It would be better for public liberty that the Lords should again throw out the Bill. Certainly something would be gained by carrying into effect the bargain between Peel and the Ministry but none of the Irish popular members could commit themselves to the plan.

Nothing can be more ridiculous than the praise of Jackson for his speech.<sup>6</sup> It was simply a piece of brawling virulence, unenlivened by one ennobling idea.

The money market is in what they call an *easier* state.<sup>7</sup> It is generally believed, however, that the Bank of England must come to the pound notes. Indeed, the only question seems to be how many thousands of persons are to be reduced from affluence to beggary by the Bank machinery before they have the candour to admit that they cannot continue to pay in gold. It would be well if they at once determined to meet the pressure of the existing evil and gave relief without delay to the commercial and manufacturing classes.

Upon the whole the popular party in Ireland have every reason to hope and none to despond or distrust.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 78-80

- 1 The Irish municipal reform bill. It was introduced on 7 February and received its second reading on 17 February.
- 2 A government measure providing for the abolition of church rates. Vigorously opposed by the bishops and disliked by many Whigs as tending towards church disestablishment, it received its second reading on 23 May by a majority of only five — 287 to 282 — and was later abandoned (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 340-42).
- 3 On 20 February Lord Francis Egerton moved for the abolition of corporations in Ireland, and the making of alternative arrangements for the government of town and cities there. The motion was defeated on 22 February, after three days' debate, by 322 to 242 (*Annual Register*, 1837, 40-8; *Hansard*, New Series, XXXVI, 657-757, 773, 855, 863-962).
- 4 The appropriation of part of the income of the Irish established church for purposes not specifically Anglican such as popular education.
- 5 On reintroducing the Irish Municipal Reform bill on 7 February, Russell alluded to the evil consequences likely to arise from government bills being rejected by the Lords year after year, and he and Hobhouse hinted that if this year's Irish Municipal Reform bill were not accepted they

would resign. Peel in reply demanded that the government should first outline terms for the maintenance of the established church in Ireland, whose enemies he declared the government to be strengthening by granting municipal reform. Russell's reply to Peel made it appear that the government was prepared to yield on appropriation (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 336-7).

- 6 A reference to Serjeant Jackson's speech on the introduction of the Irish Municipal Reform Bill on 7 February, in which he attacked government appointments and its administration of justice in Ireland. He denounced O'Connell for habitually using violent language, and accused him of being anti-Protestant (*Pilot*, 10 Feb. 1837). The *Times* of 8 February 1837 commented: 'Mr. Serjeant Jackson, in the debate of last night, utterly destroyed the miserable pretences of the present government, and bearded the arch-demagogue Mr. Daniel O'Connell so that even that brazen abuser quailed under the infliction.'
- 7 After a period of expansion and speculation the latter half of 1836 witnessed the danger of bank crashes and a serious drain in the Bank of England's gold reserves. The suspension of payments by the Agricultural and Commercial Bank of Ireland (see letter 2091 n3) was a cause of the financial crisis (W. Marston Acres, *The Bank of England from within 1694-1900*, London, 1931, II, 463-4).

2384

*From Rev. John Sheehan*

Waterford, 19 February 1837

My Dear Friend,

I return you my most cordial thanks for the interest you have taken in the application I have made in behalf of my brother.<sup>1</sup> The Major Rowan to whom Mr. Drummond's letter alludes is the brother of the Governor of the Lunatic Asylum in Waterford. I was wrong in calling the latter major for I find he was an officer in the E.I. [East India] service in which he accumulated a large fortune which was all lost by the failure of the great Bank in Calcutta.<sup>2</sup> Upon his return to this country, the Marquis Wellesley, who knew him in India, gave him his present appointment, having nothing else at his disposal worth acceptance at the time. He has been always dissatisfied with this appointment and he is anxiously and constantly seeking for something better. My brother wishes that Rowan's views may be acceded to, that he may, if possible, become his successor. It is painful to him in the extreme to be obliged to make this application. For he is most devoted to his profession, in which he was becoming more eminent every day. In fact I have no doubt whatever that he would in one year more be realising £1,000 professional income. But mixed as is

the practice of midwifery with physic in the country, he must be exposed to night calls, and he knows now from experience that he has not [the] constitution to go through such work, and his medical advisers have told him that if he expose himself again to such an attack in his chest and lungs, as he is just now recovering from, he must make up his mind for the most fatal consequences.

It is under such circumstances that I make the application in his behalf. He has been one of the two attending physicians of our Fever Hospital for the last ten years. He has been twice reelected without opposition and once, when there was an opposition, he was placed by the subscribers, Catholics, Protestants, and Quakers, with a vast majority at the head of the poll. In his politics he is a thoroughgoing reformer and always voted for candidates professing and acting upon such principles when there was an election in the city, of which he is both householder and freeman. I need not tell you what are my politics and how devoted I am to the present Administration. . . .

Dr. Jones has been sworn in a magistrate.<sup>3</sup> There never was a more unworthy appointment. It is calculated to bring Lord Mulgrave's administration into contempt. It is all the doing of that corrupt mean creature, Barron, but he will hear enough about it. He has led Mr. Stuart into a most shameful exercise of his influence with the Lord Lieutenant. I wish you would let me know whether you will really visit us at Easter. I want to have arrangements made to give you a suitable reception.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 2379.

2 Probably the Bank of Hindustan which failed in 1832 (G. Findlay Shirras, *Indian Finance and Banking*, London, 1919, 345-6).

3 See letter 2379.

2385

*To Richard Sullivan*

London, 24 February 1837

My dear Friend,

I hope you now get the parliamentary papers regularly. I directed them to be sent to you the first day of the session but the stupid English vagabond directed them to me in Kilkenny. I did not discover the mistake until the postmaster of Kilkenny properly sent them back. I trust however there is no longer any blunder. If there be, let me know and it shall be redressed.

Will you have the goodness to inform my friend Smithwick<sup>1</sup> and the other respectable persons who wrote to me on the subject of a 'permit officer' in Kilkenny that I have urged the request on the Government and that Mr. Spring Rice promised me either to send a permit officer to Kilkenny to reside or to give authority to one of the excise officers in our city to grant permits. I see no objection to the latter plan as it seems to me to answer the object of getting permits on the spot. If however there exists any objection of which I am ignorant, I pray you to let me know and I will exert myself to rectify it.

I have sent the memorials of the suspended officers<sup>2</sup> to the Board of Excise with as strong a letter of recommendation as I could possibly pen. The moment I receive an answer you shall hear from me again.

I this day got Con Maxwell's<sup>3</sup> letter and the resolutions of the inhabitants of Kilkenny who desire to have that city placed in Schedule B of the Municipal Reform Act.<sup>4</sup> May I ask you to convey to Mr. Maxwell my ready acquiescence in his request and that I will use my best exertions to succeed. I also entertain the strongest hopes of success. The moment any result of my application to the Government on this head is ascertained by me I will write to Mr. Maxwell. I do not see *how* the Ministry can refuse to comply with the wishes of my constituents in this respect.

I am happy to inform you that the prospects of the stability of the present Ministry are most cheering. Ireland is the bane of the English Tories. We will force the Irish Corporate Reform Bill through the Lords.<sup>5</sup>

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

- 1 Edmond Smithwick (1800-76), brewer, Kilcreen House, Kilkenny. Elected alderman of Kilkenny in 1843 and mayor 1844, 1864 and 1865.
- 2 No information concerning this suspension has been traced.
- 3 Cornelius Maxwell, land agent, Patrick Street, Kilkenny sometime publisher of the *Kilkenny Journal*.
- 4 This was a request to have Kilkenny city transferred from a franchise limited to £10 householders (Schedule A) to one limited to £5 householders. The bill as printed on 23 March shows that this change was not effected. When the measure was finally passed in 1840 the franchise in all the municipalities including Kilkenny was limited to £10 householders.
- 5 The bill was eventually rejected by the Lords.

2386

*To Richard Barrett*

London, 25 February 1837

My dear Barrett,

Really private, I did what I could for Mr. Birch.<sup>1</sup> There is this cruel treatment which I receive from everybody – that when I do not succeed for any applicant, which is the case in 99 instances out of every 100, I am blamed for want of zeal or sincerity. ‘ONE WORD’ – how I hate that ‘one word!’ – from him would have done it!! In future I ought to say no, bluntly, to every application. I feel that I ultimately get the same displeasure and have all my trouble for nothing. I must say Mr. Birch has treated me badly in complaining to you. I explained to him, as far as I could, without mentioning names, what I had attempted on his behalf and the nature of the obstacles in the way of having his wishes complied with, whereupon he *disavowed* the present Administration and left me without as much as one expression of thanks for the efforts I made. I wish I were in opposition again but I must say you and Birch treat me most unjustly.

So far really private.

I have now the pleasure to tell you that the last division<sup>2</sup> has placed the Ministry in an attitude of perfect security. The Tories feel humbled – crushed. The public sentiment in favour of ‘Justice to Ireland’ is too powerful to permit them to hope for office upon any other terms than throwing the Orange faction in that country overboard and governing for the benefit of the people. This is a line of policy which Peel would have the good sense and the want of principle to act upon but he is hampered by his colleagues and supporters.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 82-3

1 James Birch, a native of Londonderry. Proprietor of the *World* newspaper which was founded in Dublin in 1840.

2 On Lord Francis Egerton’s motion for abolishing Irish corporations (see letter 2383 n3).



2387

*From Michael Maley, Sr. to London*

3 Cavendish Row, Dublin, 1 March 1837

My Dr. Sir,

I will confine my observations to a few words not to encroach on your time.

The *Recorder*<sup>1</sup> arrived on Sunday. There was a post assembly on Monday when at his suggestion a petition is to go to Parliament to provide that the *present* aldermen and sheriffs' peers should hold office for *life*. This the Recorder expects to carry as a rider.<sup>2</sup>

If you find that this would be pressed so as to endanger the Bill, might it not be softened by providing 'that all aldermen or sheriffs' peers *being bankrupt, insolvent* or having *compounded* with their creditors within 21 years prior to the passing of the Act should be excluded, testimony to be given by the parties themselves on oath before one of the judges of the King's Bench.'

By this provision Darley, King, Beresford, *Smyth*, Fleming, Tyndall, *Perrin* and Brady<sup>3</sup> would be excluded, also 12 sheriffs' peers or, if the provision for all aldermen that have *not* passed the civic chair,<sup>4</sup> only 5 would be retained, viz., Dixon,<sup>5</sup> Warren,<sup>6</sup> Hoyte,<sup>7</sup> Lamprey<sup>8</sup> and Brady.

Mr. Stock's report.

Confirming the allegation that the 7/7 for [one word illegible] list and £1. 19. 7 for car hire was expended out of the paving tax fund to further the petition against you, and that *not one* of the allegations put forth in *Aldn. Smyth's answer* to the charges and furnished to the Lord Lieutenant was well founded, *in fact* the whole of *such answers being false*.

But I should not omit to inform you from *Mr. Kearney* that he has been informed on what he considers undoubted authority that a few days before Mr. Stock made his report Mr. Brewster called on Mr. Stock and assured him that the Tories were coming into power immediately and not to hear Heany<sup>9</sup> or *Smyth* and that 'Stock' acted accordingly.

For my part, a more vile conspiracy never existed. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Frederick Shaw.

2 The press reports of the meeting of the Dublin Corporation on Monday, 27 February, state that it passed a resolution expressing concern at the proposal that the present aldermen and sheriffs' peers should hold office for life (*MR*, 28 Feb.; *DEM*, 1 March 1837). Maley was probably referring to a meeting of the board of aldermen.

- 3 Sir Nicholas William Brady (1791-1843), Killiney Park, Co. Dublin; elected alderman 19 March 1833; lord mayor of Dublin for year 1839-40. Gold and silver lace manufacturer. Knighted 1821. Elder brother of Maziere Brady.
- 4 That is, held the office of lord mayor.
- 5 William Dixon, Lr. Mount Street, Dublin; elected alderman 17 January 1827.
- 6 Samuel Warren, Mespil House, Donnybrook, Dublin. Elected alderman 4 October 1830; lord mayor of Dublin 1837-8.
- 7 George Hoyte, 1 Pembroke Place, Upper Baggot Street, Dublin. Elected alderman 24 February 1832; lord mayor of Dublin 1838-9.
- 8 Joseph Lamprey, elected alderman 24 October 1832.
- 9 Possibly Patrick Heany, salesmaster, 20 Smithfield, Dublin.

## 2388

*From P. V. FitzPatrick to Pall Mall, London*

Dublin, 1 March 1837

My Dear Sir,

I enclose a letter from Michael Maley<sup>1</sup> on a subject to which he attaches considerable importance. My anxiety for the success of Mr. Meyler's<sup>2</sup> application for a situation in *your* Bank<sup>3</sup> increases hourly and, as the matter appears to depend a good deal upon Mr. Taylor's<sup>4</sup> report, it will perhaps be *very* useful to have a line from you to Mr. Taylor should you feel justified in writing such in your particular position. I have already assured you of the fitness of the applicants for *any* appointment which the concern can offer and his success would gratify numbers of your friends. I trust that in the London management things are found to proceed *amicably* as well as prosperously. At this side of the water active rumours of misunderstandings prevail which, if borne out by fact, will materially affect the character as well as the property of the Establishment. The accounts from the country continue to be very gloomy<sup>5</sup> and the difficulty of obtaining money here is universally complained of.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Letter 2387.
- 2 Probably Robert Meyler, brother of Rev. Walter Meyler, P.P. of St. Andrew's, Westland Row.
- 3 National Bank of Ireland.
- 4 John Taylor, manager of the National Bank in Cork.
- 5 See Letter 2383 n7.

2389

*From Rev. William J. Whelan, Clarendon Street, Dublin,  
5 March 1837.*

Asks O'Connell to give his patronage to a book, *The Expositions of the Law of Parliament*, written by a young Irishman practising at the English bar (his name seems to be Ferrall).<sup>1</sup> 'I hope you are taking care of your health and that you do not attempt to fast or even abstain.' 'Your threat on Stanley and Co. of the Repeal question<sup>2</sup> has had a wonderful effect in Dublin and the country also.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Simon Ansley Ferrall (born c. 1804), second son of Simon Ferrall, late of Dublin, deceased; barrister; author of *The Question of Privilege. . .* (London, 1837), which was partly based on letters entitled 'Exposition of the Law of Parliament' published in the *Sun*.
- 2 Speaking on 22 February in the adjourned debate on Lord Francis Egerton's motion (see letter 2383 n3), O'Connell declared that in seeking municipal reform 'the Irish people were the claimants before a legislature which was not Irish.' 'Everything he had heard that night . . . convinced him . . . that there was not the disposition on the part of a great portion of that House . . . to do justice to Ireland' (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXVI, 952). Stanley, speaking earlier than O'Connell had declared that the people of Ireland should not have municipal reform so long as they demanded it with threats and intimidation, and so long as the Irish church remained insecure (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXVI, 930-1).

2390

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 6 March 1837

My Dear FitzPatrick,

You will be glad to hear that the prospects of the popular party daily brighten. I am quite sure that you may rely on what I now tell you, namely, that the Administration is quite safe. The Tories, who are well informed, gave up all hopes of office, let their lower rank retainers say what they please. I know from *sources of certain knowledge* the facts I tell you of the Tory despair and of the fixity of the Ministry. If I were at liberty, which I am not, even to hint at the quarter from which I derive my information, you would see that it is one which *could* not be deceived, and *would* not deceive.

The strength of the Ministry consists in the Irish Municipal Reform bill on the one hand and the Church Rate Bill<sup>1</sup> on the other. The general sentiment in England is decidedly favourable to the first. The overwhelming majority<sup>2</sup> on the question in the Commons sufficiently indicates the state of the public mind and if anything were wanting, the letter of Sir George Crewe<sup>3</sup> makes it demonstrative that the Tories cannot possibly be allowed to misgovern Ireland again. In short, the conduct of the Ministry on that question has given them a triumph.

But if they have gained a great victory on that subject they have been more, infinitely more successful on the Church Rate Bill. It has literally taken away the breath of the Tories. It has given unmixed satisfaction to the dissenters of all classes and to all the rational tenants of the Church lands.

Get Barrett to announce, as from a private correspondent, *that* there will not be any change of Ministry during this Session, and still more, that there WILL NOT BE ANY DISSOLUTION IN THE PRESENT YEAR.<sup>4</sup> All is safe, all is secure, so that Ireland may anticipate a lengthened career of utility from the present accomplished Viceroy.

I have also to add that this certainty of the duration of the present wise Government in Ireland is created in a great measure by the steps taken to ascertain the sentiments of the county constituencies in England.<sup>5</sup> The result is the conviction, founded on actual examination, that if there were an election tomorrow the Reformers would gain a large majority, even in the English counties. Hence, indeed, Tory despair and popular confidence are easily accounted for.

Tell Barrett that I have attended every moment of the Fictitious Voters Committee,<sup>6</sup> as well as of the Joint Stock Committee,<sup>7</sup> and intend to do so. No case whatsoever has been made to impeach the Belfast registry at least hitherto. As yet the impeachment is a complete failure and is likely to continue so. Next Clonmel and then Dublin.

Take care my name is not coupled with any hint you may give to the press but *only on what* I TELL YOU. I had it from *exceedingly* good authority.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 83-5

- 1 O'Connell underestimated the strength of the opposition to this measure. (see letter 2383 n2).
- 2 Against Lord Francis Egerton's motion on 22 February (see letter 2383 n3).
- 3 Sir George Crewe, 8th Bt. (1795-1844), Calke Abbey, Ashbourne, Derbyshire; M.P. for S. Derbyshire 1835-41. This letter has not been identified.

- 4 O'Connell's views were published in the 'Private Correspondence' section of the *Pilot*.
- 5 Presumably a reference to the new method of organising channels of information from provincial areas about the Whig party. The Reform Club in London, founded mainly by Radicals in 1836, was the clearing house for this information (Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 393-412).
- 6 O'Connell was a member of the select committee appointed on 6 February 1837 to inquire 'how far the intentions of the Reform Bill are defeated by creating and registering fictitious and improper votes in Ireland'.
- 7 O'Connell was a member of the select committee appointed on 6 February 'to inquire into the operation of the Acts permitting the establishment of Joint Stock Banks in England and Ireland, under certain restrictions, and whether it be expedient to make any amendment in the provisions of those Acts'.

2390a

*To James Charles Michell*<sup>1</sup>

16 Pall Mall [London], 17 March 1837

Sir,

I return the ticket you sent me (without my permission) for the dinner<sup>2</sup> this day.

I also enclose you my usual donation of five pounds.

The school is so well regulated that I cheerfully subscribe to it but I never will attend the dinner until the very unbecoming influence of your Tory politics ceases to interfere with its arrangements. I particularly condemn a practice which I have the best authority for saying has prevailed of giving free tickets to persons holding subordinate offices under government but of Tory politics in order – for there could be no other reason – to give a tone to the expression of opinion or feeling upon the mention of particular names.

It would be vain to deny that the choice of President and Stewards is influenced in many instances by your political bias. Else surely the short period of Lord Haddington's government<sup>3</sup> of Ireland would scarcely have served as an excuse or pretext for putting into the Chair a nobleman over whose head the 'No popery' flag upheld by Orange bigotry waved in Dublin. . . .

How if such bias did not exist has it happened that no Irish member of parliament who subscribed for two years was omitted save myself from the list of Stewards yet I have subscribed for I think seven years. Avow political motives and then my exclusion is perfectly right. Disavow them and account as well as you may for my exclusion and the prompt seizure of Lord Haddington for the

office of President. . . .

I have only to repeat that the institution itself is conducted in so admirable a manner that I cheerfully add my humble mite to its support and intend to continue it whilst I remain in parliament.

SOURCE: Papers of the Earl of Haddington

- 1 A native of Brighton.
- 2 On the fifty-fourth anniversary of the Benevolent Society of St. Patrick at the Freemasons' Tavern in London. The dinner was attended by Lord Haddington as chairman and by Dr. Whately (the Protestant archbishop of Dublin), Lord Morpeth (chief secretary for Ireland) and Thomas Spring Rice (chancellor of the exchequer). The chairman reported that there were '550 children on the establishment who received a moral and religious education' (*Times*, 18 Mar. 1837).
- 3 Lord Haddington was the (Tory) lord-lieutenant of Ireland from December 1834 to April 1835.

2391

*To a kinsman in Kerry*

Dublin, 27 March 1837

*Excerpt*

It is also strictly true that instead of a readiness to comply with my request there is a jealousy in certain quarters of being supposed to be dictated to by me which dispossesses me of my share of patronage from a Government to which I gave no small share of support. But the fact is that I have used every exertion in my power for Charles Brenan without any success beyond the offer of a second-class constableness of police, not worth taking. It is possible these things may amend. I may have more power in the next change of Administration, as in the events approaching the Ministers will want *radical* support. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 85

2392

*From James Sheil, P.P.<sup>1</sup> to Dublin*

Enniskillen [Co. Fermanagh], 28 March 1837

*Private*

My Dear Mr. O'Connell,

. . . You will see in the later Enniskillen trials<sup>2</sup> in yesterday's *Pilot* the name of John Abercrombie, an Orangeman. On last week his brother and several others of the same stamp were appointed through, I believe, Lord Cole,<sup>3</sup> to the peace police. You will see by this that the new Police Bill<sup>4</sup> will be of little service here. One stipendiary magistrate, Major Burke,<sup>5</sup> and all the officials connected with the Police are Protestants. Were any of them Catholics I would communicate with them and put them in possession of these things. Could not a rule be made at the Castle that at least one half of those that are added to the Police should be Catholics.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 James Sheil (1784-1846), parish priest of Enniskillen 1837-46.
- 2 The trial of seven men for riot at Enniskillen on 29 August 1835, when Lord Mulgrave was visiting the town. All were found guilty but the judge, due, he alleged, to inquiries as to 'the character and general conduct of the prisoners respectively', saw fit to vary their sentences considerably, Abercrombie receiving the lightest sentence of all (*Pilot*, 27 Mar. 1837).
- 3 William Willoughby (Cole), styled Viscount Cole until 1840, (1807-1886) M.P. Co. Fermanagh 1831-40 when he succeeded his father as 3rd earl of Enniskillen.
- 4 This was the act of 1836, 'An Act to consolidate the Laws relating to the Constabulary Force in Ireland' (6 & 7 Will. IV c. 13) which established a modern police force for all Ireland (outside Dublin), known from 1867 as the Royal Irish Constabulary or R.I.C. (R. B. McDowell, *Irish Administration*, 138-41).
- 5 Major William Burke appointed a stipendiary magistrate 10 August 1836.

2393

*From Cornelius O'Brien*

London, 31 March 1837

My dear Sir,

I asked the Lord Lieutenant to appoint my nephew, H. Lysaght, Clerk of Appearance in the Court of King's bench in the room of Mr. Cormick decd.<sup>1</sup> I request you will recommend *that* appointment and urge my claims on the Government. You know that I

have been a constant and zealous supporter, that I had for that purpose to *resist* Tory persecution and bear the expense of two contested elections.<sup>2</sup>

You can serve me on this occasion and I hope you do so.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Michael Cormick, attorney, late clerk of appearances in the court of King's bench.
- 2 For Co. Clare in 1832 and 1835 being elected on both occasions.

### 2393a

*From Rev. John Croker, Fort Elizabeth near Croom, Co. Limerick,  
31 March 1837, to Merrion Square*

Seeks O'Connell's support for his application for the vacant deanery of Dromore.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 15473

### 2394

*From Rev. J. O'Leary<sup>1</sup> to Merrion Square*

Castleisland [Co. Kerry], 2 April 1837

My dear Sir,

Poor Mr. Ware, the protestant clergyman whom I introduced, requests to refresh your memory while you are in Dublin.

An Irish *Catholic priest* applying to a *Catholic gentleman* in favour of a clergyman of the Establishment is rather a novel feature in the history of this country.

He is a truly worthy and much injured man.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Jeremiah O'Leary, a native of Killarney, Co. Kerry; curate in Castleisland parish and in 1836 appointed P.P. there. He spent 53 years altogether in Castleisland. Died 19 October 1866, aged 79.



2395

*From Michael Staunton to Merrion Square*

Dublin, 4 April 1837

My dear Sir,

The terms Mr. Smith<sup>1</sup> authorised me, on behalf of the Proprietors of the *Dublin Review*, to offer Mr. Cumming<sup>2</sup> were: 4/- each copy – 25 or 24 – and settlement by bill at six months. Besides this I was to receive ‘a certain commission on the amount of sales.’ I still am reluctant to undertake the Agency<sup>3</sup> but, if I do it, the conditions should be, I think, those which were to be offered to Mr. Cumming. . . . Another indispensable condition is that I shall be able to publish in Dublin as soon as the work gets out in London, and that no bookseller here shall be enabled to publish before me. . . .

SOURCE: O’Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 James A. Smith, Catholic journalist, convert from Presbyterianism. A solicitor at the supreme courts in Edinburgh. Edited *Edinburgh Catholic Magazine* April 1832 to November 1833; numbers 4 and 5 (April and July 1837) of the *Dublin Review*; editor of the *Catholic Directory*, having founded it in 1838; secretary to the Catholic Institute of Great Britain.
- 2 John Cumming, bookseller and publisher, 16 Lr. Ormond Quay and Roebuck Grove, Roebuck, Co. Dublin.
- 3 Staunton’s newspaper, the *Morning Register* of 25 April 1837 carried an announcement, dated 24 April, that he had undertaken the agency for the *Dublin Review*, the fourth number of which ‘will be published on Friday next, the 28th instant, at this office.’ He is listed in the *Dublin Review* as its Irish agent from December 1836 to October 1838 inclusive, and Cumming again as his successor, on and from 1839. Cumming had been the first Irish agent of the *Dublin Review*.

2395a

*From James Charles Michell to 16 Pall Mall [London]*

Copy

Brighton, 6 April 1837

[Explains that he was unable to reply earlier to O’Connell’s letter of March 17].

During the years in which you have been a benefactor to the Charity I have as its Secretary under the Direction of the Committee regularly transmitted to you an invitation to its annual Festival, and I much regret your prohibition of a continuance of

that which was intended as a mark of respect and as a grateful recognition of your annual bounty. [He denies O'Connell's accusations and states that a man in his humble position could exert no such influence].

A list is preserved of all to whom invitations are sent which is open to your inspection, as it is to that of every Governor of the Charity.

For 20 years past, during which period I have had the Honour of being Secretary to this Society, all allusions to or discussion of politics has been studiously avoided. . . . You, Sir, upon one occasion at the Festival expressed yourself thus 'It is hard for one who has served an apprenticeship to politics to be restrained from alluding to them' but you kindly did abstain, and thus proved yourself a real benefactor to the Charity. . . .

SOURCE: Papers of the Earl of Haddington

2395b

*From James Charles Michell*

*Copy*

Brighton [Sussex], 11 April 1837

Mr. Michell, Secy. to the B[enevolent] S[ociety] of St. Patrick presents his respectful compts. to Mr. O'Connell, and takes the liberty of informing him that a Quarterly Meeting of that Society (of whom Mr. O'Connell is one) will be held at their Schools in Stamford Street on Wednesday the 3rd day of May at Eleven o'clock. At that hour or at any hour later, which may be more convenient to Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Michell will be happy to produce to Mr. O'Connell the Documents referred to in Mr. Michell's letter of the 6th instant, and every proceeding of the Society from the day on which he had the Honour of being appointed its Secretary.

SOURCE: Papers of the Earl of Haddington

2396

*To Pierce Mahony*

London, 12 April 1837

My dear Mahony,

I think it would be exceedingly useful to the Reform cause if you were to accept the invitation to Kinsale.<sup>1</sup> At all events go down and ascertain how the land lies. I will be very happy to assist you and that zealously and well. I will write to the Catholic Priest, who is a most intelligent, respectable man, the Rev. Dr. Toby McNamara,<sup>2</sup> and for many years a most kind friend of mine. In short *this* is a point at which you should strike at once. Go down, ascertain everything, command me, and you can fall back on Kerry should a suitable arrangement be made for Kerry.

I write from the Committee<sup>3</sup> so can say no more and, perhaps, it is not necessary but I will repeat – you command me for Kinsale.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 To stand as candidate for the borough. In the general election of 1837 Mahony was elected for Kinsale (on 7 August) by 103 votes to 98 for Henry Thomas. But he was unseated on petition and Thomas declared elected on 11 April 1838.
- 2 Justin F. McNamara parish priest of Kinsale from before 1836 until 1847.
- 3 O'Connell was at this time a member of at least two parliamentary committees (see letter 2390 n6 and n7).

2397

*To Richard Barrett*

[London], 21 April 1837

My dear Barrett,

I will write you if possible a *private correspondence*<sup>1</sup> tomorrow. In the meantime, exert yourself:

First, to put forward in the strongest way the necessity of procuring addresses and petitions to sustain the present Ministry.

Second, *write a paragraph*<sup>2</sup> – observe, a paragraph IN LEADS, upon the Irish Members. Mention Mullins of Kerry, who has been *missing* ever since the recess. Mention the folly of pairing<sup>3</sup> as to election petitions. Mention Smith O'Brien's refusal to vote on the late division respecting the Irish Legion,<sup>4</sup> although his coun-

had been published in the Catholic Church in Ireland prohibiting the taking of the masonic oaths, or at least before I was aware of that censure.' He declared, however, that on becoming acquainted with this censure, he 'many, very many years ago, unequivocally renounced Freemasonry', Archbishop Troy deeming a public renunciation on his part unnecessary. 'Freemasonry in Ireland', continued O'Connell, 'may be said to have (apart from its oaths) no evil tendency, save as far as it may counteract in some degree the exertions of . . . the Temperance Societies.' However, he condemned what he considered 'wanton and multiplied taking of oaths', without adequate reason, by the freemasons. (*Pilot*, 24 Apr. 1837; also, Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 642-3).

- 4 The *Freemasons Quarterly Review*, which, according to Fagan, first published the fact that O'Connell had been a freemason, in April 1837. From this it appears that the year after he was called to the bar O'Connell became a member of lodge 189, which then met in Dublin. It went on to state that he was 'a most prominent, accomplished and practical craftsman, working well in all the ceremonies, and was instrumental in introducing into the society, several of its most excellent members.' According to the *Review*, O'Connell retired from the freemasons due to pressure of public business, but ever afterwards 'both in public and in private, he always pays homage to the order. . . .' This article, according to Fagan, was promptly 'copied into all the papers in the three Kingdoms' (Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 640-2).

2399

*To Joseph Denis Mullen*

London, 22 April 1837

My Dear Mullen,

I cannot avoid thinking of complaining of the imputation of folly with which I am charged on the subject of the Longford petition.<sup>1</sup> First, we had a majority of two on the Committee. That has been thrown away by nominating an adverse Chairman,<sup>2</sup> who has thus two votes because one<sup>3</sup> of our friends got ill and was discharged. I had nothing to do with this most unfortunate blunder. Second, it is said that I have prevented the abandonment of the defence, and have thereby left the voters to be struck off by the Committee.

The advice I gave is this: as you have got yourselves into a Tory Committee, strike at once if you can save a single elector; but if the Committee go on after you have given in, to strike off voters until the majority is disposed of, go on with your defence and defend each vote.

Such was my only advice. I understand that nothing could possibly be gained by giving up the defence. *The voters would be struck off only with more flippancy.*<sup>4</sup> Understand me. The giving

in, the abandoning the defence, would not preserve a single vote. The Committee would go on and strike off 93, or rather 94. They cannot do more at the very worst. Yet I get a letter from you and another from Sausse, blaming me as if I had given an advice which placed the voters in jeopardy. I again beg to infix on your mind this, *that the Committee would strike off the voters even if the defence was abandoned.*

I beg of you to let Sausse see this letter but do not let it get into the newspapers.

I also bitterly regret to find that the Association<sup>5</sup> was badly attended on Thursday. Murphy<sup>6</sup> and other men of strong intellect were absent. They seem not to understand the present crisis. There is but one thing that can save the present Administration, and that is a great and overpowering exertion from Ireland. Lord John Russell is at present determined to resign if the Irish Corporation Bill be rejected by the Lords. There is on this subject a split in the Cabinet. If I could have got Ireland to make a great movement all might be saved but, alas, the apathy of our public men, of our men of sense and discretion, is most disheartening, I did hope that there would have been a rising *en masse* of the mercantile wealth and respectability of Dublin. How is it possible to serve a country in which such shameful apathy pervades even the wise and the efficient? May I implore you to go round and to rally for Tuesday next. It is not too late. Will you abandon us to the Tories?

The Longford election must get £200 out of 'the Justice Rent.'<sup>7</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 88-9

- 1 In a by-election for Co. Longford vacant on the death of Lord Forbes; the Liberal candidate, Luke White, was returned on 30 December 1836 defeating his Tory opponent Charles Fox by 619 votes to 526 (*FJ*, 2 Jan. 1837). Petitions against White's return were presented on 1 February. In a letter to the speaker, on 14 February, White declared he did not intend to defend his seat. On 27 February a petition was presented from three Longford farmers, electors of the county, asking to be admitted as defending parties in White's place. The petition was accepted (*Commons Journal*, LXXXXII, 89-90). On 4 May a committee appointed to try the petitions found for Fox, the 93 votes in White's majority having been struck off as invalid. The return was amended in Fox's favour on 5 May.
- 2 Lord Clive.
- 3 Edward Horsman.
- 4 An attempt was made by Henry Grattan on 9 May to save the franchises of the 93 voters in White's majority, on the ground that the Speaker was not authorised to direct the clerk of the peace in any constituency in Ireland to strike the name of any voter off the register. The

- attempt was defeated when the attorney-general for Ireland opposed it (*Pilot*, 12 May 1837).
- 5 The General Association. The meeting in question took place on Tuesday, 18 April and passed three strong resolutions in support of the government and the Irish Administration (*FJ*, 21 Apr. 1837).
  - 6 Probably Michael Henry Murphy, 7 Wellington Quay, Dublin. Called to the bar 1833.
  - 7 See letter 2343 n3.

2400

*From Sir George Grey*

Downing Street [London] 12 May 1837

Sir,

I have had the honour to receive and lay before Lord Glenelg your letter of the 2nd inst. in which you urge on his Lordship's consideration the propriety of granting a free passage, together with an annual provision of £400 for their support, to three Roman Catholic Clergymen who are about to proceed to the Cape of Good Hope.<sup>1</sup>

Lord Glenelg regrets that he is unable to add anything on this subject to what he has already addressed to Dr. Murray from whom in the course of last year a proposition of a similar nature was received.

His lordship continues to be very desirous that a clergyman should be appointed to succeed the gentleman who sometime since resigned the functions of spiritual instructor to the Roman Catholic Congregation of Cape Town; and to such a clergyman his lordship would be prepared to grant an allowance of £60 for his passage as well as the annual stipend of £200. But his Lordship is compelled to add that he is not in possession of any authentic information with respect to the amount of the Roman Catholic population of the Colony which would enable him to judge whether he could properly recommend that provision should be made by the Colony for the maintenance of an additional number of Roman Catholic clergymen even if the present state of the local revenue would admit of any new burden being imposed on the Colonial Treasury which, from the heavy charge to which it has been recently subjected in consequence of the invasion of the Colony by the Caffirs,<sup>2</sup> he fears is at present impracticable.

SOURCE : Dublin Diocesan Archives

- 1 See letter 2398.
- 2 The Sixth Caffir War was being waged in the Cape Colony at this time.

2401

*To Archbishop Murray*

London, 18 May 1837

My respected Lord,

I have the honour to enclose to your Grace the ultimate reply I obtained from Sir George Grey on the subject of the Cape of Good Hope. I certainly did not expect anything better from that quarter, and the only advantage derived from it is the knowledge that it is useless to press the matter further. Lord Glenelg is liberal in politics but, I believe, a good deal bigoted in his feelings towards the Catholics. Sir George Grey, I fear, joins in the latter quality whilst he gives but lip service to the former. At all events I have failed to do any good.

The return of Burdett for Westminster<sup>1</sup> is a severe blow. It is difficult to calculate its consequences. You will probably regret to hear that many English Catholics voted for him although they must have known how the fate of Ireland hung upon that election. The truth is that there is a national antipathy to the Irish people which predominates in the English mind over similarity of religious feeling and even political gratitude.

I enclose to your Grace also the letter from Rome<sup>2</sup> which you bid me return to you.

SOURCE : Dublin Diocesan Archives

- 1 Because of his hostility to the government Burdett was requested by his Radical electors to resign his seat. He did so but was reelected on 12 May by 3567 to 3052 for his Radical opponent, John Temple Leader (Patterson, *Burdett*, II, 642-8; *FJ*, 15 May 1837).
- 2 Unidentified.

2402

*From Archbishop MacHale*

26 May 1837

My dear Mr O'Connell,

In accordance with the wishes of the clergy of this diocese, as well as my own, I beg leave to transmit to you their petition<sup>1</sup> on the

approaching Tithe Bill, accompanied with their request that you will have the goodness to present it at your earliest convenience in the House of Commons. I cannot express to you how great the dissatisfaction of the people is at the prospect of being obliged to pay the full amount of the tithes after the hopes so often held out to them of being released from the odious impost. Paying it to the landlord rather than the parson,<sup>2</sup> they do not conceive to be any benefit to them. Though it cannot be expected that they should be all at once relieved from the encumbrance of the Protestant Establishment, there should be at least a commencement in reducing to practice the principle of justice by getting rid of it in those districts in which the Protestant clergy have no congregations. This was a feature in last year's bill of which the omission in that of the present session has rendered very unpopular. The former gave a pledge, by this incipient reduction of the Establishment, of its total legislative extinction in due time. The present bill holds out no such encouraging prospect. As for the £10 per cent. for education, the sum could not by any means reconcile the people to an enactment which would confirm the claims of the parsons to a large portion of the tithes of which they have so precarious a tenure, without freeing them from any portion of the remainder. On no other measure are the hearts of the people so much fixed as on their release from contributing to the support of an Establishment that is ever opposed to their best interests. The Tithe Bill they look on as the test of the justice which has been so long promised but of which the performance is, they complain, so long delayed. Such is the general feeling throughout this extensive district as I have learned from the assembled clergy and which we deemed it our duty to convey to the Legislature.

Wishing you many happy years to aid in the consummation of that justice which the country expects, I have the honour to remain,

+ John MacHale

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator* 633-4

- 1 This petition against the Irish tithe bill, which, the petitioners claimed was insufficient for the purposes for which it was intended, was presented to the Commons by O'Connell on 9 June (*Commons Journal*, LXXXXII, 453; *Pilot*, 12 June 1837). See letter 2403.
- 2 Morpeth's tithe bill of 1837, which he introduced to the Commons on 1 May, proposed that tithes should be converted into a rent charge amounting to 70 per cent of the current tithe. It proposed also to levy a tax of 10 per cent on the incomes of the clergy of the established church to be applied to the education of the people generally, Catholic as well as Protestant (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1837, II, 1269-72).



*To Archbishop MacHale**Confidential*

London, 31 May 1837

My dear and revered Lord,

I had the honour of receiving your Grace's letter and the still more cherished honour of your confiding to me the petition of the clergy of your Archdiocese. It is a petition fraught with matter and pregnant with events. The Ministry is tottering to its base, and the old oppressors are ready again to pounce upon Ireland. I am, I own, timid and could have wished that this blow had not been given to the falling fabric of ministerial power. I do believe it will be decisive of their fate. But do not understand these as tones of reproach. I may be sorrowful but, in plain truth, I can have no elements in my mind which could create anger when, as in this instance, the wise and the good adopt a course too bold for my humbler temper. What I grieve at is simply that it should have been necessary for your Grace to have adopted that course at the moment of all others most critical to the continuance of the only bearable government Ireland ever experienced since the fatal day when the followers of the murderers of Becket polluted our shores.

Perhaps I would have been anxious to have canvassed the present Tithe measure<sup>1</sup> with you had I been apprised of your opinions upon it. It is now too late. Yet, in vindication of myself, permit me to say:

1st., that this Bill is not worse than the Bill of last year for *that* kept a parson in every parish.<sup>2</sup> It was Lord Morpeth's *first* plan which excluded *resident* parsons from totally Catholic parishes.<sup>3</sup> Even that first plan gave a species of missionary fund<sup>4</sup> for every parish whatsoever. 2nd., that this bill gives no additional legal 'rivet' to our chains. The Tithe Composition Acts gave legal rights to every parson to the fullest extent the law could give them. Stanley's Bill<sup>5</sup> riveted and completed the iron bond of law. It is not possible to go farther. 3rd., that this Bill gives a new investigation in every case where the Tithe composition is too high — a matter of great importance, so long as the impost remains in any shape. 4th., that this Bill at one blow strikes off £30 per cent of the impost, affording a precedent for going further; and if such a Bill passed it would be the first law directly depriving the parsons in all cases of any percentage. 5th., that it appropriates £10 per cent in direct terms out of the impost to other than *parson*

*purposes* — namely, to education. Thus the new Bill would introduce a new legislation for the first time, taking from the parsons £40 per cent — £30 as reduction, £10 as appropriation — operating upon both ends of the scale.

It is quite true that, although the parsons would lose by this bill £40 per cent, there is this difficulty that the landlords would pocket in many instances part at least of the £30 per cent reduced. But that is a difficulty inherent in the abolition of tithes. In spite of every precaution to the contrary there is that in the present agrarian economy of Ireland of a mischievous tendency to throw into the pockets of the landlord every sum of which the tenant is relieved. This however is not to be attributed as a fault to Lord Morpeth's present measure. It has that fault in common with every other plan of partial or even total abolition.

I address these observations to your Grace not only respectfully but, I will venture to say, in sentiments of affectionate respect. Your character is indeed cherished by me in a mode which makes it equally revered and loved. I believe your Grace to be a great blessing, bestowed by a merciful Providence on a long persecuted and, I trust, now rising and spreading religion. Judge then how poignant must be the regret with which I differ from you and from your eloquent and powerful resolutions. Perhaps indeed my more feeble judgment is clouded by my apprehensions of, I fear, the now certain advent of Orange restored rule in Ireland, aggravated as that bitter misfortune will be by the fact that, in the exercise of a conscientious and awful duty, the clergy of Tuam have been under the necessity of accelerating that deplorable restoration. But the motto of purer spirits has ever been *fiat justitia ruat coelum*.

I do however, my revered Lord, feel so deeply on this subject that I write off for my son who is, I trust, sufficiently recovered<sup>6</sup> for the journey, to support the Ministers. But as the majority of the Connaught members will, as they ought, take their tone from your Grace, the consequence will be the Ministers will be left in a minority<sup>7</sup> and, as they came into power on the Irish Church Bill, so will they be compelled to go out upon the same subject. The old judges will of course resign<sup>8</sup> and, for another generation, *justice* (!!!) will be administered to the Irish people by the Wests, the Jacksons, the Brewsters, the Lyttons and the Blackburnes.

It is almost in despair that I venture to suggest to your Grace just this for your consideration whether, as it is in committee of the House, alterations may be made in the Bill in all its details and, as the Committee comes *after* the first and second reading, you would think it right to write to each of the friendly Connaught

members, counselling them to support the Bill into committee and, when there, endeavouring to extend its relief and lessen its mischief. That would probably prevent any Catholic from being a party to the downfall of the Mulgrave Administration in Ireland.

But if this course does not appear to your cool and deliberate judgment to be a right one, then of course your Grace will treat my suggestion as one which ought not to be acted upon and, at all events, forgive me for making it. You will easily estimate the deep absorbing anxiety for the peace of Ireland which alone stimulates me to make this suggestion. If however it were to be acted upon it ought to be done without delay. This I submit to your Grace.

I need not add that, although I myself deem Lord Morpeth's measure a valuable instalment and, as a politician, know how it would aid my next move, yet I will, as of course, do every justice in my power to the petition with which I feel so highly, so truly honoured. But I will not present it until I have an opportunity of learning whether the sentiments of this letter render me in your Grace's eyes less fit to have that honour.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 634-7

- 1 See letter 2402 n2
- 2 The tithe bill of 1836. When introducing it on 25 April Morpeth said it did not include the provision in the tithe bill of the previous year (1835) for the suspension of all livings in parishes in which the congregation numbered less than fifty.
- 3 That is, parishes with less than fifty members of the established church, a reference to the tithe bill of 1835.
- 4 Under Morpeth's tithe bill of 1835 it was proposed that the spiritual wants of parishes containing less than fifty Protestants should be attended to by the clergyman of the neighbouring parish, who should receive an additional £10-£50 a year, or by a curate, who should receive a salary of £75 a year (O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, 499).
- 5 The act for the recovery of tithes in 1832 (see letter 1873 n3).
- 6 Probably his son Maurice.
- 7 In fact, the bill passed its second reading on 9 June, by 229 to 14.
- 8 By this O'Connell meant that as soon as a Tory government would come into power the old (Tory) judges would resign in order that their successors would be Tories.

2404

This letter is now numbered 2435a.

2405

*To Arthur French*<sup>1</sup>

June 1837

I think matters look very favourable for the permanence of the present Ministry.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 96.

- 1 Arthur French (born c. 1802) eldest son of George French, K.C. (1771-1860) who was the fourth son of Arthur French (died 1820) of Frenchpark, Co. Roscommon. Secretary of the General Association. He was first cousin to Arthur French, created Baron de Freyne in 1839.

2406

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 June 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

I ought indeed to have written to you and would have done it if it were possible. The fact is I had a long and intricate account to unravel and an answer to put in in an equity suit. The last three weeks were all *lost*. I had each day a committee consuming from twelve to four; from four to twelve at night I was in the House and my answer in equity absorbing every other minute. But you shall certainly hear from me once a week.

I was in the city this day. The confusion amongst the American traders is immense.<sup>1</sup> It will affect all the manufacturing towns to an extent really deplorable. I find that, with the exception of Belfast and Londonderry, Ireland will not suffer. The Irish trade *in provisions* is every way safe. We have no other. The season is spent and the prices have held up better than that of any other commodity. But I went to the bank — our bank<sup>2</sup> — this day to see that we were all prepared for everything and I am happy to tell you that we have upwards of four hundred thousand pounds of immediately available means, *exclusive* of £700,000 and upwards in Irish bills. Keep this to yourself, because a precaution implies fear. But I only tell it to you to show you how impossible it is to do *us* any injury.

Dr. MacHale's resolutions<sup>3</sup> have made a considerable sensation. He sent me the petition<sup>4</sup> to present, which enabled me respectfully but distinctly to argue the case with him. Unless he shall relax, the Connaught members will vote against us.

The Ministry, in the meantime, are determined not to resign. The King was, I am told, *not better* yesterday. The belief is that he has his last illness on him.<sup>5</sup> Certainly there is no prospect of his being able to play off another *coup d'état*,<sup>6</sup> as the French call it.

I will tell you a secret, *which must not get into print*, mind that. The answer to the city of London address<sup>7</sup> by the duchess of Kent is greatly admired. *She privately got Lord Melbourne to draw it!!* There cannot be a better proof of her confidence.

The success of THE TRIBUTE<sup>8</sup> has really astonished me. I was convinced it would be a total failure. I repeat my conviction that I owe it all to you. Your arrangements must be admirable.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 94-5

- 1 There was a financial crisis and an economic depression in the United States at this time.
- 2 The National Bank of Ireland.
- 3 These resolutions were passed at a meeting of the Catholic clergy of the archdiocese of Tuam, at Westport, Co. Mayo on 22 May. They favoured a continuance of agitation for total abolition of tithes, and called for appropriation of these and the lands of the established church to national purposes. They also condemned the government's tithe bill as inadequate (*FJ*, 26 May 1837).
- 4 See letter 2402 nl.
- 5 William IV died on 20 June.
- 6 A reference to the king's dismissal of Melbourne's first ministry in November 1834.
- 7 Presented by the lord mayor, aldermen and common councillors of London to the duchess on 30 May, to congratulate her on Princess Victoria's attaining her majority. It expressed a hope that the duchess's influence on Victoria's education should continue. In her reply, the duchess declared she had always pressed on Victoria her duties 'so as to gain by her conduct the respect and affection of the people. This I have taught her should be her first earthly duty as a constitutional sovereign.' She expressed her confidence in Victoria's fitness to reign, 'communicating as she does with all classes of society.' (*FJ*, 3 June 1837).
- 8 The O'Connell Tribute was suspended during 1836 in order to make way for the collection of the General Association's 'Justice Rent' (Lyne, 'General Association'). Sunday, 28 May 1837 was appointed for the collection of the Tribute throughout the country (*Pilot*, 10 May 1837).

2407

*From Bishop John England to House of Commons,  
forwarded to Dublin*

Newbern, Craven Co., North Carolina, 3 June 1837

My dear and respected friend,

I have, since I had the pleasure of seeing you in Dublin in the month of November, returned with some Ursuline nuns by New York to Charleston, and after regulating my concerns there, gone back to New York whence I sailed for Port-au-Prince in Haiti on the 1st of March. I endeavoured during three weeks to induce the President of Haiti<sup>1</sup> to allow the provisional administration of the ecclesiastical affairs of the island, by me or by one or more bishops, until by remodelling of some articles in the constitution, he should remove the impediment which prevents the Holy See from formally ratifying any treaty made with him. You are, I believe, aware that the unfortunate Grégoire and others of the Constitutional Clergy<sup>2</sup> of France have induced the compilers of this constitution for Haiti to insert two articles, totally at variance not only with Catholic discipline but even touching on faith, and whilst these appear upon the document the Holy Father cannot enter into any diplomatic relations with the Government. I could not prevail. Nothing but a formal treaty would be admitted as the basis for constructing an hierarchy and no provisional administration would be allowed but I was requested to remain as legate for the purpose of treating with the Government. This I could not consent to and therefore retired until I shall receive further instructions from the Holy See. I therefore arrived in Baltimore on the 16th of April, on which day our third provincial council assembled and have been very closely occupied in my duties there and in drawing my report concerning Haiti which I transmitted to the Holy See, and now am visiting a portion of my Diocese as I wend my way to Charleston.

I felt, however, that it was due to you and perhaps to Lord Palmerston to state that upon my return to Haiti I enquired of Captain Courtenay,<sup>3</sup> the British consul-general, whether the Haitian Government had opened itself to him respecting the subject upon which I conversed with his lordship and you, and he replied that they had not in any way touched upon it. I then took occasion to speak upon the subject at my second interview with President Boyer. He merely remarked that he felt obliged by what I had done and much gratified at the spirit in which Lord Palmerston received my communication, but that at the present

moment he did not know what measures would be the best for the Haitian Government to take.

Probably it is due from me to have this communication conveyed to Lord Palmerston, and if you think so, may I trouble you to let him see this letter or to have the communication made in any way you think proper? I would myself write but I fear it would appear too much like assuming an official character to which I am not entitled.

I have no news to send hence but what you will find better told upon the public papers than I could convey. I have had no opportunity of knowing how you keep ground at your side but you have my best wishes.

I know the value of your time and shall not tax it. Pray make my kindest respects to the members of your family whom I have the pleasure of knowing. May God bless and protect you is the sincere prayer of your affectionate friend,

+ John, Bishop of Charleston

P.S. I mentioned to President Boyer your having given me the portrait<sup>4</sup> for him, at which he was much gratified and I accounted to him for its delay, by narrating what I now state to you. On my being about to proceed to Rome, I gave it to *Hickson* who promised to have it left for me in Cork with my brother<sup>5</sup> or brother-in-law, and in my haste to Liverpool coming hither I did not recollect to ask for it. I fear from a letter I since received that it has in some way been mislaid. I wrote to my brother to make strict enquiry for it. I regret this much.

I gave Courtenay who returns in bad health, a letter to you. He is a most worthy little man, intelligent and most honourable.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Jean Pierre Boyer (c. 1773-1850), president of Haiti 1818-43; ousted in revolution 1843, died at Paris.
- 2 The clergy who accepted the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in 1790 during the French Revolution.
- 3 George William Conway Courtenay, R.N. (1795-1863), a native of Chester, consul-general in Haiti 1832-42. See *Boase*.
- 4 Presumably a portrait of O'Connell.
- 5 Rev. Tom England, P.P.

2408

*From Archbishop MacHale*

Tuam, 4 June 1837

My dear Mr O'Connell,

I have been favoured with your much esteemed letter of the 31st ult. . . . Were the present Tithe Bill a matter of mere difference of opinion between us, I should acquiesce in your superior and experienced judgment. Coming in daily contact with the clergy and having a good deal of intercourse with the people themselves I can state that I never knew a measure to which they are more opposed. Their aversion to the bill is such as that I am convinced no influence that the clergy could exercise would persuade them of its advantage. The £30 per cent. to the landlord, so far from looking to it as a boon, they really regard as an encouragement to that body to unite with the Establishment in the wish to perpetuate the impost. What confirms the distrust of the people in the measure is that the bill is palatable to many of the parsons of the country and to the Tory landlords. It is a matter of notoriety that some of the latter laboured to have public meetings to petition the Legislature to pass the bill into law. We endeavoured to convey to them the impression of the people that they considered the Tithe Bill anything but justice. Besides our own opinions, we gave expression to the deep and general discontent it excited.

. . . It would not be just to the Government to let them imagine that they would be conferring a favour by a measure which we knew excited general discontent. We were, therefore, impelled by a deep sense of duty to convey the seasonable petition to the Legislature in the hope that the Government might be induced to make larger concessions to the just demands of the people. . . . I regret much that the Government has not taken a firmer stand in endeavouring to realise its professions to do justice. By its frustrate attempts to conciliate the Tories, its strength has been gradually impaired. . . .

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 638-9.



2409

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 9 June 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

I believe the King is *dying*. Poor man! The event will, of course, cause a crisis. I believe the result will prove favourable. The QUEEN – I mean Victoria – is at present in excellent hands.<sup>1</sup> There is but one chance against us; that is that the Ministry should be turned out this night on Sharman Crawford's motion.<sup>2</sup> That chance is on the dice. What insanity! because if *we* are in possession when the King dies, possession will give the Government the next House of Commons. If the Tories get that advantage – that is, of being in possession of power when the new reign commences – they may keep it long indeed. And now Sharman Crawford's motion in aid of the Tories makes more than a possibility of the Whigs being left this evening in a minority. How miserable would that result be if the *Irish patriots* were to produce it! But I will not anticipate evil. I am writing from a committee-room, and *in confusion*.

I will certainly write to Mr. Hamilton tomorrow but you really have no notion of how the Fictitious Votes Committee<sup>3</sup> consumes my time.

I send under this cover a letter from Staunton Cahill with a five-pound note. Acknowledge in the newspapers. Your success<sup>4</sup> really astonishes me. At such a time as this it is really surprising that the people should be willing to continue their kindness.

I will write again to you tomorrow. We must prepare for a contested election everywhere. There must be a new parliament *after six months*. We are in a most critical period, but we are in the hands of God. How my heart beats at the advantages or miseries which Ireland may obtain or suffer by the approaching events!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 95-6

1 See letter 2406.

2 Against the second reading of the Irish tithe bill, which Crawford declared was 'unjust for all its principles and delusory in all its details'. His motion was defeated by 229 to 14 (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXVIII, 1370-81).

3 See letter 2390 n6.

4 In the collection of the O'Connell Tribute (see letter 2406 n8).

2410

*From Thomas Spring Rice*

Downing St. [London] 10 June 1837

My dear Sir,

I have prepared and dispatched a minute on the subject of the application from the parties interested in the completion of Tralee Harbour.<sup>1</sup> It recites all the facts of the case : the additional security thereby given for the public money already advanced, the existing distress and the future improvement of that part of the Co. of Kerry. . . . I will, if you wish it, forward your letter to Col. Burgoyne's<sup>2</sup> Board officially but the more regular course, and that I should suggest, is that you should address him directly yourself.

SOURCE : Monteagle Papers, NLI 545

1 See letter 2352 nl.

2 John Fox Burgoyne (1782-1871), illegitimate son of General 'Gentleman Johnny' Burgoyne; entered Royal Engineers, 1798; chairman of board of public works, Ireland 1831-45; major-general and K.C.B. 1838; created baronet 1856. See *DNB*.

2411

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

[London] 13 June 1837

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

The triumph in the House last night was truly great. There was a most unexpected rally round the Ministry. The first division, though much more numerous, being a majority of 83, than the second, being 26, was yet more useful. The last time we divided on *the same point* we were only five majority.<sup>1</sup> This is a hint to the young coming Queen that Lord Melbourne's government, aided by *the Court*, will be all powerful. We have had various reports which must have reached you of the King's health. It is not permitted to wish for the death of every man and such a wish must be excluded. Then how difficult it is to speculate on the consequences of a termination of his reign without allowing the manifest advantages of the political alterations to be derived from that event to interfere with our ideas respecting his health. The fact, however, I believe to be that he is dying fast. I am told that until this day the Tories never abandoned the hope of his recovery. Now it is belie-

ved they are in despair. A few hours may terminate *his* sufferings. It is said that beyond a few days he cannot linger. What next? Certainly a continuance of Lord Melbourne's government with more, much more power; the Horse Guards, hitherto hostile, placed in their hands, the Court party not, as at present, thwarting but supporting them. A new election under the most favourable auspices. *The period* alone doubtful, depending on this question. Are the present English registries more favourable to the reformers than a new registry would be? The new registry<sup>2</sup> takes place in July. If we wait for that we shall not have an election before October, probably not until December. You may well believe that the Irish members will not omit to press the *confirmation* of a liberal policy on the *new* Ministers. My course is obvious: to insist upon all and get something substantial, at all events, for Ireland — a better Corporate Reform Bill, an enlarged constituency, and a *break down* of the tithes. At the worst, I repeat, I will get something for Ireland.

I will write to you as often as I can. Did I tell you that Lord Durham is on his way from St. Petersburg? He will be here within ten days. I dine tomorrow with his friend, Lord Radnor.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 96-8

- 1 Resolutions paving the way for the abolition of church rates were introduced by the government on 22 May. They were carried after two days debate by the slender majority of five votes — 287 to 282 (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXVIII, 929-78, 980-1077). Russell thereupon contented himself by moving for a committee to inquire into the property of the bishops and chapters of the established church, and it was carried on 12 June by 319 to 236. Two attempts by Goulburn on the same day to oppose Russell's motion were defeated by the majorities mentioned by O'Connell (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXVIII, 1384-1439).
- 2 The parliamentary reform acts of 1832 for England and Wales and for Scotland provided that the electoral registers be revised every July.

2412

*From Ellen Connor*

Denny Street [Tralee], 14 June 1837

My dearest Uncle,

I received your affectionate letter of the 7th inst. I can *repeat in sincerity* that I am shocked and grieved at the immense sums you have advanced for our family but there is no use in my regrets [much of the remainder of the letter is missing or illegible]. . . on Friday last the Kerry Evening Post announces 'to *his house* in

Castle Street.<sup>1</sup> However, unless he breaks the doors, he will not be likely to get in there as I hold the keys for you who are certainly the rightful owner. His reverence is residing with the poor widow and family of the late Jerry Lynch, the attorney. May God convert him.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 The *Kerry Evening Post* of Saturday, 10 June 1837 (no doubt it appeared the day before) reported: 'The Rev. Charles James O'Connor, nephew of Mr. Daniel O'Connell, after a short sojourn on the Continent, arrived yesterday at his house in Castle Street.' O'Connor (formerly Connor) was Ellen Connor's brother and the nephew of O'Connell's wife. The 'house in Castle Street' was clearly the home of their father, James Connor, which later became the Bank of Ireland.

2413

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 16 June 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

I may write to you again in the evening when *we* shall have heard from Windsor.

The report is that the King is better this day. There really is no knowing what to believe or what *his* real state is.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 98

2414

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 17 June 1837

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write from Brooks's. The report of an improvement in the King's health, which circulated yesterday, is all fudge. He is very ill and I believe all hope of his recovery is over. I have had some communication which will in the event of another reign, lead I hope to something useful for Ireland. It is expected by my informant that all will go right well with the new Queen. Of course these things are not to be *printed* but I am greatly deceived unless the

genuine friends of Ireland shall be consulted on the future arrangements. Perhaps it is my vanity which makes me believe I am to be listened to.

Tell J.D. Mullen he may depend on my not forgetting him. Indeed, I should rejoice more than he will if I can serve him. I hope and believe I can.

I will expect the lodgment of the other £1,000 with impatience. In haste.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 98-9

2415

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, Monday, [19 June 1837]

My dear FitzPatrick,

At this moment I write merely to say that the votes of supply were not taken this evening because it is supposed that at this hour we have not authority to vote anything; that is, that the king is believed not to be alive<sup>1</sup> and, of course, we have not as yet sworn allegiance to Queen Victoria. The intelligence, however, of his death will probably not arrive until after post hour. At all events prepare 'the lieges' for intelligence of important movements. I will, of course, write you tomorrow. I have arranged to see some of the Cabinet Ministers as soon as the new movements begin. I need not say that we are all alive to the vital interest of the present moment. I have already had a most satisfactory communication though of course of totally unofficial nature. Not a word on this subject. I hope it will be said of me, *Vigilat pro salute civium*.

As to the Agricultural Bank,<sup>2</sup> I wish to save the shareholders from as much of ruin as I can but will not press further the private Act<sup>3</sup> respecting them, that is, give up any further co-operation. But if our friends knew as much of the evidence as I do, they would thank me heartily for endeavouring to save them from any further participation in that concern.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 99

1 He died early on the morning of 20 June 1837.

2 See letter 2091 n3.

3 On 10 May petitions were presented by Shaw Lefevre from shareholders of the Agricultural and Commercial Bank, for leave to bring in a bill to vest the property of the bank company in trustees, with powers to dis-

solve the company, discharging all its liabilities and distributing its surplus assets among the proprietors. A bill for this purpose was presented and read on 30 May. Several petitions, including one from directors and members of the consulting committee of the bank were presented against the bill, which was not given a second reading.

2416

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 20 June 1837 (Evening)

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write merely to say that the general arrangements<sup>1</sup> are not as yet made. This day is employed upon them but everything is cheering. Lord Melbourne, I am assured, has got a *carte blanche*. Tomorrow we shall see about Ireland. This day I have had much labour, done some good, but have nothing tangible until tomorrow, if even so soon. The delay is not ominous of evil. On the contrary, I take it to be decisive of good. 'Wait awhile.' You shall hear again tomorrow.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick *Corr.*, II, 100-101

1 Following the death of William IV.

2417

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 24 June 1837

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

I was prevented by *pressure of business* from writing to you yesterday and from anxiety to know how matters really stand. I now have the pleasure to tell you that *all is safe and well*. The Melbourne Administration has the Court decidedly with it. They will no longer be opposed by the Horse Guards of the officials surrounding the Royal person. It is believed that Lord William Bentinck is to get a peerage and to succeed to Lord Hill, whose resignation will be *accepted*, as Commander-in-Chief. This is really the touchstone of the strength of the Administration. Besides, Lord Durham is hourly expected and is a great favourite at Court. All his views are sound and liberal. As to Ireland, I need give you no better proof of the determination to do right than

this, that Lord Mulgrave's being sent for IS to arrange with him all the measures of good policy intended for that country. I will, of course, pay him my respects so soon as he arrives and I have reason to know that he will return to Ireland with increased powers to do good. I will press for the BARONETAGES, etc. You may be quite certain that I will not forget our friend J. D. Mullen.

I have had confidential communications, which enable me to say this, that *all is right*. I mean that I do not speak from conjecture but I need not say that I cannot enter into details.

The office of 'Clerk of the Hanaper' has been offered to my son-in-law, Fitz-Simon. It is a clear £600 per annum for life and scarcely any trouble. In my opinion he ought to accept the offer.<sup>1</sup> When he arrives in Dublin see him and pay out of my money the expenses of the patent appointing him to his new place, so that he may get into the office without its costing him one shilling.

We must, of course, be prepared for the elections. I will be in Dublin as soon as I possibly can. My own opinion is that the government party will carry the city, notwithstanding every effort of the Orange faction. The English elections will give a majority of twenty-six Liberals, the Scotch about fourteen and the Irish at least twenty, giving at the least a working majority of from 60 to 70, to which are to be added at least 50 who always followed a settled Ministry.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 101-102

1 He did.

2418

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 28 June 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have just sent off my letter to the Association. We are to be the 'Friends of the Queen'.<sup>1</sup> All is going on exceedingly well. I will send my address to Kilkenny on Monday. We are making all useful arrangements. Do not for one moment entertain a fear of Meath.<sup>2</sup>

I hope to leave this within the week.

I will see Lord Mulgrave tomorrow. I have no news because everything is going on as smoothly as we could wish. It is quite certain that Sir James Graham loses his present county.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 102-103

- 1 O'Connell addressed a letter to Arthur French, secretary of the General Association of Ireland, on 28 June. In it he declared 'we must all, with one accord, rally round the throne of the Queen and in support of her majesty's government.' He recommended that the Association constitute itself a committee for elections to be called 'The Friends of the Queen' (*Pilot*, 30 June 1837; FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 103-5).
- 2 Apparently in connection with the forthcoming general election in which O'Connell's son Morgan and Henry Grattan were returned unopposed for Co. Meath.
- 3 Graham was rejected by the electors of Cumberland in the ensuing general election.

2419

This letter is now numbered 2435a.

2420

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

1 July 1837

*Confidential*

You know that I can be *compelled* to stand for Dublin.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 105

2421

*From his son Maurice to Cork*

Derrynane, Saturday, 1 July 1837

My dearest father,

I arrived here on Monday night or rather Tuesday morning about 2 A.M. having had a very pleasant and rapid journey from London. . . . I had this day a letter from John Scott. He has written to Mr. Hickman to communicate *fully* with you. I send *his* letter to me. . . . John says 1st that he cannot afford to give more than £4,000 in addition to Mary's<sup>1</sup> £3,000 which last sum he is ready to pay, and give his bond for the £4,000. He agrees to everything else except that he says that he thinks Mary's jointure ought to be £500 a year and the allowance to us for maintenance £600. . . .

John Scott is very anxious to *get into Parliament* and seems to



have some notion, in case of a vacancy, of offering for Clare. He is in politics a thorough radical, in short you can mould him as you please. I wish that you would if possible write him or, if not, write to me on this subject. I trust you may be able to get him into the House.<sup>2</sup> You will [*remainder of letter missing*]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Wife of Maurice O'Connell, M.P. and sister of John Scott.
- 2 Scott was never elected a member of parliament.

2422

*From A. V. Kirwan*<sup>1</sup>

5 July 1837

*Extract*

... to remind you of our conversation in the Reform Club<sup>2</sup> and to reiterate my readiness to stand either for Dungarvan or Drogheda in the event of Sir William Somerville<sup>3</sup> going to Meath. I have some small claims on Dungarvan, having been counsel for the sitting member in April 1834. For the rest, it may be necessary to declare that I am for the Ballot, Household Suffrage, and Triennial Parliaments and disposed to support 'even unto the death' the administration of the best (shall I say, the only good viceroy?) that has even been in Ireland. You know I live at the seat of Government, and I promise exemplary attendance and entire zeal and devotion. I am not, however, a 'millionaire', but am, of course, prepared for all legal expenses. I have done my country, the State, and the present ministers some small services and have never touched one shilling of public money. This is all I have to say. If I did not think your nature noble and generous, I would not now appeal to you though it was [sic] hard in strictest justice to make the man accountable for those differences<sup>4</sup> which the boy had with the first and greatest of his countrymen.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 124

- 1 Andrew Valentine Kirwan (1804-1870), eldest son of Thomas Kirwan, Wellpark, Co. Dublin and 92 Upper Abbey Street, Dublin. Called to the Irish bar (1825) and the English bar 1828; practised in Dublin and London until 1850; author of many works. Died in London. See *Boase*.
- 2 The Reform Club, London, founded in 1836.
- 3 Sir William Meredyth Somerville (1802-1873), Somerville, Co. Meath. M.P. for Drogheda 1837-52, for Canterbury 1854-65; chief secretary for Ireland 1847-52; created Baron Athlumney 1863. See *DNB*.
- 4 Unidentified. Kirwan did not stand for Dungarvan in 1837.

2423

Letter withdrawn. Unimportant matter.

2424

*From Cornelius Leicester Keogh,<sup>1</sup> Geevagh, Co. Sligo,  
7 July 1837 to House of Commons*

Seeks position in police or in poor law commission or as manager of small branch in the National Bank. Says he is a godson of Hon. Col. Leicester Stanhope.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Claims to be a grandson of John Keogh (1740-1817), the Catholic leader.

2425

*To Richard Sullivan*

Merrion Square, 7 July [18]37

My dear friend,

I intended to have written to consult you even before I got your letter. I wish to tell you my plan and then to be guided by your advice and that of my Kilkenny friends.

My plan then is this. I desire to be returned for Kilkenny *without a contest* and for Dublin with a contest. If I fail in Dublin I retain Kilkenny. If I succeed in Dublin I will thus carry two seats for that city, and then I can elect to continue member for Kilkenny and let in another liberal for Dublin. The Tories once beaten will not try a second time and thus I will have the honour of sitting for Kilkenny and of liberating Dublin. Consult with the leading men of Kilkenny of the different sections and give me their and your own opinion upon this plan. I would not wish it should get into the newspapers but to have the excellent men who with you form public opinion in Kilkenny give me their sentiments on the subject. I need not specify those who ought to be consulted but the greater number of persons you consult the better. I wish to treat each voter with the most perfect respect and not think of anything like dictation on my part. It would not become me at all

to take any liberty with such a constituency as that of Kilkenny. I am their servant heartily and truly.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

2426

*To a kinsman in Tralee*

Merrion Square, 8 July 1837

My dear ——

Though I did not hear in reply to my first letter, nor could in answer to my second, I write again.

—— says they have subscribed largely for Blenner Thompson<sup>1</sup> to oppose<sup>2</sup> Maurice. He says £2,000. If that be true, it would clearly be a 'conspiracy to bribe the voters', and very little verbal evidence would enable us to indict them all. Be discreet as to this and find out who were at the meeting<sup>3</sup> and who subscribed.

If the Hicksons took any part in the business I will have it reported to Lord Lansdowne, who has already given James<sup>4</sup> a hint on the subject of Kerry politics. It is curious that his brothers should be the most violent in opposition to the political existence of such a patron of one of their family.

How I wish that you may have retained<sup>5</sup> Tuite and Welsh the moment I wrote to you. I am dying with impatience to hear from you and have every reliance on your long head and sound heart. . . .

I have written to Dr. McEnnery.<sup>6</sup> This is in strictest confidence.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 106

- 1 Thomas Blennerhassett Thompson (1804-1853), son of Peter Thompson, treasurer of Tralee, and Anne Blennerhassett.
- 2 In Tralee. Thompson did not contest Tralee in the general election of 1837 (see letter 2450 n1.)
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 James Hickson, agent to the Marquis of Lansdowne.
- 5 Presumably as counsel for the Liberal candidates in the forthcoming elections for Kerry and Tralee.
- 6 John G. McEnnery (died 17 May 1861), born in neighbourhood of Ardfert, Co. Kerry c. 1786. Ordained 1810 and later took a theology degree at the Sorbonne. P.P. of Tralee 1824-1854 but retired from active work in 1851.

2427

*From a kinsman in Tralee*

10 July 1837

*Extract*

That they will poll as many as they can I have no doubt, and this merely for the purpose of putting you to expense and so as this object is attained they are quite careless of defeat. There are 87 Protestant voters who will adhere to one another and it is a truly disgusting and lamentable fact that there are many Catholics who can avowedly be corrupted.

James H[ickson],<sup>1</sup> who was so very forward last election, has become as adverse as possible. It is said that some transaction with the National Bank, added to his being deprived of the directorship, has caused his hostility. There is a Catholic clergyman here who, I am positively informed, has signified his intention of voting against us; why, I cannot imagine. He has resided for some time in America, and should think and act otherwise. When Maurice called to canvass him he was not to be seen, tho' certainly at home. Perhaps your writing to him may have the desired effect. He is a very eccentric man and requires to be dealt with in a peculiar way, which I am sure you will hit off.

I hope you have written to Maurice on the absolute necessity of his remaining in Tralee until after the election and during the approaching assizes. On this point there is but one opinion amongst his friends. Besides, a flying visit of a few days is not the thing. Returning *so soon* to Derrynane will be laid hold of by the enemy, who know what use to make of his absenting himself just at the present crisis. After a careful and calm scrutiny I am convinced that, let the Orange party do what they can by bribes and other means, they will be beaten. We must, nevertheless, be vigilant and ceaseless in our efforts to render their defeat as signal as possible. H - - -<sup>2</sup> is as yet undecided. Your being able to effect a remission of the fine imposed on him some time ago would do the business.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick *Corr.*, II, 107

- 1 FitzPatrick has used only the initial but letter 2426 would infer that it is James Hickson.
- 2 Unidentified. W.J. FitzPatrick has omitted the name but says he is a distiller in Tralee. See letter 2429.

2428

*From Christopher Walsh*<sup>1</sup>

Waterloo Place, Londonderry, 10 July 1837

Sir,

. . . Please Sir, to recollect that in 1834 I took a liberty with you similar to the present with references to the state of the representation of this City. I was honoured with your reply but which in part denounced me as being neither a sincere Catholic nor a lover of this my native land.<sup>2</sup> I beg leave, Sir, most respectfully to remove that impression from your mind, assuring you with the utmost sincerity and truth that I am both, which alone prompts me in this instance to lay before you a conversation I have had with Mr. Dawson, who called on me to solicit my vote and interest at the next election. Many topics were introduced, amongst others, Sir, your name, when Mr. Dawson said that he had seen you a fortnight before he left London, when he intimated his intention of standing for this City opposed to Sir Robert Ferguson,<sup>3</sup> that you replied, if you possessed any influence here over the liberal electors, particularly the Catholics, your influence would be exercised for him. I met this by stating [about three words illegible] opinion in 1832 but that in 1834 I received your just reprimand for having classed Sir Robert Ferguson, though bad, with him (Mr. D) who would have been worse. Sir Robert Peel then at the head of the Government; and that my present conviction on the coming struggle [was that it] would be one of great importance, even greater than it was in 1834 and that as he intended to come forward on conservative principles, I felt bound to decline giving him my support; and that I thought Sir Robert Ferguson entitled to a preference from having supported the Government on all occasions but one (during the session) and that, whilst I had to admit the dangerous tendency of that vote, I mean the English Dissenters Church Rate Bill,<sup>4</sup> with all his faults he was not calculated to do much evil but that as he Mr. Dawson had well founded pretensions to be a debater, therefore, that of the two evils I would choose the least; that my pledge to Sir Robert Ferguson was conditionally in the event of no other candidate offering, prepared to go further in support of the Government. . . . Alas we want union, energy, and above all we have no leader of any standing to arouse the people to a sense of their duty. The Catholic clergy in this City are most apathetic and in their political opinions not so generous as might be expected. They have never come forward on any occasion. It is therefore

not difficult to account for the tergiversation on the part of the Catholics. The number of electors that are qualified to vote are only 509 and of these 161 are Catholics and I regret, deeply regret, Sir, that many of them are capable of being bribed and as they expect a rich harvest, they are determined to stand aloof until their price is estimated and that high. Notwithstanding all this I still entertain a hope, Sir, that if you would take up our fallen state at the first public meeting of the Association,<sup>5</sup> great and paramount good would result from it.

I send you the newspaper which contains Mr. Dawson's address. It sets forth little and means less but that it is conservative cannot be denied. I wish also to state that his friends here are busy in circulating a report that you are favourable to his return. Those persons are all Orange to the heart's core. . . . In conclusion I beg leave to refer you to Mr. Barret [*sic*] in justification of my political principles. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Neither Walsh's letter nor O'Connell's reply are identified.
- 3 Sir Robert Alexander Ferguson, second baronet (1795-1860), The Farm, Londonderry. M.P. for Londonderry city 1830-60; lord lieutenant Co. Londonderry 1840-60. See *Boase*.
- 4 Sir Robert Ferguson, M.P. Londonderry city, was amongst the minority voting against the second reading of the government's church rate bill on 24 May (*FJ*, 27 May 1837).
- 5 The General Association. Speaking in the Association on 11 July O'Connell declared his opposition to the candidacy of George Robert Dawson for Londonderry city (*FJ*, 12 July 1837). Ferguson was returned for Londonderry city on 2 August, defeating Dawson by 212 to 137 (*FJ*, 4 August 1837).

2429

*To a kinsman in Tralee*

Merrion Square, 11 July 1837

My dear - - - -

I have again and again to thank you. *All is right*. I have at once applied to get off H- - - -s<sup>1</sup> fine and have succeeded. See him and send me up the particulars that I may get the order to expunge it; but the thing *is done*. This was the moment to ask. Next I have got a positive promise of a waterguard's situation for Diggan, but you must take care that this intelligence is not used to him in any way which would interfere with the bribery oath. Read that oath.

I would not for all the elections upon earth have any man take a false oath. Consult the Catholic clergy, especially Dr. McEnery, and see there is no tampering with the oath. But, in point of fact, I authorise you to pledge yourself that, let him vote as he will, he shall get the situation of waterguard.

As to the publicans, the £15 must be paid for them. See Dr. McEnery on this subject and take care not to have the money so paid as to amount in *any way to bribery*. Again, *recollect the oath*; but whoever they vote for — let them even vote against my son — the money shall be paid for them.

I depend on your discretion in every respect. I will write tomorrow to P - - - .<sup>2</sup> What is the stamp distribution<sup>3</sup> of Tralee worth?

I wrote to Maurice yesterday, fearing he would leave Tralee. See him and tell him from me that I shall be utterly offended if he leaves Tralee without my express permission. Read this passage for him, and if you coincide with me in opinion, pray urge him to remain until after the assizes at least, nay, until I tell him he may go to Derrynane. The Parliament will be dissolved about the 18th. Do not let this date get into print.

There is the son of an honest man named Ash. I got a revenue policeman's situation for him which he would not accept. See him. What is he fit for? Is he under thirty? He is unfortunately married; that is, it is unfortunate that he has a wife and family, which renders it difficult to do anything for him. But I must try.

How stand the numbers? Let me know how stand the promises at both sides. I never felt confident of M - - - .<sup>4</sup> My brother John will be sheriff<sup>5</sup> next year. This conduct of M - - - 's disembarasses John as to the sub-shrievalty.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 108-109

- 1 See letter 2427 n2.
- 2 Name omitted by W.J. FitzPatrick.
- 3 The distribution of revenue stamps on various kinds of documents.
- 4 Name omitted by W.J. FitzPatrick, but it is probably Thaddeus William Murphy, attorney, Killarney who held the position of sub-sheriff in 1837 and again in 1839.
- 5 John O'Connell was appointed high sheriff of Kerry for 1838.

2430

*To Edward Ellice**Confidential*

Merrion Square 12 July 1837

My dear Sir,

We are going on reasonably well in Ireland but we are much embarrassed by Mr. More O'Ferrall's return to London so prematurely. You must send him back to us at once, indeed *you must*. Else we shall be at sixes and sevens. Too many advisers and nobody to whom all would submit. He is distinct and intelligent. I will reckon on his speedy return.

You must also send your friends here money, I should say four to six thousand pounds would be sufficient. I am quite disinterested in pressing this point as I have to stand four contested elections without requiring any aid so that I am the more at liberty to press for the sinews of war from your side. Do something for us and we will do well for you.

If the Queen's County be well worked, you could secure *both* members, that is the eldest son<sup>1</sup> of Sir Charles Coote<sup>2</sup> with Mr. FitzPatrick.<sup>3</sup> *This could* be easily achieved but there is nobody to do it.<sup>4</sup>

I promised FitzStephen French to write to you on the subject of his brother's peerage.<sup>5</sup> May I ask you to tell him that I had done so, stating the antiquity and respectability of his family, their having been ancient barons by writ, their having represented their county for four generations without any interruption.

Will you also excuse me for taking the liberty of troubling you on this subject. I know how little attention ought to be paid to any enquiry of mine but I could not avoid promising him to write, and all I seek is that he should know that I went as far on the subject as I could venture to do, on one of so much delicacy. I told him of the inutility of my doing so. You will, I am sure, with your usual tact get me out of the awkward position I thus occupy.

It *ruins* us here that you have not as yet got the horse guards.<sup>6</sup> We have military men canvassing and voting against us in every direction. How I long to see your friends show forth *their power*. I should hope that power will at length be used *for* Ireland. Lord Mulgrave has been accused of making too many appointments from the popular party in Ireland. I send you a list which if you take the trouble of looking at it will show you that the patronage of Ireland is not applied even for Irish purposes. Lord Mulgrave therefore is unjustly accused. Indeed he has but one fault and that is believing it possible to conciliate the Orange party by kindness.



Hard blows alone can make them submissive.

SOURCE: Ellice Papers

- 1 Charles Henry Coote, J.P., D.L., (1815-1895), eldest son of Sir Charles Henry Coote, 9th Bt. Succeeded as tenth baronet 1864.
- 2 Sir Charles Henry Coote, ninth baronet, (1794-1864) Ballyfin House, Queen's Co. M.P. for Queen's Co. 1821-47, 1852-59. See *Boase*.
- 3 John Wilson Fitzpatrick, Rathkale, Queen's Co. M.P. for Queen's Co. 1837-41 and 1847-52; high sheriff of Queen's Co. 1837.
- 4 The Liberal candidates, Sir Charles Coote and John W. Fitzpatrick were returned for the Queen's Co. on 15 August, defeating the outgoing Conservative candidate, Thomas Vesey, after a severe and violent struggle. The final count was: Coote 1224, Fitzpatrick 943, Vesey 894 (*Pilot*, 16 Aug. 1837)
- 5 Arthur French (c. 1786-1856), eldest son of Arthur French, French Park, Co. Roscommon. M.P. for Co. Roscommon 1821-32; created Baron de Freyne of Artagh (U.K.) on 16 May 1839 and subsequently Baron de Freyne of Coolavin (U.K.) with a special remainder to his brothers and their male issue.
- 6 That is, to have procured the removal of the Tory Lord Hill from the post of commander-in-chief and his replacement by a government nominee.

2431

*To Lord Durham, c. 12 July 1837<sup>1</sup>*

O'Connell states that he has in preparation a pamphlet on 'Ireland and the Irish.'<sup>2</sup> He describes it as a 'brief but rather quaint and very distinct' exposition of the evils inflicted on Ireland during seven centuries of English misrule, and says it can be read in a quarter of an hour, and is addressed to the queen. He requests Lord Durham to submit it to her Majesty if, on perusal, he finds nothing in it in substance or form to which he could take exception. He tells Durham that the three kingdoms look to him to pursue to its natural and designed end the reform act of which he was the chief author; and adds that the measure has destroyed the direct power of the aristocracy of birth but only to substitute, so far, the inferior aristocracy of mere wealth. 'You are public property and no part of the empire desires so much to claim you for her own share of political improvement as Ireland.' He finally states that Durham's sentiments on the mode of consolidating the Union represent the only method of rendering it permanent, and are congenial to all right-thinking men in the country.

SOURCE: Reid, *Durham* 132-3

- 1 This letter is published in paraphrased form in this source (Reid's *Durham*).
- 2 Probably *Memoir on Ireland*, 12 mo., Simpkin (Thomas Hodgson, *London Catalogue of Books, 1816-51*, London). See also letter 2456 nl.)

2432

*To Pierce Mahony*

Merrion Square, 14 July 1837

My dear Mahony,

I never was more mortified than by your letter from Tralee. Why should you dream of leaving Kinsale until you got my answer? I did *all* you asked and everything you desired should be done. My advice to you is to go back to Kinsale and everything *double* shall, I am convinced, be done to procure you Heard's<sup>1</sup> interest. In fact, Government are bound to strain every nerve for you if you give the pledge I mentioned. I myself will *continue* to take the most active part to secure your return. I wrote in reply to your letter, the very post I got that letter, so that it is unintelligible to me why you should leave Kinsale.<sup>2</sup>

As to Kerry it is part of Tory tactics to threaten a contest everywhere. It is ludicrous except as making the candidates spend money. For Heaven's sake go back to Kinsale and fight there to the last. You will, even if defeated, entitle yourself to another constituency but I think means will be find [sic] to secure your success if you do not abandon the field.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 John Isaac Heard (1787-1862), Kinsale and Ballydaly, Co. Cork. M.P. for Kinsale 1852-59. See *Boase*.
- 2 On 4 August John Isaac Heard proposed Mahony for election for Kinsale (*DEP*, 8 Aug. 1837). See letter 2396 nl.

2433

*From John Cleave*<sup>1</sup>

1 Shoe Lane, Fleet Street, London, 14 July 1837

My dear Sir,

Mr. Tilly not having heard from Mr. Williams, the correspondence between them and between you and me has been published

by Mr. Tilly. I send you a copy of the *London Dispatch* containing the letters.<sup>2</sup>

[The writer asks O'Connell to have him freed from being a crown debtor, a burden apparently incurred for some political or other non-personal reason.]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Publisher and bookseller.

2 B. Tilly, a member of the London Working Mens' Association appears to have addressed a letter to the *London Mercury*, stating that William Williams had been overheard to say that he had been told by O'Connell that he (O'Connell) had signed resolutions in favour of universal suffrage, solely 'for the purpose of frustrating the intention of the Working Mens' Association'. Williams promptly denied Tilly's assertion (Williams to O'Connell, 19 June 1837, *Pilot*, 19 July 1837).

2434

*From Richard Sullivan*

Kilkenny, 14 July 1837

My dear Sir,

There was this day a meeting of the Independent Electors of the County, and it was proposed that each of the present members should deposit £250 and arrangements would be made to return them free of further expense.

Mr. Finn subsequently declared his determination not to stand as a candidate at the approaching election, alleging several prudential reasons. This leaves an open[ing] for a Whig candidate in his room; and it is stated that Lord Duncannon's son<sup>1</sup> or Bryan is to be put in nomination.<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt of the success of either with the Colonel. It is also rumoured, and there are good grounds for it, that there will be no opposition in this case. It is said the aristocracy here gain one object in causing the retirement of Mr. Finn and that one of themselves being up with the Colonel may influence the withdrawal of Lord Ossory<sup>3</sup> particularly when the contest would be so uncertain to the Tory party. This is speculation. But this I believe, that Ossory would not like to be instrumental in putting the Colonel to annoyance or expense, and private feeling often stands as an obstacle in the way of even party opposition. I shall know more on this subject tomorrow and acquaint you with it. My attendance in court prevented me being present at the meeting; but the resignation is quite certain.

It just strikes me very humbly to suggest whether or not in the event of your success in Dublin,<sup>4</sup> and of your electing for Kilkenny, the next on the poll (a Tory) to the Liberal elected with you would not be the sitting member. Your plan assumed the contrary, and of course you know best.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Hon. John G.B. Ponsonby.
- 2 George Bryan of Jenkinstown stood as Liberal candidate in place of W.F. Finn, and was elected with Col. Pierce Butler on 12 August, apparently unopposed.
- 3 John (Butler), (1808-1854) styled Viscount Thurles 1820-25 and earl of Ossory 1825-38; succeeded as second marquess of Ormonde on 18 May 1838. M.P. for Co. Kilkenny 1830-32.
- 4 O'Connell agreed to accept the nomination of the National Trades Political Union as candidate for Dublin city on 10 July. However he did so on condition that 'it was to be distinctly understood that he was pledged to Kilkenny city, and should sit for that city if his constituents so required.' The Union expressed its confidence that after he had been elected for Dublin 'the good men of Kilkenny would consent to his accepting the representation of the metropolitan city' (*FJ*, 11 July 1837). The difficulty was resolved when Joseph Hume, who had been defeated in Middlesex, was accepted as candidate for Kilkenny city. He was elected on 7 August, running nominally against O'Connell, who remained a candidate, and another Liberal candidate who had earlier been proposed, William Ewart of Liverpool. The count was Hume 57, O'Connell 50, Ewart 18 (*Pilot*, 9 Aug. 1837).

2435

*From H. Elphinstone*<sup>1</sup>

Liverpool, 13 or 17 July [1837]

My dear Sir,

Will you be good enough to write by return of post to *Mr. Charles W. Williams*<sup>2</sup> of the City of Dublin Steam Packet Company in Liverpool to request him to use his influence and his vote for Mr. Ewart and myself. It appears that two of his subordinates, Mr. Perry and Mr. J. [?Lane], are against us but the expression of Mr. Williams' wish may counter-balance their votes. Our canvass looks well but it will be a very hard fight, and *every* vote is of consequence.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Howard Elphinstone (1804-1893), only son of Sir Howard Elphinstone, 1st Bt. M.P. for Hastings 1835-37; for Lewes 1841-47; succeeded to the baronetcy 1846. See *Boase*.

- 2 Charles Wye Williams (1779-1866), a native of Dublin. Founder of Charles Wye Williams and Co. which merged with the City of Dublin Steam Packet Co. in 1823. See *Boase*.
- 3 In this election both Elphinstone and Ewart were defeated by their Conservative opponents.

2435a

*From William Hodges<sup>1</sup>*

Mould's Hotel, London, Sunday morning [c. 16 July 1837]

Sir,

I hope you will pardon this intrusion but from the determination I have come to I consider myself perfectly justified in addressing you confidentially. From the reports recently made to me by many of my best and most faithful friends I am led to believe that were I to accede to their requests and permit myself to be put in nomination for Dublin as one firmly attached to the liberal and enlightened policy of the present Government and ever anxious for the maintenance of the constitution, subject however to the mild and qualifying influence of legitimate reform, my success would be certain. To achieve this object I would not profess myself the adherent of any extreme radical party but, if an entire concurrence in the sound principles set forth in Lord Durham's admirable letter<sup>2</sup> be any recommendation in the choice of my fellow citizens, then I most willingly adopt his Lordship's opinions as embracing the full force of my political creed. If returned I would deem it my duty at all times to support the existing Government because I believe their intentions towards the country to be just, honest and sincere.

With respect to the expense necessary upon a contest I would not hold myself liable for a larger sum than £3,000 but that I will most readily advance.

To conclude, if you approve of my pretensions which I am given to understand will not prove unavailing with the great body of the Corporation, you have my permission to announce me as a candidate the first public opportunity but, if otherwise, all I require is that you will treat this communication *strictly confidential*. In adopting this course I have no personal motives to gratify and I assure you I refused to take any part till some of the best friends of Ireland pointed out to me the injury which the cause and the Ministry would suffer by all their supporters holding back and remaining inactive.

P.S. If you think well you can propose me as a member of the General Association. My secretary at the Mansion House will pay my subscription of £5.0.0.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Hodges, Belville, Donnybrook. Alderman since 1830; lord mayor of Dublin for 1837.
- 2 Durham to the Electors of North Durham, 8 July 1837 (*Pilot*, 14 July 1837). He declared his policy was to preserve all existing institutions but also to 'throw them open to all who had the ability to comprehend them, and the vigour to protect them.' He declared his life's wish to be to bring both the middle and the lower classes 'within the pale of the true, not the spurious, constitution.'

### 2436

*From William Stephens,<sup>1</sup> 30 Stafford Street, Dublin, 17 July 1837*

States that an enemy of liberality, Francis Spratt<sup>2</sup> of 34 Bolton Street, Dublin, free smith, has died. Mr. Moore<sup>3</sup> of 53 Capel Street, Dublin, is leaving and going to Belfast. He is 'also an enemy of ours.' 'I paid him for voting for Harty and Perrin.'<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A free hosier, and collector of public money.
- 2 Also a painter and glazier.
- 3 Robert Moore, cabinet maker and upholsterer.
- 4 Very probably in the general election of 1831 when Robert Harty and Louis Perrin were returned for Dublin city.

### 2437

*From Thomas Haughton*

Carlow, 17 July 1837

My dear Sir,

In the absence of our candidates<sup>1</sup> who are in the lower part of the county agitating, I know you will be glad to learn what we have been doing here in furtherance of the good cause, which you have devoted your laborious life to promote. On Friday we finished the canvass of the town for Mr. Maule,<sup>2</sup> he was everywhere warmly received and a considerable majority of the electors stood pledged to him and I have no doubt of his return.<sup>3</sup> On Friday evening he published a most excellent address to his friends and

the friends of Ireland . . . a copy of which you will find in a 2nd edition of the *Leinster Independent sent you by last night's post*. In truth he is everything you could wish, and I make no doubt will make a most valuable acquisition to the Liberal party, having talent, and what's better, integrity to bring in aid. In the county the cause will be strengthened by the return of two honest reformers in the persons of Vigors and Yates<sup>4</sup> *by a large majority*. The Messrs. Bruen and Bunbury<sup>5</sup> have published their addresses<sup>6</sup> composed of a large portion of *water* to a small portion of *skim milk!* . . . Sir Charles Coote's *mode of address*.<sup>7</sup> By the bye, Mr. Fitzpatrick's<sup>8</sup> agent has been now with me to state that that gentleman is to be here this evening on his canvass.<sup>9</sup> We are to meet him on the Queen's County bridge at 4½ o'clock to accompany him in his progress. The truth is, everything looks well for the cause of our gracious Queen and liberty! And I hope that a rich reward awaits you in the evening of your life in the fruition of the mighty efforts you have made in the cause of universal liberty to mankind of every creed and clime but above and before all the regeneration of your own lovely land.

[P.S.] 7. o'clock. Evening inst. Mr. F. not yet arrived. T.H.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Nicholas Aylward Vigors and John Ashton Yates who were elected for Co. Carlow on 11 August.
- 2 William Henry Maule (1788-1858), son of Surgeon Henry Maule, Edmon-ton, Middlesex. Called to the bar 1814; K.C. 1833; baron of court of exchequer (England) 1839; justice of court of common pleas 1839-55; M.P. for Carlow borough 1837-February 1839; knighted 1839. See *Boase*.
- 3 Maule, the Liberal candidate, was returned for Carlow borough on 5 August, defeating Francis Bruen by 180 votes to 158 (*FJ*, 8 Aug. 1837).
- 4 John Ashton Yates (1782-1863), Bryanston Square, London, son of Rev. John Yates, Liverpool. M.P. for Co. Carlow 1837-41. See *Boase*.
- 5 Thomas Bunbury (died 1846), Moyle, Co. Carlow. M.P. Co. Carlow 1841-46.
- 6 Henry Bruen's address 'to the Independent Electors' of Co. Carlow dated 14 July, consisted of an attack on the Irish government and, by implication, on O'Connell. It declared Ireland had become 'the arena of strife, of violence, and corruption' and in an obvious reference to the Raphael affair stated the country had become a safe field for speculation 'where every adventurer, provided he has a sufficient sum in his hand - be he Christian, Heathen, Turk or Jew, is welcome. . . .' Thomas Bunbury's address, dated 12 July 1837 consisted of a brief notice of his intention to stand (*DEM*, 17 July 1837).
- 7 In his address 'To the Free and Independent Electors of the Queen's County', dated 10 July, Coote expressed support for municipal reform, declaring that in giving his support to the late ministerial bill for municipal reform he had given up his own views in deference to the wishes of his constituents. He claimed he had been encouraged to again come

forward at this election by Wellington's recent declaration that he would concur in granting a measure of municipal reform to Ireland.

8 John W. Fitzpatrick.

9 With Sir Charles Coote, J. W. Fitzpatrick successfully contested the Queen's County in the ensuing general election. (see letter 2430 n4).

2437a

*From John Shea Lawlor*

Carlow, 8 o'clock [17 July 1837]

Here we are. Mr. Haughton permits me to add a line.<sup>1</sup> We have had four parochial meetings<sup>2</sup> of freeholders this day. We have agitation without excitation. Not a word which could give an excuse to any squeamish Protestant to feel, or pretend to feel, that Fitzpatrick<sup>3</sup> was in the hands of those who sought the destruction of their Church. Open arms for Coote yet active preparations for battle. All is right, firm, moderate and united.

P.S. I should not be at all surprised was Vesey<sup>4</sup> to retire. Coote will be pressed by the Tories to make his selection and if he decide to [?stay] neutral (as he will) the opinion is Vesey won't stand.<sup>5</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 This letter is written on the same sheet as that of Thomas Haughton's letter to O'Connell of 17 July 1837.
- 2 In the election campaign for Queen's county.
- 3 John Wilson Fitzpatrick.
- 4 Hon. Thomas Vesey (1803-75), eldest son of 2nd Viscount de Vesci. M.P. for Queen's Co. 1835-37 and 1841-52. Succeeded to the peerage in 1855. See *Boase*.
- 5 Vesey did stand but was defeated.

2438

*From Lord Durham*

18 July 1837

I have delayed answering your letter<sup>1</sup> until I could ascertain whether your project was feasible or not. I find that, constitutionally and honourably, I cannot transmit any communication to the Queen, and that it ought to go alone through her confidential advisers. In these circumstances you will perceive the imposs-



ibility of my doing what you suggest. I return you many thanks for your flattering expression in regard to myself. I am at the disposal of my Sovereign and my country. If my humble services can be made available for the honour of the one or the interests of the other, I will not shrink from offering them but I will confess I am little prepared either in health or spirits for the arduous contest which must take place whenever Parliament meets. Whether I am in the field or not, I earnestly hope that the result will be beneficial to the Empire, and more especially to that much injured portion of it to which you belong.

SOURCE: Reid, *Durham*, 133

1 Letter 2431.

2438a

*From Richard More O'Ferrall*

[c. 19 July 1837]

My dear O'Connell,

You are quite right not to be angry or jealous with me, for there has been no wish on my part to withhold confidence. I give all or none. There is not a single circumstance fit to be committed to paper of which you have not been informed. Lord Cork would not allow his son to go to Cork or Bandon. Boyle<sup>1</sup> behaved as well as man could do. In every step I took I had the concurrence of Callaghan and O'Driscoll<sup>2</sup> as regards Cork. I concur in all you say about Kilkenny and will second every effort you make in the public cause, whether it be for Finn and Tighe<sup>3</sup> or any one else. Bryan would not on any account interfere with the county. Mr. Rennie<sup>4</sup> has gone over for Carrickfergus, and Colonel Rawdon,<sup>5</sup> an Irishman married to Lady Cremorne, will follow me tomorrow to be ready to supply the place of any man who fails us at the last moment or exacts terms which could not be complied with. Can I do more? *I have attended* to all your instructions with regard to N . . . .<sup>6</sup> of Tralee and to Jackson's<sup>7</sup> qualification. I hope to see you soon after you receive this letter.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 110

- 1 Hon. Robert Edward Boyle (1809-1854), second surviving son of the eighth earl of Cork. M.P. for Frome 1847-54. See *Boase*.
- 2 Probably Redmond O'Driscoll, proprietor of the *Cork Southern Reporter*.
- 3 William Frederick Fownes Tighe (1794-1878), eldest son of William

- Tighe, M.P.; Woodstock, Co. Kilkenny. High sheriff Co. Kilkenny 1823 and Co. Carlow 1837.
- 4 Matthew Boulton Rennie, son of Sir John Rennie, Kt., the reform candidate for Carrickfergus, was defeated by the Tory candidate Peter Kirk.
  - 5 John Dawson Rawdon (1804-1866), married 5 July 1828, Anne Elizabeth Emily, daughter of John Whaley and widow of Richard Thomas (Dawson), 2nd Baron Cremorne. M.P. for Armagh city 1840-52; lieutenant-colonel in Coldstream Guards from 1832. See *Boase*.
  - 6 Name omitted by W.J. FitzPatrick. See letters 2427 n2. The initial is given as H in letters 2427 and 2429 and as N in the above and letter 2439
  - 7 Perhaps Joseph Devonsher Jackson.

## 2439

*To a kinsman, Tralee*

Limerick, 22 July 1837

My dear - - ,

You are my 'confidential man' on electioneering points. First, read the letter<sup>1</sup> which surrounds this and then read for N . . . the passage I have underlined. The letter is written by More O'Ferrall, who you know, is one of the Lords of the Treasury. Keep the letter that I may keep O'Ferrall to his tackle. Second, you can pledge yourself that if the county call on Stephen Rice, the second son of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, *he will stand*. I wish you to do this *discreetly*; *see sensible men* and make the communication discreetly.<sup>2</sup> I do not want to turn Mullins out of the county;<sup>3</sup> far from it. All I want is to fight the battle against our paltry Conservatives with all the best materials. But, if need be, do not hesitate to pledge yourself as a gentleman that, if called on, Mr. Rice will stand. Mat Barrington and his other legal friends will at once go to Kerry to canvass, make up poll books, etc. Third, this is the most delicate of all. Barrington bids me let Mullins know that, if he resigns in favour of Rice, he will confer a favour on men who have the inclination and, I believe, the ability to return the favour. If you can communicate this to Mullins, see that he promises you not to speak of it otherwise than as seeking thereafter to avail himself of it, which of course, he will have to do, *but will meet no disappointment*. You may tell him you will keep this letter at his service. In short, this is a subject of much delicacy. It must be known through you that Rice, if necessary, is ready to stand if called on.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 109-110

- 1 Letter 2438a.
- 2 Stephen Rice did not stand for any constituency in 1837.
- 3 That is Kerry.

## 2440

*To Pierce Mahony, Kinsale, Co. Cork*

Mitchelstown, [Co. Cork] 22 July 1837

My dear Mahony,

I have but one line to write as the hour of post passes. I got your letter this day on the road from Limerick. I was angry with you for leaving Kinsale<sup>1</sup> but I am now more vexed you ever went there. I have no affectation at all but I would not for all the elections in Ireland have one man take the bribery oath<sup>2</sup> falsely. Meet me in Cork on Monday morning without fail and I will talk to you. There must surely be evidence had of Thomas'<sup>3</sup> bribery if it be as gross as you say. *We must not be bribers.* We must not indeed.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 See letter 2432.
- 2 Before voting an elector could be compelled to swear as to whether he had received a bribe.
- 3 Henry Thomas, Old Derrig, Queen's Co., M.P. for Kinsale 1835-41. See *Boase*.

## 2441

*To Alexander Sherlock care of Richard Sullivan Esq., Kilkenny*

Cork, 25 July 1837

*Copy*

My Dear Sherlock,

I know not what to say or to do about Kilkenny. I ought perhaps to complain that Finn threw up the County<sup>1</sup> without thinking it of any use to apprise me of his intention — and now, when the new candidate, Mr. Tighe has been put forward with my humble but entire concurrence, you without any previous communication put forward another candidate and then write to me for that support which you suppose I could give him.<sup>2</sup> Is this treating even me right but what is of much more importance, is it treating a friendly Government right?

I, of course, have a very sincere regard for the son<sup>3</sup> of my old friend Denis Scully but you see that I can [not] say one word under existing circumstances in his behalf. Nay, that if I had any influence with you or others — which I have not except when I do exactly what you choose — I certainly would use that influence to prevent so unpleasant an occurrence as that which would place the Government of our patriotic Queen in direct opposition with the popular party in the County of Kildare [*sic*]. I do implore of you however to reflect on the subject and to deliberate well before this unpleasant exhibition is made in the presence of the British nation. At all events I wash my hands out of the transaction. The popular party in Kilkenny County have not consulted me either as to the resignation of one candidate or the substitution of another until after both facts had become decided and public. I may be wrong but I do really and honestly think both facts to have been prematurely brought forward and I deeply regret to say I do fear you are following a course which will do mischief.

Do not blame me.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

- 1 See letter 2434.
- 2 The new candidate for Co. Kilkenny was James Scully. The *Kilkenny Journal* attacked Tighe's candidacy on the ground that he was 'opposed to the people and the most decided Tory.' It declared that Tighe, a personal friend of Lord Mulgrave and brother-in-law of the duke of Richmond, was supporting the government solely in the interests of obtaining a baronetcy (FJ, 27 July 1837, quoting *Kilkenny Journal*). Bryan came forward as candidate on 29 July, declaring himself for abolition of tithes, municipal reform, a poor law and the ballot (Pilot, 31 July 1837). With Col. Butler he was returned for Kilkenny on 12 August, apparently unopposed (see also letter 2446).
- 3 James Scully (1809-1842), Kilfeacle, Co. Tipperary, eldest son of Denys Scully (died 1830). James Scully was murdered at Kilfeacle on 26 November 1842 (*Pilot*, 30 Nov. 1842).

2442

To Pierce Mahony, Kinsale

[27 July 1837]

My dear Mahony,

The annuity on which my son John qualified<sup>1</sup> at the last election is now useless as my son-in-law,<sup>2</sup> who gave it, has a son since born whose estate tail interferes. I want you instantly to

write out the above agreement.<sup>3</sup> Insert the lands and the parish or parishes and send it up dated and signed by you to my house in Dublin for which place I go off this evening. Do not delay one moment to do this as my son may be called on for his qualification paper at the hustings. I shall be in a fever till I hear from you simply because I have delayed this matter too long.

Wishing you all manner of success.

[P.S.] I will assign you a charge against the estate of John Scott for £3,000 Irish as a security.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers.

1 For his property qualification.

2 Charles O'Connell.

3 The agreement is written on the same sheet as the letter. It runs: 'This is the agreement of and between Daniel O'Connell and Pierce Mahony Esquires.

The said Daniel O'Connell agrees to pay or secure to the said Pierce Mahony the sum of £3,000 (say three thousand pounds) sterling for the purchase of an annuity in the name of and for John O'Connell the third son of the said Daniel and the said Pierce Mahony agrees in consideration thereof to grant unto or in trust for the said John O'Connell a clear yearly annuity of £300 per annum over all charges and deductions whatsoever for the life of the said John O'Connell chargeable on all that and those the towns and lands of \_\_\_\_\_ situate in the parish (or parishes as the case may be) of \_\_\_\_\_ in the County of Kerry and to release such annuity of any equitable or other lien for the purchase money or by reason of the nonpayment thereof or otherwise howsoever. In witness etc.'

2443

*From Jane Lees*<sup>1</sup>

Edinburgh, 27 July 1837

My dear Sir,

Although I was not so fortunate as to hear from you when I was in London I am sure you will be glad to hear that Lord Lichfield<sup>2</sup> has taken up Sir Edward's<sup>3</sup> case<sup>4</sup> in the kindest [manner] and in a few days it will be forwarded to the Treasury *strongly* recommended by his Lordship but notwithstanding the Postmaster-General's [1 word illegible] exertions he has [3 lines illegible] claims at the Treasury and could I but hope that you would be *that* friend, our success would be certain. I shall not intrude upon your valuable time longer than to express a hope that the *mad* act<sup>5</sup> of his brother may not influence you to withdraw that friendship. . . .

P.S. In place of fourteen hundred and fifty pounds a year as [3 words illegible] has only asked whatever [3 or 4 words illegible] to him at the *Union* [2 or 3 words illegible] hundred and fifty pounds a year.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Jane Lees, probably the wife of Sir Edward Lees.
- 2 Thomas William (Anson), first earl of Lichfield (1795-1854), P.M.G. 1835-41 during which time the penny post was introduced.
- 3 Sir Edward Smith Lees, Kt. (1783-1846), fourth son of Sir John Lees, 1st Bt. and brother of Sir Harcourt Lees, 2nd Bt.; knighted 1821; formerly secretary to the post-office in Ireland and presently secretary in Edinburgh which post he resigned in 1845.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 Unidentified.

2444

*From Edward Ruthven*

Dublin, Thursday [c. 27 July 1837]

*Private*

Dear Sir,

I feel it to be my duty to make another and a last appeal to you before the coming contest in Kildare.<sup>1</sup> I am not only aware you as well as the Government look forward to it with some anxiety but believe you are actuated by friendly feelings to myself.

*I shall be returned.* Of that, as I always told you, there does not exist a doubt. I have now more than 650 men pledged to me. 1,000 votes will not be polled at the Kildare Election and there are many persons I have not seen and consequently have not canvassed who will vote for me. Indeed, few will appear at the hustings who will not give me one vote. Under these circumstances is it prudent to continue an opposition which may have the effect of unseating Mr. O'Ferrall and of perhaps putting a Tory in his place! Is it fair to me or to my friends that I should be opposed by any friend of the present Government? I know the bad feeling which this contest will leave between the upper and the lower classes in the county. I know it will spread itself to other counties and I would for that reason alone if unbiassed even by any others much prefer that the Kildare Election should pass over quietly.

I have no personal dislike to O'Ferrall and any attack I have ever made upon him has been in my own and for my friend's defence.

There is no inducement can make me withdraw. The people are to a man for me. Such is the popularity and influence I possess among them, I could were it wanting or could it be useful, bring twenty thousand labourers who would be guided by me together at any point I wish in any of the five neighbouring counties.

It is in your power to [one word illegible] the mischief which must arise from this useless and mischievous attempt to put me out. Consequences I do not wish and which I fear others do not see must follow it. My political course shall be what it has ever been, exactly the same as was that of my ever lamented father.<sup>2</sup>

It is the last application I shall make about the matter. I have never made any but to you whose determined supporter I have always been and I shall only add, I know my strength and have well weighed my position. It is one the united power of the [General] Association cannot, if they would, remove me from. I am happy they have not attempted it or forced me to show my strength and influence in a battle with them from which I would not shrink and in which I would be the conqueror.

I have felt it to be my duty as a man, to you and to my country to be thus explicit with you whose banner I so long followed. Excuse the intrusion. It shall not (*unasked*) be repeated. God wills all things for the better. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 For background information on the subject of this letter, see O'Connell to the Ten Pound Electors and Labourers of Co. Kildare, undated; and Ruthven to the Men of Kildare and Trades Political Union, undated (*Pilot*, 4 Aug. 1837). Ruthven claimed O'Connell had informed him in London that Lord Mulgrave wished to have Lord Cloncurry's son, Edward Lawless, returned for Co. Kildare as soon as he should come of age. 'You', he declared, 'are to hold Kildare as his *locum tenens*.' Upon Ruthven's refusing to accept such an arrangement, O'Connell offered him £1,000 and 'the first vacant colonial situation you think worth your acceptance.' On Ruthven's again refusing, O'Connell threatened to oppose him if he stood for Kildare. When he did so, O'Connell called on the electors to support the Liberal candidates, Richard More O'Ferrall and Robert Archbold. These were returned by substantial majorities on 11 August, Ruthven receiving only a few votes (*Pilot*, 7, 11, 14 Aug. 1837).
- 2 Edward Southwell Ruthven.

2445

*To Pierce Mahony*

Limerick, 28 July 1837

*Immediate*

My dear Mahony,

I write to say that I forgot adding to my letter yesterday that the £3,000 security will be in *addition* to the £3,000 consideration so as to prevent any accident of death before my honorary engagement is fulfilled. I need not say, however, that you can rely on the honour of my son as you do on that of

Yours very faithfully,

Daniel O'Connell

[P.S.] Do not delay one hour sending me the contract to Dublin where I am going.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

2446

*To Richard Sullivan*

Merrion Square, 29 July 1837

My dear friend,

George Bryan certainly stands for your county<sup>1</sup> so *all* is right.

I leave everything to the Committee. Surely I ought to have no voice at all in the manner of your proceeding in the City. I leave it all to yourselves to determine. But it would be an advantage to me to be 'Member for Kilkenny' as speedily as possible, so choose on Monday.<sup>2</sup> As to the rest, my excellent friend, I have no notion of feeling *displeased* about not being consulted about your county. In haste but always, my dear friend,

most sincerely and gratefully yours,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

1 Co. Kilkenny (see letter 2441 n2).

2 On Thursday, 3 August, O'Connell wrote to the Liberals of Kilkenny city asking that the poll be kept open until after the Middlesex election (see letter 2434 n4). At a meeting on the same day, O'Connell, Hume, and William Ewart of Liverpool were accepted as candidates for the city (*Pilot*, 4 Aug. 1837).



2447

*From Pierce Mahony*

Kinsale, Sunday, 30 July 1837

*Copy*

Dear O'Connell,

I sent you by last night's post a deed<sup>1</sup> for your son John. I told you as I now repeat that I trust in every way to your and his honour. If it is necessary that you should for the protection of John's seat send me securities, do so. Otherwise I do not want them.

*You* have placed me in the very sink of corruption as to politics, namely, Kinsale that I know not where expense will end. The price this night is £130 for neutrality. I must frankly tell you, as my friend, that this is a position for which I was not prepared. I will fight the battle to the last but I must tell you that I expect decidedly the support of you and the Government in the most unexceptionable and decided manner. I have been exceedingly ill-used and feel it. It is now for you and for *them* to place me and yourself relatively in the only position I will remain in, namely, that of an independent and acknowledged member of Lord Melbourne's party.

As to this election, it shall be fought to the last and in the most decided manner but if I am not returned for Kinsale, I expect that you and the Government also will decidedly support me for the vacancy I wish to avail myself of.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

1 See letter 2442.

2448

*From John McMullen*

Canal House, William Street, [Dublin]. 31 July 1837

*Private*

Dear Sir,

I deeply regret how little it is in my power to serve the cause of reform at this moment.

Let me beg of you, however, to cause it to be thoroughly understood that the payment of taxes can be required only from £10 householders and that no other class of voters is subject to

this test. I beg to assure you that it is *very generally understood* that *no voter* in Dublin is qualified unless his taxes are paid up. I acted myself unfortunately under this impression at the last Election. I know another individual who did so too and *the consequence* which I bitterly regret was *the majority of one* in the Dublin *Election Committee!!*<sup>1</sup> . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 2333 n5.

2449

*To Pierce Mahony, Kinsale*

Merrion Square [postmarked 2 August 1837]

My dear Mahony,

Any attempt to expose Dwyer<sup>1</sup> in public would only make him worse. Surely you have abundant evidence against him and his crimps instantly to commence a criminal prosecution 1st. for a conspiracy to bribe, 2nd. for offering bribes, 3rd. for attempting to bribe. I should write more but that you know how I am pressed. I do believe we will win here.

Ten thousand thanks for my son's qualification.<sup>2</sup> You may indeed rely upon our honour.

In haste

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

1 James Dwyer had come forward as a candidate for Kinsale. On 11 July O'Connell opposed his candidature in a speech in the *General Association* on the ground that it would split the anti-Tory vote (*Pilot*, 12 July 1837). In a public letter in reply Dwyer quoted a long passage from O'Connell's denunciation of Mahony in 1832 when Mahony was trying to stand for Limerick city (*Pilot*, 12 July 1837). Dwyer did not stand.

2 See letter 2442.

2450

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

11 August 1837

I have been greatly amazed by our defeat<sup>1</sup> in Kerry, owing as it was to the most afflicting stupidity.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 105

- 1 O'Connell's son, Maurice, was defeated for Tralee by 75 votes to 64 by the Tory John Bateman, who was declared elected on 7 August (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIII, 47). Bateman was unseated on petition and Maurice declared elected on 12 March 1838. By Friday, 11 August, it was clear that one of the Liberal candidates for the county, Frederick W. Mullins, would be defeated. When the poll closed on the following day O'Connell's nephew, Morgan John O'Connell, and the Tory Arthur Blennerhassett were declared elected, the figures being O'Connell 697; Blennerhassett 546; Mullins 498; Samuel Murray Hickson 112 (*MR*, 15 Aug. 1837).
- 2 According to an unsigned letter in the *Pilot*, addressed from Tralee, dated 12 August, Maurice O'Connell's defeat was due to a decision of the assessor, George Blake Hickson. On the ground that the addresses on their certificates of registry were insufficient, he disqualified close on one hundred of the voters pledged to Maurice O'Connell (*Pilot*, 14 Aug. 1837).

2451

*To William Woodlock*

Tralee, 11 August 1837

My dear Woodlock,

My bargain<sup>1</sup> with Mr. Hutton, as I understood it, was this: he was to pay for his half of the expenses £700; anything beyond that sum I was to pay, even if it amounted to thousands.

But he (Mr. Hutton) was to have a committee of his own, and any expenses they incurred were not to be included in the £1,400 joint stock as above. Besides this, I take it that I am clearly liable to one half of all expenses incurred by Mr. Hutton's committee which were or could be of mutual advantage, of which I participated in any way, such as the hire of additional cars

I gave £100 to the Trades' Union; this reckons in my first £700.

See Mr. Hutton with this note. If he differs from me in his construction of my contract, I at once abandon my view of it and abide by his.

I will make you a remittance early next week. You shall have the first instalment of £200, and the balance without delay until every demand is satisfied.

Some of the parochial committees came to me as I was leaving Dublin and stated that they had a surplus of their parish collection which they wished to apply to a public dinner to the newly elected members. Now I wish you to send Ray round to the parishes to beg that any such surplus may be applied to the

expenses of the election, through you, as a much more available mode of application. See whether anything can be made of this plan. At all events, I will indemnify you from the effects of your pledge, *that* you may rely on.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 111

- 1 In connection with the Dublin city election. O'Connell and Robert Hutton were elected on 5 August, defeating the Tory candidates George A. Hamilton and John Beatty West (*Pilot*, 7 Aug. 1837).

2452

*To Thomas Drummond, 17 August 1837, from Derrynane*

Asks Drummond's kind attention to Charles S. Cahill who has been treated harshly.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

2453

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 17 August 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

Here I am 'in repose' for a season, greatly mortified at our Kerry defeat,<sup>1</sup> the fault of which may, as usual, be shared amongst many. I acted, of course, for the best but judge of my horror when, going into Mullins' Committee on the second day, I found a voter who had just voted complaining with truth that 1s. 3d., that is, fifteen pence, would not be paid for his car hire home! Such a fellow to fight for as the man who refused such a trifle! I cannot now help it. What trash of Conway to say that Blennerhassett is not Conservative!<sup>2</sup> Bah! he is Orange to the backbone.

Enquire for me the impression made on the Ministry by the general result of the elections.<sup>3</sup> I tremble lest they should dream of resigning. Are you in the way of getting anything like accurate information upon this point?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 112

- 1 See letter 2450.  
2 F.W. Conway's paper, the *Dublin Evening Post*, declared on 15 August that though Blennerhassett, the recently elected candidate for Kerry,

had had the 'misfortune' of being supported by many Orangemen, he had also received considerable support from Catholics. It would be found that 'he will not be . . . a factious opponent of the Queen's government' (*DEP*, 15 August 1837).

- 3 As a result of the 1837 elections, the ministerial majority was 'cut to perhaps 40 on paper and to rather less, between 20 and 40, in practice' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 154).

2454

*To Arthur French*

Derrynane, 23 August 1837

*Private*

My dear French,

I agree with you that the Association should be dissolved.<sup>1</sup> It will be a befitting compliment paid to the Ministry and to Mr. Green.<sup>2</sup> I will, however, continue the registry office<sup>3</sup> and pay Ray and Merlin as usual. Let me know what their weekly allowance is.

I will write to you in a post or two, at the utmost, a letter<sup>4</sup> to the Association advising the dissolution. I will thank you to see T[illegible] and show him my letter. Allow him to make any corrections he pleases. Of this, more in my next. You know we can bring together the Association whenever we please — or rather form a new one.

You are I hope aware that your representative<sup>5</sup> is in France where he works on a literary subject — to make researches in the French archives for a history of the Irish brigades which he contemplates writing. I have, therefore, postponed the Athlone Dinner<sup>6</sup> till after his return.

I do not know, my dear French, how to thank you sufficiently for all you have done for my son and for the public cause.<sup>7</sup> Believe me, the impression will never be effaced from the mind of

Your sincere and grateful friend,

Daniel O'Connell.

SOURCE: Unknown (the owner of the letter can no longer be identified)

- 1 On O'Connell's proposal the General Association went into voluntary dissolution on 31 October (*MR*, 1 Nov. 1837).
- 2 Probably Richard Wilson Greene, legal adviser to Dublin Castle.
- 3 For facilitating and encouraging the registration of voters.
- 4 O'Connell waited nearly two months before publishing his intended letter. In it he declared that he had taken the decision to dissolve the Association 'with some hesitation, but I think we are arrived at a period

when we should give this proof of our satisfaction at the improved state of the administration of Government in Ireland, and I am confident in the good intentions of our most gracious Sovereign, and in those of her Majesty's Ministers' (O'Connell to French, 19 October 1837, *Pilot*, 25 Oct. 1837; see also letter 2455).

- 5 O'Connell's son John, now M.P. for Athlone.
- 6 In honour of John O'Connell.
- 7 As secretary of the General Association.

2455

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 4 September 1837

Send me *Tait's Magazine* and *Bentley's Miscellany*<sup>1</sup> for this month. The story of 'Oliver Twist' is continued in the latter, and I am most impatient to see it.

If Milliken has any recent *Ministerial* pamphlet, send it and any other books which strikes your own fancy. I intend to stay six weeks longer in this county. I enjoy it as much as I can possibly enjoy anything. The Ministry wish to dissolve the Association<sup>2</sup> and I see no reason why we should not gratify them. It is easy to start another whenever necessary.

[P.S.] Get a copy of Dryden's *Hind and Panther*<sup>3</sup> and send it to me but do not delay.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 112

- 1 A periodical first produced this year by Richard Bentley. Charles Dickens was its editor until 1839, "Oliver Twist" being published in serial form in its first editions, complete with Cruikshank's famous illustrations.
- 2 See letter 2454.
- 3 John Dryden, *The Hind and the Panther. A Poem in Three Parts*, first published in 1687.

2456

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 18 September 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have sent to London the draft of my 'Memoirs on Ireland and the Irish'<sup>1</sup> to be printed and published. I have now to make out the notes and illustrations for the appendix. The book altogether

will be, say, 300 pages. I want, to complete the appendix, to have here Barrington's *History of the Union*,<sup>2</sup> and the speeches of Plunket in 1799 and 1800, and also Bushe's speeches and Saurin's. I have them all at my house in Dublin, and I beg of you without any delay to send them to me, whether you find them at my house or not. I have many books here, but I want especially those I mentioned. You sent me a very small allotment of covers.<sup>3</sup> Take this opportunity to send more, and of a smaller size. Those you sent me are only fit for Castle despatches.

I write by this post to Mr. Drummond to remind the Government of our friend J.D. Mullen. I do it in the strongest terms; indeed, somewhat reproachfully.

You sent me a vagabond Carlist work,<sup>4</sup> which I do not want. No matter. Send me, if you can, the continuation of the defence of the policy of England in Spain, also *Captain Rock*<sup>5</sup> by Tommy Moore.

I never had so much reason to wish to remain in this country as long as I can save 'the aching void left craving at my heart'.<sup>6</sup> I can never again know happiness and every day convinces me more and more of that fact. But my health is excellent and the tone of my mind beginning to be quite fit for business.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 113-4

- 1 This was probably an extended version of the pamphlet mentioned in letter 2431.
- 2 See letter 2043n3. Many editions of this work had been published before 1837.
- 3 Envelopes.
- 4 Referring to the party of Don Carlos in the current civil war in Spain.
- 5 *Memoirs of Captain Rock, the celebrated Irish Chieftain, with some account of his ancestors; written by himself (or rather by Thomas Moore and ed. by S.E.)*, Longman, 1824.
- 6 A reference to the death of his wife the previous year.

2457

To J. Arthur Roebuck,<sup>1</sup> *Raymund's Buildings, Gray's Inn,*  
*London*

Derryane, 23 September 1837

My dear Roebuck,

I am grieved to collect from your article on the Bath election in the last *Spectator*<sup>2</sup> that you have no such tangible grounds for a petition as would justify the expense of the experiment. So I collect from the manner of the article. It is clearly *yours*.

Rintoul<sup>3</sup> is a very clever fellow, the cleverest at the press but there is a terseness in that article which brings it home to you. I treat it therefore as yours and as yours I complain of the implication it raises that the Irish popular members concur with Mr. Barron of Waterford in a feeling of satisfaction at your defeat.<sup>4</sup> I assure you that our statements are dramatically the reverse. We regret and I, for one, deeply deplore that you are not in the House and most sincerely hope you will soon be in the throng again. There is about you a parliamentary talent of the utmost value, and the sincerity of your zeal as a thorough Radical cannot be doubted by those who like myself are at liberty to question the policy of some of your movements. But if the Queen be really and steadily with us, your overzeal would have its great advantages in giving a colour of moderation to the intrinsically strong measures which I *do* hope her Whig Radicals will produce.

But my reason and my apology for writing to you is this. I want to know whether you are able and willing to do two things. First, to bring back Rintoul from personal strife and some pique to the straightforward working of the Reform cause. Quote the 'dew drops from the lion's mane' or any other piece of eloquence which may induce him to give one short highminded paragraph to his quarrel with the *Examiner* etc.,<sup>5</sup> and with that close the personal strife, 'our future strife — who serves England best.' Will you bring that about?

Secondly, will you organise any *pressure from without*, any agitation in favour of radical measures, any reform association, any public meetings, any petitions *strong* and *numerously* signed? In short, anything to bring out in open day public opinion in favour of short parliaments, extended suffrage and the ballot. Indeed I am not to be told that the Ministry ought to bring these measures forward, that they ought to leave them open questions at the least. Why, suppose they ought and do not? What then? Why are we to do nothing simply because the Ministry do nothing? On the contrary my practical rule would arise from this conviction. The less the Ministers do, the more remains to be done by the reformers. Let each of us then bestir himself to do his share of the work. Ireland at least will support us. What will England do? Bigotry and Toryism inundate that country. But this is another reason for agitation. Agitation alone can keep us afloat.

I sat down intending to ask you one question. It is time I should come to it. Do you intend to practise before election committees? If so, my agent will hand you a retainer for the sitting members for Dublin.<sup>6</sup>



SOURCE: British Museum Add. MSS 41063, ff. 90-1

- 1 John Arthur Roebuck, (1802-1879), Radical politician and writer. MP for Bath 1832-37, 1841-47; for Sheffield 1849-68 and 1874-79. See *DNB*.
- 2 The *Spectator* of 16 September 1837.
- 3 Robert Stephen Rintoul (1787-1858) founder and proprietor of the *Spectator* 1828-58. See *DNB*.
- 4 The article in the *Spectator* defended Roebuck against an attack made on him by Henry Winston Barron, M.P. for Co. Waterford at a public dinner in honour of the members for Waterford county and city and the borough of Dungarvan, on 30 August. Barron declared Roebuck was 'the worst enemy to the government in the last session of parliament' and 'did act and vote and speak against the interests of the people' (*Pilot*, 4 Sept. 1837). In its article 'from a correspondent' the *Spectator* criticised Barron and praised Roebuck for his support of government policy in Ireland, his advocacy of law reform, the ballot and improved colonial administration.
- 5 In the article in the *Spectator* (see above note 4), it is stated that the *Examiner* in a recent paragraph claimed that 'the speeches of Mr. Roebuck at Bath, previous to the last election, removed every peg upon which the Whigs could hang their support of him'. The article denied that Roebuck had used any language which might justify the Whigs in withdrawing their support.
- 6 A petition against the return of O'Connell and Robert Hutton for Dublin city was presented in the Commons on 27 November 1837. Two further petitions were presented on 4 and 7 December (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIII, 126-30, 177-80) but were subsequently discharged. A committee to try the first petition was appointed on 13 March 1838, which found on 26 March in favour of the sitting members O'Connell and Hutton.

2458

*From Thomas Drummond*

Bray [Co. Wicklow] 23 September 1837

My dear Sir,

On my return to this place yesterday evening from a short excursion I found your letter <sup>1</sup>of the 18th inst.

There appears to me to be some extraordinary misapprehension with regard to the new Police Bill:<sup>2</sup> with respect to the divisional justices it causes no vacancy — it creates no new appointment: under certain circumstances it empowers the Lord Lieutenant to diminish the number of the magistrates: under none does it give him the power to increase them. With regard to Mr. Mullen I have no difficulty in stating that his Excellency entertains a very favourable opinion of his merits, his intelligence, his integrity and his active habits and that his Excellency had, and I believe still has,

in view an arrangement by which he hopes to render Mr. Mullen's qualifications available in the best manner for the public service. But his Excellency was and I apprehend still is inclined to the opinion that the office of a magistrate in Dublin is not the most suitable to a gentleman who has neither had the practical experience of the magistrate nor the professional education of the barrister.

Be that however as it may, his Excellency has not been called upon to decide upon Mr. Mullen's fitness for this office. The question has not arisen. Before any application was made either by Mr. Mullen himself, by you or by any of his friends for the *office of divisional justice*, the two first vacancies were promised: the one to Mr. Hugh O'Callaghan,<sup>3</sup> the other to Mr. Carew O'Dwyer.

The first gentleman was urgently and strongly recommended by Sir Patrick Bellew and his brother and by Mr. Sheil and with regard to the latter I need not tell you the grounds on which his claim to consideration rested. It was a departure from the Lord Lieutenant's usual practice, promising these appointments before they were actually vacant but it was expected that the first Police Bill would occasion at least two vacancies. That Bill, as you know, was thrown out and the second passed without the clause which would certainly and with great advantage to the public have produced several vacancies by enabling magistrates after 35 years service to retire on their present full salary amounting to £461 *per/ann.*<sup>4</sup>

... I have explained to you the real circumstances of the case as I have before explained them to Mr. Mullen. Now that you are in possession of them you will say whether you wish your letter to be forwarded to the Lord Lieutenant. ...

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2149

1 See letter 2456.

2 'An Act to make more effectual Provisions relating to the Police in the District of Dublin Metropolis' (1 Vict. c. 25) enacted on 3 July 1837.

3 Hugh O'Callaghan, J.P., D.L., Culloville, Crossmaglin, Co. Louth.

4 Drummond's statement is very puzzling. The first police bill, as printed by the Commons, did not contain such a provision.

2459

*To Thomas Drummond*

Derrynane, 25 September 1837

My dear Sir,

I rest perfectly satisfied with your judgement<sup>1</sup> and of course withhold from the Lord Lieutenant my unfounded complaint. But perhaps you will smile at the choice which has chanced upon Catholics for government favour.

The first is Lord Southwell. He has got the ribbon of St. Patrick. Yet he was the only Catholic of rank or fortune who did not join in the struggle for Emancipation. About the year 1812 he was looked on as the leader or rather the head of our Catholic Tories — the Vetoists — and was one of those who called by advertisement a meeting<sup>2</sup> in a private gentleman's house to offer the 'Veto' that is, the power to nominate bishops to the government, as a price of Emancipation. The popular party broke into the house and dispersed the Vetoists without violence. From that moment Lord Southwell deserted the cause. We brought over before 1829 every other Vetoist, every other nobleman, every other Catholic, in short. Lord Southwell alone stood out. He attended no meeting. He was not a member of the Catholic Association. *He alone.*

Yet he is selected to have a high honour conferred on him as a Catholic nobleman.

Understand me, I beg of you. I do not state this as any matter of complaint. I only mention it as matter of curiosity.

Mr. O'Callaghan is also to be appointed to an important office. He was very nearly similarly circumstanced but it was out of personal enmity to me. His brother,<sup>3</sup> who left him a large fortune, was offended with me for having felt it a duty to diminish his professional emoluments. But I not only admit, I readily state that a man better suited to an important public station cannot be found. He has intelligence, activity and first-rate integrity. You perceive, therefore, that I not only do not complain of his appointment, I rejoice at it heartily and I am tempted to mention these two cases as affording a fine contrast with the foolish or partisan exaggerations or rather falsehoods respecting my influence put forward by knaves and blockheads from the *Times* to Sharman Crawford.<sup>4</sup>

I thank you heartily for the information you give me of my friend J.D. Mullen.

Will you be so good as to let me know all that is *tellable* about the forthcoming revision or restriction of the commission of the peace.<sup>5</sup> There are some very improper persons in the Commission in this county but as they are Protestants — that most uncandid thing in the world — the affectation of over candour will I fear prevent Lord Kenmare from striking them out or concurring in that measure. Besides we are literally *inundated* in this quarter with parsons as *justices*. I wish much to know what precautions you think will be taken to purify these nuisances. You are aware that much complaint is made of Lord Plunket. I wish to heaven you were assisted by the energy and honesty of Baron Richards<sup>6</sup> as Lord Chancellor, but that would be *too good*.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 See letter 2458.
- 2 This meeting may have taken place in March, 1814 (see 'Reminiscences of a Silent Agitator' in *The Irish Monthly*, 1, (Aug. 1832, 229-30) or in February 1817 (see *Freeman's Journal* of 7 February 1817). On both occasions O'Connell insisted on gaining admission.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 In a recent letter to O'Connell Sharman Crawford had declared his belief that government patronage was being disposed of 'in all cases so as to meet your unqualified approbation' (Crawford to O'Connell, 22 Aug. 1837, *Pilot*, 28 Aug. 1837).
- 5 A revision of the entire Irish magistracy, apparently for the purpose of eliminating or reducing the number of Orange partisans in that body was forecast about this time (*FJ*, 27 Nov. 1837, quoting the *Examiner*).
- 6 John Richards, now a baron of the exchequer.

2460

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 25 September 1837

My dear FitzPatrick,

In this and another cover you will find Mr. Drummond's letter<sup>1</sup> to me on the subject of my friend Mullen. Take care of it for me, just letting him know how 'the land lies'. Of course you will take care that no person beyond those interested should know anything about the matter. I am glad that there is a determination to do something for him, sincerely glad.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 114

- 1 Letter 2458.

2461

*To Lord Morpeth*

Derrynane, 1 October 1837

My Lord,

I beg leave to thank you very respectfully for your kind attention to my friend Mr. Costello. He certainly is one of those who deserve the care and protection of a government identified with the feelings as well as the interests of the Irish people. As he has however been disappointed with respect to the office of filazer it is a great consolation to have it bestowed on such a man as Mr. Power<sup>1</sup> who is in every respect suited to the office and whose integrity and conduct entitle him to the favourable consideration of his Excellency. Indeed, I must say that no man could possibly be more deserving of promotion than Mr. Power. . . .

I understand also that there was another candidate highly recommended and he could not be too highly recommended — Mr. Woodlock. Will you allow me also to beg that he, Mr. Woodlock, may remain in your Lordship's recollection. He has rendered eminent services in *both*<sup>2</sup> the elections for Dublin. There is a generous disinterestedness about him which is the sure characteristic of a mind fit to be entrusted with public duties because it demonstrates that species of honourable disposition which ensures the faithful performance of a public trust.

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

1 Edmond Power appointed filazer at the law side of the exchequer.

2 Presumably that of 1835 and certainly that of 1837.

2462

*To William Woodlock, Attorney-at-Law, Dublin*

Derrynane, 1 October 1837

My dear Woodlock,

I got your letter with its enclosures and I should be indeed ungrateful if I could for one moment hesitate to pledge myself that, whenever there is a vacancy in the office of Clerk of the Rules or sooner if it be deemed right, I will use whatever influence I possess for you and you alone. No person *can* be before you on that occasion as you have now my promise and solemn pledge in priority to anybody else. It is however not mere gratitude which makes me give this pledge but it arises principally from my con-

viction that there could not possibly be found any man whose integrity, intelligence and honourable feelings better suit him for the due and conscientious performance of public duties than yourself. . . . I however regret to be bound to add that nothing can be more exaggerated than the notion of my influence. In truth I have, I believe, less *effective* influence than any other Irish supporter of the Government but, *be the same more or less*, you shall heartily command it.

I send you back your letter to the Master of the Rolls<sup>1</sup> who did not honour me with a visit.

SOURCE: William Woodlock Papers, NLI MS 7325

1 Michael O'Loughlen.

## 2462a

*To Peter Purcell*<sup>1</sup>

Derrynane, 19 October 1837

My dear Purcell,

I entirely agree with you that there ought if possible be a public dinner<sup>2</sup> to Lord Mulgrave prior to the opening of Parliament. I intend to be in Dublin by the 30th and will heartily concur with you in carrying out any plan of that description. Indeed I do think I should be very apt to concur in any plan of yours.

SOURCE: Papers of Prof. Andrew B. Myers

1 Peter Purcell, (? - 1846), Halverstown House, Co. Kildare, son of John Purcell, M.D. of Dublin and Eleanor FitzGerald of Williamstown. Started the *Monitor*, a Dublin liberal journal in 1838. Peter Purcell was brother to John Purcell Fitzgerald of the Island, Waterford.

2 No record of this dinner appears in the newspapers.

## 2463

*To Thomas Drummond, 1 November 1837, from Merrion Square*

Seeks accommodation in the House of Industry for the Catholic chaplain, Rev. Mr. Delany,<sup>1</sup> so that the inmates may have at all hours 'that spiritual assistance which the humanity of the government has intended for them when it provided a salary for their chaplain'.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 Rev. D.B. Delany, Catholic chaplain House of Industry, North Brunswick Street, Dublin from 1837-41.
- 2 A note by Drummond on the letter reads: 'Now done. Mr. Delany has been admitted, March 14, 1838.'

## 2464

*From William Ewing, Queensferry, Scotland, 3 November 1837*

Expresses indignation that O'Connell has not acknowledged either of his letters, one of which included a copy of 'my letter to our mutual friend, Mr. Hume', and a paper on the politics of Sir Walter Scott.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

## 2465

*From Henry Coppock<sup>1</sup> to Dublin*

Stockport [Cheshire], 4 November 1837

Sir,

Our arrangements for the dinner<sup>2</sup> on the 13th are progressing very favourably. We shall have 2,000 persons at the dinner, and the demonstration of good Radical feeling will be the greatest ever known in this neighbourhood. . . . [it is intended to meet O'Connell 'a sufficient distance from the entrance of Stockport to escort you into the borough.']

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Henry Coppock (born c. 1800), younger son of William Coppock, Stockport, Cheshire. Town clerk of Stockport.
- 2 This dinner, held in Stockport on 13 November in honour of Henry Marsland and Richard Cobden, was attended by O'Connell and his son Maurice. They were escorted into Stockport by the mayor, William Barlow Worthington, and a crowd of many thousands, O'Connell being presented with a complimentary address by the Catholics of the town. In his speech to the welcoming crowd, and at the dinner attended by over 2,000 persons, O'Connell spoke in favour of abolishing the corn laws, and in support of the ballot, tithe abolition and municipal reform. He also attacked the 'apostacy of Sir Francis Burdett' (*FJ*, 17 Nov. 1837).

2466

*To Archdeacon Bathurst*

London [late 1837]

Sir,

I had the honour to receive a letter from you this morning, and I feel much obliged by your reference to the *Life*<sup>1</sup> of your venerated father, which I will certainly procure and peruse with deep interest. He was indeed a superior being, an ornament to his own Church, and an honour to our common Christianity. I earnestly hope he is now enjoying in inexpressible beatitude the reward of his pure virtues.

I did imagine that you were disposed to deal with me harshly<sup>2</sup> but there was not one element in my composition to allow me to retaliate. I am very glad to find that I was mistaken in my first opinion and that you are kind enough to think more favourably of me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 81

- 1 Rev. Henry Bathurst, *Memoirs of the Late Dr. Henry Bathurst, Lord Bishop of Norwich* (London, 1837).
- 2 According to W.J. FitzPatrick, Bathurst thought O'Connell lacking in gratitude towards his father, the late bishop of Norwich 'the only spiritual peer who had consistently supported the Catholic *claims*' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 81).

2467

This letter is now numbered 2474a.

2468

*From Alexander Seton*

[4] L[ower] Rutland Street, 8 November 1837

My dear O'Connell,

You are already aware of the debt due me by the Liberals of Dublin for professional attendance at 9 successive registry sessions, of which I gave you a detailed account early in this year, and of the treatment I met when, in March last you endeavoured to have justice done me in respect thereof. I know not however, whether you are also aware that, labouring under extreme pecuniary



embarrassment, I subsequently sent a statement on the same subject to your friend Pigot with the intention of seeking relief, as an act of justice, by an appeal to the liberal public when, on his suggesting that such step, taken at that time, would look like a threat and might prejudice the liberal cause at the then expected general election, such intention was immediately abandoned altho' the means of subsistence were only to be procured by the actual sacrifice of part of my furniture. It is perhaps not altogether unconnected with the subject to observe that, when a fund was found to carry on the subsequent registries, I was unceremoniously thrown overboard. This however is merely a personal matter. That which is of more importance than the ill-usage of an individual — the establishment was made exclusively religious, i.e., every liberal Protestant, previously connected therewith, was studiously excluded. Whether such fact met the eye of the vigilant Conservative, or the cunning but more insidious observation of the scrutinising *ci-devant* or *soi-disant* Liberal, I know not, but if it did, some votes at the last election, when Repeal slept, may perhaps be accounted for. . . .

[Seton asks O'Connell] to urge my case upon government or in your own energetic expression, to *insist* on some employment for me.

The spontaneous offer of your interest whenever opportunity should occur, made just after the election of [18]35 and subsequently repeated and confirmed in person and by letter, encouraged me to press this subject upon your attention, and my particular and critical situation leaves me no resource but in your friendship.

It may be a makeweight that this, your first interference, is on behalf of a Protestant who was liberal to his own serious disadvantage ere liberality became fashionable and who, when our most excellent Viceroy was, on account of his anticipated impartial and parental principles of government, insulted by the Corporation of Dublin,<sup>1</sup> led the way to those addresses<sup>2</sup> which bore universal testimony of that respect and veneration so pre-eminently his right. These circumstances, of whatever value they in themselves may be toward obtaining the attention of government, must acquire an infinitely increased importance when that attention is solicited by O'Connell.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 At the meeting of Dublin Corporation on 21 May 1835, some ten days after Mulgrave's arrival in Ireland as lord lieutenant, the usual address to a new viceroy was proposed, but no seconder could be found (*DEP*, 23 May 1835).

- 2 Seton was chairman of a meeting of St. Thomas parish, Dublin, which passed a series of resolutions complimentary to Mulgrave, and headed the deputation which presented them to the lord lieutenant on 6 June 1835 (*DEP*, 9 June 1835). St. Thomas parish was amongst the first in Dublin to address the new lord lieutenant.

2469

This letter is now number 2363b.

2470

*From Rev. John Sheehan*

[Dublin] 9 November 1837

My dear friend,

I know you will be waited upon today by some gentlemen from the country to talk to you on the matters upon which I was speaking to you last night, and I am anxious to apprise you of the points which they wish to have adjusted that you may give them such answers as will satisfy them.

1st. They object to the commission on small local bills.

2nd. They say that the Bank of Ireland as well as the Provincial has a decided advantage over them, whereas these banks charge only 5% on good local paper, whilst the National will not discount such bills for less than 6%.

3rd. Several of them object to Reynolds as an inspector. He has contrived to get into disfavour with many. It is not for me to say how far he has merited their dislike. I know that he has a very large family and God forbid that I should lend myself for one moment to any measure that could injure him or anyone placed in similar circumstances. But I cannot forbear mentioning to you that Alcock<sup>1</sup> has taken a most extraordinary dislike to him, and that dislike arises from an impression that he made an unjust report to the London Board and that it was in consequence of such report the offensive letter was written to him by Roskell.

4th. It has been very currently reported in the bank circles that a resolution was adopted with your concurrence by the London Board to purchase all the local Irish shares<sup>2</sup> and to make the Bank an exclusively English concern thus placing an establishment, which the people got up themselves, in the hands of a body of men who can have no feeling about Ireland except one of a most selfish kind, viz. of making money by her.

5th. There is an outcry against the constant change of men and measures. Those changes have given a character of unsteadiness to the concern, and have made the persons connected with it very dissatisfied. You have it in your power to settle all those points amicably with those gentlemen who will wait upon you. The very fact of their coming up to see you at this inclement season is a proof of their confidence in you. I am particularly anxious about Alcock and for that reason I shall endeavour to remove from his mind the feeling about Reynolds, should he be continued in the inspectorship. But I want you to do me this one favour, viz. to write one line or two to Alcock, saying that you will not allow him to be treated with injustice. I ask you this favour because I am more deeply indebted to Alcock on public grounds than to any other man in Waterford.

[P.S.] If you comply with my request about Alcock, you may as well write tonight and let him have your communication before I see him on my return. I owe it to Murray to say that he has had no share whatever in this deputation. In fact when I saw him in Waterford, he was so busy about his insurance affair<sup>3</sup> that he scarcely spoke of anything else.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Henry Alcock (1792-1840), Wilton, Co. Wexford, J.P. for Cos. Kilkenny and Waterford. Fourth son of Henry Alcock, M.P. (died 1811); alderman and magistrate of Waterford city, manager of the National Bank of Ireland, Waterford.
- 2 The National Bank was founded on a system which provided that the business of each branch or group of branches would be conducted by a subsidiary company to which the parent company would subscribe half the capital and the other half would be subscribed by local shareholders. This system proved cumbersome. In 1837 the capitals of the parent company and five of the subsidiary companies were amalgamated. The Carrick-on-Suir company and the Clonmel company continued as subsidiary companies for several years but in 1856 they also were amalgamated and, henceforth, the bank conducted business in the name of the parent company at all branches (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 155-6).
- 3 Unidentified.

2470a

*To Joseph Rayner Stephens*<sup>1</sup>

Merrion Square, 10 November 1837

Sir,

I am exceedingly amused by your mock modesty and affected meekness. You are a pretty fellow! I let you know that I did not care one straw what your opinion of my vote on Thompson's bill was especially as you did not state one single objection in fact or in argument to the account which I rendered my own constituents of that vote.<sup>2</sup> You now write me a second and a long letter and you do not specify any one such objection — simply because you could not — although indeed the report of that speech<sup>3</sup> was not as accurate as I could wish.

But do you really imagine that I am so absurd as to give this matter the importance of a public meeting. Bah!

I am ready to discuss that vote with any one or any twenty who address me civilly and require explanation on the subject. I am ready to discuss it thus even with you whose civility appears to be little better than muffled insult. Indeed since I got your letter I am informed that you are the person who advised the children to destroy their employers' property by inserting or using for that purpose knitting needles. I do not exactly know the process you are said to have suggested to young and innocent minds but I know it was calculated to destroy the property of other people. If you be not that person you are entitled to the fullest acquittal of the charge. If you be, then indeed I would not willingly be in the same room with you.

Still I am ready to discuss my Factory Vote with you. *But it must be in writing.* I will by that means hold you fast to the point or points in dispute. Every exaggeration and every untrue statement will thus at once be detected and exposed and the real question placed in its true light. That question is whether I did wrong in voting for the committal of Poulett Thomson's bill. If it were wrong the extent of that wrong is open to you. Your letters on that subject shall be answered within three days of the receipt of each, and I feel that I shall have no difficulty to overthrow the clumsy calumny circulated against me. We are both at liberty to publish the correspondence — that is, each is to be at liberty to publish the correspondence, and for my part I am determined to publish it and now, Sir, I defy you to discuss the matter in the deliberate form I propose. I taunt you with your utter inability to make a shadow of a case against me in the deliberate form of

written statement. I know well you will shrink from my challenge. You wish to pack an auditory of your friends or of my political enemies. I desire to appeal to the tribunal of the reading public — and if you do shrink from that tribunal I will to them brand you as a wilful calumniator and then forget the silly controversy for ever.

SOURCE: Library of the University of Texas at Austin

- 1 Joseph Rayner Stephens (1805-79), social reformer, chartist and sometime Methodist minister. See *DNB*.
- 2 On the second reading, on 9 May 1836, of the Factories Regulation Amendment bill which was designed to remove children aged 12 from the protection as to shorter working hours of the Factories Regulation Act (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 103) of 1833. The bill was sponsored by Charles Edward Poulett Thomson on behalf of the government. It passed the second reading by a majority of only two — 178 to 176. In consequence Thomson informed the Commons on 10 June that the government was withdrawing it (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1836, II, 1816).
- 3 The exact speech has not been identified. At a meeting of the General Association in Dublin on 31 October 1837 O'Connell said in relation to his vote 'I wish once for ever to set that business at rest'; and explained that he had intended opposing the bill but had been converted by what was said in the debate to supporting it (*MR*, 1 Nov.; the *Times*, 3 Nov. 1837).

2471

*From James Roche*

National Bank of Ireland, Cork, 18 November 1837

My dear Sir,

. . . I beg leave to refer you to the enclosed outline of a project for establishing a university in Cork. Its want has been long felt for the south of Ireland but no efficient step for its formation was taken until very lately when, at a meeting<sup>1</sup> held for that purpose, I was honoured with the chair and named president of the committee appointed to carry the design into execution. Our County and City members attended the meeting and promised their zealous co-operation; but your influence is what we reckon most upon; and that it will be actively exerted for an object of such high national importance, we cannot doubt. We are ignorant and rather fearful of the views of government which our representatives are instructed to ascertain; for without some legislative assistance we could not proceed in our enterprise. . . . Mr. William Crawford<sup>2</sup> joins his earnest hopes with mine that the undertaking will receive your countenance. . . .

[P.S.] On reflection, knowing the multiplied demands on your franking privilege, I send this through my brother.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 A meeting was held in Cork on 31 October in support of a project for founding a university in the south of Ireland. William Fagan (O'Connell's future biographer) acted as secretary at the meeting. The proposed establishment was to be lay and non-sectarian. (*FJ*, 7 Nov. 1837, quoting *Southern Reporter*).
- 2 William Crawford (died 1840), Lakesland, Co. Cork. Eldest son of William Crawford of Lakelands.
- 3 William Roche, M.P.

2472

To P. V. FitzPatrick

House of Commons, 20 November 1837

Go to the Castle and pay at Mr. Bessonett's<sup>1</sup> office about £ — for renewing my patent of precedence. Also pay at the club in Stephen's Green<sup>2</sup> the entrance and subscription of my sons and my own. *Private*. You will be glad to hear that the Queen is firm with us. She is determined to support this Ministry and I have it from undoubted authority that, if Lord Melbourne resigned tomorrow, she would not send for any Tory. She *certainly* said this.<sup>3</sup> You must take care that this does not get into any newspaper whatsoever, as it might be traced. Lord Melbourne, of course, has no notion of resigning but the Queen said what I told you to show her dislike to the Tories. Again I recommend caution as to letting out this fact. The Liberal members meet tomorrow at the Reform Club to decide upon the course to be taken as to the Spottiswoode gang.<sup>4</sup> English and Scotch Liberals meet as well as Irish. I hope a decisive line will be taken. I am convinced that a prosecution ought to be instituted; of this more hereafter.

The speech, you see, says everything and nothing.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 125

- 1 Francis Bessonett, 21 Leeson Street, Dublin, senior clerk, chief secretary's office.
- 2 The Union club, 10 St. Stephen's Green N., Dublin, founded in February 1837. It changed its name to the Stephen's Green club about 1840.
- 3 'In political matters generally, the Queen became altogether Whig. They regarded her as their champion and she followed their fortunes as a partisan' (C. K. Webster, 'The Accession of Queen Victoria', in *History*, XXII, 14 (1937-8), 30).

- 4 The 'Spottiswoode Conspiracy' (named after Andrew Spottiswoode, the queen's printer) originated at a meeting in London on 30 August, 1837. A number of resolutions were passed stating that the election of certain Liberal members in Ireland had been secured by intimidation and corruption; expressing fears that the views of the Protestant electors of Britain would be overruled and set aside by the votes of ten or twelve Irish representatives; and calling for nationwide subscriptions from all classes to finance petitions against these returns (*FJ*, 5 Sept. 1837). A motion by William Smith O'Brien in the Commons to have the whole proceeding declared a breach of privilege and a select committee appointed to inquire into it was lost by 331 to 121 (*Hansard*, New Ser., XXXIX, 747-844). The 'conspiracy' proved a failure (see letter 2531).

2473

*From Ralph Pickering, 315 Oxford Street, London,  
21 November 1837*

Promises to give a money subscription to the Dublin election fund<sup>1</sup> if O'Connell will support his application for a government post. He says he had been recommended to Lord Howick<sup>2</sup> for the post of landing waiter in the customs but understood that he would need the support of an influential member of parliament.

SOURCE: Earl Grey Papers

- 1 A subscription was set afoot at a meeting in Dublin on 16 September under the chairmanship of John O'Neill, for the purpose of defeating the petition against the return of O'Connell and Hutton for Dublin (*Pilot*, 18 Sept. 1837. See also letter 2457 n6).
- 2 Henry George (Grey) (1802-1894), styled Viscount Howick until 17 July 1845 when he succeeded as third Earl Grey. M.P. almost continually 1826-41; secretary at war 1835-39; secretary for colonies 1846-52. See *DNB*.

2474

*To Lord Howick<sup>1</sup>*

16 Pall Mall [London], 22 November 1837

Mr. O'Connell presents his compliments to Lord Howick and begs leave to say that this intrusion is occasioned by his conviction that he owes it to Lord Howick to put him on his guard against being deceived by misrepresentation to form a favourable opinion of a person capable of writing such an atrocious letter as that

enclosed.<sup>2</sup> Of course, Mr. O'Connell wishes that Lord Howick should make any use he pleases of the enclosed letter.

SOURCE: Earl Grey Papers

- 1 This letter bears the note: 'Ansd. November 27.'
- 2 Letter 2473.

2474a

To A. V. Kirwan

16 Pall Mall [London], 8 December 1837<sup>1</sup>

Sir,

I have no small reason to complain<sup>2</sup> of your conduct towards a man who never did you a wrong; on the contrary, my feelings were most kindly towards you and for that you have rewarded me with one of the most detailed libels that ever was penned against anybody. If I had imagined you would have neglected the ordinary sources of information which were obvious — Burke's *Commoners*, the *Monthly Magazine* by young Curran,<sup>3</sup> the obituary of my uncle, Daniel Count O'Connell, in the [Dublin] *Evening Post*, the obituary of Maurice Baron O'Connell in the same paper — I should have protested against your writing at all. Even Tait's *Ireland and O'Connell*,<sup>4</sup> advertised on the cover of his magazine for years, was neglected; but more than enough of your neglect; your positive inventions are most prominent.

First, my family forfeited upwards of £20,000 a year so late as the revolution of 1688. I have two estates, worth together £1,000 per annum, the ancient inheritance of my family. I care not for that family, for myself, but for my children.

Second, at St. Omer I was first in the first class and got premiums in everything; so far from being idle there, I shook my constitution by intense application.

Third, no man ever got into business at the Bar more rapidly than I did. I know but one who succeeded so rapidly and that was McMahan, the Master of the Rolls.

These were facts within your reach if you did not prefer inventing to reading, especially reading my reply on the Repeal debate.<sup>5</sup> If you read that, you would be ashamed of your description of it. I will not proceed further, save by a general description, 'less of truth, and more of untruth, was never stuffed into so narrow a compass.' I return you the copy you sent me. I have marked some thirty passages directly contrary to truth. I could



mark as many more. It is no answer to say that you have also attributed to me virtues I possess not and talent to which I have no pretension.

And now I call upon you as an honest man to make me compensation. You cannot be honest if you refuse to do me justice. Withdraw the article if you do not correct it. I have a right, in point of common honesty, to require it. Recollect you have inflicted a most grievous injury upon me who never did, never would do, you the *slightest* disservice; one who, on the contrary, was ready and anxious to serve you if he could. If you refuse to do me justice, I must appeal to the Editors of the works and if they do not redress me, I believe the French law will. It is not reasonable to suppose that I should submit to such a tissue of the most gross *misrepresentations*. Hoping you will comply with my very reasonable request of suppressing or correcting this at present foul libel.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick *Corr.*, II, 117-9

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick erroneously dates this letter as 8 November 1837. Letter 2475 (10 December) is the reply to it.
- 2 Kirwan had written a biographical note on O'Connell for a French biographical publication.
- 3 The article on O'Connell by William Henry Curran in the series 'Sketches of the Irish Bar' in the *New Monthly Magazine and Literary Journal*, VIII, (1823), 1-10. This article has often been erroneously ascribed to R.L. Sheil (see 'Sheil' in the *DNB*).
- 4 William Tait, *Ireland and O'Connell*. . . (Edinburgh, 1835).
- 5 On 29 April 1834 (see letter 2062 n1).

2475

*From A.V. Kirwan*

73 Gloucester Place [London], 10 December 1837

Sir,

I received half an hour ago, on my return home to dinner, your letter of the 8th inst. . . . Five days ago I sent you with a polite note a 'biography' which even your most fulsome adulators call 'flattering,' and I receive in acknowledgement a letter which under excited feelings I do not care to characterize as it deserves. I undertook, Sir, at the solicitation of others to write your biography with a firm determination as far as in me lay, to be at once impartial, authentic and just. . . . I, in August last, addressed you a letter requesting of you to favour me with authentic details of your birth and education and at the same time pressing for an immediate reply, as I was limited to a precise day. That letter,

which *I know* you received (for in conversation with me you admitted it), was politely couched, perhaps even flatteringly, remains to this hour without the slightest reply. Of the want of courtesy to myself I do not complain, neither do I complain of the tone and temper of your letter of yesterday. But I repeat to you now what I said at Charing Cross, and what I politely wrote to you on Wednesday last, viz. that if there be an error in your genealogy, YOU, not I, am to blame. . . . Favour me with half a dozen lines on the subject of your descent in your own handwriting, and they shall be inserted, as coming from *you* directly, in the next number of the *Dictionnaire*. . . .

The article<sup>1</sup> in the *Monthly*, published in 1825, I have read. If I remember rightly, there is an offensive allusion in that article which I abstained from, and to the best of my recollection also mention of that very harmless subject of college *laches*. The article in Tait's *Ireland and O'Connell* I have also read but without admitting that these publications are authentic, I will merely oppose to any anonymous statements in them a very recent speech of your own, in which you boasted 'that you had *no* pride of ancestry, that you were merely the son of a grazier, or gentleman farmer.' The people of France, as well as of England, would laugh most assuredly at this discussion, but I must revert to it in answer to your appeal, to prove to you *that your own statement conflicts with your own authorities*. . . . How, then, was I to reconcile these conflicting statements, *save by an appeal to yourself?* That application you will not deny I made. That application you admitted you never answered, and when I saw you, now more than three weeks ago, I lamented the fact (waiving all discourtesy) because my manuscript was already in the printer's hands. Unsuccessful not from the want of asking you, yet notwithstanding your own culpable *laches* and discourtesy against me, I repeat, I will, despite *laches*, discourtesy, abuse, adopt *unreservedly* any short account of your pedigree written and signed by you, and transmit it to Paris without delay. . . . Neither have I read the obituary of Count and Baron O'Connell in the *Dublin Evening Post*. . . . Truly, Sir, the error about St. Omer is not of great importance. *I* did not, however, *invent it*. I met last season at dinner a most distinguished schoolfellow of yours, who stated (speaking at the same time in the kindest and handsomest terms of you) that you were a gay and thoughtless youth of more abilities than application. . . . I do hope, however, that reflection and a perusal of this my reply may induce you to regret, not alone the tone of your letter but the employment of a menace — I mean a recourse to French law — a threat which a gentleman ought not to utter, much less to pen

deliberately, to one who was quite unconscious of having done him wrong. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 119-22

1 See 2474a n3. 1825 is a misprint for 1823.

## 2476

*To A.V. Kirwan*

16 Pall Mall [London], 11 December 1837

Sir,

I send you back your most unsatisfactory letter, as no further correspondence can take place between us now.

I have too many libellers to be annoyed by one who, as you for once justly observe, mixes 'fulsome flattery' with what *I* call flagrant untruth. I care *nothing* for *pedigree*, but the total reverse of the fact ought not to be stated. The justice I claim is to have the article cancelled and remodelled according to truth, leaving out both the *fulsome flattery* and the *flagrant falsehood*. If you are unable or unwilling to do this, I banish from my recollection you and your libels, only giving one moment of melancholy recollection of the quarter which has aimed this *brutum fulmen* at your very obedient servant,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 123

## 2477

*From A.V. Kirwan*

[c. 12 December 1837]

*Extract*

It is indeed a most flagrant falsehood to say that I ever wrote a libel on you, and no one knows it better than you do *yourself*. *My name* is signed to the article, I *avow* the authorship and, though you were called to the Bar long before I was born, I am ready to meet you, aye, to *defeat you*, on this question in the Queen's Bench at Westminster or the *Palais de Justice* of Paris. . . . I now take leave of you, calmly reminding you that I am your

candid and just 'Biographer' but not your 'fulsome flatterer' and *certainly* not your *abject slave*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 123

2478

*From Joshua Scholefield*<sup>1</sup>

Birmingham, 16 December 1837

My dear Sir,

... We sat ... on Thursday evening ... and ... a resolution was passed declaring that Lord John Russell's declaration<sup>2</sup> against the ballot, extension of the suffrage and triennial parliaments had caused the meeting to withdraw its confidence from the Melbourne Administration. Nor will you be surprised to hear of such a resolution being *unanimously* approved. . . .

You must however be guarded when you meet us again and say *rather less* in praise of the present Administration than you did on Thursday.<sup>3</sup> . . . The men of Birmingham claim you as one of their own kindred and are jealous even that any preference should be given *by you* to Ireland over England! Of all things we cannot afford any division amongst Reformers. Our object is one and indivisible. . . .

[P.S.] I find that you and I were born in the same year, 1775, and hope we are both *young* enough to give despots some trouble in the world before we quit the stage of life ourselves.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Joshua Scholefield (1775-1844), M.P. for Birmingham 1832-44; banker, merchant and manufacturer. See *DNB*.
- 2 Commenting on 20 November on the royal speech at the commencement of the session of 1837-38, which declared against any further changes in the electoral law, Russell declared that such things as the ballot, suffrage extension, and triennial parliaments 'taken together' constituted 'nothing else, but a repeal of the Reform Act,' and, he declared he could not support them for this reason (*Hansard*, N.S., XXXIX, 69).
- 3 On Thursday, 14 December, O'Connell unexpectedly visited Birmingham *en route* to Ireland. He addressed a crowd who assembled in the town hall when they heard that he had arrived in Birmingham. He spoke in support of universal suffrage, the ballot and shorter parliaments. To secure these he recommended the establishment of a General Reform Association in Birmingham, and a National Reform Association in London, supported by a 'Reform Rent'. He pointed out the benefits accruing to Ireland from the Whig administration, and pleaded with the

meeting, for Ireland's sake, not to withdraw their support from the government. Scholefield was chairman of this meeting (*Pilot*, 18 Dec., 1837; see also letter 2486). The resolution referred to by Scholefield was passed at what was probably a meeting of the Birmingham Political Union.

2479

*From Earl Spencer*

Althorp [Northampton], 17 December 1837

My dear Sir,

My father was a trustee under the will of the late Lord Macartney<sup>1</sup> but I have declined to act in this trust. I find, however, that in order to relieve myself from it I must sign an answer to some proceeding in the Irish court of chancery. The enclosed letters will explain to you the reason for this and, as I have to name some gentleman at the Irish bar before whom the papers may be laid and who may advise me whether it is right that I should sign the answer as requested, I have asked Messrs. Armstrong to lay them before you.

The matter is probably a very trifling one to give you any trouble about but I am better acquainted with you than with any other gentleman at the Irish Bar and I need not say that I know your opinion is one of the best I could have.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 George (Macartney), first Earl Macartney (1737-1806). See *DNB*.

2480

*From his brother James*

Lakeview [Killarney], 18 December 1837

My Dear Dan,

John Primrose was here for the last two days. I gave him my opinion as to the real value of your property in the baronies of Iveragh and Dunkerron. He has added to your present rent roll the additional rent which both Primrose and I conceive your tenants can pay: the increase *on the entire* property amounts to five hundred pounds a year. . . . [details about the property].

As I presume you are now about making a settlement on your son Maurice, I trust you will take care and have *a clause*

*introduced* to prevent him from anticipating a gale's rent or raising money by the sale of [annuities]. . . . You ought, in my humble judgement, keep out of settlement *the lands of Maglass*, [and other lands]. I know you intend McSwiney's property and O'Mullane's for your son Morgan. You could then give Maglass to one of your other sons, say John, and those farms of Alihee, etc. to poor little Dan. . . . Maurice is the one of your children I am most attached to but a long experience of the cold heartedness of the world makes me fear these young men may, in the event of your being suddenly taken out of their life, be left without the means of existence. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

2481

*To R. B. Foster*<sup>1</sup>

Merrion Square, 19 December 1837

Sir,

I am sincerely sorry to learn the death of your father. Had I known or recollected it, I should not have mentioned his name. But the fact I stated<sup>2</sup> was one which I had stated in his presence at the Catholic Association, the details of which he himself admitted.

He was no friend of mine. In 1828 and in 1829 he gave me all the opposition he could in Clare.

I deeply regret having hurt the feelings of any of his family and would make them any *atonement in my power*, but it is not in my power to retract a statement which is strictly true in its essential particulars. But this you may be certain of, that I never again will mention the fact. I heartily wish I had not done so at Norwich. I repeat that I most readily comply with your wish not to speak on the subject again.

Deeply regretting that I did hurt your natural and amiable susceptibility.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Robert Blake Foster, Knockmoy Abbey, Dangan, Co. Galway.
- 2 The statement to which O'Connell refers was made by him at a dinner given in his honour by the Radicals of Norwich on 28 November 1837. Speaking of the corruption which he believed the ballot could prevent, he declared 'When the forty-shilling franchise existed, he knew a gentleman in Ireland, at least so he called himself, who first sold his forty-shilling

men to Mr. James Daly, the next day he sold them to Mr. Martin, and the third day he turned them loose to sell themselves. This gentleman's name was Blake Foster, and his excuse was, that now he was bribed on both sides, he felt bound in honour to vote for neither, and being thus disengaged, why should he not let the poor men make the most of themselves' (*Pilot*, 4 Dec. 1837).

2482

*From Rev. John Sheehan to Dublin*

Waterford, 19 December 1837

My Dear Friend,

We are all extremely anxious in this quarter about our next county sheriff. The three names returned by the going judges of assize to the Lord Lieutenant are John Musgrave, Shapland Carew Morris<sup>1</sup> and John Fitzgerald,<sup>2</sup> the brother of Peter Purcell. Now John Musgrave is no more. John Fitzgerald is in a bad state of health on the continent and there remains of the judges's selection but Shapland C. Morris. A more unrelenting bigot does not exist, and to his bigotry he adds a blind fanaticism in matters of religion and education that would qualify him to take the first place amongst the followers of Devonsher Jackson. State this to the Under-Secretary<sup>3</sup> and save the people of this county from such an infliction.<sup>4</sup> He is at present in England and there he is determined to remain another year unless the Lord Lieutenant call him back to place the Shrievalty of the County Waterford in his hands. Why he was ever named at all, the people here [are] at a loss to ascertain for he has not more (if he have that same) than £300 per annum in this County or in any other. His consequence is principally derived from his connection with Morris Reade whose junior brother he is.

It is said that Sir Richard Keane for purposes of his own, connected with the oft attempted experiment of removing the assizes to Dungarvan, is endeavouring to have his son<sup>5</sup> nominated. From the party professing to act upon liberal principles a worse or more unpopular selection could not be made. I am convinced that in heart a greater enemy to popular rights, a greater Orangeman than Sir Richard does not exist. His machinations about removing the gaol and court house have all in view to benefit his own property and that of his cousin, J. Keily<sup>6</sup> of Strancally. Besides, the site they would build upon is part of the Marquis of Waterford's property. The town would immediately increase in that quarter and the influence of the Liberal party in the Borough would be

thereby completely jeopardised. This is the opinion of Dr. Foran who knows Dungarvan well and who deprecates the foolish idea of making such a place as Dungarvan the assize town of this great county. I think young Pat Power,<sup>7</sup> second son to the late member, James Power of Ballydine, Alex. Sherlock (he has £2,500 a year in the county) or the son of Rowland Alston,<sup>8</sup> member for Hertfordshire, could be looked to and a proper selection made, no matter which of them is chosen.

I hope you don't forget the affair of Sir Benj. Morris,<sup>9</sup> I am sure after the fight you have made for the Ministers against the Radicals,<sup>10</sup> you should be able to effect this very easily. I agree in all your positions<sup>11</sup> about the new Poor Law Bill. I think it should be denominated a bill to increase pauperism as if we had not enough of that commodity already. I hope I perceive in your reasoning a leaning to the necessity of a clause of settlement.<sup>12</sup> I never could abide a poor law but as a substitute term for a resident proprietary, and how will you invest it with that quality unless you quarter the evicted tenantry of the leviathan absentee upon his rent roll?

I regret that I did not seek to be presented to Lord Mulgrave when he came down here to dine with the gentlemen of the county and city.<sup>13</sup> I was the secretary in conjunction with Henry Alcock. In fact I got up the whole business in concern with Mr. Stuart, and yet such was my negative to all intercourse with great men that I kept out of his way altogether except when I read to him the address<sup>14</sup> of our Bishop and Clergy. If I had at the time become known to him, perhaps a facility would have arisen from it to procure something for my brother such as I requested<sup>15</sup> of you to seek for him. I am sure you don't forget this affair.

There is a passage in your last letter about Lamie Murray which I am satisfied you wrote under great misapprehension. You attribute the opposition to Reynolds to a cabal created by Murray against him. Now I hope you know me too well to suppose that I would lend myself to any cabal against your measures, yet let me assure you that there is not in the community another more deeply impressed with Reynolds' unfitness than I am. I have been long of this opinion but I should be sorry, even under the very deepest conviction on that head, to do anything that could injure his family and therefore it was that I suggested his getting a pension as a retiring allowance suitable to his merits. I say then that I had this conviction and I felt deep and very deep regret at observing that your mind and Fitz-Simon's were so much imbued with unfavourable impressions of Murray, as if he had created the feeling against Reynolds. I watched Murray's conduct throughout



in this business and I must say a man of more calmness, of less acerbity of manner or expression; a man with views less under the control of passion or personal dislike when appealed to on the subject of Reynolds, I never knew. *You* certainly have no reason to feel angrily towards him for, when he was aware that others had succeeded in making an unjust impression on your mind against him, he never ceased to think and to speak of you but as you could expect from your most sincere and *disinterested* friend. I never met a man in whom I have found less duplicity. Everyone with whom he had intercourse in the formation of the Bank<sup>16</sup> admired him, and the constituency to my knowledge continues to repose in him the most unlimited confidence. I have thought it my duty to say so much but at the same time let me observe that I am under no compliment to Murray, neither am I, nor have I ever been to the Bank. The Directors from my local knowledge have sometimes been induced to seek my advice and, when the run took place last year,<sup>17</sup> I was sent for and at the request of Reynolds I wrote the enclosed circular.<sup>18</sup> It was read at the chapels on the Sunday following its date and there was not the slightest appearance of a run on Monday. I think this that the Bank is rather under obligations to me and yet Mr. Roskell has been carrying on a correspondence with Mr Curtis<sup>19</sup> of this city who, upon his (R's) visit to this locality, told him that Henry Alcock put me in possession of the bank secrets, that is, he told him that the manager violated his oath of secrecy and that I, a priest, was a party to said violation. Yet Mr Roskell corresponded with this man and in one of his letters which Curtis exhibits publicly, he states unreservedly his opinion of the maladministration of the Waterford bank.<sup>20</sup> Is this a prudent course for a bank director? Certainly there is an indiscretion in it of which Murray never would be guilty.

Sherlock has just come in to me and he requests that I will again impress on your mind the necessity of putting the government on their guard against Sir Richard Keane's machinations. He and Bagge<sup>21</sup> have contrived to throw out at the general sessions all the presentments for the Joint charities hitherto supported by county and city. All this has been done with a view to facilitate the removal of the assizes.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Shapland Carew Morris, J.P., D.L., Harbour View, Waterford, second son of William Morris and Mary, daughter of Shapland Carew (grandfather of Lord Carew). Younger brother of William Morris Reade (1787-1847) of Rossenarra, Co. Kilkenny.

- 2 John Purcell Fitzgerald, J.P. (c. 1773-1852). The Island, Waterford, eldest son of John Purcell, M.D., of Dublin and Eleanor Fitzgerald of Williamstown. He assumed by royal license in September 1818 the name and arms of Fitzgerald only. M.P. for Seaford 1826-32. High sheriff of Co. Waterford 1838.
- 3 Thomas Drummond.
- 4 John Fitzgerald was in due course appointed high sheriff.
- 5 John Henry Keane (1816-1881), eldest son of Sir Richard Keane, 2nd Bt.; succeeded to the baronetcy in 1855. See *Boase*.
- 6 John Keily, J.P., Strancally, Tallow, Co. Waterford.
- 7 Patrick William Power, second son of Patrick Power, M.P. of Bellvue, Co. Kilkenny.
- 8 Rowland Alston (1782-1865), M.P. for Hertfordshire 1835-41.
- 9 Sir Benjamin Morris, Kt. (1798-1875), son of George Morris Wall; sheriff of Waterford 1836 and 1854; mayor of Waterford 1845-7 and 1867-8. See *Boase*.
- 10 O'Connell was at this time exerting himself to prevent the Radicals abandoning the ministry on account of Russell's declaration (see letter 2478 n2) against the ballot.
- 11 For the text of the ministerial poor law bill see *Freeman's Journal*, 16 December, 1837. O'Connell's views on the bill were published in a letter to his constituents, dated 18 December 1837 (*FJ*, 19 Dec. 1837). In this he declared that a poor law would 'create a species of social revolution in Ireland, and would mean a new and heavy charge on property.' The result would be to stimulate rather than retard the rate of eviction. Above all, added O'Connell, the measure would leave the absentees completely untouched, and, in fact, would encourage absenteeism. It is O'Connell declared, 'emphatically a landlord's bill.'
- 12 It had been believed, O'Connell declared in his letter above (note 11), that a poor law would discourage landlords from evicting, because it would entitle a pauper to support from his parish, hence from his landlord. The proposed poor law, however, allotted one workhouse to every twenty square miles, so that the landlord would only be called on to contribute a paltry sum in common with all inhabitants of an extensive district.
- 13 Mulgrave visited Waterford in the course of one of his tours of the south on 8 August 1836. According to the *Pilot*, Waterford 'possessing a resident gentry, for the most part liberal, and a numerous and influential class of traders . . . gave to his Excellency a reception such as he had not previously met with in any part of Ireland' (*Pilot*, 10 Aug. 1836).
- 14 The address of the Roman Catholic bishop and clergy of the diocese of Waterford and Lord Mulgrave's reply are published in the *Pilot* of 12 Aug. 1836.
- 15 See letters 2379 and 2384.
- 16 The National Bank of Ireland.
- 17 See letter 2383 n7.
- 18 Not extant.
- 19 Probably Robert Curtis, 34 Lady Lane, Waterford, wine and spirit merchant.
- 20 The Waterford branch of the National Bank of Ireland.
- 21 Henry Bagge, Dungarvan and 23 North Earl Street, Dublin, attorney and commissioner of affidavits, Dungarvan.

2483

*From Peter Connery*<sup>1</sup>

22 Wicklow Street [Dublin], 21 December 1837

Sir,

I beg leave agreeable to your request to proceed to give you a written detail of facts connected with trade.

1st, with respect to what is termed slating.<sup>2</sup> To my knowledge, in 1822 a system of slating was introduced by William Clinton<sup>3</sup> (of whom more hereafter) that every house-painter at work was to pay 3s. 3d. per week to the slating party, and every painter not at work to render their assistance personally or by payment. On that occasion the idle tailors were hired by money and drink. During that year several houses were broken into and wrecked, amongst them were Vero's the glaziers, Bride St.; Austin's the painters, Molesworth St.; a house in Baggot St. where Austin's men were working; with several others and property to a considerable amount destroyed. At that period the carpenters lent the painters £20, and as well as I can recollect, the coachmakers lent £20. These sums have been paid back to the above mentioned.

In 1822 through conscientious motives I refused to be either a subscribing or slating member and that on the morning of Vero's attack I was met by Clinton who headed a large party and demanded my compliance with their rules and through a promise (extorted by fear) of compliance I escaped. Which promise I did not keep.

From the diversions created by drunkenness and slating after some time the parties seeing their errors considered I was the only person who could bring the moderate and violent men together and was appointed President. During these periods a violent man named Clinton, a house-painter (before mentioned) who had access to all the trades committees of Dublin and who has great influence on all the trades and had narrowly escaped conviction in the case of Hanlon,<sup>4</sup> the sawyer, afterwards, and has been considered a principal also in the assassination of Morton's [?] apprentice and who I believe to be an active member of the late outrages. That within the last 3 months there has been 3 respectable builders attacked, Mr. Mason nearly deprived of life, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Charles severely beat and at present I am informed there is 2 painters in confinement for assaulting Mr. Armstrong.

They wrecked Mr. Mackey's<sup>5</sup> house in Baggot St. and destroyed a great deal of property. I have been 8 years in business on my

own account and during that interval had but 2 apprentices. In last midsummer one of them being out of his time and having an opportunity of getting one who had part of his time served, my men would not allow [me] to take him on trial if I did not bind him at once for the purpose.

I beg leave to subscribe myself, Your very obedient servant  
Peter Connery

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Painter and glazier. A witness before the select committee of the Commons on combinations of workmen (*Parliamentary Papers, Reports from Committees*, 1837-8, VIII, 2nd Report, 153-67).
- 2 Beating, physical assault.
- 3 William Clinton, sometime president of committee of painters' society.
- 4 Hanlon was murdered in 1829 but it was not until January 1840 that a man called William Lynam was arrested in Manchester and brought over to Dublin. He was charged as an accessory and found guilty (*Pilot*, 6 Jan., 19 Feb. 1840).
- 5 William Mackey, 139 Lower Baggot Street, Dublin, builder, brushmaker and ironmonger.

2484

*From James Cosgrave*<sup>1</sup>

97 Brunswick Street, [Dublin] [c. 21 December 1837]

Cosgrave has to state he has been about 9 years in business and during the first five years done a large share of business and found although getting fair prices for his work, at the expiration of that time, he was £280 in arrear notwithstanding the greatest sobriety and industry in consequence of which I was obliged to confine myself to what I could give personal attention to and I find it as much as I can effect to meet my engagements, leaving very small profits (although having the name of being high in my prices) from the large wages required by the workmen. I have also to state being the last 4 years engaged in the north that the Glasgow and Edinburgh painters has got the greatest portion of the employment in that country, our character being up exorbitant prices. The Scotch workmen of the first-rate abilities, wages per week from 16s. to 18s., steam boat fare being low and the men requiring no extra allowances. Our men require in the country £1.12.6 and in Dublin £1.7.6.

The results is that the following noblemen and gentlemen has Scotch or English employed:

Earl Gosford, Market Hill<sup>2</sup>  
 Mr. Close, Drumbanagher<sup>3</sup>  
 Mr. Brownlow, Lurgan  
 The Cathedral, Armagh  
 Col. Creighton, Crum Castle<sup>4</sup>  
 Sir Arthur Brook, Colebrook<sup>5</sup>  
 Mr. Hall, Narrowwater<sup>6</sup>

And Mr. Barre Beresford<sup>7</sup> and Sir Edmond Hays<sup>8</sup> got their work done sometime since by Scotchmen. I have also to state that in the stone cutting a man can procure a chimney piece 30% cheaper in Glasgow, Belfast or Armagh than in Dublin, taking all charges into calculation. All other manufactures in proportion. Brown,<sup>9</sup> stone-cutter of Armagh, is able to make chimney pieces in Armagh, take them to Dublin and set them up 30% cheaper than they can be procured in Dublin.

I have further to state that in 1816 when all articles for sustenance were 40% above the present prices, the wages was 26/- per week. At present it has increased to 30/- Irish currency, instead of a proportionate decrease, the results of which will be, if not stopped, to drive all from Dublin.

I beg leave to subscribe myself,  
 Your very obedient servant,  
 James Cosgrave

[P.S.] In addition to the Scotch painters employed in the North, they are or have been employed in the following houses in Dublin:

Robert Borrowes, Esq., Merrion Square North  
 Mr. Blacker, Merrion Square North  
 Sir Henry Jervis White [Jervis]<sup>10</sup>  
 Col. Close  
 T. B. C. Smith Q.C.<sup>11</sup>  
 Club House, Sackville Street.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 James Cosgrave, house-painter and paper-hanger. This letter was obviously written for James Cosgrave by Peter Connery, hence the change from the third person to the first person in the course of the letter.
- 2 Archibald (Acheson), second earl of Gosford (1776-1849) Gosford Castle, Market Hill, Co. Armagh and Worlingham Hall, Beccles, Suffolk.
- 3 Lt.-Col. Maxwell Close (1783-1867), Drumbanagher, Co. Armagh.
- 4 John Creighton, J.P., D.L., Crum Castle, Co. Fermanagh.

- 5 Sir Arthur Brinsley Brooke, second baronet (1797-1854), Colebrook, Brookeborough, Co. Fermanagh.
- 6 Roger Hall (1791-1864), J.P., D.L., Narrow Water, Warrenpoint, Co. Down.
- 7 Henry Barre Beresford (1784-1837), Brookhall, Londonderry, youngest son of Rt. Hon. John de la Poer Beresford (brother of 1st marquess of Waterford).
- 8 *Recte* Sir Edmund Samuel Hayes, third baronet (1806-1860), Drumboe Castle, Stranorlar, Co. Donegal; M.P. Co. Donegal 1831-60. See *Boase*.
- 9 Benjamin Brown, marble mason.
- 10 Sir Henry Meredyth Jervis-White-Jervis, second baronet (1793-1869), Belcamp, Raheny, Co. Dublin.
- 11 Thomas Berry Cusac Smith (1795-1866), 8 Merrion Square, East, Dublin; second son of Sir William Cusac Smith, 2nd Bt. Solicitor-general September-November 1842; attorney-general November 1842-February 1846; prosecuted O'Connell in the Queen's Bench, 1844; master of the rolls 1846-66; M.P. for Ripon 1843-46. See *DNB*.

## 2485

*From William B. Herron<sup>1</sup> to Merrion Square*

National Medical Hall [Dublin], 23 December 1837

Sir,

Your letter<sup>2</sup> in *Saunders's* of this day entitles you to the thanks and gratitude of every householder and landholder in Ireland. I voted against you at the last election and if you favour me with five minutes I will call at any time you appoint at your house. I want to let you know the reason in person.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William B. Herron, National Medical Hall, 6 Lr. Sackville St., Dublin.
- 2 A public letter on the new poor law bill in *Saunders's News-Letter*. O'Connell objects to having the cost of the new scheme fall on the occupier rather than the owner.

## 2485a

*To George Julian Harney<sup>1</sup>*

Merrion Square, 24 December 1837

Sir,

I can not recognise in you any right to call on me for any avowal on behalf of the Working Mans [*sic*] Association.<sup>2</sup> I have the honour to be a member of that association and if any explana-

tion of my conduct were required by that body they would communicate with me either by their very intelligent and able secretary, Mr. Lovatt,<sup>3</sup> or through an esteemed friend of mine, Mr. Cleave. With both these gentlemen I have had discussions upon most of the important topics connected with that association and I must say that I have seldom if at all met with more intelligent, clear sighted or honestly disposed men, and whilst we agreed upon many points we differed on others without ceasing to respect the integrity of purpose of each other though we mutually regretted what we deemed erroneous opinion.

I can not therefore recognise you at all as belonging to that association though you may for what I know be a member. I write to you merely as an individual who has thought fit to give me upon a subject of all others in my mind the most important to the well-being of society and especially of the working classes borne down as they are by the double effects of increasing machinery on the one hand and undiminished taxation on the other. At the same time deprived as they are of the franchise they have not the power to elect legislative guardians in whom they could confide and they therefore are liable to be lead astray by every paltry pretender to zeal for their interests, zeal often without either discretion, information or wisdom.

I have further to observe that the Working Mans [*sic*] Association is merely a *political* body and is not connected with any combination, useful or mischievous, to enhance the wages of particular trades or to exclude particular classes or individuals from work.

Having thus separated my compliance with your demand from any connection with the Working Man's Association I proceed to answer your question.

The quotation you furnish of my speech is not accurate — simply because it is not full enough. As far as it goes I readily and at once avow it. I said all that is reported but I included these two things, first, a declaration of my opinion that the persons charged with the base assassination in question must be deemed innocent as they pressed for trial and had been postponed if not refused, and secondly, that it was my intention to bring before parliament an enquiry into the effects upon the working classes themselves of combinations with a view especially to ascertain the frightful as well as fatal effects of such combinations on wages and employment in Ireland.<sup>4</sup>

You have now my whole speech. By adding what I have thus written to the quotation you made and which quotation I declare to be in itself perfectly accurate though not compleat.

And now, Sir, as the friend and advocate of the working classes

I have the honour to announce that it is my intention immediately after the recess to bring this subject before a committee of the house of Commons. I will examine both workmen and employers amongst my constituents. I will be able, I believe, to show that in Dublin these combinations have had the most important and unhappy effects on wages and employment. At least my present opinion is that such will be the result of a fair open and dispassionate investigation. Should it prove so I will endeavour to procure a legislative remedy. If it prove otherwise and that no part of the decay of trade in this city is to be attributed to such combinations I will seek for other remedies in conjunction with the tradesmen and their employees. For the present I have the happiness of knowing that the great body of the operatives in this city have conferred with me at great length and are convinced of the purity of my motives and the sincerity of my zeal to serve them if I can.

It is quite clear that the concluding paragraph of your letter was intended to be offensive, for otherwise it is without a meaning. I however totally disregard your incivility. But I do not disregard your entire silence on the subject of the base assassination mentioned in my speech. The poor victim was going home peaceably in company with his wife. In her presence he was — Oh horrible! — assassinated by two strangers employed for the purpose — men whom he had never offended — his only crime being his having worked for the highest wages he could get but wages lower than some secret society or combination had fixed for *others*, as well as themselves. I do not therefore hesitate to say that if there can be found in England one man to countenance the real perpetrators of such a murder he is a miscreant whose good opinion I repudiate and despise and whose hatred I solicit as a boon and will endeavour to deserve.

Unless some portion of the working classes in England or in Scotland shall express a desire to have the enquiry I allude to extended to Great Britain I will confine it to Ireland and more especially to the City of Dublin. At present I think that much of the mischief which presses on this city will be found to originate in secret meetings held in public houses and conducted by irresponsible persons. If the meetings be for good they require no secrecy. Open dealing is the best for everybody — but I anticipate one of the questions to be discussed upon evidence before the Committee.

I have only to add that any other letter which you may write in terms inconsistent with the courtesy [*sic*] due from one man to another shall remain unnoticed by me. I ought perhaps have dis-



regarded a letter couched in such terms as yours but after all, the importance of the two topics its contents involved must serve as my excuse.

The first is — the best method of procuring and continuing employment and wages for the working classes.

The second is — the abolition of any system if such shall be found to exist countenancing assassination. I hope no such *system* does exist.

SOURCE: Reference Library, Birmingham Public Libraries

- 1 George Julian Harney (1817-97), chartist of socialist views and journalist. See *Boase*.
- 2 Founded in June 1836.
- 3 William Lovett (1800-77), a prominent chartist and the principal founder of the London Working Men's Association. See *DNB*.
- 4 See letter 2497, note 1.

2485b

*To John Cleave*

Merrion Square, 25 December 1837

*Private*

My dear Cleave,

I enclose you a letter I received from a person calling himself Harney. If you will read over that letter and my reply you will be master of the facts. I am sincerely sorry to give you this trouble but I do wish you to understand the points and I do assure you I would take twice as much trouble for you. If this Harney be a man of any *value* send him my letter under a cover, first keeping a copy of it. If you think fit publish both his letter and mine. In short I look to your doing all that is friendly and kind without in any degree committing yourself or your opinions to mine in case you differ with me.

I send two other covers with this.

SOURCE: Reference Library, Birmingham Public Libraries

2486

*From [? Philip Henry Muntz]¹*

Birmingham, 1 January 1838

*Private*

Sir,

A report of a speech lately addressed by you to the trades union of Dublin has accidentally come before my notice; I can but regret the remarks therein contained concerning the meeting at the town hall of Birmingham. . . .<sup>2</sup> As I am one of the parties whose names you mention, I consider I am at liberty to address these lines to you in explanation of what in reality took place. . . . You state, Sir, in your address that of a body of 7,000 people only seven opposed a vote of thanks to you and that of those seven I was one.<sup>3</sup> Your memory may on most occasions be admirable but certainly in this case it appears to have failed you. It was I who *seconded* the vote of thanks to you<sup>4</sup> and at the same time gave my opinion of the conduct of the Whig government towards Ireland and Great Britain; the two other gentlemen whose names you mention<sup>5</sup> *supported* the vote of thanks and also made some remarks on the conduct of the administration. . . . There was no idea of insult to you; all were willing to pay a just tribute to one who had done so much for his fellow-countrymen; if any insult at all was offered, it was on your part; you came to Birmingham to criticise the opinions of the union. A few members of that society replied to your remarks; they knew well that Lord Mulgrave was almost the sole boon the Whig government had given to Ireland; they knew that you had no guarantee for a continuance of that boon an hour longer than the Whig administration lasted; they knew that that administration as now composed could not exist many years if even many months. . . . Their object has been to lull the people of Ireland, under your auspices and with promises of future benefits, into security; to quiet them by poor laws and a constabulary force. . . . Ireland in chains, a coalition between Whig and Tory would take place and both would then laugh at you when you found yourself in the position you were in 20 years ago, and the power which might have saved your native country glided from your hands. . . . You pleaded for a government which had declared its deadly hostility to those reforms which the people demand, and then you quitted the meeting without giving any reason for what you asserted. Sir, the people of Birmingham are not to be told to act without a reason. Mere assertions are not sufficient. They care little whether you call yourself Whig or

Radical, they want deeds, not professions, they want men to vote for an extension of the suffrage, not to speak for it and vote against it. . . .

Half an hour's conversation before you went to our Town Hall would have prevented that which apparently has so much annoyed you. . . . You may think Birmingham a town of no importance: be it so; you may think the Political Union contemptible . . . nevertheless you cannot conceal from yourself that a rupture with a town . . . which has hitherto been a sincere and zealous advocate of justice to Ireland cannot be otherwise than injurious to the cause of reform in Ireland as well as in Great Britain. Not that the radicals of Birmingham would oppose you. No! despise, abuse, ridicule us as you like, the radicals have too much principle to oppose any beneficial measures whether proceeding from friend or foe. . . .

Be not deceived by the fancy that some few individuals only in this town differ from you with regard to the Administration; an enormous majority of the people of Birmingham are of that opinion. . . . [Remainder of letter missing].

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Probably Philip Henry Muntz (1811 - 88), Birmingham merchant and political radical. Mayor 1839 and 1840; M.P. for Birmingham 1868-85. He was a younger brother of George Frederick Muntz (in *DNB*). See *Boase*.
- 2 For the Birmingham meeting, see letter 2478 n3. The speech made by O'Connell to which Muntz refers was delivered at a meeting not of the National Trades Political Union but of the citizens of Dublin on 21 December 1837 (*Pilot*, 22 Dec. 1837).
- 3 O'Connell did not in fact name Muntz in this context.
- 4 In his speech O'Connell states that 'Mr. Muntz' seconded the vote of thanks. The reports of the Birmingham meeting in the Dublin press (probably copied from English newspapers) give 'P.H. Muntz' as the seconder.
- 5 Salt and Hadly (*Times*, 25 Dec. 1837), almost certainly T.C. Salt and Benjamin Hadley.

2487

*From Lt.-Col. Yorke,<sup>1</sup> Dublin Castle, 5 January 1838*

Desires, on behalf of the lord-lieutenant, that O'Connell should call on him (the lord-lieutenant) about 4 o'clock on the following day.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Charles Yorke (1790-1880), private secretary to Lord Mulgrave as lord-lieutenant of Ireland and as home secretary. Placed on half-pay 1825, colonel, 1826; knighted 1856; field-marshal 1877. See *DNB*.

## 2488

*From Patrick Shea, Scarriff, Co. Clare, 9 January 1838, to  
Merrion Square*

Asks O'Connell to present his petition<sup>1</sup> to the Commons. He describes himself as a pensioner of the Royal African Corps, and as a forty-shilling freeholder who supported O'Connell in the Clare election.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Unidentified.

## 2489

*From W.R. Sydney to Merrion Square*

P[alace] Y[ard] [London], 10 January 1838<sup>1</sup>

My Dear Sir,

I am one of the stewards and also one of the dinner committee chosen to superintend the feast<sup>2</sup> to be given to yourself. At a meeting had this day at Mr. Leary's,<sup>3</sup> your letter to Sir John Scott Lillie<sup>4</sup> was read pointing out the 29th January as a proper day on account of its being a parliamentary holiday. . . . After some discussion it was agreed that the dinner should take place on Saturday, the 17th February. . . . Col. Evans will take the chair and Mr. Hume will be one of the stewards. *Sub rosa* perhaps you would send me a few names to whom I could apply to become stewards: we intend applying to Lord Listowel and Lord Belfast.<sup>5</sup>

[P.S.] I have had no communication from anyone on the subject of my last letter to you as to the Irish petitions.<sup>6</sup> Dolan in his letter to me says *you* can do everything.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 This letter has been erroneously dated 1837 by the writer. The postmark is clearly 1838.  
2 This dinner eventually took place on 21 February at the Crown and

Anchor Tavern, Strand, London, Sir George de Lacy Evans in the chair. Joseph Hume and many other M.P.'s attended but Lillie and Lords Listowel and Belfast do not appear to have been present (*Pilot*, 26 Feb. 1838).

- 3 Probably John Frederick Leary of 2 Abingdon Street, London, a parliamentary agent.
- 4 Sir John Scott Lillie (1790-1868), eldest son of Phillip Lillie, Drumdoe Castle, Co. Roscommon; knighted 1816; lieutenant-colonel in the army 1837-55; author of a couple of papers on parliamentary corruption. See *Boase*.
- 5 George Hamilton (Chichester) (1797-1883), styled earl of Belfast 1799-1844; M.P. for Carrickfergus 1818-20; Belfast 1820-30; Co. Antrim 1830-37; Belfast 1837-38; lord lieutenant of Co. Antrim 1841-83; succeeded in 1844 as third marquess of Donegall.
- 6 Perhaps a reference to the 'Spottiswoode Conspiracy' (see letter 2472 n4).

## 2490

*From John Smyth<sup>1</sup> to Merrion Square*

70 Blessington Street [Dublin], 14 January 1838

My dear Sir,

The lands<sup>2</sup> proposed to be settled on your son's<sup>3</sup> marriage are not worth, according to your own statement for which I am disposed to give you full credit, more than £90. 3. 6. a year, the difference between that and the sum of £380 (their full value) being absorbed by interest on the mortgage debt and other family charges. For example:-

The rental of the estate is represented to amount to		£380
Deduct: annuity payable to Mrs. McSwiney	£ 92. 6. 2	
interest on £1,292 at 6%	77.10. 4	
do on £2,000 mortgage debt	<u>120. 0. 0</u>	<u>289.16. 6</u>
Net Profit		90. 3. 6

[The writer says that he could not advise any of Miss Ryan's friends to undertake the trusts of such a deed. He then discusses at length what might best be done including a suggestion that the townlands of Drumquinna and Lacca be omitted from the settlement, and a bond coupled with a life insurance for a given sum be substituted.]<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Paper, NLI 13648

- 1 John Smyth (c. 1794-1874), became an attorney in 1819. Law agent to the Dublin city corporation 1842 until his death.
- 2 These lands, which O'Connell had purchased, were formerly the property of his brother-in-law, Myles McSwiney, now deceased. They were situated at and near the McSwiney home at Drumquinna, Kenmare, Co. Kerry.
- 3 John, O'Connells's third son, who married on 25 February 1838, Elizabeth, eldest daughter and co-heir of Dr. James Ryan (deceased) of Jubilee Hall, near Bray, Co. Wicklow.
- 4 Smyth's request was met since the marriage settlement, dated 20 February and registered on 26 February 1838, did not include any of John's property in land but did include a cash legacy from Count O'Connell of £1,500 and five insurance policies of £1,000 each taken out on the life of O'Connell.

2491

*From Adam Ward*<sup>1</sup>

Dublin, 15 January [1838]

Revered Sir,

Pursuant to my promise I proceed briefly to state how far my knowledge of combination may support the statement already put forward by Mr. Peter Connery.<sup>2</sup>

In the summer of the year 1820 I was admitted a member of the Painters Society by means of an oath in (O'Brien's public house, Stephen St.) which stated amongst other things that I should hold myself ready to comply with any commands sent by the committee. William Clinton was then President, but, having been working in the country, his place was filled by the late William Broderick, [the greater part of the remainder of the letter is illegible owing to paper damage] [The writer gives the names of several workmen who were beaten by other workmen deputed for that purpose] . . . About this time the unfortunate Patrick McDaniel was killed by Carolin<sup>3</sup> of Talbot St. in defence of himself and his property. Of this I knew nothing until the deed was done. . . . At this period I left them but not wishing that any portion of my money should be applied to such purposes I wrote on next monthly night of meeting to have it returned. They sent for me to the room. James Birch sat at the head of the table. John Anderson acted as secretary. In the room I recognised most of the men who acted as slaters together with most of Mr. Boylan's men. They told me I was going to do a foolish thing in separating myself from the body of trade. I replied that it was a disgrace to belong

to a set of men who acted in the manner they had done. They said my opinion would change and refused giving me the money. I finally arrested the president to whom the money was paid and obliged him to refund it. . . . The unfortunate Hanlon was murdered on the day following. On that night I received an anonymous communication to beware as I was to be sleated [*sic*] in consequence of my quarrel with Clinton. I took the hint and withdrew. I then finally left them for ever, and sometime following, left the Carolins' employment. When to such an extent was combination carried that with a mind capable of exploring the secrets of my business and hands to work them out, I could not obtain anything to do whilst the veriest botch was employed. . . .

P.S. . . . The carpenters protest they have not been connected with any of the late outrages. Now how prodigiously considerate must not the fellows have been who would without their knowledge and without their pay throw the vitriol on Edward Carolin Junr. about 8 or 9 years ago and 4 or 5 years since beat one of the Whelans of High St. and 2 or 3 years ago another of the Whelans [and two other men] and all for having employed carpenters not belonging to the Body.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The writer describes himself as 'house painter etc., No. 7 Clare Lane [about one word illegible] one door of [f] Clare St.' On the back of the letter is written in another hand, 'Ward became a violent Young Irelander lately. July '47.'
- 2 Letter 2483.
- 3 Edward Carolin, carpenter and builder, 13 Talbot Street, Dublin, of Carolin & Co.

## 2492

*To Thomas Drummond, 16 January 1838 from Merrion Square*

Recommends James O'Toole for the vacant post of teller in the stamp office, Dublin. A note on the letter by Drummond reads: 'Saw Mr. O'Toole and explained that the appointment in question is not in the gift of the lord-lieutenant. — Jan. 21, 1838.'

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

2493

*From Eliza Leslie,<sup>1</sup> 97 Lr. Baggot Street, Dublin, 16 January 1838*

She asks O'Connell to support a claim she has on government for a pension. She says she is the daughter of 'the late Dep. Judge Advocate General for Ireland'.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Daughter of R.G. Leslie, deputy judge advocate general until c. 1822.

2494

*From Lord Morpeth*

19 January 1838

My Dear Sir,

I think I can hardly do less than transmit the enclosed and I trust to your not resenting my having done so.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

2495

*From his brother James*

Lakeview, 20 January 1838

My Dear Dan,

. . . The sum coming to John<sup>1</sup> in right of our uncle, the General, subject now of course to d'Etchegoyan's claim,<sup>2</sup> was fifteen hundred pounds. This sum by the will *I proved* in Dublin, as I recollect, was to be paid to him when he was twenty-five years old. *The entire* amount of the general's property in my hands when he died was *about* two thousand, eight hundred and fifty pounds (£2,850). This sum I placed in the Government 3½% stock in order to have it ready to pay Mr. d'Etchegoyan should he succeed by law in establishing his right to it. The money continues in the funds. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 O'Connell's son.

2 See letter 2076.



2496

*From R.I. Fowler*<sup>1</sup>

London, 23 January 1838

Sir,

It would be a great support to my confidence in you as a public man if, when I see you denouncing in such powerful, useful and just terms the combination of dealers, traders and artisans, you were at the same time to use and exert those same talents as powerfully, as usefully and as justly in denouncing the combination of the aristocracy who met under a nomination borough system and tyrannically passed the horrid, wicked and *murder-instigating* Corn Laws, laws out of which have sprung the lamentable combinations of the artisans etc. Remove their cause of complaint and give them the advantage of their proportion of the (say) £20,000,000 *sterling per annum* which the great combination of the aristocracy have so long robbed, plundered and filched from them. Remove those *anti-Christian* laws and you at the same time destroy all motive for combining as at present. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Unidentified.

2497

*From Thomas Wakley*

Library, House of Commons, 28 [?29] January 1838

My dear Sir,

I have this moment arranged with Lord John Russell to bring on the motion relative to the Glasgow cotton spinners<sup>1</sup> on *Tuesday next, February 6th* on which occasion I hope to be aided in my object by your unrivalled power. Trusting that the day now chosen may suit your convenience and that you may again return to this place in the enjoyment of full health and complete happiness. Permit me to subscribe as your sincere and grateful friend the name of

Thomas Wakley

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 It was not until 13 February that Wakley moved for a select committee to inquire into the constitution, practices and effects of the 'Association

of operative cotton-spinners of Glasgow and its neighbourhood.' To this O'Connell moved, by way of amendment, for a select committee to inquire into trades unions and combinations generally, in the United Kingdom. Spring Rice, after complimenting O'Connell for the course he had pursued on this subject, proposed a second amendment providing for a select committee to inquire into the operation of 6 Geo. IV c. 129 (the act of 1825 repealing the combination laws) and into the general constitution of trades unions, and also of the combinations of workmen and masters in the United Kingdom. Wakely expressed himself satisfied to leave the question in the hands of the ministry, and Spring Rice's motion was carried (*Annual Register*, 1838, 206-8; *Pilot*, 16 Feb. 1838).

2498

*To Thomas Drummond*

Merrion Square, 2 February 1838

My dear Sir,

Permit [me] to have the honour to introduce to you the two Roman Catholic clergymen from Waterford of whom I spoke to you yesterday — the Rev. Mr. Sheehan and the Rev. Mr. Flin.<sup>1</sup> They have brought up the memorial on behalf of Edmond Pyne and Maurice Flyn, the persons who were tried before Mr. Berwick and who were *sentenced to transportation by four magistrates who were not present at the trial* against the opinion of three magistrates who were.

I need not, I well know, urge the fitness of having Mr. Berwick's report of the trial obtained without delay as I am quite sure every step will be taken by the Irish Government to do justice to two men of excellent character.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 Probably Rev. Martin Flynn, (died c. 1848) C.C. Trinity Within and St. John's, Waterford from before 1836 to 1837; parish priest of Passage, 1838-42; parish priest of Trinity Within (Ballybricken) 1843-48.

2499

*From some Philadelphia Citizens*

Philadelphia, 2 February 1838

Dear Sir,

There has been published in many of the newspapers of this country an extract from a speech, said to have been delivered by

you at an anti-slavery meeting<sup>1</sup> in London on the 23rd of November 1837, copied from the *London Morning Chronicle* of the 24th of that month. Some of the sentiments attributed to you in that speech have caused no inconsiderable excitement in the United States.

The sentiment which is especially objected against is that in which, according to the construction given to it here, you are represented as having said that the people of the United States instead of being the highest in the scale of humanity are the basest of the base and the vilest of the vile.<sup>2</sup> Before we presume to ask whether you have or have not been accurately reported . . . we would respectfully state upon what authority we address you.

In the United States there are hundreds of thousands of our countrymen and countrywomen who have by persecution been driven from the land of their nativity. Here they have been hospitably received and honourably admitted to all the rights, privileges and immunities of native Americans. . . . The natives of Ireland, while they bear true allegiance to the country which has adopted them and are every ready to serve her, have never ceased to feel a deep interest in all which does or can affect the welfare and happiness of the land which gave them birth. . . .

The subscribers here appointed a committee to address you, in relation to the publication above spoken of, at a respectable meeting of natives of Ireland, Citizens of the United States and inhabitants of the City and County of Philadelphia. We assure you, Dear Sir, that at that meeting there was not a man who does not only admire and do willing homage to your principles. . . . No Saint Patrick's Day for many years has passed over their heads in which you have not publicly in their flowing cups [been] freshly remembered and the air been rent with loud and oft repeated cheers for the *Liberator*. . . . You will instantly perceive how jealously and suspiciously we may be looked upon by our native American fellow citizens if the man, whom we have delighted to honour, shall by them be believed to have *en masse* deemed them the basest of the base and the vilest of the vile. . . . We respectfully ask whether you would not feel it due to yourself and to your fellow-countrymen who with you had become identified with the American people to request an explanation from the Speaker in order to remove from the natives of Ireland American citizens the odium which in the eye of their Native American fellow Citizens had been cast upon them from their devotion and disposition to love and laud the man who had libelled them.

. . . With sincere and candid wishes for your health and happiness we remain your friends and countrymen.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 A meeting of anti-slavery delegates from all parts of the United Kingdom. O'Connell attacked Americans in the slave-owning states and condemned what he alleged to be American aggression in Texas conducted for the sake of perpetuating slavery (*MC*, 24 Nov. 1837).
- 2 O'Connell's speech which contained these words — 'instead of their being the highest in the scale of humanity, they are the basest of the base, the vilest of the vile' — is reported in the account of the meeting in the *Pilot* of 27 November 1837.
- 3 The letter has five signatures of which three are legible: Alex. Diamond, Wm. Dickson and John Binns. See letter 2566.

2499a

*From John McMullen*

Grand Canal House, Dublin, 4 February 1838<sup>1</sup>

My dear Sir,

The petition from this city, praying for a parliamentary enquiry into the existing system of illegal combination<sup>2</sup> sustained by force and violence, went forward yesterday evening by post, and I trust has reached you safely.

You will observe that it is signed by the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor,<sup>3</sup> the High Sheriffs,<sup>4</sup> and several of the most influential members of the Board of Aldermen, and of the Corporation, and by the Governor and a number of the Directors of the Bank of Ireland, all the private bankers and by the great majority of our leading merchants and manufacturers. But the fact to which I am especially desirous of drawing your attention is that a very large proportion of the names to which I now allude are of those (with whom I may be permitted to class myself) who differed altogether from you on the great question of the maintenance of the Union; and very many of whom are still your staunch opponents on the several important political questions now before the public and the legislature. I regret to be obliged to add that numerous other persons of great respectability, who are deeply sensible of the evils of illegal combination and most anxiously desire to see it suppressed, distinctly avowed that they were compelled to withhold their signatures from the petition in consequence of their thorough knowledge that such an avowal of their sentiments would be fraught with danger either to their persons or property. . . .

You are aware of the vast importance which has always been attached to the extension of calico-printing in Ireland in consequence of the very large amount of employment it affords; and it

became, as you must also be aware, a very considerable and rising trade both in Belfast and Dublin. In both places, powerful efforts were made by the workmen to dictate regulations to the employers under the usual system of coercive combination. In Dublin the attempt was met by the most determined resistance on the part of the employers *and they were successful*. In Belfast, on the contrary, either in consequence of less energy or of greater difficulties, the resistance was *unsuccessful*, and *combination triumphed*. Now pray mark the result. In Belfast the trade is virtually *extinct*, and the very large sums unfortunately sunk in buildings and machinery lost to the proprietors. In Dublin, on the contrary, the trade is still not only in existence but prosperous; affording a fair remuneration for the capital invested in it; and employment to the extent probably of from fifteen hundred to two thousand persons.

. . . Nor is this case singular. I have been now for more than five and twenty years, a close and anxious observer of the combination system and its results; and in no portion of the experience of my past life have I been able more clearly to trace effect to its cause or more thoroughly satisfied myself of the dependence of the one on the other than in arriving at the conclusion that the decline of manufactures in Dublin is beyond all other causes to be attributed to illegal combination.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 This letter was erroneously dated 1837.
- 2 'The petition of the undersigned bankers, merchants, manufacturers, traders, householders and other inhabitants of the city of Dublin.' It is published in the *Pilot* of 2 February 1838, and was presented to the Commons by O'Connell on 9 February. It asked that an enquiry be made into the system of 'illegal combination sustained by force and violence, which now exists in the city of Dublin.'
- 3 Samuel Warren.
- 4 John Jones and Thomas James Quinton.

2500

*From Richard Sullivan*

Dublin, 5 February 1838

My dear Sir,

I am obliged to trouble you to have the kindness to send or present at the Treasury the memorial I send herewith. Its prayer is that they would forgive or mitigate a penalty of £200 for which

there was a consent for judgment given. I sent a similar memorial to Mr. Hume, and you have herewith the copy of the letter which I addressed to him. He has informed me that he fears Mr. Baring,<sup>1</sup> from what he said, is adverse to any commission which I assure you I look for on the ground of merits alone.

I fear Mr. Hume's influence in that question, owing to recent events,<sup>2</sup> is diminished, and he states he will get you to join him. I have troubled you much for others. This time I beg a favour for myself.

If they will enforce the penalty, for God's sake let it be paid by me in London as I could not endure the taunts of Tories and others in Kilkenny at my failure of all just influence either by myself or by powerful friends. The Commissioners have evinced a severity on this occasion quite pointed. My statement fortified by my oath ought to have some effect.

May I beg your friendly interference before any order shall be made at the Treasury.

[P.S.] I hope Mr. Hume will not join the Tories on any question that may endanger the present Government. As an Irish member,<sup>3</sup> it would be the wish of his constituents that he would not disserve himself from you in your support of the Administration. He was so much committed on the Canada question that no one could blame him for the course he had taken.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Francis Thornhill Baring (1796-1866), eldest son of Sir Thomas Baring, second baronet; M.P. for Portsmouth 1826-65; a lord of the treasury 1830-34, and joint-secretary, 1834 and 1835-39; chancellor of the exchequer 1839-41; first lord of the admiralty 1849-52; succeeded as third baronet 1848; created Baron Northbrook in 1866. See *DNB*.
- 2 At the commencement of the session in January 1838 Hume strongly opposed the government's bill to suspend the constitution of Lower Canada (*Annual Register*, 1838, 22-65).
- 3 Hume now represented Kilkenny city.

2501

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 10 February 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . The Government have not as yet given the least intimation of what they intend doing with the Tithe Bill.<sup>1</sup> I believe they have

not decided. I will endeavour to give you the earliest information on the subject which can be relied on; for the present there is none. The Municipal Corporation Bill<sup>2</sup> will certainly be pressed by the Ministry through the House of Commons. They have not the power to press it through the House of Lords but I do believe that there will be a yielding on the part of Wellington's party sufficient to carry it through. My own opinion is that it will be law this session.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 127

- 1 No measure was as yet before parliament. On 27 March the Commons accepted a motion from Lord John Russell to 'consider the subject of tithes in Ireland' on 30 April.
- 2 A further government bill for the reform of Irish corporations was introduced in the Commons on 5 December 1837. It received its second reading on 2 February 'without a division — practically without a discussion.' It was rejected by the Lords in August 1838. (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIII, 149, 245; O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 633-5).

2502

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 10 February 1838

The Poor Law Bill<sup>1</sup> is in Committee. The Bill will pass nearly in its present shape. There will not be one single substantial improvement in it and we shall have the constituency swamped and the farmers ruined to gratify a few unthinking men, exceeding charitable at the expense of others, and, what is worse, of others who cannot afford it. Never was cant more conspicuous than in the cry of some of our Poor Law mongers. Others imagine that, because they point out distress and destitution, they make a case for a Poor Law. Yes, they forget that Poor Law affords less relief than it inflicts injury, but the delusion will end in greater misery and more dissatisfaction. I have done my duty.

[P.S.] The Minsters are quite safe. All right with the queen.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 127

- 1 Russell introduced the Poor Law Bill in the Commons on 1 December, 1837. On 9 February, 1838 O'Connell proposed its rejection. He had not, he declared, had the 'moral courage' to oppose the bill earlier. After a 'dull debate' the house divided on O'Connell's amendment,

which was defeated by 277 to 25. The bill was passed by the Commons on 30 April, by the Lords in final form on 27 July, and received the royal assent on 31 July as 1 & 2 Vict. c. 56 (O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 558-64).

2503

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 15 February 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

... I enclose you £1,000.

I wish to tell you in the strictest confidence — take care to keep it a secret — that the Queen has expressed a wish to see me. She is determined to conciliate Ireland. I will, of course, attend the next *levée*,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps some good to Ireland may be the consequence. You will feel how imperative it is to keep all this from every eye but your own, especially as I may perhaps be honoured with an audience within ten days. Again, you would ruin all my hopes for Ireland if you were to communicate these facts, though circumstanced as you and I are, I cannot conceal them from you. My projects include the final settlement of the Tithe question, the completion of the corporate reform and of the electoral franchise in cities and counties. These are great objects, should they be realised, but perhaps I am dreaming. We shall soon see.

Tell everybody that there is not the least chance of amending the Irish 'Destitution' Bill.<sup>2</sup> We must have it as it stands or not at all.

The office Sheil has got<sup>3</sup> is one of great respectability. It is also a most comfortable one, as it is for life, and is compatible with a seat in Parliament, and with the holding, at the same time, any other office. It is worth, as the saying is, 'in money and marbles', at least £1,200 a year.

I have applied to Lord Morpeth for Dillon. I also wrote to Mr. Drummond on his behalf.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 128

- 1 O'Connell and his sons Morgan and John were presented by Lord Morpeth to the queen at her *levée* in St. James' Palace on 21 February. His nephew Morgan John O'Connell was presented to Victoria on the same occasion by Thomas Spring Rice (*Pilot*, 26 Feb. 1838).
- 2 The Irish Poor Law Bill (see letter 2501 n1).
- 3 The Commissionership of Greenwich Hospital. He exchanged it for the vice-presidency of the board of trade on 29 August 1839.



2504

*To Archbishop Slattery*<sup>1</sup>

16 Pall Mall, London, 18 February 1838

My Lord,

I beg leave very respectfully to call your attention to the *Dublin Review* of which I am one of the proprietors.

The object with which this publication was instituted was and is to afford the Catholic literature of these countries a fair and legitimate mode of exhibiting itself to the people of the British Empire and especially to the people of Ireland in the shape most likely to produce a permanent as well as useful effect. The other quarterly publications are in the hands either of avowed and malignant enemies of Catholicity or of, what is worse, insidious and pretended friends who affect a false liberality at the expense of Catholic Doctrines.

The *Dublin Review* though not intended for purely polemical discussion contains many articles of the deepest interest to the well informed Catholic disputant. The name of Dr. Wiseman, who is also a proprietor of the work, ensures the orthodoxy of the opinions contained in it and will be admitted to be in itself a pledge of the extent and depth and variety of its scientific as well as theological information.

The seventh number is just published. The former numbers can be had either bound or any one of them separately. Mr. Staunton of the *Morning Register* is in Dublin, the agent for Ireland. He will transmit the last or any other number you please, to you free of carriage.

To sustain this publication which, while Catholicity is assailed by so many virulent enemies and has so few friends amongst the periodical literature, appears to me to be an object of considerable importance. It will be necessary to increase its circulation and augment the number of purchasers. It is for this purpose that I respectfully solicit your aid and friendly co-operation.

I have the honour to be etc.

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE : Cashel Diocesan Archives

1 This is a circular letter seeking support for the *Dublin Review*.

2505

*To Archbishop MacHale*<sup>1</sup>

[c. 18 February 1838]

*Private*

P.S. In calling the attention of your Grace to the enclosed *circular*, I venture respectfully to direct your notice to my opposition to the present scheme of Poor Laws.<sup>2</sup> It is a subject on which I have dwelt long and painfully — on which if I be in error, I am exceedingly culpable. But my objections depend much on the effects to be produced on the *ratepayers*. An additional tax of one million at the least, affecting in the first instance and almost exclusively *the occupiers*, fills me with alarm, especially as imprisonment in a workhouse is the *only* relief to be given. That is, all relief is to be administered solely to persons inhabiting the workhouse.

Your Grace must have seen my plan<sup>3</sup> for the abolition of tithes. It would abolish *them in toto* and throw the payment of Protestant clergy on the Consolidated Fund, giving to England and Scotland the same interest in abolishing sinecure livings in Ireland as the Irish have.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 644

- 1 This letter is written in O'Connell's hand on the back of a copy of the circular letter 2504. He adds his personal letter as a postscript.
- 2 See letter 2502 n1.
- 3 This plan is contained in a letter from O'Connell to the Protestant Clergy of Ireland, dated 9 November 1837 (*FJ*, 11 Nov. 1837). O'Connell estimated that the total of Irish tithes amounted to £600,000 per annum; that this sum be reduced by 30 per cent and the reduced amount be paid out of the consolidated fund. Ireland would in return pay the entire cost of the Irish constabulary.

2506

*To James Scully, Tipperary*

London, 27 February 1838

My dear Scully,

I enclose the letter you wish for of introduction of your son<sup>1</sup> to my relative and friend, Sir Maurice O'Connell, who goes out to New South Wales as Commander of the forces there, early in

April. If I *could* write a stronger letter I certainly would have great pleasure in doing so at your request.

SOURCE: Property of Mrs. Marjorie McCan

1 Captain John Scully, 80th Regt. and, later, a resident magistrate.

2507

*From Matthew Richard Sausse*

Hume St. [Dublin], 27 February 1838

My dear Sir,

. . . I was employed to draw up the County [and] City of Dublin Grand Jury Bill<sup>1</sup> and introduced into it two principal provisions, differing from those of the General Grand Jury Bill<sup>2</sup> and from the present system in force, viz., the substitution of the Police valuation under 1 Vic. c. 25<sup>3</sup> for ministers money<sup>4</sup> as a basis of assessment (the Police valuation is founded on and more extensive than Sherrard's<sup>5</sup>). Secondly, the appointment of rate payers to act as associates to the Justices at presentment sessions, by *election* in each parish, instead of by *nomination* of the Grand Jury. I do not know whether this latter provision will be retained but I think it ought.<sup>6</sup> Until we have a representative grand jury system we will never break down thoroughly the Orange party who are bonded together by their Grand Jury meetings twice in the year. I am anxious to get in the point of the *wedge*, and we can after drive it home. The Corporation system is to be elective and if that is (*ex concessio*) the best way of managing their funds, why not equally so in managing the funds arising from a tax, in principle, *voluntarily* imposed by the whole community on itself for local purposes. . . . I have relieved from *liability* to the tax all persons inhabiting houses under the value of £10 in the Police valuation (which is one third under the real value) and all persons inhabiting houses which are let out in portions or as lodgings. This is done by a reference to the Police tax<sup>7</sup> which contains similar provisions and thus we shall to a great extent avoid the tax question at any future election in respect to these two onerous taxes. I put you in possession of these facts without desiring to have my name mentioned as, although I feel myself at perfect liberty to do so, I don't know how far it is usual upon such occasions.

Should not the Government give directions to the Board of Works not to employ any person connected with the Union of trades? Being an illegal combination, they ought to do so and it

would give good example. I regret that I was not informed of your meeting<sup>8</sup> on Sunday last respecting the petition as I had been urging the meeting for some time previous.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 On 20/21 February leave was given to Morpeth and the Irish attorney-general, Stephen Woulfe, to bring in a bill to 'assimilate the Levy and Expenditure of Grand Jury Cess in the County and the County of the City of Dublin, to the mode at present by law established in the other counties of Ireland'. The bill was presented on the same day and was enacted in due course as 1 & 2 Vict. c. 51.
- 2 'An Act to consolidate and amend the Laws relating to the Presentment of Public Money by Grand Juries in Ireland' (6 & 7 Will. IV c. 116, enacted 20 August 1836).
- 3 See letter 2458 n2. This act accepted the valuation of property in Dublin city as provided by the act of 5 Geo. IV c. 118.
- 4 The urban form of tithes.
- 5 The valuation provided by 5 Geo. IV, Local, c. 118, 'An Act to provide for valuing the Houses situate in and near the City of Dublin, and for the more equal Payment of the Local Taxes there,' which received the royal assent on 17 June 1824.
- 6 It was not, but the provision concerning the police valuation apparently was.
- 7 A reference to section IX of 1 Vict. c. 25.
- 8 Unidentified.

## 2508

*From Archbishop Mac Hale*

Tuam, 27 February 1838

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have been favoured with your esteemed letter<sup>1</sup> regarding the *Dublin Review* and I entirely concur in your views as to the benefits of such a periodical. . . . It is unnecessary to say that I have been from the commencement a subscriber. . . .

So impressed have I been with the evils with which the present Poor Provision Bill<sup>2</sup> is fraught that, before the receipt of your respected letter, I published<sup>3</sup> that I coincided in your opposition to its details. I ventured, too, to express my surprise at the perseverance of the Government in pressing such a measure, with the consciousness of their dependence on the support of the Irish representatives and of the obnoxiousness of the measure to the feelings and the interests of the Irish people. They have not, it may be said, manifested this feeling by a corresponding number of petitions. The fact is, they tell us they are tired of petitioning. . . . The result of the ballot<sup>4</sup> has not escaped their notice and they

deplore that place has had the effect of making some [M.P.'s] vote against a measure essential to their protection. I wish I could be able to have your views on the tithe system<sup>5</sup> carried into effect so as to have the payment of Protestant clergy charged on the Consolidated Fund. I should hail such a measure as an excellent instalment since then we could securely calculate on the co-operation of England and Scotland in finally doing justice as far as regarded the Protestant Establishment.

There is another subject regarding the interests of our religion on which you may do incalculable service. It is for procuring a grant for the separate education of Catholic children. This is the subject and the only one of which the Catholic bishops of Ireland have expressed their solemn and unanimous approval. It must come to this at last. The lamented indisposition of Dr. Murray occasioned the adjournment of this question at our last meeting and prevented our adoption of any resolution on the subject. The present system is far from being popular, nay, many of the bishops are conscious it is full of danger. I know that separate education would not be relished at present by the government. I know, too, that many, with an erroneous feeling of liberality, cherish the plan of mixed education. I like religion to be as free as air which is the only true liberality, and the fate of the Archbishop of Cologne,<sup>6</sup> the injustice of which you have so eloquently denounced,<sup>7</sup> and which is the fruit of a plausible system of mixed education, can attest the benefits or evils of such a project.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 644-6

- 1 See letter 2504.
- 2 The poor law bill.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 On 15 February Grote's motion in favour of the ballot was defeated by 315 to 198. O'Connell did not speak in the debate, but he voted with Grote in the division (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIII, 280; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XL, 1131-1225).
- 5 See letter 2505 n3.
- 6 Clemens August von Droste zu Vischering (1773-1845), archbishop of Cologne 1836-42. See *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*.
- 7 The denunciation was made by O'Connell in a letter to the *Morning Chronicle* dated 28 November 1837 (*Pilot*, 4 Dec. 1837). In his letter O'Connell expresses approval of the archbishop of Cologne for his refusal to sanction marriages between Protestants and Catholics without a guarantee that the children of such marriages would be brought up in the Catholic Faith. O'Connell adds that the church 'wisely considers that sectarian animosities form a bad ingredient for domestic tranquillity and happiness.'

2509

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 28 February 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

You are all anxious to hear about me and my plan of future operations — at least, I take for granted that you are. I mean not you personally, but the good people generally.

You will have seen that the Tories have carried two votes against me, and have ordered me to be reprimanded by the Speaker.<sup>1</sup> That reprimand will be given this day. My decision, of course, is taken. I will repeat my words and let them send me to Newgate if they please. My own opinion is that they must commit me. I do not see how they can avoid it; it is quite clear that I cannot for one moment submit to retract or disavow one word. I said only the truth. Everybody knows I said nothing but the truth. Let what will come, my course is obvious.

I have no doubt that good, much good, will flow from my determination. The enormity of packed committees *must* be put an end to. The facts respecting these committees must come before the public in so distinct a manner as to make it impossible to continue the system longer. I care not one farthing for going to Newgate in such a cause. I suppose my committal will make a sensation amongst 'the wilds' of Ireland. It certainly will make a noise *here*. I may have acted wrong, which I do not believe, but I have acted with the coolest deliberation. It is ruinous to Ireland to have the representation left to a lottery. It is true that in two cases out of three the lottery has been in our favour, but we have lost Belfast<sup>2</sup> owing to the corrupt partiality of a Tory Committee. It really is too bad. Nobody else was taking means to abate the nuisance. I tried it in the House and failed. I therefore determined to try it out of the House in such a way as the Tories could not get over — that is, they could not avoid complaining of what I said.

Thus far we have proceeded. I believe it will be admitted that I have the moral courage to go through with the case until I have done all that men of my limited talent can do for ensuring its success. I laugh at myself for writing to you so much in the style of a martyr.

You *shall* hear again from me tomorrow.

[P.S.] See my excellent friend Cornelius Mac Loughlin and tell

him I will do the best I can for his friend, but he knows how slow and difficult any chance of success is.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 131-2

- 1 At a dinner to O'Connell by the friends of Ireland resident in England, in the Crown and Anchor Tavern, on 21 February 1838 (see letter 2489 n2), O'Connell declared that there was 'foul perjury in the Tory Committees of the House of Commons' and that eminent Tories, members of the government, were daily perjuring themselves on these committees. On 26 February Lord Maidstone moved in the Commons that O'Connell's speech constituted a breach of privilege. This motion was carried by 293 votes to 85. Maidstone then moved that O'Connell be reprimanded by the speaker, and this was passed on the following day by 226 to 197. On receiving the speaker's reprimand on 28 February, O'Connell declared he retracted nothing of what he had alleged, and declared he would move for a committee to investigate the validity of his assertions (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLI, 59-61; 99-187; 207-37; 263-70). O'Connell did not move for any committee. However, an act was passed in 1839 (2 & 3 Vict. c. 38) setting up a general election committee nominated by the speaker to arrange for the trial of controverted elections. For many decades prior to this act the committee for each controverted election was obtained by ballot and judgments were often partial (Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 134-5, 257).
- 2 As the result of an election petition the members returned for Belfast in the general election of 1837, Lord Belfast and James Gibson, were declared unseated on 8 March 1838.

2510

*To a Kinsman in Tralee*

London, 28 February 1838

My dear ———,

You all must be off for London without delay.<sup>1</sup> We will want: First, to authenticate the poll books.

Second, to identify the persons who tendered their votes with the persons registered; that is, to show that it was the same persons who registered that tendered their votes.

As to the first, we must bring over (first) the provost; (secondly) the provost's poll clerk; and (thirdly) the Clerk of the Peace in whose custody the poll books were deposited. But we must verify these books by the poll clerk. As to the second, we must identify every (?) voter whose name we seek to add to our poll, or to strike off *theirs*. For example, John Primrose tendered his vote. We must prove that he was the John Primrose who is registered who tendered his vote. It will be necessary to bring over our poll clerks for this purpose, and I fear Lynch<sup>2</sup> must come also. In

short, we must take care not to fail in point of form.

You must pay a viaticum of twelve pounds to each person who is to come over, that is, to the unwilling witnesses.

Write to me by return of the post and tell me how the fund — I mean the fund subscribed to the election — stands. Did S— pay in his subscription? I suppose not. Call peremptorily — that is as peremptorily as you can — on the subscribers. Get also an ‘attempt,’ if it be feasible, made to have an increased subscription. I suppose, however, that is vain and we should be only laughed at. We must bring over the valuator to show *our houses* of the full value and also the houses of our adversaries to be of *less* value. This I hope has been looked to.

I will write to you again tomorrow. Of course you will bring over any balance of the fund.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 133-4

- 1 A petition from O’Connell’s son Maurice against the return in the late general election of the Tory John Bateman for Tralee, was lodged on 23 November 1837. A committee, appointed to try this petition on 6 March 1838, declared on 12 March that Bateman had not been duly elected, and on 13 March the return was amended in favour of Maurice O’Connell.
- 2 George D. Lynch, attorney, Tralee.

2511

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 March 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

Object<sup>1</sup> to Palmer.<sup>2</sup> He is my personal and political enemy and is conducting very virulently another Tithe case<sup>3</sup> against me.

They all say here that my triumph<sup>4</sup> is complete. The Tories did not dare to meddle with me or they would have sent me to the Tower.

Not the least alteration of any importance in the Bill for Poor Laws. It will come out of the Committee as oppressive and useless as when it was first prepared.

The tithe question will be on next week. I believe the Government will announce it on Monday. There is to be a meeting at Lord John Russell’s at two that day for the purpose, I believe, of taking it into consideration. I will attend.



Tell Harnett<sup>5</sup> that I will be over at Easter and get my son Maurice's fortune, over £6,000.<sup>6</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 134.

- 1 That is, object to him as a witness before the Dublin city election committee (see letter 2457 n6).
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 O'Connell was at this time 'sorely pressed' in combatting legal proceedings against him for tithes. He held out against the court of exchequer proceedings (see letter 2342 n5) which were at this time being employed against tithe defaulters. The parson, he told the General Association, 'might sell the very bed from under him but he never would consent to pay a single farthing for tithes' Fagan, *O'Connell*, II, 535-6; see also, Lyne, 'General Association'. In April 1838, on hearing of the government's proposed tithe bill, O'Connell declared that, as a gesture of goodwill, he would at once pay off four years of tithe arrears (O'Connell to the Protestants of Ireland, 23 Apr. 1838, *Pilot*, 25 Apr. 1838).
- 4 See letter 2509 n1.
- 5 William Harnett, agent for the National Bank of Ireland in Dublin.
- 6 Presumably the dowry of Maurice's wife.

2512

*To the Earl of Winchilsea*

16 Pall Mall, London, 5 March 1838

My Lord,

...The Lord Bishop of Exeter<sup>1</sup> is reported by the newspapers and, in particular, in the *Morning Post* and *Morning Chronicle* to have quoted you, my Lord, as his authority for attributing to me<sup>2</sup> opinions and assertions, the exactitude of which I mean publicly to deny. . . . I solicit at your hands a reply to the two questions which I beg leave to address to you on the subject. . . . The first question is whether your lordship ever quoted the questions and answers specified by the Rt. Rev. Prelate? . . . The second question is, if the facts be answered affirmatively, upon what authority did you, my Lord, quote them? . . . It is right that I should add that I am not inquiring into anything that was said or done in the House of Lords. I appeal solely to the newspaper statements and my enquiries are limited exclusively to the document set out in these newspapers, purporting to be an examination I underwent. I solicit information merely as to whether that document was represented to your Lordship as genuine and, if so, by whom and in what manner. . . .

SOURCE: Fagan, O'Connell, I, 410-12

- 1 Henry Philpotts, D.D.
- 2 In the Lords on 1 March 1838 the bishop of Exeter quoted from an unspecified source, which he claimed to have accepted on the authority of the earl of Winchilsea, what purported to be evidence given by O'Connell on Catholic Emancipation at some time prior to the passing of that measure (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLI, 289-90).

2513

*From the Earl of Winchilsea*

Eastwell Park [Ashford, Kent], 6 March 1838

Sir,

. . . In answer to the first question which you have put to me, whether I ever quoted the questions and answers lately specified<sup>1</sup> by the Bishop of Exeter in the House of Lords . . . I beg to inform you that I certainly have upon different occasions, both in the House of Lords and elsewhere, publicly quoted them. In answer to your second question, upon what authority I quoted them, I have only to reply that I read them in the House of Lords out of a newspaper in which they had been inserted; stating at the same time, as they had received no contradiction from you, that I conceived them to be authentic. . . . I cannot bring back to my recollection positively at what time or in what paper the quotations appeared but I think either in the *Morning Post* or *New Times* and that they were founded on the evidence<sup>2</sup> given by you about the year 1825 on the subject of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill.

SOURCE: Fagan, O'Connell, I, 412

- 1 See letter 2512, n2.
- 2 In 1825 O'Connell gave evidence before select committees of the Lords and Commons on the state of Ireland. The evidence of the witnesses was published in the appropriate parliamentary papers.

2514

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 9 March 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

If I had written to you on Monday last I should have written in great despondency, if not despair. The Ministerial existence was at

stake. If they were defeated on the Canadian question they would at once have resigned. The defeat<sup>1</sup> of Ewart, by reason of the vile and virulent conduct of the Tory Radicals, gave the most decided encouragement to the Tory faction. The duke of Wellington declared that it was a symptom of reaction not to be mistaken and the entire party determined to try the chance of battle on Molesworth's motion.<sup>2</sup>

It was supposed that Molesworth would affect at least six members, thus giving the Tories by their votes a difference of twelve, or at all events bring down the anti-Tory force by six.

On Sunday and Monday the most sinister rumours were afloat even amongst the Ministerialists. I heard one gentleman, who knows much of the interior movements of the Whigs, say on Sunday that the majority only would be five at the utmost, probably three. This was indeed, discouraging. Judge then of the delight with which we hailed the division, giving the Ministry on their weakest point a majority of 29. In any event of the ensuing contested elections they must retain a majority, be the same more or less. This demonstrates that it is utterly impossible the Tories should form a Government without a dissolution. The Queen will not consent to a dissolution, neither would the party itself feel satisfied to undergo the expense and trouble of an election so soon again. I may thus pronounce the Ministry safe — quite safe; at all events they have another year of office without doubt or difficulty, and unless they commit some notable piece of folly towards their own supporters they have a clear prospect of many years of office. At all events they are secure for the remainder of the session. This is a great triumph.

The Irish members did their duty. They voted in the House 69 to 28, majority 41. Such is the decided support they have given the Administration. The Committee in the Tralee Election Petition<sup>3</sup> have unanimously overruled Assessor Hickson's<sup>4</sup> law.<sup>5</sup> The sitting member, Mr. Bateman,<sup>6</sup> franks for the last time today.

The report in Maurice's favour will be drawn up tomorrow. I hope he will take his seat on Monday. At all events he is member for Tralee. Hurrah!

The Tithe Bill<sup>7</sup> will be brought forward next week, and the fate of Dublin<sup>8</sup> be decided on Tuesday by the lottery of names. All is on the dice.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 135-6

1 In Liverpool, in the late general election.

2 On Tuesday, 6 March, Sir William Molesworth, a Radical, proposed a motion of censure on the colonial secretary, Lord Glenelg. To this

Lord Sandon proposed an amendment for the purpose of censuring the government itself. On the following day Molesworth withdrew his motion, and Sandon's amendment was proposed as a motion. It was defeated by 316 to 287 (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLI, 476-684).

3 See letter 2510 n1.

4 George Blake Hickson, eldest son of Robert Hickson, late of Tralee, deceased. Called to the bar 1819.

5 See letter 2450 n2.

6 John Bateman (1792-1863) Oak Park, Tralee and Dirreen Lodge, Castle-island, both Co. Kerry. Eldest son of Rowland Bateman; high sheriff Co. Kerry 1820. M.P. for Tralee 1837 but unseated on petition March 1838.

7 Morpeth did not introduce the government's tithe bill until 13 June.

8 On the decision of the Dublin city election committee.

2515

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 16 March 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

Yesterday the case<sup>1</sup> was opened. The statement was mild. No intimidation. No bribery. Nothing in the slightest degree harsh or virulent.

This morning they postponed the paving tax,<sup>2</sup> as their witnesses had not arrived, and they assailed more than 400 of my votes on the ground of defects in the affidavits of registry. They argued the points for three mortal hours. My counsel, Mr. Austen,<sup>3</sup> rose in reply and spoke for about a quarter of an hour when he was stopped by the Committee who decided, I believe unanimously, but, at all events decided in favour of the voters by overruling the objection. This, at all events, saves 400 voters.

The objection really was frivolous in the extreme and serves only to show the virulence and pertinacity with which I am assailed. I do not know what they are next to go on with.

They have risen for this day at a quarter to two, not being ready to go on with any other part of the case. I understand we had 608 votes in jeopardy. What would have become of us if we had had a Tory committee?

They *ought* not to persevere but they certainly will, to put me to expense.

They are fighting, according to the vulgar phrase, 'on velvet'. They have the bulk of the Spottiswoode money,<sup>4</sup> while I am left like a boat on the strand with the tide out.

No matter, God's will be done. I must battle to the last. If the paving tax be, as it ought, decided in my favour, *all* must be well.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 136-7

- 1 A reference to the sitting of the Dublin city election committee.
- 2 The payment of certain municipal taxes, including the paving tax, was necessary before a Dublin city elector was entitled to vote.
- 3 Charles Austin (1799-1874), second son of Jonathan Austin, of Creeting Mill, Suffolk. Called to the English bar 1827; Q.C. 1841; his success at the parliamentary bar was unprecedented. See *DNB*.
- 4 See letter 2472 n4.

## 2516

### *To the Earl of Winchilsea*

16 Pall Mall [London], 17 March 1838

My Lord,

. . . I owe it to myself and I think I also owe it to you, my Lord, to state that, although I had no doubt that the pretended extract of my evidence which you found in the newspapers mentioned by your Lordship, was a mere fabrication by the writers of those newspapers, yet I have taken the trouble of reading over the entire of my evidence before both Houses of Parliament and I can now solemnly pledge myself that the passage quoted by you is totally unfounded and that no evidence of mine could warrant the publication of that passage as genuine. You have therefore, I do assure you, my Lord, been deceived by the newspaper you quote; and perhaps you would permit me to say that my leaving the deception uncontradicted would be no proof of its truth as I have little inclination and less time to contradict the multitudinous false charges daily published in the newspapers against me. . . .

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 412-3

2517

*From the Earl of Winchilsea*

2 Hill St, 19 March 1838

Sir,

I was on the point of writing, when your letter reached me, to inform you, after a considerable search, I have discovered that the extracts of the evidence reported to have been given by you before the Parliamentary Committee in 1825 were inserted in the *Standard* newspaper of the fifth of February, 1833, accompanying the leading article of that day. I have since carefully perused the evidence given by you before the Committees of both Houses in that year, and I am bound in justice to you to state that the opinions attributed to you in the extracts referred to are not in any way borne out by the sentiments you then expressed. I have only to express my sincere regret that I have in any way been instrumental in misrepresenting any part of the evidence which you gave before the Committees in 1825. I shall be most ready to make you the only reparation in my power, by placing you right before the public on this point in any way most gratifying to your own feelings, either by contradicting it in my place in the House of Lords or by publishing the correspondence which has passed between us.

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 413-4

2518

*To the Earl of Winchilsea*

16 Pall Mall [London], 19 March 1838

My Lord,

I am bound to say, and I say it cheerfully, that nothing can be more candid or handsome than your Lordship's conduct on the subject of the fictitious extracts from my evidence in 1825. I therefore accept your offer of the publication<sup>1</sup> of our correspondence on the subject. I cannot conclude without once more tendering to your Lordship the expression of my thankfulness.

SOURCE: Fagan, *O'Connell*, I, 4141 The letters were published in the *Times* of 21 March 1838.

2519

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 22 March 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

Two most important decisions<sup>1</sup> in my favour this day. First, that no *default* arises until *demand* made of the paving tax. Second, that the paving tax of 1837 is *not* chargeable to the voters.

We lost one — a stupid fellow who owed the *entire* tax of 1836 — an isolated case, which does not furnish another to be regulated by it. A demand on him was proved. In short, though I do not shout victory, as I lost one, yet this day crowns everything bygone and renders the success of the petitioners impossible.

They are fighting out to put me to expense — nothing else, but I do hope tomorrow will bring them to a close. You may confidently promise victory.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 137

2520

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

26 March 1838

And we will plant a laurel tree  
And we will call it "Victory",  
Said the Shan Van Vocht.<sup>1</sup>

All over. Victory declared.<sup>2</sup> Report in. All over. Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah!!! In spite of old Holmes of the Northern Bar and all the Conservatives. Hurrah!

It is really delightful to have this matter over so satisfactorily. Miller<sup>3</sup> is a lucky fellow to have so cheap a seat for such a constituency. I am, blessed be God, lucky not to have more to pay; I mean, that the period of continuing to pay has ceased.

The Orangeists persevered as long as it was *safe* for them to do so. They struck this morning at eleven. We have had a most glorious *escape* from the Villains, as a Tory committee would, of course, have ruined me. As it is, I think one thousand pounds will cover all my expenses above the £300 I got from, or rather

through, Close. I cannot get one shilling of the anti-Spottiswoode money.<sup>4</sup> It is but little and the English Whigs swallow it all. But the outcry is great indeed. Besides, there never was a set of fellows so crestfallen as our adversaries. Their faces are as long as your arm; dismay and desolation are in their camp whilst joy and gladness prevail as of course amongst US.

No more bulletins but I will write to you about the advice of my wise and worthy friend.<sup>5</sup> It is not possible for me to do what he says with *consistency*; at least, such is my present opinion.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 138.

- 1 See letter 2093 n1.
- 2 On 26 March the Dublin city election committee declared O'Connell and Hutton duly elected.
- 3 This is obviously meant to be Hutton. In O'Connell's handwriting the names Hutton and Miller could quite easily be mistaken.
- 4 At a meeting in London on 4 January 1838, arrangements were made to raise money throughout Briatin to counter the Spottiswoode petitions (*FJ*, 15 Jan. 1838). A thousand pounds was raised within a fortnight (*FJ*, 18 Jan. 1838).
- 5 Unidentified.

2521

To R. Tighe<sup>1</sup>

London, 28 March 1838

My dear Tighe,

There has been strong impeachment of you by Courtney<sup>2</sup> and a witness called Gardiner.<sup>3</sup> I think you ought to be here. I will send you the evidence as soon as I can. In fact Longford is a good deal abandoned by all but *cross-examination*.<sup>4</sup>

The Committee will adjourn until after Easter. I will let you know *the time* to which we adjourn and send you a summons to attend.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 Robert Tighe (born 1806), 14 Fitzwilliam Square, N., Dublin, son of Robert Tighe and a native of Co. Westmeath; assistant-barrister for Co. Longford from 1838.
- 2 Thomas Courtney, attorney, 1 Upper Pembroke Street, Dublin. He attended registration sessions of Longford since before 1832.
- 3 George Gardiner, Barry, Co. Longford, a schoolmaster and surveyor.
- 4 In the investigation by the select committee into fictitious and improper votes in Ireland which had been set up by the Commons on 28 November 1837 of which O'Connell and Morgan John O'Connell were members.



2522

*From Josiah Conder*<sup>1</sup>

4 April 1838

Will Mr. O'Connell have the goodness to *support* the second resolution<sup>2</sup> after it has been moved and seconded? This will give him an opportunity of speaking earlier than if he moved a subsequent resolution. Or would he prefer to move a distinct resolution?

SOURCE: Library of Religious Society of Friends in Ireland.

- 1 Josiah Conder (1789-1855), bookseller and author; edited the *Eclectic Review* 1814-37, the *Patriot* 1832-55, non-conformist periodicals. See *DNB*.
- 2 This note was written by Conder and handed to O'Connell on the platform in Exeter Hall, London, 4 April 1838. The occasion was a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society. O'Connell did not propose or second any resolution but made a long speech calling for more vigorous agitation of the anti-slavery cause (*FJ*, Apr 1838).

2523

*To Josiah Conder*

[4 April 1838]

I am in *your* hands. I *think* I had better *wait a while* but do with me as you deem best.

SOURCE: Library of Religious Society of Friends in Ireland.

2524

*To Joseph Sturge*<sup>1</sup>

[c. 10 April 1838]

[Extract]

What ineffable delight it must afford you, my esteemed friend, to reflect that your exertions have created a flame before which the chains of two years' slavery of half a million, at the lowest calculation, of your fellowmen have melted away!<sup>2</sup> But for your

exertions the two years more of apprenticeship would certainly be inflicted; and every hour of these two years would become more and more aggravated in cruelty. If you had remained at home,<sup>3</sup> it is perfectly clear, clear beyond any doubt, that these two years would have continued without remission. This is, indeed, a proud thought for you, and, in spite of any shrinking from praise, all good men on earth will thank you, and may our gracious God reward you with eternal happiness, is my fervent prayer.

SOURCE: Hobhouse, *Sturge*, 43-4

- 1 Joseph Sturge (1793-1859), prominent Quaker, philanthropist and opponent of slavery. See *DNB*.
- 2 A reference to the slavery abolition act amendment bill which passed the Commons on 9 April and received the royal assent on 11 April as 1 & 2 Vict. c. 3.
- 3 In 1836 Sturge and Thomas Harvey had visited the West Indies to examine the condition of the Negroes. They published a journal of their visit (*The West Indies in 1837 ...*, London, 1838).

2525

*From Joseph Sturge*

Birmingham, 13 April 1838

Dear Friend,

I received yesterday a letter from Sir Dudley Hill<sup>1</sup> with a few lines written upon it from thee. I have briefly replied to it today. I was the bearer from the West Indies of certain written charges against Sir D. Hill made by Dr. Robinson.<sup>2</sup> I sent them to the Colonial Office and gave up my authority. A copy of a letter from Lord Glenelg to Sir D. Hill was sent to me from which it appeared that an enquiry was to be instituted but if I were to publish it would show that Lord Glenelg had prejudged the case and I consider I have nothing to do personally with the case or with the proof or disproof of the facts and, indeed, the Colonial Office have not thought it worth while to inform me of the decision of the referee. A copy of the evidence has however been sent here from St. Lucia and I should be glad to send it to thee to read over and judge if the publication of it would be likely to serve Sir D. Hill. From the very constitution of the tribunal (however high the personal character of the referee), a decision in favour of the accused would not of itself have much weight with the British public.

I should be obliged by thy opinion whether thy motion<sup>3</sup> for

the liberation of the female Negroes on the 1st of August should come on before Sir J.E.E. Wilmot's<sup>4</sup> on the immediate liberation of the *whole*.<sup>5</sup> The latter coming first would perhaps be most likely to serve the cause of the Negro as in case of the failure of Sir J.E.E. Wilmot's motion all those who voted for it would be almost obliged in consistency to vote for thine.

We are getting rather sanguine of success but it greatly grieves me that we should be indebted to the Tories for it. I earnestly hope the Irish members who were absent and some of those at least who voted against us<sup>6</sup> will support us next time. The ministers cannot I think remain in long and those Irish M.P.s who think the cause of freedom to the Negro is not identified with the cause of freedom to their long oppressed countrymen will I am persuaded find themselves in error.

[P.S.] Art thou likely to remain in town during the recess?

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Sir Dudley St. Leger Hill (1790-1851), born Co. Carlow. Appointed governor of St. Lucia in 1834 and returned home in 1838, for his second marriage. See *DNB*.
- 2 A medical doctor and a member of the council of St. Lucia.
- 3 On a debate on the slavery abolition act amendment bill on 6 April O'Connell announced his intention of moving that the final emancipation of female Negroes should take place on the following 1 August.
- 4 Sir John Eardley Eardley Wilmot, first baronet (1783-1847), M.P. for N. Warwickshire 1832-43.
- 5 On 22 May Wilmot carried a resolution by 96 to 93 in favour of immediate abolition of slavery. Wilmot, however, failed to use this resolution to any purpose, and on 28 May it was virtually rescinded by a motion of Sir George Grey carried by 250 to 173 (*Annual Register*, 1838, 95-6).
- 6 In the division on the motion of Sir George Strickland on 30 March, in favour of abolishing Negro apprenticeship in the British colonies on 1 August 1838. The motion was defeated by 269 to 205. O'Connell and 32 other Irish members supported Strickland's motion, but 40 Irish members voted against it (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLII, 41-107; 156-261; *FJ*, 3 Apr. 1838).

2526

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 14 April 1838

My very respected Lord,

I need not tell you with what a deep interest and profound respect I have followed your Grace's exposition<sup>1</sup> of the present

system of national education. I pretend not to decide but I do know that vigilance was never misplaced whilst "the wolf is on his walk."

I have now to implore your Grace to read the *Pilot* of Monday before you form your decided opinion on the new tithe plan. You will find in it my view of Lord John Russell's tithe resolutions.<sup>2</sup> They contain much I dislike but also have a smack of better principle and of more easy application of *future* remedy than the present system. . . .

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 646

- 1 MacHale to Russell, 12, 22 February, 12 March, 7 April 1838 (*DEP*, 13, 24 Feb., 20 Mar. 1838; *FJ*, 11 April 1838). The letters comprise a statement of the Catholic claim to separate education and a denunciation of the government scheme of national non-denominational education.
- 2 Ten resolutions which Russell on 22 March informed the Commons he proposed to move when the question of Irish tithes should be brought forward (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLI, 1318). O'Connell's opinion of Russell's resolutions appeared in the *Pilot* of 25 April in a public letter dated 23 April 1838, to 'The Protestants of Ireland of the Established Church'.

2527

*From Rev. John Connell*<sup>1</sup>

Royal Hospital [Dublin], 21 April 1838

Dear Sir,

You will I trust pardon me as the son of an old friend, Col. Connell<sup>2</sup> of the Co. Limerick militia, the liberty I took in calling on you yesterday. . . .

The anxious object of my visit was to draw your attention more immediately to the present state of the Royal Hospital<sup>3</sup> which now appears in as much danger from false friends as undisguised enemies.

. . . If any of the abuses charged against its administration do exist, they are as nothing in comparison to the cruel and unjust exclusion of the poor worn out old Irish soldiers, against whom no matter how covered with wounds or recommended by service, the gates remain closed from session to session and from year to year, without a single valid or satisfactory excuse.

No matter who is guilty, the punishment falls entirely upon the injured and innocent veteran, and I firmly believe, without your powerful interference, so far from obtaining redress, that this ancient, hereditary home and glorious monument of bygone days,

will follow the fate of every other national establishment and be gradually, silently and surely swept away.

Encouraged by the few words you did me the honour of addressing at Lord Mulgrave's when discussing Carew O'Dwyer's successful battle<sup>4</sup> in its defence, I as well as others feel strong in hope that you will never permit the unnecessary and ruthless destruction of *the old man's house*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Chaplain, Royal Hospital, Kilmainham, Dublin 1838-50.
- 2 John A. Connell, a member of the Co. Limerick militia from 1796-1810. Promoted lieutenant-colonel 16 June 1809.
- 3 The Royal Hospital, Kilmainham, an institution for aged and disabled soldiers, the Irish equivalent of the Chelsea Hospital.
- 4 In 1834 Edward Ellice, secretary at war, obtained the government's approval for closing Kilmainham on economy grounds and transferring its disabled inmates to Dublin hospitals and its other inmates to Chelsea Hospital. The proposal met with opposition from Irish M.P.'s of all parties, including O'Connell and O'Dwyer; the latter pursued the matter until on 24 June Ellice stated that the plan had been abandoned (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, 619-21, 1361, 1450-2, 2422).

## 2528

*From W. Shaw Mason,<sup>1</sup> Camden Street, Dublin 21 April 1838.*

Thanks O'Connell for enabling him to establish his compensation claims at the Treasury.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Shaw Mason (1774-1853), 54 Camden Street, Dublin. Author of *A Statistical Account or Parochial Survey of Ireland*, (3 vols.) 1814-9, and several other works. See *DNB*.

## 2529

*To Archbishop Slattery*

London 26 April 1838

My respected Lord,

I cannot perhaps give a stronger proof of the unhappy position in which I am placed by the constant recurrence of increasing business than in the fact that it has prevented me from sooner replying to the letter of your Grace, the letter of one, for whose personal character as well as venerable station, I entertain so sincere a respect.

I trust this will be deemed as I entreat it may be deemed by your Grace, a sufficient apology.

The case you mention is a melancholy one but I fear it is without remedy. A marriage by any clergyman save by a Catholic is valid between two Protestants or between a Catholic and a Protestant. The marriage law in Ireland is in a great state of laxity. The only clergyman prohibited from celebrating a valid marriage except between two Catholics is a Catholic priest. All other clergymen may marry, that is celebrate a legal marriage between any two. But marriages under twenty-one, when the party under age has property, may under peculiar circumstances be rendered void by the Ecclesiastical Court. An advocate of that court, which I am not, would be the best person to consult in the case of minority property and special circumstances such as fraud or circumvention.

I return from suggesting the possibility of a remedy to the melancholy fact that unless the clergyman were a Catholic, that is, free from apostacy, the marriage mentioned by your Grace is in its nature valid.

SOURCE : Cashel Diocesan Archives

2530

*From Archbishop MacHale*

Tuam [Co. Galway] 26 April 1838

My dear Mr O'Connell,

I waited for the appearance of your promised letter on the tithes<sup>1</sup> before I should acknowledge your favour of the 14th, directing my attention to that exposition.

It cannot be denied that the bill falls far short of what the Ministry was pledged to and the people of Ireland expected. It has no appropriation clause. It does not reduce one of the supernumary parsons even where a single Protestant is not found. Nor does it, out of the proposed reduction of thirty per cent., if I understand the resolutions correctly, give any advantage to the occupying tenantry. As for the surplus to be applied to the purposes of education, I must frankly own that, if he meant to apply it as the funds in management of this education board,<sup>2</sup> it would be a curse rather than a blessing. I am delighted that you have turned your attention to the bearings and workings of the present plan. . . . Now, one thing is certain, that an anti-Catholic Government is

labouring to upset an essential principle and to usurp the right of inculcating religious doctrine through books and masters of their own exclusive selection. I could be silent for ever on Repeal or even the tithe system with all its baneful appendages but when I see a government requiring a compromise and surrender of religion as the condition of its support, so much so, that I have known high ecclesiastics, otherwise pious, to own that they are silent from a fear of embarrassing the Ministry, I cannot comprehend any reason for justifying such expediency. . . . The greater number of the present members of the board are rank infidels. The books which they put into the hands of children are calculated to unsettle their belief or, at least, to diminish their reverence for the faith of their fathers; and by the entire system it is intended, as is acknowledged by a competent authority (Mr. A.R. Blake), to place the religious education of the Catholics in the hands of the Crown. Now, setting religion aside, you can best estimate the consequence of such a prospect in the abridgment of the liberties of the people. By a timely interference the Irish members may prevent much angry discussion which must eventually terminate in the correction of any plan by which the Government would attempt to interfere with the legitimate authority of the pastors or the religious liberty of the people. You know well the unconquerable attachment of all classes to their faith. As long as I live, I shall not cease to expose and denounce any attempt to interfere with that faith; and the more they try to silence me, the louder will be my remonstrance for we must have complete religious freedom.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 646-8

1 See letter 2526 n2.

2 The Board of National Education.

2531

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 4 May 1838

*Private*

I am delighted to tell you the Ministry is *safe*. I was yesterday in great alarm because I knew they were *most weak* on the subject of the English Church. It was, in fact, their trying question.<sup>1</sup> Last year we were brought to the water's edge by this very subject. Our majority on this very topic, in a Parliament in which the Ministers were on other subjects stronger in number than they

are in this, was only five last year. This year it is *eleven* – more than twice the majority we had last year. There will not be half so dangerous a question during the entire session. In fact, there *cannot*, because on this all of English bigotry was roused into action, aided by Scotch. You may therefore reckon with certainty that the present ministry will have all the coronation<sup>2</sup> patronage, and without any difficulty another year of office. This, after all, is cheering for Ireland, as it leaves with us Lord Mulgrave and gives us another winter *to kill* our worthless judges. They will stick fast as long as they can, the vagabonds!!

I cannot express to you how much I feared the fate of last night. I was bid not to fear but still I would have given a large sum to ensure such a victory as we have obtained, blessed be God! It is almost fantastical to have the fate of Ireland depend on the vile passions of English Churchmen. What an argument for the Repeal!

The Hull election Committee is just over. Two Tories unseated, two Reformers seated;<sup>3</sup> difference on a division, *four*. On the whole, the election committees have added to our majority. So much for the Spottiswoode conspiracy.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 138-9

- 1 On 3 May 1838 Russell moved that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the mode of granting and renewing leases of landed and other property of the Established Church in England and Wales, with a view to improving its management. Russell's motion was carried by 277 to 241 while a hostile amendment by Henry Thomas Liddell was rejected by 265 to 254 (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1838, 3717-56).
- 2 Victoria's coronation took place on 28 June 1838.
- 3 O'Connell was partly mistaken. On 7 May the committee declared only one (William Wilberforce) of the sitting members unseated and substituted for him William Hutt.

2532

*To John Primrose, Jr.*

London, 4 May 1838

My dear John,

. . . I have not yet heard from Galloway<sup>1</sup> about Polls [?Potts] but the matter looks very badly on *his* part. I will in a few days write again on the subject. If he can be *made out* he shall.

I am told my scoundrel huntsmen have allowed my dogs to be covered with mange. Will you at your earliest convenience go to Derrynane and see them or get them brought to you. Get them



cured if the fact be that they are diseased. Let me know how the two last English dogs thrive.

The Ministry are quite safe for the present year. We had last night *the trying* division,<sup>2</sup> the most trying of all. Last year on this subject we had but a majority of five — this year with a new parliament we have a majority of eleven.

Give my sincerest love to Rickarda and your babes.

Write to *all* my parsons, asking them to stop proceedings at law<sup>3</sup> as I was ready to settle with them for the past, in the hope that the tithe question may be settled this session. Do not charge the tenants tithes save those who have leases.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Alexander Galloway, 19-21, West Street, Smithfield, London, engineer. Political reformer and radical.
- 2 See letter 2531 nl.
- 3 See letter 2511 n3.

2533

To Charles Dolman,<sup>1</sup> *New Bond St., Middlesex*

16 Pall Mall [London], 5 May 1838

*Private*

My dear Sir,

I insisted on the article of 'Novels'<sup>2</sup> being paid at thirty guineas only because I was resolved that it should not cost the work one shilling. I therefore send you a cheque for 30 guineas so that you may strike out of the account your draft and enter the article as a free article.

SOURCE: Property of Rev. W. O'Connor, P.P.

- 1 Charles Dolman (1807-1863), 61 New Bond Street, London, bookseller and publisher. Publisher of the *Dublin Review* with his uncle, J. Booker in 1838. Sole publisher of the *Dublin Review* 1838-45. See *DNB*.
- 2 The article referred to may be either 'Irish Novels and Irish Novelists' (article X) published in the *Dublin Review*, April 1838, or 'Controversial Novels', (article X) in the October 1838 issue. The first, and probably the second article, was written by O'Connell's daughter, Ellen Fitz-Simon ('The Early Dublin Reviewers', *Irish Monthly*, XXI, (1893), 83).

2534

*To Sir Augustus D'Este*<sup>1</sup>

16 Pall Mall [London] 10 May 1838

Mr O'Connell presents his compliments to H.R.H. [the Duke of Sussex] and begs to apologise for not having been able to have the honour of waiting on him sooner but Mr O'Connell is so pressed by public duties that he cannot for some days to come leave home before the hours which require his presence in the House of Commons but should his R.H. be passing in this neighbourhood any morning about 11 Mr O'Connell would be proud of the honour of receiving his commands.

SOURCE: Wilde Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 43,728, f.26

- 1 Sir Augustus Frederick D'Este (1794-1848), only son of the duke of Sussex by an illegal marriage. See *DNB*.

2535

*To Lord Melbourne*

16 Pall Mall [London] 10 May 1838

[extract] [possibly virtually the whole letter]

If I could take the liberty of marking this letter 'Private' I should do so, simply because I write without the avowed sanction of any other Irish member. I, however, have so extensive and so intimate a knowledge of the wishes and the opinions of the Irish people that I can venture without hesitation to pledge myself to this — that, even should the House of Commons reject Lord John Russell's resolutions,<sup>1</sup> it would be desired and indeed expected that the present Ministry should not consider that defeat final as to their power, so as to deprive Ireland of the practical and most useful protection that country enjoys by the impartial administration of the existing laws.

I hope you, my Lord, will not deem me presumptuous in the necessary suggestion which this statement of fact implies. I believe that the highest proof a British statesman can give of political sagacity is the determination to take every step in his power to make Ireland an efficient and useful portion of the Empire, by conciliating her people to the British rule. Few know how deep has been

and still is the conviction of the Irish people that the dominion of England works only for mischief. Your Ministry is the first to lessen that conviction and it only requires time and a perseverance in the present course to obliterate it for ever.

This letter requires no reply. It is even better that it should be unanswered.

But I feel it a duty to claim for Ireland from the present Administration the sacrifice of some proud feelings if that be necessary in order to continue their protection to Ireland.

SOURCE: Sanders, *Melbourne's Papers*, 372

1 See letter 2526 n2.

2536

*To Sir Robert Peel*

16 Pall Mall [London] 17 May 1838

Mr O'Connell presents his compliments to Sir Robert Peel and will be very much obliged if Sir Robert will have the goodness to inform him of the date of the document purporting to be written by Mr O'Connell and quoted by Sir Robert Peel in the recent debate.<sup>1</sup> The date was not mentioned in that debate or Mr. O'Connell would not give this trouble.

SOURCE: Peel Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 40,425, f. 88

1 On 14 May Russell moved for a committee to consider the resolutions (see letter 2526 n2) on which it was proposed to base the new tithe bill. In the course of the debate that followed Peel on 15 May taunted O'Connell with denying at the moment any desire on the part of the Catholics of Ireland to share in the property of the Established Church, while having formerly (and he quoted) counselled the government to 'give the glebes to the value of £300 per annum as the pay of the clergy of the great and overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland' (*Hansard*, LXII, 1325-7).

2537

*From Sir Robert Peel*

Thursday evening [17 May 1838] Whitehall [London]

Sir Robert Peel presents his compliments to Mr O'Connell and begs leave to acquaint him that while Mr O'Connell was speaking on Tuesday evening and just before Sir Robert Peel rose, the enclosed was put into his hands. . . .

. . . Should there have been any mistake in attributing to Mr O'Connell the expression quoted, Sir Robert Peel will sincerely regret it and do anything in his power to repair it.

SOURCE: Peel Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 40,425, ff. 89-90

2538

*To Alex Galloway, West St., Smithfield [London]*

16 Pall Mall [London] 17 May 1838

My dear friend,

Kindly excuse me for not sooner answering your friendly and obliging letters. Be assured that I have not one friend living for whom I would do more than for you. But it is quite *out of my power* to make the request you suggest on behalf of Mr. Walker.<sup>1</sup> When I see you I will tell you why.

I am most sincerely sorry I cannot accept Alderman Harmer's<sup>2</sup> kind invitation. If I had time disengaged I would gladly avail myself of it but the truth is that the only day in this week I have to spare is bespoke so far in advance as to preclude the possibility of my naming a suitable time to enjoy the patriotic Alderman's hospitality,

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 11489

1 Unidentified.

2 James Harmer (1777-1853) alderman of London 1833-40. See *DNB*.

2539

*To Sir Robert Peel*

16 Pall Mall [London] 18 May 1838

[Thanks Peel for his reply.] I return the portion of the newspaper which you were so good as to enclose to me. No person could possibly suppose that you would make any use of a document which you could suspect to be either fictitious or garbled. I need not therefore repudiate any such idea. [He asks that Peel let him know the date or give him some other means of identifying the letter he is alleged to have written. He thinks he wrote some such statement in favour of a connection between the Roman Catholic Church and the State but considers it has been quoted out of context.]

SOURCE: Peel Papers, British Museum, Add. MSS 40,425, ff. 91-2

2540

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 18 May 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am glad to tell you that the Ministry never appeared more secure. The defeat on Ackland's<sup>1</sup> motion<sup>2</sup> was indeed a triumph. We had (I speak not of myself) all the best of the debate. And when it is recollected that the Tories *artfully* mustered for the dinner to Peel,<sup>3</sup> their not being able, after all, and with the greatest *whipping*, to produce within nineteen of us, it shows that they cannot possibly *govern the country*. Recollect *that* is the hitch. THEY cannot possibly govern with this parliament and there is no possibility of a dissolution. The Queen is decidedly with us and the movements in Belgium, or rather towards Belgium, give to the Queen's uncle<sup>4</sup> so deep a personal interest in the continuation of the present Ministry, and above all in the exclusion of the Tories, that her Ministry are strong in court favour.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 140

1 *Recte* Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, tenth baronet (1787-1871); M.P. Devon 1812-18, 1820-31; for North Devon 1837-57. Leader of the religious party in the House of Commons. See *Boase*.

- 2 See letter 2536 nl. In this debate on Irish tithes Sir Thomas Acland proposed an amendment in opposition to Russell's motion. The amendment was defeated by 317 votes to 298.
- 3 Peel was entertained to dinner on 12 May in the Merchant Tailor's Hall by over 300 Conservative M.P.'s (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 379).
- 4 Leopold I (1790-1865), elected king of the Belgians 4 June 1831. Uncle of both Queen Victoria and her future husband.

## 2541

*From Sir Robert Peel, Whitehall [London], 19 May [1838]*

States that he has now had sent to him the Irish newspaper which is dated 3 August 1836 and which contains O'Connell's letter: it is addressed 'To the People of Great Britain'.<sup>1</sup> Peel adds that he will send O'Connell the newspaper if he has difficulty in procuring a copy.

SOURCE: Peel Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 40,425, ff. 93-4

- 1 See letters 2536, 2537. The letter in question, O'Connell to the People of Great Britain, is undated in the *Pilot* of 27 July 1836. It details the grievances of tithe payers in the parishes of Kilcrohane and Templenoe, Co. Kerry. O'Connell concludes his letter 'Would you tranquillise Ireland, follow up this plan: give the glebes to the value of £300 per annum to the pastors of the great and overwhelming majority of the people of these parishes.' See letters 1597 and 2072.

## 2542

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 June 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

You tell me that the grocers retailing spirits are angry with me under an impression that I withheld my assistance from them.<sup>1</sup> Be it so. I cannot help them. There never yet were men more unjust, or perhaps more likely to persevere because they are unjust. Now I will tell you the fact, that I never in my life was so anxious upon any matter of detail as I was, and am, upon that subject. So far from neglecting them, I actually saw Spring Rice three times and Lord Morpeth as often, upon the subject, besides *occasional* con-

versations: *these* were regular appointments. I have done all I could by argument, entreaty, and any influence I could use. I declare to you solemnly that I never took so much trouble as I did with this affair and that as well out of abhorrence for the manner Lord Morpeth allowed us to be tricked as from conviction of the injustice done the Grocers. Rice is with us, Morpeth against us, upon the report of the Poor Law Commissioners<sup>2</sup> and volumes of cant from other quarters. Notwithstanding the shameful *disregard* of my efforts by the Grocers, I will continue my efforts to the last. If I had no better motive than my regard for FitzPatrick<sup>3</sup> I would be active. It is true I could not see the deputation<sup>4</sup> as often as they wished, but I repeat I never was so hearty in any cause as in theirs. I have also incurred the blame of many friends of mine amongst the members for my zeal for the Grocers. Thus the world goes, and these things would soon drive me from politics but that every day convinces me *we must repeal*. There is nothing else for it; everything else is trifling and childish. I will not ask anything for any son of mine. I hate the idea — God forgive me! — but I am heartsore at many disappointments. Yet I *live for the Repeal*. The enmity to the Union was my first effort, it will be my last; and, idle as it may seem, I *do* hope for success.

I have written to Ray about the new franchise proposed by Peel. The newspapers give no idea of the battle I made.<sup>5</sup> No matter, agitation is absolutely necessary. I have been promised assistance from the Liberals of Liverpool. My letter to Ray explains the Peel project in all its details.

[P.S.] I see by the tone of your letters that my heyday of popularity is gone by, blessed by God!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 141-2

- 1 The grocers were at this time agitating against the retail spirits act of 1836 (see letter 2338). A bill to suspend the operation of that act was introduced to the Commons on 20/21 July 1838. It was passed by the Commons on 10 August but not proceeded with in the Lords probably owing to the lateness of the session.
- 2 In 1833 the government appointed a commission on Irish poor laws including the Protestant and Catholic archbishops of Dublin. Its report, which appeared in the spring of 1836, was unfavourable to the application to Ireland of a poor law on the English model. The government, however, rejected the commission's report in favour of one by George Nicholls, a commissioner of the English Poor Law, who recommended in November 1836 the extension to Ireland of a poor law on the English model. Morpeth favoured Nicholls's report but Spring Rice disliked it. (see O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 552-7; Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 211-16).
- 3 William Fitzpatrick, 23 Dame Street, Dublin, grocer and wine merchant. He died on 28 November 1877, aged 103.

- 4 A deputation from the Irish grocers, consisting of two members — Maurice Redmond and John McKenna — had gone to London to endeavour to procure from Lord Morpeth the suspension for a further year of the clause in the act of 1836 prohibiting retailing of spirits by grocers (*Pilot*, 6 June 1838).
- 5 On 29 May on the committee stage of the Irish municipal reform bill Peel proposed that eleven of the largest towns in Ireland should have corporations elected on a franchise of £10 rateable valuation under the poor law, and that in smaller towns a majority of such electors should apply to the lord lieutenant for a charter of incorporation. Russell was prepared to accept all of these proposals, but under strong pressure from Sheil and O'Connell he stood out for a £5 franchise for the towns in schedule B and carried the issue with Irish support on 11 June by only 20 votes — 286 to 266 (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 254; *Annual Register*, 1838, 127-9).

2543

*To Viscount Morpeth*

16 Pall Mall [London], 10 June 1838

My Lord,

Accept my very sincere thanks for the trouble you have taken to communicate to me the determination of the Government<sup>1</sup> on the subject of the municipal franchise. I am deeply indebted to your Lordship. In plain truth you have given a new character to the office you fill. That kind courtesy with which you execute its duties takes away from disappointment all its harshness and makes resentment utterly impossible.

But I am disappointed, deeply, bitterly disappointed. You would probably smile if I were to tell you how it has unmanned me almost to woman's weakness. The scant Tithe Bill<sup>2</sup> and the utter exclusion of the popular voice from municipal corporations will fill the Irish people with a sentiment bordering on despair. They will declare themselves betrayed and the attempt to conciliate enemies by giving up friends, sincere suffering friends, will make only one more event in Irish history concluding as all others in bitterness and sorrow.

The compromise of taking £8 as the rate is only going over to the enemy when three-fifths of the difference are conceded — from £5 to £8. The remaining two will be required by Peel and of course conceded if not in the Commons at least in the Lords. Indeed the entire argument, everything of logic, is given up by going up to £8. If £8, why not ten? The franchise is a ten pound franchise, it will be said. It is absurd, it will be added, to stop at eight.



The £5 rate had this advantage and this argument to support it, that it identified the Irish with the English Bill. In the English Bill the qualification in point of property is 'being rated to the poor'. These words would make the £5 rate in Ireland identical because the £5 is to be the lowest rate in that country. This made me consent to the clause, suddenly and without previous notice, proposed by Lord John Russell. Otherwise I never should or could consent. The very words of the English Bill would answer our purpose.

The rating to the poor is in truth a complicated and overpaid test. It will almost annihilate the franchise in Dublin and at £8 render it quite exclusive. I had documents to prove this which I have sent to Lord Mulgrave and will get back tomorrow. I will get more information from Dublin tomorrow, and I exceedingly regret that my earnest entreaties for a conference with the Irish legal advisers have not been complied with. I could demonstrate the mischiefs to arise in Dublin from the plan but it was not thought fit to allow me that conference, and the Government have decided without condescending to give a hearing to the representative of the people of Dublin where their rights are so materially concerned.

The population of Dublin is 265,316 or rather was in 1831 according to the population return — 265,316 — taking them still at the same. There are not so many as 4,000 parliamentary electors, taking them at *that* which is the highest number *available*. In other words the parliamentary constituency is less than 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ % of the entire population. Take the poor rate at £8 and you will have a corporate constituency not amounting to 1500 upon a population of 265,000!!!

The Government call for no explanation of these facts and indeed refuse or rather decline to receive the explanation which the representative of that city is ready to give. I offer the outline to your Lordship in discharge of a painful duty. It is this, *first*, the number of taxes paid by the citizens of Dublin is great. Therefore a pecuniary difficulty to pay such a large sum exists. Have the registration small and the number *fit* to poll at an election smaller still. *Second*, the amount of many of the taxes vary annually. Ignorance of how much is to be paid prevents the payment in time to register. *Third*, the collectors are changed so often that the elector does not know to whom he is to pay many of the taxes. This ignorance again prevents the payment of the taxes in time to register. *Fourth*, the collectors, when sought after and known, *keep out of the way as the time of registry approaches* and thus multitudes are prevented from registering. *Fifth*, the collectors, when found, frequently refuse under various pretexts to receive

the taxes; such as their books are with the treasurer; they have no stamped receipts; the books are at the stamp office being stamped; and various other excuses some of which they can easily contrive to make true. . . . *Sixth*, in most cases amongst the middle and humbler classes of society the taxes are by contract sometimes written, many times only verbal, payable by the landlord, and the Tory landlords take care not to pay until after the time of registry. *Seventh*, if the tenant makes a voluntary payment of taxes payable by his landlord which some tenants do in order to enable themselves to register, the landlord need not repay. There is no legal remedy when one man *voluntarily* pays money for another. *Eighth*, if the tax collectors were to distrain or threaten to distrain the tenant, he could *then* pay the taxes and recover them from his landlord but the collectors are in collusion with the landlords and never threaten to distrain till the time for registry is over. *Ninth*, there are several houses built on what was formerly and even recently a single tenement. The taxes are rated still as on a single tenement. In general in such cases the taxes of the entire tenement are by contract made payable by one of the householders only. This is manifestly the most convenient mode of letting such houses. In every such case, if the householder of *right* chargeable with taxes does not pay them, all the other householders cannot register. *Tenth*, there are parts of Dublin in which the liability to pay certain taxes is disputed yet they are annually assessed though not levied. In these districts nobody can register. *At the last registry we lost 150 electors in one district on this account alone.*

I know how wrong it is to trouble your Lordship with these and similar details. . . . Is there not Sherrard's valuation, as it is called, made under a Tory Act of Parliament, 5 Geo. IV c. 118,<sup>3</sup> by Tory commissioners, giving the specific value of every house in Dublin? Why is not that valuation taken as the criterion of value in the corporate as it is in the parliamentary franchise? With that Tory, detailed, elaborate valuation what occasion in Dublin to resort to poor rates or to anything else for the value of the houses? . . .

Even with the best intentions on the part of the Government nothing happens to us as it happens to the rest of the empire. As the servant, the hired servant of the Irish people I claim the privilege of complaint. . . .

Dublin is, I see, fated to pass from one servitude to another, and the second state will be worse than the first in insolent domination of the faction who hate you more if possible than they hate me. . . . The Grocers of Dublin and indeed generally in Ire-

land are most materially injured<sup>4</sup> by the management of the Recorder. . . . I perhaps feel this more acutely because the entire blame is attributed to me, and it finds a place here because it is one of the ingredients which will embitter the discontent of the citizens of Dublin at the mockery of reform with which they are threatened. . . .

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 See letter 2542 n5.
- 2 On 18 May Russell, in response to Tory pressure, agreed to drop the appropriation clause from the proposed Irish tithe bill. The statement of intention satisfied Peel, and was accepted by O'Connell (O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 525).
- 3 See letter 2507 n5.
- 4 See letter 2338 n2.

2544

*To Pierce Mahony*

London 13 June 1838

My dear Mahony,

You may be certain that the moment I hear either from Lord John Russell or Lord Duncannon I will write to you. I have spoken of you to each of them in the strong terms you deserve and asked from each of them the solicitorship<sup>1</sup> as a favour personal to myself. I could not do more. Some of the delay was however mine but I will not defer one moment sending you the replies. If I can do more in future, of course I will do it.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 Probably to some government board or office. Pierce Mahony and his brother David had an exceedingly large legal practice.

2545

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 15 June 1838

*Confidential*

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write one line that you may know facts.

First, Lord Cloncurry wrote no letter intimating that I had

asked or sought for the office of Chief Baron. I saw him on the subject.

Second, if he had, it would be to the last degree untrue.

Third, Woulfe has, I learn, stated to the government that he waived all claim of his in my favour. This was generous.

Fourth, I believe that office, or that of Master of the Rolls, will be offered to me tomorrow,<sup>1</sup> when Lord Mulgrave returns from Windsor where he has been during the week.

Fifth, my friends may (but most confidentially) know that I do not intend to accept any office whilst Ireland is so totally unredressed. I nail my colours to my country's mast.

Sixth, perhaps the conviction of my refusing may prevent a direct offer. *The indirect one has been already made.*

Take care that not an inkling of all this gets into the newspapers. I am perhaps a fool but I have not the heart to desert Ireland — Ireland that never yet had a steady friend.

Whatever I do, be assured, be assured I never can express sufficiently my sense of your invaluable services. If my gratitude and affectionate friendship can cheer you, be joyful, for you possess and deserve both.

[P.S.] My heart is sad at the sacrifice I now make. If SHE<sup>2</sup> was alive I should have my reward and my consolation, but *her* memory casts a protection about me which will prevent me from abandoning my struggles for Ireland save with my life.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 142-3

- 1 The office of master of the rolls was offered O'Connell but he refused it. His refusal 'based largely on an accurate estimate of the effects of acceptance on Irish public opinion, undoubtedly saved his political career' (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 162).
- 2 His wife.

2546

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 18 June 1838

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

The die is cast. *I have refused office.*<sup>1</sup> Lord Mulgrave sent for me yesterday to state the vacancy in the Exchequer and to hear my wishes on the subject. I easily showed that I ought not to accept the judging of tithe causes.<sup>2</sup> He then stated that he believed it would not be difficult to make an arrangement to offer me 'the

Rolls', and in fact he offered it. You know that, if I took anything, it would be the Rolls. But I could not bring myself to accept it. My heart is heavy but *I have made this sacrifice*. Nothing could exceed the handsome manner in which Lord Mulgrave treated me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 144

- 1 See letter 2545 n1.
- 2 Since he was presently involved in exchequer court proceedings in connection with the non-payment of tithes on his own lands in Co. Kerry (see letter 2511 n3); and, doubtless, because of his attacks on the tithe system.

2547

*From James D. Scully<sup>1</sup> to London*

Cashel 22 June 1838

My dear Friend,

Your esteemed favour of the 19th I this morning received. A very large majority of the voters<sup>2</sup> will keep themselves disengaged for a few days. Mr Woulfe's letter was received here yesterday, saying he was to be Chief Baron and recommending the Chan[cellor] of the Exchequer's son<sup>3</sup> as the object of his choice. A Mr Kirwan<sup>4</sup> from the County Galway is here canvassing. Counsellor Welsh<sup>5</sup> has also addressed them. It is therefore necessary, to prevent opposition, you should without delay address them. Come here and introduce your son. We will then settle this affair at a very trifling expence.

[P.S.] Give me your orders by return of post.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Probably the eldest son of Denys Scully.
- 2 A vacancy occurred for Cashel because of the appointment of Stephen Woulfe as chief baron of the exchequer. On 16 July the liberal Joseph Stock was returned unopposed (*Pilot*, 18 July 1838).
- 3 Stephen Edmund Spring Rice.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 Thomas Welsh, 96 Lr. Gardiner Street, Dublin, eldest son of Robert Welsh, Curryglass, Co. Cork. Called to the bar 1830.

2548

*From T.M. Ray*

Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin, 9 July 1838

My Dear Sir,

I send the enclosed statement of George McManus (at present residing at No. 2 Exchequer Street) [about one word illegible] Mr. Connery. It is the case referred to [about two words illegible] nchin's letter, and shows the agency through which these outrages *were effected*.

*Carpenters.* William Clancy residing at present at No. 118 Stephen's Green, master builder, called on me to say he had intimated to you at the commercial buildings that he could give very material evidence concerning the combinations in this trade.

He was, I believe, originally a journeyman and became an employer; but afterwards failed, and went to conduct business for Messrs. Williams & Cockburn.<sup>1</sup> Upon this occasion he received an intimation from the men that it was necessary he should join 'the body'. He consulted with Messrs. Williams who thought it better for him to do so, in order to avoid any differences.

On attending the committee they required a fee of, I think, 3 guineas; and [about two words illegible] he should conform to the rules – the [about two words illegible] to inspect, but found them rather [about two words illegible]. They handed him *a book with a cross* upon it, and required him to *swear* to the due observance of the stipulated terms that none but regular men of the body should be employed in the shop, that he should take no more than two apprentices etc. and likewise *that* he should not in his capacity of superintendent *make* any complaint which would involve the *dismissal* of a man.

He refused to take the oath, and the men were afraid to press it. I believe he remained but a short time in the employment. I wanted him to write to you a statement of what he could depose to but he seemed apprehensive lest it might come to the ears of the men that he had volunteered. Mr. Connery knows him [about two words illegible] explain further.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 Builders and carpenters, 9 Upper Dorset Street, Dublin.

2549

*To his daughter Kate*

London, 16 July 1838

My darling Catty,

I will do the best I can for my most loved child. Charles<sup>1</sup> may draw on me for £250 at 3 months and £250 more at 4 months and, before either bill is due, I will see you and *give* you in some shape or the other £500 more. . . .

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

1 His son-in-law Charles O'Connell.

2550

*To Lord Morpeth*

16 Pall Mall [London] 6 August 1838

My Lord,

Permit me to refresh your recollection as to the claims of my friend and relative Maurice Brenan.<sup>1</sup> He is the gentleman on whose behalf Lord John Russell wrote to his excellency the lord lieutenant about three years ago, in consequence of his having been deprived of the office of Collector of Barony Cess, for his active services in the Liberal cause in Kerry.<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that he is perfectly qualified for the office of Assistant Commissioner under the Poor Laws, and he *certainly* is the only person for whom I should ask a similar situation. I intend to write to the Marquis of Normanby on the same subject and venture to hope for your lordship's kind assistance.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 15473

1 W.J. FitzPatrick omits Brenan's name.

2 See letter 2273.

2551

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 11 August 1838

I have arranged to get Mass from the Rev. Mr. Whelan at seven tomorrow morning so as to go to Birmingham in the half after nine train.

Blessed be Heaven that the Session is over and that we have a respite from the enemy and good government for another year!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 147

2552

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Derrynane, 6 September 1838

*Private*

My venerated Lord,

I feel the deepest anxiety that my present plan of agitation<sup>1</sup> should meet favour in your eyes because that would show that an intellect of the first order concurred with my humble judgment.

That judgment induces me to mark that we have arrived at a period in which we may attain all we politically desire or, at least, much of it, if we take the proper means of achieving our objects.

The aspect of public affairs is such as seems propitious to our pressing our claims. The unfortunate state of the crop will produce a winter and spring in England in which the working class will suffer much and their political discontent already exhibits itself in a shape which may become truly formidable when aggravated by personal distress and individual misery such as a scanty crop is sure to produce.

There is also much brooding discontent on the Continent; much more, I believe, than is usually suspected. Some Prussian regiments the other day cried out for a constitution. It is true the soldiers were drunk, but drunkenness is, to a proverb, *sincere*.

But, confining myself to the British empire, the poorer classes are all disgusted and irritated at the limited franchise conceded by the reform bill and amidst these clamours is our time to press claims founded on eternal justice. I may be greatly mistaken but I



do think that an additional bonus<sup>2</sup> of 15 or even 25 per cent. to the landed interest would bring them over to separate the rent charge from the church, *not of the people*, and have them easily to consent to appropriate the remaining 50 per cent. to purposes of real and public utility. I do believe that steady and universal exertion would free us from the incubus of the State-paid Church and obtain for us all we desire besides.

If, indeed, these things – I mean disconnection of the State from the Church and real corporate reform – were achieved, we should then have ninety-nine out of every hundred of the Irish of every persuasion friendly to a domestic Parliament. If Connaught aids us with the efficiency which your Grace can put in motion if you deem it right, we will have such an overwhelming majority of the Irish nation with us that the Lord Lieutenant may go on to preach patience to the winds. The time for impatience has arrived. I think your province has given strong symptoms of the prevalence of a similar opinion much earlier and, perhaps, more correctly formed; but if you now, my Lord, think we ought to be aided, I would venture to promise complete success to this agitation. Perhaps the fate of Ireland depends on your decision. Thousands of ‘Precursors’, headed by the dreaded name of ‘John of Tuam’, would make an impression just now beyond any ever before made by a numerical force. I will await your Grace’s reply with no small impatience. You will have seen in the *Pilot* my *first* letter<sup>3</sup> with its objects in detail.

How delighted I shall be if you think it right to enrol yourself as a ‘Precursor’.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 147-8

- 1 O’Connell launched the Precursor Society of Ireland at a meeting of his constituents in Dublin on 18 August 1838, in order ‘to organise the expression of the National Will of Ireland towards making . . . a last attempt to procure from the British legislature full justice to Ireland. . . .’ This O’Connell defined as ‘an entire and equal participation with Great Britain in all franchises, privileges, and rights, civil and religious. . . .’ If these objects were not attained in the next session of parliament the society would merge in a Repeal association. Amongst the objects of the society were the total extinction of tithes in any form and full corporate reform (*Pilot*, 20 Aug. 1838).
- 2 The tithe act of 1838 replaced tithes by a rent charge, amounting to three quarters of the former tithe composition, and payable twice yearly by head landlords. (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 198).
- 3 O’Connell to the People of Ireland, 6 September 1838 (*Pilot*, 10 Sept. 1838). In this letter O’Connell defined as objects of the Precursor Society agitation – abolition of Orange domination, elimination of partisan judges from the judiciary, the appointment of ‘intelligent and impartial’ sheriffs, an end to the packing of juries, ‘a real and a per-

manent revision of the magistracy', the 'total extinction of the odious tithe system, no matter how called or described', a measure of municipal reform equal to that obtained by England, an extension of the franchise, and 'our just and due proportion of representatives in the united parliament.'

2553

To Frederick W. Conway

Derrynane 6 September 1838

Private

My dear Conway,

. . . I believe my business is to remonstrate with you on joining the *three marquises together*.<sup>1</sup> Three is to me an ominous number. Do not, I pray you, praise in the same article Anglesey, Wellesley and Normanby. Lead me not into temptation. Anglesey conferred Doherty, Joy, Blackburne *cum multis aliis* upon us and, having exhausted prosecutions,<sup>2</sup> he threatened us with gun brigs!<sup>3</sup> '*Le pauvre homme*'!!! as the French say. Wellesley suppressed the Catholic Association, gave us the first Algerine Law<sup>4</sup> and, in my *humble* estimation, capped the climax by prosecuting me.<sup>5</sup> Had he convicted me he would — I say this quite seriously — have struck perhaps a fatal, certainly a dangerous, blow to the Catholic cause. He was all his life a Pittite and there could be nothing worse.

Do not, I implore of you, unless bound by your bond<sup>6</sup> to do so, do not in this critical time mix the three together. Lord Normanby deserves better of *us* all. He is a bird of a quite different feather. To be sure, in some late speeches<sup>7</sup> he seems verging to the 'gun brig vein'. The 'Hercules vein' was commonsense to it.

As to patience, preach *that* according to the card as much as you please. The stock is exhausted and so you can do no harm. I just arrived in Ireland in time to prevent a strong movement amongst the *wild Irish* in favour of Attwood, Oastler<sup>8</sup> and that tribe. Impatience for all those rights which Ireland requires is the only policy and there is no wisdom in attempting to prevent its displaying itself. Display itself it will and in my conscience I do solemnly declare my conviction that *it ought* but it will display itself either under my guidance for peace and the sustentation of the ministry or in bitter resentment at the delays and in combination with the headless and heartless leaders of the English democracy.

I am beginning to fear for Lord Normanby. The vital mistake made by poor Anglesey, who really meant well, was thinking that

the Irish could be deluded with words. . . . Lord Normanby has surely too much sterling good sense to imagine that so shrewd a people as the Irish can believe, after their good conduct of the last session ending in total abortion, that anything can possibly be obtained by 'good behaviour,' that patience will obtain anything from the bigotted and interested English Tories. . . . Patience would invite more kicking and, believe me, the Irish know *that* by sad experience.

I sat down to give you, who advise the nation, a dose of your own medicine. I believe there is but one chance of saving the present Ministry from the English, the majority of whom hate us and hate the Ministry for our sake, and that one chance is raising a strong Irish party in their favour under the guidance of

Your very sincere,  
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 Conway had declared in a recent editorial that Lord Normanby (formerly Lord Mulgrave) was 'with the exception of the Marquesses of Wellesley and Anglesey . . . the only Chief Governor really, thoroughly, heart and soul devoted to the interests of the country' (*DEP*, 1 Sept. 1838).
- 2 See letter 1751a n1.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 The act of March 1825, 6 Geo. IV c. 4, 'An Act to amend certain Acts relating to unlawful Societies in Ireland.' This act suppressed the Catholic Association.
- 5 See letter 1144 note 2.
- 6 Conway was probably in receipt of a government subsidy or pension (Inglis, *Freedom of the Press*, 207).
- 7 Unidentified. All of Normanby's speeches in the Lords during 1838 were such as O'Connell could not have objected to.
- 8 Richard Oastler (1789-1861), known as the 'factory king' due to his prominence in the agitation for reform of factory conditions. See *DNB*.

2554

*To Richard Barrett*

[Derrynane] 14 September 1838

My dear Barrett,

I am sorry to see the 'Precursors' coming in so slowly. I have delightful hunting. Yesterday's was the best I ever saw.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 149

2555

*To Frederick W. Conway*

Derrynane, 15 September 1838

*Private*

My dear Conway,

Of course you may make any use you please of my letter<sup>1</sup> except printing it. That is what I mean by the word *Private*.

There is but one chance for the present ministry. I do believe it to be a strong one. It is that so much *agitation* should be raised in *both* countries as to show the Tories that they cannot possibly hold office. I mean to have 'a progress' on my way to Dublin in November.

Take what course you may upon the Repeal question, I do not hesitate to pledge myself never to write or say an unkind word to you. I feel *comfortable* that we are friends again.

You see what broadsides the P.P. of Knockany<sup>2</sup> is pouring on me.<sup>3</sup> Pour away, say I, but not one word of answer.

Wishing you many years of literary fame and more *solid* advantage.

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

1 Letter 2553.

2 Rev. Patrick O'Brien Davern (died 30 August 1843), curate (not parish priest) of Knockany, Bruff, Co. Limerick (diocese of Cashel).

3 These were two public letters to O'Connell, both dated 29 August, in the *Freeman's Journal* of September 5 and 10, 1838. In these Davern subjects O'Connell to harsh criticism for having supported the Irish tithes act of 1838 and for his policies in recent years.

2556

*From Archbishop MacHale*

Tuam [Co Galway] 26 September 1838

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

After being absent for some time, on my return I found here your much respected favour.<sup>1</sup> I fully agree with you that, to secure the rights that are so insultingly denied them, the people must depend on their own strenuous exertions.

Indeed, they appear already to have been brought to that conviction and hence the activity with which they are bestirring themselves throughout all parts of the country.

For a long time they felt but little confidence in the present ministry. The Tithe Bill, in which they abandoned the principle on which they ousted their predecessors from office,<sup>2</sup> has filled up the measure of the public distrust.

If the ministers fancied that the Irish people could acquiesce in so unjust a law, they must already be convinced of their mistake. . . . The Catholic clergy, in denouncing<sup>3</sup> the Tithe Bill and urging the necessity of an immediate resumption of the question in Parliament, are only expressing the opinion and seconding the views of the people.

. . . Nay, more, they [the people] have no reason to expect much since the ministers have declared against granting those measures on which you are insisting. If they expressed an inclination to extend the suffrage or to enlarge the number of our representatives or to reduce the Established Church to the dimensions required by justice, then indeed might there be reason for hope.

But from our present rulers what hope can we entertain when, besides with their inability, they proclaim their unwillingness to do us justice by insisting on the finality of reform etc.?

It is my conviction that the unreserved confidence which has been hitherto placed in the Ministry has had a baneful influence on the interests of Ireland and that, if they were taught to feel that measures of general good, and not of individual benefits, would be the test of the public confidence, something would have been done for the country. . . . The People must strive to force on them [the Ministers] by moral influence the necessity of doing justice to Ireland, not in name but in reality.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 650-51

1 Letter 2552.

2 A reference to the government's abandonment in the tithe act of 1838 of the appropriation clause (see Macintyre, *Liberator*, 197) which they had used to oust Peel's ministry from office in April 1835 (see letter 2224 n7).

3 MacHale was probably referring in particular to a meeting in Mayo on 9 September which condemned the tithe act and in which Catholic clergy played a very active part (*Pilot*, 14 Sept. 1838).

2557

From David R. Pigot<sup>1</sup>

8 Merrion Sq., South, Dublin, Monday [c. September 1838]

*Private*

Dr. O'Connell,

Look, I pray you, without delay, at the 3rd, 9th, 10th and 13th rules of the Precursor Society.<sup>2</sup> I send them in this, or in an accompanying letter, with a full copy of the convention act.<sup>3</sup>

The following is the resolution on which Sheridan and Kirwan were convicted.<sup>4</sup>

'That the committee to be appointed to prepare petitions to parliament do consist, first of Catholic Peers and eldest Sons of Peers, and Catholic Baronets. Secondly, Catholic Prelates; third, ten persons chosen from each county, and the survivors of the delegates of 1793, to form an integral part of that number; *fourth, five persons from each of the parishes in Dublin.*'<sup>5</sup> It was under the last paragraph that the convictions were had.

There was this other resolution.

'That in exercising this undoubted right of petitioning, we shall continue to adhere to the ancient principles of the constitution, and to conform also to the peculiar restrictions which by modern statutes are imposed on the people of Ireland.'

The following is an extract from the judgment of Downes in Kirwan's case,

'The *character* of the *assembly*, or its *members*, is not made to depend on the number of its objects, or the *generality* or *particularity* of the trust reposed in them, but on the original constitution of the Assembly; if it be elected, or *appointed*, to represent any portion of the people, and has for its objects the procuring such alteration of the laws as the act mentions, though it holds out to the world, and *that truly*, no other means or intent of affecting that object but by petition, it as a representative assembly, and its members are representatives within the meaning of the act, and with respect to the distinction taken between delegates and representatives, the act seems to use these terms as synonymous, *it is immaterial by what names they shall designate themselves*, if, *in fact*, they are to act as representatives in a representative assembly, they fall within the act and may be described as representatives . . . [remainder of letter missing]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 This letter, being incomplete, has no signature but the writer has been identified by the handwriting and the address.
- 2 The rules of the Precursor Society were published at a meeting of the organisation in Dublin on 26 November 1838.
- 3 The Irish act of 1793 which prohibited the holding of representative assemblies (see letter 342 n3).
- 4 See letter 342.
- 5 This is a substantially true but not strictly accurate copy of the resolution as it was officially inserted in the newspapers in July 1811.

2558

*From David R. Pigot*<sup>1</sup>

[c. 27 September 1838]

*Copy*

. . . (I write of course in confidence) . . . Pledged as the members of that society [the Precursor society] must be to a repeal of the Union within *one year*, if certain measures be not within that time passed by the Legislature, the Government, I am convinced, would find themselves unable to advance to public office any individual so pledged.<sup>2</sup> . . . Give me credit for not stating this without being perfectly sure that I am not mistaken.

The resolution of the present Administration to oppose a repeal of the Union is not confined to the English part of that administration. It is shared by the heads of the Irish government fully and without reserve. I speak this not from conjecture, not from opinion, but from knowledge.

While the alternative of 'Justice or Repeal' remained undefined as to time and as to the objects comprised in the first part of the alternative, there was no near peril of such collision as is now upon the point of being forced by the Precursor Society. The fixing of one year as the term and the propounding as indispensable of certain measures . . . which it is utterly impossible to carry in any parliament . . . the very name, too, of the Society . . . render what is in appearance an alternative agitation of Repeal in effect — plainly and palpably — a substantial present, positive, unequivocal agitation of that question as one of practical policy to which the popular party in Ireland are to be committed and pledged. *Here* lies the danger. The public so treat this proceeding, the Government must so treat it. They must meet it by acquiescence or by resistance or they must retire from power. They cannot acquiesce. . . . The chasm will yawn between the Government and the

popular party. And, O'Connell, if it shall ever open, it will never close. The accession will be inevitable and immediate of a Tory ministry, moderately conservative in England, ultra-Orange in Ireland.

A dissolution will follow. You know well that a dissolution under the auspices of a Tory administration must secure to the Tories a compact working, invulnerable majority in the House of Commons. . . . The breaking up of the English liberal party into fragments of which many, worthless for every purpose but that of giving effective votes to the ascendant party, would attach themselves to the new ministry.

Suppose Wellington Home-Secretary, Hardinge Chief Secretary for Ireland, a military lord lieutenant, the troops garrisoning, the police patrolling, spies at every meeting, an indictment for every speech, the magistracy (including many of the people's friends) banded in support of the new government because banded against a repeal of the Union, the popular party itself divided . . . with an opposition in parliament, powerless in the Lords, nearly, no equally powerless in the Commons and . . . composed though in diminished numbers of the very men who will have voluntarily relinquished power or have been driven from it in consequence of the agitation of this very question of Repeal, in *such* a state of things what, O'Connell, could avail all your own gigantic efforts, seconded by any co-operation that there is the least chance of your collecting *and keeping* around you? . . .

. . . The Repeal of the Union had but one British advocate<sup>3</sup> in the House of Commons at a time when the popular will was almost absolute in that assembly. The whole Whig party are to a man and as one man pledged to resist it. My belief is but it is opinion and nothing more, founded however on no light grounds, that the Government will deal with it (if driven to the wall by the party which has sustained them in Ireland) not by attempting coercive measures but by resigning office. . . . There is nothing to be gained from *them* [the present government] by this species of warfare; and instead of making them stronger against the common enemy, it will infallibly force them to surrender the citadel to the foe.

. . . If a change of government took place *now* and, above all, a change produced by a rupture between the Irish Liberal party and the existing Administration, adieu for our generation to a liberal government in Ireland. . . .

It will be difficult to put back this movement or to give it a more limited scope and a safer name. True. It can be done only by



you and by you only. . . . The position which I hold gives me the means of offering you an honest warning. . . .

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 Pigot sent Morpeth O'Connell's letter of 30 September 1838 along with the above copy under cover of a letter dated 'Wednesday' in which he says that 'much of what O'Connell has written deserves serious consideration'.
- 2 In August 1839 the government announced that no Repealer would be considered for official appointments (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 163).
- 3 On the Repeal motion in the Commons in April 1834 (see letters 2062 and 2064).

2559

*To David R. Pigot, Merrion Square*

[The letter is franked 3 October 1838]

Derrynane 30 September 1838

The 'Precursor Society' must continue and accumulate. That is to my mind inevitable. I say this in the first instance that you may consume as little of your time on this letter as you choose. Do not imagine, my dear Pigot, that there is anything of flippancy or disregard of you in my decision. The simple truth is that I never met a man who has so completely won my esteem and affection as you have. If anything could be done in the way of *influencing* my judgment independent of reasoning you could influence me. I do not know that so clever, so estimable, so amiable a man was ever employed by any government as you or indeed was ever unemployed by any government for it is in the category of the *unemployed*, men like you are generally found. If there were arguments to convince or if I could yield to kindly feelings I should at once follow your advice. But I am too deeply convinced of the propriety and necessity of organizing my 'Precursor' plan that I must proceed with it.

Your argument is this, that if we proceed with this association, the Government whilst in office cannot bestow patronage on *any* of its members and that the necessary consequence of creating *this* dissension between the Irish popular party and the Government will be that the Ministry must resign or be turned out. As to the patronage, that loses all effect with me. I will caution barristers not to join us but, beyond that, the statement gives no pain and has no weight. As to the dismissal of the Ministry, it is not

possible to describe the unhappy consequences of such an event to Ireland in terms more strong or more just than you have done. A more grievous calamity could not be inflicted on us but the question is how is that event to be avoided. You say, by the suppression of the 'Precursor Society.' I say by its continuance. You will see at once the hinge on which the question between us turns. That question is — how are the Ministry to be kept in office?

Now I am most deeply convinced they cannot remain in office unless they do something popular or unless a popular force is brought by others in their aid. I watched them with painful anxiety during the last session and I saw that they were not only cutting their own throats but actually smoothing the way for the Tories to regain office. First, Lord John behaved cruelly on the Ballot.<sup>1</sup> I saw the entire. It was a mere access [*sic*] of ill temper. Wakely was sarcastic and insulting, Joseph Hume was grossly so. The sensitive disposition of Lord John was overwhelmed. He answered in anger, and anger is the worst of counsellors.<sup>2</sup> He committed himself unwisely but not irretrievably. He had time to repent and explain away. He was too proud to take that course and he therefore naturally and necessarily plunged into the directly reverse. He made a bitter bad speech against the Ballot, bad in temper, bad in logic, bad in taste, bad by its ingratitude to the Irish people who have made such sacrifices for his party. If the Tories *could* buy such a speech for money they would cheerfully have paid one million for it, aye, and got value for their money. Then his making *the Ballot* a Cabinet question — of course I mean opposition to the Ballot — it was insanity!

Again, his declaring that the Reform Bill was a final measure. My dear friend, my excellent friend, were not *these* playing the Tory game, disheartening, throwing away and insulting the honest, peaceable but conscientious Reformers? Then, the Cabinet universally treating the Lords with an abject deference, shaping the Government measures not as they ought to be but as they might be considered palatable to the Lords, truckling in everything to the Lords and to the Tories. And their Irish bills! Look at their conduct on the Tithe Bill and on the Corporation Bill.<sup>3</sup> They have thrown away their 'modes' of procuring popular strength and support in England. We heard of 'bombarding the Lords' with good measures. Alas, if there has been any bombarding with good measures, it has been *from* the Lords and not against them. What chance is there of any bill to amend the registry passing? There is every probability of its being made worse. In the meantime the Government are daily growing more unpopular. Power is always unpopular and, left to themselves, they will be kicked out before

the next session is over amidst popular indignation and contempt. They have but one thing for it — to make the Ballot a Cabinet measure and to commence the next session with it. Lord Ebrington might easily get up a public dinner and announce at it, by way of parenthesis, that he knew the Ballot would be brought on by the Ministry as a government measure in the commencement of the next session. What an army of partisans would this raise for the Ministry but it is idle to expect it.

The strength of the Ministry is diminishing daily. The Tories are collecting strength in proportion as the others decline and, if the insane Radicals had not taken the field so indecently, I believe the Ministry could scarcely waddle on till Parliament meets. At present I believe their great strength consists in their reaction created by Radical violence. But at all events it is to me perfectly clear that the Whigs cannot continue in office without some external aid much longer. Their fall can be prevented only by external aid.

Now my opinion is that this aid can be given them best from Ireland. I intend to have agitation so well organized by the beginning of next session that Peel would see that he could not accept office, that the *rational* part of the people of England would also see the impossibility of governing Ireland by a Tory cabinet and the danger of attempting such a government. Some *bread distress*, some Radical violence. The first, the state of the harvest ensures; the second, *Ferguses*<sup>4</sup> will produce, and then the decorous agitation of Ireland may and ought to be successful. *Besides*, the Ministry *can* do nothing permanent for us. They are too weak and refuse to make themselves strong by adopting popular measures. *Besides*, Ireland is so discontented and so justly discontented that it is impossible to keep the people quiet. They would agitate *with* the Radicals of England if I did not throw their exertions into another and a better channel.

Even in Ireland Lord Normanby loses popular respect. The revision of the magistracy<sup>5</sup> has given bitter offence to the multitude. The restoration of the Grand Orange officer Holt Waring<sup>6</sup> and other parsons to the commission of the peace; the *insufficient* purgation that the commission was subjected to — all these coupled with other facts of the same nature render the Irish Government *unsatisfactory*. Then there is Vignolles. How can it be expected that Lord Normanby should not share the fate of poor Anglesey and be as little respected when he allows himself to be spat upon by such an underling as Vignoles? To me it might be accounted for, I mean the craven submission<sup>7</sup> to Vignoles might be accounted for, thus: he calumniated *me*<sup>8</sup> and is not cashiered lest it should be said that he was punished at my instance. How other-

wise is it to be believed that he should be allowed to bully the Government especially as I for one never made him so important as to complain of him. Alas, we have no hope from the Ministry in England. I solemnly assure you that, in dealing with them on the Irish bills, I found the same repulsive coldness last session that I experienced in Lord Grey's time. In the Irish phrase, they 'neither love us nor like us.'

We must act for ourselves, we must raise the cry again all over Ireland. It is the only mode to obtain anything for the country. I believe it to be the only mode of fencing the Ministry in office but at all events we must rely on ourselves. We have nothing else to rely on.

As to the 'Precursor', instead of its being a Repeal society it is directly the reverse. It is a society to prevent the necessity of seeking Repeal. I have called on enemies to Repeal to join us in order to consolidate the Union. I will do *that* again but I see by your letter that the Government have determined to oppose us as 'Repealers'. Of course all explanation will be thrown away upon them. Repealers they *will* declare us and ultimately drive not the 'Precursors' but the people to Repeal. How little they know of human nature and how much less of Irish nature who are ignorant of the magic power of 'Repeal' on the Irish mind. Remember I now solemnly promise to carry the Repeal. Laugh at me now but recollect my prophecy. One thing alone *could* prevent it but *won't*. It is the Ministry adopting the Ballot which they will not. In the meantime my business is with the 'Precursors.' . . .

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 See letters 2478 n2 and 2508 n4.
- 2 A reference to the debate on Grote's motion in favour of the ballot on 5 February 1838 (see letter 2508 n4).
- 3 That is, the Irish municipal corporation bill.
- 4 The Chartists, followers of Feargus O'Connor.
- 5 The occasion for a general revision of the magistracy arose following the death of William IV in June 1837, but did not actually occur until May 1838. (Circular dated 4 May 1838 from Drummond to the lords lieutenants of counties, *Pilot*, 11 June 1838). The revision was attacked by Lord Londonderry in the Lords on 3 July on the ground that it had not been carried out impartially. At the same time the *Pilot* expressed deep dissatisfaction with the revision. Speaking in the Lords in reply to Lord Londonderry, Normanby declared that 'upwards of 700 magistrates had been excluded from the new list' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLIII, 1226-43; *Pilot*, 11 June 1838).
- 6 Rev. Holt Waring, J.P. (1766-1850), Waringstown, Banbridge, Co. Down; dean of Dromore 1842-50.

- 7 The affair to which O'Connell refers originated in a disturbance at the Co. Carlow election of 1837. In consequence Samuel Vignoles lodged a complaint against the police sub-inspector for the county, Captain Thomas Gleeson, reputed to be a Catholic, for failing to give him due protection (*Pilot*, 21 Aug. 1837). In his judgment of the case, Normanby censured both Gleeson and Vignoles. He directed that both be transferred from Co. Carlow (*Pilot*, 8 Sept. 1837; see further, letter 2574 nl).
- 8 According to the *Pilot* Vignoles was the authority cited in making a 'gross misrepresentation' of a speech made by O'Connell in Carlow. Vignoles did so, the *Pilot* claimed, in order to make O'Connell appear the personal enemy of Vignoles, so as to embarrass the government in their dealing with the affair of Vignoles and Gleeson (*Pilot*, 8 Sept. 1838).

2560

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Derrynane, 4 October 1838

My respected Lord,

I wish I could be as sanguine as you are that the people will persevere in that course of agitation without which there is no hope for Ireland. I know to a certainty the Ministry are taking every means in their power to oppose the organisation of the Precursor Society. I have been written to menacingly<sup>1</sup> — I may call it so — but their menaces, I need not tell your Grace, I despise. Let them threaten away. There are, indeed, several of the Ministry exceedingly anxious to be out of office, and I have reason to believe that they are seriously thinking of resigning. All of them do not concur in this view but so many do as to make it highly improbable they should face parliament again. This, of course, I say in the strictest confidence but it is right that you should know the facts. The Tories, when they come in, will do sad work for Ireland, but we must do all we can to prevent them. The only comfort I have is, that we have assisted the Whigs as long as there was any, even the slightest, prospect of their obtaining for Ireland any one advantage. Nor did we desert them until their incompetency to do us good almost equalled their unwillingness to exert themselves for us. It is, indeed, a dismal prospect to have the insolent Tories again in power but the fault is not ours. My present anxiety is to have our organisation completed during the reign of the present Ministers. It is that which takes me up to Dublin in November. The four principles of our new agitation are — first, complete corporate reform; second, extension of the suffrage; third, total extinction of compulsory Church support; and fourth, adequate representation in Parliament. These seem to me to con-

stitute the proper basis of future agitation. On these, I think, we should organise for that contest which is now inevitable. When the Tories return to power they, of course, will again endeavour to establish the ascendancy of the Protestant clergy and aristocracy. It seems to me that it would be highly useful, or at least, that it is the prudent course, to have our organisation as perfect as we well can before the enemy assumes the reins of Government. I entreat the consideration of your Grace to these topics as this is the best plan for *future* agitation, or can you assist me with any other? Connaught will naturally go with your Grace. If you approve of my project, we shall have from the west abundant precursors. I fear much for the result unless I can procure your aid, depending, as that aid must, on your deliberate and powerful judgment. I see a mistake committed by several speakers at the great tithe meetings.<sup>2</sup> It is in seeking for the repeal of the Tithe Bill of last Session, without repealing at the same time Lord Stanley's Tithe Bill,<sup>3</sup> the first which removed the payment of the tithe composition from the tenants to the landlords.

It is astonishing how rapidly Stanley's Act was prospering. It had come into operation in no less than one-half of the tithe compositions in Ireland. By a Parliamentary return it appears that more than one-half of the tithe composition had become payable by the landlords in the short time since Lord Stanley's act was passed, that is, in about four years. The transition was going on rapidly and one landlord after another was submitting. The new Act has completed the transition with a loss to the parsons of one-fourth of the entire.

Our business is to look to the appropriation of that which remains, not the miserable appropriation which the Government promised,<sup>4</sup> and which would operate only after existing leases had dropped, but an appropriation *immediate* and *universal*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 149-50

- 1 No doubt a reference to David R. Pigot's letters (2557 and 2558).
- 2 Several meetings to protest against the tithe act of 1838 took place about this time (*Pilot*, 17, 20 Aug.; 5, 14, 21 Sept.; 1, 3 Oct. 1838).
- 3 The tithe composition act of 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 119).
- 4 In the final plan for Irish Tithes outlined by Russell in March 1838, it was proposed to convert tithes into a rent-charge at 70 per cent of the composition, and 'the proceeds of this tax were to go to the payment of the Irish constabulary and other secular purposes, while the Consolidated Fund was to bear an equal sum for the payment of clergy and tithe-owners' (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 193).

2561

*To Archbishop Slattery*

Derrynane 7 October 1838

My revered Lord,

I had the honour to receive your Grace's letter this morning. Whilst I am highly flattered by the solicitude which that letter expresses I feel exceedingly sorry for the trouble I have been the cause of giving you. My only excuse is to state the exact facts. They were these. Mr. Doheny wrote to me to know whether I would think it advisable to have a 'Precursor' demonstration in Tipperary and particularly whether I could attend it. My reply was affirmative as to the first question and to the second that I would gladly attend the meeting upon two conditions. *First* that a requisition suitable to the great cause we were engaged in should be got up and, 2ndly, which I deemed most essential, that it should be ascertained privately but through an authentic source whether the meeting could be disagreeable to your Grace. I said that the only reason I had to have that enquiry made was this, as a parish priest, for such the Rev. Mr. Davern was described, being a subject of your Grace, had strongly attacked me,<sup>1</sup> it might be possible that your Grace agreed in any part of his condemnation, because, if you did, I would certainly decline going to your county. This out of pure respect to your opinion.

I solemnly assure your Grace that I never *charged* you as having sanctioned *these* letters. I merely expressed an apprehension, grounded to be sure on an insufficient surmise, a matter which to me would be of the bitterest regret, and would have this effect and no other of declining to go into your diocese as a public man if I had lost the valued and most esteemed confidence of your Grace. In short I intended solely to submit to your Grace's judgment had it been adverse to me.

I hope you will now kindly excuse me for giving you this trouble. My motives were pure and most respectful to your Grace. I am bound to struggle for the religion and liberties of Ireland but I am deeply convinced that these struggles to be useful must merit the sanction or at least avoid drawing down any censure from the high dignitaries of the Catholic Church in Ireland.

I confess that I feel some pleasure mixed with great pain at your Grace's letter, a pleasure arising from the interest you are pleased to take on the subject. But the pain is indeed great that I should be deemed capable of making anything which could be called 'a charge' against a prelate for whom, as well from duty as from sin-

cere conviction, I entertain profound respect and esteem.

Again entreating your forgiveness for being the cause of giving you *any* trouble. I have the honour to be etc.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 See letter 2555 n3.

2562

*To Richard Barrett*

Derrynane 8 October 1838

My dear Barrett,

I send you four *letters* of my reply<sup>1</sup> to Walter Savage Landor.<sup>2</sup> I believe it will take *ten* more to finish him.

How happens it that no friend has warned you of the ruin perpetrated on your property in the *Pilot*. For more than a month past the three or four concluding lines of the *Pilot* in each page are totally illegible. One gets provoked and throws away the paper in disgust. You may rely on it that if you do not protect yourself against this fraudulent neglect on the part of your people nobody can continue to read the *Pilot*. You know I *can* have but *one* object in telling you so.

SOURCE: Hornby Collection, Liverpool Public Library

- 1 O'Connell obviously meant *pages* not *letters*. He was replying to a recent letter from Walter Savage Landor (Landor to O'Connell, 25 Sept. 1838, *Pilot*, 1 Oct. 1838). In his letter Landor asserted that Ireland could never hope to have her wrongs righted by Repeal. He proposed that the state pay both Catholic and Protestant bishops, that lands of the established church be sold to provide funds for popular education, that there be state-assisted emigration, and that the poor be employed on public works. In his reply O'Connell praised Landor as a poet but dismissed his political ideas as impracticable (O'Connell to Landor, 4 Oct. 1838, *Pilot*, 12 Oct. 1838).
- 2 Walter Savage Landor (1775-1864), poet and writer, author of *Imaginary Conversations* and many other works. See *DNB*.



2563

*To Robert Curtis*

Derrynane, 9 October 1838

My dear Sir,

I thank you very much for your kind letter. I am truly anxious to set the Precursor Society into full effect, and I would go to Waterford or anywhere else to do so but I acknowledge that I should feel a bitter pang at not stopping at my long-esteemed friend, Father Sheehan's. I am most sincerely obliged to you for your kind invitation and, under other circumstances, would be proud to avail myself of it but I could not go to Waterford without a previous request in the shape of a requisition or something of that kind and if such a thing be not deemed advisable it would be better for me not to go. Besides, I would not go there unless the Bishop<sup>1</sup> was consulted and unless his opinion was favourable to the measure; it is, therefore, better not to think of it. But this should not prevent the organisation of the Precursor Society. That I take to be a matter of the most pressing necessity. Pray look to it.

As to my old friend Mr. Sheehan, I solemnly assure you I never gave him intentionally the least offence. He was told that I had spoken slightly of him. It was totally untrue; I never spoke of him but with unfeigned respect. I therefore cannot help his anger to me though I very much regret it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 152-3

1 Nicholas Foran, D.D.

2564

*To Archbishop Slattery*

Derrynane 12 October 1838

My revered Lord,

I had the honour and the pleasure of receiving your letter this morning. I at once and with much gratitude accept your Grace's kind invitation.<sup>1</sup> The honour is doubly dear to me at this moment and I feel very thankfully the delicacy with which that invitation is just now offered.

I am quite sure there cannot be a second opinion on the subject of your Grace's determination<sup>2</sup> respecting public dinners.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 An invitation to stay as the guest of Archbishop Slattery on his proposed public visit to Co. Tipperary now being planned.
- 2 Archbishop Slattery said some years later that he disliked appearing before the public except in the course of his episcopal duties (see letter 3015).

2564a

*From J. Fletcher*<sup>1</sup>

18 October [1838]

My Dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have the honour to present to you my just now printed work<sup>2</sup> on the Spanish Inquisition! It was my wish to have dedicated it to you, not because you are a friend to the Inquisition but because you are an enemy to it, precisely as the Count De Maître<sup>3</sup> addresses his letters to the Russian nobleman, because he was strongly prejudiced against the said Holy Office. But, I wished also to have inscribed my book to you in order to have expressed both my friendship for your person and my admiration and praise of your whole conduct, talents etc. I was, however, persuaded out of the wish under the idea that you would dislike the dedication.

I hope you will read the work, and I shall be angry if you don't like it. My notes on the Penal Laws and on Ireland, I am sure, you will approve of.

Yours affectionately,  
J. Fletcher

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 John Fletcher (died c. 1849), Catholic clergyman and author of books on religion. Member of an old Lancashire Catholic family. See *DNB*.
- 2 J. M. de Maistre, *Letters on the Spanish Inquisition; with Notes by Rev. John Fletcher*, (London, 1838).
- 3 Joseph M. de Maistre (Maître) (1754-1821), the celebrated French Catholic philosopher and writer.

2565

*To James Roche, Cork*

Derrynane, 19 October 1838

My dear Sir,

I shall be glad to assist in every mode in my power the objects you have in view, namely, the carrying into practical effect the report of the Education Committee<sup>1</sup> of the last session.

I hope the meeting<sup>2</sup> you propose to hold will not limit its efforts to speech-making and passing resolutions but that you will go on to practical purposes and appoint a working committee or some body of that kind, to keep up and continue that salutary 'agitation' without which no measure of great public utility was ever achieved. I do implore of you to set about this great object as men of business habits; and if my humble assistance be deemed acceptable, I am ready to devote my best energies for the purpose — the plan of Provincial Colleges in conjunction with, and subordinate to, a National University. . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 153

- 1 A Common's select committee, under the chairmanship of Thomas Wyse, which issued its report, 'in its entirety composed by Wyse', on 9 August 1838. (Auchmuty, *Wyse*, 164-6).
- 2 A meeting in Cork on 15 November for the purpose of establishing 'a lay college in Munster'. Thomas Wyse, M.P. was the principal speaker (*Pilot*, 16, 19 Nov. 1838).

2566

*From E. Wright Jr.<sup>1</sup> to Derrynane redirected to  
Thurles, Co. Tipperary.*

Anti-Slavery Office, 143 Nassau St., New York [City]  
20 October 1838

Sir,

The cause of American abolition is deeply indebted to you for the rebuke<sup>2</sup> you have dealt to American Slavery in the matter of Mr Stevenson.<sup>3</sup> Severe as your language is, it shall not make you our enemy. While you are dealing death to American Slavery you are in truth acting the most friendly part to *genuine* American institutions. Slavery is not American, it is Satanic. Persevere, good Sir, and your *liberatorship* shall stretch far beyond the green isle of your ancestors.

I have been informed that a body of your countrymen in Phil-

adelphia some time since wrote to you<sup>4</sup> for an explanation of language used in one of your Anti-Slavery speeches, bearing harshly upon our human-chattel system, and got for answer what it has not suited them to publish! It seems to me you may do great service to the slave by sending over an address to the Irish portion of our population, giving plainly your views on *slavery*. They will listen to *you*. If the address be directed to me, it shall not fail of publication. In drawing up such an address you will need to bear in mind that, as our parties stand, your countrymen among us hold the balance of power; that three fourths of them at least are democrats and have followed their party to most undemocratic results; that our democratic President has pledged himself to the slaveholders to *veto* any bill for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Colombia, not consented to by the South. But I need not enlarge.

Your 'non-intercourse' ought to be *carried out*. Let Britain exclude from her ports every Slave-grown product. It would annihilate slavery in five years; in ten, Britain would be the richer for her sacrifices. Without such step, all your cruising against the the slave-trade will but *increase* it.

With great respect I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant

E. Wright Jr.

Sec. For. Cor.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Elizur Wright, Jr. (1804-1885), corresponding secretary of the American Anti-Slavery Society 1833-1839. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 2 At an anti-slavery meeting in Birmingham on 1 August O'Connell had said that Andrew Stevenson, the American minister to Great Britain, was reported to be a slave-breeder (*Spectator*, 4 Aug.; *Pilot*, 17 Aug., 21 Sept. 1838).
- 3 Andrew Stevenson (1784-1857), nominated for the Court of St. James in 1834 but not confirmed by the senate until 1836. Served in London until 1841. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 4 Letter 2499.

2567

*To Charles O'Connell, Ennis redirected to Ennistymon*

Derrybane, 23 October 1838

My dear Charles,

My opinion is in your favour. The right to the tithe composition was not extinguished by the IOUs. They are only evidence of a

debt and that debt was the tithe composition which is extinguished so far as relates to the tenants by the late Statute.<sup>1</sup> My opinion therefore is that these people have a good defence to any suit or new memorandum.

How sorry I am that you never come [? near me]. Do you not know that there is no man living I should be more happy to see? Nor is there anyone whom I respect and love more. Give my kindest regards to your dear wife.

SOURCE: Property of Dr. Michael Lysaght Rynne

1 The tithe act of 1838.

2568

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 23 October 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

Above you have the cheque you require and you find enclosed the bill on Fitz-Simon. So far all is arranged. I have spent some unhappy time between the receipt of your letter of September and that which I got yesterday. Your former letter was more out of spirits than any I have ever got from you. In general you lean to the sanguine side, and as you then appeared in some despondency you easily affected me with that malady. Besides, I was assailed at every turn and defended with zeal or spirit by nobody save the *Newry Examiner*,<sup>1</sup> a paper to which I really am more indebted than to any other in Ireland. But the tables have turned and Sharman Crawford has written himself *into trouble*.<sup>2</sup> Whilst my defenders are multiplying I have as yet received only four invitations<sup>3</sup> – one to Kanturk, one to Youghal, the great Tipperary and one to Galway. Of course I will attend them all

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, Corr., II, 154

1 The *Pilot* of 17 October 1838 praised the *Newry Examiner* 'which by its writing and in the present instance through a valuable correspondent, has done good service in refuting the fallacies and fictions of Mr. Sharman Crawford.' Thomas O'Hagan was currently editor of the *Newry Examiner*.

2 See above note 1 and letter 2572 n3.

3 O'Connell attended public dinners in his honour at Kanturk, Thurles, Cork, Youghal, Waterford, Limerick and Galway on 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 19 November respectively (*Pilot*, 9, 12, 16, 19, 21 Nov. 1838).

2569

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 28 October 1838

My dear FitzPatrick,

See Peter Purcell at once and tell him I have conceded to him everything I could concede<sup>1</sup> – everything, in short, save ‘principle’. Now the name of the society involves ‘principle’ without clashing with any. ‘The Precursors’ may precede justice to Ireland from the United parliament and the consequent dispensing with Repeal agitation. It may precede Repeal agitation – and will, shall, and must precede Repeal agitation if justice be refused.

I cannot abandon the name, which is the best in the world, because it signifies what each of us means.

I have reserved the name ‘National Association’ for the agitation of the Repeal.<sup>2</sup> That alone can be called a ‘National Association’ which seeks to make Ireland a nation again. The other may be United or Imperial or anything else, but it would be a practical blunder to call that national whose efforts may induce us to acquiesce in being merely a province.

It is therefore vain to struggle with me on this point. I have conceded all I could concede and it is really not fair or reasonable to ask me for more. Let it be asked as often as it may please anybody, I cannot concede it and I now prefer making my effort with diminished numbers to the abuse of the name ‘National’. Fie upon it! Our present struggle is not national; it is only ‘precursor’ of nationality or of continued provincialism.

I will publish my own book;<sup>3</sup> publish therefore Stuart’s,<sup>4</sup> if you choose. The more shapes the facts are put in the better.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 158

- 1 No precise information on this subject has been traced. It appears, however, that Purcell wished to change the name of the Precursor Society.
- 2 O’Connell had earlier, in July 1836, similarly insisted on the title ‘General’ as opposed to ‘National’ for the General Association of Ireland (see Lyne, ‘General Association’).
- 3 Probably his *Memoir on Ireland* (see letter 2431 n2).
- 4 This work, probably by James Stuart (1764-1842) does not appear to have been published. See *DNB*.

2570

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 30 October 1838

I cannot but smile at the lack of wisdom there is in the government folk not to be content with what they have got in the constitution of the Precursor Society, without dragging us through the mire by taking away *even our name*; but I have written enough on this subject and I only am the more convinced that I was right from what has since occurred.

I hope to have roused a 'pretty considerable' agitation by my arrival on the morning of the 21st in Dublin. Will you take the trouble to give these directions more distinctly than I have written them?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 159

2571

*To Thomas O'Brien, Rockvale, Castlemartyr [Co. Cork]*

Limerick, 17 November 1838

My dear Sir,

I enclose you a cheque for £15 and my two notes at 3 & 4 months for £100 each. They will of course be taken up as they fall due and I have drawn them in a shape by which they will serve as a receipt without giving you further trouble. I regret exceedingly that the perpetual pressure on my time prevented me from settling this transaction sooner.

SOURCE: Library of Congress

2572

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

Galway, 19 November 1838

*Private*

My dear Friend,

You will be surprised, I think pleased, to hear that Doctor MacHale has come here to *honour me*. On politics he is *now* heartily with me. We travel together tomorrow to Mount Bellew.

There is but one inconvenience can arise. Something may be said at this dinner *adverse* to Dr. Murray. I need not tell you that if it be, it will be done without my consent and directly contrary to my wishes. But the question, what am I to do? I cannot stop anybody but, above all, an Archbishop, in making a speech. If it were a meeting to pass resolutions I would have some control but at a dinner meeting there is no possibility of checking a speaker and of course there ought to be no responsibility, save of the speaker himself.<sup>1</sup>

I think you had better see the Rev. Mr. Miley<sup>2</sup> – I mean the gentleman who wrote so beautiful and so kind a defence<sup>3</sup> of me in the public papers – and explain to him my position. Above all things, let him know that I would rather cut off my right arm than show any disrespect to Dr. Murray, a prelate who above all living men, I venerate.

I have determined to take no part in the controversy<sup>4</sup> unless *compelled* by duty, which is a case I hope extremely unlikely to arise but it never can be my duty to do otherwise than show my most respectful submission to my own diocesan. Use this discreetly or not at all.

[P.S.] Nothing ever was so triumphant as my entire mission.<sup>5</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 160-61

- 1 O'Connell attended the public dinner in his honour in Galway on 19 November. The chairman was Bishop George Browne and MacHale was among the guests. The *Pilot* of 21 November 1838 published a lengthy account of the proceedings, including MacHale's speech, but the account made no reference to Archbishop Murray.
- 2 Rev. John Miley (1805-1861), a native of Co. Kildare. Educated at Maynooth and Rome; C.C. Marlborough Street, Dublin 1835-1849; rector of the Irish College, Paris 1849-59; P.P. Bray 1859-61. See *Boase*.
- 3 In a letter dated 12 October 1838 (*Pilot*, 17 Oct. 1838) addressed to 'the Liberator of Ireland' Fr. Miley rejected any idea of discarding O'Connell from the national leadership and condemned his opponents including 'the would-be leader of Ulster' (William Sharman Crawford).



- 4 The controversy concerned the national education board in which Murray had recently become involved in public disputation with MacHale (Murray to MacHale, 8 Nov. 1838, *Pilot*, 12 Nov. 1838; O'Reilly, *MacHale*, I, 416, 420).
- 5 Attending public dinners in his honour to gain support for the Precursor Society (see letter 2568 n3). On 5 November he had launched the Society in Kerry at a meeting in Tralee (*Pilot*, 9 Nov. 1838).

2573

*From T.M. Ray*

Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin 5 December 1838

My Dear Sir,

I believe Mr. James Martin<sup>1</sup> wrote to you last night soliciting your recommendation of Mr. Healy for the vacancy that is likely to be in the Customs Department. . . . He has devoted his time during the last three or four years in attending the Registry<sup>2</sup> and at that essential department, the keeping of the objection or note book of the cases as they appeared. You will remember that he was in attendance in London last March to be examined with Mr. Martin before the fictitious Votes Committee.<sup>3</sup> . . . He is now 24 years of age, his name Thomas Ambrose Healy.

I learn from Sam that there is not yet an *actual* vacancy. Mr. Hearne,<sup>4</sup> the 8th clerk in the Long Room, was promoted to the first clerkship at the Port of Newry and left Dublin on last Friday to enter upon his new office. On yesterday a letter was received from him by the collector here, stating that he could not stay in Newry, as the place was not suited to his health, and this day he has arrived in Dublin to seek a restoration to his former berth which it is possible the Board may grant and supply the vacancy in Newry from some other port. Should this be the case I presume there will be no other change made here. Hearne's removal from the Eighth clerkship would have raised the two lower clerks, of whom Sam is one, and have consequently left a vacancy for the tenth or last place, the one which Mr. Healy seeks for. . . .

Everything here is going on admirably.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 James Martin, a prominent member of the National Trades Political Union.
- 2 For the registration of voters.
- 3 The select committee set up by the Commons on 28 November 1837

to inquire into fictitious voting in Ireland. There is no evidence that Martin and Healy were examined. A similar committee had been set up by the previous session of the Commons (see letter 2390 n6).

- 4 Owen Hearn is still listed as first clerk in the Custom House, Newry in 1840.

2574

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 15 December 1838

My ever respected Lord,

In the affair<sup>1</sup> of the unfortunate Captain Gleeson<sup>2</sup> I must, in parliamentary *slang*, report progress and ask leave to write again. There is, however, no pleasantry in my mind on the subject. The facts have occurred in this order. The day after I arrived in town I had communicated to the Lord Lieutenant that my conviction was that he (Captain Gleeson) was treated with great injustice. In consequence, the documents in the matter were handed over to Mr. Drummond to be prepared to meet me and to justify the conduct of Government.

I accordingly waited on that gentleman and found that though he had the documents in his possession — they were lying on his desk — he had not read them. I, however, availed myself of the opportunity to give him a distinct view of the utter falsity of the principal ground of dismissal — that which alleged a *false* charge of drunkenness against Mr. St. Clair O'Malley.<sup>3</sup> I called in the strongest terms for an investigation and trial of the truth or falsehood of that allegation.

I mentioned that Captain Gleeson stated that he had more than ten witnesses to support his assertion. I believe I made some impression. I certainly did all I could to make it.

I was promised a speedy communication. A great deal was said of Lord Morpeth's being the patron of Mr. Gleeson and of his being satisfied with the decision but all this is trash. I have since had no further communication from Mr. Drummond but immediately on receipt of your letter I wrote to him again, pressing the case for investigation or trial.

I went again pretty fully into my views of it and I deemed it right to send him privately and under another cover, your letter to me, in order to show him how deep an interest was taken in the injustice done to poor Gleeson.

I have had as yet no answer nor can I *press* for one before Wednesday next, on which day I will see Lord Morpeth, and I have a right to a reply, which I will of course insist upon. I never felt a deeper interest for any man than I do for him, independent of my most unaffected anxiety to satisfy your Grace on the subject.

There is a strong rumour, or at least a suspicion, that the Whigs are to get Tory accession — perhaps that of the Duke of Wellington. At all events, Lord Fingall, who is in attendance on the Queen, writes that Lord Melbourne is perfectly satisfied that no change of Administration will take place during the ensuing Session. We shall see. But, in any event, Ireland has no resource save in self-exertion.

Three of the provinces are showing their conviction of the truth.<sup>4</sup> Ulster, I think, is foremost.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 161-2

- 1 Capt. Thomas Gleeson was dismissed from the police in October or November 1838. It was alleged that Lord Sligo had complained to Dublin Castle of 'the insolent and overbearing conduct of Mr. Gleeson towards the Mayo magistracy', and threatened to resign his lord lieutenancy of the county if Gleeson was not dismissed (*DEP*, 22 Nov. 1838).
- 2 Thomas Gleeson, a native of Tipperary. After he was dismissed he started a newspaper in Castlebar, the *Mayo Mercury and Connaught Advertiser* which commenced in January 1840. Having lost money on this venture, he accepted a post as barrack-master in the West Indies. The *Dublin Evening Mail* of 7 December 1840 complains that Gleeson 'was offered a situation which he refused, only to be offered a better, which he has accepted.'
- 3 St. Clair O'Malley J.P. (1800-1847), Lawn House, Castlebar, Co. Mayo, second son of Charles O'Malley, The Lodge, near Castlebar, Co. Mayo.
- 4 Probably a reference to protests against the tithe act of 1838.

2575

*To Lord Ebrington*

Merrion Square 3 January 1839

My Lord,

I have always met so much courtesy and kindness from your Lordship upon the many occasions on which you have been good enough to communicate your views of Irish affairs that I should be exceedingly grieved if I did not hope you will pardon me for leaving your letter so long unanswered when I tell you the fact, that I waited to be able to reply with more satisfaction to some of your reproaches, the justice of which I was not prepared to deny.

Since I had the honour of receiving your letter the principle

of the Precursor Society has been altered. Every reference to the Union has been omitted and its purposes now are quite consistent with the *objects* avowed by the Irish Government.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the complaint I made of the undue rejection of Irishmen from offices in Ireland, I can assure your Lordship that it exists to a much greater extent than you can be aware of. Yet I do agree with you that it does not extend so far as to be a serious cause of complaint. Neither should I have mentioned it publicly at all was it not that at *that* time it was generally believed that Lord Plunket, our Chancellor, was to resign and that his successor was to be taken from the English Bar. I do confess that such a proceeding would create extreme indignation and injure the popular cause with the Irish Bar, with whom *we* are but too weak already, and this indignation would really, my Lord, be the more natural when it is recollected that there is a person so highly qualified as Mr. Baron Richards for the office. The Master of the Rolls, O'Loughlen, also a most admirable judge, cannot be Chancellor being a Catholic but Baron Richards is a Protestant and was not well treated in not getting the Rolls on account of the prior though irregular claim of O'Loughlen. Why I would ask — but I have no right to ask it of your Lordship, should such an excellent lawyer and judge and so steady but moderate and liberal at all times, be passed over and the entire Irish Bar again insulted as the Tories repeatedly insulted them by filling the office with an English barrister.

You will perceive, my Lord, the feeling which pervaded my mind. I hope you will deem it not unjustifiable. Lord Plunket, however, does not at present resign so that *the grievance* does not arise. But I owe it to you in candour to state that the Irish Government have no small occasion to take a leaf out of the Tory book wherein it is written, 'Oppose your enemies, back your friends.' Much could be done, not by vainly endeavouring to conciliate inveterate enemies but by forming from those who were rather inimical a strong and zealous government party which would make a gap in the ranks of our enemies and give us friends not the less zealous for having '*a tinge of the renegade*' but I believe Lord Normanby is induced to think that his personal popularity can sustain the effects of political mistakes without diminution. However I have really said more than enough on this matter.

I have the pleasure to tell you that if the Radicals in England give you any trouble<sup>2</sup> you can withdraw from Ireland by a few arrangements *all* the regiments now here.

SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

- 1 O'Connell dissolved the Precursor Society on 18 December 1838 and at once re-established it under a new constitution. The objects of the re-constituted society included corporate, franchise and tithe reform, shorter parliaments, the ballot and an increase in the Irish representation in parliament (*Pilot*, 19 Dec. 1838).
- 2 O'Connell was thinking of the Chartist agitation.

2576

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 3 January 1839

My ever respected Lord,

I have read, and return your Grace, Mr. Vigers' letter. I was aware that the Liberals of the county Carlow had strongly testified to Captain Gleeson's services;<sup>1</sup> nay, Mr. Drummond admitted to me that they had certified that he (Captain Gleeson) had prevented much bloodshed. As far as Carlow is concerned, his case cannot be made much stronger. All I can do for him is to endeavour to prevail on the Government to give him some office in substitution of that which he has been deprived of. I told him the only plan which could assist me with that view — namely, the procuring a memorial most numerous and respectably signed in his favour. I do not know that such memorial will have the desired effect but I do know that, without it, nothing can be done.

I could obtain an *investigation* — that is, I believe I could — but that there is one decisive fact to warrant the dismissal of this unfortunate gentleman, which is admitted most distinctly by himself and, indeed, cannot possibly be denied: namely, his publication in the newspapers of the most peremptory contradiction of O'Malley — a species of publication most emphatically prohibited by the printed rules of the service.

How, then, can I talk of investigation when I am met by this plain proposition? Suppose every other charge disproved, here is one of the gravest admitted, and only palliated by showing the truth of the matter published. But the publication itself, not its truth or falsehood is the offence.

It seems to me that there is no reply. I wish I could prevail on your Grace to believe me when I tell you the real situation of the Ministry. In the hope that you will give proper weight to my testimony I repeat it. Some of the Ministry, including Lord John Russell, are anxious to retire with honour; with the exception of

Lord Melbourne himself, perhaps there is not one tenacious of office.

There is lately another element. It is the fearful state<sup>2</sup> of England, which makes it impossible to change the administration. The Tories could not and would not — that is, the leading and national Tories, Wellington, Peel, etc. — would not accept office at present. Even if Connaught or all Ireland were to abandon the Ministry, neither the threat nor the fact would have the least influence on any Government measure.

They are sure of gaining three Tories for every Irishman they may lose. There never was anything more hopeless than to attempt to bully them. *I know it from experience.* I have tried it and totally failed. I will never try it again — at least until there is a change in our prospects.

I do not, my respected Lord, presume to interfere with Connaught politics. Connaught has been neglected and vilified by the Railway Commissioners.<sup>3</sup> You have in your last letter<sup>4</sup> shown that it has been almost equally neglected by the Education Commissioners. It was the province from which the Emancipation struggle we received the least and the last assistance and now that the rest of Ireland is engaged, more or less, in another movement,<sup>5</sup> with the exception of Galway, Connaught omits to join. This may be all quite right but me it afflicts with melancholy. That it should rise in an effort for Captain Gleeson would give me great pleasure because, although I think a struggle with and for Ireland would be more useful as well as more dignified, yet any political exertion is better than torpor or acquiescence. Ireland has never acted together since the close of the Emancipation fight, and she never again will combine in a simultaneous exertion until the happy day shall, if ever it shall, come when it shall be on the eve of another and a greater political victory.

But it is vain to hope for combination from Connaught until your judgment goes with us in our struggles.

It is not by mere neutrality or even passive countenance that we can be aided by your Grace. You do not *think* with us or you could *act* with us. So far from stating this as matter of complaint, I tender my respectful approbation of the line of conduct you pursue because I am convinced it is the dictate of a mind of the highest order, and of a heart full of the purest love of country and of religion.

I trust your Grace will pardon me this lengthened trespass. I will conclude by assuring you that I do not deprecate any attack, however violent or powerful, on the present ministry. I love them not — I respect them little indeed — but I support them to keep out the

Tories and if it shall happen, as events portend, that a Coalition Ministry shall be formed, you will probably have me in direct opposition before the end of the ensuing Session.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 163-5

- 1 See letter 2574.
- 2 Due to the Chartist agitation.
- 3 A royal commission on Irish railways was appointed in October 1836. It issued its first report in March 1837. A second report was issued in 1838. It recommended the construction of two lines of rail, one in a southerly and one in a northerly direction. The commissioners decided that a line to the west would not be needed as 'it would run parallel with two canals and would not succeed unless it got all or nearly all of the canal traffic' (Conway, *Railways in Ireland*, 5-7).
- 4 MacHale to Lord John Russell, 29 December 1838 (*FJ*, 1 Jan. 1839). This is a long letter containing statistics purporting to show that Conn-aught had been unjustly treated by the Board of National Education in its financial arrangements.
- 5 That is, the support of the Precursor Society.

### 2577

*From Daniel McCarthy, 1 Sir John Rogerson's Quay, Dublin,*

3 January 1839

He seeks a post as head store keeper<sup>1</sup> for his son Dan who has been in the excise for the past ten years and who is known to O'Connell. The writer adds that he is a £100 freeholder in Kerry and has a £50 franchise in Cork, is now a Dublin constituent, and has always supported O'Connell. 'You can, if you think it useful, vouch for my *acknowledged* services and utility to the present government.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The incumbent of this position did not retire until 1843.

2578

*From his brother John to Merrion Square*

Grenagh [Killarney], 5 January 1839

My Dear Dan,

I don't know whether you heard of the awkward scrape Kit Gallwey has got into and by which he has lost the commission of the peace for Kerry, Cork and Limerick. The act for which he was dismissed was at the *worst* only one of indiscretion. A man of the name of Fitzgerald<sup>1</sup> was extremely insolent to him. Kit gave him in charge to the police and got Mr. Gubbins<sup>2</sup> of Kilfrush to commit him to the bridewell of Bruff, Fitzgerald refusing to give bail either for his appearance or to keep the peace. Kit swore an information before Gubbins for an obstruction in the execution of his duty upon which the man was tried and acquitted at the last [one word illegible] sessions for the County Limerick. Fitzgerald then sent up memorials against Gubbins and Gallwey. The former in his reply to the chancellor<sup>3</sup> admitted his error and is retained in the commission while Kit, who attempted to testify, has been *dismissed*.

A memorial most numerous and respectably signed was presented to Lord Kenmare with a request that he would use his influence with the chancellor for his restoration. To this the peer received a cold and peremptory refusal which circumstance I *know* has annoyed *him* much. We are now about getting a memorial to the lord lieutenant in the hope that he would use his prerogative and restore Gallwey. This would be a most *desirable* thing for *us* to accomplish. Do you think you can give him any help? Could *we* *succeed*, it would insure Lord Kenmare's and Kit's active co-operation in renewing the registries as well as in putting new men on the books.<sup>4</sup> This *aid* *we* will want as the Conservatives are putting every man they can on the *list* while *we* are doing scarcely anything. There is not a Conservative in Kerry who has not given all *their* sons rent charges<sup>5</sup> while our *gentry* are neglecting *that* as well as any other exertion. It would not surprise me if the *Tories* returned both the members on the next vacancy.

My concerns are well.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 Joseph Gubbins, J.P., D.L., Kilfrush, Knocklong, Co. Limerick.
- 3 Lord Plunket.



- 4 Christopher (Kit) Gallwey was land agent to Lord Kenmare. Gallwey was later reinstated in the commission of the peace for the three counties (see *Dublin Almanac* for 1841).
- 5 That is, conferred on them a form of property enabling them to vote.

## 2579

Public letter dated 7th January 1839 to Peter Purcell and published in the *Freeman's Journal* of 9 January 1839. Withdrawn.

## 2580

*From E.J. Stanley*

Treasury, 7 January 1839

*Private*

My Dear Sir,

I am really very sorry that I did not hear from you before in favour of Mr. Healy for the clerkship in the Customs, Dublin, as I should have had great pleasure in complying with your request.<sup>1</sup>

As it is however I am afraid that I am committed to give it to a son<sup>2</sup> of Mr. McKenna of Dublin in whose behalf I was applied to by Mr. Evans.

I shall however have great pleasure in appointing him to a clerkship in the Excise Office in London if that will suit him; as I would appoint Mr. McKenna to the Excise and Mr. Healy to the Customs if they could make the arrangement between them.

I should however say that the clerkship in the Excise was as good as the other and the salary is the same so that it would not be worth while disturbing the present arrangement.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 See letter 2573.

2 Joseph Neale McKenna (1819-1906), eldest son of Michael McKenna, nursery and seed merchant of Dublin. M.P. for Youghal 1865-8 and 1874-85; for South Monaghan 1885-92. Knighted 1867.

2581

*From Lord Ebrington*

Weare Gifford [Bideford, Devon], 9 January 1839

*Copy*

Dear Sir,

I must trouble you with one line of acknowledgment for your kind and courteous acceptance (conveyed in your letter of the 3rd inst.)<sup>1</sup> of the *remonstrance* which I ventured to address to you. I need not say now cordially I rejoice at the change<sup>2</sup> which you announce in the principles of the Precursor Society or at the generally good and peaceful temper of your countrymen. However, I fear that this most unfortunate and melancholy assassination<sup>3</sup> of Lord Norbury,<sup>4</sup> although it may be nothing more than a diabolical act of personal revenge wholly unconnected with the general state and feeling of the country, will afford but too successful a handle to those who delight in maligning the Irish people and to the many alarmists in this country who are always ready to believe them.

I am glad too that the grievance of the Chancellorship<sup>5</sup> is gone by but I sigh for the time when by persons so enlightened as yourself it shall no longer be considered an injury or an insult to see legal as well as other promotion on both sides the Channel opened equally and without distinction of country to all the ablest and best citizens of our united Empire.

SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

1 Letter 2575.

2 See letter 2575 nl.

3 Lord Norbury was shot by an unknown assassin on 1 January 1839, near his home, Durrow, Tullamore, King's Co., and died on 3 January.

4 Hector John (Graham Toler), second earl of Norbury (1781-1839). He succeeded to the peerage in 1831.

5 See letter 2575.

2582

*From Rev. John Sheehan to Merrion Square*

Waterford 18 January 1839

My Dear Friend,

I request you will have the enclosed transmitted to its destination. It is the First monthly subscription of my parish to the Fund

lately established to aid in propagating the Catholic Faith.<sup>1</sup> I think it one of the best institutions that ever was set on foot in this or in any other country, and I know no way in which we can better manifest our gratitude to Almighty God for having preserved to us the true faith under persecutions more trying than the worst contrivances of Roman tyranny than by aiding holy and disinterested men who undertake to carry the light of the Gospel amongst those natives who are as yet immersed in the slavery and darkness of Paganism and Idolatry. The present time seems peculiarly auspicious for the undertaking. England, hitherto the proud and haughty insulter of everything Catholic, is undergoing a mighty change in the affair [of] religion. The heretical principle of private judgment has produced its proper fruits. Dissenters have increased at such a frightful rate in England that the ministers of the Establishment ceased to have any congregations and it is under these circumstances that Dr. Pusey<sup>2</sup> and his colleagues recurred to the Catholic principle of Apostolic succession and mission to prove that the Dissenters had no right to teach. But the battle which the Oxford doctors directed against the Dissenters has been turned completely against themselves and may we not hope that the prayers of Mr. Spenser<sup>3</sup> and of the other good people of England have at length mollified the rage of an angry God and that in his mercy he has resolved to dispel that darkness of intellect with which in punishment of her rebellion he has covered her people for the last 300 years. If her Navy were Catholic, what a means would thereby be afforded to Catholic missionaries for carrying the knowledge of the Gospel to the uttermost extremities of the earth.

It is to afford my humble aid in carrying such magnificent projects into effect that I have established the collection in my parish and I hope the Bishops of the country will give it their hearty sanction.

I am really rejoiced that you have been so indulgent to Peter Purcell.<sup>4</sup> I know some of his connections and I don't believe there are more amiable people on the Earth. I hope he will act properly by making a public apology and he will be then higher than ever. Nothing ever elevated you more than the public apology you made to Drs. Troy and Murray when the foolish and treacherous Ned Hay published your confidential letter.<sup>5</sup>

[P.S.] Don't, I pray you, forget our friend, Sir Benjamin Morris. He is a most excellent man.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 The Society for the Propagation of the Faith was founded in France in

1822. An Irish branch of the society was formed in Dublin on 18 September 1838 at a meeting of the clergy of Dublin and its vicinity under the chairmanship of Archbishop Murray (*DEP*, 20 Sept. 1838).
- 2 Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882), Anglican clergyman, Oxford professor and a leader of the Oxford Movement. See *DNB*.
  - 3 George Spencer (1799-1864), brother of fourth Earl Spencer. Ordained Anglican clergyman 1822; became a Catholic 1830; ordained priest 1832; superior of the order of Passionists. See *Boase*.
  - 4 Peter Purcell announced his determination to resign from the Precursor Society on 5 January 1839 because, he claimed, O'Connell did not comply with his request that the funds of the society, which Purcell had discovered to be lodged to O'Connell's personal credit in the National Bank, Tralee, be placed in the hands of treasurers publicly appointed. An acrimonious controversy resulted, O'Connell defending his conduct in the society and criticising Purcell for publishing details of the affair. The treasurers of the society vouched for the regularity of the funds. O'Connell called on Purcell to 'make an open and full retraction of his faults', but offered him the opportunity of inspecting the society's accounts. O'Connell later mitigated the severity of his strictures. Purcell was, however, expelled from the society (Purcell to the *Freeman's Journal*, 5 Jan. 1839, *FJ*, 7 Jan. 1839; *FJ*, 9, 12, 16 Jan. 1839).
  - 5 This apology has not been traced. The letter which Sheehan alleges that Hay published may well have been letter 713.

2583

*From James Dwyer*

Mountjoy Square [Dublin], 19 January 1839

Sir,

On receipt of your letter of yesterday enclosing a letter signed James Birch addressed to you, scandalous in its composition and false in its statements, I wrote in reply a hasty line but not perhaps as formal and precise as your frank conduct required from me. I beg leave therefore most explicitly to state that the articles in the *Journal*<sup>1</sup> alluded to by Mr. Birch stated to be attacks on you, never proceeded from me and that I never saw them until they were published in the paper and received by me as subscriber. I did enquire as to who was the author of the editorial remarks upon the controversy with Mr. Purcell.<sup>2</sup> 'The responsible editor' was the reply. He has, I perceive, stated his opinion in his Thursday publication.<sup>3</sup> I knew nothing whatever of it until I read it in the paper. If you allow me to use Mr. Birch's letter in the way most conclusive to establish its falsehood and malignity I pledge myself to do so.

I beg leave to return you the letter signed James Birch but will feel obliged if you place it as a matter of justice at my disposal.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The *Dublin Monitor*. It first appeared on 6 November 1838. James Birch was its first editor but within 'a fortnight or three weeks' he quarrelled with the proprietors and was replaced by Durham Dunlop. It went out of circulation in July 1845. From early in 1840 Peter Purcell seems to have been the proprietor but the ownership was not acknowledged (*Pilot*, 19 June, 3 and 19 Aug. 1840; *Kerry Evening Post*, 23 July 1845 quoting the *Tipperary Vindicator*).
- 2 Concerning the use of the funds of the Precursor Society. See letter 2582 n4.
- 3 In a long editorial attacking O'Connell on Thursday, 17 January 1839 the *Dublin Monitor* stated: 'In alluding to the investment of the Precursor Society funds to the credit of Mr. O'Connell in his own bank, we stated that such conduct on the part of Mr. O'Connell was calculated to awaken recollections of the part played with the funds of the Catholic Association *not one shilling of which has ever been satisfactorily accounted for.*'

## 2584

*From Rev. James Sheil, P.P., to Dublin*<sup>1</sup>

Enniskillen [Co. Fermanagh], 28 January 1839

My dear Sir,

[Introduces Dr. P. Maguire<sup>2</sup> of Enniskillen who seeks an inspectorship of hospitals and whom O'Connell has helped when a candidate for this position on a previous occasion].

He goes up to Dublin . . . when he will be able to explain to you how we are circumstanced in Enniskillen and of what little use Emancipation or reform has been to us here as yet. I trust you will give the respectable bearer your advice and assistance. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 This letter was returned by O'Connell to Dr. Maguire when he presented it to him in Dublin and, on it, Maguire wrote his letter to O'Connell of 12 July 1839 (letter 2639).
- 2 Peter Maguire, Darling Street, Enniskillen.

## 2585

*From R.B. Claiborne,<sup>1</sup> Overton, Flintshire, 29 January 1839,  
to Merrion Square*

A long letter on religion from a former Protestant clergyman who has become a Catholic. He says that his father was a friend and

aide of General Washington and that he has two brothers in Congress. If O'Connell could tell him of some opening, 'I would immediately avail myself of the dispensation which you alluded to in your letter and be reordained.' Much of the letter is illegible owing to damp.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

1 Rev. Richard Claiborne, B.A. (Oxon.), 1823, a native of Virginia, U.S.A.

2586

*To David R. Pigot*

Merrion Square, 3 February 1839

My dear Pigot,

The late Sheriff Veevers<sup>1</sup> will hand you this letter. You know how often I spoke to you about him. You do not know *how often* I spoke of him to others.

I am going away and in my absence I want you, and ask you, my excellent friend, to take his case<sup>2</sup> up and pledge yourself from me that if he be dealt with *generously*, much, very much, can be done for securing the city. If he be neglected longer I despair.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 423

- 1 John Veevers, 2 Kildare Place, Dublin, wine merchant. High sheriff of Dublin city 1837.
- 2 Veevers was voted an address of thanks by the Liberal Registration Club of St. Michan's Parish, Dublin, for his impartial conduct in the course of the general election of 1837 (*DEP*, 19 Aug. 1837).

2587

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 6 February 1839

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

Your sister arrived safe and well. One of the best female travellers I ever saw but, I fear, sadly disappointed by the dulness of her travelling companions. I need not add that, if I *could* have shown her more attention. I would. She is a very clever, clear-minded being and one capable of securing friends on her own account.

I found the state of politics here as dull and Lethean a pool as one would desire to see. The talk of agitation is fudge. The Corn Law meetings portend little and the ultra-radical rabble<sup>1</sup> still less. The House was exceedingly crowded but the debate<sup>2</sup> was prosy and dull. The Tories mustered strong and there was a good muster of *our* side. I do not know on what point the House could so divide as to separate Whigs from Tories. I think they appear to be as much alike as possible nor do I see the least chance of there being a change of ministry. It has been said that we were to have a very animated session but, in my humble opinion, it will be as little so as any I ever saw.

With respect to Ireland there is a thorough indifference in both parties. In the Whigs, coldness and apathy; in the Tories, suspended hostility. They equally desire to keep Ireland out of sight and to let her people continue in, I may call it, hopeless servitude. I am thoroughly convinced that my plan of going back once a fortnight<sup>3</sup> is of the utmost importance. The Duke of Wellington drivelled about Ireland last night.<sup>4</sup> He is not as much broken down as was imagined. Peel is in good health. I believe that the salvation of the cause of useful reform will come from Ireland. In short, my summary is that it is the policy of the Ministry to get through the session as quietly as they can; of the Tories, to abide their time but not to make any violent attempt at power. So let us dabble through. The ultra-radicals are held in contempt, I think, by all parties.

I hope to rouse the torpor of the entire. Something *must* be done for us or we become worse by mere acquiescence. I owe Brougham *one*, and I intend, if I can, to pay him.<sup>5</sup>

Keep this letter merely to see how far my prophecy of a quiet session will be verified. In fact, there seems no point of controversy. Canada is compromised as far as Lord Durham is concerned.<sup>6</sup>

The only thing good is the apparent stability of the Ministry.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr*, II, 167-8

- 1 The Chartists.
- 2 The debate on the address to the queen at the opening of parliament on 5 February.
- 3 That is, to return to Ireland. See letter 2588.
- 4 In the Lords debate on the address Wellington stated that Ireland was not as tranquil as the government had liked to present over recent years. He then attacked 'a gentleman, high in the confidence of government [O'Connell] who goes about devising new modes of agitation every day.' He added that O'Connell talks of raising men and 'at another time of a fund of £20,000 sterling which is deposited in his "private bank" and

- ultimately to be deposited in his private pocket' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1839, 8-11).
- 5 The *Dublin Evening Mail* accused O'Connell of having insinuated in a speech at a dinner in Drogheda that Lord Norbury had been murdered by his own son (*DEM*, 28 Jan. 1839). Referring in his speech, in the debate on the address, on 5 February to the murder of Norbury, Brougham expressed the wish that 'justice may be done, if not upon the murderer, at least upon those who only yield in infamy to the assassin of the father — I mean the assassin of the reputation of the son' (*Annual Register*, 1839, 14; see further letter 2588 n2.)
  - 6 Durham had returned from Canada. His celebrated report had been furnished to the government but public opinion was confused as to relations between him and the government (Chester W. New, *Lord Durham*, Oxford, 1929, 491.

2588

*To T.M. Ray*

London, 9 February, 1839

My dear Ray,

You may assure the Precursor Society that I will keep my promise of attending a meeting of that body about once a fortnight during the session of parliament.

I am the more confirmed in this determination by everything I see and hear in this country. Their statesmen in and out of office have their minds too occupied with English and foreign affairs to have either leisure or inclination to be troubled with the wants of Ireland or the rights of her people. I solemnly declare my conviction that the senate of Petersburg or the divan of Constantinople would be as ready to attend to the grievances of Ireland as the British House of Commons. There is an utter ignorance of, and indifference to, our sufferings and privations. It is really idle to expect that it could be otherwise! What care they for us, provided we be submissive, pay the taxes, furnish recruits for the Army and Navy and bless the masters who either despise or oppress or combine both? The apathy that exists respecting Ireland is worse than the national antipathy they bear us. You have seen the speech<sup>1</sup> attributed to Lord Brougham. That publication contains one of the most virulent libels ever uttered against Ireland. As to my own share of the calumny, I freely forgive the noble lord, as he is called by courtesy. I have, I think, repaid him tolerably well and would have amused myself with a little more of his history but that the speaker stopped me; yet I did describe some of his qualities accurately enough.<sup>2</sup> I have another volley in store for



him when he attacks me again. I think I can demonstrate that he is the most devoid of principle of any public man that every exhibited on any political stage. Nay, I doubt whether I have not materials to seek for an impeachment in due form.<sup>3</sup> But I will think of this more deliberately.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 168-9

- 1 That delivered by Brougham on 5 February (see letter 2587 n5). In addition to accusing O'Connell of slandering Norbury's son, Brougham also denounced the government for having offered O'Connell a judgeship in Ireland, and referred to the frightful state of anarchy prevailing there, insinuating that O'Connell's public statements were responsible for inflaming the people (*Pilot*, 8 Feb. 1839).
- 2 In the Commons on 6 February, O'Connell denied that he had ever implied that Lord Norbury had been murdered by his own son. He attacked Brougham for having accepted uncritically the assertions of the *Dublin Evening Mail* and described him as 'one who, to the judicial office, adds that of a court jester . . . so unfit for the judgment seat that he has been removed from it. . . .' The speaker hereupon appealed to O'Connell to desist, pointing out 'the great inconvenience which must arise from having a war carried on between the two houses.' O'Connell desisted (*Pilot*, 8 Feb. 1839).
- 3 O'Connell did not attempt to impeach Brougham.

2589

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 11 February 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I kept my word with you; I paid off Lord Brougham, and even the Speaker's interruption served to give more poignancy and point to the attack.<sup>1</sup> I am told HE has determined to let me alone in future.

The only news here relates to the change in the Ministry. Lord Glenelg was, in fact, shoved out by his colleagues.<sup>2</sup> He was a mere nuisance. The Tories make his resignation a proof of Ministerial weakness. It is no such thing. On the contrary, it shows that they feel their strength and can afford to throw overboard one of their Cabinet. In his room as a member of the cabinet we have Lord Morpeth. It is of the utmost use to Ireland that he of all other men should have a seat in the Cabinet. It will throw the management of Irish affairs into his hands and they could not be in better.

There is no doubt that Lord Normanby succeeds Lord Glenelg as secretary to the colonies, an alteration of the utmost value.

Lord Normanby will leave Ireland without delay. The question is who is to be his successor? There are four persons named. The first in rank is the Duke of Sussex, but *that* will not happen; there is no chance of his being Lord-Lieutenant. The second is the Duke of Richmond; *that* would not do at all, and will not, cannot happen. The other two are Lords Radnor and Clarendon.<sup>3</sup> The former is a sincere radical reformer in *Church and State*; he was the Lord Folkstone of the Duke of York's trial.<sup>4</sup> He would be an excellent man in every respect and my own opinion is rather favourable to the probability of his appointment. As to Lord Clarendon, there could not probably be a better man. His opinions are all of the very best and highest excellence. I knew him in Ireland in the time of Lord Anglesey's *first* government.<sup>5</sup> He knows Ireland well and understands the Orange faction in all its rascality. But he is now in Madrid and they cannot well afford to wait his return. But for that he would unquestionably be the man. I think Lord Normanby fortunate in leaving Ireland before he involved himself in any quarrel with us. He leaves in the height of his popularity.

I intend to be in Dublin, please God! on Saturday morning next, weather permitting, at all events on Sunday. I will leave again on Monday evening to be in time for the debate on the Corn Laws.<sup>6</sup>

There has occurred a *hitch* in the appointment to the bench. The Chancellor has been prevailed on to object, by reason of Maule's being a free liver.<sup>7</sup> What stuff and hypocrisy!

My prophecy of the mildness and dulness of the session is thus far verified. It may break out into a storm but I do not as yet see the elements of any such violence. My opinion is that the Tories are hopeless of maintaining themselves in power. Even if they got into office the public discontent would render it extremely dangerous to have the Tories in power. A Tory Administration would soon combine the disaffected of all classes in their resistance to government.

That unfortunate Feargus O'Connor is desperately ill. He has burst a blood-vessel and although at first it was not thought much of, it has, I am told, assumed a most alarming state. He can scarcely speak above his breath. Poor unhappy man! I am, after all, sincerely sorry for his premature fate. May the great God be merciful to him!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 169-71

1 See letter 2588 n2.

2 In October 1838 Glenelg's colleagues Russell and Howick insisted that his incompetency at the colonial office made his dismissal necessary, and

when Melbourne hesitated to act Russell threatened to resign. Finally on 8 February 1839 Glenelg yielded and retired (see 'Glenelg' in *DNB*).

3 George William Frederick (Villiers), fourth earl of Clarendon (1800-1870), lord lieutenant of Ireland 1847-52. See *DNB*.

4 The investigation in 1809 by a select committee of the Commons of alleged corrupt practices by the duke of York in granting promotions to officers. Lord Radnor, then Viscount Folkestone, had taken an active part in the investigation.

5 March 1828 to March 1829. From 1827 to 1829 Lord Clarendon was employed in Ireland arranging the details of the union of the English and Irish excise boards (see 'Clarendon' in *DNB*.)

6 On 19 February on a motion proposed by Charles P. Villiers concerning a petition on the corn laws. The motion was defeated by 361 to 172. O'Connell did not speak but voted with the minority (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLV, 609-95; *Annual Register*, 1839, 32-7).

7 Maule was made a baron of the English exchequer on 14 February 1839 and transferred to common pleas in November the same year.

## 2590

*From his son John*

London, Friday [15 February 1839]

My dear Father,

The money you said you would send me from Ireland I would prefer, if you please, that you should send it *direct* to Eliza.<sup>1</sup> . . . She will require fifty pounds. . . .

There is a rumour that Lord Durham has been offered the viceroyship but has refused, not liking to expose himself a second time to being abandoned by Ministers.<sup>2</sup> Charles Sugrue arrived here this morning. He has come over with Taylor, the Cork N[ation-]al Bank manager, to plead the latter's claims to some compensation.<sup>3</sup> He says he has heard from my poor Uncle James' travelling companion, Dr. Dwyer. My uncle had been for nearly a week before the letter was written visibly improving in spirits — without one relapse. They were at Lyons.

Wynn's motion<sup>4</sup> against Harvey tonight is expected to be a long thing.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Wife of John O'Connell.

2 A reference to Durham's mission to Canada in 1838.

3 See letter 2591.

4 On 15 February Charles W.W. Wynn moved that a new writ be issued for the borough of Southwark, as its representative Daniel Whittle Harvey was, he alleged, disqualified from the seat. The motion was withdrawn when the attorney-general moved for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the case (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLV, 446-66).

2591

To Thomas Lyons Esq., Merchant, Cork

Merrion Square, 18 February 1839

*Confidential*

My dear friend,

You will easily give me credit for an unfeigned desire to comply with any suggestion coming from so sincere and so intelligent a friend of mine but I owe it to you to say that Mr. Taylor cannot any longer be employed in any capacity in our Bank. It is impossible he should for two reasons. 1st. He most distinctly disobeyed the reiterated orders of the Board and not only did that but he countervened [sic] them by acting in the direct opposite manner. 2dly. 'The run.'<sup>1</sup> I care not whether Taylor was a party to that run or not. It was done at all events by his friends. We cannot possibly have a man in our employment who could in his misconduct hold over us the terror of another run. I would prefer any alternative to being the employer of such a servant.

You are, my worthy and esteemed friend, much mistaken in supposing Taylor to have been a *profitable* servant to us. His branch was under his management the most troublesome and least emolumentary of all our branches — doing an immense deal of good business certainly but also Taylor creating losses that absorbed nearly the entire of our profits.

I send you in confidence a letter I received yesterday from one of our directors. It will give you a notion of the machinery of the late run. Send me back that letter directed to London.

We will of course take care to have one of our best managers in Cork, one who will take care to regulate our affairs on sound banking principles and will pay every attention to our friends and consult with them on his proceedings. Depend on it we will have a man there with whom you will be satisfied. If *you* are not satisfied with him I promise you that he will not be continued.

Believe me to be, Your very sincere and grateful friend

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Harrington Papers

- 1 In early February 1839 a run was experienced by the Provincial Bank in Cork. The National Bank appears to have been affected (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 170-1).

2592

*From Charles Sterne,<sup>1</sup> Arklow, Co. Wicklow, 4 March 1839*

Seeks O'Connell's support for a parliamentary bill to establish a joint stock company for providing a harbour at Arklow.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Sometime innkeeper and postmaster.

2593

*From Rev. F.J. Nicholson<sup>1</sup> to 16 Pall Mall, London*

9 Rue Castiglione, Paris, 4 March 1839

I send you, my dearest Friend, some observations of one of the leading writers of Paris on the Clermont affair.<sup>2</sup> It went through five editions in about a fortnight. I gave it to your son to bring to you to London but I found yesterday it remained still in Paris. I sent you by him then also a most excellent authoritative statement upon the affairs<sup>3</sup> of the Archbishop of Cologne which will enable you to answer all attacks upon that Party. If we consider the state of the Church in Switzerland, Russia, Prussia and elsewhere, we will find it suffering more now from persecution than it has for centuries past. Thank God, it has such defenders in you and yours. Were you not well pleased with your son's letter<sup>4</sup> upon that subject? I was delighted with it and intend having it published in French and Italian for circulation in France and Italy.

Dr. Smith,<sup>5</sup> Coadjutor Bishop of Trinidad, and I had the pleasure of dining yesterday at Mrs. Ryan's,<sup>6</sup> where we met of course your son and his good lady. . . .

I intended mentioning before now that our late and ever dear Mrs O'Connell said to me before I left London in July 1836 that you ought to send one of those portraits of Haverty's<sup>7</sup> last and best to the Pope. . . . She was one of the dearest and most cherished friends I ever had. The mere absence of her affectionate letters has been to me a loss I never cease to deplore. She and I used to write and talk together as mother and son. . . . Oh! how she loved *you!* She was indeed a *rara avis*.

P.S. All the bishops of the Christian world are invited to Rome, it

seems for the canonization of the saints that takes place the 26th of May next. Before their arrival I would be glad your letter and your portrait would have reached His Holiness as many of those would know of both, and carry back to their districts this gracious and gratifying news about you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Francis Joseph Nicholson (1803-55); born in Dublin he joined the Discalced Carmelites in 1825. Consecrated coadjutor archbishop of Corfu in 1846, succeeding in 1852.
- 2 Comte de Montlosier, an excommunicated French political figure and writer, was refused Christian burial by the bishop of Clermont. The French press raised a great outcry about the bishop's action (*Annual Register*, 1839, 357; *Pilot*, 28 Dec. 1838; 4 Jan. 1839).
- 3 See letter 2508 n7.
- 4 Presumably written by O'Connell's son John.
- 5 Richard Patrick Smith (1800-1853) a native of Co. Cavan, ordained 1827. A bishop in Trinidad from 1836.
- 6 Wife of Dr. James Ryan, Jubilee Hall, Bray and mother-in-law of John O'Connell, M.P.
- 7 Joseph Patrick Haverty (1794-1864), a native of Galway. A portrait painter. See *DNB*.

2594

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 13 March 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

This letter will be handed you by a young Circassian who is going over to Ireland, sent by the Minister of Public Instruction of Mahomet Ali,<sup>1</sup> the ruler of Egypt. This young man has been directed to reside with a Miss Neville, or a Mrs. Neville, at No. 33 Upper Rutland Street but who she is or what her character is are not known. I write you to take the trouble to ascertain these matters discreetly and confidentially and also without delay. If this Mrs. Neville be not a suitable person for the youth to reside with, you will, I am sure, easily find a suitable residence for him. The gentleman who accompanies this youth will give you full information as to the station in life for which the youth is being educated at the expense of his government.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 172-3

- 1 Mahomet Ali (1769-1849), Ottoman viceroy of Egypt.

2595

*To John Primrose, Jun.*

London, 15 March 1839

My Dear John,

I enclose a bill of lading for 64 tons and a quarter of potatoes which are on their [way] or, I hope, already arrived at Derrynane.<sup>1</sup> See to their landing at once and to their security. Use them discreetly and they will serve to keep down the markets. Give of course as much as needful in charity and, for the rest, get from those who can pay, a moderate price. Especially take care to give the people seed.

I will be in Dublin on the 26th and will stay there ten days. You *must* meet me there, say, Easter Monday at the latest.

[P.S.] You will have to pay the freight which is quoted in the bill of lading. The entire I paid was £202.2.6. To this add the freight and charges of landing and you will then see the price altogether per ton.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 There was famine in several places along the west coast at this time.

2596

*From P. V. FitzPatrick to Pall Mall, London*

Dublin, 18 March 1839

My Dear Sir,

The anxiety to procure the place vacant in the Post Office for young Mr. Reily<sup>1</sup> increases so much amongst your friends on account of the merits of that gentleman's father that I am induced to inflict another scrawl upon you on the subject. You will find herein a letter from Lord Lichfield which shows that a first step was taken in Mr. Reily's behalf in the course of last summer when his name was put upon Lord Lichfield's list. The knowledge of this may in some degree strengthen your application now and I am glad to learn that no appointment to the vacancy has yet taken place. It may be proper for me to set forth anew the name of the applicant, viz. Thomas White Reily, and the place sought is a clerkship in the office of the Accountant General vacant by the

death of Mr. Beare.<sup>2</sup>

Do all you can to secure it and you will grafitly and oblige 'troops of friends.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Thomas White Reily (born c. 1811), only son of John Reily of Dublin. Called to the bar 1834. He did not obtain the appointment.
- 2 Henry E. Beare, Drumcondra Rd., Dublin.

### 2596a

*To John Benjamin Smith,<sup>1</sup> Browne's Hotel*

16 Pall Mall [London], 22 March 1839

My dear Sir,

In consequence of a suggestion of yours — deserving upon every account the greatest attention — I have drawn the accompanying address and plan<sup>2</sup> of an acting body to carry it into effect. I submit them altogether to your cool and deliberate judgment. Alter, amend or fling away just as you think right but I really think the time is come when men of soberness and sincerity must combine to take the management of the popular movement which in bad hands bears on to mischief. The leading part you have with so much of talent and discretion taken on the Corn Law question imposes I think a species of moral obligation on you to labour for more decided improvements in the commercial and political relations of these countries. If I can unobtrusively be of any service in that cause under your guidance you shall command my best exertions.

SOURCE: Archives Department, Manchester Public Libraries

- 1 For identification see letter 2598 n4.
- 2 See letter 2597.

### 2597

*To Richard Cobden<sup>1</sup>*

Liverpool, 23 March 1839

My dear Sir,

I send as a parcel by the railroad the draft of an address which, following your suggestion, I sketched — in haste and liable to one thousand inaccuracies. Do with it what you like. To it is attached



the plan of an association laying down the principles of action.<sup>2</sup> I have not the least regard for my own composition or for my individual notions of the preferable modes of expression. All I want is *the thing itself*. Of course I have not the least idea of being obtrusive or prominent though I am most desirous to be useful. You can be eminently so if you will put your shoulders to the wheel and rally round you 'good men and true' for the advancement of political amelioration and indeed to rescue your country from the hands of the sanguinary charlatans. Recollect that it is as true as that tomorrow's sun will rise that *this* nation of all others cannot be *stationary*. The movement is onward. The poor read — the poorer are learning to read — shortly the poorest will read — and, if the more cool and calculating classes do not now, while there is time and opportunity, take the guidance of the transition into their own hands, you will have a volcanic explosion in the room of a safe and steady change. I do not say it to flatter *you* — why should I? — but *you* really have the talent, the energy and the prudence necessary to take a cautious but steady lead. Nay, in my conscience I do believe that you will be responsible — awfully responsible — if you do not exert yourself to form such a combination of men of sober habits and pure intentions as will give an impulse in the right direction. If such an idea shoots across your own mind, do pray obey its impulses and then fling away postponement. Anything that is postponed is half lost, nay may be considered as virtually abandoned. Strike then at once. All the reasonable men of the 'Universal Suffrage' will be easily brought over. We do not want the rest. I have sent a copy to Mr. Smith<sup>3</sup> and I wrote to him. I have sent Parkes,<sup>4</sup> the solicitor, a copy. He is a wise man, sometimes inclined to a crotchet but on the whole certainly wise. I have sent a copy to honest Joseph Sturge. Yours is my last copy but you can command me. I will, please God, be in Dublin on Monday morning the 25th. I will remain in Dublin ten days. If you desire, I will return by Manchester but recollect I do not want or wish to obtrude myself on public attention in the formation of any regulating power of the movement. My *sole* object is utility but I have experience which is said to be the 'wisdom of fools' so I am wise and, in that wisdom, I tell you confidently not to be alarmed at difficulties. Begin, persevere and go on. You may at first be deserted and taunted and ridiculed but, if you persevere, you will certainly be successful because you are certainly *right*.

I got a letter from the Anti-Corn Law Secretary of Manchester,<sup>5</sup> as I was leaving London, about my *abrupt* speech.<sup>6</sup> Unfortunately I left the letter behind me. I beg of you to give me his name and

address that I may write to him.

I have only to conclude by saying that I should not have written one line unless everything I write be liable to the utmost extent of criticism. The address and plan are therefore subject to be changed 'haft and blade.'

SOURCE: Cobden MSS, West Sussex County Record Office

- 1 Richard Cobden (1804-1865), the celebrated factory owner and political reformer; leader of the movement to repeal the corn-laws. M.P. for Stockport 1841-47. See *DNB*.
- 2 At the formal founding of the Anti-Corn Law League at a meeting in London on 19 March. Cobden on this occasion appealed to O'Connell for his advice as to extending the agitation to Ireland. O'Connell in reply stated that 'they should have his best assistance in forwarding their objects', and promised to aid in the sending of anti-corn law lecturers to Ireland (*Morning Chronicle* 20 Mar. 1839).
- 3 John Benjamin Smith, chairman of the above meeting.
- 4 Joseph Parkes (1796-1865), a Birmingham solicitor and political radical. See *DNB*.
- 5 John Ballantyne, secretary of the anti-corn law association of Manchester.
- 6 O'Connell spoke in the adjourned debate on the corn laws on 18 March. He declared at the outset that he was determined to make a short speech, and declared, presumably in jest, at the end of a fairly long speech that he had kept his word (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1839, 1336-40).

## 2598

*To Joseph Parkes*

Merrion Square, 30 March 1839

My dear Parkes,

I got both your letters and they gave me much pleasure. I also delight and glory in your articles<sup>1</sup> in the *Chronicle* for, whether you wrote them or not, they are substantially *yours*.

I only begin to complain that all is theory as yet. Believe me that in politics whatever is postponed is necessarily half lost and the half is what the Irish children call the *biggest* half. Let us then be at work. Begin with half a dozen associators and the rest will come in speedily till they are half a dozen thousands. I have got my project<sup>2</sup> printed without my name. I have in consequence of the speculations in the *Chronicle* added a 'No qualification' article.<sup>3</sup>

As far as speculation goes, this will complete us. But where are the actors? I will send you printed letters and a printed sketch of the address. If you could get Grote, Warburton etc. to join, it

would be well, very well but if you cannot get them – Smith – Cobden etc. would answer, and answer right well – no better. I am of course ready to come forward but I will not *obtrude* myself on your Saxon jealousies. I can however back you up with universal Ireland. Let me conjure you to get to work as speedily as you can. Meetings should at first be select. The principal obstacle will arise from your '*difficulty-mongers*'. Do not mind them. The Chartists prove that there is a public mind ready for useful agitation. I wrote to R. Cobden, Manchester, and also to Smith, the Corn Law Chairman,<sup>4</sup> but have not heard from either. I do not care for that if they be at work. All is right in Ireland.

SOURCE: Parkes Papers, University College London

- 1 In a series of editorials on 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 March the *London Morning Chronicle* put forward proposals for parliamentary reform including household suffrage and the ballot.
- 2 Obviously a project of agitation for franchise reform.
- 3 That is, no property qualification for the exercise of the franchise.
- 4 John Benjamin Smith was chairman of the anti-corn law meeting on 19 March (see letter 2597 n2). He was president of the Manchester chamber of commerce 1839-41; M.P. for Stirling 1847-52 and Stockport 1852-74. See *Boase*.

2599

*From Richard Cobden*

[Postmarked Manchester, 30 March 1839]

[early part of letter missing]

political plunge at present we are making Radicals of the Whigs by our Corn-Law Agitation, and we are spending their money in enlightening the rustics. Had we declared ourselves political in London we might have had some difficulty in getting any part of the £6000 pledged to be at our service.<sup>1</sup> Leave us to pick at the keystone of the monopoly arch in our own way a little longer and we will by-and-by be ready to lend a hand to overturn it from the foundations.

By way of helping us to move on to closer quarters with the aristocracy, will you sometime in the spring, during the session, honour us with a visit if invited to a great Corn Law dinner of the League? If so, we'll get a gathering of good folks, such as was never equalled, to meet you. The meeting will be strictly a Corn Law meeting but you know when addressing 2,000 admirers

*you* may say anything upon any subject.

Pray address your answer to the Secretary of the Anti-Corn-Law Society, Manchester (Mr. Ballantyne), authorizing us to print a correct copy of your speech<sup>2</sup> which is viewed here as one of the most important that has been delivered on the question.

[P.S.] But don't say anything about the Dinner in your letter to the Secretary. Oblige *me* with a word or two upon that subject.

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XV, 601

- 1 At the anti-corn law meeting on 19 March (see letter 2597 n2). Joseph Sturge moved a resolution that it be recommended immediately to raise at least £5,000 to defray the expenses of the league for the coming year. Joseph Parkes attempted to introduce the subject of franchise reform but was successfully opposed by Cobden (*MC*, 20 Mar. 1839).
- 2 See letter 2597 n6.

## 2600

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 4 April 1839

My dear and ever respected Lord,

. . . I am tremblingly alive to the importance of the subject on which I sit down to write to you — one effort more to procure your countenance to the junction of Connaught to the general exertions of the rest of Ireland. Hitherto that province contented itself with great and striking but only occasional efforts to aid the great cause and strike down the common enemy and it was not until after we had sent G. McDonnell on a *foreign mission*<sup>1</sup> that we obtained any substantial assistance from that province. There were then as there are now, some excellent reasons for good men to differ. But now we want union and the assistance of each other more than we did then, when the *English* bigotry was not near as much roused at it is now.

There is at present one ingredient which seems to operate against 'Precursor' cooperation from Connaught, and it is this — the condemnation of the National Education scheme by your Grace, which would require parochial contributions for the purposes of education and, as an *apparent* consequence, the prevention of any part of the funds of any parish being diverted into the 'Precursor' *treasury*. On this subject, however, I can say, *Experto crede Roberto*. I can give your Grace the result of thirty years and more of experience and it is this, that once get a parish into a mood of contributing to public purposes, the more such pur-

poses are brought before them the more liberal will be *each aggregate* contribution. So many persons will not give pounds or five shillings, but many more will give one shilling.

It will and has uniformly become a *habit* to contribute, and thus a Precursor subscription would, according to my experience, augment your school contributions.

At least results of this *description* have followed in almost every other instance. The fact is, the great resource, even for collecting the revenue of the state, is to be found in the multiplication of small sums.

The contributors should individually be solicited to give sums smaller than each could reasonably afford.

The peril of a Tory restoration is very imminent and everyone's opinion is that upon a new election the liberal members for Ireland would little exceed forty.

The Tories in England would be greatly augmented. The English people are essentially Tory and nothing preserves us from actual persecution but the numbers and the moral energy of the Irish people.

It is with this conviction I venture once again to solicit or at least to suggest your leading Connaught into the controversy by joining the organisation of our Precursors. We may, and I believe will, have a majority on Lord John's motion<sup>2</sup> but he will infallibly break up the administration within twelve months. He is tired and disgusted with office, and would *personally* be glad we were defeated on the ensuing debate. We are arrived at *portentous* times. We are arrived at times in which persecution may again raise its head and, at all events, there would appear to be no safety save in perfect union amongst ourselves.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 660

- 1 Unidentified. The reference may be to Eneas (not G.) McDonnell, who was a native of Co. Mayo. The 'foreign mission' would have referred to McDonnell's appointment in 1824 as London agent of the Catholic Association.
- 2 Russell's motion of confidence in the Irish administration, notice of which was given on 8 April, and which was moved on 15 April. After five days of debate the house divided on 19 April on two separate issues — an amendment to Russell's motion by Peel, and the attempt to add a rider to the motion by Thomas S. Duncombe — which were defeated by 318 to 296 and 299 to 81, respectively. Peel then declined a division on Russell's original motion (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLVII, 4-225; 234-456; *Annual Register*, 1839, 62-81).

2601

*To William Smith O'Brien*

Merrion Square, 5 April 1839

My dear Sir,

Your *Registry Bills*<sup>1</sup> are down for an early day next week before the Irish Members can arrive in London. I wish I could persuade you to let them drop altogether convinced as I am that if they pass they annihilate the liberal interest in Ireland and you will become unconsciously the worker-out of the greatest mischief that could possibly be done to this country. I know that I have no influence nor any right to have any influence over you but, surely, you cannot doubt that I am thoroughly acquainted with the working of the present system and competent to form a just opinion of the result of your alterations and, in that point of view and in that alone, entitled to be listened to by you with some attention. Allow me then to tell you that the most virulent of the Orange Tories could not desire a more fatal measure to us, their opponents, than your Registry Bill or your Polling Bill, the Registry Bill especially. The Irish Attorney-General<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Pigot agree with me fully, indeed their opinions are stronger than mine, and we all deeply deplore that these fatal blows are aimed at us by a friendly hand. However the only request I can venture to make is that you will have the courtesy to postpone the second reading until after the 15th. You will perceive that I will feel it my duty to divide the House upon every stage of these bills. You have no prospect of carrying them except with and by the votes of the worst enemies of Ireland. The Irish Government are decidedly hostile to them.

It is perhaps my duty — but I do it with great diffidence — to conclude by earnestly imploring you to allow these bills to drop for the present year as I know the present Government intend to bring in a registry bill next session and as your bills are in my most thorough conviction calculated to do the Irish people the greatest mischief.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Paper, NLI MSS 430

- 1 On 5 March Smith O'Brien, Sir Denham Jephson Norreys and Thomas Wyse obtained leave to bring in two bills, one 'for the better registration of voters in Ireland' and the other 'to regulate polls at Elections in Ireland'. The two bills were given a first reading on 22 March but were not proceeded with.
- 2 Maziere Brady (1796-1871), solicitor-general 1837-39; attorney-general, 23 February 1839-14 August 1840; chief baron of the exchequer 1840-

46; judge of court of chancery 1846; lord chancellor of Ireland 1846-52, 1853-58, 1859-66. See *DNB*.

2602

*To Lord Normanby*

Merrion Square, 6 April 1839

My Lord,

I could have at a more early period expressed my respectful gratitude to your Lordship for your kindness in offering me the aid of your counsel on the present critical state of affairs but I could not sooner be warranted in appealing to the members of the Irish government as I now can, to bear testimony to the precision with which I have *obeyed*, for that is the proper word, the advice you were so good as to give me. Believe me, my Lord, that I shall ever feel highly flattered by your taking the trouble to give me any suggestion relative to the conduct of affairs in this country, and it will be to me a source of pride and pleasure to work out that suggestion as fully as in my power. Ireland owes you too much and you know Ireland too well not to command the entire confidence of every man interested in the welfare of the Irish people and, humble as I am, I cannot conceal how completely you command my wishes and best exertions for that line of policy which you deem wise and useful.

Of course the greatest anxiety prevails here for the result of Lord John Russell's motion.<sup>1</sup> The fate of Ireland depends on it, and may I venture to sigh over the policy which, by connecting the present administration with the '*finality*' doctrine,<sup>2</sup> has disheartened so many friends and encouraged all our enemies. Is it permitted to breathe a hope that some declaration may be made early in the debate to justify an expectation of amending the Reform Bill so as to prevent the effects of the 'despair of good' by which so many steady reformers are now tempted to sin against Ireland and justice. I of course am prone to exaggerate the value to the British Crown of tranquillised Ireland displaying her unfettered energies in commercial and agricultural improvements aided *then* by British capital and strengthened for good by a resident and a loved because a beneficent proprietary, a proprietary who would practically show that they knew property had duties as well as rights. You, my Lord, have done more to bring about such a happy state than any other man living or dead. Could you not — pardon the tremulous anxiety which dictates the question —

could you not whisper to your colleagues 'Enlist once again the Reform force in order to be *able*, as you are willing, to add to the security of the Throne the *active* gratitude of the Irish people.' Of course my question is one to which I seek no reply. It is one which can be answered only by a suggestion covered from me and the world by the impenetrable obscurity of official privacy.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 See letter 2600 n2.
- 2 Russell's statements, particularly that of 20 November 1837 (see letter 2478 n2), that the Reform Act of 1832 was a final measure and that he would not support any further major reforms. This declaration earned him the nickname, 'Finality Jack'.

2603

*From Rev. Michael Tobin, P.P.*<sup>1</sup>

Cahir, Co. Tipperary, 7 April 1839

*Copy*

I claim a little of your attention to the doings of Earl Glengall.<sup>2</sup> Ever since we announced our adhesion to the Precursor Society he has vowed vengeance against any of his tenantry who should become a member.<sup>3</sup>

But the election of guardians<sup>4</sup> has at last afforded the opportunity of executing his threats. He made out a list of guardians for the whole Union — of persons who were either noted partisans and of the right sort; or nominal Catholics who are tenants — of course dependents, and might be managed. In the divisional district of Cahir he placed on his list 3 rank Tories to the exclusion of over 8,000 Catholics; but he has been signally defeated. His nominees were rejected and three honest, patriotic Catholics returned. He affected it was a matter of indifference who should be returned but, as soon as Lady Day<sup>5</sup> came on, the mask was removed. It was not usual to call for the March Lady Day rent until harvest but on this occasion orders were issued to have it paid on the following day. The law agent, J. Barry,<sup>6</sup> had instructions to serve latitats<sup>7</sup> upon every person whose rent was not paid within four days. He sent letters through the Post Office with this warning and charged 7/6 for the same. He went to Dungarvan and did not return till the fourth day. Several went with the rents to the Land Agent's office, *who actually refused until they first settled costs with the Law Agent*. One man called and tendered his rent.



He was desired to go to Barry, the Law Agent. He did so; and, while in the act of paying the money, a latitat was served on him, the cost of which he was obliged to pay in addition to the rent! Is this legal? I know it is not just.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Michael Tobin (died 12 March 1852), parish priest of Cahir from before 1836 till his death.
- 2 Richard (Butler), second Earl of Glengall (1794-1858), Cahir Castle, Cahir, Co. Tipperary.
- 3 O'Connell read this letter to the Commons (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLVII, 438-9) in the adjourned debate of 19 April on Russell's motion of confidence in the Irish administration (see letter 2600 n2).
- 4 That is, poor law guardians.
- 5 25 March, feast of the Annunciation. The spring gale was usually collected at this time.
- 6 James Barry, attorney, 49 Jervis Street, Dublin and Cahir.
- 7 Writs.

## 2604

*To Thomas Drummond, 8 April 1839, from Merrion Square*<sup>1</sup>

Seeks a government post, such as a paymastership of police, for Mr. Markham of Youghal who has been ruined in trade because of his services to the Liberal interest in that town. O'Connell says that Mr. Howard,<sup>2</sup> the present M.P. for Youghal, supports the request.

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI 2152

- 1 A note by Drummond on this letter says: 'Saw Mr. Markham and told him how little probability there was of being able to appoint him to any situation, April 19, 1839.'
- 2 Frederick John Howard (1814-1897), Burlington Gardens, London. M.P. for Youghal 1837-41. See *Boase*.

## 2605

*From Archbishop MacHale*

Tuam [Co. Galway], 16 April 1839

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have been in receipt of your last esteemed favour, and beg to return you my sincere thanks for your very kind congratulations. However, it must be owned, though the name of Protestant Arch-

bishop is abolished together with the bishoprics of the Establishment,<sup>1</sup> much if not all of that remains which has been the bitter source of the misfortunes of Ireland. Not only are the temporalities of the Establishment secured but they are also so disposed of in sending missionaries and scripture-readers through the country as to give much annoyance to the Catholic people. In short, the spirit of religious ascendancy and intolerance still prevails and, were it not under some check from the popular influence, it would manifest itself in a still more offensive manner. Nay, in the provisions made for educating the people, the bigotry that so long cursed Ireland is not at all concealed. It is attempted to supersede the exercise of the most ordinary duties of the pastors and to hand over the education of the Catholics of Ireland to a board<sup>2</sup> composed of the ancient enemies of our country and of our faith, and some Catholics, a portion of whom care but very little for the practical observances of religion as connected with the education of Catholic children. It is this state of things as well as the marked insult and injustice with which their province in particular is treated,<sup>3</sup> that makes the people of Connaught so indifferent in joining the Precursor Society. There can be no hope of that justice for which the people are struggling. While the ascendancy of the Protestant Establishment is left in full vigour without active strenuous exertions to abate all mischief, it is my sincere conviction that it will be difficult to concentrate the national spirit such as it was in the Catholic associations. The people require progressive improvement in legislation as well as a fair administration of the laws. Without a sure prospect of such improvement and, above all, without a hope that the religious ascendancy, which is still felt, will be put an end to.

Without this entire religious equality the foundations of justice cannot be laid. If the people do not obtain an enlargement of their civil rights, they and their pastors should be left the free enjoyment of their religious rights without an attempt to subject them to an unhallowed combination of religious bigotry and political despotism. . . . Still we have all done our duty during this crisis and raised our voice in protesting against the sanguinary demonstrations of the Tories. Yet, if the system of politics is not changed, you may rely on it, the name of Whigs or Radicals will have no charm, and the people, tired of promises not fulfilled, will abandon them to their fate. Their only chance of a permanent continuance in power is a firm determination to do justice to Ireland which is incompatible with its ecclesiastical establishments and the present religious inequality of its people. I hope the Ministers will take a salutary lesson from the difficulties into which their feeble

policy has thrown them and that you will be enabled, if you hope for the free, generous and uncalculating aid of the nation, to enlarge your demands upon the Government. . . . I cannot omit this opportunity of thanking you most sincerely for your zeal in behalf of Captain Gleeson which he hopes will be successful in doing him justice.<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 662-3

- 1 The Irish church temporalities act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV c. 37) suppressed ten sees, amalgamating them with neighbouring sees, and reduced the archbishoprics of Cashel and Tuam to bishoprics.
- 2 The Board of National Education.
- 3 See letter 2576.
- 4 See letter 2576.

## 2605a

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

[c. 20 April 1839]

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is well, very well. The majority, as you know, twice as great as I expected.<sup>1</sup> We are safe for another year.

Sheil was brilliant, Stanley stupid; but, on the whole, we had the greatest triumph in the debate. They talk much of a change in the detail of the Ministry, now in its principle sure to radicalise it a little.

The Tories are confounded.

Col. Butler applied for a lieut[enant]cy in the navy for his son, else he *would not vote* with the Ministry. His son is passed only one year. The Ministry *could not* possibly make him a lieut[enant].

Therefore Colonel Butler stayed away from the division. *Oh shame, shame!*

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 139-40

- 1 On Russell's motion of confidence in the Irish administration (see letter 2600 n2).

2606

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 24 April 1839

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is going on well with the Government. The effect of the late debate<sup>1</sup> has been excellent. It is so manifest that we have had decidedly the best of it. Sheil's speech<sup>2</sup> was admirable, argumentative and brilliant. He is a noble creature.

I am delaying my address to the Irish people until after Sunday, the reason of which delay is not obvious, but is in fact because we are to have a snug dinner of staunch reformers that day, say about eighteen, to make arrangements for an association or society for further reform. My course will be shaped according to the result. I am determined, if I get five to join me, to make the attempt at associating. In fact, the Ministry cannot remain in power unless some steps be taken to popularise them. I am working every possible engine to persuade them of this truth and am determined to act my part at all events.

How bitterly do I deplore the publication of the squabble<sup>3</sup> about the paltry £40 received by French! How our enemies chuckle at this miserable quarrel!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 174-5

- 1 On Russell's motion of confidence in the Irish administration (see letter 2600 n2).
- 2 Sheil spoke on the final night of the debate, above (see *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLVII, 381-400).
- 3 Arthur French has been treasurer of a meeting on 13 February convened to address Lord Normanby on the occasion of his retirement. Ignatius Callaghan demanded from French a statement of the expenditure of £41.15.0 which he alleged had been collected for the purpose (French claimed it was only £31.14.0). An acrimonious correspondence ensued and it was published. On 23 April a meeting was held to audit the accounts. It passed a resolution censuring Callaghan and expressing confidence in French's integrity (*Pilot*, 22, 24 Apr. 1839).

2607

*From Alexander Seton, Lr. Rutland Street, Dublin 27 April 1839*

Discusses registration of voters and abuses therein but not with the clear statement of facts that would make his letter really useful.

He attacks some unnamed Dublin Tory vigorously.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

2608

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 29 April 1839

We were in some anxiety lest the Ministry should be defeated on Friday<sup>1</sup> on the Jamaica question<sup>2</sup> but I have the pleasure to tell you that *all* is quite safe. The saints of the anti-Harvey party<sup>3</sup> all, or at least many of them, vote with us. If this had not been so we should have been in some peril. Blessed be God, the danger is over! I believe Lord Plunket is about to resign (the Seals). Campbell will be his successor and it is believed that O'Loghlen will get a peerage, to help to keep Brougham and Lyndhurst in check in the lords. The idea of a change in the *interior* of the ministry is, I fancy, abandoned or at least postponed. But I have strong reason to hope that the reduction of postage to one penny per letter will be adopted by the Ministry and in that case it will give them the first accession of popularity. It will be a most beneficial measure to the poorer classes.

I, with a most numerous deputation of members, go to Lord Melbourne on Thursday on the postage question.<sup>4</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 175-6

- 1 This seems to be a mistake or misprint for Tuesday (23 April).
- 2 A bill to suspend the constitution of Jamaica for five years, because the assembly of that island had refused to adopt the prisons act passed by the British parliament, received its second reading on 23 April. On Friday 3 May Russell moved that the House go into committee on the bill. Peel opposed it as a hasty and harsh measure, and in the division in the early hours of 7 May the radicals including Grote, Hume and Molesworth, voted against the government whose majority on the bill sank to five. O'Connell spoke and voted in favour of the bill. Later in the day (7 May) the government resigned. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., 871-972; *Annual Register*, 1839, 94-118; Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 415-16).
- 3 That is, those Radicals who supported Charles W.W. Wynn in his motion in favour of depriving Daniel Whittle Harvey of his seat for the borough of Southwark (see letter 2590 n4). O'Connell may have meant that these Radicals were 'saints', the nickname given to the evangelical wing of the Church of England in the early nineteenth century.

- 4 On Thursday, 2 May, a deputation from the city of London uniform penny postage committee, attended by some 150 M.P.'s including O'Connell, were received by Melbourne. Since the room was densely crowded O'Connell climbed on a chair and made a special appeal to Melbourne on behalf of the poor Irish in Britain who were cut off by the existing post office rates from 'home, kindred and friends'. Melbourne informed the deputation that he was much impressed by what had been said by the speakers present particularly O'Connell (*Globe*, 3 May 1839).

## 2609

*To his daughter Kate*

London, 1 May 1839

My own heart's darling child,

. . . How it wrings my heart to find you complaining of your and my ever loved Charles'<sup>1</sup> situation. You would indeed wrong me, my own darling heart's child, if you thought I could neglect these complaints. The fact is, darling Kate, that they are not appointing more stipendiary magistrates and Heaven alone knows when there will be a vacancy. Depend on it, beloved, ever beloved Kate, that if there be such I will do *all I can* to procure it for *your* and *my* Charles. . . .

I wept for the lovely boy<sup>2</sup> who is with his God enjoying a never ending felicity. Such is human nature. I wept bitterly for him. . . . Recollections came upon me which make bitter contrasts with my widowed state. I *was* the happiest of men. Think of your father in your prayers. . . .

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

- 1 His son-in-law, Charles O'Connell.
- 2 The young son of Charles and Kate O'Connell.

## 2610

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

We shall be pressed close on the Jamaica Bill.<sup>1</sup> Hume deserts us of which, I think, Kilkenny<sup>2</sup> has to complain bitterly but it is now too late. However, we expect a majority. If we do not get it the Ministry will resign. If we get it there will be some changes in

the administration — internal changes I may call them. I thought this was an idle rumour, and I believe, told you so, but I have recent reasons for believing it quite true. If made, they will be all for the better. I also have reason to believe that we shall carry the universal Penny Postage.<sup>3</sup> It would be the most popular measure ever adopted. I said a few words on the subject yesterday at Lord Melbourne's, which were very favourably received and pointedly noticed by him.<sup>4</sup> The dinner to Hume went off admirably. The *Morning Chronicle* gives some notion of a most successful speech<sup>5</sup> I made but which is turned into trash by the *Morning Advertiser* and other papers.

It is hoped that there are to be more peerages especially in the Legal department.

If the Ministry succeed on the Jamaica question, and carry the penny postage, they will certainly survive this session and, in that case, we shall be able to raise a rational reform system and agitation for the next session. The Chartists will be *hors de combat* by that time and then we will easily unite a large portion of the middle classes in favour of further reform and in the effort to push on the Ministry. This is our great hope.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 176

- 1 See letter 2608 n2.
- 2 Hume was M.P. for Kilkenny city.
- 3 A bill for this purpose was introduced in July and duly enacted (2 & 3 Vict. c. 52).
- 4 See letter 2608 n4.
- 5 This dinner took place on 1 May in the Crown and Anchor tavern. O'Connell's speech was mainly concerned with attacking the privileges of the House of Lords, Brougham, Wellington and the Chartists (*MC*, London, 2 May 1839).

2611

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 7 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is over. The Melbourne Ministry have expired.<sup>1</sup> Lord Normanby is with the Queen<sup>2</sup> but he cannot make up a valid Administration. Tomorrow the Duke of Wellington and the Tories will try. Blessed be God, it is a sad infliction! Principally to be attributed to Joseph Hume. His conduct encouraged Smith O'Brien and others to revolt. O'Brien, though very ill-conditioned, would

not have had the courage to behave so basely as he did if he had not been countenanced by Hume. Then that goose of geese, Brabazon, put his retreat specially on the fact of Hume's *speech*. We lost six Irish votes — four by Hume and Smith O'Brien voting *against* instead of *for* us; two by the absence of Brabazon, and Martin of Galway; four by the two Tories<sup>3</sup> voting *against* instead of *for* us. These ten would have kept the Ministry in.

Regret is vain. The Tories *must* dissolve.

But the blow is too fearful to allow me to do more than announce it to you.

The Whigs are out but the Tories are not yet *in*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 177

- 1 See letter 2608 n2.
- 2 Normanby, secretary of state for war and the colonies, was asked by the queen to form a ministry following Melbourne's resignation. He did not succeed (see 'Normanby' in *DNB*).
- 3 The 'two Tories' were no doubt the Radicals, Grote and Molesworth.

2612

*To Richard More O'Ferrall*

16 Pall Mall [London], 7 May 1839

*Confidential*

My dear O'Ferrall,

I am so unhappy about the Ministry for the sake of wretched Ireland that I cannot resist asking you your private and of course your candid opinion as to the course they will take. I need not urge you, if anybody should consult with you, to advise them to preserve Ireland from the faction as long as they possibly can. Give me at all events any materials you have to enable me to *form an opinion* on the ministerial movements. I do not know when I felt so uneasy and unhappy.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward G. More O'Ferrall



2613

*To Edmond Smithwick*

16 Pall Mall [London], 7 May 1839

*Private*

My dear Smithwick,

What are we to do with Joseph Hume. He has behaved as ill to us as he *possibly* could. He has preferred the tyrannical planters of Jamaica to the people of Ireland and that in defiance of the remonstrance of his constituents.<sup>1</sup>

I learn this moment that the Government will resign.

If Hume had voted with us, the majority would have been sufficient to keep in the Government.

What are the men of Kilkenny to do? I am obliged to close. You shall hear again from me tomorrow.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 A meeting of the Kilkenny Citizens Club on 13 May passed resolutions censuring Hume for voting contrary to the expressed wishes of his constituents but giving him credit for having done so in good conscience (*Leinster Journal*, 15 May 1839).

2614

*To Edmond Smithwick*<sup>1</sup>

London, 8 May 1839

*Private*

My dear Smithwick,

Peel has the formation of the ministry so we shall have a dissolution. It is not worthwhile throwing away a thought upon Hume; It would be impossible under a Tory government to carry Dublin. I am therefore thinking strongly of Kilkenny. What do you think? Write to me as speedily as possible on this subject. Mr. R. Sullivan behaved exceedingly handsomely<sup>2</sup> to me on this subject. But you know the city so well that I wish for *your* candid opinion.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 This letter was addressed in error to R[ichard] Smithwick (see letter 2621a). Richard Smithwick (1805-60), Birchfield, Kilkenny, attorney, was the second son of John Smithwick; and M.P. for Co. Kilkenny, 1846-7.
- 2 In resigning from Kilkenny city in favour of O'Connell following his being unseated for Dublin city on petition in 1836 (see letters 2314 and 2328).

2615

*To Richard Sullivan*

London, 8 May 1839

*Private*

My dear friend,

I believe it is not *worth while* to waste any time upon Hume. A dissolution is of course approaching and I want to consult you on the subject of my standing myself for Kilkenny. Dublin is lost under a Tory Ministry and, if you still think I can have Kilkenny, I will be sure of it as I know your intelligence and have already experienced your friendship.

[P.S.] Peel has just been with the Queen. He forms the new administration.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Anne Smithwick

2616

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 9 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

Peel does not find it so easy to make out his Administration as he expected. He has, in fact, about him a species of double Cabinet — that is, two men for every one place. He will, however, get over the difficulty but probably to fall into another. At present — past five — the only appointment known is Lord Lyndhurst to be Chancellor. This is the man who called us *aliens*<sup>1</sup> and spoiled our Corporation Bill<sup>2</sup> last year. In short, one of the greatest enemies Ireland has.

The list of Ministers in the *Times* is pure conjecture. Many probable guesses, that is all.

It is now believed that we are not to have a dissolution till after the Session is over. I have this fact from good authority — that is, from a person who would not deceive, and who *ought* to know.

I will give you another *bulletin* tomorrow.

There are symptoms of the commencement of a Reform Association.<sup>3</sup> In a day or two these will probably ripen into activity. I am incessant in my endeavours to make men act together. I see

reasons to hope that Peel's Ministry will not last.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 177-8

- 1 In a speech in the Lords on the Irish municipal reform bill in 1836 Lyndhurst was reported to have described Irish Catholics as 'a population alien to Englishmen, speaking, many of them, a different language, professing a different religion, regarding the English as invaders, and ready to expel them at the first opportunity.' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1836, 1378). In the Lords six weeks later (27 June) he denied having made this charge but he maintained that the repeated statements of Irish agitators, particularly O'Connell, justified such an assessment of the Irish Catholic population (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1836, 2077-8).
- 2 According to Macintyre, Lyndhurst made 'sweeping amendments' to the Irish municipal corporations bill of 1838 (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 256).
- 3 In a public letter to Barrett on the previous day O'Connell appealed for the formation of a broadly based reform association in Ireland (O'Connell to Barrett, 8 May 1839, *Pilot*, 10 May 1839). At a meeting in London on 13 May called by advertisement, he launched the 'Precursor of Reform Association of Great Britain,' the objects of which included the ballot, extension of the franchise, free trade, equal electoral districts, triennial parliaments and abolition of the property qualification for M.P.'s (*FJ*, 16 May 1839).

2617

*From Lord John Russell*

Whitehall, 9 May 1839

My dear Sir,

It is a pleasure which I cannot refuse myself to acknowledge the constant and disinterested support which you have given to the Ministry in which I held a department chiefly connected with the affairs of Ireland.

I am glad to see that you exhort your countrymen to abstain from acts of violence<sup>1</sup> and I feel little or no doubt that, although you differ from me with respect to several measures relating to Ireland, you will persevere in refraining to press for Repeal while there is any prospect of equal justice to be obtained by other means.

It is my opinion that there is not, as you sometimes allege, any hostility among the people of England to their fellow subjects in Ireland. But so much pains have been taken to persuade them that the Roman Catholics wish to subvert the Protestant religion that they act in ignorance of the real question in dispute. It has been my anxious wish to diffuse by calm argument more sound ways of thinking on the subject of Ireland and to oppose free-

dom of conscience to the religious bigotry of Exeter hall.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: Walpole, *Russell*, I, 321

- 1 O'Connell voiced this appeal in a letter to the People of Ireland, 8 May 1839, (*MC*, 9 May; *Pilot*, 10 May 1839).
- 2 Meeting place of the anti-Catholic Protestant Association.

2618

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 10 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

Hurrah for the darling little Queen! Peel is out; Melbourne is in again. This I have from a source of undoubted credit. The scoundrel Tories insisted on her parting with all her court.<sup>1</sup>

She has shown great firmness and excellent heart. The best of her race, the country will respond to her call. The dispute with Peel commenced yesterday. Last night the old cabinet sat from ten till one. Lord Melbourne was with her majesty two hours this morning, and his cabinet sat again this day at half after two. They are just risen and I have it for certain that all is right. I am just going to a confidential meeting and can, of course, give you no further details of what has passed. You will laugh at the gratification to my vanity in some persons supposing that my letter<sup>2</sup> had some influence, but that is idle.

Of course I will write to you tomorrow again. For the present, *all is well*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 178

- 1 A reference to the celebrated 'Bedchamber Crisis'. Peel insisted as a condition of taking office that the queen get rid of some of her Whig household ladies. She indignantly refused to do so whereupon Peel resigned his commission to form a government, and Whigs returned to office (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 416-26).
- 2 O'Connell to the People of Ireland (see letter 2617 n1). In this letter O'Connell warned that the Tories' accession to government would mean a revival of Orange persecution and widespread violence in Ireland; and he called on the people of Ireland to organise a mass agitation against a Tory administration.

2619

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 11 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

This has been a most interesting and exciting day. The formal decision of the ministry was to be known this day. Without doing something they could not expect the support of the Radicals. I have the happiness to tell you that, after five hours' debate, the Cabinet have determined to continue in office, conceding the principle of progression as contrasted with finality.<sup>1</sup> They intend to adjourn for a fortnight from Monday to make all arrangements of detail. Peel and his party are totally flung overboard. The ballot is to be made an open question and amelioration in the registry acts is to be introduced into the Cabinet so as practically to extend the franchise. The franchise itself in the counties will be put by the Ministerial Bill on the tenure of house and land at ten pounds a year as the least *bona-fide* rent, not clear value over rent, but of that value, £10 or upwards annually, as in cities. The rate-paying clauses also will be modified or abolished. If the Lords throw these bills out we will have the Queen and the country with us. The queen has behaved nobly. To her we are indebted for our safety. May God bless her! Peel was for allowing her some of her ladies but the Duke of Wellington insisted on turning out the entire corps.<sup>2</sup> The Queen had a ball last night. She was in great gaiety and good humour, remarkably civil to all the Liberals, the reverse to the Tories.

The Tories are in the greatest rage. All Lefroy was offered was a baronetcy and it was distinctly stated that Perceval,<sup>3</sup> etc., were not to embarrass the new Government by insisting on office in Ireland. Perceval was told he might be Governor of Trinidad, where it is clear he would kill himself in three months drinking *sangaree*, a favourite beverage in the West Indies. In short, the mere approach to office has created one hundred divisions in their party. Every man who was not promised something is a declared enemy! More bad luck to the vagabonds! You cannot conceive how I seem to tread on air after the dismay for three days of suffering all the horrors of Tory rule! The *Globe*, of course, states there was a meeting of Reformers this day at which I made a speech. A pure lie.

I believe Brougham will give his aid to the Ministry. He is so clever a rascal that we ought, if possible, to have him. I have been busy and useful.

[P.S.] Of course you are not to let what I write get into the newspapers.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 179-80

- 1 See letter 2478 n2.
- 2 A reference to the 'Bedchamber Crisis' (see letter 2618).
- 3 Alexander Perceval, J.P. (1787-1858) Temple House, Ballymote, Co. Sligo, second son of Rev. Philip Perceval. Lieutenant-colonel Sligo militia 1809-55; M.P. Co. Sligo 1831-41; a lord of the treasury 6-16 September 1841; sergeant-at-arms of the House of Lords 1841-58. See *DNB*.

## 2620

*To P.V. FitzPatrick, 7 o'clock [13 May 1839]  
from House of Commons*

'All is right, quite right, improving hourly. I cannot write more till tomorrow. We owe all to the darling Queen.'<sup>1</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 180

- 1 See letter 2618.

## 2621

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

14 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have little to tell you but that little is *all good*. Everything is progressing as favourably as possible. A section of the Radicals, sixteen in number, met on Sunday and formed a project of *progression* on which they were to give their support to Lord Melbourne. They included eight of the men who deserted on the Jamaica Bill. They sent a deputation to Lord Melbourne and he met them this day. The interview was conducted in the most amicable manner and the deputation came away quite satisfied. This gives us *all our support* again and ends the hopes of Toryism. I rejoice in the goodness of God for our escape, especially as it seems from your letter that that wretched unmanly spirit of truckling to enemies in power, which has been the great source of the depression and degradation of Ireland, was beginning to show

itself again. I never will get half credit enough for carrying Emancipation because posterity never can believe the species of *animals* with which I had to carry on my warfare with the common enemy. It is crawling slaves like them that prevent our being a nation. As to the Duke of Leinster, what would my friend Murphy have? I paid him a compliment when I talked of dormant patriotism.<sup>1</sup> I should have denied the quality *almost* altogether. I go tomorrow to the races, and leave for Dublin on Friday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 183

- 1 In his letter to the People of Ireland (see letter 2617 n1), O'Connell appealed to the duke of Leinster and Lord Charlemont to assume the leadership of the popular cause (*Pilot*, 10 May 1839).

## 2621a

*To Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny*

[London], 14 May 1839

My dear Smithwick,

I believe I put the initial R to your letter instead of the right one.<sup>1</sup>

I am happy to tell you that all is going on right well and there is every appearance of a Union between the radicals and the ministry.

We will have no dissolution for the present. When it comes I have no idea of thinking that I could transfer my claim on the kindness of the Kilkenny Constituency<sup>2</sup> to any other person. I never will be so presumptuous as to attempt anything of that kind. Richard Sheil has paramount claims of his own but whilst such a constituency as that of Kilkenny honours me with a preference, or to be more accurate with a priority I will not abandon it to any other person. This is all I need say for the present. I am too proud of and too grateful to the 'boys of Kilkenny' not to esteem their confidence as one not to be trifled with in the slightest degree — and the conversation between me and Sheil on that subject must have been mistaken, totally mistaken, by him as he made such an impression on the mind of my very esteemed friend, D. Cormack.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps I spoke to him loosely on the subject but my mind was never called to a deliberate opinion other than that which I now write.

Put off any thing about Hume, I pray you, until my letter<sup>4</sup> of Thursday next reaches you.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 See letter 2614.
- 2 See letter 2614.
- 3 Denis Cormac, member of a Kilkenny brewing family who were ruined by Father Mathew's temperance movement. He married 2 June 1838 Mary, a daughter of Walter Kavanagh of the Ballyhale, Co, Kilkenny family.
- 4 Not extant.

2622

To Joseph Parkes

16 Pall Mall [London], 14 May 1839

*Confidential*

My dear Parkes,

I enclose you a cheque on Ladbroke's<sup>1</sup> for my Carlow subscription £50.<sup>2</sup> I must not take credit for generosity because I knew that the Precursor Society would at once repay me, and I accordingly got this morning the amount from Dublin.

The Irish people are ready at this crisis to do *anything* that may be *advisable*. Can you give me or procure me any *sound advice* relative to an Irish demonstration,<sup>3</sup> I could work out its details to the uttermost.

SOURCE: Parkes Papers, University College London

- 1 Ladbroke, Kingscote and Gillman, Bank Buildings, Cornhill, London, bankers.
- 2 Towards the petition against the return of the Tory Francis Bruen for Carlow borough in a by-election in February 1839. Petitions against Bruen's return were presented in the Commons on 11, 15, 22 March and 8, 15 April 1839. A committee was appointed on 30 April, and reported on 11 July that Bruen was not duly returned. On 12 July the defeated candidate, Thomas Gisborne the younger, was declared elected.
- 3 The demonstration which O'Connell appears to have had in mind took place in Dublin on 23 May when a meeting was convened at the Customs House, under the chairmanship of Lord Cloncurry. An address to the queen was drawn up expressing thanks for her conduct in the recent crisis (see letter 2618 n1) and calling on the ministry to extend to Ireland corporate and franchise reform. The meeting was attended by O'Connell and two other M.P.'s, George Evans and Henry Grattan (*Pilot*, 24, 27 May 1839).



2623

*To Rev. Dr. Thomas O'Brien Costello*<sup>1</sup>

London, 16 May 1839

My respected Friend,

What are you to do with Smith O'Brien? In asking the question I have no personal resentment or personal feeling to gratify. All I want to know is what do you think best for the county in particular and the country in general? I easily forgive his foolish imprudence towards myself. The question remains, what is best to be done with him? He is an exceedingly weak man, proud and self-conceited and, like almost all weak men, utterly impenetrable to advice. You cannot be sure of him for half an hour. But are you in a condition to get rid of him, and have you a candidate to supply his place?<sup>2</sup> The answer to these two questions ought to be decisive as to the mode of proceeding and to you I apply for such answers and for suggestions as to the steps which ought to be taken. It would be, at all events, most desirable that he should be pledged not to oppose the present ministry.

I am happy to tell you that, if we were free from desertion in our own camp, the Tories would not have the least chance of resuming power. Indeed, my own opinion is that we are quite safe but then it is the part of wise men to make, if they can, assurance doubly sure.

We should, I think, address<sup>3</sup> the Queen on her escape from the Tories, and pray her to come to visit Ireland. We will set about these things when I arrive in Dublin.

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

- 1 Thomas O'Brien Costello (c. 1786-1850), C.C. Fethard, Co. Tipperary 1809-11; C.C. Cashel 1811-14; P.P. Murroe 1814-50.
- 2 Smith O'Brien had voted against the government on the Jamaica bill (see letter 2611). Costello called a meeting of O'Brien's constituents for 21 May to consider his conduct (*Pilot*, 20 May 1839). While a resolution was passed at this meeting stating that O'Brien had by his vote forfeited the confidence of his constituents, Costello's attempt to pass a resolution calling on him to resign to make way for Edward Lawless, Lord Cloncurry's son, proved a failure (*Pilot*, 22 May 1839).
- 3 See letter 2622 n3.

2624

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 16 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

At present no news are good news. All is going on smoothly and well, the Ministry disposed to *progress* with and for the country, and the parliamentary Radicals disposed to be satisfied with reasonable concessions. I think there is present security with a prospect of increasing strength in future.

I intend to leave this tomorrow evening for Dublin so as to cross over on Saturday. This would enable me to hear Mass in Kingstown on Sunday morning and consult with our friends upon a public demonstration, for I do think there ought to be a public demonstration. I am also strongly of opinion that the Queen ought to be solicited to go to Ireland this summer. It would be a *brain-blow* to the Orange faction to have the popular party well received at Court and their own leaders treated with the indifference they so highly merit.

Is there any exposure to infection of scarlatina in bringing the Precursors to assemble at the Corn Exchange, or any annoyance to poor Ray's family? Enquire into these things before my arrival. Of course you will put my name for as *much as I ought* to poor Barrett's subscription.<sup>1</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 184-5

- 1 As proprietor of the *Pilot* Richard Barrett was fined a total of £120 and sentenced to three months imprisonment in May 1839 as a result of two libel actions brought with the support of the government (*MR*, 6, 13 May 1839). Subscriptions in aid of Barrett were entered into at a meeting in Dublin of Friends of the Liberty of the Press on 16 May, to which O'Connell contributed £20. At least £133 was subscribed (*MR*, 20 May 1839).

2625

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 27 May 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

All is well — our majority<sup>1</sup> eighteen. It would have been more but for some accidents but it is quite sufficient and satisfactory. The Ministry will progress. They concede the 'penny postage', that

is, an universal postage of one penny only. This is a most popular movement. They will also announce their intention to amend the Reform Bill,<sup>2</sup> and that also, I believe, tomorrow. We are in the greatest spirits. The country will be with us to a man — that is, all that it is desirable to have.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 185

- 1 On the election of the ministerial candidate Shaw Lefevre as speaker of the House of Commons on 27 May by 317 votes to 299. He succeeded James Abercromby who was raised to the peerage as Lord Dunfermline (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLVII, 1050-5).
- 2 The Whigs were confronted in June by two radical motions, one to alter the franchise in the counties, and the other in favour of the ballot. The government opposed the first of these but allowed the ballot to become an open question, thus slightly increasing the minority in its favour (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 428). No formal statement by the government on the reform bill took place at this time.

2626

*From George ? to London*

Exeter, [postmarked 1 June 1839]

Dear and Hond Sir,

I have often thought of sending you the accompanying extract as a triumphant refutation of your enemies' abuse of you for exposing<sup>1</sup> the immorality of the lower classes in England. It may be as well for you to keep it. Unfortunately I did not mark the date of the paper but I believe Lord Eldon's and [about 1 word missing] Sugden spoke the words ten years ago. We have not mended our manners much since that time. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 If and when O'Connell did this has not been ascertained.

2627

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

7 June 1839

*All is right.* All is quite right. The Radicals quite conciliated. The Ballot an open question.<sup>1</sup> When I wrote to you yesterday the Cabinet was sitting, and I reserved the apprehension that they

might have quarrelled amongst themselves. But the result was unanimity in favour of leaving the Ballot open. The Radicals are conciliated. I have just parted with one — a leading one, who has proclaimed the entire satisfaction of his party. The carrying of that one measure in the Cabinet has done wonders. I tell you distinctly that the Ministers are stronger than they have been for the last two years. On this you may rely.

The Tories rumour a dissolution but there will not be one until the close of the year at the soonest.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 185-6

1 See letter 2625 n2.

## 2628

### *From the Silk Weavers Committee to London*

8 June 1839

Honble Sir,

The silk weavers of Dublin had the pleasure of receiving from you through Mr. Ray the two parliamentary reports on combination<sup>1</sup> . . . but fearing that your multifarious engagements have caused you to forget the promise which you made your humble servant in the corn exchange the last time the deputations from the trades had the pleasure of meeting you there, of sending us the report of the 'Commissioners of enquiry into the condition of the handloom weavers of the United Kingdom',<sup>2</sup> we take the liberty of reminding you thereof, hoping you will excuse this intrusion as we are much interested as a trade in the decision of the commissioners particularly as we gave a deal of evidence to the gentleman appointed for Ireland. . . .

Your obedient and humble servant,

James Beckett<sup>3</sup>

Secretary to the Silk Weavers Committee

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 The two reports from the select committee appointed to inquire into combinations (see letter 2497 n1).
- 2 This commission was set up in September 1837 but did not make its report until February 1841 (*Parl. Papers*, 1841, X).
- 3 James Beckett, silk weaver, 2 Wilme Court, Christchurch Place, Dublin.

2629

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*<sup>1</sup>

10 June 1839

*Extract*

The political aspect of affairs is good. There is every prospect of the Ministry keeping together and increasing in strength. I believe they are all become quite alive to the necessity of further progression. The Corporate Reform bill<sup>2</sup> of the present year is much better prepared than any former Bill but of course it is quite uncertain what the lords will do with it. The Session will not be long and we shall all be in Ireland in July.

There have been many applications for relief from many parts of Ireland — for relief in provisions or money.<sup>3</sup> Encourage such applications or rather, stimulate them wherever there is *real* distress. Let the applicants state the *ordinary* and the *present* price of potatoes and the state of employment; in short, everything that could prove the necessity for the interference of Government.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 192-3

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick prefaces this letter with the statement that it includes 'a list of eleven cheques amounting in all to £9,800 drawn by O'Connell on a bank in Tralee between December 1838 and May 1839.' (FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 192).
- 2 Morpeth introduced the Irish municipal corporation reform bill on 19 February. It was committed on 19 April after what the *Annual Register* called 'unaccountable delays and postponements, in order to receive an addition of 34 clauses which should have made part of the original measure' (*Annual Register*, 1839, 83). It was passed by the Commons on 15 July, the franchise being fixed at £8 valuation. The Lords raised the valuation to £10 and passed the bill with other changes on 5 August. Consequently the government refused to proceed with the bill (O'Brien, *Concessions to Ireland*, I, 635).
- 3 There was famine at this time in many parts of the west and south of Ireland.

2630

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 28 June 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

There are no news. The railway plan<sup>1</sup> is, you see, abandoned. Nothing can possibly be done for the vintners<sup>2</sup> this Session. For the grocers<sup>3</sup> we have tried everything. I fear we have no chance, although we have the Chairman and Board of Excise with us. The Corporation Bill will pass the commons this year but be thrown out or mutilated by the lords.<sup>4</sup> Nothing will be done for Ireland and, in fact, Ireland has nothing for it but the REPEAL.

The Ministry will certainly last until the next Session, and much longer if they will take proper steps to secure themselves in power. In the meantime the chapter of accidents may do much, especially as there are strong prospects of war. Turkey and Egypt cannot remain as they are.<sup>5</sup>

I am working up the English Catholics to peaceful agitation. The middle classes have so multiplied that we will have a force sufficient to attract attention, refute calumnies, and proclaim Catholic principles, though the aristocracy may not join us. We have resolved upon a public meeting at the Freemasons' Tavern on Monday week unless we are restrained by the Bishop,<sup>6</sup> who is out of town, but returns this evening or tomorrow. I have prepared resolutions to be converted into a petition on the education subject<sup>7</sup> and everything is arranged unless, as I said, the Bishop interposes a veto. You are aware that the Clergy here cannot stir without his permission. They are all and always in his power. I intend to hold Catholic meetings in Liverpool and Manchester on my route to Ireland.

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

- 1 The government proposed on 1 March that the treasury provide up to £2,500,000, for the construction of railways in Ireland, the money advanced to be secured on the profits of the lines, any deficiency being made up by an assessment of the district through which the railways might run. The railways to be constructed were the line between Dublin and Cork and Limerick, with branches to Kilkenny and Clonmel. O'Connell supported the grant though he wished for its application to a more general system of Irish railways. The government proposal was carried by 144 to 100, despite Peel's opposition. In the Lords it ran into difficulties. Finally, the government 'who at the best were lukewarm in their support of the measure' dropped it completely (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLV, 1051-1124; Conway, *Railways in Ireland*, 10-11).
- 2 Apparently protesting against licensing restrictions on their trade. On 16

- July 1839 O'Connell presented a petition to the Commons for the amendment of the law regulating opening and closing hours.
- 3 On 17 July O'Connell introduced a bill to repeal so much of the act of 1836 (see letter 2338) as prohibited grocers in Ireland from retailing spirits to be consumed on their premises. On 18 July the solicitor-general, David R. Pigot, introduced a bill for the 'better Prevention of the Sale of Spirits by unlicensed persons in Ireland.' On its third reading on 5/6 August O'Connell succeeded in having a clause added for the purpose of repealing that part of the 1836 act which his own bill was intended to procure. Immediately afterwards, on the same day, O'Connell's own bill was dropped. His clause must have been excised by the Lords since it did not appear in Pigot's bill as enacted (2 & 3 Vict. c. 79).
  - 4 The Irish municipal corporation reform bill (see letter 2629 n2).
  - 5 At this time the viceroy of Egypt, Mahomet Ali, was in revolt against Turkish rule, and Turkey had declared war against Egypt.
  - 6 Bishop Thomas Griffiths.
  - 7 In 1839 the government proposed to play a more active role in the education of the poor in England and Wales. The result was an acrimonious controversy, in which Anglicans, Dissenters and Catholics assailed the proposed scheme. On 15 July a meeting of Catholics was held at the Freemasons' Tavern. It passed resolutions (presumably those referred to by O'Connell above) which declared the right of all denominations to participate in the government grant for education in proportion to their numbers and insisted that religious instruction of Catholic children should be 'under the exclusive inspection and management . . . of the Catholic Church.' Another resolution moved though not prepared by O'Connell, proposed a vindication of the Catholic faith against the recent calumnies of its enemies and declared the Catholic church to be the true Christian church. (*Pilot*, 17 July 1839; John W. Adamson, *English Education 1789-1902*, (Cambridge, 1930), 123-6).

2631

*To his daughter Betsey*

London, 28 June 1839

My dearest darling Child,

I have complied with your wish. I have procured Masses to be said for your intention and after my communion tomorrow I will offer up my wretched prayers for the daughter on whom my fond heart doats with a tenderness that is not to be described or known to any but the heart of a parent.

Represent to yourself your darling boy in mental agony and then you will read my feeling of utter misery at your state of mind. This, I own, is the severest blow that ever I experienced, to have you, my angel daughter, consuming your heart and intellect on vain, idle, and unprofitable scruples. It is quite true that you are

in a state with which it is the inscrutable will of God to try the souls of His elect — a state of great danger, if the spirit of pride, of self-esteem, or of self-will mixes with it so as to make the sufferer fall into the snare of *despair*. Despair is your danger, your only danger. Oh, generous God, protect my child from despair! If you, by humility, submission, humble submission to the church in the person of your spiritual director — if you give up every thought, and throw yourself into the arms of God by OBEDIENCE and submission, you will soon be at peace and be so for life, and in an eternity of bliss.

Is your scruple such as you can communicate to your father? If it be, tell it to me, and probably you yourself, when you write it, will see how idle it is. Can my child think that the God who, in the lingering torments of the cross, shed the last drop of His blood for her, is a tyrant, or that He does not love her? Your greatest love for your babe is nothing to the love God bears for you.

Why, then, my own child, not confide in His loving kindness? Generously throw all your care on Him, confide in His love, with humble submission to Him and to His spouse, His Holy Church. Oh, my beloved child, that He may through His bitter passion and cruel death give you His grace! If your scruple be such as you cannot communicate to your father, go at once and consult Dr. MacHale about it. Determine, before you go in the presence of God, to submit to whatever the Archbishop shall say to you. In the meantime, pray quietly, and with composure of mind, once or twice a day. Say coolly and deliberately, 'Oh God! Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' and then attend to your family and children, taking your mind, without bustle and violence, from the thoughts that make you unhappy to your domestic occupations.

You would pity your poor father if you knew how miserable you make me. I fear with the most agonising fear for you in this trial. If you go through it with humility, submission, and obedience, you will be an angel for all eternity.

Write to me, darling, darling child. I enclose ten pounds to pay your expenses to France. If you do not go there, use them as you please. Ever, my own, own dearest child,<sup>1</sup>

Your fond though distracted father,  
Daniel O'Connell

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

1 Correspondence in the Rathcon Papers between O'Connell's son Maurice and Piers Mahony indicates that there was a question of committing Betsy to a mental asylum some ten years later.



2632

*To Thomas Wyse*<sup>1</sup>

16 Pall Mall [London] 29 June 1839

Sir,

I respectfully request the favour of your attendance on Tuesday the 2nd of July on my motion to take into consideration the petition of Mr. Bradshaw.<sup>2</sup> . . .

SOURCE: Wyse Papers, NLI 15025 (7)

- 1 On this date O'Connell wrote an identical letter to William Smith O'Brien, M.P.
- 2 A petition of Hercules Bradshaw, brewer and malster, Hillsborough, Co. Down was presented by O'Connell on 25 June 1839 stating that the petitioner, in the year 1835, commenced the manufacture of sugar from beet-root. In 1837, a duty of 34/- per hundred weight was laid on that article which destroyed the manufacture and caused a loss of £16,000 to him and his partners; and he prayed the House to take his case into consideration. The petition was ordered to be printed, O'Connell declaring that on that day week he would move for the appointment of a select committee on the subject of duties recently imposed on sugar manufactured from beet-root (*Commons Journal*, LXXXIV, 378; *MC*, 26 June 1839). The matter does not appear to have been pursued.

2633

*From Dr. Harty*<sup>1</sup>

4 Granby Row [Dublin], 1 July 1839

Dr. Harty presents his complts. to Mr. O'Connell and regrets again to trespass on his attention. . . .

Through Mr. P. Mahony Dr. H. had troubled Mr. O'C with two petitions<sup>2</sup> for presentation and upon which certain returns were to be moved for. Mr. Mahony informed Dr. H. that Mr. O'Connell promised to do so and, as it may be of much importance that these returns be moved for before the close of the session, *unless the chancr. of the exchequer*<sup>3</sup> *promises that the sureties shall not further be troubled*. Dr. Harty has to request Mr. O'Connell's kind attention to the subject which he does the more readily as the returns cannot be objected to, they being required by the act under which the Merino Factory<sup>4</sup> loan was made.

Should Mr. O'Connell, however, be unable to find leisure for such a purpose, Dr. H. will feel obliged by his consigning the

petitions to the care of Mr. Macrory<sup>5</sup> (who is interested therein) or to Mr. E. Tennent, member for Belfast, both of whom he believes are in London.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 William Harty (1781-1854), fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Dublin. See *DNB*.
- 2 No such petition was presented to parliament.
- 3 Thomas Spring Rice.
- 4 The Merino Factory near Ennisnag, Co. Kilkenny was founded in 1810 'for the purpose of educating and employing the industrious poor of that county, and of encouraging the growth of fine wool in Ireland' (see *Sketches of the Merino Factory . . .*, Dublin, 1818).
- 5 Probably Adam John Macrory of 23 Rosemary Street, Belfast and 97 Upper Abbey Street, Dublin. Solicitor to the General Synod of Ulster.

2634

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 July 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write merely to tell you that the hint you gave me of Harnett's being asked to join his brother in Liverpool enabled me to bring his case before the Board with effect. I succeeded in raising his salary from the 1st inst. to £600 a year; that is, an additional £100 per annum. Tell him, as you can with truth, that I have thus kept my word with him, and hope, when we pay our shareholders 6 per cent., to get him another £100.

You will be glad to hear that our bank is most prosperous. We have made this progress. I examined today the accounts of this period in the year 1837 and compared them with our present state. We have paid back £130,000 to Irish shareholders and we have an excess of more than £500,000, that is, more than half a million available assets than we had two years ago. Another year or two will place us at the head of the banking business in Ireland.

There are no news. Of course the Ministry will not resign in consequence of the decision<sup>1</sup> in the lords. They will pay no attention to it. All is, in other respects, quite right in the political world.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 191

- 1 With regard to the government's second Jamaica Bill, containing a controversial clause providing for enforcement of provisions relating to vagrancy, contracts and squatting. In the Lords, on 2 July, Lyndhurst

carried the expurgation of the clause by 149 to 80. On 9 July, Russell announced acquiescence in the Lords' amendment (*Annual Register*, 1839, 209-20).

2635

*From Joseph Sturge*

Birmingham, 3 July 1839

Dear Friend,

It is probable thou has seen the statement from America that was brought by the Great Western Steam Packet of the efforts making to get Great Britain and France to recognise the independence of Texas and that a second deputy was sent to London to assist the one already here for that purpose. I believe all this is secretly through the influence of American slave traders in the United States who are both anxious to [remove] the free kingdom of Mexico as far as possible from their slaves and it is said that many American slave-holders have speculated in large tracts of land in Texas for the purpose of cultivating it by slaves who, I fear, they have already introduced in large numbers and whom they can only securely retain in bondage by getting Texas separated from Mexico. The latter country gives no legal sanction to the continuance of slavery. Whether Texas is declared independent or incorporated into the States of the American Union, she would be an almost exhaustless market for the receipt of slaves, and it appears of the last importance to prevent either taking place. If thou approve of it, I hope thou wilt please to ask the question in the House of Commons whether there are any negotiations going forward in any shape for the sanction of a separation of Texas from Mexico by this country.<sup>1</sup> The account from America says that both the English and French agents have recommended it strongly to their respective governments. If, when the question is asked, a discussion could be raised on the iniquity of this country giving countenance in the most remote degree to the formation of a new slaveholding kingdom, it might be a very seasonable admonition to the government and prevent incalculable misery.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 On 9 July O'Connell asked Palmerston in the Commons whether anything had been done by the government towards recognising 'that portion of the Mexican territory calling themselves the state of Texas.' Palmerston replied that an application requesting recognition of Texas had been rejected by the government early in 1838. He hinted, however, that the government was presently endeavouring to bring about an understanding

between Texas and Mexico. No discussion followed this reply (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLIX, 82).

## 2636

*To Thomas Wyse*

16 Pall Mall [London] 5 July 1839

Sir,

I respectfully request the favour of your attendance on Tuesday the 9th of July on my motion to take into consideration the petition of Mr. Bradshaw. . . .

SOURCE: Wyse Papers, NLI 15025 (7)

1 See letter 2632 n2.

## 2637

*From Alexander Seton, 4 Lr. Rutland Street, Dublin  
5 July 1839*

Making his usual plea for remuneration for his work at the registry of voters. He says his claims are under arbitration.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

## 2638

*To his daughter Betsey*

London, 8 July 1839

My own darling, darling —,

I write to you by your pet name, to recall to your own tenderness your fond father's affection.

I see your case clearly, and it breaks my heart to think of it. There is one remedy and *only one*; that is, absolute, unqualified submission to your director — unreasoning submission. Do not argue with anybody. Let nobody reason with you but *submit*. Do exactly what your director requires. In your case your director may — and, I think, should, compel you to go to communion without going to confession at all. Many persons in your con-

dition have been perfectly cured by perfect submission.

Believe me, my own idolised child, you have ease and happiness here and hereafter in your own hands. Submit, my own —. Do not think on anything but implicitly obeying your director.

The moment you receive this letter tell your director you submit to do everything he desires — to pray or not to pray, to fast or not to fast, to confess or not to confess, and above all, to go to communion whenever he advises or commands you.

By that simple process your mind would be perfectly restored to tranquillity and the love of God, submission, the first of virtues, the corrective of pride, of subtile pride, that wants us to think *we* are perfect.

I believe it will kill me if I do not hear that you take my advice. I would call it, darling child, my command; but no, I give you your father's blessing, if you submit to be ruled by your director without reasoning or arguing. Cast your heart and mind in humble thought into the hands of a loving God who, in the excess of his love, died on a cross for *you*. Do not argue. Tell the priest not to argue with you, but to command you and to obey to the tittle and you will be at once and for always relieved.

The moment I can leave this I will go to you, my own darling child. I will go to you to hear you say you have obeyed me. I am sure, if you do obey, I will find you happy in your sweet family and in the spiritual delight of the love of God. *Obey*. You know you are safe in obeying your father and director.

May I not tell you, darling, that you seem not to know what the theological virtue of contrition is. Contrition, darling, is a belief and conviction that it is a great evil to have committed sin. It is the knowledge that in committing sin we did that which was a great evil, and the consequent regret. Contrition is not such a grief or sorrow as you would feel if your child was sick, or as I do at your mental affliction. It is a conviction of the evil of sin in its offending God and subjecting us to deserve punishment hereafter. Ask your director how accurate this is but obey him, and you are safe and well. May God bless you!

2639

*From Dr. P. Maguire to House of Commons*

Enniskillen [Co. Fermanagh] 12 July 1839

My dear Sir,

In compliance with your directions I have the pleasure of 'returning to you' the letter<sup>1</sup> which I had the honour of presenting to you a few days subsequent to its date, and beg merely to add that there is no manner of mitigation of the sad [about 1 word missing] circumstances to which it refers.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2584.

2640

*From Thomas Spring Rice*

Downing Street [London], 13 July 1839

*Copy*

My dear Sir,

Lord John Russell has given me Monday week for the Bank of Ireland question<sup>1</sup> when it will certainly come on. I have apprised Mr. Hume on this.

SOURCE: Monteagle Papers, NLI 539

1 The Commons went into committee on Thursday 25 July (not the 22nd as planned). The charter of the Bank of Ireland had expired on 1 January 1838. In 1837 an act was passed extending the charter to 1 January 1839. In 1838 a similar act was passed extending the charter to 1 January 1840. Under discussion now was a bill sponsored by the chancellor of the exchequer, Thomas Spring Rice, and agreed to by the bank, to renew its charter with some changes (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 189-90).

2641

*From the Linen and Cotton Weavers of Belfast  
to House of Commons*

Ballymacarrett, Belfast, 20 July 1839

Sir,

I am instructed by the Linen and Cotton Weavers of Belfast to solicit you to be so kind as to give them your support in opposing a bill<sup>1</sup> that James Emerson Tennent has prepared for the regulation of the linen, cotten and hempen manufacture in Ireland. The reason why we solicit your support in the opposing of this measure is from the following circumstances. In the year of 1837 some of our employers prepared a bill which the weavers thought would be ruinous in the extreme to the trade of Ireland and they thought they would be justified in opposing its provisions in which opposition they were supported (they are proud to state) by the magistrates of the two counties of Down and Antrim and the public at large amongst whom they could name a number of members of parliament. Even Mr. Tennent himself did subscribe one pound sterling to the weavers' funds to carry their opposition into effect.

The opposition and agitation continued from the 4th of November 1837 until the 19th and 20th of July 1838. Upon the 23rd of January that year a general meeting of magistrates to the number of 28 was convened in the Town Hall Police Buildings of Belfast which meeting was also attended by a deputation from the body of manufacturers and weavers when a committee of the three classes were appointed in order that they might correspond with each other in preparing a bill that might give a fair protection till [*sic*] both masters and workmen. Mr. Molony,<sup>2</sup> on behalf of the magistrates, prepared a bill a copy of which he submitted to the manufacturers, besides one to the weavers for their respective amendments. The weavers agreed to the bill prepared by the magistrates, not so the masters. Instead of agreeing to that bill they got up another new one. It was then suggested by Mr. Molony and Mr. Agnew,<sup>3</sup> Sovereign of Belfast, that both parties should meet face to face in presence of the magistrates and there endeavour by deliberation to come to a mutual understanding. That meeting took place on the 19th February 1838, Mr. Sharman Crawford in the chair, and, after two days' deliberation, a bill was agreed to by all

parties, a copy of which bill I furnished Mr. Tennent with immediately, craving his support in endeavouring to have it passed into a law. That gentleman's answer on the 23rd March to me was that the House of Commons would sanction the introduction of no measure until such time as the commissioners appointed to enquire into the situation of the handloom weavers<sup>4</sup> had given in their report but that, when it would come before the House, he should be prepared to take an active part in supporting the measure. Consequently we are now surprised that, although the report of that commission has not yet been given, that, although Mr. Tennent pledged himself to support the bill of 1838, he should now take advantage of the weavers' ignorance and, at the request of some of our employers, prepare a new bill and endeavour to get it passed into a law without ever consulting them. We will as soon as possible furnish your Honour with a copy of the bill we wish carried into effect. Hoping you will be kind enough to give it your influence [which] will much oblige in name of my fellow workmen.

Your devoted servant,  
Henry Crone, Weavers' Secty.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 On 29 June Emerson Tennent introduced a bill in the Commons 'to repeal so much of the Laws relating to the Linen, Hemen, Union and Cotton Manufacturers in Ireland, as relates to Manufacturers and Weavers, and to make other Provisions in lieu thereof.' His bill was not given a second reading.
- 2 Walter Molony, R.M.
- 3 John Agnew, Bloomfield, Belfast.
- 4 See letter 2628.

2642

*To Thomas Drummond*

London, 30 July 1839

My dear Sir,

I have spoken to Lord Morpeth about the office of 'auditor' of the Dublin district under the Poor Law. He advised me to confer *thus* with his Excellency on the subject. The person whom I take the liberty to recommend is Mr. Veevers, the late sheriff, who has done his duty at the election<sup>1</sup> with that zeal and impar-



tiality without which I could not have carried the election and for which he has been made a victim by his *own* party. I am more anxious than I can express for his obtaining this appointment. In the first place there cannot be found a person better suited to do the duty of the office efficiently than Mr. Veevers. In the next place it is *our* duty as well as our interest to show those of the Corporation party that, when they conduct themselves in a fair, just and impartial manner, they shall not be left exposed to the hostility of the intolerants without at least obtaining the countenance and support of a liberal government. . . .

SOURCE: Drummond Papers, NLI, MS 2152

1 See letter 2586 n2.

2643

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 5 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

It is impossible to take the Municipal Bill.<sup>1</sup> It perpetuates all the abuses of the freemen, and adds for the first time 'Burgesses' in perpetuity.<sup>2</sup> It would be as foolish as imaginable to take it, especially as we shall know to a certainty next year how the Poor Law Bill<sup>3</sup> will work. I cannot sacrifice my conscientious convictions to any advice, however I may respect it.

I know Murphy's wisdom and knowledge but after the attempt made by the Chancellor to reestablish the clauses which left to the freemen their title at law, and did not make it imperative on the new Mayor to admit them without investigation, I cannot accede to accept the bill. Besides, the Lords have altered the assessment clauses, and *that*, if the bill was otherwise capable of being relieved, is a *constitutional* objection which can never be got over by the House of Commons. The bill therefore *goes* inevitably, and indeed, I fear the Lords have been tempted to go farther against it than they otherwise would, because of the report that *any* Bill would be countenanced by influential men in Dublin. Heaven help us, what a curious race we are!

The Ministry are strong at the Court. The Queen is full of intellect. She may not marry for years as she wishes to enjoy *her*

power. She cannot be better disposed than she is at present. I see also symptoms of a better feeling amongst many of the Tories. The defeat of the Chartists at all the trials<sup>4</sup> and the approaching dissolution of that body under the vigorous means employed by the Ministry, open better prospects.

The state of Europe also is such as to show that things cannot remain as they are.

[P.S.] I will, of course, do the best I can for my friend White.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 191-2

1 See letter 2629 n2.

2 The Lords added this provision to section 6 of the bill (*Parl. Papers, Bills*, 1839, II).

3 The Irish poor law act of 1838.

4 Mass arrests of Chartists were made in the summer of 1839 particularly after the middle of July, and many convictions for illegal and seditious acts were procured in late July and early August (Mark Hovell, *The Chartist Movement*, London, 1918, 170-71).

2644

*From Lord Ebrington*

Phoenix Park, 6 August 1839

*Copy*

*Private*

Dear Sir,

I have been asked my opinion as to the course which the Government should take on the Corporations Bill,<sup>1</sup> and the conflicting statements which I have heard from friends on the subject make it very difficult for me to advise, for whatever practical good is to be derived from a settlement of the question and the stop thereby to be put to the daily increasing evils which grow out of the present system, would be to a great extent defeated if the Bill were passed against the judgment and the wishes of the Irish members and the Irish people.

In considering the question, however, it appears to me that the points to be mainly taken into view are, 1st. Whether the Bill as altered by the Lords would be a decided improvement on the existing law? 2nd. Whether there is a reasonable prospect of obtaining better terms by further delay? 3rd. Whether by accepting those

now offered any difficulty would be thrown in the way of obtaining the English qualification<sup>2</sup> at a future time?

The first of these I believe no one would hesitate to answer in the affirmative. With respect to the 2nd, I must say that looking to the present and probable state of public feeling in this country and still more in England upon this question I regret that I do not think there is any reasonable ground for believing that such a degree of interest will be excited in favour of the measure as would alone induce the House of Lords to give way on the qualification clause, nor does it appear to me that on the 3rd. point our taking the Bill now (of course under protest as to that part of it) would be likely in any degree to prejudice the success of a future measure for substituting the English qualification when 3 years operation of the Poor Law shall have rendered that qualification applicable to this country.

I understand too that some of those best qualified to judge of the feelings of the Liberal Party in this city as well as of the manner in which their interests will be affected by the Bill are decidedly of opinion that it should be taken but on this you have better means of information than I have. I have been induced however to call your attention particularly to the views which I have thrown out because I know from my own experience that, in the eagerness of party feeling which the atmosphere of your House of Commons produces, especially in matters so immediately affecting our constituents, we are all of us used sometimes to consider questions of this kind too much with reference to the appearance of triumph which they may seem to give to our opponents and too little with reference to their practical effects, and knowing as I do, the weight which your opinion on this question is likely to have with your countrymen both in and out of Parliament, I am anxious that it should be formed upon a full and deliberate view of every part and bearing of the case. Let me add too that I am the more anxious for this from my recollection of the important service which you rendered to the liberal cause by your sound judgment and good advice when some of our more eager friends were for rejecting the Lords' amendment to the English Municipal Bill<sup>3</sup> which, had it been thrown out as it must have been at that time, would not I believe have ever been carried in so good a form again.

I write this of course in confidence and I must add without any

communication with any of the Government in England, and I should therefore wish you to consider it strictly private.

SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

- 1 The Irish municipal corporations bill (see letter 2629 n2).
- 2 The English Municipal Reform Act (1835) gave the municipal franchise to all possessed of property regardless of the value of that property. The Commons passed the Irish municipal reform bill of 1839 on 15 July, restricting the franchise to those with property of not less than £8 valuation for the first three years; henceforth the £8 qualification would lapse so that the Irish measure would be assimilated to the English. The Lords returned the bill to the Commons on 5 August, having raised the £8 requirement to £10 and made it perpetual. (The bill before and after amendment by the Lords is printed in *Parl. Papers*, 1839, II).
- 3 Probably a reference to O'Connell's speech on 31 August 1835, on the consideration by the Commons of the Lords' amendments to the English municipal reform bill. O'Connell declared his belief that, though a collision was impending between the two branches of the legislature 'the Commons had only now to manage it properly. Let us take care to put our enemies in the wrong. Let us concede everything that it is possible to concede. . . . Let us even go farther than what might strictly be deemed right but when we have done that — let us appeal to the good sense of the British nation. . . .' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XXX, 1177-8).

2645

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 7 August 1839

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

My own opinion is that the Municipal Bill will pass. I do think that the corporation has got its death blow and although I did not approve of the Bill as it stands, I have no chance of successfully opposing it. The point of privilege<sup>1</sup> will, it is said, be conceded by the Lords, or so arranged as not to have the objection of any validity. My opinion, on the whole, is that the Bill will pass.

I am, I confess, very unhappy. I look upon myself in danger of ruin. The country is plainly tired out of my claims. I am, indeed, unhappy. I will write to you again on the *painful, painful* subject tomorrow. If I had thought of it sooner, I should have begged of you to come here and talk to me — the trip now is nothing — but it is too late. I do not believe I will long survive the blow I apprehend from the desertion of me by the country at large. It weighs upon my heart and interferes with my health. All this is

in the most strict secrecy. At my time of life mental agony is *poisonous*.

[P.S.] *Again strictly private*. I believe I must go to Paris for ten days about General O'Connell's will.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 193

- 1 See letter 2643. On 7 August the speaker of the House of Commons, in reply to a question from Russell, declared it his opinion that the Lords' amendments to the Irish municipal reform bill infringed on the fiscal privileges of the Commons. Russell then declared he was refusing to accept the amendments (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., L, 3-6).

2646

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 8 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

The Corporation Bill is, after all, in a most awkward predicament. The point of privilege<sup>1</sup> cannot be got over. The Lords, will of course, adhere to their Amendment, and the Speaker says that we cannot suffer them to legislate on the subject, so that the opinion I gave you yesterday that the Bill would pass is falsified by the prospects held out this day. I believe the Ministry would be glad to get out of the scrape if they could but there is no possibility of doing so. I am glad, therefore, to this extent that the risk of rejecting the Bill does not lie with me.

See Ray and *Masters of the Trades Unions* and let them know that it would be madness to think of a run upon the Bank of Ireland.<sup>2</sup> Tell this also to Barrett. The second reading has passed without debate because I lose nothing and have gained a day's delay by letting it pass. The grand debate will be on Wednesday and then we go on to battle the case in the Committee. I will have abundant motions before the Bill is out of Committee. I scarcely think I will let them pass it this Session.

My own prospects appear to me to be daily darker and more dark. It does mortify me but it does not surprise me to find that I have exhausted the bounty of the Irish people. God help me! What shall I do? I think of giving up my income, save an annuity of a small sum to myself and my two sons, and going, if I am received, to Clongowes, and to spend the rest of my life there. I want a period of retreat to think of nothing but eternity. I sigh when I look at the present agitated aspect of affairs, foreign and dom-

estic, and vainly think that if Ireland thought fit to support me I might still be useful; but it is plain I have worn out my claim on the people. You are aware that Connaught is, of course, estranged from me. I am, I believe, on the verge of illness — the illness of despondency but it is clear I have no one to blame but myself. I hope against hope, that is, there is a lurking expectation about me of relief, which my more sober judgment tells me cannot come. Sometimes my hand shakes as I write but of this querulousness there is more than enough. I have not said one word on this subject to anybody else but you, nor shall I until we meet in Dublin and compare notes, so as to determine as to my future line of conduct. For your exertions I never can be grateful enough. Your machinery was perfect<sup>3</sup> and its failure is only due to their [*sic*] materials to work upon. Still I do not regret that I gave up my profession and refused office. Adieu, my dear friend! It is a melancholy pleasure to have one to whom I can disburden my mind.

[P.S.] I believe I will write again to you tomorrow. Yes, you shall know the fate of the bill.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 194-6

1 See letter 2645 n1.

2 On 2 August the National Trades Political Union, meeting specially 'after a considerable lapse of time' to consider the position of the Bank of Ireland, passed a resolution condemning Spring Rice's determination to renew the bank's charter, and resolved to petition parliament against such a measure (*FJ*, 3 Aug. 1839).

3 For the collection of the O'Connell Tribute.

2647

*To Lord Ebrington*

16 Pall Mall [London], 8 August 1839

My Lord,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's letter<sup>1</sup> of the date of the 6th inst.

It is surely unnecessary to say with what respect and attention any suggestion of yours must be received by me. Before you formed a part of the Irish Government you were as well acquainted with the state of that country as almost any person could be but the opportunities you recently have had of *understanding* the country to its heart's core give you a right to have your opinions

received with a weight which your personal character so greatly and I may say irresistably augments. I do therefore yield any doubts I may have had to your superior judgment, and although I am bound — but this is consistent with your advice — to protest very strongly against considering this a full or adequate measure of corporate reform yet you have convinced me that I ought not to *risk* any opposition to the bill and of course I will not do so, being indeed well pleased to have this opportunity though small in itself, to testify how entirely your Excellency's Government of Ireland commands and obtains my entire and respectful confidence. All I *now* fear is that the technical rule of privilege<sup>2</sup> will prevent the bill from passing. I do however *now* hope that the difficulty may be got over by something if practicable of mutual concession.

The confidence which your Excellency reposes in me will of course not be violated. I beg to add the expression of my respectful gratitude for the communication with which you have honoured me.

SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

1 Letter 2644.

2 See letter 2645 n1.

2648

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 9 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

You will perceive by what fell *from* Lord John this evening — at least I collect from what he said — that the present Corporation Bill is to be thrown overboard, and a new Bill containing the Bill as amended by the Lords brought in and passed this Session.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, at present I have no doubt upon my mind on the subject. The consequence will be that the present Common Council and Board of Aldermen will be annihilated and we will have a chance, at least, of better men. We could not possibly have worse.

The next great debate on the Bank question<sup>2</sup> will be on Wednesday next. It then goes into Committee and will certainly be several days in discussion. It is, however, but little likely that any important amendment should be made in it.

My mind is more calm and resigned but it still preys on my frame. I, of course, dislike the idea of terminating my political

career and shrinking into obscurity but, my excellent friend, it is inevitable. I must take care<sup>3</sup> of Fitz-Simon in any event. Of this I will speak more so soon as I hear from you. I am, I believe, an exceeding blockhead to entertain hope but hope *clings* to all.

Send me the particulars of the deed of annuity from John Scott. I have paid the premium on his life.

I have a foolish impatience to hear from you. Yet what can you say? What do you think of the harvest?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 197

- 1 See letter 2645 n1. On 9 August Russell declared the question of privilege made it impossible for the Commons to accept the bill as amended by the Lords. He said it was the anxious wish of the government to pass some bill on the subject this session (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1839, 493-4). No such bill was introduced.
- 2 O'Connell had the previous month strenuously opposed the passing of the Bank of Ireland bill, delivering in the Commons on 25 July a speech attacking the monopoly of the Bank of Ireland (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLIX, 822-9) and making every effort to delay the passage of the bill through committee (for the full debate on this occasion see *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., XLIX, 773-834). The House was due to resolve itself into committee on the bill on Wednesday, 14 August (see letter 2651 n1).
- 3 Probably Nicholas Fitz-Simon who was knighted in 1841 and made a police magistrate in Dublin city in February 1841.

2649

*From Lord Ebrington*

Phoenix Park [Dublin], 10 August 1839

*Copy*

*Private*

Dear Sir,

Last night's post brought me your letter,<sup>1</sup> and I will not delay the assurance of my cordial satisfaction at the course which you have determined to take in the Corporation Bill or my thanks for the kind and flattering terms in which you express yourself towards me as well with reference to that measure as to the general course of my administration of affairs here.

It will indeed be sadly vexatious if when all other difficulties were removed, a mere technical question of privilege<sup>2</sup> should inflict upon us the continuation of the old corporate system for another year.



SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

1 Letter 2647.

2 See letter 2648 n1.

2650

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 12 August 1839

My dear Friend,

It turns out that what I first wrote to you of the clauses respecting freemen is accurate.<sup>1</sup> There was a clause inserted at the third reading in the Lords which was not printed in the Bill but is now before our House, and that clause does, as I said, confirm all that is bad respecting freemen, and throws in 'Burgesses' for the first time.<sup>2</sup> The consequence is that the cabinet find it impossible to bring in another Bill this Session and the entire stands over for the next.<sup>3</sup> This is CERTAIN.

Ten thousand thanks for your cheering letter. It removes a load off my mind.

The Bank Bill alone remains and that I will fight step by step. It comes on again on Wednesday,<sup>4</sup> and Rice will exert himself to carry it through.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 198

1 See letter 2643.

2 See letter 2463 n2.

3 See letter 2648 n1.

4 See letter 2648 n2.

2651

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 16 August, 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I believe I may congratulate the public on the total defeat of the Bank of Ireland Bill. Nay, I may venture to assure you that it cannot pass this session. You will see that the House refuses to be dragged in the kennel by Spring Rice. The House failed yesterday, it fails again this day<sup>1</sup> and what between the apathy of the members and the lateness of the season, I can promise that the Bill shall not pass until next year! There never was a more close

Orange confederacy than that at the Bank of Ireland. It was impossible to get an honest special jury in political cases in Dublin by reason of the undue influence of the Bank directors. Dishonest and bigoted they are and have been.

That miserable old apostate,<sup>2</sup> Arthur Guinness, was chuckling at carrying this Bill. I met Tom Wilson<sup>3</sup> in the street a few days ago. I proposed a compromise highly advantageous to the Bank. He treated my advance with as much careless insolence as could be consistent with keeping within the limits of personal civility. I wonder what he thinks this evening. By the failure of making a House this day I take it that the Committee is at an end, and that Rice must begin again with a new Bill if he were to go on at all. In this instance my political triumph is complete. This was an attempt to crush Ireland in its monetary system and to continue a monopoly in the hands of unrelenting enemies of the religion and liberties of the people, but the reaction of Irish spirit has in this, as in so many other instances, overthrown the enemy. I got, to be sure, as little assistance as possible from Ireland but I battled it with unflinching constancy and behold the end! Rice has also failed to fund his exchequer bills this day in the City.<sup>4</sup> Lord John [Russell] is very ill, matters look dark at every side, but the result cannot be unfavourable to Ireland — at least matters cannot be made worse. But the more we are thrown on our own resources the better. I intend, with the blessing of God, to be in Dublin in ten days.

You shall hear of every varying circumstance as it occurs.

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

- 1 On the bill being committed on 14 August, O'Connell declared that since nothing had been done for the people of Ireland in this session of parliament he was going to oppose this measure until they could learn the arguments of the people of Ireland against it (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1839, 5002). On 15 August O'Connell had the debate adjourned because of lack of a quorum (*Ibid.*, 5064-5). The Commons did not meet on 16 August owing to lack of a quorum.
- 2 O'Connell meant a *political* apostate.
- 3 Thomas Wilson, 15 Upper Temple Street, Dublin and Westbury, Stillorgan. Son of Joseph Wilson, general merchant, North Wall, Dublin. Director of the Bank of Ireland from 1821; governor 1838-40.
- 4 For background information on this reference, involving much technical economic data, see *Annual Register*, 1839, 289-92.

2652

*From Joseph Hayes,<sup>1</sup> Cork, 16 August 1839*

He states he is a shareholder in the National Bank and went security for the 'late manager, Mr. Taylor. When the branch was forming at Cork Mr. Murray connected with his offer of salary the condition that Taylor should give the bank the same security he had given at the Provincial Bank for his fidelity.' The writer is indignant because the board has dismissed Taylor and treated him (Hayes) in what he considers an unjust manner. The letter is long and detailed.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Joseph Hayes, 1 Clarence Place, Cork, a prominent merchant; later alderman.

2653

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 17 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

What can I say or what can I do for the Grocers?<sup>1</sup> I did all one man could for them and there is not the least chance of legislative relief. I know not that they have any prospect of benefitting themselves save by seeking the mercy of the Government and giving up the sale either of groceries or of spirits. There is now nothing else for it. The only comfort is that not one man in Ireland can be honest unless he be a *Repealer*. Of this more hereafter.

We have had no communication with or from Rice since I wrote to you last. The Committee,<sup>2</sup> it seems, can be reformed on Monday but nothing effectual shall be done on that day; and I may venture to say that I will tire Rice easily out of his obstinacy. Lord John, I am told, is better this day but will not be able to attend the House again for at least a week.

I am happy to tell you that I do not go to Paris<sup>3</sup> at all. A compromise has taken place which will enable me to return to Dublin the moment Spring Rice permits me — that is, the moment this Bill is disposed of. There is nothing else to detain me. I hope, therefore, to reach Dublin before you leave it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 201

- 1 See letter 2630 n3.
- 2 On the Bank of Ireland charter bill.
- 3 See letter 2645.

## 2654

*From the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, Sussex Chambers, Duke Street, St. James's [London], 18 August 1839*

Appealing to O'Connell to again exert himself in the Commons on behalf of the Polish refugees<sup>1</sup> with regard to the payment of those Poles by the treasury. The paymaster is refusing to make that payment because of a post-facto law, and now he says he won't pay them their present allowance unless they sign a renunciation of their claims for arrears. Letter signed by Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart,<sup>2</sup> Vice-President.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Since 1834 the British government had paid about £10,000 each year towards the relief of Polish refugees in Britain. The subject was reviewed in the Commons on 3 August 1840 (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1840, 5163-6).
- 2 Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart (1803-1854), fifth son of the first marquess of Bute. M.P. for Arundel 1830-37; for Marylebone 1847-54. Advocate of the independence of Poland. See *DNB*.

## 2655

*P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 19 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have the pleasure to tell you that we have beaten Rice through this day.<sup>1</sup> The question is just where it was this morning. I have not allowed them to advance a single inch. I believe we shall have tomorrow a compromise, giving all banking privileges in Dublin save issuing our own notes, and confining the monopoly<sup>2</sup> to twenty miles. This will give us Drogheda, etc.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 201

- 1 On the House again going into committee on the Bank of Ireland charter bill on 19 August O'Connell declared that 'if he should die on the floor of the House, this bill should not pass if they sat there till Christmas.'

After two divisions the bill was adjourned till the following day (*Hansard* 3rd Ser., L, 390-99).

- 2 Under the existing charter the Bank of Ireland's note-issuing monopoly extended to within fifty miles of Dublin.

2656

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 20 August 1839

*Extract*

The result of our fight against the Bank will be known at *five*. If the Chancellor<sup>1</sup> does not strike I will not be able to write to you the ultimate result in my second letter, but you may be sure I will fight it out. My expectations are that the limits will be restrained to twenty miles or the Bill given up altogether but if you do not hear from me again this day, believe that the battle is raging adversely — without compromise. I am told the House is to be prorogued on Tuesday next and believe the fact to be so. That will render it impossible to carry this Bill. There is no danger of a political change during the recess, so that Ireland will continue to be tolerably well governed in the interval. I intend to address a letter to the English Reformers and another to the Irish people. The time is come for calling for the application of the higher rent-charge<sup>2</sup> to the aid of the poor-law. I have now a double incitement to hold out: first, the taking the rent-charge from the clergy, *not* of the people; that motive will animate many; and the second motive, the exoneration from so much poor rate will make the prospect agreeable to many more. It is a just and reasonable ground of agitation.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 202

1 Thomas Spring Rice.

2 The tithe act of 1838 had changed tithes into a rent-charge, payable by the landlord, and recoverable by him from the occupier.

2657

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 21 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

The Bank Bill is thrown out.<sup>1</sup> I have had this triumph at least — that I have beaten the very worst of the Orange confederacies in Ireland. The Bank of Ireland never will get such good terms as Rice would have given them. There is some comfort in discomfiting one of your bitterest enemies.

Affairs remain much as I have described them to you, the Lords becoming daily more and more insolent. Their audacity will certainly create a reaction but at present they are most malignantly powerful and direct that malignant power chiefly against the Catholics. Indeed, the spirit that binds together the Tory party in this country is the 'No Popery' feeling — the hatred of Catholicity. You cannot form an idea how prevalent this feeling is, nor how much and how vivaciously it is cherished by the English Parsons. Nothing can exceed their rage at finding the number of Catholics and of Catholic places of worship increase. I have no doubt they would rejoice in a rebellion or any convulsion that enabled them to extirpate Catholicity with the blood of the Catholics. I do not in the slightest degree exaggerate.

It certainly is necessary to warn Ireland. Our registry force is dwindling away or swamped by fictitious votes. The crisis is more imminent than perhaps you imagine. The state of Turkey necessarily preludes to war. There is also an internal uprising in Europe. The cossacks are in revolt against the Russian emperor,<sup>2</sup> though the truth is concealed. I heard within the last two days from Prussia, and there a revolution is not improbable or at least an outbreak and separation of the Catholic provinces. The people of Hanover are awaiting in a steady German fashion a civil war. There never was a period when the continent of Europe presented more material for hopes and fears. Prussia and Hanover are the props of Protestantism in Europe and as that has ceased to be a religion and is now either merely political or indifferent, or infidel, if these powers were subverted or even checked the increase of Catholics would be probably enormous. But why do I dwell on these points? It is much because you should know *all*, and be able to see the connection which events there are likely to have with affairs at home.

In Ireland the Orange faction is strong because it is so powerfully supported by the Tory party in this country. The Tories

certainly reckon on attaining power and if they had not terrified and displeased the queen they would be now in authority and woe to the Irish and to the colonial Catholics if that were so! As to the Queen, I have it from a source of the best authority that she is perfectly *true*. But will she be able to resist *both* Houses of Parliament should the Tories get a majority in the commons?

I will develop my plan of agitation to you in this and future letters. I could indeed wish to retire altogether from political life, for I have met some disgusts but I really believe that we are near events which require my assistance. Of this no more at present. I will only tell you that I propose to address the people of England and then the people of Ireland. My address to England will be an effort to rally the Reformers once again; my letter to the Irish to animate them to the registry, to the obtaining the application of the tithe rent-charge to the poor rate, and quietly and cautiously for the Repeal. I must now conclude.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 202-4

- 1 The abandonment of the Bank of Ireland bill was implied by the fact that on the 20th Spring Rice introduced a bill to extend the charter for another year. This was duly enacted (2 & 3 Vict. c. 91). In 1840 an act was passed (3 & 4 Vict. c. 75) extending the Bank of Ireland's charter indefinitely. In 1844 a new charter was enacted (7 & 8 Vict. c. 32).
- 2 Nicholas I.

2658

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 24 August 1839

My dear FitzPatrick,

I mean to leave London early in the ensuing week. I never went to Ireland at a more critical period. The Tories are strong, very strong, and the principal ingredients in their strength is the hatred of Ireland and of Catholicity. This hate is burning more intensely in proportion as Catholicity increases in this country.

Our resources in England for support against the faction are few. It is true that the Queen is steady and the real Reformers are numerous but they are so checked and thwarted by the Chartists that it is very unlikely that the English Reformers will do much during this year to give support to the popular cause.

The House of Lords is nearly all powerful and is animated with the very worst spirit towards Ireland. I believe that the desire to do mischief *there* was never so strong. The minority in the

Commons is strong also in numbers and, what is more formidable, in unity of action, while the Ministerial majority is divided and some of its members discontented. In short, at no period of our history was the cause of Ireland more friendless and more destitute of any prospect of augmenting its friends in Great Britain.

There remain only our *own* exertions. 'Hereditary bondsmen', etc. is now becoming a literal truth. Do not think I say this to you to enhance the value of a *long tried leader* — meaning myself — yet I do believe that I am *wanting* just now or I should think, and you know I have thought seriously, of dedicating the remaining years of my life to the solitude of my native mountains and the preparation for a change which may be postponed but is inevitable.

Yet, if you are asked my sentiments, communicate *this* and no more: first, that my health and strength entitle me to struggle longer in harness; secondly, that my own conviction is that I ought to continue to struggle, especially as the coming poor law<sup>2</sup> will, when in action, give me a powerful lever to raise up even the sluggishness of the land to demand that the tithe rent-charge should be applied in alleviation of the poor rate. That is my first object. Second, [municipal] Corporate reform; third, exercise of franchise and attention to the registry; fourth, abolition of the Catholic oaths;<sup>3</sup> fifth, laying the foundation for the Repeal.

I have also the most important question of the Bank of Ireland<sup>4</sup> to be prepared for. It is more important than is generally believed. Ireland must put herself in political movement again or nothing can be obtained and, what is worse, unless we advance the Orange faction will drive us back.

All these reasons convince me that I am wanting but my fears are that the country is tired of supporting me. I fear that either my want of more prominent, or glaring success has weakened the tie of affection Ireland has cherished for me. If so, I have no reason to complain. It is only astonishing how long practical popularity has attended me. It has placed me in a situation in which enormous expense was, and is, inevitable, and that many should desert me now would be to be deplored by myself and my friends but would not be wondered at. These thoughts inspire me with melancholy occasionally, and the more so as I feel there is not anyone at present to take my place. Conceal nothing from me. I had hoped, and still hope, to make the Irish people independent in their own legislature. I see many occasions Ireland has for a faithful and fearless advocate but does the country agree with me in these opinions? If so, something must be done to enable me to



continue my services. Nor in any advent shall I complain. Indeed, I ought not. You see I think on paper when I write to you and I know how safe I am in thinking in words in your company. I have, I own, a feeling of degradation upon me when I write of these things but you will stand between me and dishonour if there be any. At all events, may God's holy will be done!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 204-6

- 1 The quotation with which O'Connell was in the habit of heading his public letters 'To the People of Ireland.' It is a quotation from Byron (see letter 2066 n5).
- 2 The machinery of the poor law had not yet come into operation. For some account of this machinery see *Observations explanatory of the Orders of the Poor Law Commissioners . . .*, (Dublin, 1839).
- 3 Under the Emancipation Act (10 Geo. IV c. 8) a form of oath was prescribed to be taken by Roman Catholics on voting at elections. The 5 & 6 Will. IV c. 36 rendered the taking of this oath at elections in England unnecessary but that act did not extend to Ireland. In consequence of the provisions of the Irish reform act, (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 88) a doubt existed as to the necessity of taking the oath, but it had been uniformly administered for fear that the validity of an election might be questioned. In 1840 the Ulster Constitutional Association suggested an act should be passed declaring this oath unnecessary (*Report of the . . . Ulster Constitutional Association*, Belfast, 1840, 23).
- 4 The legislation concerning the renewal of the Bank of Ireland's charter.

2659

*From John Childs*

Bungay [Suffolk], 27 August 1839

*Private and confidential*

Sir,

It is long since I troubled you. [Childs says he has seen in the *Morning Chronicle* (August 24) a report of a resolution by a meeting to give the franchise to 'all operatives who have served a regular apprenticeship.']<sup>1</sup>

I have for thirty-five years had some experience with working people and believe the law of apprenticeship to be one of the greatest evils that afflicts their class. Under this belief I have for many years determined as a general rule to have no apprentices in my printing office but have employed indiscriminately persons of various classes and at this moment, among a large number of people between forty and fifty, were labourers in husbandry. Young men of moderate intellect become in a few months as good operative printers as any who have served a long apprentice-

ship and, upon reflection, I think it will be apparent to you that this clause will be well omitted as the more we can do to get rid of the evils caused by combinations, gendered and fostered by the apprenticeship system, the more we shall do to create a feeling of self-reliance in the minds of the working people.

I may mention at the same time that my experience leads me to the conviction that half the evils which exist among the trades may be traced to the cupidity by which combinations among masters are continually entered into, carried on so long as they think it is their interest and broken with impunity. . . .

The Methodists

Pray accept my thanks for the mauling you have given these worthies.<sup>2</sup> They very richly deserve every word you have said of them, having been the greatest foes to public liberty that ever arose in any age. . . .

[P.S.] I suppose, such friends, of public good, as may happen to have seats in the House of Commons, are convinced by this time that, if the Whigs had been properly opposed two or three years ago, the present deplorable state of things would have been avoided.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 At a meeting in London on 18 August under O'Connell's chairmanship at which the 'Friends of Peaceable and Constitutional Reform' renamed themselves the 'Precursor of Reform Society', a resolution was passed declaring one of the objects of the new body to be 'General suffrage on the household basis, including all married men, being only lodgers, and all operatives who have served a regular apprenticeship, and all professors of any art or science' (*Morning Chronicle*, 24 Aug. 1839).
- 2 In the Commons on 20 June in speaking on the government grants for education (see letter 2630 n7) O'Connell made an attack on the Wesleyan Methodists which included the passage: 'I never knew them join with the other Protestant Dissenters during the long struggle for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. I never knew them to join in supporting the rights of the Catholics or the freedom of conscience. . . . Their history has been one of opposition to religious liberty' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1839, 3162).

2660

*To John Primrose, Jr.*

Merrion Square, 30 August 1839

My dear Primrose,

[re bill of exchange to Dr. Barry, due on September 3rd, to be paid] I leave this on Wednesday for Limerick. On Thursday I will get to Killarney and next day, please God, to Bahoss.<sup>1</sup> John<sup>2</sup> and his wife and child travel with me as does my daughter Betsey whose health is not good. We will, please God, go to Derrynane on Monday. Hannah will be with us. I hope Maurice and family will be in Derrynane before us. I long much to see the mountains once again. I hope the hounds will be before me at Bahoss, and my horse. Make arrangements for horses from Killarney to Bahoss.

[P.S.] Take care that there are coals enough at Derrynane, this above all things.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Near Cahirciveen, home of his daughter and son-in-law Charles O'Connell.  
2 His son.

2661

*From H. Martin<sup>1</sup> to 16 Pall Mall, London*

Bedlington, near Morpeth, 30 August 1839

Sir,

The *Morning Chronicle* of the 27th inst. having put before me your letter, addressed to Joseph Sturge Esq., on the subject of two motions<sup>2</sup> you intend bringing before Parliament during the ensuing sessions relative to the province of Texas, I take the liberty of addressing a few lines to you respecting the same.

. . . Indeed, Sir, I have long seen the necessity of such a move in behalf of the coloured race in those parts, more immediately alluded to by you, in order to defeat those evil designs in operation by the parties calling [themselves] an independent people in Texas but whom you have justly branded as pirates.<sup>3</sup>

I beg to bring to your condescending notice that in the year 1832 I had the intention of forming a colony of Irish and Germans in Texas for the purpose of counteracting the encroachments of the American settlers upon the Mexican territory. . . . Having

been a resident in Mexico and served a short period on the personal staff of General Santa Anna,<sup>4</sup> whom you mentioned in your communication, I make free to express to you my firm opinion that your highly enlightened views in regard to colonising a portion of Texas in the manner you describe, would be most cheerfully entertained by General Santa Anna and, whether he be in power or not, being in Mexico the same as you are in *old Ireland*, of course, his potential voice must carry *justice* before it. . . . Your plan is then the very thing wanting and should speedily be executed.

I beg to remark further that, being personally well known to General Santa Anna (whose character, as a patriot, is but little known in this country), I shall forward to him a copy of your letter and strongly recommend it to his consideration. . . . The enclosed is the printed translation of a letter which I have recently had the honour to receive from the General; and I likewise send you an original letter from your own relative,<sup>5</sup> that you may not consider me undeserving of your notice, should you have occasion to send an agent, possessing some influence with General Santa Anna, to Mexico.

Of course you will perceive from General O'Connell's letter that I have been in Spain in the Legion,<sup>6</sup> and exerted myself much in this country to obtain justice for the poor men. I am by no means satisfied with the conduct pursued towards them by the British Government nor the apathy shown by General Evans<sup>7</sup> in regard to their misery. . . . The real interest I feel in the execution of the plan you have put forth; and which I have no doubt, if acted upon, will be of great benefit to this country as well as Mexico. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 H.J. Martin, lieutenant in the British Legion to Spain; he 'left the service early, and has since been employed by the political opponents of General Evans, in circulating dishonourable accounts of the Legion' (Alexander Somerville, *History of the British Legion and War in Spain* London, 1839, 697).
- 2 O'Connell to Sturge, 26 August 1839 (*MC*, 27 Aug. 1839). The letter gave notice of these two motions. The first would call on the government to refrain from recognising the independence of Texas save with the prior consent of Mexico, and on condition that Texas would agree to abolish slavery. The second motion would request the queen to instruct her ministers to try to arrange with Mexico the creation of a free state for coloured people in the unoccupied territory on her northern border. He proposed the raising of a public subscription to finance the organisation of the new state or colony, which should be 'either subject directly to the British Crown or . . . under the protection of the British

flag; so as to obtain a rallying point for all free persons of colour who may choose to give their labour for such wages as may enable them to become purchasers of the soil'.

- 3 O'Connell in his letter mentioned above described the Texans as 'the gang of land pirates who have settled themselves on the Mexican territory'.
- 4 Antonio Ropez de Santa Anna (1794-1876), soldier, Mexican revolutionary leader and sometime president.
- 5 Maurice Charles O'Connell (1812-1879), eldest son of General Sir Maurice Charles Philip O'Connell. Born in Sydney, New South Wales; in 1828 joined the 73rd regiment; in 1835 he raised in Ireland a regiment of the British Legion for Spain; in turn became lieut.-col., colonel, deputy adjutant-general and commander of the legion. Knighted 1868. See *DNB*.
- 6 See letter 2397 n4.
- 7 Col. De Lacy Evans who commanded the British Legion in Spain 1835-37.

## 2661a

*To William Richardson*<sup>1</sup>

Derrynane, 17 September 1839

My dear Richardson,

I want to insure the life of Mr. John Bindon Scott who is largely in my debt. I insure for £2,000.

His description is John Bindon Scott, of Cahircon in the county of Clare Esq. He is owner of a large estate and beautiful house and demesne but he is strict tenant for life.

He is at the utmost only 28 years his last birthday. I insure him as not exceeding twenty nine. He has had the cowpock, never had the gout. He is in perfect health, no consumption etc.

Draw upon me at once for the premium. Have the policy executed as soon as you can and deposit it for me with Mr. Harnett at the National Bank. I depend on your expedition. Let me hear from you by return of post.

[P.S.] I insure with my own money and for my own benefit.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 17070

- 1 William Richardson, insurance agent, National Loan Fund Life Assurance Society, 36 Westmoreland Street, Dublin.

2662

*To Maurice O'Connell,<sup>1</sup> Kilgorey, Co. Clare*

Derrynane, 11 October 1839

My dear Maurice,

. . . I feel a great longing to see Kilgorey once more though it would excite regrets. I reckon on one day or the other trying whether the present generation be as good as the last. It could not be better. Remember me to your dear wife. I should wish she knew,

Yours affectionate kinsman,  
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: NLI MSS 5759

- 1 Maurice O'Connell, J.P. (1805-1868), Kilgorey, Tulla, Co. Clare, second son of William O'Connell of Tulla. Married c. 28.1.37 Emily, daughter of Denis MacCarthy O'Leary.

2663

*From Archbishop MacHale*

15 October 1839

My dear Mr O'Connell,

I am just returned from the Island of Achill where I have been for some time striving to preserve a portion of my flock from some thieves who planted themselves there, and are using every exertion to traffic by bribing and working on the misery of the poor natives. The mission<sup>1</sup> was not calculated to make me feel any gratitude to the Government since I found that the coast-guards were the active agents of those imposters, notwithstanding that complaints were made by some of the Catholic clergy there of such influence. Nay, it appeared after a long investigation held some time ago that their officer took a most offensive and unwarrantable part in their anti-Catholic proceedings. You perceive, then, how active and untiring is the hostility of our enemies to our religion and how their enormous wealth is still made the instrument by which the perversion of the people is sought. On the strongest religious grounds, then, as well as political, I am opposed to the tithes or rent charge, knowing well, as long as those who are hostile to our faith can command such a fund, they will strive to convert it to the injury of our religion.

. . . I am delighted that the gentry — the men who in general hitherto stood aloof from the contest — have at length embarked in it, resolved to get rid of an impost that involves so much their own reputation as well as the interest of their own families. This spirit is progressing fast and has already spread through all parts of the province, everywhere reprobating the injustice and cruelty of the tithes. . . . I fear the Whigs calculate on a full amnesty for all their bad acts because the people hate the Tories. The restoration of clerical magistrates etc. is not calculated to recall any of the confidence which they have forfeited. . . . Even now, at the last hour, were they [the Whigs] to come forward and throw themselves generously on the people and promise such an extension of the franchise, an increase of representatives but, above all, such an immediate and universal appropriation of the tithes as you mentioned in your letter, always respecting the rights of the present incumbents, I am sure that all Ireland would so rally round them as to bring dismay into the ranks of the Tories. . . . Any influence we command with the people is founded on the credit they give us for seeing a fair prospect of improvement in their condition. We cannot hold out this prospect to them unless it is given by our rulers or extracted from their fears. I wish you could induce them [the Whig ministers] to give us more confidence. . . .

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 664-5

- 1 The Achill Mission was founded in 1834 by Rev. Edward Nangle, a Church of Ireland clergyman, for the purpose of converting the inhabitants to Protestantism and educating their children accordingly. In general, the Protestant clergy of Connaught regarded Nangle as a troublemaker (Desmond Bowen, *Souperism: Myth or Reality*, Cork, 1970, 88-92).

2664

To Richard L. Sheil<sup>1</sup>

Derrynane, 29 October 1839

My dear Sheil,

. . . My son-in-law, Charles O'Connell, who once represented Kerry, has like so many other Irish gentlemen 'outbuilt' himself.<sup>2</sup> The building of too expensive a house has rendered it absolutely necessary that he should obtain some practical assistance. I last year applied for the great gift of the Irish government, the office of stipendiary magistrate for him. It is impossible any man could be more fit for that office. He is young, active, well-

humoured, intelligent and a perfect gentleman in mind and manners. He was seven years in the army and has been these last ten years an attentive and useful magistrate. I *thought* I was promised the office and, curiously enough, while the ministry were *out* for a few days<sup>3</sup> I was told that, if they had remained in a month longer, he would have been appointed. Now the tables are turned and, as a Repealer, any implied promise to me is as of course forgotten.

It struck me that you may *possibly* be able to remind *somebody* — I know not exactly whom — of the state of the matter. I do not want to interfere with your own claims on government for your own friends or to exhaust one of them for mine but the truth is that I promised my daughter — I could not help it — to write and mention the fact to you though I told her that I was equally convinced you had not the power as I was that you have the inclination to serve one so deservedly dear to me.

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 This letter was forwarded to Lord Morpeth by Sheil with his letter to Morpeth dated 5 November 1839. He also wrote to Drummond on that day. In both letters he (Sheil) recommended that O'Connell's request be granted.
- 2 By building his new residence at Bahoss, near Cahirciveen. Later, the house was purchased by the poor law commissioners to become part of a workhouse. The entire complex is now a ruin.
- 3 See letter 2608 and 2618 n1.

2665

*To Richard More O'Ferrall*

Derrynane, 29 November 1839

My dear O'Ferrall,

I have a crow to pluck with you, and a monstrous large one. It is this. In the House of Commons one night about a fortnight before I left London, you were complaining of the apathy of the people of Ireland respecting the registry.<sup>1</sup>

I told you that I had a plan to rouse them for registry but that it would require £2,000 of which I would undertake for the forthcoming of one thousand. You instantly said you would procure the second thousand. I think you said you would undertake for the second thousand. Do you recollect this conversation? I instantly struck the bargain with you and accordingly I dissolved<sup>2</sup> the Precursor Society said, after paying off all their liabilities, I have placed more than £1,000 at the disposal of the 'loyal Registry



Association.<sup>3</sup> Of these more than £700 are spent and the accounts vouched.

Now see to your share of the engagement. It is true that the aristocrats who meet in Westmoreland St.<sup>4</sup> have advanced £200 to our £700, and there the matter rests. The remaining £800 would put Dublin out of jeopardy and secure every seat *we* now have in Ireland and some more. I therefore ask where is your money. All we want is money. The machinery in Dublin is excellent, not one shilling is misspent but we want your share of the funds. You can easily learn what supporters of [the] Government have contributed. I will, if you choose, get Ray to send you all the accounts that you may see how faithfully we '*unofficials*' are carrying out the contract I made with you.

But to lay aside everything like jesting, there is nothing wanting but money, and not much of that, to secure Ireland to the Melbourne Cabinet. . . .

If I had kept on foot any *agitating* body, we should have friends in abundance but because I have dissolved my poor Precursors I am left on the strand with the tide out. I again entreat of you to rouse up *all defaulters*. I wrote three weeks ago to Pigot on this subject but he is too occupied between his trade and his official dignity to do anything.

What is the political viewing of the *marriage*?<sup>5</sup> I think the result must be favourable. The Coburgs are a race of excellent good sense, and I think all their interests lie at the liberal side. The independence of Belgium is most essential to English political projects. In short, I persuade myself that nothing but good can come of this alliance. Tell me what you think. At all events I sincerely wish the dear Little Lady every kind of happiness. The high style in which she threw over<sup>6</sup> Peel and Wellington deserves immortal praise.

Why do you not boast to the English lubbers of Ireland and the Irish? It was *we* beat the Chartists at Newport.<sup>7</sup> Twenty-eight poor raw Irish lads beat five thousand rebels, and then Capt. Stack<sup>8</sup> is a Kerryman, and I do believe a Papist. At all events Sergeant Daly and the privates are all Irish Papists.

And then the entire country is quite tranquil, to say nothing of the 100,000 men who have resolutely and perseveringly given up the use of *all* intoxicating liquors.<sup>9</sup> The English do not know us at all, but they *will or shall*.

[P.S.] May I ask you to present my respects to your fair Lady? I often told you no man was happy or even comfortable but a married man. You believe me *now*.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward G. More O'Ferrall

- 1 In a conversation, since he did not make any statement of this kind in a debate.
- 2 O'Connell dissolved the Precursor Society on 2 September 1839 (*Pilot*, 2 Sept. 1839).
- 3 On the same day as he dissolved the Precursor Society, O'Connell declared his intention of establishing a neutral organisation for aiding the registration of liberal voters. The first meeting of this organisation, initially named the Reform Registry Association of Ireland, was held on 3 September (*Pilot*, 4 Sept. 1839). On 14 November, the Association, in response to O'Connell's prompting, renamed itself the 'Loyal Registry Association', symbolising its purpose 'to rouse all Ireland for the Queen and Constitution' (*Pilot*, 15 Nov. 1839).
- 4 The Reform Registry Association of 1839 was an attempted revival of an earlier body of the same name, founded in January 1836, which had gone into eclipse shortly afterwards, following the foundation of the General Association. The earlier organisation remained in existence however, and continued to meet at 6, Westmoreland Street, Dublin, though apparently confined to Whig-Liberal aristocrats and their supporters. At the initial meeting of the Reform Registry Association of 1839, the chairman, Sir Montague Chapman, declared that he attended as a delegate from the older body, which had met that day and declared its intention to co-operate with the new organisation (*Pilot*, 4 Sept. 1839; Lyne, 'General Association').
- 5 Victoria announced to the privy council her engagement to Prince Albert on 23 November (*Annual Register*, 1839, 313-4).
- 6 In the 'Bedchamber Crisis'.
- 7 On 4 November a group of Chartists led by John Frost marched on Newport in Monmouthshire. They were dispersed by a small body of soldiers, after a clash in which a few of them were killed. Frost and other leaders were captured and charged with high treason (Donald Read and Eric Glasgow, *Feargus O'Connor: Irishman and Chartist*, London 1961).
- 8 Richard Stack, 45th (Nottinghamshire) Regiment, appointed captain 12 November 1827.
- 9 A reference to Fr. Mathew's spectacular temperance movement, at this time in its early stages in Ireland.

2666

To, P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 7 December 1839

I arrived only this day from Bandon where everything went on in the best possible style.<sup>1</sup> You always put me in spirits. Whether we succeed or fail, may God bless you! I really do want *the pleasures of hope*.

Could you send me the *Dublin Review* in a *Castle frank*?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 216

- 1 On 5 December O'Connell attended a dinner from the Liberals of the West Riding of Cork in Bandon, under the chairmanship of Henry Townsend of Castle Townsend (now Castletownshend) (*Pilot*, 9 Dec. 1839).

2667

To Joseph Pease<sup>1</sup>

Derrynane, 13 December 1839

Respected friend,

I wish to remind you of our clients, especially your clients, the people of India. I do think it must be admitted that our first public meeting<sup>2</sup> was of essential utility; it launched the great cause favourably but . . . I would very respectfully suggest to you the propriety of bringing the matter before Parliament as speedily as possible. *We must be defeated twenty times before we can succeed.* The English people are careless respecting the Indians, especially by reason of their ignorance of the real state of the unfortunate natives of the peninsula and of our other territories there. They never will be roused until they are made to understand the misery the Indian people endure from our misgovernment. We have the strongest case that ever was handled by the advocates of humanity. *First*, the misery, the wretchedness created by our misgovernment are on the greatest and most continuous scale that ever yet was known in human story. *Second*, this misgovernment is, in fact, as useless to us as it is horribly afflictive to the natives. We would obtain more revenue if we adopted a humane, just, and protective course. But why should I dwell on topics which are familiar to your mind — you who are the real parent of *this* cause? My object is to instigate you to active measures. On this subject the first and last *thing* necessary is public agitation; there should be a meeting (in London) as soon as Parliament sits. A petition should be presented to the Lords by Lord Brougham, who was a little astray at the last meeting but who will, even to eclipse so humble a being as myself, which he can easily do, exert himself to a splendid effect. Everything is propitious for our purposes; even the recent successes of our arms<sup>3</sup> add to the public interest, and opening as they do fresh views of increased dominion, make it doubly imperative on us to prevent the extension of the *present system* of plunder of the agriculturalists. More than one hundred millions of human beings are under our control; they have oppressors and plunderers in abundance. How few friends, how few disinterested advocates have they? Again, my excellent Sir, permit me to

remind you that the question of compensation for the opium<sup>4</sup> delivered up by Captain Elliot<sup>5</sup> will come before Parliament; we must not allow one shilling to be paid for that hideous poison. This, I say emphatically, is the time to strike a great blow, to extend our forces, to rouse all the humanity and all the pure religion, pure and undefiled before God, in the British Isles to the rescue of the miserable native, to insist upon fixed tenures and moderate rents. The former is more important still than the latter but both are an essential to the preservation of the lives as well as to the attaining of any of the comforts of existence by the now oppressed natives. I am a practised agitator and I know that you can never succeed in the most just cause without agitating the public mind until you obtain a sufficient moral force by means of public opinion. . . .

SOURCE: Bell, *British Folks and British India*, 84-5

- 1 Joseph Pease (1772-1846), a Quaker and wealthy woollen merchant of Feethams, Darlington, Yorkshire, who retired from business in middle age. Prominent supporter of the anti-slavery cause.
- 2 In London on 6 July 1839 when the British India Society, founded for 'bettering the condition of our fellow-subjects — the native of India,' held its first public meeting. After Lord Brougham, who acted as chairman, O'Connell was the principal speaker. (*Times*, 8 July 1839). See letter 2922 n2.
- 3 Probably a reference to the invasion of Afghanistan by a British force in March 1839, which ended successfully with the capture of Kabul on 7 August.
- 4 In March 1839 the Chinese authorities demanded the surrender of all the opium on British ships at Canton. Accordingly Captain Elliot, the chief superintendent, ordered the surrender of all opium in British hands. Elliott then applied for armed British intervention which led to the Opium War (1839-42) between Britain and China (*Annual Register*, 1839, 427-8; *Encyc. Brit.*, XVI, 993).
- 5 Charles Elliot (1801-1875), appointed chief superintendent and plenipotentiary on the China Trade Mission 1837; knighted 1856. See *DNB*.

2668

*To Richard Cobden*

Derrynane, 13 December 1839

My dear Sir,

I thank you heartily for your very kind letter. I am anxious to be at the Dinner<sup>1</sup> and will, if regularly invited, make a point to attend. But I think that Monday the 13th would answer members of parliament better than the 9th. It would bring them to *England* at a period more close than the 9th to the session. This is a great

matter to the Irish, and operates upon the English and Scotch in an analogous manner. Let it then for Heaven's sake be Monday the 13th. On the 14th we could have the meeting of Operative Reformers to organise for a struggle to obtain an *effectual* extension of the suffrage and to put down the physical force Tories,<sup>2</sup> for they are the worst of Tories the Chartists are, and I could get up a Catholic meeting for the 15th and go in that night's train to London. I do think it would serve the cause of rational reform to have a full explanation sent forth of all the charges, absurd as they are, made against the Catholics.<sup>3</sup> I entirely agree with you in the propriety of our doing so. Do you know a very kind friend of mine, a Mr. Daniel Lee?<sup>4</sup> You could easily find him out if you do not already know him. If you deem the matter of sufficient importance to confer with him on the subject, you would find him quite competent to form an opinion how far the Catholics of Manchester would enter into the plan. He is a Catholic himself. I too will write to him but I can make no definitive arrangement until the actual invitation arrives.

SOURCE: Cobden MSS, West Sussex County Record Office

- 1 O'Connell attended and spoke at a dinner of the Manchester Anti-Corn Law Association on 13 January 1840 (*Pilot*, 15 Jan. 1840).
- 2 On 14 January 1840 O'Connell attended and spoke at a dinner of the Operative Anti-Corn Law Association of Manchester. In his speech he counselled the workers not to resort to violence (*Pilot*, 17 Jan. 1840).
- 3 Made by Tories in Britain against Catholics and against the Irish administration for giving appointments to Catholics.
- 4 Daniel Lee (1799-1877), son of John Lee, Salford, Lancashire, cattle dealer. Partner in firm of Wright and Lee, calico printers and print warehouses from 1826; a magistrate from 1838.

2669

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 14 December 1839

I will give opinions while in Dublin to any persons unwise enough to pay for them.

Your sanguine temperament has given me cheerful feelings and pleasant anticipations. Many thanks.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 218

2670

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 23 December 1839

My dear and most esteemed Lord,

If the period we have arrived at were not one of singular interest I should not obtrude on your Grace's time or attention. I, however, believe that a crisis of deeper interest has not arisen for many years, nor one which in my humble judgment could be more capable of being converted into purposes of such great utility for Ireland. It is this conviction which emboldens me to ask your Grace for advice and for co-operation.

The time is come when all Catholic Ireland should rally — should form a strong and universal combination.

The Tories are united. You perceive that they are daily becoming less careful to conceal their intentions. They avow their bitter hostility to the religion and to the people of Ireland.

The furious and most sincere of the British Tories avow their intention to re-enact the Penal Code, whilst the more wily declare their designs not to go farther than to render the emancipation act a mere dead letter — to leave it on the statute book but to render it totally inoperative in practice. I care little for its not being repealed in point of law if it be repealed in fact and in operation.

The mainspring of Tory hostility to Ireland is hatred of the Catholic religion. This is not to be endured. We cannot suffer ourselves to be trampled under the hoofs of the brutal Orangemen of either countries.

We want protection for the Catholic against all parties, Ministerial as well as Tories. My object would be once again to organise all Catholic Ireland in an effort of resistance to all our enemies.

It is proposed by some Catholics of the very moderate party to make the basis of our new exertions a declaration that the Catholics are now too numerous, possess too much property and intelligence and are too brave to submit to *any* inferiority in their native land; and of course that, at the peril of life and fortune, they are ready to resist by all means within the law and constitution *all* and every oppression. These general principles will include all details and, of course, involve the application of the tithe rent-charge to public purposes. I know the education question creates a difficulty in the way of general co-operation between the Catholics.<sup>1</sup> But for that I should expect the signatures of all the Catholics, prelates, priests, and people, to an exceedingly strong declaration of determined resistance to the threatened oppression.

Would to God I could interfere to have your Grace and Dr. Murray understand each other, I mean, agree together on the proper securities against anti-Catholicism in the plan of general education. This wish is, I fear, an idle one, but if your Grace were in Dublin I do think something might be done to satisfy your just apprehensions. The scheme of giving government dominion over Catholic education is failing on the Continent, as the Catholic people grow alarmed at its tendency.

We have ourselves to fight the battle of Ireland and Catholicity against the Orange and Tory faction. I am tremblingly alive to the part you will take. Your co-operation would, in my mind, be quite decisive of success. Of course I will not take, nor allow to be taken, any step inconsistent with law; nor would I ask that your Grace should commit yourself one inch beyond your own inclination but I do want your countenance — your *something more* than mere acquiescence. The larger that more is the better.

Indeed, I do believe the fate of Catholic Ireland is now in your hands. If we had you going with us in the strength of your judgment there would arise a combination more powerful than the old Catholic Association.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 218-20

- 1 A reference to the hostility between MacHale and Archbishop Murray (see letter 2572 n4).

2671

*From John Dower*

Dungarvan [Co. Waterford], 30 December 1839

Dear Sir,

Now as the Brewery ceases to be of any further value to me on account of the Temperance Society which has become now so formidable in this town and surrounding district that the loss sustained thereby cannot be far short of ten thousand pounds.

I am now compelled to apply to you for the sum of £350 which remained due to me on account of Mr. Jacob's election.<sup>1</sup> By this unfortunate transaction I am out of pocket more than double the above sum. Jacob has treated me very badly. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 Ebenezer Jacob had been twice elected for Dungarvan in 1834. The first occasion was 15 February and, having been unseated on petition, he was re-elected on 16 May.

2672

*From Dom. M.V. Ryan*<sup>1</sup>

Mount Melleray Abbey, 6 January 1840

My Dear and honoured Friend,

. . . Some few months past I was enabled to open a correspondence with Monsieur *Le Sage*, editor of two Catholic journals in the town of *Grave* in Holland. He is a worthy zealous man and, having taken into consideration the state of my community here, with great good will promises to employ his influence with the numerously increasing Catholic population of Holland for the purpose of procuring us pecuniary aid. In order to further that object he is most anxious to have a few lines from you recommending this house to his consideration. He assures me that a few words coming from you will produce the most astonishing effect. . . .

Your compliance with the desire of Monsieur *Le Sage* will be the means of relieving me and my brethren in our great distress and add new force to our gratitude. . . . Should you wish to address him directly, the following is the form: A Monsieur *Le Sage*, Ten Broek, Ancien Notaire a *Grave*, Hollande. . . .

Faithful to the promise I made you I celebrated a solemn Mass of Requiem for your departed lady on the anniversary of her decease.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Michael V. Ryan (1778-1845), a native of Waterford city, and former prior of the French Mount Melleray. Founded Mount Melleray in 1832 after having been expelled from France following the revolution of 1830.

2673

*From James Haughton*<sup>1</sup>

34 Eccles Street [Dublin], 11 January 1840

Dear Sir,

Dr. Madden<sup>2</sup> having arrived in this city a few days ago, and his stay being so limited that he purposes returning to England tomorrow evening, a meeting of some friends of the Anti-Slavery Society was hastily called this morning to receive some communications from him relative to the state of slavery in Cuba and in the United States. He detailed some interesting but very shocking facts and, among other matters, he mentioned some circum-



stances relative to the Roman Catholic clergy in Cuba and to the Irish people in America which the meeting thought it would be highly desirable to put you in possession of. Dr. Madden and I were appointed to wait on you for that purpose. . . . With respect to the clergy of Cuba the doctor stated that a very general pro-slavery feeling exists among them, that a great majority of them support this vile practice and inculcate the notion, either directly or indirectly, that slavery is not an institution repugnant to the Roman Catholic religion. Dr. Madden has taken the pains to collect a number of passages from the writings of the fathers, and other eminent men of your Church which prove the fallacy and criminality of such opinions. . . .

Dr. Madden says it is a fact well known to every intelligent man acquainted with American politics that the Irishmen in that country are such a powerful and influential body that they exercise a paramount influence in the election of the president and in elections of the members of the various legislatures there; but that most unfortunately that influence has been given heretofore in favour of slavery. There are the two facts which we wished to lay before you for the purpose of asking you to use your great influence towards abating these two great impediments to the destruction of slavery. As regards the clergy of Cuba, it occurred to the committee that you would be disposed (when informed of their leaning towards slavery) to suggest to the Bishops of your Church who, we understand, are all soon to assemble in Dublin,<sup>3</sup> the propriety of some expression of their regret at hearing that such was the feeling of the clergy of Cuba so as to awaken them to a proper sense of their duty in case Dr. Madden's impressions be correct. Such an expression immediately following the late noble-minded bull<sup>4</sup> of his Holiness the Pope on the subject of slavery might be attended with excellent results. Now with regard to our countrymen in America, the fact stated is most lamentable, your influence over their minds is very great, would you think it wise to address them on this subject one of your powerful appeals? . . .

You are doing the temperance cause, of which I am an humble but a devoted disciple, good service. Father Mathew<sup>5</sup> will soon spread peace and joy all over the land. May all your expectations for Ireland soon be realised and may God grant you a long and happy life to witness the glorious results of your noble exertions.

[P.S.] I believe you are aware that Dr. Madden has resided for some years in Cuba and, as he is a writer of some eminence, his

opinions are, I expect, entitled to respect. He informed me that he is personally known to you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Haughton (1795-1873), wholesale grain merchant. A Quaker but became a Unitarian around 1834. Supporter of Repeal, anti-slavery and Fr. Mathew's temperance movement. See *DNB*.
- 2 Richard Robert Madden (1798-1886), youngest son of Edward Madden, Dublin, silk manufacturer. Surgeon; 1836-40 superintendent of liberated Africans and judge arbitrator in the mixed court of commission, Havana; a commissioner of inquiry on western coast of Africa 1841-43; secretary to Loan Fund Board, Dublin 1850-80; author of *The United Irishmen* and other works. See *DNB*.
- 3 The annual general meeting of the Catholic prelates of Ireland took place in Dublin on 14 February 1840. A letter was addressed to them by Madden on this occasion, appealing to them to publish their support for Gregory XVI's recently promulgated apostolic letter (see below note 4) on slavery. (*Irish Catholic Directory*, 1841, 367-9).
- 4 In his apostolic letter *In Supremo* (3 Dec. 1839) Gregory XVI condemned slavery and the slave trade and forbade Catholics to propound views to the contrary (*New Cath. Ency.*, VI, 786-7).
- 5 Theobald Mathew (1790-1856), fourth son of James Mathew of Thomastown Castle, near Cashel, Co. Tipperary. The celebrated apostle of temperance; ordained a Capuchin friar 1814; inaugurated his total abstinence campaign in 1838. See *DNB*.

2674

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 17 January 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

The meetings<sup>1</sup> in Manchester were most glorious. It was utterly impossible to be better received than I was, though of course, there were many Chartists present in such an assembly.

Yarde-Buller<sup>2</sup> has been selected to make the anti-ministerial motion,<sup>3</sup> as being supposed not to be a Tory, but that is a mere supposition. He is as malevolent a Tory as any amongst them. But I am assured that we shall beat them, and the lowest calculation is by twelve. The Radicals will on this occasion vote with us to a man. After that motion no other attempt to distort the ministry will be made by the *Tory power*. Some say our majority will be near thirty but all agree that we shall have a majority.

I have every reason to hope and believe that the Chartists will soon be exploded. All the reasonable men will join the reformers. This change, if it takes place, will have a more powerful effect than you can easily suppose without knowing more of the work-

ing of the internal policy of this country than anyone in Ireland.

We expect to gain all the elections except Newark;<sup>4</sup> that will be a great loss in the person of the Solicitor-General.<sup>5</sup>

The House of Commons will firmly assert its privileges, and all other bodies must therefore yield.<sup>6</sup>

*Private.* I send this day a cheque to Wright for £500. This is for London expenses. The action at the suit of Livesey<sup>7</sup> cost me £174!!! What we suffer for our country!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 220

- 1 See letter 2668.
- 2 Sir John Buller-Yarde-Buller, third baronet (1799-1871), Lupton, Devonshire. Conservative M.P. for South Devon 1835-58: created Baron Churston in 1858.
- 3 On 28 January 'a substantial county member, Sir J. Yarde-Buller, was put up to move a vote of want of confidence in the Administration.' After a debate lasting four nights, the motion was defeated by 308 to 287 (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 450-1; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LI, 1073).
- 4 Writs were issued on 16 January for elections in Devonport, Birmingham, Edinburgh, Penryn and Falmouth, Newark, Southwark, Co. Meath, Denbighshire and Beverley. On his appointment as solicitor-general Thomas Wilde was seeking re-election for Newark. He was re-elected by 541 to 532 for his Tory opponent (*Times*, 25, 28 Jan. 1840).
- 5 Thomas Wilde (1782-1855), M.P. for Newark 1831-32 and 1835-41; for Worcester city 1841-46. Solicitor-general 1839-41; attorney-general July-September 1841 and for a few days in 1846; chief justice of the common pleas 1846-50; lord chancellor 1850-52; knighted 19 February 1840; created Baron Truro in 1850. See *DNB*.
- 6 A reference to the case of *Stockdale v. Hansard* which involved a dispute between the House of Commons and the court of queen's bench. As a result, the absolute privilege of parliament in respect of papers published by either house was asserted, and the assertion embodied in the parliamentary papers act of 1840. Details of the affair are provided in the *Annual Register*, 1840, 16-52.
- 7 Unidentified.

2675

*From the Dublin Chamber of Commerce to London*

Concerning the attempt to have the treasury instruct the collector of customs in Dublin not to collect the Skerries light-house dues since the attorney-generals of both England and Ireland have declared that Irish coasting vessels are not subject to those dues. The letter is signed by Charles Haliday, secretary to the chamber of commerce. A copy of the chamber's letter to the lords of the treasury of 4 January 1840 is enclosed.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2676

*From H. Croly*<sup>1</sup>

Chatham, 28 January 1840

Sir,

Having but lately returned from the Continent I did not see until some few days back that you had in a speech delivered at the Adelphi Theatre in Dublin on the 24th ult. mentioned the Rev. Dr. Croly<sup>2</sup> as having changed his name from 'Crawley' and as the nephew of a person of that name who had committed a murder.<sup>3</sup> [The writer states that both assertions made by O'Connell are false and that he is a brother of said Dr. Croly. He has had no communication with Dr. Croly on this matter. He demands that O'Connell should publicly withdraw his two assertions.<sup>4</sup> ]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Henry Croly, lieutenant, 63rd regiment until 1837; captain from September 1837.
- 2 Rev. George Croly, LL.D. (1780-1860), Anglican clergyman, author of many works. See *DNB*.
- 3 At a meeting in Dublin on 24 December 1839, O'Connell referring to an alleged recent campaign by certain clergymen of the established church in England against Catholicism, declared '... the leader of them was a man who was promoted by Lord Brougham. The fellow called himself Crawley here, but he dignified his name to that of Croly in England. He was the nephew of the attorney, Crawley, who killed poor Mary Mooney in Dublin' (*MR*, 26 Dec.; *Pilot*, 27 Dec. 1839). The article on Rev. George Croly in the *DNB* says he was recommended by Brougham for church preferment.
- 4 For O'Connell's reply to Croly, see letter 2681.

2677

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 29 January 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you a cheque for £310. . . .

I have the pleasure to tell you that the political prospects are daily becoming more bright. The debate last night<sup>1</sup> was all in favour of Ministers. There never was such a contrast as that

between the miserable drivelling of the Opposition and the powerful discourses at our side. We will, I now think, have a majority of twenty. I know two belonging heretofore to the Tory ranks who will certainly vote with us. We fear no defection but that of Fielden of Oldham.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, Sir William Molesworth has come up to town for the express purpose of supporting the Ministry.<sup>3</sup> In short, this attempt to upset the Administration will give it additional strength. There is no doubt of another year of a Liberal Government, not the least.

You will be surprised to hear that there are not to be any creations of titles on the occasion of the marriage.<sup>4</sup> I have this from the very highest authority.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 221

- 1 On Yarde-Buller's motion (see letter 2674 n3).
- 2 John Fielden (1784-1849), cotton manufacturer, political and social reformer; M.P. for Oldham 1833-1841. See *DNB*. Fielden voted against the government in the division on Yarde-Buller's motion on 31 January (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LI, 650-736).
- 3 Molesworth does not appear to have participated in the debate though he did vote for the government in the division (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LI, 1077).
- 4 The marriage of Victoria to Prince Albert, which took place on 10 February 1840.

2678

*From Lord Morpeth*

Castle Howard [Yorkshire], — February 1840

My dear Sir,

I have just received your letter respecting Mr. Barrett's commission<sup>1</sup> and I will not fail to give Lord Hill a refresher. I believe that a year is reckoned a very short expectancy on the Horse Guards list.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Unidentified.

2679

This letter is now numbered 2807a.

2680

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 3 February 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

Be joyful and rejoice and thank God for the Tories are completely discomfited.<sup>1</sup> They are in absolute despair of gaining office. A high man amongst them said to me in a *private* conversation that he admitted the debate did the Tories the greatest disservice and that the Whigs had ensured another year of office. The truth is, Peel sees distinctly that he cannot hold power in this country with his present adherents without risking a revolution. For my own part, I solemnly assure you that my conviction is that the Tories will never obtain the Government of this country. All Peel's adherents of the violent school are quite mad with him. They say he has betrayed them.<sup>2</sup> The truth is, this attack on the Ministry was directed by the Duke of Wellington at the Apsley House meeting the day before the session commenced. Stanley, amongst the Commoners, was violently favourable to the attempt. They are all distracted at their utter defeat. The Ministry have a good working majority – over twenty – during this parliament to turn the scale against them, so that you may congratulate all the friends of Ireland on the stability of the Administration. In fact, there is a real reaction against the Tories. The Tory Radicals<sup>3</sup> are almost annihilated and the spirit of Reform, believe me, *for I know it*, will soon be roused in a shape highly useful to the present Ministers. Rejoice, then, and be glad, for the foe is really prostrate.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 221-2

- 1 By the defeat on 31 January of Yarde-Buller's motion (see letter 2674 n3).
- 2 In his speech in the debate on Buller's motion Peel announced, amongst other things, that when in office he would maintain in Ireland the principles of Catholic Emancipation. 'There is no doubt that he seemed in his speech to announce that he would not be the tool of the Ultra-Tories. . . .' (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 451).
- 3 By this term O'Connell usually meant the Chartists.

2681

*To Lieut. H. Croly, Chatham*

16 Pall Mall, London, 3 February 1840

*Copy*

Sir,

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 28th of January<sup>1</sup> and to express a hope that the state of public business since, will easily account for my not being able to answer it sooner.

I now in reply have to inform you

First, that I never heard from any person as far as I can recollect, and *certainly* that I *never* said, *either* in public or in private, tha the Rev. Dr. Croly was *the nephew* of Mr. Crawley, the attorney who was executed for murder.

Secondly, that I never saw any report of *any* speech of mine which attributed to me the assertion of any *such* relationship.

Thirdly, that if I had seen *such* a report I would at once have exposed its entire inaccuracy.

Fourthly, that I now authorize you on my *sole* responsibility to contradict any *such* report, in any manner and in any terms you think fit.

Fifthly, if *you* prefer it, and take the trouble of specifying to me the newspapers with the date of the publication containing such a report, I will myself publish a contradiction in the most distinct terms.

Perhaps under the circumstances, especially as I never (I repeat) — said that the Revd. gentleman was the nephew of the murderer, I ought not to be expected to go so far; but I do prefer going farther than the circumstances may require, rather than allow any person to think that I would not go as far as I ought to contradict an assertion untruly attributed to me.

SOURCE · O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 See letter 2676.

2682

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

4 February 1840

All I can say of politics is that we are now soberly engaged enjoying our triumph,<sup>1</sup> and the certainty of the Ministers remaining in office, with the additional conviction gaining ground that the Tories NEVER will regain power. Blessed be God, the Queen is exceedingly angry with the Tories! They had done all they can to spite and *thwart* her. So much the better for honest folk.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 222

1 The defeat of Yarde Buller's motion (see letter 2674 n3).

2683

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 6 February 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

There never was such a storm for nothing as the flour question.<sup>1</sup> How ignorant Bianconi and Co. are when they tell you they would not object to the introduction of American *wheat* but do to *flour*. Why, the wheat can at present be imported and always could. In England flour can also be imported but it cannot in Ireland. So far the Corn Laws in both countries differ. There is an additional monopoly in Ireland, namely, that of flour. This is solely for the benefit of Irish millers. You know, and the world knows, I oppose every kind of monopoly and, above all, the Corn Law monopoly, and I would make myself ridiculous and contemptible if I were to stand by the Irish millers' monopoly, superinduced as it is upon the original corn law monopoly and aggravating it of necessity.

The reason why the second monopoly — the millers' — on the back of the other — the Corn Law — has been allowed to subsist is that Ireland is a country *exporting* wheat and flour. Until the last two seasons I cannot find that there was any foreign corn imported into Ireland. I do not find either at the Board of Trade or from practical millers that a single grain had been previously imported. But these two years the quantity of Irish wheat is small and therefore some foreign wheat has been introduced, but the



quantity after all if *very very inconsiderable*.

Now the last Irish wheat crop was not only deficient in quantity but defective in quality so that it would be injurious to the human health unless mixed with a better quality of flour which can be got only from abroad, in fact, from America, the *dry* flour of which is just the corrective wanting to our flour. This flour, in order to be introduced at all, *must* pay the full duty. It seems to some of my friends that *our* plan is to intrdouce flour duty free. I am sincerely sorry to say it is no such thing. The flour, I repeat, pays the full duty. So far, therefore, as the former is concerned he does not lose any part of his *protection*, that protection being the duty. But then comes out upon me the miller and says, 'The present law entitles me to *all the profit of grinding* the corn. Bring in foreign corn but let me, the Irish miller, have the profit of grinding.' Now he can grind cheaper or as cheap or less cheap than the foreign miller. If the first, he will easily drive the foreign firm out of the market by buying foreign corn and grinding it. Even if he can grind as cheaply he still has the home market nearer him, and the foreign miller will also be defeated. But if he grinds less cheaply, then the public of Ireland are entitled to the same protection against the Irish miller which the English people have against the English miller. Besides, it is an ascertained fact that foreign corn ground in Ireland will not be sufficiently dry in time to cure the deleterious effects of the bad quality of the Irish wheat of this season. I have considered the subject fully. I am convinced that a ridiculously undue importance is given to the subject in Ireland and that, at all events, my principles, founded on the advantage of the greatest number, command me to get rid of this monopoly.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 223-5

- 1 By 9 Geo. IV c. 60 it was forbidden to import into Ireland any corn not ground in mills in Great Britain. On 28 January Henry Labouchere introduced a bill for the repeal of this act. On 22 June the bill was defeated by 90 to 79 on its third reading, its leading opponents being Irish Tories (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1840, 3951-4). O'Connell gave decided support to the bill but did not vote in the division on its third reading.

2684

*From John Childs*

Bungay [Suffolk], [Thursday] 6 February 1840

Sir,

Your kindness in noticing poor Thorogood's case,<sup>1</sup> induced me to request him to write and thank you, as I find he has done, and he reminds me that on your return to London, when you paid us the honour of a visit<sup>2</sup> here in 1836, the Tories of Chelmsford prepared their myrmidons to insult you. This had escaped me but I now remember it well. [Childs praises the now imprisoned Thorogood as a great Whig reformer and humanity worker]. On Tuesday evening of next week Mr. Duncombe<sup>3</sup> will move for leave to bring in a bill<sup>4</sup> to liberate him and I am certain it is unnecessary for me to urge upon you the support of the attempt. I hope Lord John Russell will permit Mr. Duncombe to carry it as I am sure the doing so may enable him to get rid of a great many mean spirited low fellows who, pretending to him to be representatives of Dissenters, have had only their own advancement in view and Lord John has been deceived. [Writer states that his son is being charged with not paying Church Rates and his own furniture will be seized] And these are the men, *these Tories*, of whom persons have expressed their fears, lest they should ever again reign over us. I trust that fear is now gone for ever. They will never be permitted to insult us in power again, I am confident. [The writer encloses excerpts from the *Sun* newspaper containing his letters and other relevant material in the *Sun*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13648

- 1 John Thorogood, a Dissenting shoemaker, had been imprisoned in Chelmsford gaol in Essex since 16 January 1839 for the non-payment of 5/6d. in church rates (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LII, 88). A host of petitions for his release were presented during the session of 1840. It has not been ascertained when O'Connell 'noticed' his case.
- 2 On 28 May 1836 O'Connell visited Bungay. He addressed a crowd from Childs' house and was guest of honour at a public dinner that evening when he made a speech (*MC*, 30 May 1836).
- 3 Thomas Slingsby Duncombe (1796-1861), M.P. for Hertford 1826-31 and Finsbury 1835-61. See *DNB*.
- 4 On Tuesday, 11 February Duncombe moved to bring in a bill for the relief from church rates of persons conscientiously dissenting from the established church. His motion was defeated by 117 to 62. O'Connell voted for the motion (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LII, 88-117).

2685

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 8 February 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you a cheque for £414 and a draft on Fitz-Simon for £210 which will, when paid, *abolish* £1,000 I got on his acceptance.

All looks well in the political world. The Tories are scattered and powerless. Lord John is too pliant on the privileges question<sup>1</sup> but, in other respects, all is quite satisfactory. The Queen's marriage attracts little attention. It is surprising how indifferent the public appear to it. But there is a lull in politics after the recent storm — a lull on our parts of great security. The promotion of Liberal politics and politicians in Ireland is now the great study of the ministry. There is no danger of a dissolution nor any necessity for it. Everything will be done in the next week to arrange a committee in this city to forward the Irish registries.<sup>2</sup>

I send you a specimen on this paper of the ingenious devices<sup>3</sup> which have strangely grown up under the auspices of the Penny Postage Bill.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 225

1 The case of *Stockdale v Hansard* (see letter 2674 n6).

2 See letter 2689 n4.

3 Obviously some form of postage mark used after the introduction of the penny postage scheme which came into existence on 10 January 1840. The modern adhesive postage stamp was not used until May.

2686

*From Francis Horner to London*

Londonderry, 12 February 1840

My Dear Sir,

. . . In the year 1833 there was a Petition<sup>1</sup> against the sitting member for this city. Having been the leader of the radical party in the Election I was summoned as a witness by the Petitioners. . . . The opposite party had no resource than to impugn my veracity, hence a series of the foulest slanders [that would not have mattered if one of the petitioners had not acted with treachery] all of which appears in the printed Report<sup>2</sup> 15 April 1833. [Owing to the turn of events it proved impossible to have these charges

rebutted before the parliamentary committee dealing with the petition. He asks O'Connell's advice as to how he may rebut the slanders, whether he might do it by petition to the House of Commons. In particular he asks O'Connell to read queries 4460 to 4521<sup>3</sup> of the 1833 Report and the explanation<sup>4</sup> following them.]

I depend you will not refuse me a little assistance, many a hard tug I have maintained here for the cause that you espouse and that I am a friend to.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 A petition from certain electors of the city of Londonderry was presented in the Commons on 20 February 1833, complaining of the return by corrupt means of Sir Robert Alexander Ferguson for the city in the general election of December 1832. The Commons committee appointed to try the case reported on 15 April 1833 that Ferguson had been duly elected.
- 2 Parliamentary Papers, 1833, X.
- 3 The evidence of John Atcheson Smith, president of the Londonderry chamber of commerce. He stated that Horner was a dishonest businessman, giving specific examples of his alleged dishonesty and claimed also that he (Smith) had frequently accommodated Horner in business transactions.
- 4 A reference to the declaration to the committee by counsel for the petitioners, stating that since the principal charge against Ferguson rested on Horner's unsupported testimony, and the latter's character had been impeached through other evidence before the committee, he (the counsel) could not expect the committee to act on Horner's testimony.

2686a

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

[London] 14 February 1840<sup>1</sup>

[No salutation]

I am assured from high authority that the Tory party are crumbling into factions. Do not let it get into the newspapers but I heard it from the most excellent authority indeed, derived from a personal friend of Peel, that he was so disgusted with his own party — I should say with the Conservatives — that he was determined after Easter to spend some time on the Continent; indeed, the residue of the session. This and the political demise<sup>2</sup> of the Duke give Ireland a prospect of peace.

I write merely to say that there is not the least reason to despond or to be out of spirits at the defeat of last night. It does not in the least degree affect the ministry.

The Bill<sup>3</sup> shall not and cannot pass but Ireland must be roused. See William Murphy. I will be in Dublin during Easter week. Consult about a great public meeting. I will write again, please God, tomorrow.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 227

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick has dated this letter 24 February but the reference in it to 'the defeat of last night' (see letter 2687 n2) makes it clear that the correct date is 14 February.
- 2 See letters 2687 and 2688.
- 3 Presumably Lord Stanley's Irish registration bill; leave to being in this bill was granted on 25 February.

## 2687

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

London, 15 February 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

Of course you command all the interest I can in anywise make for your being Town Clerk of the new Corporation.<sup>1</sup> *You supersede all others in my grateful estimation.* Begin, therefore, your canvass with the certainty of having me with you heart and soul. Find out *privately* what William S. Hart, the attorney, is looking for, and let me know, that I may *privately* take means to put him on another scent if he be looking for the town clerkship.

You have seen in the papers a Ministerial defeat<sup>2</sup> and may be alarmed by it. I write to quiet your fears. It will not, and cannot, have any consequences save to make our party more vigilant as we had forces in town sufficient, if brought up, to turn the balance the other way. Besides, that pig-headed fellow Hume — a man totally devoid of tact — carried over three of ours.<sup>3</sup> The Tories whipped up their men from a distance of more than one hundred miles. We did not get in even those actually in London. The only evil effect is that it will give some encouragement to the Rascals or, rather, the 'Vagabonds' at your side of the water.

The Duke of Wellington has had another attack on Wednesday. They say, I believe with truth, that it was epilepsy. He has been, it seems, subject to a repetition of epileptic fits for some time past. He was better yesterday. They administered, it is said, a large quantity of calomel — a medicine too powerful for his ailing constitution. No doubt is entertained of his being speedily *hors de combat* as a political man. Peel, too, looks very ill. The party, if they lost him, would be in sad want of leaders as the duke is

actually lost.

From what fell<sup>4</sup> from Jackson I should fear that the Corporation Bill will be so mutilated by the Lords as to be totally unacceptable.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 225-6

- 1 The new Dublin municipal corporation which would come into existence on the passing of the current Irish municipal reform bill.
- 2 On 13 February the Tory John Charles Herries moved for certain returns relating to the public finances. His motion was carried by 182 to 172 (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., 184-232).
- 3 Hume voted with the majority on Herries' motion against the government. Only one of the 'three of ours' has been identified. He was George Grote.
- 4 In his speech on the second reading of the Irish municipal reform bill on 14 February Joseph D. Jackson made a significant reference to Wellington's views on this subject (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1840, 1003).

2687a

*To David R. Pigot, Solicitor General*

16 Pall Mall [London], 18 February 1840

*Private*

My dear Pigot,

You do not seem to know how true the maxim is — it was the favourite maxim of Henry the 4th of France — that 'more flies are caught by a spoonful of honey than by a tun of Vinegar.' Look at Hyndeman's<sup>1</sup> letter to me. I do therefore urge you most strongly to allow me to make this experiment. Even if your judgment differs with mine is not this much due to me as representative of the City of Dublin. Remember too that the link which binds these men together will be broken the moment that the Corporation is dissolved. They have or rather will have to form new Combinations. Let them not be kept from us by the sense of individual wrong. The more conciliatory we can make the new plan of corporation the better. Surely it is desirable to the last degree to heal old sores not to create new. These four men have *now a vested right* to the station, dignity and emoluments of the office of aldermen for their lives. They have also a pecuniary expectancy which *must* be realised if the Law<sup>2</sup> now in progress does not abolish the present corporation. Well, is it not enough to take away the dignity and station and not to deprive them of the money. Do I pray you consider this, and consider that I have some *right* to be heard on the question of the interests of my Constituents. The magic of politics is to be right and above all to

be right at the side of generosity and forgiveness of disarmed opponents. I argue this point, and I ask it also as a personal favour.

Yours ever sincerely,  
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Jesuit Fathers, Gardiner Street, Dublin

- 1 John Elliot Hyndman, wine merchant, 28 Bachelor's Walk, Dublin and Roebuck Lodge, Roebuck, Co. Dublin: alderman of Dublin.
- 2 The Irish municipal reform bill now in process of being enacted.

2688

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 20 February 1840

[No salutation]

Do not believe the Duke of Wellington to be recovering. He is merely dragging on from day to day and, if he continues alive, he is politically defunct. Prince Albert is a fine-looking young man with a very manly countenance. I got a smile from her and a civil bow from him yesterday.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 227

2689

*From T. M. Ray to London*

Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin, 20 February 1840

My Dear Sir,

Our City Registry was resumed today – the respite gave both parties an opportunity to rally, and consequently the court was kept full and busy man for man. The numbers at the close were:

Brot. up		New Registries	Reregistries	Rejected
21	Liberals	13	5	3
20	Tories	11	9	

I perceive that Mr. Serjeant Jackson has given notice of motion to give the municipal franchise to all parliamentary electors including the virtuous Freemen, and also that the electors are to vote for only *one half* the number of Town Councillors in each ward.<sup>1</sup>

I can hardly suppose either of these motions will pass for, if carried, I apprehend they would involve a rejection of the Bill.

While the inspectors were engaged collecting notices<sup>2</sup> for last November I took [the] opportunity to gain materials for ascertaining with accuracy the existing state of the Registry up to and including the last August session (1839). I have now made up these returns with great care and I think they are as accurate as anything of the kind can possibly be where weekly and almost daily changes are taking place. I send you an abstract which shows:-

1. The existing Freeholders and leaseholders in parishes.
2.       "     Householders                         "
3.       "     Freemen                                 "
4. The £50 Freeholders (these are also included in No. 1).
5. The Householders registered in 1832.
6. The number of *these* householders who have died or removed since that (a period of 7 years).

The totals stand thus — on property:-

	Freeholders and Leaseholders	Householders
Liberals	1841	2622
Tories	1329	965
Liberal Majority	512	1657
		512
Total		2169

But on the Freeman franchise:-

Tories	2262
Liberals	98
Majority	2164 which would exactly countervail the other.

It may be said it is only fair that the Freeman should be allowed the municipal franchise as they could register from property as well. If they have property, they have the same opportunity as others to register from it and, therefore, there is no need of a peculiar enactment in their favour — but the fact is otherwise. It appears from a return I made up last year with the assistance of Mr. Woodlock, that fully two thirds of all the Freeman who voted in 1837 are merely lodgers and mostly obscure creatures, and these are the parties now sought to be turned upon as to swamp the respectable bona-fide householders of the City.



To be sure, some of the wards are so secure that no change of franchise merely, could effect them. I will instance Paul's, Four Courts, James', Catherine's and Audeon's, five out of the fifteen, but in anywhere the numbers are not absolutely overwhelming in our favour, the chances would be for the Tories, most especially as these freemen have no taxes to pay.

With respect to the other amendment of the learned Serjeant, if I comprehend it correctly, it is still more mischievous, for instance, take Paul's Ward where there are 387 Liberal to 161 Tory resident householders capable of qualifying even beyond a £10 rate — say in round number 350 to 150 (the electors to vote for two only).

The Liberals set up four candidates.

The two most popular will carry say 200 votes each.

The two others will carry say 150 votes each.

The Tories concentrate their strength on two of their choice and give them each — 150 votes each.

Thus in this ward, where the Liberals count more than two to one, the Tories have a complete chance if not certainty of neutralising the other party, and they can do the like in all the other wards where we would be otherwise perfectly secure. The only wards wherein we might retaliate are George's, Merrion and Stephen's.

I enclose an abstract of the *actual existing householders* within the Municipal Bounds who are occupiers and competent to acquire the municipal franchise on £10 value. It is the result of much patience and labour. I got it made out within the last two months in this way. I furnished the inspectors each with a copy of the street lists in *Pettigrew and Oulton's Directory*. I got them to walk through each street, and from actual inspection and enquiry upon the spot, to mark the Tory householders thus X, and to strike out the names of those persons who had removed and whose houses they found unoccupied. I thus ascertained with precision the actual number on both sides who could at the very period acquire the franchise to be 10,600 viz. 6584 Liberal, 4016 Tory.

This number may appear, as it did to myself, considerably underrated when compared with the number of houses which I ascertained from authentic sources to be actually in existence within the municipal bounds — something over 20,000.

But the following numbers are to be deducted: We have ascertained by the recent enquiry that there are *females* owning and occupying houses. 1650

There are houses under £10 value at least	3000
There are many buildings, workshops, yards, etc. valued <i>beyond</i> £10 included in the general return of Sherrard and Police, not entitled to franchise, say	2500
and there are set in tenements to lodgers, say	2000
Unoccupied and dilapidated, probably	500
	<hr/> 9650

I apprehend the above calculations will be found to be very near the truth, at all events any excess one way or the other will bear the same relative proportions.

Our friend, Mr. J.J. Murphy,<sup>3</sup> has not been at the Registry since the second or third day. I fear he is under some embarrassment.

The Committees<sup>4</sup> are going on quite harmoniously. The finance committee attend daily. They always send over for me, and I am so fortunate as to meet their approbation, as I believe and hope.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 A motion of Frederick Shaw to this effect in favour of the freemen was defeated without a division at the committee stage on the Irish municipal reform bill on 24 February (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LII, 525-9). Another amendment which Jackson attempted on the same day to the effect that 'every person entitled to vote in the election of Aldermen and Town Councillors in any borough or ward, shall not vote for more than one half the number of the Aldermen and Town Councillors to be elected. . . .' was defeated by 102 to 35 (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LII, 542-4).
- 2 That is, notices of registry, which were collected by the inspectors of registry appointed by the 'General Reform Committee' (see note 4 below).
- 3 Probably John Joseph Murphy.
- 4 At a meeting of Liberals in Dublin on 10 January 1840 under the chairmanship of Lord Brabazon, attended by O'Connell and a large number of Liberal gentry, it was resolved to form a general reform committee to which 'members of the Loyal Registry Association, and the Subscribers to the Reform Registry Association of 1839' should be automatically admitted. A seven-member finance committee to the new body was appointed which 'shall have the power of appointing all agents employed for the purpose of promoting the registries, and also an absolute power of dismissing them as they think fit.' The finance committee and a sub-committee were to report periodically to the general committee. An assistant committee was appointed in addition, consisting of all Irish MP's, who were members of the new body, and all other MP's or persons holding property in Ireland whom they should name, for the purpose of finding out and registering new claimants to the franchise in Ireland. It was decided that a meeting of this committee should be held in London ten days prior to the assembling of parliament (*Pilot*, 13 Jan. 1840).

2690

*From Lord Ebrington*

Dublin Castle, 22 February 1840

(Copy)

*Private*

Dear Sir,

I have delayed answering your letter of the 18th because I could not bring myself to give the denial which I fear I must at least for the present, to the touching appeal returned herewith though it almost brought tears into my eyes when I read it. You do me justice in believing that that appeal does not lose its force in my estimation from its coming from a member of your family,<sup>1</sup> backed by a recommendation from yourself. I have never hesitated to express to you my strong disapprobation of those parts of your conduct in which I thought you liable to blame, and I have with equal readiness and greater satisfaction done you full justice for those where I considered you entitled to praise and particularly for your late most essential service to the cause of social peace and tranquillity by the exertion of your influence in keeping away Chartism from these shores. If, therefore, I consulted only my own wishes and feelings, they would very much incline me to comply with your wishes but I am greatly pressed at present for the next two or three appointments of stipendiary magistrates whenever the vacancies may occur, besides which I must candidly confess my apprehension that it would not be advantageous either to the Government or yourself that so near a relation and a namesake of yours should be put into the place of a stipendiary magistrate so soon after the late appointment<sup>2</sup> of your son, Mr. Morgan.

I have thus stated to you candidly all that I feel on the subject and why I must say *No* to your present application. In truth, it costs me much to do so, and if at any future time a favourable opportunity should occur, I shall not be unfavourably disposed to consider of it, yet I almost fear to say this for I know how the heart sickens from disappointment, and I cannot therefore bear to encourage hopes which it may never be in my power to realise.

SOURCE: Devon County Record Office

1 O'Connell's son-in-law, Charles O'Connell.

2 As assistant registrar of deeds.

2691

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*London, 28 February 1840<sup>1</sup>

My dear Friend,

I enclose you a *reformed* cheque, being for £120, the amount of Jeremiah Dunne's bill. I wrote the former with a batch of expectants most unpleasantly boring me. I continued to write in order to signify my wish to be left alone.

The Ministry had another defeat<sup>2</sup> last night, owing entirely to the unpopularity of Spring Rice though he was not directly involved. Many of our best men such as Bannerman<sup>3</sup> and Warburton, Pattison<sup>4</sup> of the City, Mark Phillips<sup>5</sup> and several others went away without voting. Eight or ten of those who ought to be ours such as Wakely and, of course, pig-headed Hume, voted plump against us. The Tories crow over it as a great victory but it is no such thing nor does it affect the stability of the Ministry in the slightest degree. It is one of the occasions which, not having any vital importance and being in itself wrong, prevents our men from mustering and causes the 'affected' part of them to go over to the enemy. I repeat, however, that the least importance is not to be attached to it as endangering the Ministry who are exceedingly strong at Court, and the Court itself is much strengthened by the popularity of the Queen.

I fear I *must* go to Galway for Kirwan's trial,<sup>6</sup> I mean the ejection brought against Dean Kirwan.<sup>7</sup>

Can you tell me in strict confidence how stands the Education quarrel<sup>8</sup> amongst our Bishops? Let me have the facts accurately. I shudder when I see them getting into print.<sup>9</sup> How I wish that they would come to an unanimous determination not to publish any more letters in the newspapers. Our enemies triumph every time an angry letter appears. I will of course make no public or indiscreet use of the information you give me.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 232-3

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick erroneously dated this letter as 28 March but the reference in it to 'another defeat last night' makes it clear that the correct date is 28 February.
- 2 On 27 February Henry Thomas Liddell moved a series of resolutions indirectly criticising the government for having granted a pension to Sir John Newport, on his retirement from the office of comptroller of the exchequer. The resolutions were carried by 240 to 212 (*Hansard*, LII, 669-744).
- 3 Alexander Bannerman (1788-1864), shipowner, merchant and banker in Aberdeen. M.P. for Aberdeen 1832-47; knighted 1851. See *Boase*.

- 4 James Pattison (died 1849), M.P. for London city 1835-41 and 1843-49. Governor of the Bank of England 1834-37.
- 5 Mark Philips (1800-1873), M.P. for Manchester 1832-47; sheriff for Warwickshire 1851. See *Boase*.
- 6 O'Connell went to Galway on 13 March to attend the assizes for the case of *Lessee of Henry O'Flahertie and others -v- Thomas Martin*, in which Dr. Joseph Kirwan, P.P., Oughterard, was involved. O'Flahertie, the head landlord in the case, had in October 1838 served notice to quit on his tenant, Thomas Martin, a middleman and Martin's undertenants, of whom Kirwan was one. Seven acres had been leased from Martin on which had been built the parish chapel of Oughterard, a schoolhouse, and a dispensary. Immediately after service of the ejectment, an 'oucry was got up through the country that the ejectment had been brought for the purpose of getting possession of the chapel, in order to convert it to other purposes. . . .' The trial came off on 17 March, when a compromise settlement was agreed to, the chapel, school and dispensary being conveyed to trustees (of whom O'Connell was one) for the benefit of the parish (*Pilot*, 18, 20 March; *FJ*, 20 Mar. 1840).
- 7 Joseph W. Kirwan, D.D., V.G., P.P. of Oughterard (died 24 December 1849). In 1827 he was appointed to the parish of Oughterard as junior vicar of the wardenship of Galway. Appointed first president of Queen's College, Galway in 1845.
- 8 See letter 2572 n4.
- 9 On 19 February, the *Pilot* published a letter, dated 18 February, signed by MacHale and nine other bishops, in the course of which an attack was made on the board of education.

2692

*From Thomas Clarkson*<sup>1</sup>

Playford Hall near Ipswich, 2 March 1840

Dear Sir,

Though I have not the pleasure of your acquaintance yet I have been a faithful ally to you in all your great measures for promoting the welfare of your native country. I have never failed, when opportunity offered, to represent Ireland as most basely treated and misgoverned; as treated in fact by Toryism and religious bigotry, not as an amiable sister but as *a conquered land*.

I am rejoiced to learn that she is now setting *an example to the world of Temperance* in the most striking manner so as to amount nearly to a miracle. . . . If they should persevere in this laudable object, what will be the effects of their perseverance? Their streets will be without beggars, which were full of them; and their courts of Criminal Law nearly shut up. . . . Peace and personal safety will take the place of discord and riots, and the Reformed, being now to be confided in, will gradually find employers so that

industry will be seen in many instances where idleness and vagrancy appeared before.

The object of this letter is to beg the favour of you, in which I am joined by my friend Mr. Pease of Darlington, to present the petition,<sup>2</sup> which will accompany it, to the House of Commons, if you should *think it a proper one to be presented* there, for being arrived, within a few days, at the advanced age of eighty years, I begin to distrust my own faculties as to what is proper and becoming, and what is not so. If you will consent to present it, you may do it *when you think it will tell best*. You have one to present from Darlington on the same subject.

. . . I am very nearly blind, scarcely seeing at times where to direct my pen. I am too in great pain from the rheumatism and otherwise afflicted by what may be supposed to be the infirmities of old age, particularly sleepless nights which have begun seriously to affect my health.

[P.S.] O! May the Irish persist in their system of Temperance. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Thomas Clarkson (1760-1846), a leader of the movement to abolish slavery; author of many pamphlets. See *DNB*.
- 2 On 3 March O'Connell presented this petition in favour of the abolition of the opium trade with China. He presented an identical one from Darlington on 2 March.

2693

*From Rev. John Sheehan*

Waterford, 3 March 1840

My Dear Friend,

I am about to crave your interest and interference in behalf of an individual whose name is James Woulfe. [Fr. Sheehan quotes from a letter on behalf of Woulfe from Miss Blount,<sup>1</sup> an English Catholic and aunt of Rev. William Riddell,<sup>2</sup> one of the Catholic clergymen of Newcastle. Woulfe works in a solicitor's office in Cheltenham and desires a situation from Mr. Blamire,<sup>3</sup> lately M.P. for Cumberland, the Chief of the Tithe Commissioners in Somerset House. Woulfe's sister has become a Catholic and a nun, and he is showing signs of an interest in the Catholic religion. Fr. Sheehan appeals strongly for O'Connell to use his influence with Mr. Blamire.]

What are the prospects of ministers? Is there any danger of a

change? You promised to write to me soon on a certain subject<sup>4</sup> when you were leaving Dublin and I have not had [a] line from you since. I am exceedingly anxious that something definite were known as to the views of the party upon the subject to which I am alluding. Barron's<sup>5</sup> votes and his absence upon late occasions have given great umbrage to some of his constituents. I wish he was a little less selfish or that the representation of the city were out of his and Wyse's hands altogether.

What a laceration Barrett gives the 'old rebel' in the *Pilot* yesterday!<sup>6</sup> . . . Our assizes business lasted one day and a half.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Frances Blount, second daughter of Joseph Blount of Mapledurham, Oxfordshire.
- 2 William Riddell (1807-1847), third son of Ralph Riddell of Felton Park, Northumberland. Appointed 1832 assistant to Rev. James Worswick at Newcastle; 1843 coadjutor *cum successione* to Bishop Mostyn of the Northern District.
- 3 William Blamire (1790-1862), Thackwoodnock, Cumberland. M.P. for Cumberland county, 1831-2; for East Cumberland 1832-6; chief commissioner of tithes 1836-51. See *DNB*.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 Henry W. Barron.
- 6 In an article entitled 'The Old Rebel', the *Pilot* of 2 March attacked Wellington.

2694

*From Henry R. Bagshawe*<sup>1</sup>

No. 2 New Sqre, Lincoln's Inn [London], 5 March 1840  
My dear Sir,

It will be in your recollection that you were kind enough to subscribe £25 a year for 4 years towards a fund for guaranteeing Dolman against loss on the publication of the *Dublin Review* to the extent to £300 a year.

Mr. Charles Wild was appointed to audit the accounts which he has done and certifies that Dolman has sustained actual loss on the publication of Nos. 11, 12, 13 and 14 during 1839 to the amount of upwards of £300.

Dolman is therefore entitled to receive £300 from the subscribers.

The total subscription for 1839 is £400 and therefore your proportion of the £300 is £18.15.0.

I am sorry to have to trouble you to pay this sum (£18.15.0) to

Dolman or his Bankers, Messrs. Drummond.

If only the sale were increased 500 copies there would be no loss and I cannot but think this ought to be the case and I hope it will soon be so.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Henry Ridgard Bagshawe (1799-1870), called to the English bar 1825; editor of the *Dublin Review* from 1837 (No. 6) till 1863. Later, a county court judge. See *Boase*.

## 2695

*From Joshua M. Chaytor,<sup>1</sup> Dublin, 19 March 1840*

Sends O'Connell a pamphlet on currency 'as the public will turn with intense anxiety to the Committee<sup>2</sup> recently appointed on the Currency and Banking.' He considers all banks should be placed on an equal footing in regard to paper currency. He thinks his pamphlet propounds a new way to achieve financial stability.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Joshua M. Chaytor, provision merchant, Belview, Grand Canal Harbour, and Heathville, Monkstown Road, Dublin.
- 2 O'Connell was a member of the select committee appointed on 19 March 1840 'to inquire into the effects produced on the Circulation of the Currency by the various Banking Establishments issuing notes payable on demand'.

## 2696

Letter withdrawn. Public letter to Richard Barrett, 30 March 1840 published in the *Pilot*, 1 April 1840.

## 2697

*From William Greene<sup>1</sup> to London*

22 Bury Street, St. James [London], 1 April 1840

My dear Sir,

Edward Walsh has been known to me for many years from the time he was my servant in Trinity College. He always bore the very best character. May I beg of you, considering the intolerant



spirit so harshly manifested towards him by his College employers for daring to exercise his franchise in your support, to look as favourably as you can upon his petition?<sup>2</sup>. . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 William Greene, son of Nuttal Greene, of Kilmanahan Castle, Co. Waterford. Called to the bar 1838.
- 2 Walsh's petition to O'Connell is written on the third and fourth pages of this letter. He states in it that he was the only one out of 32 city voters 'belonging to the university' who supported O'Connell. He asks for O'Connell's assistance to obtain a job.

2698

*To Sir William Brabazon Bt.*

London, 2 April 1840

*Private*

My dear Sir William,

I feel it a sacred duty I owe to you as a personal friend and to the cause of the Irish people to inform you that the fate of the ministry depends on the support they get on the Chinese question on Tuesday next, the 7th inst. I would therefore very respectfully implore of you to come off for London without any delay.<sup>1</sup> Twenty-four hours will bring you from Dublin hither and I do venture to say that, if you are absent, you incur the risk of being the cause of a dissolution of parliament and of a contest in every county in Ireland represented by a liberal. I do submit to your own good sense whether this is not a responsibility greater than any you ought willingly to incur. Permit me to add that Ireland has the deepest interest in the successful event of the motion of Sir James Graham on the 7th inst. and, if you be absent, I really think you never will forgive yourself when you see the fatal consequences, nor will the people of Ireland, I think, ever forgive you.

I beg your pardon for being so extremely urgent but I owe it to my sincere personal regard for you to give you this most friendly warning. No man is your real friend who would conceal from you our present situation.

SOURCE : NLI, MSS 5759

- 1 The Opium War between Britain and China had now begun. On 7 April Graham introduced resolutions which condemned the ministry's policy towards China. Brabazon was an absentee from the division in which Graham's resolutions were defeated on 9 April by 271 to 262 (*Annual Register*, 1840, 82-104; *Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LIII, 955). O'Connell attacked

Brabazon publicly for his failure to be present for this division, and called on his constituents to compel him to attend parliament regularly in future (O'Connell to the People of the Counties Mayo and Kilkenny, 8 Apr. 1840, *Pilot*, 10 Apr. 1840; see also Brabazon to the *Mayo Mercury*, 2 Apr. 1840, excusing himself from a previous absence on a division on Stanley's registration bill, and pledging himself to be in his place in future, *Pilot*, 8 Apr. 1840).

2699

*To Archbishop MacHale*

London, 8 April 1840

*Private*

My ever venerated and dear Lord,

Whenever I have formed the intention of making a *great* popular movement or a movement which I hope to be *great* I have in latter times taken the liberty of announcing my intentions to your Grace in the strong wish to obtain the aid of your giant mind and national influence. In this I have not been very successful. I got from you much excellent and wise advice but active co-operation you thought it fit not to give me. I bow with submissive respect to the judgment which induced you to decline, I would not and I could not say, to refuse me, that co-operation. I have neither the right nor the inclination to complain of your decision. If you were not as free as air to act or not to act I would not be guilty of the great presumption of addressing your grace on political subjects at all or in any contingency.

With these sentiments, embodied as they are with the most profound respect, I now lay before your Grace my present plan.

It is this: to organise a 'Justice or Repeal'<sup>1</sup> association. The justice I require branches itself into four different heads of grievance.

First, the payment and support by the State in Ireland of the Church of the minority of the Irish people. This is the first, the greatest of our grievances.

Second, the omission to give the Irish *full* corporate reform.

Third, the omission to give the Irish people the same political franchises which the people of England enjoy.

Fourth, the omission to give the people of Ireland an adequate share of parliamentary representation.

The association I propose will organise, I hope, the Irish people to insist on the redress, the full redress, of the grievances from the

Imperial Parliament, and if not speedily and fully granted by that Parliament . . . then from a restored domestic Legislature.

I was to have a provincial meeting in Connaught to oppose Stanley's Bill<sup>2</sup> and to promote the Association I have above sketched but (*I will not invade* your province without your previous sanction or at least your previous assent.

I hope to find a letter from you on Monday next at Merrion Square.

You were in your former letters pleased to labour with me to use my influence with the present Ministry to adopt a more liberal course of legislation in Ireland or, I should say, *for* Ireland; and you conveyed the idea to my mind that I ought to obtain from the government that adoption by menacing to desert them at their need and to allow the Tories to put them out. It was in vain that I assured your Grace that the leading men of the present Ministry and, especially, Lord John Russell desire and anxiously desire an honourable opportunity of giving up power.

They do not cling to it, believe me. I do beg of you to believe me, for I know the fact, they do not cling to office with that tenacity that would make such a menace of the slightest avail. Now do, my dear and most revered Lord, *believe me* that this is the simple fact. Nay, they menace me to resign unless I satisfy them in my conduct.

Under these circumstances is it *too much* for me to ask your Grace to believe me that I am utterly unable to *influence* the Government? I implore of you to have this ingredient in your mind in coming to any determination, that I cannot possibly persuade the Ministry to adopt or reject any particular measure or take any particular course.

It is true that I have already written to this effect to your Grace but, alas, you seemed not to credit my assertion, and now I respectfully solicit an answer, if you think fit to write to me at all. Do you believe me when I say I am utterly powerless in respect to influencing, persuading or in any way affecting the acts of the Ministry?

My own private and confidential opinion is that the Tories will soon, very soon, be in office. One reason why I wish to organise Ireland is this conviction.

Give me any, even the slightest, hint that you see any inconvenience in my going into Connaught, and I will not approach its borders.<sup>3</sup> One unhappy event, on the other hand, has prevented the Irish people from having the 'power of the West' with them. I blame nobody. If anybody be to blame, I am probably the man. I certainly know no person in that province who ought to share any

such blame. Nor do I, nor can I possibly, either directly or indirectly, allude to any other circumstance or to what may have happened in the unquestionably conscientious discharge of my duty.

I do in conclusion implore your Grace to forgive me for this intrusion. It is, indeed, dictated by the most sincere respect, the most unqualified veneration and the *not culpable* anxiety to stand well in your judgment as a public man and as a Christian.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 670-3

- 1 O'Connell launched the 'National Association of Ireland for full and prompt Justice or Repeal', at a meeting in the Corn Exchange on 15 April, declaring that unless justice were secured that session, he would next session demand repeal (*FJ*, 15 Apr. 1840). On 13 July O'Connell declared the body a purely repeal organisation and it constituted itself at his bidding the Loyal National Repeal Association (*Pilot*, 15 July 1840).
- 2 The registration of voters (Ireland) bill introduced by Lord Stanley on 6 March. Its second reading was carried on 26 March by 250 to 234. The bill was designed to cure the abuses of which conservatives complained in the registration of voters in Ireland. It provided for annual registration, abolition of certificates of registration which were 'a fertile source of corruption and impersonation', and the imposition of fines for frivolous and unreasonable claims and objections. It was 'at once denounced by O'Connell and the Irish as a deliberate attempt to restrict the franchise' and increase landlord influence. It received strong Tory support and despite government opposition was brought by Stanley into committee. Though then perforce dropped, 'it remained to disgrace the Government's record and menace their future' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 165-6; Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 452).
- 3 For MacHale's reply see letter 2702. O'Connell held a meeting for repeal at Castlebar, Co. Mayo on 26 July. MacHale appeared at the banquet after the meeting and spoke 'ardently' in favour of repeal (Broderick, *Holy See and Repeal*, 113).

2700

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 9 April 1840

[Fragment]

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you a cheque, as you require, for £214. We are, thank God, rid of poor Jerry McCarthy's account. He was an excellent friend and I paid him some thousands.<sup>1</sup> God be merciful to him!

I am now told that we are to have a majority<sup>2</sup> of from eight to sixteen. It is too bad that two Irish vagabonds should be away. Brabazon is a fool but Col. Butler is a knave.<sup>3</sup>

There is nothing, my dear friend, for it in either country but agitation. I must have a permanent association in Dublin. There is no possibility of going on without it. The Repeal must mingle in the cry, 'Justice or Repeal'. That is for Ireland. For England, *further and adequate reform*. I am engaged in a Committee to arrange the plan of such a society, and am detained here for Saturday *on that account*. My intention is to go to Liverpool in the night train of Sunday and to Dublin on the day steamer of Monday.

A Repeal Association or any permanent body will injure your operations for me as the parishes in general will not make double contributions.<sup>4</sup> I of course freely submit to the sacrifice.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 238

- 1 Jeremiah McCarthy had died during 1839 since his name does not appear in the 1840 Dublin directory.
- 2 On Graham's motion (see letter 2698 n1).
- 3 O'Connell shortly afterwards made a public attack on Butler, accusing him of having withheld his vote on the Jamaica question and for being absent for the debate on China. He left it to Butler's constituents to decide what action should be taken (O'Connell to the Men of Mayo and Kilkenny, 10 Apr. 1840, *Pilot*, 13 Apr. 1840).
- 4 That is, to the Repeal Association and O'Connell Tribute. In 1836 the Tribute had not been collected in order to facilitate the taking up of the General Association's 'Justice Rent' (Lyne, 'General Association'). In 1840, however, the Tribute was collected as usual.

## 2701

*To William Blamire, 11 April 1840 from 16 Pall Mall, London*

Recommends Perceval Banks<sup>1</sup> for the office of assistant tithe commissioner.

SOURCE: Universiteitsbibliotheek Van Amsterdam

- 1 Perceval Weldon Banks (born c. 1805) eldest son of Perceval Banks, M.D., of Rose Bank, Co. Clare. Called to the English bar and practised on the home circuit. He was not appointed assistant tithe commissioner.

2702

*From Archbishop MacHale*

11 April 1840

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have read with deep interest the kind letter with which you have honoured me. I am only surprised that you could for a moment imagine that I would be indifferent to any communication from such a source. I prize it the more on account of your continued personal friendship, notwithstanding my apparent for it is only apparent, apathy in the political transactions of the country. . . . We have arrived at an awful crisis. . . . This last measure<sup>1</sup> is the deadliest stroke yet aimed at our liberty. Whilst the franchise remained, there was yet hope for a peaceful assertion of our rights — take that away and the people are left without any arms in their hands. . . . The protection, nay, the extension of the franchise is a common cause on which there should be no controversy. . . . Already have there been meetings in this part of the country denouncing this infamous measure and not forgetting those who were absent from the division.<sup>2</sup> It is worthy of the hatred of Stanley for Ireland. I shall cheerfully give you all the assistance in my power; and when you come to Connaught to hold your meeting, how delighted shall I be if you honour again with your presence my humble mansion.

You cannot 'invade' any part of Ireland. For you, at least, the boundaries of dioceses and provinces should disappear. It is only against the heretics and the Sassenachs, for I really have no relish for the ascendancy pretensions of either, that I proclaim the inviolability of my spiritual territories. . . . Ireland must now be awakened to its duty and fully impressed with the conviction that it is not on Whig nor Tory nor Radical it is to rely, for they are all hostile to our holy religion, but on our own concentrated efforts which alone can save us from the despotism to which we shall otherwise be doomed. Come, then, among us as early as you can find it convenient and you will have a *céad míle fáilte*.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 673-4

- 1 Stanley's Irish registration bill.
- 2 At a meeting of several parishes of Mayo and Galway, held at Ballydine on 5 April, resolutions were passed denouncing Stanley's registration bill, and censuring Sir William Brabazon, Thomas Martin and John J. Bodkin 'for their absence on late divisions' (*FJ*, 9 Apr. 1840).
- 3 Gaelic for 'one hundred thousand welcomes'.

2703

*From Thomas Sadlier, Jun.*<sup>1</sup>

Ballinderry House, Borrisokane [Co. Tipperary], 28 April 1840  
Sir,

To you, as the friend and advocate of the peasantry, I take the liberty of submitting the enclosed. The unexpected death<sup>2</sup> of Mr. Drummond leads me to look for your assistance in behalf of these poor people and I am led to hope from your knowledge of the country that you will conceive it a subject not unworthy of your notice. I beg you will look upon my letter as being perfectly of a private nature and, as I think it best to forward my entire correspondence with the Castle, request you will by no means imagine that I call your attention to any matter at all personal to myself. I have numbered the letters as I wish you to read them. That from Mr. Drummond is the only communication I have had from the Government. The neighbourhood has since become much disturbed, the practice of our Bench continues to be the same, in fact so long as session clerks are allowed, either by law or sufferance, to receive fees in such cases and that the Police are permitted to do this duty, so long will these wretched poor people be tormented, harassed and exasperated.

As I happen to be a sailor, I may perhaps be wrong in my view of the 4th and 5th William IV, Chap. 50<sup>3</sup> being the only act to summon and convict under and which I think is not affected by a later one empowering magistrates to give costs in certain cases.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Thomas Sadleir, Jr., J.P. (1796-1863), Castletown and Ballinderry, Borrisokane, Co. Tipperary; sometime R.N.
- 2 Drummond died in Dublin on 15 April.
- 3 An act passed in 1834 for amending the Irish road acts. It provided that where animals were found straying on streets and public roads the police were empowered to summon the owner to appear before a magistrate or, if the owner should not be known, to impound the animal until claimed. The magistrate might fine such owner not more than one shilling, without costs.

2704

*To his son John*

Merrion Square, 29 April 1840

My dearest John,

. . . I am getting on famously with agitation. The *Repeal* will soon spread like wildfire. After Stanley's blow at our franchise and the manner in which the House of Commons has received it, who can doubt of the necessity of Repeal? It is true they have not passed his Bill *yet* but if they meant to redeem their pledges to Ireland, why should he have got the support he has. His Bill<sup>1</sup> is only postponed, and unless we rouse ourselves, he will succeed.

You will have seen the address<sup>2</sup> I drew up for the Association — we are now *fairly launched*.

I leave in the early boat on Sunday night, and will be in the House on Monday night.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 316-7

- 1 The Irish registration bill.
- 2 'The Address of the National (Repeal) Association of Ireland to the People of Ireland,' dated 21 April 1840, signed by O'Connell as chairman of the committee preparing it. The address declared repeal to be the only solution to Ireland's grievances and outlined arrangements for collecting the repeal rent (*Pilot*, 22 Apr. 1840).

2705

*From Joseph Sturge*

34 Eccles Street [Dublin], 29 April 1840

Dear Sir,

Since the conversation I had the pleasure to have with you yesterday, my mind has been strongly impressed by the truth of those views which I had anticipated respecting the ultimate object of the British Ministry in going to war with China. When I suggested to Mr. Conway a week or two ago that it seemed to me as if Mr. Macaulay<sup>1</sup> in his late speech<sup>2</sup> on the subject conveyed the impression that he looked forward to the subjugation of China, it was more a stray idea which had arisen, rather than any real feeling on my mind, that such an object really had any place in the minds of ministers. The wickedness of our proceedings in India<sup>3</sup> caused me to hazard an opinion that Britons might still be found



willing to burden themselves with added criminality, by the practice of similar atrocities in China and, from what you told me, I have been painfully convinced that such is in truth the fact, that in spite of her enormous debt, her own internal wranglings and the all but open enmity of Ireland, England's ministers are willing to rush into a war with China which in any case would be of doubtful issue but which, in the present case, the moral feeling of the nation will rise up against and pray that it may not succeed. For let ministers say what they may, the war will be called an opium war, a war aggressive and therefore wholly unjustifiable, a war which ought not to succeed. These are the sentiments of a large and, I hope, an influential portion of the British people. You are anxious to keep the present ministers in office. In this anxiety every honest Irishman participates but, my dear Sir, are they strong enough to risk any chance of defeat (I would call it a certainty of defeat) by engaging in such an odious war? If it had been known before the division on the late debate<sup>4</sup> that orders for reprisals on the Chinese had been issued, I believe they would have been left in a minority but the members and the public were clearly given to understand that the war was merely in support of national honour and that the smugglers would be left to their fate.

I wish you would turn your mind more and more to the morality of this great question. We have plundered India, we have taken an unhallowed possession of a country in which God has decreed that we shall not enjoy health of body, in which our race cannot be perpetuated except by constant importations. You are of opinion that our subjugation of that mighty empire has been productive of happiness to its inhabitants. My reading has led me to an opposite conclusion but it is most certain that we have no cause to *boast* of the superior mildness of our government as compared to that of the native princes. You will know, my dear sir, that after all the exertions of philanthropists at home, enough of tyranny remains to brand our name in India with disgrace indelible. Our opium monopoly and our salt monopoly, alone prove my case. Add to these the constantly recurring famines sweeping off hundreds of thousands of the miserable inhabitants and we may well exclaim that 'the phial of Divine wrath is ready to be poured out on our nation, so preeminent in blood guiltiness'.

I entreat it of you to use your great, your deservedly great influence in preventing any aggressions on China. If we try to act the part of a bullying schoolboy who attacks his fellows because he thinks them weak, but who would fear to say a harsh word to one as big as himself, I hope we shall be disappointed.

We want to trade with the Chinese, they are quite willing to trade with us, if we agree to do so on fair and honest terms.

Your friend,  
Joseph Sturge

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859), the celebrated writer and historian. M.P. for Calne 1830-32; for Leeds 1832-34; for Edinburgh 1839-47 and 1852-56. Secretary at War 1839-41. See *DNB*.
- 2 Delivered in the Commons on 7 April 1840 in defence of the government's policy towards China.
- 3 Probably a reference to the first Afghan war.
- 4 That is, on Sir James Graham's motion (see letter 2698 n1).

## 2706

Withdrawn. Either a public letter or a circular.

## 2707

*From P. Shapler<sup>1</sup> to New Broad Street, London  
c/o Rev. John Scoble favd. by Capt. C. Stewart*

62 Liberty St., New York [City], 8 May 1840

Dear Sir,

I took the liberty a few months ago to write you a rather long letter on the subject of such a modification of the Corn Laws of G. Britain as would conduce to the mutual and *equal* benefit of G. Britain and the *free* States of this Union. I hope and trust you received that letter and hope also that it may have met with some favour in your eyes.

Mr. Birney,<sup>2</sup> the gentleman nominated by our abolitionists as candidate for our next President U.S.,<sup>3</sup> goes out either in the G. Western tomorrow or Montreal on Monday as one of the delegates to the great convention from all the world to meet in London in next month.<sup>4</sup> The article in the *Emancipator* of 23 Jany which I took the liberty to send at same time with my letter . . . has had the good fortune to attract considerable attention — that part especially in relation to the Corn Laws. I have had conversation on the subject with Mr. Birney and Mr. Leavitt,<sup>5</sup> the Editor of the *Emancipator* (who also wishes to go out to London), and they appear to take a particular interest in the subject. At their instance I have given them abstracts of the arguments I ven-

tured to employ with you in favour of the proposed modification, with the additional one hinted at in my letter to you, which is in brief that such modification would make the population of the free states feel sufficiently independent of the cotton trade of the South, to act and determine right on the subject of slavery. These gentlemen, Mr. Leavitt, in particular, entertain the proposition with enthusiasm and propose to press it on the attention of the influential persons whom it is presumed will attend the Convention. I need not say that they will look to you as the prime mover of this business on your side of the water and will seek your powerful influence and aid to give it the right direction. I earnestly hope you have been able to view the plan with sufficient favour to grant that aid and influence.

I send with this the *Emancipator* of 2 April and 16th of same month, each of them containing a letter in continuation of that in the *Emancipator* of 23rd January (which I sent you). Perhaps you may not feel sufficient curiosity to wade through them both in order to see how the whole matter is carried out but I take the liberty to request your attention to the argument in the paper of April 2, that part especially which I have *marked in the margin*. I send an *Express* of [date not given] containing Mr. Calhoun's<sup>6</sup> 'Resolutions' and 'speech' in relation to them, and solicit your attention to his flourish respecting national law etc. I believe the principle assumed by me as being at the foundation of all systems of law in all Christian countries is correctly assumed. I am no lawyer but I have as yet *met* with no lawyer who has the hardihood to deny that it is as I have stated. Must it not be virtually so in respect to the law of nations? My main object in sending these papers, is, for the purpose of submitting this question to your most serious consideration. Is not this the fitting time and do not these Resolutions furnish the fitting occasion to place this principle on its true ground as the foundation of the law of nature and nations? I am not very deeply read, it is true, in national law. But I cannot resist the feeling that the principle must be there though perhaps never formally recognised or perhaps buried up and hidden by Treaty stipulations and decisions of admiralty courts etc. Something of this kind seems to be referred to by Mr. Calhoun; and I think some decision<sup>7</sup> of Sir William Scott<sup>8</sup> may countenance Mr. C's reference. But that was given at a time when, with respect to the slavery question, G. Britain could not come into a court under the law of nations with 'clean hands'. The case is different *now* and I hope you will find, on reflection, that this is a question worthy of your great and unquestioned abilities to bring up this principle from the depths where it may be buried

and render it effective, as you so well know how, against slavery in general and the slave trade in particular of any and every nation.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 James Gillespie Birney (1792-1857), a prominent lawyer and opponent of slavery. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 3 In April 1840 Birney was nominated for president by an anti-slavery convention representing six states (see 'James Gillespie Birney' in *Dict. Amer. Biog.*)
- 4 The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society held a convention of delegates from all over the world in London in June 1840.
- 5 Joshua Leavitt (1794-1873), Congregational clergyman, abolitionist, reformer and editor. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 6 John Caldwell Calhoun (1782-1850), the celebrated South Carolina statesman, political philosopher and pro-slavery advocate; vice president U.S.A. 1824-33. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 7 A decision given in 1827 by Lord Stowell, formerly Sir William Scott, as the judge of the high court of admiralty, in the case of a slave (see 'William Scott, Lord Stowell' in *DNB*).
- 8 William (Scott), first Baron Stowell (1745-1836), the celebrated judge. See *DNB*.

2708

*From Sam Hilliard to House of Commons*

Nelson Street, Tralee, 18 May 1840

Dear Sir,

The much to be lamented death of poor Mr. Primrose<sup>1</sup> which took place this day leaves the office of returning officer vacant in this Union. Might I hope that my claim on you and your former promise of getting me a situation will now succeed in your applying to the commissioners for my appointment to that office.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John Primrose, father of John Primrose Junior.

2709

*From Rev. Henry Lea*

35 Golden Square [London], 18 May 1840

Dear Sir,

Bishop Griffiths has received during the last few days the accompanying Petition<sup>1</sup> and Letter from the Bishop of Montreal<sup>2</sup> in Canada. His Lordship intended to have presented them in person but being prevented by indisposition has requested me to forward them. His Lordship thinks it scarcely necessary to add a word respecting the pious and exemplary labours of the Venerable Bishop of Montreal or of the deep interest which he (Bp. G) takes in the welfare of the Catholic religion in that Diocese. His Lordship has desired me to assure you of his best and kindest regards.<sup>3</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 From the bishop and other members of the Catholic clergy of the diocese of Montreal against making any change in the Canadian constitution as settled by 31 Geo. III c. 31. O'Connell presented it to the Commons on 25 June.
- 2 Jean Jacques Lartigue (1777-1840), first Roman Catholic bishop of Montreal. Died 19 April 1840.
- 3 Lea signs the letter 'Henry Lea Secy etc.'

2710

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 23 May 1840

*Private*

My dear FitzPatrick,

I *must* on Monday draw a cheque on the Hibernian Bank. I depend on you to take care of it. Pray, pray contrive to do this. It will be for £250.

I told you Stanley's Bill would go into Committee.<sup>1</sup> I thought his majority would be greater but, in the event itself, I was right. I now tell you he will succeed in every stage of it. The Tories are determined to carry it and, of course, there are loose fists enough amongst the Whigs to assist in the attack against Ireland. The prophecies of its being thrown out are all idle. I tell you Tory power is *consolidated* to carry the bill. If I could rouse the Repeal cry sufficiently it would be otherwise. If, for example, some of the

Catholic Prelates joined the Association it would have a great effect but there is a weakening in the holding back of the Catholic Clergy generally and, if this bill was not so pressing and so mischievous, I should not be surprised or at all sorry for their not coming forward so soon. I will endeavour to go over next week and make a strenuous effort to procure support.

There is nothing else new. In fact, this Bill absorbs all the public attention. The conduct of Lord Howick and of his comrade is atrocious.<sup>2</sup> His father<sup>3</sup> came to town since the second reading, and has a notion that, if matters are sufficiently disturbed, he will be called on to form a new Administration — a thing which is just as probable as that they should call on the Lord Mayor of Dublin to be Prime Minister. But the old [word omitted] is acting on this notion, and it is to the last degree probable that he has driven his son to the wicked course he has taken. I should not care but for the criminal apathy of Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 238-9

- 1 Stanley's Irish registration bill was carried into committee after it had passed its second reading on 21 May by 301 votes to 298.
- 2 The second reading of Stanley's Irish registration bill was carried 'by the defection of Lord Howick and Charles Wood, which was caused, as is said, entirely by the influence of Lord Grey, who is always out of humour with the Government, glad to give them a knock, though ostensibly their friend' (Greville, *Memoirs*, 2nd Part, I, 287).
- 3 2nd Earl Grey.

2711

*From Frederick Romilly*<sup>1</sup>

Dublin Castle, 24 May 1840

Dear Sir,

Information, conveyed by an anonymous letter of which I enclose a copy, was this morning sent to me that an attempt was likely to be made to dispatch a letter containing fulminating powder addressed to you in London. The letter was received too late this morning to take any steps to warn you or to prevent the delivery of such a letter. . . . It is hoped that you may receive this in time to put you on your guard with respect to it.

I . . . sincerely trust that the information may prove false. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Frederick Romilly (1810-1887), brother of John, later first Baron

Romilly. Captain in Scots Fusilier Guards; A.D.C. and later private secretary to the lord lieutenant. See *Boase*.

2712

*From Lt.-Colonel Yorke*

Home Office [London], 26 May 1840

Lt.-Colonel Yorke presents his compliments to Mr. O'Connell and sends him a letter which he has this moment received from Capt. Romilly. The information, as Capt. Romilly observes, is in all probability a hoax but as it is possible from the circumstance Capt. R. mentions, that the letter he has himself written to Mr. O'Connell may not reach him till late in the day, Lt.-Col Yorke could not of course delay sending him the enclosed. He will be obliged to Mr. O'Connell to return it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2713

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 30 May 1840

[No salutation]

I enclose you the stamp accepted. I ought to have sent it sooner but everything is growing dark and dismal. My daughter<sup>1</sup> is ill, very ill. . . . We lose a Welsh county<sup>2</sup> and, they say, the County of Monaghan.<sup>3</sup> Ireland is in foolish apathy. May God help us! His holy will be done! I will not, because I cannot, go to Dublin for some days to come. Of course I feel very unhappy. The first moment I can I will write to Dr. Blake and Dr. MacHale.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 240

- 1 Probably Betsey Ffrench.
- 2 The county was Radnor. On 10 June a Tory, Sir John Walsh, was elected unopposed (*Pilot*, 15 June 1840).
- 3 No election for Co. Monaghan took place this year.

2714

*From Edward William Richard*

45 Chiswell St., Finsbury Square [London], 3 June 1840  
Honoured Sir,

You may probably remember a young man who sat immediately before you at the meeting on Monday last at Exeter Hall<sup>1</sup> and to whom you did the honour of giving your hand before you left the place. [The writer expresses strong admiration for O'Connell and for his work for Ireland, and offers to provide him with any information he may desire on both the Church of England in Wales and the Dissenters in Wales. He says he is a native of Wales but is practising in London as a surgeon. He adds that he has not forgotten the cruelties inflicted on Wales by the English in former times.]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 This was the first anniversary meeting of the Society for the Extinction of the Slave Trade, and for the Civilization of Africa, on 1 June (*Times*, 2 June 1840). The society was a predominantly Anglican organisation as opposed to the predominantly Nonconformist British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society (see letter 2720 n 2).

2715

*From Daniel M. Collisson,<sup>1</sup> 84 Grafton Street, Dublin,  
8 June 1840*

States that under a Conservative government years ago he suffered great injustice as a result of the 'breaking up of our Irish Departments.' He asks O'Connell to obtain redress for him even though he was a supporter of the Conservatives but relies on O'Connell's statement<sup>2</sup> at the Corn Exchange that he would willingly seek redress of injustice for political opponents.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Of Daniel Marcus Collisson & Co., druggists and spice and tea merchants.
- 2 Probably a reference to the meeting which founded the National Association (see letter 2699 n1). O'Connell there said he had helped the 'Orange corporators' of Dublin when they had requested his aid, and he had told them: 'I expect no gratitude from you in a political sense. I don't want you to vote for me; . . . I see your case is just, and I wish to see justice done you, and see whether there is any high Tory of them all who will be more ready to grant you every assistance than I will' (*Pilot*, 15 Apr. 1840).



2716

This letter is now numbered 2720a.

2717

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 14 June 1840

[No salutation]

At present they are not traced but, unless the Government be unwilling to *explode* the real conspirators, the entire will come out.<sup>1</sup>

There are symptoms of the conspiracy being extensive and its acting parties intelligent. An attempt has been made to palm a wrong ball on the police. A flattened ball was found on the ground but it was too large for the pistol. If they had not been compared at once, but the comparison left for the trial, it would have operated favourably for the prisoner, and was probably so intended. The horrible fate of Ireland, if the assassin succeeded, is too dreadful to be looked at. We should, I do verily believe, have a persecution of blood.

This is really the time when men ought to join the Repealers so as to be organised legally before there is any change.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 241

- 1 An attempt was made on the lives of Victoria and Albert on 10 June by a youth named Edward Oxford who fired two pistols at their carriage. A jury found Oxford guilty but insane (*Annual Register*, 1840, 249-63).

2718

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 14 June [1840]

[No salutation]

Stanley's Bill<sup>1</sup> comes on again tomorrow. In a daring contest to usurp a Government day any other man but he would shrink from such an unexampled act of audacity. As long as Parliament has sat — at least since the reign of Elizabeth — Monday and Friday belong to the Government. This is the first attempt to take one of them away. I expect that he will be beaten on *this* point

but then he comes on again on Thursday, and that day will decide the disfranchisement of Ireland. I cannot possibly say how that day will *result*, as the Americans say, but it will be decisive.

I am sorry to tell you that I see scarcely a possibility of preserving the Corporate Reform Bill from the fangs of the vile Duke.

There is nothing for it, my dear friend, but Repeal.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 242

1 The Irish registration bill.

2719

*From P. V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 16 June 1840

My Dear Liberator,

Having failed to convert into cash your acceptance given me last Wednesday and, as it was endorsed by Richardson in order to *try* the Bank of Ireland, I return it to you cancelled, enclosing at the same time a stamp for a fresh acceptance with which I may be more successful when money becomes less scarce. The failure of last year's harvest appears now to make itself really felt, not only through the general complaints from all parts of the country but also by its political apathy and the cessation of remittances to *me*.<sup>1</sup> In this state of things I consider it right (with your approval which I shall await) to apply to Tom FitzGerald to renew your outstanding engagements to him in the manner following.

The aggregate amount of the *three* last bills is, as you will perceive, £668. This sum I would propose to Fitzgerald to renew by *two* drafts, one of which may be paid off at maturity and the other to be again and *once more only* renewed.

As to John Bourke, he is always ready to accommodate and, besides, I believe the only bill to him which *you* are to provide for will not fall due for more than two months to come.

There is a bill still out to Charles Meara<sup>2</sup> for £250, to Richardson for £130 and one in my own favour, £350. These comprise all *I* know of your engagements but, as I may have occasion to go to London shortly and *must* make an extensive circuit of the Kingdom during the summer, I am anxious to be furnished with a list, if possible by return of post of *all* your bills that my arrangements may be made accordingly. Meanwhile make no difficulty of drawing upon me for the £200 you seem to require at 21 or 31 days,

the latter to be preferred. I still hope, notwithstanding the stagnation of *my* business in the country during the last few weeks, to glean a respectable sum from the outstanding parishes between this and autumn. I shall keep the pressure on judiciously and publish week after week reports of parishes already received to stimulate the defaulters. Be therefore of good cheer on this subject whatever may occur in politics. We have a prospect of a glorious harvest and I shall reap a proportion of the benefit thereof. Give me news whenever you conveniently can.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 That is, through the O'Connell Tribute.
- 2 Charles Meara and Co., wine and flour merchants, 3 Bachelors' Walk, Dublin.

2720

*From Lucretia Mott*<sup>1</sup>

London, 17 June 1840

The rejected delegates from America to the 'General Anti-Slavery Conference'<sup>2</sup> are desirous to have the opinion of one of the most distinguished advocates of universal liberty as to the reasons urged by the majority for their rejection, viz: that the admission of women being contrary to English usage would subject them to ridicule, and that such recognition of their acknowledged principles would prejudice the cause of human freedom.

Permit me, then, on behalf of the delegation, to ask Daniel O'Connell the favour of his sentiments as incidentally expressed in the meeting on the morning of the 13th inst.,<sup>3</sup> and oblige his sincere friend,

Lucretia Mott

SOURCE: Stanton, *Woman Suffrage*, I, 432

- 1 Lucretia Coffin Mott (1793-1880), Quaker preacher and reformer, protagonist of anti-slavery and women's rights. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 2 This was the anti-slavery convention of delegates from the United Kingdom and many parts of the world. It was organised by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society and was held in Freemasons' Hall, London on 12 June 1840 and succeeding days. On its first day the convention decided to withhold recognition for women delegates (*Times*, 13 June 1840).
- 3 The press reports of the meeting on 13 June make no reference to O'Connell.

2720a

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*London, 20 June 1840<sup>1</sup>

[No salutation]

The Ministry are safe as they had the majority<sup>2</sup> yesterday against Stanley. But no person can tell what will become of the Bill. I am very apprehensive lest it should become law in many of its mischievous provisions. The scale trembles in the balance, and we are not sure of Lord Howick for one hour.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 240

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick dates this letter 9 June 1840 but O'Connell departed from Dublin for London on 10 June (*Pilot*, 10 June 1840). The reference to 'the majority yesterday' makes it clear that 20 June is the correct date.
- 2 Shortly before midnight on 19 June the government carried an amendment by 296 to 289 to Stanley's registration bill. The amendment provided that all persons at present on the register would retain their vote after the coming into force of the new bill.

2721

*To Lucretia Mott*

16 Pall Mall [London], 20 June 1840

Madam,

Taking the liberty of protesting against being supposed to adopt any of the complimentary phrases in your letter as being applicable to me, I readily comply with your request to give my opinion as to the propriety of the admission of the female delegates into the Convention.

I should premise by avowing that my first impression was strong against that admission, and I believe I declared that opinion in private conversation. But when I was called on by you to give my personal decision on the subject, I felt it my duty to investigate the grounds of the opinion I had formed; and upon that investigation I easily discovered that it was founded on no better grounds than an apprehension of the ridicule it might excite if the Convention were to do what is so unusual in England — admit women to an equal share and right of the discussion. I also without difficulty recognised that this was an unworthy and, indeed, a cowardly motive and I easily overcame its influence.

My mature consideration of the entire subject convinces me of

the right of the female delegates to take their seats in the Convention and of the injustice of excluding them. I do not care to add that I deem it also impolitic because, that exclusion being unjust, it ought not to have taken place even if it could also be politic. My reasons are:

1. That, as it has been the practice in America for females to act as delegates and office-bearers, as well as in common capacity of members of Anti-Slavery Societies, the persons who called this Convention ought to have warned the American Anti-Slavery Societies to confine their choice to males, and, for want of this caution, many female delegates have made long journeys by land and crossed the ocean to enjoy a right which they had no reason to fear would be withheld from them at the end of their tedious voyage.

2ndly. The cause which is so intimately interwoven with every good feeling of humanity and with the highest and most sacred principles of Christianity – the Anti-Slavery cause in America – is under the greatest, the deepest, the most heart-binding obligations to the females who have joined the Anti-Slavery Societies in the United States. They have shown a passive but permanent courage which ought to put many of the male advocates to the blush. The American ladies have persevered in our holy cause amidst difficulties and dangers, with the zeal of confessors and the firmness of martyrs; and, therefore, emphatically they should not be disparaged or discouraged by any slight or contumely offered to their rights. Neither are this slight and contumely much diminished by the fact that it was not intended to offer any slight or to convey any contumely. Both results inevitably follow from the fact of rejection. This OUGHT NOT to be.

3rdly. Even in England, with all our fastidiousness, women vote upon the great regulation of the Bank of England;<sup>1</sup> in the nomination of its directors and governors, and in all other details equally with men; that is, they assist in the most awfully important business – the regulation of the currency of this mighty Empire – influencing the fortunes of all commercial nations.

4thly. Our women in like manner vote at the India House,<sup>2</sup> that is, in the regulation of the government of more than one hundred millions of human beings.

5thly. Mind has no sex; and in the peaceable struggle to abolish slavery all over the world, it is the basis of the present Convention to seek success by peaceable, moral and intellectual means alone, to the utter exclusion of armed violence. We are engaged in a strife not of strength but of argument. Our warfare is not military; it is Christian. We wield not the weapons of destruction or

injury to our adversaries. We rely entirely on reason and persuasion common to both sexes, and on the emotions of benevolence and charity which are more lovely and permanent amongst women than amongst men.

In the Church to which I belong, the female sex are devoted by as strict rules and with as much, if not more, unceasing austerity to the performance (and that to the exclusion of all worldly or temporal joys and pleasures) of all works of humanity, of education, of benevolence and of charity, in all its holy and sacred branches, as the men. The great work in which we are now engaged embraces all these charitable categories; and the women have the same duties and should, therefore, enjoy the same rights with men in the performance of their duties.

I have a consciousness that I have not done *my* duty in not sooner urging these considerations on the Convention. My excuse is that I was unavoidably absent during the discussion on the subject.

SOURCE: Stanton, *Woman Suffrage*, I, 432-4

- 1 As members of the general court of proprietors of the Bank of England.
- 2 As members of the court of proprietors of the East India Company.

2722

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

c. 20 June 1840

Shortly after I got your letter, Lords Charlemont and Gosford came to consult me on *that* subject.<sup>1</sup> You will see my opinion in Monday's *Pilot*.<sup>2</sup> I approve of every effort to do good to Ireland but retain my Repeal agitation, which, by the bye, is the cause of this step.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 229

- 1 Charlemont and Gosford were among the Liberal nobles and gentry of Ulster who at this time formed the Ulster Constitutional Association 'to attempt to gain for Ireland equal rights with Great Britain. . . .' O'Connell got up an address to the Ulster body from the Repeal Association, pointing out that both organisations had similar objectives and suggesting that the Ulstermen petition against Stanley's Irish registration bill. The Ulster association replied that Gosford and Charlemont had informed O'Connell of the impending formation of the society simply out of courtesy but 'not for the purpose of asking Mr. O'Connell's guidance'. Shortly afterwards, it denounced the Repeal movement

(McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 175).

- 2 O'Connell to Ray, 20 June 1840, *Pilot*, 22 June 1840. In this O'Connell expressed his support for the Ulster association, comparing it to the Precursor Society 'after we struck out all allusion to the Repeal'.

2723

To Charles Gavan Duffy<sup>1</sup>

London 20 June 1840

*Private*

My Dear Sir,

FitzPatrick sent me your note and *since* I got it, Lords Charlemont and Gosford called here to consult me as to their association.<sup>2</sup> Of course I approve of every effort to obtain justice to Ireland whilst I confine my own exertions to the one thing necessary – the Repeal. You will however see my opinion at large in the *Pilot* on Monday.<sup>3</sup>

I know full well that this Association was got up as a blow at my projects but I also know that it will not succeed. In fact they have nobody who could manage a body of that description to do which properly requires great tact and dexterity, qualities which can be derived only from experience. It would also require a sacrifice of time and money which few will give and those who would give the latter could not afford the former. I am, between you and me, quite sure it will be a complete failure but nobody shall have the power to say that I caused its failure by opposing it. Besides it really will do some good especially by giving men the courage to be agitators even in a small degree, a fit preparation for embarking on a larger scale. My request to you (which I am sure you will comply with) is to consider this letter as what it is – confidential – and so shape your public course like mine in hailing this movement as one that can do nothing but good.

SOURCE: Gavan Duffy Papers, NLI MSS 5756

- 1 Charles Gavan Duffy (1816-1903), the celebrated Young Irelander, born in Monaghan town, youngest child of John Duffy, a prosperous shopkeeper and Anne Gavan, daughter of a gentleman farmer. Joined the staff of the *Morning Register*, Dublin, in 1836; first editor of the Belfast *Vindicator* 1839-41; of the *Nation*, 1842-49. M.P. for New Ross 1852-55. Prime minister of Victoria, Australia, 1871-2; knighted 1873. See *DNB*.
- 2 The Ulster Constitutional Association.
- 3 See letter 2722 n 2.

2724

*From P.V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 20 June 1840

My Dear Liberator,

I write merely to say that at this moment no use could be made of your acceptance payable in London. I do not therefore send a stamp for that purpose but, if I shall find an open[ing] for it hereafter, will communicate with you at once and arrange as to the drawer in the most judicious way I can.

I have written to Fitzgerald to renew the bills of which I furnished a statement in my last and, presuming that this will be done, I expect to be able to manage matters smoothly until this year's Tribute begins to be available and the promise of an early as well as abundant harvest will, please God, put me in funds several weeks sooner than in latter years. You did not tell me whether you knew of any bills of yours afloat – other than these which I subjoin to help your memory viz.

To Fitzgerald 3 bills 3d – 13th – 21 June. Total	£667
" Charles Meara say early in August	£250
" Richardson do do	£132.18.0
" P.V. Fitzpatrick September 4	£350
" John Bourke, date unknown, supposed to fall due in August	£460
Fitz-Simon (the accomodation bill)	£900

I am anxious of course to have a list of *all* bills of yours still outstanding. You left with me an acceptance of Primrose in blank and it has not yet been filled, neither shall I perhaps have any immediate opportunity of converting it into cash. Is *it* the 'counter security' to a bill passed by you to Fitzgerald to which you allude in your letter received today or has Fitzgerald the bill which constitutes such counter security? Do not permit your spirits to flag in the least as respects your bills. If the list on the other side goes near to comprise them, we shall manage them all and pay them too and that I trust before the close of the year.

I continue to hope to visit London before many days elapse. Should Fitzgerald send you renewals or write to you in consequence of my letter to him, take care to reply to and put all matter in train with him at once and this will greatly facilitate the other operations of

Your always most devotedly,  
P.V.F.



2725

*From P.V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 29 June 1840

(Private)

My Dear Liberator,

I paid to Ray the amount of your check on the Hibernian Bank and, fearing lest Fitzgerald might not forward the drafts to renew your bills to him falling due next month and which I could not meet, I sent to *him* the blank acceptance that reached me on the 19th, telling him to use it if requisite or return it should he have already received the renewals directly from you. As yet no reply to this last letter has reached me and, as I have a prospect of getting your acceptance cashed (for £250) after the 1st July, I send herein a stamp to replace that which I forwarded to Fitzgerald. Pray let me have this back by next post.

Your Cork friends have written to say they are most anxious to enrol you among the subscribers to the Testimonial to William Crawford. I answered that I not only undertook from foreknowledge to promise your subscription but that it should be accompanied by *an appropriate letter to William Fagan*. Independent of his other merits, Crawford continued to the day of his death and year after year the largest contribution that I could reckon amongst *my* cooperators. He always gave £50 and on the last occasion desired that, if the Cork contingent should fall short of the average, he should be called upon to *double* that sum. Do not fail to let me have a letter<sup>1</sup> to William Fagan within the present week. I will supply the subscription which should not be under £10, it ought perhaps to be £20.

*Our* bishop of Down was with me today (Right Rev. Dr. Denvir)<sup>2</sup> for the purpose of having your private sentiments respecting the Ulster Association which he would not join or abet if it did not meet your entire approbation. I gave him your opinion as expressed in a late letter to me, and Dr. Denvir is now quite satisfied to further the objects of the Association. It will, he thinks, be productive of much good *in its way*. Don't delay the letter to William Fagan.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The letter with O'Connell's contribution of £10, was delayed for nearly two months (O'Connell to Fagan, 25 Aug. 1840, *Pilot*, 31 Aug. 1840).
- 2 Cornelius Denvir (1791-1866), parish priest of Downpatrick 1826-35, bishop of Down and Connor 1835-65. See *Boase*.

2726

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

London, 30 June 1840

My dear FitzPatrick,

I delayed writing to you until I could give you some authentic information on the subject of *the future*. I did much apprehend that the ministers would upon our last defeat<sup>1</sup> throw up the game in despair, and this opinion was much fortified by a very influential supporter of theirs who told me that he and others would advise them to resign. I confess my heart sank within me at the dismal prospect that resignation would open for Ireland, especially as there are so many base and sluggish amongst our own people and, in particular, amongst the wealthy classes, to countenance any government that condescended to play the hypocrite ever so little. The restoration to power of the Orange faction would be accompanied with such horrible vexation as to render it impossible to calculate how long we should be able to preserve the peace. But I need not for the present dwell on these things because one of the men in power told me they were determined that nothing should induce them to resign until after the birth of the Queen's child.<sup>2</sup> They deem themselves bound to keep her from the turmoil and uneasiness of a change of ministry and of a dissolution until after she is a mother and recovered from her confinement. Thus we are sure of remaining in our present position until next February. In the meantime many a card may turn up a trump. It is known that the Tories are much divided amongst themselves and, if any one section of them were to join the government, all would be safe.

I hope you have read the *Morning Chronicle* of yesterday. There is a beautiful spirit-stirring article on agitation in it.<sup>3</sup> The truth is, they ought to feel that if my 'Repeal Society' had increased so as to attract attention here it would create an alarm for the consequences, an alarm salutary for every good purpose. I think you may communicate this hint in the proper quarters but I leave it altogether to your discretion.

I am deeply grieved to see the prospects of the harvest becoming unfavourable. We have HEAT with a north wind for many days. What do you hear in Ireland as to the coming harvest, especially the potato harvest?

[P.S.] You see the corporation bill is GONE.<sup>4</sup> It never will *pass* the House of Lords.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 242-3

- 1 On 26 June, on an attempted amendment to Stanley's Irish registration bill, the government was defeated by 275 to 271 (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LV, 120-58).
- 2 The Princess Victoria was born in November 1840.
- 3 The *Morning Chronicle* of 29 June 1840 devoted its principle leading article to an attack on Stanley's Irish registration bill and called on all liberal Irishmen to organise a united movement against it.
- 4 On 29 June the Lords made a large number of amendments to the Irish municipal reform bill.

2727

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*

1 July 1840

[No salutation]

All going on well with the ministry. The Tories more and more divided. The duke on the Canada bill at direct variance with Peel.<sup>1</sup> Lord Brougham seems fearfully gone in health.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 243

- 1 On 30 June in the Lords Wellington made 'a terrific speech' against the government of Canada bill, a measure which Peel approved of (Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party*, 455-8).

2728

*From Thomas Fitzgerald, Cork, 3 July 1840, to Merrion Square  
redirected to Pall Mall, London*

Mr. Rowan,<sup>1</sup> the manager of the National Bank in Cork, has refused to cash O'Connell's acceptance for Fitzgerald who states that he does not know why.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Thomas Rowan.

2729

*From G.C. Hebbe, care of Messrs. Hewitt Bolin & Co., Hull,  
Yorkshire, 4 July 1840*

States he is a lawyer who has come to England and is writing a history of Europe since the beginning of the French Revolution.

He asks O'Connell to lend him £200 to enable him to remain in England to complete the work. He states that his work is anti-monarchical and anti-aristocratic.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2729a

*To John Easthope*

10 July 1840

My dear Sir,

I am going off for Ireland this moment but I stop to write you this note on behalf of an excellent young man, John Lodge,<sup>1</sup> who expects employment from you. . . . I feel a deep interest in him as two of his family were in my service some years and they found favour with a person who was eminently qualified to judge.<sup>2</sup> . . .

SOURCE: Duke University Library

1 Not identified.

2 O'Connell's wife. On the back of this letter is written 'Ansd. July 12'.

2730

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 16 July 1840

*Private*

My dear and venerated Lord,

You have probably been witnessing, at least occasionally, in the newspapers, my progress. If so, you will have seen that I have devoted myself to the restoration of the Irish parliament — a matter of difficulty but an impossibility only to those who will not take the proper means to overcome the difficulty.

I have placed, as a master grievance to be redressed by the Repeal of the Union, the payment by the nation of the church of the minority. I am convinced that there is no mode of attaining this object but through the Repeal agitation.

Of course your Grace will not mistake me so far as to suppose that I obtrude these opinions as presuming to call for your assent. I simply state them to be understood as to the principles on which I act, being (as I am) convinced that, if there be not a combined

effort made by the Irish people, Stanley's Bill will be carried into law in the next session.<sup>1</sup> The effect will be to repeal in substance the Reform and the Emancipation acts.

I propose to contribute to the development of the public sentiment by attending provincial meetings during the vacation. Of course I will not *invade* Connaught without the assent of your Grace and, indeed, I should say without your cooperation. I propose Tuam as the place; the time I would leave to your Grace if you shall be so kind as to assist me, and you must perceive that I am incapable of fixing on Tuam without your approbation. My object would be to forward the Repeal if that were practicable but, if not, to confine the object to these four:

First, petitions for the extinction or public appropriation of the tithe rent-charge.

Second, petitions for the extension of the elective franchise in Ireland.

Third, petitions against any bill on the principle of Lord Stanley's Bill.

Fourth, petitions for full corporate reform.

Those who choose to assist in the Repeal and to declare themselves Repealers would have an opportunity of doing so but I confess I should desire a Repeal resolution of the provincial meeting if attainable. An organisation by parishes for the purpose of carrying the above objects into effect would be very desirable. In short, if we had the Repeal,

Religion would be free.

Education would be free.

The press would be free.

No sectarian control over Catholics; no Catholic control over sectarians; that is, no species of political ascendancy. The law would of course sanction in the fullest measure the spiritual authority of the episcopal order over religious discipline amongst Catholics including Catholic education.

These are plans of great importance. I think I could with support from a chosen few, comparatively speaking, carry them into full effect. I go specially to Mayo, *I believe* – certainly to Galway.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 243-5

- 1 In the Commons on 6 July Lord Stanley withdrew his Irish registration bill but stated that he would introduce a similar bill in the next session (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1840, 4318-9).
- 2 To attend court in Castlebar, Co. Mayo, and in Galway. He attended a Repeal meeting at Castlebar on 26 July 1840 under the chairmanship of Sir Samuel O'Malley (*Pilot*, 29 July 1840). On 2 August he was given a public reception in Galway, where a Repeal meeting took place under the chairmanship of Sir Valentine Blake (*Pilot*, 5 Aug. 1840).

2731

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*Castlebar [Co Mayo], c. 25 July 1840<sup>1</sup>

[No salutation]

I am greatly pleased at my son Morgan's match.<sup>2</sup>

In other respects I am very unhappy. But for you I know not what would become of me. May God bless you.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 245

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick gives the date of this letter as 23 July but according to a Castlebar assize report in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 28 July 1840 O'Connell arrived in Castlebar on 24 July.
- 2 Morgan married Kate Balfe on 23 July at her father's home, South Park near Castlerea, Co. Roscommon.

2732

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Castlebar [Co. Mayo], 25 July 1840

[No salutation]

My dear and venerated Lord,

I received your admirable letter with the greatest pleasure and gratitude. All is safe now: we will work the great question of questions until it becomes too big for the English opposition. I have the strongest confidence in complete and not remote success. What I propose relative to the provincial meeting is founded on your letter and it is this — that it should be held at Tuam on the second Monday in August.<sup>1</sup> The Galway assizes will be quite over, and the return from the assizes will enable many without inconvenience to come to Tuam. I will prepare a requisition here and get it signed for that day. I will send a copy to your Grace and, if it meets your approval, we will put our shoulders to the wheel for that day.

It is vain to expect any relief from England. All parties there concur in hatred to Ireland and Catholicity; and it is also founded in human nature that they should for they have injured us too much ever to forgive us.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 676

- 1 The Connaught provincial meeting for Repeal took place in Tuam on Thursday, 13 August under the chairmanship of Lord ffrench. The attendance reported at 10,000 included John James Bodkin, M.P. and

Robert Dillon Browne, M.P. A public dinner followed which was attended by MacHale and Bishop Browne of Galway (*Pilot*, 14, 17 Aug. 1840). O'Connell spoke at both events.

2733

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Merrion Square, 30 July 1840

My very dear and respected Lord,

We have launched the Repeal cause well in Connaught, ten thousand thousand thanks to your Grace.

But well begun will not alone do. We must follow it up well for the provincial meeting. More depends on the success of that meeting than I can describe. If we make an impression by the magnitude and respectability of that meeting the result will be most favourable on the other provinces, and having the three provinces with us we shall easily procure a great portion of Ulster, perhaps more than may be imagined by those who look only at the surface. That being the reverse of the case of your Grace, I look with the utmost confidence to your decided and energetic support at the approaching provincial meeting.

The first thing — a most important thing it is — necessary is to have a requisition<sup>1</sup> as numerous and as respectably signed as possible. For this I must depend mainly on your Grace. It will, my Lord, require activity and energy which you (blessed be God!) possess, but it will require time, which amidst your great and important duties you cannot well spare, and yet I trust that *this* is one of those duties, or at all events that its tendency is to promote the greatest and best of them. I do, therefore, venture to solicit your active co-operation.

You will at once get Lord ffrench's<sup>2</sup> signature and that of his son's, perhaps brother's.<sup>3</sup> Blake, the member for Galway, will, I know, be guided by you. He is at times *sturdy* but he is a truly honest man, honest to the heart's core and a faithful Catholic. In short, he will, if you deem it right to ask or advise him, give his hearty cooperation.

The Ulster meeting<sup>4</sup> will take place the day after ours.

I should be so proud to beat them in everything.

Copies of the requisition should be sent round the counties to get additional names and all may be collected at the close of the first week of the assizes of Galway.

Excuse me for being thus tediously particular but I am most thoroughly convinced that the Repeal alone can keep secure the

religion and the liberties of the Irish people.

The insidious machinations of the enemies of both can be counteracted successfully only by an Irish legislation.

It is true these observations do not apply to the humble class of the people. They have never tasted nor do they expect to taste the sweets of public employ and they will be as ready to hurrah for Repeal as ever, if the occasion of any public meeting shall offer in connection with it. If you were here and held any meeting, a house large enough to contain your apparent adherents could not be procured. When you would have gone away, away also would go the steam of Repeal.

In such a state of things as I have humbly attempted to describe, what chance can any man with the best intentions have of rousing an agitation on Repeal? . . . Repeal is an indication of hatred of English legislation: the discussion of it 'nurses the people's wrath and keeps it warm' and, practicable or impracticable as it may be, whenever it rears its front here, it shall have my humble adhesion. With respect to its consequences upon the present administration I am perfectly indifferent. To do any service to the democracy of the country they must be put out. They have long served as an outwork defence of Toryism and misrule and, until they are turned out and turned in again, the bonds of faction will not have been broken. Both the vagabond factions, Whig and Tory, must be crushed, and long and sorely have I deplored that you and the Irish party have kept the former in power. You can beat the Whigs and you know it and you cannot beat the Tories unless they are in office. As an opposition they increase in strength and, did they succeed to office tomorrow, your difficulties would be greater in dealing with them than it would have been had you three years since unshipped the Whigs.

It would be uncandid of me to let pass that part of your letter which refers to the *Southern Reporter* without comment. It would not serve your purposes nor any public purpose to endanger that journal and, whatever the private judgment or wishes of the individual proprietors of it may be, they hold the opinion that the adoption of the Repeal as a leading policy of the paper would be attended with injurious consequences. Their present views consist in giving publicity and circulation to all that can be favourable to Repeal and to take up occasionally such subjects as inferentially lead to impress their readers with a conviction that an Imperial Parliament neither can nor will legislate equitably for Ireland. This policy will be steadily pursued and, taking into consideration the class and character of the readers of the *Reporter*, I am disposed to think that, even for your purposes, it is the better course to



pursue. I am more *amicus curiae* than proprietor in that paper. My friend Wm. Fagan, in O'Driscoll's absence, is the director and as I am aware you have written to him as you have to me, I must beg of you to read him as authority on what relates to the paper and read what I say as individual opinion in no shape or way affecting to speak for the *Southern Reporter*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 246-7

- 1 A lengthy requisition, dated 8 August, was published in the *Pilot* of 10 August 1840. Amongst the signatories were MacHale, Lord ffrench and the Hon. Thomas ffrench, Bishops Browne and Feeny, Sir Samuel O'Malley, Sir Valentine Blake and a large number of the Catholic clergy. The name of Martin Joseph Blake, M.P. for Galway city, was not included.
- 2 Charles Austin (ffrench), third Baron ffrench (1786-1860), J.P., D.L., Castle ffrench, Ahascragh, Co. Galway.
- 3 Hon. Thomas ffrench (1790-1846), brother of the third Baron ffrench.
- 4 On 14 August a meeting of the Ulster Constitutional Association was held in Belfast for the purpose of electing officers and considering general arrangements for the society's government. The chairman at the meeting was Hon. Henry Caulfield; Lords Charlemont and Gosford as vice presidents; and amongst the large attendance was William Sharman Crawford, M.P. (*Pilot*, 17 Aug. 1840).

#### 2734

*To John Easthope, 11 August 1840, from Merrion Square*

Recommends for employment 'a young friend of mine' named Hughes, who has been for some time a reporter for the *London Times*. 'He is, I know, a gentleman in feeling, education and conduct.' Easthope has written on the back of this letter: 'My dear O'C. I am sorry there is *now* no Vacancy. When there is one your application on behalf of Mr. Hughes shall have due consideration.' Written on the back of the letter is the note: 'Ansd. Aug. 15.'

SOURCE: Duke University Library

2735

*From Joseph Hayes*

Cork, 14 August 1840

My dear Sir,

There is no imaginable *phasis*<sup>1</sup> which hatred or hostility to English domination, legislative or social, can assume, which shall not have my best wishes. This feeling with me is not the growth of recent events or time — it is the conviction of experience and reflection, supported by universal judgment, that none can do your business so well as yourself, if you are disposed to do it.

To agitate such a subject as Repeal, however, requires more than such individual feeling. It requires capability in the individuals undertaking it, willingness in the public mind to receive the impulsion, and that the question shall have some practicable shape as well as practicable result in view. On the former occasion that the Repeal was agitated here, the public crowded the ranks, regarding the agitation as auxiliary to the carrying of the elections then in progress. Many who allowed themselves to be ranked as Repealers laughed at the agitation and at themselves, so soon as the fever subsided and may I be allowed to say to you that the swappings and changes in the nature and character of the associations, which followed, have not tended to alter their feelings in relation to it. At present, then, I may say that there is great indisposition on the part of the people, who may be called of the middle classes, to join in agitation for the Repeal. This is chiefly grounded on the conviction that its attainment is impracticable and hereon, I must be candid to say, for myself, that I firmly believe England would war to the knife before she would legislatively concede the question. That to win it and wear it we must fight for it, and before we pursue such a course we must be prepared to say we have a rational chance of success. Have we that chance? If we have, are we justified in the hazard or is such a speculation nonsense?

‘To die for treason is a common evil

To hang for nonsense is the very Devil.’

Thus is it reasoned among the people with whom I talk politics and I would feel altogether at a loss where to point for the material of an effective agitation. We have no lawyer now among us who will speak one word on the subject. Walsh,<sup>2</sup> who in former times was prompt and flippant upon political subjects generally, broad and decided on Repeal, will not now stir. The second branch of the legal profession is equally disinclined. There are offices for

public prosecution, clerkships of the Peace and of the Crown to be occasionally given away, and a Repealer solicitor, nay a solicitor attending political meetings distinct from elections, will be as far from filling one of them as Yorick's head was from fitting a mitre. And writing of mitres, how are the clergy affected? Almost to a man withdrawn from Repeal, at least the secular order of that body. The Trades are no longer in any force here. They have not the leaders who formerly gave effect and weight to the association. Some few of them of the best capacity for business have obtained situations through Beamish<sup>3</sup> and of course they are *hors de combat*. In fact a process of corruption has been going on through the instrumentality of place giving and, wherever a member of a family has been started a candidate for public employ, the whole division of kindred deem it necessary to eschew Repeal, lest of its embarrassing the speculation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 A form of the word *phase*.

2 Francis Andrew Walsh (c. 1806-1852), only son of Francis Walsh a Cork physician. Called to the bar 1836; professor of Law Queen's College, Cork 1845-51. See *Boase*.

3 Francis Bernard Beamish (1802-1868), sixth son of William Beamish, brewer of Cork. M.P. for Cork city 1837-41 and 1853-65. See *Boase*.

## 2736

*From Rev. William Stafford,<sup>1</sup> Charlemont Mall, Dublin,  
15 August 1840*

On O'Connell's instructions the writer sends along, as a reminder, the copy of Archbishop Murray's letter on the problem of raising a mortgage of £500 on the church and presbytery. Two of the trustees, Terence Dolan and John Redmond, won't agree to sign for the mortgage, and the writer asks O'Connell to use his influence with them. The money is needed to complete the erection of the presbytery in Rathmines.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 William Stafford (1766-1848), P.P. Rathmines and Milltown, 1823-48.

2736a

*To William Colles*<sup>1</sup>

Merrion Square, 21 August 1840

My dear Colles,

You see I have taken, or rather endeavoured to take, your hint. I did as well as I could and according to my policy I will repeat the idea in many forms before I think I have fully complied with your suggestion. Sensitive men — and most men of talent are so — shrink from repetition of the same thought. As far as the public are concerned it is a great mistake. It is necessary to say the same thing one hundred times before the public *catch it*. But then it becomes identified with the popular mind. So I delude myself.

For heavens sake why do you not attend a meeting of the Citizens Club,<sup>2</sup> and give us the benefit of one sarcastic argumentative interesting speech against the Union? Do not answer the question, but think of the thing.

SOURCE: Richard Colles Johnson, 'Notes on the Family of Colles',  
The Newberry Library, Chicago

- 1 William Colles (1772-1849), Millmount, Kilkenny. An Anglican, educated at Kilkenny College and Trinity College Dublin, Colles supported the Catholic Emancipation and anti-tithe causes. He was the eldest son of William and Mary Anne Bate Colles and a brother of Abraham Colles, M.D.
- 2 The Kilkenny city Liberal club. It had just addressed O'Connell in favour of Repeal (see O'Connell's speech in the Repeal Association on 17 August as reported in the *Pilot* of 19 August 1840).

2737

*From Rev. George Crolly,<sup>1</sup> Charles G. Duffy, and C. Lennon<sup>2</sup>*

Belfast, 22 August 1840

Dear Sir,

A large number of persons having already enrolled themselves as 'Repealers' in Belfast, the most respectable Catholics met privately for the purpose of considering the propriety of *immediately* holding a public meeting in favour of a 'Repeal of the Union'. Although almost all present avowed themselves Repealers, considerable doubt was entertained concerning the propriety of holding a public meeting at present, a large number of persons thinking such a step premature and precipitate and that it would eventually damage the cause which it was intended to

advance. Some persons even expressed the opinion that, as you still countenanced the 'Ulster Association,' you would not yourself advise a step which would at once and openly break with it whilst others insisted that we could expect nothing but opposition from the members of that body and that consequently nothing was to be gained by delay.

Under these circumstances we, whose names are affixed to this letter, were appointed to consult you on the prudence of holding at once or deferring for a time the 'Belfast public meeting in favour of Repeal,' all present unanimously pledging themselves to be guided entirely by your advice.

We beg to congratulate you on your glorious success amongst the ancient Irish in the Province of Connaught<sup>3</sup> and to assure you that our efforts, however humble, shall be zealously directed to aid you in the great and good cause in which you are engaged. Hoping that you will favour us with an early reply, we have the honour

to remain, Dear Sir, with the most profound respect and esteem,  
 Your most obedient servants,  
 Geo. Crolly, R.C.C.  
 Charles G. Duffy  
 C. Lennon (?Jr.)

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 George Crolly, Roman Catholic curate in the bishop's parish, Belfast.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 A reference to the recent Connaught provincial meeting (see letter 2732 n 1).

2738

*To Thomas Clarkson*

Manchester, 27 August 1840

My dear Sir,

I cannot avoid using this familiar language in addressing you because in my mind it suits well with that respect which participates in affectionate gratitude for your eminent services in the cause of humanity. . . . At the commencement of your career, local interests and contracted views stifled benevolence or rendered it partial and operative only within a narrow and contracted circle. You had to oppose interested and selfish hostility armed with the shafts of ridicule — the most dangerous weapons to sensitive minds — and fortified by prejudice and political as well religious

animosity. . . . This really glorious revolution has been principally caused by you. . . . You have been the great leader in the cause of Universal Emancipation. . . .

But my object in sitting down to address these hasty lines was to congratulate you on being appointed President of a new society<sup>1</sup> devoted to rescue more than one hundred millions of human beings from the most cruel and unrelenting bondage. . . . Under the auspicious name of our President we minor *operatives* in the struggles of humanity will proceed with the laudable ambition of being considered worthy of being your disciples.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: Clarkson Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 41, 267A, ff.224-5

- 1 On 29 May Clarkson seems to have been appointed president of a special provincial committee of the British India Society (Bell, *British Folks and British India*, 101).
- 2 O'Connell was the guest speaker at a meeting in Manchester on 26 August at which the northern central branch of the British India Society was founded. The purpose of the society was to arouse British public opinion on various evils especially 'the present system of landed tenures and landed revenues . . .' in force in British India. (*Pilot*, 28 Aug. 1840; *Times*, 28 Aug. 1840).

2739

To his son John

Maryborough [Queen's Co.], 9 o'clock, Friday 5 September 1840  
My dearest John,

We arrived here a quarter of a hour ago well and merry, screeched<sup>1</sup> a great deal as we came along.

I want to write to you my directions:

1st. Go to the office of the *Dublin Evening Post* and get my paper of tomorrow, Saturday, directed to Limerick. Leave a *written* order to have it forwarded from tomorrow out to Darrynane Abbey.

2nd. Do exactly the like at the *Monitor*<sup>2</sup> office.

3rd. Give *similar* orders at Johnson's respecting the *Sun*.<sup>3</sup>

4th. Send the *Morning Chronicle*<sup>4</sup> that arrives tomorrow, Saturday, to Limerick, thenceforward to Darrynane Abbey. By your reading the *Chronicle* at my house, I will miss the *Chronicle* which will arrive in Dublin each Sunday, as you cannot forward it on *that* day, though Johnson could.

5th. Send the *Freeman*<sup>5</sup> and *Register*<sup>6</sup> tomorrow to Limerick ; afterwards to Darrynane Abbey.

6th. Give directions to Johnson to forward the *Examiner*<sup>7</sup> to

Darrynane Abbey.

7th. Send me one *Tablet*<sup>8</sup> to Darrynane every arrival.

8th. Send me *Humphrey's Clock* tomorrow to Limerick, afterwards to Darrynane.

You see what a quantity of commands I have. But that which I am most anxious about is that you should *cut a figure* at the Association. It is the best opportunity you could have to introduce yourself quietly and discreetly into public life, especially by showing yourself a man of business. The facility of being so will grow upon you though you should feel awkward at first. I implore of you to try. Begin manfully on Monday. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 318-9

- 1 Cheered.
- 2 The *Dublin Monitor*.
- 3 A Whig London newspaper.
- 4 The *Morning Chronicle*, London.
- 5 The *Freeman's Journal*, Dublin.
- 6 The *Morning Register*, Dublin.
- 7 A radical London weekly newspaper.
- 8 A weekly London Catholic review edited by Frederick Lucas, the first edition of which appeared on 16 May 1840.
- 9 *Master Humphrey's Clock*, a collection of serialised stories chiefly comprising Charles Dickens' 'The Old Curiosity Shop' and 'Barnaby Rudge', now published for the first time.

2740

*From William B. MacCabe*

Mount Gardens, Westminster Road, London, 5 September 1840  
Dear Sir,

I enclose you with this, a prospectus of a new Catholic journal of which, if established, I am to be the editor.<sup>1</sup> The politics of the paper I mean to be yours. Therefore they will go a great deal farther than the Catholic aristocracy of this country are inclined to move. I could say more on this point but that I fear to trespass on your time and that I know Mr. Steele is likely to see you soon and is acquainted with the facts.

I sent you the *Planet* last week, in which I ventured to come forward as a testimony on your behalf.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The journal does not appear to have ever been published.

2741

*From Sir Philip Crampton, Bart.*

13 Merrion Square, North, 5 September 1840

Sir,

I take the liberty of addressing you in consequence of a communication which has been made to me by our mutual friend, Mr. George Roe.

Mr. Roe informs me that he is authorised by you to express your regrets that (acting under a misconception) you had on a late occasion<sup>1</sup> animadverted on the conduct of the Rev. Josiah Crampton<sup>2</sup> in a manner that you would not have done had you been aware that he was my son. I am induced by this communication to request that you will favour me with an interview for a few minutes at your earliest convenience, when I will submit to your consideration some documents which will supply you with a purer and higher motive for regret than any which could arise out of feelings of personal regard towards me.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 Unidentified.

2 Rev. Josiah Crampton (1809-1883) second son of Sir Philip Crampton, M.D. Bart., Rector of Raheny, Co. Dublin.

2742

*To his son John*

Limerick, 6 September 1840

My dearest John,

. . . You ought to have sent me the *Morning Chronicle* of Friday which arrived yesterday. I know it came in time because I got the *Sun* of that evening *via* Johnson & Co.<sup>1</sup>

I send an address on the subject of the registries.<sup>2</sup> I direct it to Ray. Go and read it before the meeting so that you may read it *at* the meeting *legibly*, as K.M. said about reading the affidavit.

Move 1st. The admission of Dr. Cantwell,<sup>3</sup> the Bishop of Meath. His diocese is the largest in Ireland. Pronounce the deserved eulogium on him without any contrast with others which is always invidious.

2nd. Move the admission of Dr. Blake, the Bishop of Dromore. Speak of that good prelate too as he deserves. Read his letter, move its insertion on the minutes, and that I be requested to



send him a suitable reply.<sup>4</sup>

3rd. Move the admission of your fair daughter.<sup>5</sup>

Let the Secretary then read his correspondence carefully so as to prevent confusion.

As I wrote the above, your letter was sent to me. I am delighted with the account of your proceedings in committee.<sup>6</sup> Accept my blessing — go on and prosper. I see I can safely rely on you — you only want an opportunity of showing yourself. What about the *Morning Chronicle*? Look to that paper especially. I got *Humphrey's Clock* at Maryborough.

[P.S.] Call on FitzPatrick and tell him not to omit to send me the published papers respecting Ireland in the reign of Henry VIII. I want them at once.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 320-1

- 1 John Kent, Johnston and Co., 1 Eden Quay, Dublin, a newspaper and advertising office.
- 2 O'Connell to the Liberal and Independent Electors of Ireland, undated (*Pilot*, 9 Sept. 1840). The address states that the claims to the franchise of persons registered in 1832 expire in November 1840, and appeals to all those registered in 1832 to come forward to register again at the next sessions. The *Pilot* remarks that the address, though posted in Limerick on Sunday, 6 September, was not received in Dublin until 8 September.
- 3 John Cantwell (1792-1866), bishop of Meath 1830-66.
- 4 O'Connell's son John attended the meeting of the Repeal Association on 7 September to conduct the business in the absence of his father. This was the first occasion on which he addressed the association. He moved the admission of Bishops Cantwell and Blake, and read to the meeting a letter, dated 3 September 1840 from Blake to O'Connell (*Pilot*, 7, 9 Sept. 1840). See letter 2752 n2.
- 5 At the meeting, above, John O'Connell moved the admission of the infant Eliza O'Connell, described as O'Connell's twenty-fourth grandchild.
- 6 That is, the committee of the Repeal Association.

2743

*To his son John*

Bahoss, Cahirciveen, Wednesday, 9 September 1840

My dearest John,

I came here on Monday from Killarney. Morgan and *suite*, as the newspapers say, remained in Killarney that day for a stag hunt on the lake. They were pleased with the amusement and came here yesterday in torrents of rain. I had excellent hunting in

the morning, as good as ever I had. Tomorrow we go to Darrynane, (D.V.) I hunt on the way.

I got, and could get, the papers only of Monday, Dublin, *today* that is, they were at Cahirciveen at 12 last night. As I have those only of Monday, I cannot form any opinion save from your outline of the proceedings<sup>1</sup> but I like that outline much.

Attend as much as you can at the Committee. Give your best support to Ray who is just the best man in his station I ever met with, beyond any comparison the best. Protect him from annoyance. There is a man of the name of — who is a jealous and most unmanageable man. He endeavours to get others to annoy Ray. Shield the latter with temper and tact from all attacks.

Get the correspondence abbreviated. If Ray's health permit him, he will do it well. The letters that come in during the meeting may be read but not inserted in the newspapers until they are abbreviated. If necessary, form a committee for abbreviation. Meet every evil with a remedy.

You have not sent me the *Tablet*. I must get that. If the one of Saturday last be missing, get Johnson,<sup>2</sup> the newspaper agent, to send to England for another.

You have not sent me the *Morning Chronicle* of either Friday or Saturday. This annoys me the more as I perceive by your letter that one of them contains a saucy article on *the Repeal*. I have had more disappointments about newspapers since I left Dublin this time than I ever had before. If possible, get me a *Morning Chronicle* with *that* article. Perhaps Ray could give it to you. But make me sure of a *Tablet* of Saturday last, the 5th instant.

There is a most *answerable* article on the Repeal in the *Sun* of Saturday. What a pity that Barrett of the *Pilot* does not read and answer *these* articles occasionally!

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 321-3

1 The meeting of the Repeal Association (see letter 2742 n4).

2 Johnston and Co., 1 Eden Quay, Dublin.

2744

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Bahoss [near Cahirciveen], 9 September 1840

[No Salutation]

What a pity that I have nobody to answer the very answerable articles on Repeal in the London press. Staunton is my only

support in that respect.<sup>1</sup> If you would speak to Barrett to *read* those articles, he would then answer them.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 227

- 1 In his *Morning Register* of 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 September 1840, Michael Staunton published editorials in answer to arguments of the British and Irish press against Repeal.

2745

*To his son John*

Derrynane Abbey, 11 September 1840

My dearest John,

I have got the *Tablet* I wanted, and all is now quite right. We arrived here yesterday, all well. The new road<sup>1</sup> splendidly beautiful. I hunted on the way, and had admirable running.

Ray is mistaken. On the registries the title need not be shown.<sup>2</sup> That is the *law* but he is right that several Tory barristers require such production *against law*.

I was greatly pleased with the proceedings<sup>3</sup> of last Monday. *You* got on exceedingly well. I hope you will do as well next Monday. Determine on *making* topics to speak upon. You will delight me by *doing* business. Your paragraph in Ray's admirable report<sup>4</sup> was just what it ought to be – clear, and satisfactory of its intended object. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 323-4

- 1 The road from Waterville to Sneem over Coomakista pass which runs within one mile of Derrynane.  
 2 Concerning the registration of voters.  
 3 In the Repeal Association (see letter 2742 n4).  
 4 A lengthy report was read at the meeting from the committee of the association appointed to investigate the rise, progress and decline of Irish manufactures (*DEP*, 8 Sept. 1840). John O'Connell's paragraph in this report has not been identified.

2746

*From P. V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 12 September 1840

My Dear Liberator,

One word to say that your check for £800 on the Hibernian Bank has been duly received and applied to the payment of

Christopher Fitz-Simon's acceptance passed for your accommodation.

I took the requisite steps to secure the correct transmission of your papers and letters to Derrynane from henceforth and they will, I trust, arrive regularly. I likewise spoke to Staunton, Stevenson of the *Freeman* and Barrett to take up the articles of the London press against Repeal, and I believe you will find this done with attention and effect as a consequence of the suggestion.<sup>1</sup> By Monday's mail I will forward some books which I learn from John that you are anxious to receive.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 On 14 September the *Freeman's Journal* carried an editorial in answer to William Sharman Crawford's arguments against Repeal, and on 15 September it published an editorial commenting on various political observations in the English press. On 14 September the *Pilot* also carried an editorial attacking the *Standard* for its views on Repeal.

2747

To his son John

Derrynane, Monday, 14 September 1840

My dearest John,

Congratulate my darling — on the great accounts I get of your — and business habits. I am delighted with you, my darling child. . . .

I think you are right in making the experiment of abbreviating the letters before you put yourselves under any subsidy to the newspapers. I have always found schemes of subsidy fail. The public will, be assured, come round to the papers which give the *fullest* report. Everything that relates to Repeal has met an accumulating interest.

In every letter you will mention the state of Ray's health. How I hope that you will all get on well at this day's meeting! I shall have no publication with the proceedings before Thursday. I am not sorry that the — — attacked you even with ridicule. It is a certain sign they think you worth frightening off the stage, if they can. But that they cannot do.

I should write to Ray but that I am writing to you. Let him and you set about getting signatures for the Leinster Provincial meeting,<sup>1</sup> from as many quarters as you can. Especially from Wexford County. If there are any persons whom I should specially write to, give me their names and addresses. Send from yourselves

to Drogheda.

I have had another day's delightful hunting. The dogs ran down five hares in the wildest parts of the mountains in noble style. The last, especially, was as fine a hunt as ever I saw. Morgan and his darling wife are quite well. She and her sister admire the place exceedingly. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 324-6

- 1 John O'Connell has erroneously published the word *Limerick* instead of *Leinster*. A lengthy requisition for an aggregate repeal meeting of the province of Leinster, to be held on 14 October, is published in the *Pilot* of 9 October 1840.

2748

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 14 September 1840

[No salutation]

I always agreed with Conway that we should have war. I think it quite inevitable.<sup>1</sup> Pigs and Papists will begin to look up again. Seriously, the result of a present war may be beyond conjecture useful to Ireland.

I have had delightful hunting since I came here and am grown young again. . . .

The Repeal prospects are brightening at every side.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 228

- 1 France had taken umbrage at her exclusion from the quadrilateral treaty of July 1840 between Britain, Prussia, Russia and Austria, who had determined to act in concert to settle the Eastern crisis by imposing terms on Egypt which was in revolt against Turkey. British, Austrian and Turkish troops went into action against Egypt in September, and the press at this period carried accounts of preparations for war by France (*Annual Register*, 1840, 185-93). F. W. Conway's *Dublin Evening Post* had for some weeks been forecasting the outbreak of a general European war.

2479

*To Pierce Mahony*

Derrynane, 14 September 1840

My dear Mahony,

I have not heard nor do I believe that the National Bank are about to appoint another agent in Dublin, where they have one already with whom, as far as I know or believe, they have had no difference. I think if they were about to take such a step they ought to consult me and they have not done so. I say this to impress on you my entire conviction that the report you have heard is not true. But if you find out that it is so, though I should feel mortified at their not condescending to inform me of their intention, I should not hesitate one moment to recommending [*sic*] you in the strongest terms in the language not only by reason of our private friendship, which would carry me far, but because they could not possibly have a more safe or satisfactory agent than you so that, if you were a total stranger, I should recommend you as strongly though not so zealously as I would now. Find out from Harnett whether there be any truth in the report and *then* command me.

The time for your being a Repealer is not yet come but note down that I prophecy that I will have you decidedly and actively so within *about* twelve or fourteen months.

SOURCE : Rathcon Papers

2750

*To his son John*

Derrynane, 19 September 1840

My dearest John,

I am still continuing highly pleased with your conduct and mode of doing business. I have no doubt that it will be useful to you during life to have an opportunity of making yourself known.

I proceed to answer your questions. First, Reynolds is right in saying that it is useful to have a petition to Parliament one subject of every meeting but his case<sup>1</sup> does not apply. It was an anti-Tithe meeting case, and as they were for abolishing tithes, it was agreed that as they were not about to *petition*, they must intend to abolish tithes by other, that is, by *illegal* means. Have therefore

a petition in every case that you can, or what will do as well, appoint a committee to prepare and procure signatures to a petition. The prayer of every Repeal petition must for the present be simply that the House may pass a bill to repeal the act for the legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland — nothing more.

To the second question. I am as decided as ever I was in my life that the plan to subsidise the newspapers by taking off a weekly quantity ought to be rejected. We had twenty such plans in the Catholic Association, and every one of them proved abortive. If even it were necessary to give them money, I would do it in cash and take no papers. Any papers gratuitously distributed have no other effect save the raising of a belief that the parties do not think their own proceedings of sufficient value to be purchased. That which is given for nothing is supposed not to be better than the price.

But of course I admit that our proceedings encumber those papers which insert them, even in an abridged state. I also admit that it is very important to have the publication of what we do as ample as possible. The difficulty of getting the newspapers to publish in that manner may be got over by increasing our advertisement in the two morning papers and the *Pilot*. Let every resolution passed by the Association be published, that is, a substantial advertisement of each Association-day's resolution, with the gross amount received from the last meeting. It will not be difficult thus to have a good advertisement after each meeting.

The Monday meeting, that is, the preliminary notice of it, may also and I think should, be inserted in the morning papers of Saturday as well as Monday and in the *Pilot* of Friday. As we go along we shall have more occasions to advertise, and I will take care so to arrange when I go up to Dublin, that our advertisements shall be a good thing for the honest papers. They may rely on my promise and do you in the meantime consult and see how you can augment the advertisements to compensate the papers that serve us. This is the proper way to assist the friendly press. Ray will be able to carry it into effect. Let it, if possible, be done *at once*, for the deserving papers.

The objection to the application of the Repeal funds to the Registry in Dublin County is not well-founded. It is not for Evans or Brabazon we are acting but for the cause. We are not pledged to either of them and it may, before the new registries are out, be necessary to put out both of these gentlemen. We are, I repeat, working for the cause and I hope that we will soon have money enough to carry on the registries in every county in Ireland.

At all events we are pledged to Dublin county for the next ensuing Registration session. I do therefore entreat that matters may go on as they are until my return. I will then calmly and deliberately discuss the subject with the dissentients and we will all endeavour to come to the right conclusion for the future. But I repeat that I understood – I may be mistaken but I very distinctly understood – that no alteration in this matter should take place until my return. I repeat that *then* the subject shall be perfectly open and unbiassed for the opinion of each member of the Committee.<sup>2</sup>

Your article<sup>3</sup> was an excellent one.

I had a splendid day's hunting on Thursday. We ran down five hares in the best style and with long continued running. . . . This being a fast-week I have not hunted since Thursday.

[P.S.] Write articles for the papers as often as you can – short and pithy.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 326-30

1 Thomas Reynolds had been imprisoned in 1832 for his part in an anti-tithe meeting at Bohernabreenagh, Co. Dublin (Patrick O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1830-31' in *Studia Hibernica*, No. 6, 1966, 83; *Pilot*, 29 Apr. 1833).

2 That is, the finance committee of the association.

3 Unidentified.

2751

*To Thomas Lyons*

Derrynane, 28 September 1840

My dear friend,

I entirely agree with you that the most politically dishonest trade in the world is the profession of the Law, and especially the Bar. Cobbett says that 'when the Devil wants a lawyer, he is sure to catch him, he has so many good baits to put on his hook'. The worst of it is, in Ireland, that it is not the lawyer himself but his brothers and cousins also who think it their duty to be as unpatriotic as the expectant himself. I will of course have great pleasure in breakfasting with you on the morning of Tuesday the 6th<sup>1</sup> and will be most happy to meet your amiable sister-in-law, and to thank her for her personal kindness and for her patriotic sentiments. Get your freinds to be as punctual at the hour of ten as you possibly can because I must start in the evening to make out



some of my way to Limerick where the Trades intend to come out to meet me on the morning of Wednesday.<sup>2</sup>

I am sincerely sorry that little Frank Walsh should be showing the white feather as a trimmer. He has very considerable talents and is fit for better things yet the miserable taint of the lawyer craft is upon him. It cannot be helped. But Joe Hayes is really a trump. He is out-and-out, I think, the cleverest public debater I ever met with. William Fagan is also thoroughly honest and full of intellect. I shall not omit writing to my excellent friend Meagher<sup>3</sup> and to as many of the others whom you mention as I possibly can.

I mean to go to Killarney on Saturday the 3rd and to go Macroom in the afternoon of Sunday so as to be in Cork to breakfast on Monday morning.

SOURCE: Harrington Papers

- 1 Lyons and a procession of the trades escorted O'Connell into Cork on the morning of 5 October. He received a complimentary address from the trades and a meeting and dinner followed (*Pilot*, 7 Oct. 1840). On 6 October a meeting was held under the chairmanship of Lyons, with William Fagan and O'Neill Daunt as vice presidents, to petition for repeal (*Pilot*, 9 October 1840).
- 2 O'Connell, his son Maurice, and O'Neill Daunt arrived in Limerick on Wednesday, 7 October. O'Connell received a complimentary address from the trades and a Repeal dinner followed (*Pilot*, 9 Oct. 1840).
- 3 Thomas Meagher (1796-1874), mayor of Waterford 1843-45; M.P. for Waterford city 1847-57. Father of Thomas Francis Meagher, the Young Irelander. See *Boase*.

2752

*From Bishop Cornelius Egan*

Killarney, 28 September 1840

My dear Sir,

On my arrival from Tralee this morning I found on my table your letter of the 14th inst. enclosing a Rescript from Rome granting certain indulgences upon specified conditions to such as would visit your Chapel<sup>1</sup> (Parish Chapel I suppose) on certain Sundays and solemn Festivals of the year.

With great pleasure and satisfaction I hereby give my sanction to, and full approbation of, the above grant of indulgences to your chapel. A detailed exposition of the terms, which must be complied [with] in order to gain the indulgences, should be given to the people.

Since writing the foregoing lines it occurred to me that the grant of indulgences already alluded to may be intended for your private chapel, being the only one that can be properly said to be *sita in Derrynane Abbey*. If such be the intention of his Holiness, the grant has my full sanction and approbation.

You will not be surprised that I should feel timid in even alluding to the subject of the latter part of your letter. It is a subject much too vast and complex for puny politicians like myself. I strongly feel and freely confess that the Irish people are not done justice to by our British Parliament but cannot satisfy myself by what means justice can be obtained for them. Your letter<sup>2</sup> to Doctor Blake [bishop of Dromore] I think is one of the best documents I have seen on the subject coming from you or from any other person. I have no doubt it will make many converts to your cause. Still, some and not a small or inconsiderable number are deterred from joining the Repeal Association through fear of a revolution or of forcing the moderate Tories to unite with the Whigs who, on all occasions as often as the Repeal question would be discussed in Parliament, would be heartily supported by the Orange members.

Not seeing my way sufficiently in a matter of such vital importance, a matter on which highly talented and I believe very sincere friends to Ireland so widely differ, I am unwilling to form an opinion of it myself or to find fault with the decision to which others may think proper to come. Whatever may be the fate of the measure or however unsuccessful may be your efforts to obtain justice for Ireland, in common with the Irish millions, the conviction of the purity and disinterestedness of your motives is deeply and indelibly impressed on my mind, and if the remedy proposed be a good one, most sincerely do I wish you full and speedy success.

SOURCE: Property of Maurice R. O'Connell

- 1 The chapel in O'Connell's house at Derrynane.
- 2 O'Connell to Blake, 18 September 1840 (*Pilot*, 23 Sept. 1840). This is a lengthy letter in which O'Connell replies to the objections which Blake, in his letter to O'Connell of 3 September, contemplated might be raised against Repeal. Among them was the consideration that an Irish legislature might decide not to support Britain in the event of war with a foreign power; that a Catholic Irish parliament might pass penal laws against Protestants; that offices in Ireland might come to be filled, not on grounds of merit, but from each religious denomination in proportion to its strength; and that Catholics might exclude Protestants from places of particular trust (*Pilot*, 7 Sept. 1840).

## 2753

*From his grandson Christopher O'Connell Fitz-Simon to Derrynane*

Glencullen [Co. Dublin], 3 October 1840

My dear Grandfather,

It is my turn to write to you today. We went with Papa to Kilmainham the other day. We saw the treadmill, some men got on it, and showed us how it worked. We saw Jones<sup>1</sup> who escaped from Newgate. He is a thin man, about the middle size, rather good looking. We saw the condemned yard and cell but there was no one in them. We saw the women's prison. Papa brought us into the Committee room and a magistrate, Mr. Savage,<sup>2</sup> asked O'Connell<sup>3</sup> and me if it was the Repeal cloth<sup>4</sup> we had on because we had grey cloth coats; we saw the drop, where the people are hanged. Then Papa brought us to the Old-mans Hospital;<sup>5</sup> we saw the Chapel; the ceiling and the altar were carved beautifully in wood; it is a pity that it should be a Protestant Chapel now as it is the ancient Chapel that belonged to the Knights Templars;<sup>6</sup> in the dining-hall there are several flags; some that were taken at Gibraltar were all burned. We slept in town that night and went to see the Wizard of the North.<sup>7</sup> He does very surprising things. Goodbye, dear Grandfather.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Richard Jones who was tried on 27 October for gaol-breaking. The jury disagreed which amounted to an acquittal, the crown never resorting to a third trial. This was the second. (*Pilot*, 28 Oct. 1840).
- 2 Probably Francis Savage, J.P., 50 Lr. Gardiner Street, Dublin.
- 3 Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon.
- 4 The Repeal Association was at this time seeking to promote the use of Irish manufactures. It was arranged that O'Connell and the committee members of the association should provide themselves with 'coats, trousers and vests of the neatest and best materials which the present depressed state of our woollen manufactures can furnish' (*Pilot*, 9 Sept. 1840). On 18 September O'Connell wrote to Ray instructing him to have a Dublin tailor, Thomas Arkins, make him two suits of grey frieze-like cloth, with velvet collars attached, to encourage manufacture of velvet in Ireland (*Pilot*, 23 Sept, 1840).
- 5 The Royal Hospital, Kilmainham for old and incapacitated soldiers.
- 6 Kilmainham (but not the existing buildings) was in medieval times the property of the Knights Templars.
- 7 '... J. H. Anderson, the great Wizard of the North, whose nightly shows of seeming miracles [at the Adelphi Theatre, Dublin] baffle the inquiries of philosophy, and leave the out-riden solution-seekers far behind...' (*Pilot*, 25 Sept., 5 Oct. 1840).

2754

*From Henry Prittie,<sup>1</sup> Corville, Roscrea, Co. Tipperary, 10 October 1840*

Asks O'Connell to assist in having Edward Egan, who has been superseded as manager of the Roscrea National Bank, reinstated.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Henry Prittie, J.P. (1807-1885), son of Hon. Francis A. Prittie. High sheriff for Co. Tipperary 1840. Succeeded his uncle as third Baron Dunalley in 1854.

2755

*From John Greene<sup>1</sup>*

Wexford Independent Office [Wexford], 10 October 1840  
My Dear Mr. O'Connell,

I purposely waited till after the period for signing the Leinster Requisition should have expired<sup>2</sup> before I replied to your letter of the 30th ult., and I am deeply pained to add that your opinions and my worst apprehensions are literally verified by the result. Our quondam leaders, almost to a man, are studiously keeping aloof from the present national movement but the great middle class — the bone and sinew and I may add the intelligence and public virtue of the community — superadded to the clergy of the people, are nobly flocking to your banners. I admit it is melancholy to reflect that the men who have been raised on the shoulders of the people to honour and distinction should now turn round and kick away the ladder by which they climbed into a factitious elevation or, what is nearly the same thing, to hold back from joining in the most important political struggle in which we were ever engaged.

We have suffered sadly heretofore in this locality by division which is the reason of my not having as yet publicly assailed the seceders; but if they do not promptly rally to the post of duty, *coute qui coute*, I will show up their delinquency.

I read your letter for the Rev. Mr. Sinnott<sup>3</sup> of St. Peter's College and our truly estimable friend, Mr. Talbot. Their opinions and yours are nearly analogous, touching the cause of the present apathy in certain quarters.

I have now, my dear Sir, honestly stated in reply to your query that it is my firm belief the cause of the present torpor amongst

our quondam leaders is attributable to the indirect operation of government influence on the pride and sordidness of placehunters and their dependants; but like unfortunate Henry Lambert the cloud may burst about their heads when it will be too late to recover their lost character and influence.<sup>4</sup>

I forwarded yesterday to Mr. Ray the signatures of the honest people of Taghmon, Kilmore and Tagoat to be attached to the Leinster Requisition.

Promising myself the pleasure of being able to greet you personally in Kilkenny on Wednesday next,<sup>5</sup> believe me to be with anxious solicitude for your happiness and long life to fight your county's moral battles.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Proprietor of the *Wexford Independent*.
- 2 That is, the requisition for a meeting of the province of Leinster in favour of repeal. It contained some six hundred signatures arranged alphabetically (*Pilot*, 9 Oct. 1840).
- 3 John Sinnott, D.D. (c. 1792-1850), professor St. Peter's College, Wexford 1820-31; president, 1831-50.
- 4 Probably a reference to the fact that Lambert had supported the coercion bill of 1833 (see letter 1963).
- 5 The Leinster provincial meeting for repeal took place at Croker Hill, Kilkenny on Wednesday, 14 October (*Pilot*, 16 Oct. 1840).

2756

*From Thomas Steele*

Limerick, 16 October 1840

My dear Sir,

Sir Richard Franklin<sup>1</sup> and I have been expecting a letter from you in reply to the one I wrote you on Sunday. . . .

By careful management I have prevented any revival of the subject of Sir David Roche's not having attended the Dinner.<sup>2</sup> It was intended to renew it at the last meeting of the Citizens Club<sup>3</sup> but I expressed opinions so strong on the subject before the time of meeting that no allusion was made to it. . . .

I hope you approve of the manner in which the account appeared of your admission etc. and your answer to the trades, and the account of John's reception. . . .<sup>4</sup>

I did not stir and will not stir the question of your admission to 'the Citizens Club' as I know that the Catholic clergy are displeased with its principle of organisation as not being sufficiently respectful to them. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Sir Richard Franklin (1801-?1846), M.D., 83 George's Street, Limerick. Knighted July 1840.
- 2 The Repeal dinner in Limerick (see letter 2751 n2).
- 3 A local political organisation of which the *Pilot* remarks that it was a body largely favourable to Repeal, though reformers also were admitted and all questions were left open (*Pilot*, 18 Sept. 1840).
- 4 On 8 October a meeting took place of masters and wardens of the guilds of Limerick trades, under the chairmanship of Thomas Steele. O'Connell and his four sons were voted the freedom of all the guilds. Particular enthusiasm was expressed on this occasion for the admission of John O'Connell in view of 'the wisdom and extraordinary tact and judgement with which he has recently acted in Dublin as his father's representative.' On 9 October, on O'Connell's return from Ennis, the masters and wardens waited on him and presented him with a congratulatory address (*Pilot*, 16 Oct. 1840, quoting the *Limerick Reporter*).

2757

*To Robert Curtis, Waterford*

Merrion Square, 17 October 1840

My dear Sir,

. . . I see with bitter regret the continuance of the feuds and wrangles in Waterford. It is most afflicting to find the friends of Ireland torn up by unwise and unhappy personalities. I have observed in these kinds of quarrels that the more anybody at any side is in the wrong, the less willing he is to make any concession for peace' sake. If there be any perfectly in the right, they are the persons with whom concession would begin, both in matter and in manner. Can you, my good friend, help me to put an end to these wranglings? I wish I knew how to do it without discredit to anybody.

Surely some sacrifice ought to be made to the extent at least of extinguishing all anger and resentment when our country demands entire union amongst ourselves.

I beg of you to present to his Lordship,<sup>1</sup> the Bishop, my most respectful and kindest regards.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 248

- 1 Dr. Foran.

2758

*From Charles Gavan Duffy*

Belfast, 18 October 1840

My dear Sir,

I have been requested by the meeting,<sup>1</sup> a resolution of which accompanies this note, to inform you privately of a few facts which could not be put into the letter meant for publication.

The dinner of the St. Patrick's Orphan Society<sup>2</sup> is intended to be an open one at which 'Repeal of the Union' will not be proposed as a toast — this arrangement being intended to embrace in the company Protestant Reformers whom it is anticipated your speech might bring over to Repeal.

A great Repeal meeting will be held the *following day*. . . . The Catholics of Belfast and a few truly honest Liberal Protestants unconnected with the *Northern Whig* are most enthusiastic in their exertions to make the demonstration triumphant, and I have not the smallest doubt of our success.

But I am bound to inform you that Dr. Denvir — on the ground that he is a *junior* bishop and that, therefore, it would not become him to take the lead in the Repeal movement while the Primate and some senior prelates are undecided — has not promised to attend the meeting or dinner. However he is a decided Repealer.

Permit me in conclusion to suggest that, if under any circumstances you find it impossible to come to Belfast, you would with your reply send for publication an appeal to the Reformers of Belfast and Ulster, and there will be a movement immediately here and in numerous other districts of the province, with the clergy and laity of which I have communicated on the subject.

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XV, 600

- 1 Unidentified. A deputation of Ulster Repealers was due on 19 October to wait on O'Connell to invite him to Belfast (*Northern Whig*, 20 Oct. 1840, quoting *Drogheda Argus*).
- 2 This proved to be a *soirée* (see letter 2785).

2758a

*From John Bowring to Dublin*

London, 22 October 1840

My dear O'Connell,

Five minutes conversation with Mr. J.A. Collins<sup>1</sup> will tell you of the interesting object of his journey and save you the trouble of reading a long letter from me. He has brought general credentials from the American Society and multitudes of letters from the most ardent friends of the anti-slavery cause on the other side of the Atlantic. The part you have taken in the woman question<sup>2</sup> appears to have created a strong feeling of regard and affection for you, and I leave Mr. J. A. Collins in your kind hands to aid him as far as you are able.

SOURCE: Harvard University Library

- 1 John Anderson Collins (c. 1810-c.1879), abolitionist and social reformer. General agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society who sent him abroad to gain sympathy for its work in England and to try to raise funds for carrying on propaganda. His letters of introduction included one from William Lloyd Garrison. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 2 See letter 2720 and 2721.

2759

*From Rev. John Sheehan*

23 October 1840

5 o'clock

My Dear Friend,

Since I wrote to you in the morning I have had a conversation with some friends and they have given it to me as their fixed opinion that I ought not on any account to allow you to take up your quarters anywhere out of my house.<sup>1</sup> If the respectable portion of the community can be kept united in the public cause, my friends say, it is only to be done through me and therefore it is their opinion that it would weaken my influence in keeping down the angry spirits of our party if, by your taking up your quarters in any house but mine after I had announced at a public meeting I had invited you, the slightest appearance of a difference of opinion between us were given. Let me know if Duggan<sup>2</sup> will accompany you as, in that case, I shall direct my housekeeper to have a bed ready for him.



SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 When in Waterford for the Repeal meeting organised by the Waterford Citizens Club. It took place under the chairmanship of Sir Benjamin Morris on 28 October, O'Connell coming to Waterford from Carlow on that day. Sheehan took a prominent part in the meeting (*Pilot*, 30 Oct. 1840).
- 2 John Duggan, O'Connell's manservant, who accompanied him to Italy in 1847 and kept a journal of his last illness.

2760

*To Charles Gavan Duffy*

Merrion Square, 24 October 1840

My dear Duffy,

This post carries my answer to Mr. Campbell.<sup>1</sup> I am sorry that I cannot at once accept the invitation.<sup>2</sup>

I write to you to solicit you to put an end to the controversy with the *Newry Examiner*.<sup>3</sup> Let that paper have the last word, aye, as many last words as it pleases. It is *too bad* that the only two really and honestly liberal papers in the North should be fighting like cats and dogs to the amusement of the Stanley party and to the disgust of the friends of freedom. *You* are it seems accused of showing *me* disrespect. I do not believe it and, if it happened, I most freely and cordially forgive you and, if I forgive you, surely others may afford to do so. Besides, how do I know but I was doing something at the time which deserved disrespect. I bear cheerfully the calumnies of the false friends and other enemies of Ireland. Why should I shrink from the attack of a mistaken friend to Ireland. But all this philosophical indifference is misplaced as I do not believe you ever assailed me. I believe you were always friendly to me as I have been to you and, now indeed, more so than ever when you are doing so much good in the North. You have completely muzzled the writers of sly paragraphs of bigotry in the knavish *Whig*.<sup>4</sup> That paper under your lash is obliged to assume a virtue which it has not. Go on and prosper but giving up all wrangle with any other Repeal paper. It is astonishing how little interest the public take in newspaper broils except to laugh at or ridicule both parties. And now do not deem any expression of mine harsh but *pray, pray* adopt my advice. Attack the common enemy, the open foe and the pretended friend for of such materials is the common enemy composed, and leave all your energies and faculties free and unfettered for the promotion of that cause which at one time cast a halo of glory on that Ulster

which now sits in almost murky darkness — the cause of the legislative and judicial independence of Ireland.

Let *us* have the honour and the delight of struggling for the perfect freedom and prosperity of our fatherland. Leave to others the miry ways of party politics.

SOURCE: Gavan Duffy Papers, NLI MSS 5756

- 1 Unidentified.
- 2 To a Repeal Dinner in Belfast.
- 3 The exact nature of this dispute has not been ascertained. Duffy was the able young editor of the *Vindicator*, founded as the organ of Belfast Catholicism. The *Newry Examiner* was also a Catholic newspaper. (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 174; Inglis, *Freedom of the Press* 198). On 20 October O'Connell moved a resolution in the Repeal Association calling on the *Vindicator* and *Examiner* both of which had declared in favour of Repeal, to suspend further hostilities (*Pilot*, 21 Oct. 1840).
- 4 The *Northern Whig*, a liberal unionist Belfast journal hostile to Repeal.

2761

To George D. Lynch, Tralee

Derrynane, 5 November 1840

My dear Lynch,

It is useless to tell you how pleased I should be to be of service to *your father's son*, but I am not in a condition to get a situation for anyone. I am indeed surprised that you were not aware that the lord lieut. had taken a public occasion to notify that no government patronage of any kind would be given to the Repealers.<sup>1</sup> This declaration has been the cause of so much public comment that it seems strange you should not have heard of it. I thought everybody by this time knew that this declaration was principally intended against me; or, at all events, that it directly applied to me. It follows, however, irresistibly that I cannot possibly comply with your request. I regret this on your account because to the extent of any patronage in my power you would have a fair and just claim on me and a claim which, without affectation, I would most cheerfully recognise. You thus will perceive that I want not the inclination but actually the means, to promise a situation for your brother, which, *indeed*, I would do if in my power.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 248-9

- 1 At the inauguration of the new lord mayor on 30 September, Lord Ebrington in his speech declared his and the government's unconditional hostility to Repeal as synonymous with separation, involving the ruin of Ireland and the dismemberment of the empire. He declared that he had not suppressed the Repeal agitation because he believed in allowing the exercise of constitutional rights, but, he said, 'whatever favour or patronage the government were wont to bestow on its supporters, for those who take part in this agitation, whatever other claims they may have to consideration no application will on any account be attended to' (*FJ*, 1 Oct. 1840).

2762

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Derrynane, 6 November 1840

[No salutation]

I feel nervous but you always cheer me. Do you hear anything about Carlow?<sup>1</sup> Surely Bruen is not to be allowed to walk over! Alas! that they did not join the Repeal cry!<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 228

- 1 The death of Nicholas Aylward Vigors caused a vacancy in Co. Carlow. On 5 December 1840, the Tory Col. Henry Bruen defeated the Whig candidate, Hon. Frederick Ponsonby, by 722 votes to 555 (*DEM*, 7 Dec. 1840).
- 2 The *Pilot* of 7 December said that offers of help by Repealers had been rejected by Ponsonby's supporters. The speeches at the nomination of candidates on 30 November would support this statement. Rev. Thomas Tyrell, P.P. of Tynriland, Co. Carlow, said he did not think a single Carlow man had attended the Leinster provincial Repeal meeting (*DEP*, 1 Dec. 1840).

2763

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Derrynane, 6 November 1840

My ever dear Lord,

I write merely to say that, if it strikes your Grace that I can do or say or write anything to forward your views respecting the approaching election for Mayo,<sup>1</sup> you have only to intimate a wish and it shall of course be to me as a command. Sir S. O'Malley<sup>2</sup> has written to me but I have replied in general terms, referring him to your decision.<sup>3</sup> It is, to be sure, very unlikely that

I could in any respect influence the Mayo election; and I write to your Grace on the subject only because others foolishly think that I could be of use to them. But if there were any utility in me it should all be most cheerfully and readily at your Grace's command.

I was glad to hear that Valentine O'Connor Blake<sup>4</sup> of Tower Hill is a candidate.<sup>5</sup> It will delight me to hear that he has your countenance and support. I think it would be a happy choice but of that you must be a better judge than I can be.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 699

- 1 Following the death in October of Sir William Brabazon, M.P.
- 2 Sir Samuel O'Malley, J.P., D.L. first baronet (1779-1864), Kilboyne House, Castlebar, Co. Mayo. See *Boase*.
- 3 O'Connell soon afterwards referred to the 'laudable and honourable example Sir Samuel O'Malley has given in postponing his own natural and respected claims [to the representation of Mayo] to a future period'. (O'Connell to the Electors of Mayo, 1 Dec. 1840, *Pilot*, 7 Dec. 1840).
- 4 Valentine O'Connor Blake, J.P., D.L. (1808-1879), Tower Hill, Ballyglass, Co. Mayo. High sheriff Co. Mayo 1839.
- 5 Though the Mayo Liberal Club favoured Blake's candidacy, he declined to come forward (*FJ*, 9 Nov. 1840).

2764

To Thomas Steele

Derrynane, 18 November 1840

My dear Steele,

You have done precisely what was right in preventing any show or procession.<sup>1</sup> We have had as much of that as could for the present be necessary or useful. I am happy to tell you that the Repeal cause is prospering. Quiet and timid men are joining us daily. We had before the bone and sinew. What we wanted was to create the conviction that the Repeal can be obtained in as peaceable a manner as we obtained Emancipation. This conviction is becoming general, and this is all that can be required to ensure success.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 249

- 1 This occasion has not been identified.

2765

*To his son John*

Derrynane, 21 November 1840

My dearest John,

I wrote last night one word of advice respecting the 'Irish Manufacture' meetings.<sup>1</sup> I am very anxious you should do all in your power to help their promoters.

I now want to write you a few words on another subject, and by way of caution. I allude to the subject of *representation*. In that excellent paper of yours, the address to the English people against the conduct of their press<sup>2</sup> — an admirable address it is, and I am exceedingly pleased with it — you however speak of our being supposed, as members of the Repeal Association, to be *representatives* of the Irish people. True, you then disclaim that title but you give us a qualified station in some degree of the same nature.<sup>3</sup> Now your phrase is perfectly accurate in itself and free from being fairly construed to claim any element of representation. But we would not get a fair construction. We should have the unscrupulous Court of Queen's Bench and an Orange jury who would sign our conviction before they heard even the evidence for the prosecution. What I want to impress upon your mind is this — the danger of our assuming *any species of representative capacity*. We must always be *an original society*, emanating from no other body or class and not responsible to any other body or class. Our danger in point of law is lest we should be accused of being either *representatives* or *delegates*. Just keep this always in your mind: always disclaim unqualifiedly delegation or representation. It is the Irish Convention Act<sup>4</sup> which creates the danger; and the construction put upon that act in Dr. Sheridan's case<sup>5</sup> enhances the danger.

You will not, my beloved John, mistake me. I say this to you not by way of reproach but simply by way of caution. Your *only* reply is to say you will bear my caution in mind. Say not one word in explanation of the past.

I also wish to advise you to volunteer your services at the Carlow election and at the preceding agitation. Write down to Arthur French or to Mr. Fitzgerald who acts as secretary — Ray will give you his address — and offer any aid in your power to the success of Mr. Ponsonby's<sup>6</sup> election. Say that you will go about agitating or working in any other way in which you could be useful.<sup>7</sup>

Let these offers come as emanating from yourself and not at

all as suggested by me.

God bless my dearly loved John. . . . God Almighty bless you!

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 330-2

- 1 During the autumn of 1840, numerous meetings were held in Dublin and the provinces for the promotion of Irish manufactures. At a meeting in Dublin on 10 November the Provisional Board of Trade was established 'for the promotion and protection of Irish manufactures and trade,' representative of the various manufactures. At a meeting in Dublin on 17 November this board established the National Board of Trade.
- 2 At a meeting of the Repeal Association on 16 November, John O'Connell read an address from the association to the people of England, which charged the British press, especially the Liberal and Radical section of it, with suppressing news concerning the progress of Repeal agitation in Ireland and calumniating and ridiculing Repealers. The Radicals, it alleged, were hostile to Repeal because Ireland had spurned the Chartists. Thomas Reynolds objected to this condemnation as too sweeping and for including papers which had rendered Ireland good service such as the *Morning Chronicle*. The address was, however, adopted after some discussion (*Pilot*, 18 Nov. 1840).
- 3 The address, above, declared 'The body that thus address you [the English people] do so, not in the capacity of actual legally recognised representatives of the Irish people – such a title the law forbids us – but as a body thoroughly identified with the strength of the popular sentiment in Ireland, and generally considered the mouthpiece and organ through which that sentiment gains expression.'
- 4 The Irish Convention act of 1793. See letter 342 n3.
- 5 See letter 2557.
- 6 Hon. Frederick George Brabazon Ponsonby (1815-1895), third son of first Baron Duncannon who later became fourth earl of Bessborough. Frederick Ponsonby succeeded in 1880 as sixth earl of Bessborough. See *DNB*.
- 7 John O'Connell took no part in the Carlow election. See letter 2762 n2.

2766

*From Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association*

Leeds, 23 November 1840

Dear Sir,

I enclose you a few copies of the address<sup>1</sup> which has been reprinted here for general distribution. I trust that it will meet your views and lead to union and co-operation between Irish and English Reformers.

Your letter<sup>2</sup> reached Mr. Hamer Stansfeld<sup>3</sup> on Sunday and will be published in the *Leeds Times* (the organ of the association) on Saturday next. It is rather a singular coincidence that the

association should have addressed you,<sup>4</sup> and you them, at almost the same moment.

I suspect that the Ulster Reformers are all that you say of them but it is well to give them a fair trial. We expect their return address<sup>5</sup> in the course of this week.

The *Leeds Mercury* has attacked, in an address to Hamer Stansfeld of four columns, the new association. We shall now know our friends from our enemies. I believe Mr. Stansfeld will himself write you on the subject of our proposed banquet.

Your most obedient servant,

Samuel Smiles<sup>6</sup>

Secretary to the L.P.R. Association

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 An address of the Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association to the Ulster Constitutional Association, suggesting co-operation between the two bodies (for text of address, see *Northern Whig*, 24 Oct. 1840). The Leeds reformers proposed to hold a public dinner for 6,000 persons, half of whom would belong to the middle classes, and the other half would be operatives. At the dinner its principles would be proclaimed. A copy of the address was sent O'Connell together with an invitation to attend the dinner (O'Connell to Barrett, 18 Nov. 1840; Hamer Stansfeld to O'Connell, 22 Oct. 1840; *Pilot*, 23 Nov. 1840).
- 2 O'Connell to Stansfeld, 16 Nov. 1840 (*Pilot*, 23 Nov. 1840). This is a public letter in which O'Connell denounced the inadequacy of the great reform act and criticised the anti-corn law league for failing to take up the question of parliamentary reform. He suggested that a convention of delegates from all over England be convened in London before the next session of parliament to draw up a plan of parliamentary reform and proposed that he himself be elected as one such delegate by the Irish of Liverpool. He stressed, however, that Ireland was now primarily interested in Repeal.
- 3 Hamer Stansfeld, political reformer and alderman of Leeds corporation.
- 4 Address of the Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association to O'Connell and the Repealers of Ireland, undated (*Pilot*, 27 Nov. 1840). The address expresses doubts about Repeal, which it says will only divide England and Ireland when unity is needed between them. It appeals to the Irish to join in seeking equal justice for both nations.
- 5 No return address from the Ulster Constitutional Association has been traced.
- 6 Samuel Smiles (1812-1904), editor of the *Leeds Times* 1838-42. Prolific author.

2767

*To Joseph Sturge*

Derrynane, 24 November 1840

My dear friend,

I had just made up my mind to write to you upon the subject matter of your letter — I mean the Texas — when that letter reached me. I never felt more afflicted upon any political subject than I did at the announcement in the newspapers that Lord Palmerston had entered into a commercial treaty with that nest of land pirates.<sup>1</sup> It has put the seal upon his political delinquency. He has been upon the very verge of plunging us into all the horrors of war upon the most uninteresting of all possible grounds, that is, which of two barbarians shall misgovern, for each of them would misgovern, the unhappy inhabitants of Syria.<sup>2</sup> We have escaped (if we *have* escaped) all the crimes of war by the King of the French wisely submitting to the humiliation of the Syrian arrangement being made without his concurrence.<sup>3</sup> In the meantime our natural alliance with France is broken off; the French people are insulted and irritated and will, the first opportunity, seek means of revenge. Lord Palmerston however has substituted an alliance with that unchristian monster, the Emperor of Russia, and as I said before, to crown all, he has entered into a commercial treaty with the Texans red from the slaughter of the wretched Comanche Indians.

. . . That state is as much recognised now by this treaty as France or the United States. It is admitted into the comity of nations. Their ambassador would have a right to be presented to our Queen and we of course will have a diplomatic agent in one of the '*Shantys*' of what is called the City of Houston. Thus, you see, Lord Palmerston has the knack of connecting us with the worst portions of the human race in the eastern and western divisions of our hemisphere.

The English nation has paid 20 millions to abolish slavery in its own territories and it is now the patron of a state that will consume more slaves in process of time than could have been sacrificed to the planters of Jamaica. Of a truth there never was a people so swindled and humbugged as you worthy Britons on the subject of Negro slavery. . . .

What are the anti-slavery societies of England *now* to do? I am sure *I* do not know! But *this* I know — that they ought to do something energetic, something decisively reprobatory of Lord Palmerston's conduct. Why, what a humbug is Sir Fowell



Buxton's<sup>4</sup> society<sup>5</sup> for terminating slavery, compared with Lord Palmerston's Texan Society for perpetuating that abomination!

I cannot send my address<sup>6</sup> on the subject of slavery to the Irish in America until after the contest for the election of President shall have terminated. But I promise you it shall appear in the American papers before the end of January.

SOURCE: Joseph Sturge Papers, British Museum Add. MSS 50, 131, ff. 326-7.

- 1 The treaty was signed in London on 16 November by General James Hamilton as representative of Texas (*Annual Register*, 1840, 225).
- 2 A reference to the revolt of Mahomet Ali against the Turks.
- 3 A reference to the quadrilateral treaty of July 1840 (see letter 2748 n1).
- 4 Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton (1786-1845), the celebrated reformer, particularly as a protagonist of the abolition of slavery. M.P. for Weymouth 1818-37. Created a baronet July 1840. See *DNB*.
- 5 Buxton was a leading member of the Society for the Extinction of the Slave Trade and the Civilisation of Africa (see letter 2714 n1).
- 6 At the anti-slavery convention in London on 12 June 1840 (see letter 2720 n2) James Cannings Fuller publicly asked O'Connell to issue an address to the Irish in America since 'his influence in that country was greater than that of the whole convention'. O'Connell replied that he would do so if it were thought desirable. (*MC*, 13 June 1840). It has not been ascertained whether he sent the proposed address. He later signed two addresses, one joint and one personal (see letter 2951 n4).

2768

*From P.V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 25 November 1840  
Noon

My Dear Liberator,

I shall have £1,500, to begin with, transferred to your credit today so that Ray's checks will be fully provided for. Morgan's bill in your favour £750 and others fall due about the 1st December. Send me a cheque for say £1,000 for these purposes and I shall continue to lodge, and take cheques from you as occasion may require week after week. I expect to place at least £1,000 to your credit early next week and so on steadily and satisfactorily for all your purposes. I hoped to have been able to see O'Neill Falls<sup>1</sup> of Belfast with regard to your invitation to that town but have been so unreasonably hampered by numerous persons, who mistakingly attribute to me the power of serving their very dissimilar objects, that I have not been permitted to call upon Falls. I think the Tribute impediment<sup>2</sup> will be readily

put out of your way as respects your visit to Belfast but I must await the interview with the gentleman alluded to to write definitively on the matter.

The news of Wright's stoppage<sup>3</sup> and a slight indisposition which will incapacitate me from completing the business allotted for today causes me to postpone writing to Mr. Moffett<sup>4</sup> and enclosing him the half note for £100 until the next post.

Under the circumstances he had perhaps better retain the balance of the note when had from the Bank of England and *he* can take care of the bill in favour of Dan<sup>5</sup> which you speak of as running due.

Barrett handed me the remittance<sup>6</sup> from Father Sheehan on receipt thereof and he has settled all matters respecting the Tribute satisfactorily. I use *his* columns on the present occasion as you will perceive for my detailed returns.<sup>7</sup>

Expect to hear from me more at length tomorrow, *D. V.*

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 James O'Neill Falls, attorney, 3 Arthur Place, Belfast and 7 Dominick Street, Dublin.
- 2 Unidentified. The O'Connell Tribute was due to be taken up on Sunday 8 November 1840 (*Pilot*, 6 Nov. 1840).
- 3 The banking firm of Wright and Co., 5 Henrietta Street, Covent Gardens, London suspended payment on 23 November 1840 (*Times*, 24 Nov. 1840).
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 O'Connell's youngest son.
- 6 The remittance consisted of £58.1.4 subscribed by the inhabitants of St. Patrick's parish, Waterford city (*Pilot*, 16 Nov. 1840).
- 7 Returns of the O'Connell Tribute for 1840 appear in every second issue of the *Pilot* at this time.

2769

*From Christopher Fitz-Simon*

Dublin, 26 November 1840

My Dear Sir,

Poor John Redmond<sup>1</sup> has left his wife and his nephews in less comfortable circumstances than was hoped. He had been in expectation and he hoped of obtaining some situation under the Corporation Act through you. His friends have begged of me to write to you in favour of his nephew, Mr. John Redmond, that perhaps you might be able to have him appointed to the place (marshall, I believe) that poor John Redmond looked to. It would

be a kind act to the memory [of] that honest man.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 John Redmond died c. 17 November 1840.

2770

*To Archbishop MacHale*

Derrynane, 30 November 1840

My dear and ever respected Lord,

I have felt great anxiety as to the mode in which I should comply with your Grace's command — for your request is justly a command — to address the men of Mayo.

There are so many local interests, prejudices and passions to be consulted and avoided, so much irritation to be soothed, and so much dormant rancour to be allowed to remain in repose, that I have been exceedingly uneasy, lest, while I sought to do good, I might be doing nothing but mischief.

There is that fellow Cavendish;<sup>1</sup> treating him as he ought to be treated might perhaps provoke him to continue, or give him a plausible excuse for continuing, his canvass.

Under these circumstances I have resolved to draw up an address in the form which appears to me at this distance suitable. I make two copies of it; the one I send to your Grace, the other to Barrett of the *Pilot*. I am anxious that your Grace should alter and amend the address in any manner you think fit. I adopt beforehand all your alterations and make them my own. Barrett will not print the copy I send him until he hears from Your Grace. You can send him a private letter telling him what to do, but until he gets that letter he will not print the address.<sup>2</sup>

If you alter it, send him a *full copy* of the altered address. This to prevent mistakes in the printing.

If you wished for my presence in Mayo, I would go there at once; or my son John would go *agitating* there, if you thought that advisable. In short, my dear Lord, command us all.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 251

- 1 Hon. Frederick Cavendish (1800-1877), fifth son of the second Baron Waterpark; formerly a captain in the army. Proprietor of the *Castlebar Telegraph*. See FitzPatrick, *Correspondence*, II, 252-3.
- 2 O'Connell's address to the electors of Mayo, dated 1 December is published in the *Pilot* of 7 December 1840. It contains a strong attack on Cavendish as being secretly a 'stalking-horse' of the Tories. O'Connell

calls on the electors to support Mark Blake, eldest son of Maurice Blake of Ballinafad, as candidate. Blake had been selected to stand by the Mayo liberal club (*Pilot*, 9 Nov. 1840). Cavendish ultimately withdrew from the contest and on 16 December, Blake was returned unopposed, being proposed by MacHale on the hustings (*Pilot*, 18 Dec. 1840).

2771

*To Richard Barrett*

Derrynane, 2 December 1840

*Private*

My dear Barrett,

I send under free covers an address to the Electors of Mayo. Do not print it until you hear from Dr. MacHale on the subject. I sent him another copy asking him to alter the address in any manner which might seem to him most likely to be useful. Keep what I send you, therefore, until he or someone on his behalf writes to you. It is really too bad that the scoundrel Cavendish should disturb the Liberal party with his absurd and wicked pretensions but they deserve it all for having given any encouragement to such a fellow.

I am just making my arrangements to return to Dublin.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 251-2

2772

*To his son John*

Derrynane, 4 December 1840

My dearest John,

I entirely approve of all you have done. You have my blessing, my esteem and my cordial love.

Recollect two things, first, that your business is not to be disturbed by anybody, not to mind what this one or that other said, and to conciliate everybody, *good, bad* and indifferent without *yielding any principle*, and without failing to make the *good* perceive the preference of your kindness for them. Secondly, recollect this, that in a joint-stock concern<sup>1</sup> every contributor, even down as low as to him who contributes one shilling, is liable to the extent of his fortune or means, whatever that may be, for the debts and losses of such joint-stock concern. I doubt if one constituted on

the basis proposed could be managed with economy and prudence. Be therefore cautious how you proceed. . . .

Next, it is in my mind highly desirable to make no opposition to what may promote M ----'s<sup>2</sup> pecuniary interest in the new agitation for the using domestic manufacture wherever such interests do not clash with public utility. He will work the harder if he see that his private interests are not to be compromised; and the people will thus be better served.

I highly approve of Pierce Mahony's Requisition.<sup>3</sup> It does not imply any dereliction of Repeal, and that I will *practically* prove. And it does not assert any such thing. Attend therefore at Westmoreland Street and put my name and Maurice's to that Requisition. Tell Mahony by a note, written when you receive this, that I approve of and sign his Requisition. . . .

Give Ray this list, that I may write to him about my letters and papers. Tell Maurice Prendergast that I can see him in Merrion Square on Saturday, the 19th, and that he can have the Charity Dinner<sup>4</sup> any day in the ensuing fortnight. . . .

I have had *great* hunting — only one blank day. I have, since I saw you, killed seventy-seven hares. Yesterday the most splendid hunting I ever saw.

[P.S.] See my letter of directions to Ray. Assist him but let him alone be responsible. You must not share the responsibility. I do hate to be disappointed in my letters and papers.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 333-5

- 1 John O'Connell states that there was a popular desire at this time for a joint-stock company of manufacturers, artisans, etc. in order to promote the manufacture and consumption of Irish goods (O'Connell, *Recollections*, I, 333).
- 2 Probably Thomas Mooney, secretary of both the Provisional Board of Trade and the National Board of Trade (see letter 2765 n 1).
- 3 For a general meeting of Irish reformers.
- 4 The annual dinner of St. Bridget's Female Orphan Society, of which Maurice Prendergast was president. The society maintained 34 orphans with the Brigidine nuns at Tullow, Co. Carlow. O'Connell took the chair at the dinner held in Dublin on 21 December (*Pilot*, 23 Dec. 1840).

indulged in a furious tirade against the board of trade for its marked exclusion of him and when he had done I did not rise, though there was a pause and an evident expectation that I would do so and would speak in much the same tone. Clements<sup>4</sup> however got up and spoke strongly, and then the '*onus*' was upon me, as the Connaught gentlemen say, and I was obliged to stand up for Reynolds, especially as the meeting were *ardent* and *unanimous* for him. He is a *very popular* man as you know and the truth is, there was some caballing against him.

I have endeavoured sedulously to treat the Rev. Dr. Flanagan with every respect and don't think that in a single instance a word derogatory to him escaped me. I will still more carefully pursue the same line of conduct.

Today's meeting, so long as I attended it, went on well and seemed likely to end satisfactorily. It was held in that curious old room, the *Carpenter's Hall*.<sup>5</sup> I had to go to the Westmoreland St. meeting<sup>6</sup> and such a meeting!! Ponsonby (of Carlow) was there. An hour was lost in modifications of Pierce Mahony's requisition.<sup>7</sup> . . . I of course took no part in such a discussion, merely watching that no alteration of the *sense* and bearing of Mahony's requisition should take place. After that Ponsonby (who seems an ill-conditioned fellow) made a *not-to-go-further* speech on the causes of failure at Carlow and remarked upon the 'agitators' who would not 'themselves feel the sufferings of the people' etc. and he concluded by saying that no man would like to be returned at the expense of the people's sufferings. I very quietly answered that he had no right to say anything about the agitators when he did not know what they would do, that they would have gone at personal inconvenience etc. to themselves, and would not only have advanced *public funds* for the people, but been as ready as any to subscribe privately when called upon, that my opinion was, as I had stated publicly and would [one or two words illegible] that agitation was necessary in order to teach the people their rights and keep them up to exertion, and finally that if the principle of non-interference because of landlords' persecution were carried out, there was an end to the hope of political amelioration etc. . . .

*Instead of money for 'agitating' expeditions*, I am obliged, my dear father, to ask you to let me place to your account one or two of my heaviest *household* bills (not wine) since you left town. I have no choice as the money I calculated upon has *suddenly* failed me. House property is so precarious that after getting £200 a year these 2 years as my third of Eliza's joint property, I now learn I am not to get more than what I have received this year,

viz., £130 – deficit £70 on one third alone, making on the whole £210. This, with the £70 Eliza's illnesses cost me, renders me a *beggar* for the rest of this year but *it shall be the last time*. I have had to raise money to meet Eliza's illness which will give some idea of my condition.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 St. Audoen's parish, Dublin, met on 9 December for the purpose of forwarding Irish manufactures. John O'Connell expressed satisfaction that the parish intended to elect Thomas Reynolds to the Board of Trade, and a resolution was passed appointing him (*FJ*, 10 Dec. 1840).
- 2 At a meeting of the National Board of Trade on 2 December, presided over by Rev. Dr. Flanagan, it was proposed that O'Connell, his son John, George A. Hamilton and Thomas Reynolds' be admitted honorary members. All but Reynolds were admitted, Flanagan objecting to the admission of Reynolds. It was decided to refer Reynold's name to committee. (*Pilot*, 4 Dec. 1840). At a meeting of the Repeal Association on Thursday, 3 December, John O'Connell expressed surprise at the objection to Reynolds' admission and declared that he himself would not take his place on the Board until Reynolds should be admitted (*Pilot*, 4 Dec. 1840).
- 3 Thomas Reynolds chaired the meeting of the Repeal Association on this day (see note 2 above).
- 4 Edward Clements, second son of Hill Clements of Dublin. Called to the bar 1829. A prominent member of the Repeal Association.
- 5 At St. Audoen's Arch, Dublin.
- 6 Of the Reform Registry Association of 1839 (see letter 2665 n3).
- 7 See letter 2772 n3.

2776

*From P. V. FitzPatrick*

Dublin, 11 December 1840

My Dear Liberator,

The official friend<sup>1</sup> whose fears with respect to Mayo I communicated to you on Sunday, appears to think *now* that the county is safe. I put your letter<sup>2</sup> in his hands and he is thus made acquainted with the channel which you suggest as to money affairs if that agent should be thought necessary. It is believed that it will *not* be requisite but he will hold the suggestion in mind should it become judicious to act upon it. John has no present idea of starting for the west. In fact he received no invitation or other intimation that he might be useful save your letter received by me today.

It is said here that the worst *blot* in our proceedings applies to the apathy if not the disinclination to interfere as the friend of my

school boy as well as maturer days, Right Rev. Dr. McNicholas, Bishop of Achonry. This estimable prelate has been always remarkable for the *quietude* of his character and no small degree of pressure is necessary to propel him into anything like action. I have taken the best course open to me to render him efficient on the coming occasion and I have a right to hope that he will be stirred so as to cause him to influence his clergy to interfere. We are represented as having held back universally up to this time. Barrett had a letter from the archbishop quite of an encouraging character and you may, as far as I can venture to guide, relieve yourself of the notion of proceeding to Mayo. The Government folk seem to have analysed the state of things well and to have acted upon the Whig landlords judiciously and successfully.

The cry now is that the Whig landlords will not register their tenantry, anticipating that the Repeal agitation will speedily cause the test<sup>3</sup> to be put anew as to that question on the hustings. It is strange however that these personages did not bestir themselves as to the registry while the Repeal was placed in *abeyance*.

I expect to be able to lodge another £1,000 next week. Send me therefore a cheque for £350 to meet a bill for that amount due on Thursday. You should send the cheque at once. I continue to prosper.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 16646

1 Unidentified.

2 Probably letter 2773.

3 A reference to the Repeal pledge, first proffered on a wide scale to parliamentary candidates in 1832.

2777

*From the Wool Combers of Limerick*

[—December 1840]

Sir,

It is with feelings of sorrow arising out of former recollections that the only surviving branch of the Ancient Clothiers — the Wool Combers of Limerick — beg to address you. We are, Sir, the remnant of a trade once amongst the most respectable in Ireland but, owing to the unjust laws and monopolising character of English competition, reduced to the skeleton of what we were, and the best branch of our trade totally annihilated by the Acts of 1822 and the subsequent years to 1829<sup>1</sup> which gradually took off the duty on the importation of English goods and thus effectually



put it out of the power of the Irish Manufacturer to compete with the enormous capital and the vast machinery of that more favoured land.

Prior to the Union there were 600 men employed at the several branches of our business in this city and vicinity but will the astounding nay incredible fact be believed that we are now reduced to the insignificant number of 29. To the introduction of machinery we may in a great measure ascribe our depression as it is on hand labour that we depend which, besides giving us employment, would contribute to diffuse among other classes of society in the line of weaving, spinning, knitting etc. We therefore earnestly request that you would favour us with your powerful advocacy in inducing the public to give a preference to the production of hand labour as, although it may come a little dearer at the moment of purchase, yet will prove cheaper in the end, a fact well ascertained by competent judges. It shall be our duty to make public the names of those manufacturers who are struggling with almost insurmountable difficulties to encourage and employ the men as a matter of justice to them and ourselves. That the Almighty may favour your efforts to ameliorate the condition of a depressed and long suffering people is the sincere prayer of

Sir,

Your most devoted servants,  
The Wool Combers of Limerick  
John Egan, Master

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The protective duties on imported cloth agreed to at the passing of the Act of Union were repealed in 1823 (O'Brien, *Economic History of Ireland*, 303-6). The specific acts referred to have not been identified.

2778

*From the Limerick Tallow Chandlers*

Limerick, 13 December 1840

Sir,

Your long desired and welcome visit to Limerick<sup>1</sup> is hailed by the Guild of Tallow Chandlers as the precursor of better days to that deeply injured and suffering body, who can now scarcely produce one man employed to the twenty they had prior to the year 1828. [The importation of English soap, which sells cheaper than Irish but is adulterated with clay, so is really inferior, has destroyed the Irish manufacture. An additional unfair advantage

which the English manufacturer enjoys is the drawback he receives on exporting soap.]

Signed on behalf of the operatives  
 John Hefferan                      Master  
 William Jackson                    Wardens  
 John O'Grady

SOURCE: O'Connell Paper, NLI 13649

- 1 O'Connell presided at a meeting of the congregated trades of Limerick at the Court House, Limerick on 17 December. Sir David Roche, M.P. and William Roche, M.P. were among the speakers. The meeting resolved to promote Irish manufactures and 'to discountenance every attempt at combination or dictation to capitalists who may establish themselves amongst us; and to use our best endeavours, as operatives, to prevent a system so injurious to the best interests of our trade' (*Pilot* of 21 December 1840 abridging the *Limerick Reporter*).

2779

*To P. V. FitzPatrick*

Killarney, 14 December 1840

[No salutation]

I came from Derrynane this day, a beautiful day and transcendent scenery. There is a new road<sup>1</sup> opened through the boldest mountains in Ireland, and *you, you* have never seen one of my mountains!!

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 255

- 1 The road from Waterville to Sneem which passes within one mile of Derrynane.

2780

*From Frederick Lucas*<sup>1</sup>

3 Brydges Street, Covent Garden [London], 14 December 1840  
 Dear Sir,

I have received this day your favours of the 8th containing a letter to the *Tablet* which will of course be published in the next number.<sup>2</sup>

I have received also by the same post a private letter for the

contents of which and the advice therein contained I thank you very much. I shall not fail to attend to it.

Allow me however, not for the foolish purpose of justifying myself where there is no intention to misconceive or misinterpret, just to explain that in the case of Mr. Stowell<sup>3</sup> and the Catholic who was said to have desired war to advance Catholic interests, I may have erred but not from an excess of candour. The fact is that before Stowell had said anything about it, I had heard on good Catholic authority — the very highest indeed, except that it was not first hand — that a certain Catholic gentleman had uttered such an opinion. I had also reason to believe that this very gentleman was conveying on this very matter, false reports to the *Univers*<sup>4</sup> of the opinions of the Catholics, and these reports were duly registered in the *Univers*. I was therefore, before Stowell's harangue, on the look out for an opportunity to say a word or two on this point.

I believe now that Stowell did not tell a lie in this instance. I may be wrong. I think his crime consisted in endeavouring to slander the whole body of Catholics on the authority of a private conversation which he had no right to refer to and which, when pressed by the calumniated parties, he could not therefore substantiate.

As to the fact, it is among Catholics tolerably notorious; the person I alluded to is known as well as if I had named him; and I have only three or four days ago received an indirect message from the Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh<sup>5</sup> to say that the thing has excited 'considerable sensation', of course of an unfavourable kind and to advise that no attacks on individual Catholics should be permitted in the *Tablet*.

I only mention this to show that, whether the admission was well or ill judged, *excess of candour was not the origin of it*.

In the Stockport case, my words may have been ill chosen but I had no intention to *admit* anything. In the report of the proceedings, the accused persons were stated to be Catholics, and I gave it as it was given in the ordinary accounts without either affirming it or denying it as of my own knowledge. The next week when the contradiction came I published the contradiction.

As to the articles on the Eastern Question I am the more disposed to acquiesce in the justice of your complaint because I have reason to believe the opinion is somewhat general. I thank you very sincerely however for telling me plainly what I should probably not have heard so frankly from any other quarter. I will endeavour to avoid a like error in future.

With many thanks for your kindness and attention on this as

well as on former occasions I remain, etc.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Frederick Lucas (1812-55), a London Quaker who became a Catholic in 1839. Founded the *Tablet*, a weekly Catholic journal, in 1840. M.P. for Co. Meath 1852-55. See *DNB*.
- 2 O'Connell to the *Tablet*, 8 December 1840 (*Pilot*, 23 Dec. 1840). The letter is in reply to an argument advanced by the *Tablet* in its edition of 28 November against Repeal of the Union, on the ground, among other things, that Repeal would tend to undermine the position of Catholicism in England. O'Connell declared that '. . . even if it were true that by repeal . . . the interests of the Catholic church in England would cease to be promoted . . . I am not at liberty to abandon the repeal for the promotion of those interests.'
- 3 Rev. Hugh Stowell (1799-1865), a leader of the Evangelical movement and author of many religious works. Rector of Christ Church, Acton Square, Salford 1831-65. See *Boase*.
- 4 The *Tablet* was engaged in a controversy with the important French Catholic newspaper *l'Univers* which 'assumed that France was the natural defender of Catholicism throughout the East, and on that ground wanted a religious war.' In the *Tablet*, Lucas pointed out the danger of identifying the interests of the church with a national interest (Edward Lucas, *Life of Frederick Lucas*, M.P. London, 1886, I, 39-44).
- 5 Thomas Walsh (1766-1849), a native of London and son of an Irish merchant there. Educated St. Omer. Vicar apostolic of Midland District 1826-49.

2781

*From John Cleave to Merrion Square*

1 Shoe Lane, Fleet St., London, 16 December 1840

Dear Sir,

Here is another copy of the Chartist plan.<sup>1</sup> I feel greatly obliged by your promptitude in answering my letter addressed to you at Derrynane. Your opinion as given in your letter before me, corresponds with all my own recollections and readings in relation to both the acts referring to societies, especially the celebrated Corresponding Act<sup>2</sup> drawn up by Mr. Scott, the late Lord Eldon.

Trusting you will find time to look at the matter again.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The enclosed plan is a printed statement entitled '*A Plan for organising the Chartists of Great Britain*, agreed upon at a meeting of delegates appointed by the people, and held at the Griffin Inn, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, on Monday, July 20, 1840.'
- 2 The traitorous correspondence act of 1793 (33 Geo. III c. 27).

2782

*From Daniel Lee to Dublin*

Manchester, 18 December 1840

My dear Sir,

I was in Ireland for the last three weeks and hoped to have seen you but found you were enjoying the delightful air of your native mountains, and much good may it do you.

I wished to have spoken to you on the Repeal move here. Our friend Duggan<sup>1</sup> has hard work to keep his party back. They want to go too fast for him. He called upon me today and wished me to write you just to give them a little advice. They are most anxious to have you over to a Repeal dinner. I think we are not ripe for that but we had better go on as we are doing at present, and I think the cause will be much better served for really the number is daily increasing and it would tend to alarm the English Liberals, a great many, I may say nearly all of them, are against the question so that it will be wiser (in my opinion) to allow the subject to be better understood before it is so openly broached here. My immediate object in writing now is because there is a person going over with an address from the *Repeal Ladies* of this town<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Duggan tells me he is the most forward to press the matter on so that perhaps you will give him your opinion on the matter, which will of course cause them to act accordingly. Mr. Duggan is the best Repealer and reformer I ever knew and is doing more for the liberal cause here than any other man. Hoping to see you in the beginning of the year.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Timothy Duggan, Salford, near Manchester, an early supporter of the Repeal movement. By the end of 1840 he had sent 27 remittances to the Repeal Association. Made energetic efforts to support textile manufacture in Ireland.
- 2 The address was from 600 'matrons and maids resident at Manchester and Salford, . . . daughters of Erin' and was in support of Repeal. It was read by a Mr. Healy of Manchester (the 'person' involved) at a meeting of the Repeal Association in Dublin on 21 December (*Pilot*, 23 Dec. 1840).

2782a

*To John Easthope, 22 December 1840, from Merrion Square*

Recommends 'a young friend of mine, Mr. Washington Downing'<sup>1</sup> for employment as a parliamentary reporter. He says that Downing has been for some time a reporter in the Dublin press. On the back of the letter is written: 'ansd. 31 Decr.'

SOURCE: Duke University Library

- 1 Washington Downing (died October 1877), sub-editor and the celebrated parliamentary reporter of the London *Daily News*. He was the third son of Eugene Downing of Kenmare, Co. Kerry and Nellie, daughter of Timothy McTom McCarthy, Kilfadimore, Kilgarvan, Co. Kerry. Married Mary Frances, eldest daughter of Daniel McCarthy, Kilfadimore. She died on 28 April 1879 and is in *Boase*. She assisted James Stephens, the Fenian, to escape to Paris.

2783

*From J. F. Winks<sup>1</sup>*

26 December 1840

Sir,

At a meeting of the Leicester Voluntary Church Society held in the county gaol, Mr. W. Baines,<sup>2</sup> the Church Rate victim in the chair! it was resolved to get up a great public demonstration in Leicester against Church Rates and Ecclesiastical Courts and for the release of Mr. Baines.

At this meeting a unanimous and strong desire was expressed of obtaining your presence and assistance.

Our borough members, Easthope and Ellis,<sup>3</sup> with Hume, Duncombe and others will be invited.

Hamer Stansfeld, Esq. of Leeds informs us that you are expected there January 20 and 21. Leicester is about 8 hours off Liverpool by railway and 6 off Leeds by railway.

The 18th or 19th would suit this locality better than later in the week but we would say the 22nd on your way from Leeds to London, if more agreeable to you.

I state this in the way of business, and we shall suspend our decision as to the day of our meeting till we hear from you.

Mr. W. Baggs, the Chairman of our Reform Society, desires me to remind you that you were once engaged to meet us at Leicester but prevented by a domestic calamity, you promised us your

presence on some future occasion.

Allow me to add that a more decided band of reformers is not to be found in the Empire than ours is.

We fought well for Parl[iamentar]y Reform and returned all Reformers for both town and county. We battled in the front for Corporation Reform. We indignantly protested against the Irish Coercion Bill. We petitioned for Irish corporation reform. We approve of your political conduct and admire your unbounded philanthropy.

We shall be delighted to be able to announce that you will be with us. Requesting a reply as early as convenient.

[P.S.] I enclose a copy of the resolutions proposed for submission to the meeting.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 A Baptist preacher and publisher of religious books.
- 3 William Baines (1806-91), manufacturer in Leicester. A Nonconformist he resisted payment of church rates and was imprisoned in November 1840 until July 1841 for contempt. See *Boase*.
- 3 Wynn Ellis (1790-1875) picture collector and silk merchant. M.P. for Leicester borough 1831-32 and 1839-47. See *DNB*.

2784

*From Thomas Steele to Merrion Square*

Limerick, 27 December 1840

My dear Sir,

. . . King George the 4th who, by his hypocritical visit, swindled old Dunleary out of its ancient name.<sup>1</sup>

You will see in the next *Reporter* a full report of the proceedings of the meeting on the Jamaica Emigration.<sup>2</sup>

I made as good a speech as I could and such as, I hope, you will approve. Mr. Moore,<sup>3</sup> the delegate, did his work with noble spirit, and noble talent.

. . . I yesterday in consequence collected an enormous crowd and at their head proceeded through all the most public parts of the town (the crowd of course continually accumulating) and this was the warning given at almost every hundred yards. I spoke at full length when I had the crowd at the ship, and afterwards at his office near Wellesley Bridge.

'There is a slave ship in the Shannon. Mr William White is

the Agent of the blood-stained House of Assembly of Jamaica. An attempt is making to *kidnap* our poor people. I warn the people against this villainous attempt at *Kidnapping!!!*'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Following George IV's visit to Ireland in 1821, the name Dunlaoghaire or Dunleary was changed to Kingstown. It has since reverted to Dunlaoghaire.
- 2 An attempt was made at this time to recruit Irishmen as labourers for Jamaica in place of the emancipated Negro slaves. Advertisements appeared in the Irish press for this purpose, and a vessel named the *Robert Kerr* entered the Shannon, offering a free passage to Jamaica. O'Connell denounced the project, and sent Steele down to Limerick to warn the people. Despite this, some 240 persons embarked on the *Robert Kerr*, all of whom perished from the effects of the climate within a few months of their arrival in Jamaica (O'Keefe, *O'Connell*, II, 637-8). The meeting referred to took place on 23 December in Limerick under the chairmanship of David Roche, M.P. William White, president of Limerick Chamber of Commerce, and John White, his brother, attended as agents for the emigration company. Resolutions were passed by the meeting condemning the project (*Pilot*, 28 Dec. 1840, quoting *Limerick Chronicle*). According to the *Morning Register* of 31 December 1840 only about twenty passengers sailed.
- 3 Robert Ross Rowan Moore (1814-64), eldest son of Rev. William Moore of Garden Hill, Mount Brown, Dublin. Political economist, barrister, friend of Thomas Davis and member of the Irish anti-slavery society. See *DNB*.

## 2785

*From Miss Millicent Teeling,<sup>1</sup> 28 December 1840, to Dublin*

As secretary of the Catholic Orphan Society of Belfast, she is directed to request an answer to their invitation transmitted to O'Connell. They understand he will be coming to Belfast on Monday and remaining until Wednesday. They hope to have his company on Tuesday evening, for an hour.<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Paper, NLI 13649

- 1 King Street, Belfast.
- 2 O'Connell accepted the invitation and attended a *soirée* on Tuesday, 19 January of this body, the St. Patrick's Orphan Society (*Northern Whig*, 21 Jan. 1841).



## 2786

*From Thomas Steele, Limerick, 29 December 1840, to  
Merrion Square*

States that Browne<sup>1</sup> is too timid to publish his (Steele's) denunciation of White who had assailed 'the truth of our proceedings at the public meeting.'<sup>2</sup>

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 James R. Browne, proprietor of the *Limerick Reporter*.
- 2 See letter 2784.

## 2787

*From Barnaby Scott, Jr.,<sup>1</sup> Archerfield, Kilkenny,  
30 December 1840*

Sends O'Connell the case for the claim to a considerable property 'in this and the adjoining county' by a poor man named Butler of Callan, Co. Kilkenny. The Abbot of Mount Melleray<sup>2</sup> has asked that O'Connell should take up the case on Butler's behalf. It involves a good deal of legal labour. Scott has prepared the case.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Attorney, Dublin and Kilkenny.
- 2 Michael Vincent Ryan.



## *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.

- Abercrombie, John, 2392  
 Abercromby, James, 2625  
 Acheson, Archibald, 2nd earl of Gosford, 2484, 2722-23, 2733  
 Ackland, *see* Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke  
 Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke, 10th baronet, 2540  
 Agnew, John, 2641  
 Albert, Prince, 2665, 2677, 2688, 2717  
 Alcock, Henry, 2470, 2482  
 Alston, Rowland, M.P., 2482  
 Anderson, J.H., 2753  
 Anderson, John, 2491  
 Anglesey, 1st marquis of, *see* Paget, Henry William  
 Anson, Thomas William, 1st earl of Lichfield, 2443, 2596  
 Anstey, Thomas Chisholm, 2370a  
 Archbold, Robert, 2444  
 Arkins, Thomas, 2753  
 Armstrong, Messrs., 2479  
 Armstrong, Francis, 2483  
 Ash, —, 2429  
 Attwood, Thomas, 2553  
 Austen, *see* Austin, Charles  
 Austin, Charles, 2515  
 Austin, Richard, 2483
- Bagge, Henry, 2482  
 Baggs, W., 2783  
 Bagshawe, Henry R., 2694  
 Baines, William, 2783  
 Balfe, Kate (Mrs. Morgan P. O'Connell), 2731, 2747  
 Ballantyne, John, 2597, 2599  
 Banks, Perceval Weldon, 2703  
 Bannerman, Alexander, 2691  
 Baring, Francis Thornhill, 2499a  
 Barrett, Mr., 2678  
 Barrett, Richard, 2386, 2397, 2554, 2562, 2771: 2382, 2390, 2428, 2616, 2624, 2646, 2693, 2743-44, 2746, 2768, 2770, 2773, 2776  
 Barrington, Sir Jonah, 2456  
 Barrington, Matthew, 2439  
 Barron, Henry Winston, 2379, 2384, 2457, 2693  
 Barry, James (Cahir), 2603  
 Bateman, John, 2450, 2510, 2514  
 Bathurst, Archdeacon Henry, 2466  
 Bathurst, Henry, bishop of Norwich, 2466  
 Beamish, Francis Bernard, 2735  
 Beare, Henry E., 2596  
 Becket, Saint Thomas, 2403  
 Beckett, James, 2628  
 Belfast, earl of, *see* Chicester, George Hamilton  
 Bellew, Sir Patrick, 7th baronet, 2458  
 Bellew, Richard Montesquieu, 2458  
 Bentinck, Lord William Henry Cavendish, 2417  
 Bentley, Richard, 2455  
 Beresford, Henry Barre, 2484  
 Beresford, Henry de la Poer, 3rd marquess of Waterford, 2482  
 Beresford, Alderman John Claudius, 2387  
 Berwick, Walter, 2498  
 Bessborough, 5th earl of, *see* Ponsonby, John George Brabazon  
 Bessonett, Francis, 2472  
 Bianconi, Charles, 2683  
 Binns, John, 2499  
 Birch, James, 2386, 2583  
 Birch, James (Dublin), 2491  
 Birney, James Gillespie, 2707  
 Blackburne, Francis, 2553  
 Blacker, Maxwell, 2484  
 Blake, Anthony Richard, 2530  
 Blake, Mark, 2770  
 Blake, Martin J., 2733

- Blake, Rev. Michael, P.P. (later bishop of Dromore), 2713, 2742, 2752  
 Blake, Sir Valentine, 2730, 2733  
 Blake, Valentine O'Connor, 2763  
 Blamire, William, 2701: 2693  
 Blennerhassett, Arthur, Jr., 2450, 2453  
 Blount, Frances, 2693  
 Bodkin, John James, 2702, 2732  
 Booker, Joseph, 2533  
 Borrowes, Robert, 2484  
 Bourke, John (Bourke, John and Son), 2719, 2724  
 Bouverie, William Pleydell-, 3rd earl of Radnor, 2411, 2589  
 Bowring, John, 2758a  
 Boyer, Jean Pierre, 2407  
 Boylan, Patrick, 2491  
 Boyle, Edmund, 8th earl of Cork, 2438a  
 Brabazon, William, *styled* Lord Brabazon, *later* 11th earl of Meath, 2689, 2750  
 Brabazon, Sir William John, 2nd baronet, 2698: 2611, 2700, 2702, 2763  
 Bradshaw, Hercules, 2632, 2636  
 Brady, Maziere, 2601  
 Brady, Sir Nicholas W., 2387  
 Brenan, Charles, 2391  
 Brenan, Maurice, 2550  
 Brewster, Abraham, 2378, 2387  
 Broderick, William, 2491  
 Brooke, Sir Arthur Brinsley, 2nd baronet, 2484  
 Brougham, Henry Peter, 1st Baron Brougham, 2587-88-89, 2608, 2610, 2619, 2667, 2676, 2727  
 Brown, Benjamin, 2484  
 Browne, George Joseph, bishop of Galway, *later* bishop of Elphin, 2572, 2732-33  
 Browne, Howe Peter, 2nd marquis of Sligo, 2574  
 Browne, James R., 2786  
 Browne, Robert Dillon, 2732  
 Browne, Valentine, 2nd earl of Kenmare, 2459, 2578  
 Brownlow, Charles, 2484  
 Bruen, Francis, 2437, 2622  
 Bryan, Major George, 2434, 2438a, 2441, 2446  
 Bruen, Col. Henry, 2437, 2762  
 Buller-Yarde-Buller, Sir John, 3rd baronet, 2674, 2680, 2682  
 Bunbury, Thomas, 2378, 2437  
 Burdett, Sir Francis, 5th baronet, 2401, 2465  
 Burgoyne, John Fox, 2410  
 Burke, Major William (magistrate), 2392  
 Bushe, Charles Kendal, 2456  
 Butler, —, 2787  
 Butler, John, *styled* earl of Ossory, *later* 2nd Marquess of Ormonde, 2434  
 Butler, Col the Hon. Pierce, 2434, 2441, 2605a, 2700  
 Butler, Richard, 2nd Earl of Glengall, 2603  
 Butler, William, R.N., 2605a  
 Buxton, Thomas Fowell, 2767  
 Byron, Lord, 2658  
 Cahill, Charles Staunton, 2409, 2452  
 Calhoun, John C., 2707  
 Callaghan, Daniel, 2438a  
 Callaghan, Ignatius, 2606  
 Campbell, Mr., 2760  
 Campbell, John, 2608  
 Cantwell, John, bishop of Meath, 2742  
 Carlos, Don, 2397, 2456  
 Carolin, Edward, Jr., 2491  
 Carolin, Edward, Sr., 2491  
 Caulfield, Francis William, 2nd earl of Charlemont, 2621, 2722-23, 2733  
 Caulfield, Hon. Henry, 2733  
 Cavendish, Hon. Frederick, 2770-71  
 Chapman, Sir Montague, 3rd baronet, 2665  
 Charlemont, 2nd earl of, *see* Caulfield, Francis William  
 Charles, —, 2483  
 Chaytor, Joshua M., 2695  
 Chichester, George Hamilton, *styled* earl of Belfast, 2489, 2509  
 Childs, John, 2659, 2684  
 Claiborne, Rev. Richard, 2585  
 Clancy, William, 2548  
 Clarendon, 4th earl of, *see* Villiers, George William Frederick  
 Clarkson, Thomas, 2692, 2738  
 Clay, Charles, 2372  
 Cleave, John, 2433, 2485b, 2781: 2485a  
 Clements, Edward, 2775  
 Clermont, bishop of, *see* Féron, Louis  
 Clinton, William, 2483, 2491  
 Clive, Viscount, *see* Herbert *formerly* Clive, Edward  
 Cloncurry, 2nd Baron, *see* Lawless, Valentine Browne  
 Close, James Strathearne, 2520  
 Close, Maxwell, 2484  
 Cobbett, William, 2751  
 Cobden, Richard, 2597, 2599, 2668: 2465, 2598  
 Cole, William Willoughby, *styled* Viscount Cole, *later* 3rd earl of Enniskillen, 2392  
 Colles, William, 2736a  
 Collins, John Anderson, 2758a  
 Collisson, Daniel M., 2715

- Cologne, archbishop of, *see* von Droste zu Vischering, Clemens
- Conder, Josiah, 2522-23
- Connell, Rev. John., 2527
- Connell, John A., 2527
- Connery, Peter, 2483: 2491, 2548
- Connor, Mr., 2376a
- Connor, Charles, 2412
- Connor, Ellen, 2412
- Connor, James, 2412
- Conway, Frederick William, 2553, 2555: 2453, 2705, 2748
- Cooté, Sir Charles Henry, 9th baronet, 2430
- Cooté, Charles Henry, *later* 10th baronet, 2430, 2437, 2437a
- Copley, Sir John Singleton, Kt., *later* 1st Baron Lyndhurst, 2608, 2616, 2634
- Coppock, Henry, 2465
- Cork, 8th earl of, *see* Boyle, Edmund
- Cormac, Denis, 2621a
- Cormick, Michael, 2393
- Cosgrave, James, 2484
- Costello, Patrick, 2461
- Costello, Rev. Thomas O'Brien, 2623
- Courtenay, George William Conway, 2407
- Courtney, Thomas (attorney), 2521
- Crampton, Rev. Josiah, 2741
- Crampton, Surgeon Philip, 2741
- Crawford, William, 2471, 2725
- Crawford, William Sharman, 2408, 2459, 2567, 2572, 2641, 2733, 2746
- Crawley, — (attorney), 2676
- Crawley, Rev. —, 2676
- Creighton, John, 2484
- Cremorne, Lady, 2438a
- Crewe, Sir George, baronet, 2390
- Croker, Rev. John, 2393a
- Croly Rev. George, 2737
- Croly, William, Catholic archbishop of Armagh, 2758
- Croly, Rev. George, LL.D., 2676
- Croly, Henry, 2676, 2681
- Cruikshank, George, 2455
- Cumberland, Ernest Augustus, duke of, 2397
- Cumming, John, 2395
- Curran, William Henry, 2475
- Curtis, Robert, 2563, 2757: 2482
- Daly, Sergeant, 2665
- Daly, James (Dunsandle), ? 2481
- Darley, Frederick, 2387
- Daunt, William Joseph O'Neill, 2751
- Davern, Rev. Patrick O'Brien, 2555, 2561
- Davis, Thomas, 2784
- Dawson, George Robert, 2428
- Delany, Rev. D.B., 2463
- De Maistre, Joseph M., 2564a
- Denvir, Rev. Cornelius, 2725, 2758
- D'Este, Sir Augustus, 2534
- d'Etchegoyan, Jean Louis Bernard, Baron, 2495
- Diamond, Alex., 2499
- Dickens, Charles, 2455, 2739
- Dickson, William, 2499
- Diggan, —, 2429
- Dillon, —, 2503
- Dixon, William, 2387
- Doheny, Michael, 2561
- Doherty, John, 2553
- Dolan, Terence, 2489, 2736
- Dolman, Charles, 2533: 2694
- Dower, John, 2671
- Downes, Judge William, 2557
- Downing, Washington, 2782a
- Downshire, 3rd marquis of, *see* Hill, Arthur Blundell Sandys
- Drummond, Messrs. (bankers), 2694
- Drummond, Thomas, 2452, 2458-59, 2463, 2492, 2498, 2605, 2642: 2377, 2384, 2456, 2460, 2482, 2503, 2559, 2574, 2576, 2703
- Dryden, John, 2455
- Dublin Chamber of Commerce, 2675
- Duffy, Charles Gavan, 2723, 2737, 2758, 2760
- Duggan, John, 2759
- Duggan, Timothy, 2782
- Duncannon, Viscount, *see* Ponsonby, John William
- Duncombe, Thomas S., 2600, 2684, 2783
- Dunlop, Durham, 2583
- Dunne, Jeremiah, 2691
- Durham, 1st earl of, *see* Lambton, John George
- Dwyer, Dr., 2590
- Dwyer, James, B.L., 2583: 2449
- Easthope, John, 2369c, 2376a, 2729a, 2734, 2782a: 2783
- Ebrington, Viscount, *see* Fortescue, Hugh
- Egan, Cornelius, bishop of Kerry, 2752
- Egan, Edward, 2754
- Egerton, Lord Francis, *see* Gower, Lord Francis Leveson -
- Eldon, 1st Baron, *see* Scott, John
- Elizabeth, Queen, 2718
- Ellice, Edward, 2430: 2527
- Elliot, Charles, 2667
- Ellis, Wynn, 2783
- Elphinstone, Howard, 2435: 2369c

- England, Rev. John (bishop of Charleston), 2407
- England, Rev. Thomas Richard, 2407
- Evans, George de Lacy, 2489, 2661
- Evans, George Hampden, 2580, 2622, 2750
- Ewart, William, 2376, 2434-35, 2446, 2514
- Ewing, William, 2464
- Excise, Chairman of the board of, *see* Wood, John
- Fagan, William Trant, 2471, 2725, 2733, 2751
- Falls, James O'Neill, 2768
- Feeny, Thomas, bishop of Killala, 2733
- Fenton, John, 2370, 2375
- Ferguson, Sir Robert Alexander, 2nd baronet, 2428, 2686
- Féron Louis, bishop of Clermont, 2593
- Ferrall, Simon A., 2389
- ffrench, Betsey, *see also* O'Connell, Elizabeth Mary (Betsey) (daughter), 2631, 2638: 2660, 2713
- ffrench, Charles Austin, 3rd Baron ffrench, 2732-33
- ffrench, Hon. Martin Joseph, 2733
- ffrench, Hon. Thomas, 2733
- Fieldon, John, 2677
- Finn, William F., 2434, 2438a, 2441
- Fitzgerald, —, 2578
- FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick, 3rd duke of Leinster, 2621
- Fitzgerald, Edward Michael, 2765
- Fitzgerald, John Purcell, 2462a, 2482
- Fitzgerald, Thomas (Cork), 2728: 2719, 2724
- FitzMaurice, Henry Petty, 3rd marquis of Lansdowne, 2426
- FitzPatrick, Miss, 2587
- Fitzpatrick, John Wilson, 2430, 2437, 2437a
- FitzPatrick, Patrick Vincent, 2378, 2382-83, 2388, 2390, 2406, 2409, 2411, 2413-18, 2420, 2450, 2453, 2455-56, 2460, 2472, 2501-2-3, 2509, 2511, 2514-15, 2519-20, 2531, 2540, 2542, 2545-46, 2551, 2568-70, 2572, 2587, 2589, 2594, 2596, 2605a, 2606, 2608, 2610-11, 2616, 2618-21, 2624-25, 2627, 2629-30, 2634, 2643, 2645-46, 2648, 2650-51, 2653, 2655-58, 2666, 2669, 2674, 2677, 2680, 2682-83, 2685, 2686a-87, 2688, 2691, 2700, 2710, 2713, 2717-19, 2720a, 2722, 2724-27, 2731, 2744, 2746, 2748, 2762, 2768, 2773-74, 2776, 2779: 2723, 2742
- Fitzpatrick, William (23 Dame St.), 2542
- Fitz-Simon, Christopher, 2377, 2769: 2374, 2378, 2417, 2482, 2568, 2685, 2724, 2746, 2753
- Fitz-Simon, Christopher O'Connell, 2753
- Fitz-Simon, Daniel O'Connell, 2753
- Fitz-Simon, Ellen, *see also* O'Connell, 2533
- Fitz-Simon, Nicholas, 2648
- Flanagan, Rev. Matthew, 2775
- Fleming, John Smyth, 2387
- Fletcher, Rev. John, 2564a
- Flinn, Rev. Mr. *see* Flynn, Rev. Martin, Flynn, Maurice, 2498
- Flynn, Rev. Martin, 2498
- Foran, Rev. Nicholas, 2482, 2563, 2757
- Forbes, George John, Viscount Forbes, 2399
- Fortescue, Hugh, *styled* Viscount Ebrington, 2575, 2581, 2644, 2647, 2649, 2690: 2559, 2761
- Foster, F. Blake, ? 2481
- Foster, Robert Blake, 2481
- Fowler, R.I., 2496
- Fox, Charles, 2381, 2399
- Franklin, Sir Richard, 2756
- French, Arthur (General Association), 2381, 2405, 2454: 2418, 2606, 2765
- French, Arthur, *later* 1st Baron de Freyne, 2430
- French, Fitz-Stephen, 2430
- Frost, John, 2665
- Fuller, James Cannings, 2767
- Galloway, Alexander, 2538: 2532
- Gallwey, Christopher (Kit), 2577
- Gardiner, George, 2521
- George IV (*see also* George Augustus Frederick, prince of Wales, later prince regent), 2784
- Gibson, James, 2509
- Gisborne, Thomas, 2622
- Gleeson, Thomas, 2559, 2574, 2576, 2605
- Glenelg, 1st Baron, *see* Grant, Charles
- Glengall, 2nd earl of, *see* Butler, Richard
- Gordon, Jules, 2369a, 2369b
- Gosford, 2nd earl of, *see* Acheson, Archibald
- Goulburn, Henry, 2411
- Gower, Lord Francis Leveson -, 2383, 2386, 2389-90
- Graham, Sir James Robert, 2nd baronet, 2418, 2698, 2700, 2705
- Grant, Charles, 1st baron Glenelg, 2398, 2400, 2401, 2514, 2525, 2589
- Grattan, Henry Jr., 2399, 2418, 2622

- Greene, John, 2755  
 Greene, Richard Wilson, 2454  
 Greene, William, 2697  
 Grégoire, Abbé Henri Baptiste, 2407  
 Gregory XVI, Pope, 2369a, 2593, 2673  
 Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl Grey, 2559, 2709  
 Grey Sir George, 2nd baronet, 2400: 2398, 2401, 2525  
 Grey, Henry George, *styled* Viscount Howick, 2474: 2589, 2710, 2720a  
 Griffiths, Bishop Thomas, 2630, 2709  
 Grote, George, 2381, 2508, 2559, 2598, 2608, 2611, 2687  
 Gubbins, Joseph, 2578  
 Guinness, Arthur, 2651
- Haddington, 9th earl of, *see* Hamilton, Thomas  
 Hadley, Benjamin, 2486  
 Haliday, Charles, 2675  
 Hall, Roger, 2484  
 Hamilton, George Alexander, 2409, 2451, 2775  
 Hamilton, General James, 2767  
 Hamilton, Thomas, *styled* Lord Binning, *later* 9th earl of Haddington, 2390a  
 Hanlon, Thomas, 2483, 2491  
 Hannah (a servant), 2660  
 Hardinge, Sir Henry, Kt., 2397, 2558  
 Hare, William, 2489  
 Harmer, James, 2538  
 Harnett, William, 2511, 2634, 2661, 2749  
 Harney, George, J., 2485a: 2485b  
 Hart, William Sterne, 2687  
 Harty, Robert Way (later 1st baronet), 2436  
 Harty, William, 2633  
 Harvey, Daniel Whittle, 2590, 2608  
 Harvey, Thomas, 2524  
 Hatton, George James Finch -, *styled* Viscount Maidstone, 2509  
 Hatton, George William Finch -, 10th earl of Winchelsea, 2512-13, 2516-17-18  
 Haughton, James, 2673  
 Haughton, Thomas, 2437: 2437a  
 Haverty, Joseph Patrick, 2593  
 Hay, Edward, 2582  
 Hayes, Sir Edmund Samuel, 3rd baronet, 2484  
 Hayes, Joseph, 2652, 2735: 2751  
 Healy, Mr. (Manchester), 2782  
 Healy, Thomas Ambrose, 2573, 2580  
 Heany, Patrick, 2387  
 Heard, John Issac, 2432  
 Hearn, Owen, 2573
- Hebbe, G.C., 2729  
 Herbert *formerly* Clive, Edward, *styled* Viscount Clive, 2398  
 Heries, John Charles, 2687  
 Herron, William B., 2485  
 Hickman, Edward S., 2421  
 Hickson, -, 2407  
 Hickson, George Blac, 2450, 2514  
 Hickson, James (Kenmare), 2426-27  
 Hickson, Samuel Murray, 2450  
 Hicksons, the, 2426  
 Hill, Arthur Blundell Sandys, 3rd marquis of Downshire, 2378  
 Hill, Sir Dudley St. Leger, 2525  
 Hill, Rowland, 1st Baron Hill, 2417, 2430, 2678  
 Hilliard, Samuel, 2708  
 Hobhouse, Sir John Cam, 2nd baronet, 2383  
 Hodges, William, 2435a  
 Holmes, Robert, 2520  
 Horner, Francis, 2686  
 Horsman, Edward, 2399  
 Howard, Frederick John, 2604  
 Howard, George William Frederick, *styled* Viscount Morpeth, 2461, 2494, 2543, 2550, 2678: 2390a, 2402, 2403, 2503, 2507, 2514, 2542, 2558, 2574, 2589, 2629, 2642  
 Howick, Viscount, *see* Grey, Henry George  
 Hoyte, George, 2387  
 Hughes, Mr., 2734  
 Hume, Joseph, 2434, 2446, 2464, 2489, 2500, 2559, 2608, 2610-11, 2613-14-15, 2621a, 2640, 2687, 2691, 2783  
 Hutt, William, 2531  
 Hutton, Robert, 2451, 2457, 2520  
 Hyndman, John Elliot, 2687a
- Jackson, Joseph Devonsher, 2383, 2438a, 2482, 2687, 2689  
 Jacob, Ebenezer, 2671  
 Jervis, Sir Henry Meredyth Jervis-White-, 2nd baronet, 2484  
 Johnston, John Kent, 2739, 2742-43  
 Jones, Daniel, 2377  
 Jones, Edward, 2379, 2384  
 Jones, John, 2499a  
 Jones, Richard, 2753  
 Joy, Henry, 2553
- Kavanagh, Thomas, 2377-78  
 Keane, John Henry, 2482  
 Keane, Sir Richard, 2nd baronet, 2482  
 Kearney, Hickman, 2387  
 Keily, John, 2482  
 Kenmare, 2nd earl of, *see* Browne, Valentine

- Kennedy, James Shaw, 2377  
 Kent, Duchess of, 2406  
 Keogh, Cornelius L., 2424  
 Keogh, John, 2424  
 King, Abraham Bradley, 2387  
 Kirk, Peter, 2438a  
 Kirwan Mr., 2547  
 Kirwan, Andrew V., 2422, 2474a, 2475-76-77  
 Kirwan, Rev. Joseph, 2691  
 Kirwan, Thomas, 2557
- Labouchere, Henry, 2683  
 Ladbroke, Kingscote and Gillman (bankers), 2622  
 Lamb, William, 2nd Viscount Melbourne, 2535: 2378, 2406, 2411, 2416, 2447, 2472, 2478, 2574, 2576, 2589, 2608, 2610-11, 2618, 2621, 2665  
 Lambert, Henry, 2755  
 Lambton, John George, 1st earl of Durham, 2431, 2438: 2411, 2417, 2435a, 2587, 2590  
 Lamprey, Joseph, 2387  
 Landor, Walter Savage, 2562  
 Lane, —, 2435  
 Lansdowne, 3rd marquis of, *see* Fitz-Maurice, Henry Petty  
 Lartigue, Jean Jacques, bishop of Montreal, 2709  
 Latouche, David Charles, 2373  
 Lawless, Edward, *later* 3rd Baron Cloncurry, 2444, 2623  
 Lawless, Valentine Browne, 2nd Baron Cloncurry, 2444, 2545, 2622  
 Lawlor, John Shea, 2437a  
 Lea, Rev. Henry, 2709  
 Leader, John Temple, 2401  
 Leary, John Frederick, 2489  
 Leavitt, Joshua, 2707  
 Lee, Daniel, 2782: 2668  
 Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association, 2766  
 Lees, Sir Edward Smith, Kt., 2443  
 Lees, Jane, 2443  
 Lefevre, Charles Shaw, 2415, 2625, 2646  
 Lefroy, Thomas Langlois, 2381, 2619  
 Leinster, 3rd duke of, *see* FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick  
 Lennon, C. (?Jr.), 2737  
 Lennox, Charles, 5th duke of Richmond, 2441, 2589  
 Leopold I, king of the Belgians, 2540  
 Le Sage, —, 2672  
 Leslie, Eliza, 2493  
 Leslie, R.G., 2493
- Lichfield, 1st earl of, *see* Anson, Thomas William  
 Liddell, Henry Thomas, 2531, 2691  
 Lillie, Sir John Scott, Kt., 2489  
 Limerick Tallow Chandlers, 2778  
 Linen and Cotton Weavers of Belfast, 2641  
 Listowel, 2nd earl of, *see* Hare, William  
 Literary Association of the Friends of Poland, 2654  
 Livesey, —, 2674  
 Lodge, John, 2729a  
 Londonderry, 3rd marquis of, *see* Vane, Charles William  
 Louis-Philippe, king of the French, 2767  
 Lovett, William, 2485a  
 Lucas, Frederick, 2780: 2739  
 Lynam, William, 2483  
 Lynch, George D., 2761: 2510  
 Lynch, Jerry, 2412  
 Lyndhurst, 1st Baron, *see* Copley, John Singleton  
 Lyons, Thomas, 2591, 2751  
 Lysaght, H., 2393
- McAlister, Charles, 2774  
 Macauley, Thomas Babington, 2705  
 MacCabe, William Bernard, 2740  
 McCarthy, Dan, Jr. (Dublin), 2577  
 McCarthy, Daniel (Dublin), 2577  
 McCarthy, Jeremiah (Dawson, St., Dublin), 2700  
 Macartney, George, 1st earl Macartney, 2479  
 McDaniel, Patrick, 2491  
 MacDonnell, Eneas, 2600  
 MacDonnell, G., 2600  
 McEnnery, John G., 2426, 2429  
 MacHale, John, Catholic archbishop of Tuam, 2402-3, 2408, 2505, 2508, 2526, 2530, 2552, 2556, 2560, 2574, 2576, 2600, 2605, 2663, 2670, 2699, 2702, 2730, 2732-33, 2763, 2770: 2406, 2572, 2631, 2691, 2713, 2771, 2773, 2776  
 McKenna, John, 2542  
 McKenna, Joseph Neale, 2580  
 McKenna, Michael, 2580  
 MacLoughlin, Cornelius, 2509  
 MacMahon, William, *later* 1st baronet, 2474a  
 McManus, George, 2548  
 McMullen, John, 2448, 2499a  
 McNamara, Rev. Justin F., 2396  
 McNicholas, Patrick, Catholic bishop of Achonry, 2776



- Macrory, Adam John, 2633  
 McSwiney, Bridget, 2490  
 McSwiney, Myles, 2480, 2490  
 Mackey, William, 2483  
 Madden, Martin, 2378  
 Madden, Richard Robert, 2673  
 Maguire, Peter, 2639: 2584,  
 Mahomet, Ali, 2594, 2767  
 Mahony, Pierce, 2396, 2432, 2440,  
 2442, 2445, 2447, 2449, 2544, 2749:  
 2631, 2633, 2772, 2775  
 Maidstone, Viscount, *see* Hatton, George  
   James Finch-  
 Maley, Michael, 2387: 2388  
 Markham, Mr., 2604  
 Marsland, Henry, 2465  
 Martin, H.J., 2661  
 Martin, James, 2573  
 Martin, Richard, M.P., ?2481  
 Martin, Thomas Barnewall, 2611, 2702  
 Mason, —, 2483  
 Mathew, Rev. Theobald, 2665, 2673  
 Maule, William Henry, 2437, 2589  
 Maxwell, Cornelius, 2385  
 Meagher, Thomas, 2751  
 Meara, Charles and Co., 2719, 2724  
 Melbourne, 2nd Viscount, *see* Lamb,  
   William  
 Merlin, —, 2454  
 Meyler, Robert, 2388  
 Michell, James Charles, 2390a, 2395a,  
   2395b  
 Miley, Rev. John, 2572  
 Milliken, Richard, 2455  
 Moffett, Mr., 2768  
 Molesworth, Sir William, baronet, 2514,  
   2608, 2611, 2677  
 Molony, Walter, 2641  
 Montlosier, Comte de, 2593  
 Montreal, bishop of, *see* Lartigue, Jean  
   Jacques  
 Mooney, Mary, 2676  
 Mooney, Thomas, 2772  
 Moore, Robert, 2436  
 Moore, Robert Ross Rowan, 2784  
 Moore, Thomas, 2456  
 Morpeth, Viscount, *see* Howard, George  
   William Frederick  
 Morris, Sir Benjamin, Kt., 2482, 2582,  
   2759  
 Morris, Shapland Carew, 2482  
 Morton, —, 2483  
 Mostyn, Bishop Francis, 2693  
 Mott, Lucretia C., 2720-21  
 Mulgrave, 2nd earl of, *see* Phipps,  
   Constantine Henry  
 Mullen, Joseph D., 2399: 2414, 2417,  
   2456, 2458-60  
 Mullins, Frederick W., 2397, 2439,  
   2450, 2453  
 Muntz, George Frederick, 2486  
 Muntz, Philip H., 2486  
 Murphy, John Joseph, 2689  
 Murphy, Michael H., 2399  
 Murphy, Thaddeus William, 2429  
 Murphy, William (Smithfield), 2643,  
   2686a  
 Murray, Daniel, Catholic archbishop of  
   Dublin, 2398, 2401: 2400, 2508,  
   2572, 2582, 2670, 2736  
 Murray, T. Lamie, 2470, 2482, 2652  
 Musgrave, John, 2482  
  
 Nangle, Rev. Edward, 2663  
 Neville, Miss, 2594  
 Neville, Mrs., 2594  
 Newport, Sir John, 1st baronet, 2691  
 Nicholas I, Czar, 2657, 2767  
 Nicholls, George, 2542  
 Nicholson, Rev. Francis Joseph, 2593  
 Norbury, 2nd earl of, *see* Toler, Hector  
   John Graham  
 Normanby, 1st marquess of, *see* Phipps,  
   Constantine Henry  
 Norreys, Sir Denham Jephson, *formerly*  
   Jephson, Charles Denham Orlando,  
   2601  
  
 Oastler, Richard, 2553  
 O'Brien, Cornelius, 2393  
 O'Brien, Thomas, 2571  
 O'Brien, William (publican), 2491  
 O'Brien, William Smith, 2601: 2397,  
   2472, 2611, 2623, 2632  
 O'Callaghan, Hugh, 2458-59  
 O'Callaghan, Hugh, brother of, 2459  
 O'Connell, Catherine (Kate, daughter),  
   2549, 2609: 2660, 2664  
 O'Connell, Charles (son-in-law), 2442,  
   2549, 2609, 2660, 2664, 2690  
 O'Connell, Charles (Ennis), 2567  
 O'Connell, Daniel (son), 2480, 2756,  
   2768  
 O'Connell, Lt. Gen. Daniel Charles,  
   Count, 2474a-75, 2490, 2495, 2645  
 O'Connell, Daniel John (son of John  
   O'Connell, M.P.), 2660  
 O'Connell, Eliza (daughter-in-law), 2590,  
   2660, 2775  
 O'Connell, Eliza (granddaughter), 2742  
 O'Connell, Emily, 2662  
 O'Connell, James, 2480, 2495: 2590  
 O'Connell, John (brother), 2578: 2429  
 O'Connell, John (son), 2590, 2704,  
   2739, 2742-43, 2745, 2747, 2750,  
   2765, 2772, 2775: 2442, 2447, 2449,

- 2454, 2480, 2490, 2495, 2503, 2593, 2646, 2660, 2746, 2751, 2756, 2770, 2773, 2776
- O'Connell, Mary (wife), 2456, 2545, 2593, 2729a
- O'Connell, Mary Frances (daughter-in-law), 2421, 2511
- O'Connell, Maurice (son), 2421: 2403, 2426-27, 2429, 2450, 2465, 2480, 2510-11, 2514, 2631, 2660, 2756, 2772
- O'Connell, Maurice (Kilgorey), 2662
- O'Connell, Maurice Charles, 2397, 2661
- O'Connell, Maurice Charles Philip (*later* Sir Maurice), 2506
- O'Connell, Morgan John, 2450, 2503, 2521
- O'Connell, Morgan P. (son), 2418, 2480, 2503, 2646, 2690, 2731, 2743, 2747, 2756, 2768
- O'Connell, Baron Moritz, 2474a-75
- O'Connor, Feargus Edward, 2559, 2589
- O'Driscoll, Redmond, 2438a, 2733
- O'Dwyer, Andrew Carew, 2458, 2527
- O'Ferrall, Hon. Matilda More, 2665
- O'Ferrall, Richard More, 2438a, 2612, 2665: 2430, 2439, 2444
- O'Flahertie-v-Martin, 2691
- O'Hagan, Thomas, 2568
- O'Leary, Rev. Jeremiah, 2394
- O'Loghlen, Michael, 2373-74, 2462, 2575, 2608
- O'Malley, St. Clair, 2574, 2576
- O'Malley, Sir Samuel, 1st baronet, 2730, 2733, 2763
- O'Mullane, Edward, 2480
- Ossory, earl of, *see* Butler, John
- O'Toole, James, 2492
- Oxford, Edward, 2717
- Paget, Henry William, 1st marquis of Anglesey, 2553, 2559, 2589
- Palmer, —, 2511
- Palmerston, 3rd Viscount, *see* Temple, Henry John
- Parkes, Joseph, 2598, 2622: 2597, 2599
- Pattison, James, 2691
- Pease, Joseph, 2667: 2692
- Peel, Robert, second baronet, 2536-37, 2539, 2541: 2383, 2386, 2428, 2540, 2542-43, 2556, 2559, 2576, 2587, 2600, 2608, 2614-15-16, 2618-19, 2665, 2678, 2680, 2686a, 2687, 2727
- Perceval, Alexander, 2619
- Perrin, Arthur, 2387
- Perrin Louis, 2437
- Perry, Mr., 2435
- Philadelphia Citizens, 2499
- Philips, Mark, 2691
- Philpotts, Henry, D.D., 2512-13
- Phipps, Constantine Henry, 2nd earl of Mulgrave (*later* 1st marquess of Normanby), 2373-74, 2380, 2602: 2378-79, 2384, 2390, 2392, 2397, 2403, 2417-18, 2430, 2441, 2444, 2458-59, 2462a, 2468, 2482, 2486-87, 2527, 2531, 2543, 2545-46, 2550, 2553, 2559, 2574-75, 2589, 2606, 2611
- Pickering, Ralph, 2473
- Pigot, David Richard, 2557-58-59, 2586, 2687a: 2468, 2560, 2601, 2665
- Plunket, William Conyngham, 1st Baron Plunket, 2379, 2456, 2459, 2575, 2578, 2608, 2643
- Plunkett, Arthur James, *styled* Lord Killeen (*later* 9th earl of Fingall), 2574
- Polls/Potts, 2532
- Ponsonby, Hon. Frederick George Brabazon, 2762, 2765, 2775
- Ponsonby, John George Brabazon, *later* 5th earl of Bessborough, 2434
- Ponsonby, John William, *styled* Viscount Duncannon, 2544
- Power, Edmond, 2461
- Power, James (Ballydine), 2482
- Power, Patrick William, 2482
- Prendergast, Maurice, 2772
- Primrose, John, Jr., 2532, 2595, 2660: 2480, 2510, 2724
- Primrose, John, Sr., 2708
- Primrose, Rickarda (*née* Connor), 2532
- Prittie, Henry, 2754
- Prunty, Bridget, 2381
- Prunty, Peter, 2381
- Purcell, Peter, 2462a: 2482, 2569, 2582-83, 2774
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie, 2582
- Pyne, Edmond, 2498
- Quin, Michael J., 2370a
- Quinton, Thomas James, 2499a
- Radnor, 3rd earl of, *see* Bouverie, William Pleydell -
- Rawdon, John Dawson, 2438a
- Ray, Thomas M., 2548, 2573, 2588, 2689: 2451, 2454, 2542, 2624, 2628, 2646, 2665, 2722, 2724, 2742-43, 2745, 2747, 2750, 2753, 2755, 2765, 2768, 2772, 2775
- Reade, William Morris, 2482

- Redmond, John, 2736, 2769  
 Redmond, John (nephew of John Redmond of Mountpleasant), 2769  
 Redmond, Maurice, 2542  
 Reily, Thomas White, 2596  
 Rennie, Matthew Boulton, 2438a  
 Reynolds, John, 2470, 2482  
 Reynolds, Thomas, 2750, 2765, 2775  
 Rice, Stephen Edmund Spring, 2439, 2547  
 Rice, Thomas Spring, 2410, 2640: 2385, 2390a, 2497, 2503, 2542, 2633, 2646, 2650-51, 2653, 2655-56-57, 2691  
 Richard, Edward William, 2714  
 Richards, John, 2373, 2459, 2575  
 Richardson, William, 2661a: 2719, 2724  
 Richmond, 5th duke of, *see* Lennox, Charles  
 Riddell, Rev. William, 2693  
 Rintoul, Robert Stephen, 2457  
 Robinson, Dr., (St. Lucia), 2525  
 Roche, David, 2756, 2778, 2784  
 Roche, James (Cork), 2471, 2565  
 Roche, William (Limerick), 2471, 2778  
 Roc, George, 2741  
 Roebuck, John A., 2457  
 Romilly, Frederick, 2711: 2712  
 Roskell, J., 2470, 2482  
 Rowan, Robert, 2379, 2384  
 Rowan, Thomas, 2728  
 Russell, Lord John, 2617: 2383, 2399, 2411, 2478, 2497, 2501, 2502, 2511, 2526, 2531, 2535-36, 2540, 2542, 2543-44, 2550, 2559-60, 2576, 2589, 2600, 2602-3, 2605a, 2606, 2608, 2634, 2640, 2645, 2648, 2651, 2653, 2684-85, 2699  
 Ruthven, Edward, 2444  
 Ruthven, Edward Southwell, 2444  
 Ryan, Elizabeth, *later* Mrs. John O'Connell, 2490  
 Ryan, Ellen, widow of James Ryan, 2593  
 Ryan, Dom. Michael Vincent, 2672: 2787  
 Ryder, Dudley, *styled* Viscount Sandon, 2376, 2514  
 Sadleir, Thomas, Jr., 2703  
 Salt, T.C., 2486  
 Sandon, Viscount, *see* Ryder, Dudley  
 Santa Anna, Antonio Ropez de, 2661  
 Saurin, William, 2456  
 Sausse, Matthew Richard, 2507: 2399  
 Savage, Francis, 2753  
 Scholefield, Joshua, 2478  
 Scott, Barnaby, Jr., 2787  
 Scott, John, 1st Baron Eldon, 2626, 2781  
 Scott, John Bindon, 2421, 2442, 2648, 2661  
 Scott, Sir Walter, 2464  
 Scott, William, 1st Baron Stowell, 2707  
 Scully, Denys, 2441  
 Scully, James (Tipperary), 2506  
 Scully, James D., 2547: 2441  
 Scully, Captain John, 2506  
 Seton, Alexander, 2371, 2468, 2607, 2637  
 Shapler, P., 2707  
 Shaw, Frederick, 2381, 2387, 2689  
 Shea, Patrick, 2488  
 Sheehan, Rev. John, 2379, 2384, 2470, 2481, 2582, 2693, 2759: 2498, 2563, 2768  
 Sheehan, Patrick, M.D. 2379, 2384  
 Sheil, Rev. James, 2392, 2584  
 Sheil, Richard Lalor, 2664: 2378, 2458, 2474a, 2503, 2542, 2605a, 2606, 2621a  
 Sheridan, Edward, M.D., 2557, 2765  
 Sherlock, Alexander, 2441: 2482  
 Sherrard's valuation, 2507, 2543  
 Silk Weavers Committee, 2628  
 Sinnott, Rev. John, 2755  
 Slattery, Rev. Michael, P.P. *later* Catholic archbishop of Cashel, 2504, 2529, 2561, 2564  
 Sligo, 2nd marquis of, *see* Browne, Howe Peter,  
 Smiles, Samuel, 2766  
 Smith, James A., 2395  
 Smith, John Atcheson, 2686  
 Smith, John B., 2596a, 2598: 2597  
 Smith, Bishop Richard Patrick, 2593  
 Smith, Thomas Berry Cusac, 2484  
 Smithwick, Edmond, 2613-14, 2621a: 2385  
 Smithwick, Richard, 2614, 2621a  
 Smyth, John, 2490  
 Smyth, Richard, 2387  
 Somerville, Sir William Meredyth, 5th baronet, 2422  
 Southwell, Thomas Anthony, 3rd Viscount Southwell, 2459  
 Speakers of the House of Commons, *see* Abercromby, James; Lefevre, Charles Shaw  
 Spencer, Rev. George, 2582  
 Spencer, John Charles, *styled* Viscount Althorp, *later* 3rd Earl Spencer, 2479  
 Spooner, William, 2370a  
 Spottiswoode, Andrew, 2472, 2515, 2520, 2531  
 Spratt, Francis, 2436  
 Stack, Richard, 2665

- Stafford, Rev. William, 2736  
 Stanhope, Hon. Col. Leicester, 2424  
 Stanley, Edward Geoffrey Smith, 2389, 2403, 2560, 2605a, 2680, 2686a, 2698, 2699, 2702, 2704, 2710, 2718, 2720a, 2722, 2726, 2730, 2760  
 Stanley, Edward John, 2580  
 Stansfeld, Hamer, 2766, 2783  
 Staunton, Michael, 2395: 2504, 2744, 2746  
 Steele, Thomas, 2756, 2764, 2784, 2786: 2740  
 Stephens, James (the Fenian), 2782a  
 Stephens, Joseph R., 2470a  
 Stephens, William, 2436  
 Sterne, Charles, 2592  
 Stevenson, Andrew, 2566  
 Stevenson, John, 2746  
 Stock, Joseph, 2387, 2547  
*Stockdale-v-Hansard*, 2674  
 Stowell, Rev. Hugh, 2780  
 Stowell, 1st Baron, *see* Scott, William  
 Strickland, Sir George, 2525  
 Stuart, Lord Dudley Coutts, 2654  
 Stuart, Henry Villiers, 2379, 2482  
 Stuart, James, 2569  
 Stuart, William Villiers, 2379, 2384  
 Sturge, Joseph, 2524-25, 2635, 2705, 2767: 2597, 2599, 2661  
 Sugden, Sir Edward Burtenshaw, kt., 2626  
 Sugrue, Charles, 2590  
 Sullivan, Richard, 2385, 2425, 2434, 2446, 2500, 2615: 2614  
 Sussex, Augustus Frederick, duke of, 2534, 2589  
 Sydney, Sir William Robert, Kt., 2489  
 Talbot, John H., 2755  
 Taylor, John, 2388, 2590-91, 2652  
 Teeling, Millicent, 2785  
 Temple, Henry John, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, 2407, 2635, 2767  
 Tennent, James Emerson, 2633, 2641  
 Thomas, Henry, 2396, 2440  
 Thompson, Poulet, *see* Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett  
 Thompson, Thomas Blennerhassett, 2426  
 Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett (later 1st Baron Sydenham), 2470a  
 Thorogood, John, 2684  
 Tighe, Robert, 2521  
 Tighe, William Frederick Fownes, 2438a, 2441  
 Tilly, B., 2433  
 Tobin, Rev. Michael, 2603  
 Toler, Hector John Graham, 2nd earl of Norbury, 2581, 2587-88  
 Townsend, Henry, 2666  
 Tracy, William S., 2377  
 Troy, John Thomas, Catholic archbishop of Dublin, 2398, 2582  
 Tyndall, Samuel Wilkinson, 2387  
 Tyrell, Rev. Thomas, 2762  
 Unknown Correspondents, 2369a, 2369b, 2391, 2426-27, 2429, 2439, 2512, 2626  
 Van Buren, Martin, President of the U.S.A., 2566  
 Vane, Charles William, 3rd marquis of Londonderry, 2559  
 Veevers, John, 2586, 2642  
 Vero, Thomas, 2483  
 Vesey, Thomas, 2430, 2437a  
 Victoria, Princess, 2726  
 Victoria, Queen, 2397, 2406, 2409, 2411, 2414-15, 2418, 2431, 2437, 2437a, 2441, 2454, 2457, 2471, 2503, 2514, 2531, 2540, 2611, 2615, 2618-19-20, 2622-23-24, 2643, 2657-58, 2665, 2677, 2682, 2685, 2688, 2691, 2717, 2726  
 Vignoles, Capt. Samuel, 2559  
 Vigers, Nicholas A., 2378, 2437, 2576, 2762  
 Villiers, Charles P., 2589  
 Villiers, George William Frederick, 4th earl of Clarendon, 2589  
 von Droste zu Vischering, Clemens, 2508, 2593  
 Wakley, Thomas, 2497: 2559, 2691  
 Walker, Mr., 2538  
 Walmsley, Joshua, 2376  
 Walsh, Christopher, 2428  
 Walsh, Edward, 2697  
 Walsh, Francis Andrew, 2735, 2751  
 Walsh, Sir John, 2713  
 Walsh, Rev. Thomas, 2780  
 Warburton, Henry, 2598, 2691  
 Ward, Adam, 2491  
 Ware, Rev. Mr., 2394  
 Waring, Holt, 2559  
 Warren, Samuel, 2387, 2499a  
 Washington, George, 2585  
 Wellesley, Arthur, 1st duke of Wellington, 2384, 2501, 2514, 2558, 2574, 2576, 2587, 2610-11, 2619, 2665, 2680, 2686a, 2687, 2688, 2693, 2718, 2727  
 Wellesley, Richard Colley, 1st Marquis Wellesley, 2553  
 Wellington, 1st duke of, *see* Wellesley, Arthur

- Welsh, Thomas, 2547  
 West, John Beatty, 2451  
 Whately, Richard, Protestant archbishop  
 of Dublin, 2390a  
 Whelan, Rev. William J., 2389: 2551  
 Whelan, James and Patrick (builders),  
 2491  
 White, John, 2784  
 White, Luke (c. 1787-1854), 2381, 2399  
 White, Robert (Fleet St., Dublin), 2643  
 White, William (Limerick), 2784, 2786  
 Wilberforce, William, 2531  
 Wild, Thomas, 2694  
 Wilde, Thomas, 2674  
 William IV, King, 2383, 2397, 2406,  
 2409, 2411, 2413-14, 2415-16, 2559  
 Williams, Charles Wye, 2435  
 Williams, William, 2433  
 Williams and Cockburn, 2548  
 Wilmot, Sir John Eardley Eardley, 1st  
 baronet, 2525  
 Winchilsea, 10th earl of, *see* Hatton,  
 George William Finch -,  
 Winks, J.F., 2783  
 Wiseman, Rev. Nicholas Patrick Stephen,  
 2370a, 2504  
 Wood, Charles, 2710  
 Wood, John (Chairman of Board of  
 Excise), 2630  
 Woodlock, William, 2451, 2462: 2461  
 Wool Combers of Limerick, 2777  
 Worswick, Rev. James, 2693  
 Worthington, William Barlow, 2465  
 Woulfe, James, 2693  
 Woulfe, Stephen (1787-1840), 2399,  
 2507, 2545, 2547  
 Wright, Elizur, Jr., 2566  
 Wright and Co., 2768  
 Wright and Lee, 2668  
 Wynn, Charles Watkin Williams, 2590,  
 2608  
 Wyse, Thomas, 2632, 2636: 2379,  
 2565, 2601, 2693  
 Yates, John Ashton, 2437  
 York, Frederick Augustus, duke of,  
 2589  
 Yorke, Charles, 2487, 2712















