

THE
CORRESPONDENCE
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume VII

1841-1845

THE
CORRESPONDENCE
OF
DANIEL O'CONNELL

Volume VII

1841-1845

The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell

Volume VII

1841-1845

High St. Dublin
Dublin University

THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF IRELAND
DUBLIN

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 VII

1841-1845

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*

1981-1982
ISBN 0 905471 03 2

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	
1841 (letters 2788-2935)	1
1842 (letters 2936-2992)	129
1843 (letters 2993-3044)	183
1844 (letters 3045-3123)	233
1845 (letters 3123a-3182).	298
Index of persons	357

Acknowledgement

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

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

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

Abbreviations

<i>Ann. Reg.</i>	<i>Annual Register</i>
BM	British Museum
<i>Boase</i>	Boase, Fredric, <i>Modern English Biography . . .</i>
<i>DEM</i>	<i>Dublin Evening Mail</i>
<i>DEP</i>	<i>Dublin Evening Post</i>
<i>Dict. Amer. Biog.</i>	<i>Dictionary of American Biography</i>
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>FJ</i>	<i>Freeman's Journal</i>
<i>Gillow</i>	Gillow, Joseph, <i>A Literary and Biographical History . . . of the English Catholics . . .</i>
<i>MR</i>	<i>Morning Register</i>
NLI	National Library of Ireland
<i>New Cath. Encyc.</i>	<i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i>
<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:

- Duffy, *Young Ireland* Duffy, Charles Gavan, *Young Ireland: A Fragment of Irish History*. 1840-1850. London 1880.
- FitzPatrick, *Correspondence* FitzPatrick, William J., ed. *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*. 2 vols. London 1888.
- Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel* Gash, Norman, *Politics in the Age of Peel: a study in the Technique of Parliamentary Representation 1830-1850*. London 1953.
- Greville, *Memoirs* *The Greville Memoirs, Second Part: a journal of the reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852*. By Charles C.F. Greville. Henry Reeve, ed. 3 vols. London 1885.
- Gwynn, *Young Ireland* Gwynn, Denis R., *Young Ireland and 1848*. Cork 1949.
- Halevy, *Victorian Years* Helevy, Elie, *Victorian Years 1841-1895*. London 1951.
- Hall, *Bank of Ireland* Hall, Frederick G., *The Bank of Ireland 1783-1946*. Dublin 1949.
- Hobhouse, *Sturge* Hobhouse, Stephen, *Joseph Sturge, His Life and Work*. London, 1919.
- Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party* Kitson Clark, G. *Peel and the Conservative Party: a study in party politics 1832-1841*. London 1929, 1964.
- Lingard, *History of England* Lingard, John, *History of England*. 8 vols. London 1819-30.
- Lucas, *Lucas* Lucas, Edward, *Life of Frederick Lucas, M.P.* 2 vols. London 1886.
- MacDonagh, *O'Connell* MacDonagh, Michael, *Life of Daniel O'Connell*. London 1903.
- McDowell, *Public Opinion* McDowell, R.B., *Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846*. London 1952.
- Macintyre *Liberator* Macintyre, Angus, *The Liberator: Daniel O'Connell and the Irish Party 1830-1847*. London 1965.
- Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal* Nowlan, Kevin B., *The Politics of Repeal: a study in the relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-1850*. London 1965.

- O'Connell, *Memoir of Ireland* O'Connell, Daniel, *A Memoir of Ireland, native and Saxon*. Dublin 1843.
- O'Keefe, *O'Connell* O'Keefe, Christopher Manus, *Life and times of Daniel O'Connell with sketches of his contemporaries*. 2 vols, Dublin 1872.
- O'Connell, *Recollections* O'Connell, John, *Recollections and Experiences during a Parliamentary Career, 1833-1848*. 2 vols, London 1849.
- O'Neill Daunt, *Personal Recollections* O'Neill Daunt, William J., *Personal Recollections of the late Daniel O'Connell, M.P.* 2 vols. London 1848.

2788

From Lord John Russell

Downing St. [London], 2 January 1841

Sir,

The meeting of Parliament being fixed for Tuesday the 26th inst., I take the liberty of very particularly requesting your attendance on that day.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2789

From Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association

Leeds, 4 January 1841

Dear Sir,

The Committee of the Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association have resolved to postpone their festival meeting to Thursday, the 21st January, in order to have the honour of your attendance. Probably you would have no objection to address the meeting on the point of 'Household Suffrage'.¹

We find that the interest to see and hear you is so great that, had we not postponed a day to secure your attendance, we should have met with general censure.

Some slight Chartist opposition is expected but I think it will be much better that you should meet those gentry fairly on their own ground. The immense mass of the meeting will be friendly to you. We are at present providing and arranging for the due preservation

of order, peace and quietness. The West Riding is on the tiptoe of expectation.

Your obliged and obedient servant,
 Samuel Smiles
 Secretary to the Association

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Apparently owing to an accident which caused delay O'Connell was not present at the great Leeds Reform Festival meeting on 21 January (see letter 2802). He arrived in Leeds on Friday, 22 January, for the opening of a Catholic school in the town, and later attended a banquet at which Smiles, Crawford, Hume and Roebuck were present. On this occasion he spoke in favour of extending the franchise (*Pilot*, 25 Jan. 1841; see also letter 2802).

2790

From the Shipwrights of Dublin

Committee Rooms, Creighton Street [Dublin], 6 January 1841
 Sir,

Our attention having been directed to a speech delivered by you at the meeting held at the Theatre Royal on Thursday last in which you have alluded to an alleged combination existing amongst the ship carpenters of Dublin in regard to the apprentice system as applicable to that body.¹

[To an attack on them by an anonymous person on ship building and on the apprentice system, they replied in a letter in the *Irishman* newspaper of 2 May 1840. They expect to have a letter of defence in the *Irishman* and *Weekly Freeman* of Saturday next. They maintain that their society never entertained] any feeling hostile to our employers' interests or to public good or to any question of public utility as for instance the encouragement of native manufacture of which Society² we have enrolled ourselves members. There is nothing we have such an aversion to as illegal combination.

Your most obedient humble servants,
 The Shipwrights of Dublin

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1. At a meeting of St. Mark's parish, Dublin, for the promotion of Irish manufactures, on 31 December 1840, O'Connell declared the shipbuilding industry in Dublin had retrograded due to the combination of workers engaged in it for the purpose of limiting the numbers of apprentices. He called on the shipbuilding workers to abandon such combination (*Pilot*, 1 Jan. 1841).
2. Probably the society founded in October 1840 by 'a few working men in the Liberty' for the purpose of promoting Irish manufacture.

Members were pledged to purchase, as far as practicable, goods of exclusively Irish manufacture for themselves and their families (*Pilot*, 19 Oct. 1840).

2791

*From Thomas Steele to Merrion Square, readdressed to Kinnegad
[Co. Westmeath]*

Trades Hall, Limerick, [postmarked Limerick 6 January 1841]
My dear Sir,

The Mayor has through reptile jealousy refused to convene a meeting to form a Board of Trade because he was not consulted or called on before that at which you presided.¹

I told him that the meeting he alluded to was one of the trades of Limerick and of all who chose to meet there, presided over by you as a *brother* tradesman.

However he refused, and said he thought that on this occasion we could do without him, to which I replied 'indeed, please your worship, *we can*.'

Sir David Roche, for whom I instantly sent, came to us. I dissolved the trades meeting and put him in the chair, having resolved ourselves into a meeting of *requisitements*.

He gave such an account of the increasing disturbance of his district that I go tomorrow morning to organise a force of 'O'Connell's Police'² to put it down.

. . . [Steele suggests that 'Mr. Walker,³ an Englishman who has established the lace manufacture' should be appointed President of the Board of Trade of Limerick about to be formed.]

The slave ship⁴ is still on the Strand.⁵ My address⁶ to the Catholics which I framed with great caution (lest a doomed heretic should appear to be without delicacy writing of Catholicity), is in type and will appear on Friday.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letter 2778 nl.

2 The General Association had in 1836 launched a scheme for the appointment in every parish in Ireland of two association officers to be known as pacificators, one to be appointed by the parishioners themselves, and one by the clergyman of the majority. One of the main duties of the pacificators was to preserve the peace for which purpose they were to co-operate with the police and magistracy in suppressing faction fights and secret societies, and were to report regularly on such matters to the association. In dissolving the General Association, O'Connell emphasised that the pacificators should remain in being and continue to exercise their peace-keeping functions throughout the

- country. Tom Steele, who took a prominent part in their organisation, was styled O'Connell's Head Pacificator of Ireland (Lyne, 'General Association').
- 3 Charles Walker. A native of Oxford, he established the lace manufacture in Limerick city in 1829, having come to Ireland in 1824.
- 4 See letter 2784n2.
- 5 Part of the Limerick city docks.
- 6 Unidentified.

2792

From Thomas Steele to Merrion Square

Limerick, 8 January 1841

My dear Sir,

[Enthusiastically agreeing with O'Connell's decision to ask Charles O'Connell and some unnamed person to do a certain work. He adds that he has just returned from Co. Limerick, touring through Patrickswell, Adare, Rathkeale, 'the Strand',¹ which he describes as 'a bad spot' and on to Croom.] I organised the people of all these places as if by magic into O'Connell's police, to put down the disturbers and get the arms they have taken.

Even this morning the arms taken from the person in James Lyons' employment were returned to him

[Steele passes on the suggestion of Dr. O'Hanlon of Rathkeale, which Steele thinks admirable, that the words 'The man who commits a crime gives strength to the enemy. — Daniel O'Connell,' be cut in a stone in every city, town, village and hamlet in Ireland. He thinks it should be called the O'Connell stone.]—

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Part of the Limerick city docks. See letter 2784n2.

2793

From Hamer Stansfeld

Leeds, 8 January 1841

My dear Sir,

I am desired by the Committee to enquire whether it will be equally agreeable to you to speak¹ to the question of the freedom of suffrage, the ballot or to household suffrage which Dr. Smiles mentioned to you. Of course it is but a gate to any field you choose to fix it.

As we are to have the honour also of Mr. John O'Connell's presence,² I hope he will add to my pleasure by joining you under my roof, and I shall be glad if you could give me some idea of your movements that I may make the necessary arrangements.

. . . They talk of a public breakfast to you on the Friday at the opening of the Catholic school³ and in the evening the temperance people are conspiring against you. Thus your visit to the West Riding will be no sinecure.

I wish I could promise you nothing but your desert, cheers, but I am afraid the Chartists will utter a few discordant notes till you have had the opportunity of charming them into harmony.

Leicester, I understand, will claim you on the 23d⁴ and to facilitate your own arrangements I enclose the time-tables of the Manchester and North Midland Railways.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 At the Leeds Reform festival.

2 John O'Connell did not attend the Leeds Reform Festival. On 23 January he was entertained to a public dinner in Liverpool (*Pilot*, 27 Jan. 1841).

3 See letter 2789 nl.

4 See letters 2783 and 2796.

2794

From Charles Pelling¹ to Merrion Square, redirected to Dungarvan

Belfast, 11 January 1841

Dear Sir,

A number of the Belfast tee-totallers are anxious that you should honour them with your company at a public soirée. Will you be kind enough to inform us whether you can accept of our invitation.² If so, state what evening would suit you.

Apart from all religious and political considerations, and differing from you, as most of us do, both in religion and politics, we regard your conduct in furthering that temperance movement a proof at once of your disinterestedness and genuine patriotism. Hoping for a favourable answer.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Charles Pelling, sewed muslin manufacturer, Academy Street, Belfast.

2 O'Connell does not appear to have attended this *soirée*.

2795

From Rev. James J. Gordon,¹ Church of the Incarnation, Altnabae by Ballindalloch, Banffshire, Scotland, 15 January 1841

Expresses admiration for O'Connell and reminds him of the two subscriptions he gave to him for his church at Altnabae (the first in O'Connell's house in Merrion Square on 4 December 1826, the second in London on 12 February 1838). He has now learned from the *Freeman's Journal* that O'Connell proposes to visit Leeds at the end of the coming week. He suggests O'Connell should look up Mr. Atkinson, 'a good *Catholic, an Englishman and a coach proprietor,*' who named one of his sons O'Connell Atkinson in honour of O'Connell. The writer adds that he was a member of the Catholic Association in Dublin.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. James J. Gordon, born 13 August 1786: pastor in Glenlivat, Ballindalloch.

2796

From J.F. Winks

Leicester, 15 January 1841

Dear Sir,

Brevity is the soul of business as well as of wit.

Allow me then to say at once that we *must* have you.

Your reply from Cork,¹ we were anxiously waiting, and it arrived today at the time our Committee were deliberating in Baines² cell at the County Gaol. They directly resolved to hold our meeting on the Saturday evening, the 23rd, in order to secure you. Notices to this effect have been sent to Easthope, Ellis and others by this post.

By this arrangement we shall also secure Hume, Bowring and others on their way from Leeds to London; and Gillon³ is expected from Scotland.

Now, my dear Sir, do let me entreat you to say you will be with us.⁴ It has got wind that you are coming, and the excitement cannot be allayed without injury to our cause in Leicester — a second disappointment⁵ would be a serious evil.

Monday, the 25th, we would have had if you preferred it. But we feared that you and other M.P.s would be in haste to get to London after the Leeds meeting.

With the greatest anxiety we wait your reply.

We have now advertised you to be here on Saturday evening in

our newspapers, a copy of which I will send tomorrow.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 O'Connell was in Cork for the Munster Provincial Meeting in favour of repeal (see letter 2798 n2)
- 2 William Baines.
- 3 William Downe Gillon, M.P. for Selkirk borough 1831-2; for Falkirk district, Linlithgow etc. 1832-41.
- 4 O'Connell addressed a meeting against church rates in Leicester on 23 January (*Times*, 26 Jan. 1841).
- 5 See letter 2783.

2797

From J. Michie, Calcutta, 16 January 1841

Duplicate

Asks O'Connell's aid in preventing a great injustice to Mr. John Curnin, an Irish Catholic and assay master and secretary to the mint committee in the East India Company. Mr. Curnin made powerful enemies by attempting to suppress corruption. Now, through a want of judgment in connection with the theft of some gold, his enemies have been able to bring about his suspension by the court of directors. He fears that Curnin will not get justice from the House authorities in determining his case, especially as Lord Auckland has been artfully drawn into a conspiracy against him, and anti-Catholic prejudice may be involved.¹

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John Curnin retained his post as assay master and, presumably also, that of secretary to the mint committee.

2798

To Archbishop Slattery

Belfast, 17 January 1841

My dear and respected Lord,

I this day had the honour of a letter from the Rev. Mr. O'Leary [sic]¹ stating that your Grace was much displeased with a speech attributed to me at the provincial meeting.² Be assured, my Lord, that nothing could give me greater affliction and at the same time nothing could be farther from my intention than to give your Grace any kind of offence.

I have no copy of the paper before me or within my reach here

and, therefore, I cannot tell how far the report of my speech differed from what I really said. But I will state to your Grace the facts and afterwards do anything you require to do away any impression unpleasant to you. The facts are that there was last summer or autumn a meeting of some of the priests of your archdiocese in which they entered into very strong resolutions on the subject of Stanley's bill, declaring that, in case it were carried, they would seek for the Repeal. I certainly never said that your Grace was at that meeting or agreed to those resolutions. But somebody who spoke before me, I am not prepared at present to name him, declared that your Grace was equally determined *in the event of Stanley's bill being carried into law* to set an example to your clergy by becoming a Repealer.³ Such a line of conduct would be so consistent with the patriotism and good sense evinced by your Grace upon all occasions that I naturally embodied the two ideas in my mind although I cannot say to what extent I might have expressed them and, therefore, I am quite ready to do anything your Grace may require to make atonement for being in any respect a party to any publication displeasing to you. Tell me what you wish me to do and I will readily do it. I certainly did not say one word that I thought would give your Grace pain, not one, I am utterly incapable of doing so. Be assured, my dear Lord, that no man venerates your Grace more than I do or would be more afflicted to cause you any uneasiness.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 A mistake (see letter 2800) for Patrick Leahy (1806-75), a professor at St. Patrick's College, Thurles, Co. Tipperary since 1837; president 1839-54; archbishop of Cashel 1857-75.
- 2 The Munster Provincial meeting in favour of repeal on 14 January (*FJ*, 15 Jan. 1841).
- 3 In his speech at the Munster Provincial meeting O'Connell is reported as saying 'Dr. Slattery and his clergy had also met and said they would become Repealers when the bill [Stanley's Irish registration bill] passed' (*Pilot*, 15 Jan. 1841 quoting *Southern Reporter*). There were several speakers before O'Connell, but none of them is reported as making any reference to Slattery, or to the meeting of his clergy (see further letter 2800).

2799

From his son Morgan

Sunday night, 17 January [1841]

My dear Father,

I got your letter this moment. I never was so ashamed of myself until I got your communication; a thought of the notes never entered

my head. I have no excuse to offer.

Everyone here in Dublin is delighted at your manoeuvre stealing such a march on the Orangemen and thereby preventing a possibility of what was feared, a collision with the Orange gang and the people.¹ I met Judge Ball² today who said it was the best thing you ever did, also Jack Gibson,³ who passed you halfway on his way up but was asleep at the time. I am glad you were so perfectly successful and hope you will excuse and pardon my *lapsus*. I enclose the half notes. I gave all the directions in your letter to John.⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 O'Connell received warnings that the Orangemen intended to ambush him on his way to Belfast and used a stratagem to outwit them. He wrote the innkeepers along the road from Dublin ordering posthorses for 18 January. Other letters were at the same time sent out in the name of one C. A. Charles, a Dublin ventriloquist, ordering posthorses for 16 January. O'Connell set out for Belfast on that day leaving Dublin at five in the morning and arriving in Belfast that same evening (16 January) without incident (*O'Keeffe, O'Connell*, II, 641-2; *Pilot*, 18, 20 Jan. 1841). He attended a Repeal dinner on 18 January and addressed a Repeal meeting on 19 January. He left Belfast on the morning of Wednesday, 20 January (*Northern Whig*, 18, 21 Jan. 1841).
- 2 Nicholas Ball (1791-1865), 85 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin. Catholic; M.P. for Clonmel 1836-39; attorney-general 1838-39; judge of common pleas 1839-65. See *DNB*.
- 3 John Gibson, only son of Lewis Gibson, of Cloyne. Assistant-barrister for Co. Antrim.
- 4 O'Connell's son John.

2800

From Archbishop Slattery

19 January 1841

Draft copy

Dear Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of this favour of the 17th from Belfast, referring to a communication addressed to you at my instance by the Rev. Mr. Leahy of Thurles College with regard to a passage in your speech at the Munster provincial meeting in which my name was introduced.

I do confess that it caused me great pain for I am a retiring person and have an almost invincible repugnance to appear before the public either in person or in print. That you would not willingly give me pain, I can easily believe, and as you are kind enough to say to me in your letter, 'tell me what you wish me to do and I shall readily do it', I cannot perhaps do so more clearly than by the enclosed¹ which I

had written to be sent to the *Pilot* when your letter reached me. I considered it a better act of courtesy towards you to leave in your hands the explanation I wished to be made in the *Pilot* as that is, I may say, your official paper. If you have the kindness just to write one line to say that this has reached you it will be regarded as a favour.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 The draft of Slattery's letter to the *Pilot* in which he said that O'Connell had been misinformed if he had said, as reported, that he (Slattery) and his clergy met and said they would become Repealers when Stanley's bill should pass. The draft was not published. O'Connell, however, wrote a public letter to Barrett dated 28 January, requesting him to 'set him right' with Slattery by giving a correct report of his (O'Connell's) speech, which he claimed the *Pilot* had reported incorrectly. He declared 'I spoke of a meeting of *some* of the clergy of his [Slattery's] diocese, at which I did not say his Grace attended; on the contrary he did not, and from the nature of the meeting he was not at all likely to have attended' (*Pilot*, 1 Feb. 1841).

2801

*From Rev. John Ritchie*¹

19 Salisbury Road [Edinburgh], 23 January 1841

Dear Sir,

You know nothing of me. Who has not heard of the Liberator! To all its friends the cause of civil and religious liberty and, let me add, the cause intimately allied to both — temperance — these causes give a claim of common affinity. This is my plea for troubling you at present.

I fought the voluntary church battle with Harry Cooke on his own dunghill — Belfast — from 7 P.M. to 6.20 of St. Patrick's Day in the morning — in front of his phalanx of Orange boys amid their platoons of Kentish fire, every art but the art of reasoning he there put in requisition.²

He came once to Edinburgh. I challenged him to public discussion here where his Ulyssean weapons could avail him nothing. Our streets were placarded with my challenge. Notwithstanding his establishment troops, lay and clerical, he shamefully fled. This is matter of notoriety to every voluntary and compulsory in Scotland, aye and beyond it. If you desire information as to details I can furnish them in shape the most authentic — society minutes. Tell Harry to retrieve his white feather character by meeting *me* from whom he, as he knows, fled, and then you may take in avisandum³ his [profer]. This is *argumentum ad hominem* which hurled by *you*

will silence his bellowings on the score of your declinature.⁴ I can give you all particulars. This note was suggested to me by the *L[ondon]derry Standard* and the [*Northern*] *Whig* which since my crusade to Belfast, friends are in habit of sending me when containing anything piquante.

I have been an attentive observant of your career since its commencement. I started for Dublin when a student to judge of Ireland with my own eyes. It was not then the Ireland that *now* is. Major Sirr⁵ was *then* in pay and power. O, what an account that man had to give in! My native town was on the high way to Ireland. I saw the regiments and squadrons that passed *for* Ireland, hungry and fierce and returned from Ireland gluttled with her spoils and glorying in her miseries. Than Ireland I know no country under heaven whose amelioration has been more rapid and promising to be more permanent. May you long live to feast on and promote her best interests, her political, civil and religious liberties.

*Presenti tibi largimur honores.*⁶

[P.S.] . . . My duty which took me to Caithness on a voluntary church crusade debarred me the pleasure of seeing you when in Edinburgh. My *boy* dined with *you*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Seceding Presbyterian clergyman and leading opponent of the church of Scotland.
- 2 This debate took place in 1836 on the evenings of the 16 and 17 March, ending after 6.00 a.m. on 18 March. See pamphlet, *The Voluntaries in Belfast: Report of the discussion on Civil Establishments of Religion . . .* (Belfast, 1837). Ritchie's statement that the discussion ended on St. Patrick's Day is not accurate since it ended the following morning.
- 3 In Scottish law, the withdrawal or suspending of a case by a judge for further consideration.
- 4 Rev. Henry Cooke wrote a public letter to O'Connell, dated 5 January 1841, inviting him to a public discussion on Repeal (*Northern Whig*, 7 Jan. 1841). O'Connell did not accept the invitation.
- 5 Henry Charles Sirr (1764-1841), town major of Dublin 1796-1826. See *DNB*.
- 6 This translates: We honour you in your presence.

2802

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 January 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

I arrived last evening from Leicester and find public affairs here rather languid. This is probably a good sign, as if there were to be a change made on the ministerial phalanx it would give an animation

participating of coming events. It is believed they¹ will hold out another session, and if the Repeal agitation becomes imposing in Ireland, and a new Reform agitation takes place, as I believe it will in England, the Tories may be kept out for ever. But their exclusion can be effected by nothing else unless the Repeal agitation becomes formidable.

How I wish that our friends in Ireland would all see this matter in its true light by first considering what will become of Ireland if the Repeal be not agitated. It is certain, in that case, that the Tories will come into power. It may be said that the Repeal will not prevent them but is it not clear that there is nothing else that will? Are they not on the very verge of being in office?

I was detained in Portpatrick, and on the road by accident, and did not reach Leeds until the second day. The papers have told you this. I travelled the entire night and was in time for the breakfast at the Catholic schoolhouse, where I was very well attended to. But I was never more cheered, or more cordially received, than I was at the great dinner at Leeds. I had also another *gala* day at Leicester. The reports in the *Morning Chronicle* will show all this. I am afraid that Fergus² intended me personal mischief; but if he did, he has been signally disappointed. Leicester was an unmixed triumph.

I got an unintelligible verbal message by Reynolds³ — as all verbal messages about business must be. I am sure I shall have a letter from you tomorrow. It would be too bad to have me depending on Reynold's translation of something you told him.

Did you ever see anything so scoundrelly as the *Monitor*? I will stop it and pay them off.⁴

We shall hear of Stanley's Bill tonight.⁶ You see that the Ulster [Repeal] Association have done us mischief. It could not be otherwise. Edge tools should never be handled by the unskilled in work.⁷

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 256-7

- 1 The Whig government.
- 2 Fergus O'Connor. For O'Connell's visit to Leeds see letter 2789nl and to Leicester see letters 2783 and 2796.
- 3 Tom Reynolds.
- 4 The *Dublin Monitor* had published an editorial stating among other things that O'Connell's Repeal dinner and meeting in Belfast had been poorly attended. The *Belfast Vindicator* promptly published a refutation of these statements (*Pilot*, 3 Feb. 1841).
- 5 In a letter to Ray dated 30 January O'Connell wrote: 'Stop the rascally *Monitor* — do not let them send me any more of their papers' (*Pilot*, 3 Feb. 1841).
- 6 On 26 January Sir Thomas Fremantle informed the Commons on Stanley's behalf that the latter intended on 2 February to bring in a motion on the subject of his registration of voters (Ireland) bill.

O'Connell declared that should the bill fail to contain a clause 'to define the franchise', he would divide the house on its first reading (*Pilot*, 29 Jan. 1841).

- 7 By this O'Connell probably meant that his visit to Belfast was a tactical blunder. O'Connell's letter accepting the invitation to Belfast (see letter 2774 nl) gives the impression that his acceptance lacked enthusiasm. The liberal Protestant but anti-Repeal *Northern Whig* of 21 January 1841 summed up the visit as a failure for Repeal, as only advertising the fact that there was little support for it in the north, and as injuring the liberal cause. This editorial is written in a melancholy rather than a triumphant spirit.

2803

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 27 January 1841

My Dear Liberator,

. . . You may as well send me at the same time a cheque for £750 to pay Morgan's acceptance for your accommodation due early next week. I am exerting myself to get in the necessary funds for the payment of that bill and hope to be successful. I calculate on the receipt of a considerable sum *yet* from the collection now in progress, enough indeed to relieve you of all liabilities save those contracted to the Bank. Since your departure from Dublin I have canvassed future prospects and the processes that should be adopted with reference thereto, very accurately, with the assistance of some important 'privy counsellors' from the Provinces. The event has been to win me over anew to a grand final exertion,¹ and the ground work of the plan for the purpose of very large but by no means unmanageable proportions is already laid in my mind. You *must* be made perfectly comfortable for the future year. You *shall* be so.

No speech of yours in latter times has gained you more applause than that at Leeds applying to Roebuck's objection.² It has attracted great attention here and the Whig anti-Repealers are candidly laudatory of its extraordinary power. The Belfast *People* are full of exultations on the subject of your proceedings there. You should take an opportunity in an early public letter of congratulating your friends there on the success of their arrangements to compliment you and to advance the general cause. Your conference with the Belfast Whigs³ is likely to have very valuable results.

[P.S.] Give me the usual bulletins when news actual or hypothetical is astir. This is important.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letters 2807 and 2815.

- 2 At the Leeds Reform Festival dinner on 22 January, Roebuck proposed a toast to 'Justice to Ireland under the Union' and declared O'Connell was mistaken in supposing Englishmen to have no sympathy for Ireland. O'Connell in reply stated he believed only English Tories were unsympathetic to Ireland and declared Stanley's proposed registration bill was designed to disfranchise Ireland and in itself, provided grounds for seeking Repeal (*Pilot*, 25 Jan. 1841).
- 3 In Belfast O'Connell received a 'critical deputation of three leading Ulster liberals, who pointed out they were not Repealers. Admitting that the [*Northern*] *Whig* had perhaps been "too persevering and acrimonious in controversy", they regretted that O'Connell had countenanced the *Vindicator* and had visited Belfast on the invitation of a small group actuated by sectarianism. O'Connell with typical good humour made the best of an awkward situation, declaring himself much gratified by the conversation' (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 175-6).

2804

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 28 January 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

... The political news are not important. There is at present a calm but a calm such as that which precedes a storm. Stanley has undoubtedly a majority for his Bill.¹ Others doubt this but I do not. The Ministry bring in an Irish Registry Bill on February 4.² Stanley had Sir William Fremantle lurking until the Ministry named the day and then he named the 2nd for Stanley's bill.³ This was very unusual, and indeed indecent, but it was only the more like Stanley.

We have been just up with the address to the Queen.⁴ There were very few of the members in attendance. We had therefore a much better view of the dear little lady. She is looking very well, and read the answer most sweetly. Prince Albert is really a handsome young man.

The Opposition have not as yet agreed upon any plan. It is supposed that they rely on Stanley's Bill as being carried in spite of the Ministry, and thereby compelling them to resign. There are, you know, three English vacant seats. That for [East] Surrey may possibly be in our favour but I am convinced it will not. It, however, leaves matters as it found them, the late member⁵ having been a Tory. As to Walsall, my *conjecture* is that we shall lose it; and my *belief* is that we shall lose Canterbury.⁶ If so, there will be an end to the ministry. In fact, their only support, though they will not say so, is the Repeal. If I could get the Repeal cry sufficiently loud the Tories would be terrified from attempting the government. But, alas, our own friends countervene me there. I wish the clergy were

alive to the real situation of Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 257-8

- 1 On 2 February Stanley moved for leave to introduce his Irish registration bill. O'Connell divided against him but leave was granted by 261 to 71. The bill received its first reading unopposed on 8 February. It did not, however, receive a second reading.
- 2 The parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill. Its second reading was carried on 27 February after three nights of debate by 299 votes to 294. The bill was designed to counter Stanley's Irish registration bill and to 'extend rather than restrict the constituency in Ireland' (Kitson Clark, *Peel*, 463). This bill eventually lapsed.
- 3 This arrangement must have been made at some informal parliamentary business meeting. O'Connell was almost certainly referring to Sir *Thomas* not Sir *William* Fremantle since only the former was at this time a member of the Commons. Furthermore Sir Thomas was one of the tellers in support of Stanley's bill on 2 February (see above note 1).
- 4 That is, the address from parliament at the commencement of the session.
- 5 Richard Alsager, late M.P. for East Surrey 1835-41.
- 6 The Tories won all three by-elections, that for East Surrey without a contest (*Times*, 3, 4 and 9 Feb. 1841).

2805

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 28 January 1841

My Dear Liberator,

Your letter received by me today has had some effect upon such of the Whig Anti-Repealers as I had an opportunity of speaking with, and its purport will be made known at the Castle through Conway. The agitation must however continue for the present to look mainly if not altogether to the people for sustainment but, in the event of a Tory invasion, many of the classes which now stand aloof or even oppose the Repeal are likely to become its strenuous supporters.

You are aware that Lethbridge,¹ who spoke at the meeting in the Theatre,² had made arrangements for being enrolled as a Repealer on Monday last. Some friends of Government however influenced him to forego the intention for the present but he expresses himself as fixed in opinion upon the justice of the proposition, and his wealth and station may make him a useful man in the event of a general election. He is not likely to be the discoverer of the Longitude but he seems attached to the liberal cause with the fervour of a renegade or a descendant of one.

I believe my conversation with Reynolds, to which you allude, had reference solely to the remittance of £250 for your account at

London. I was not accurately acquainted with the name of the Bank at which you wished the money to be lodged and I adopted the course of getting Roach³ to send the cash through Johnston's⁴ to *the Bank which acted as successor to Wrights*. You will have known this by my former letters. I progress satisfactorily in putting funds together for the bills of next week, Morgan's £750, Tom Fitzgerald etc. £275. Things will go on steadily in this particular as events will show.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 John Henry Lethbridge (1798-1873), succeeded his father as third baronet in 1849.
- 2 Lethbridge addressed the meeting in the Theatre Royal, Hawkins Street, Dublin, on 15 January 1841, for the purpose of condemning Stanley's Irish registration bill. He created a great sensation by declaring that 'he could not see the objection that many did to the measure [Repeal] which he [O'Connell] was now agitating . . .' and expressed his belief that Repeal would not only prove a salutary measure for Ireland but would unite her more closely to England (*Pilot*, 15, 18 Jan. 1841).
- 3 Probably Michael Roach, secretary of the Hibernian Bank in Dublin.
- 4 H. & J. Johnston and Co., the London agents of the Hibernian Bank.

2806

From John Childs to London

Bungay [Suffolk], 30 January 1841

Sir,

The [*Morning*] *Chronicle* burked the speech¹ of my friend, Mr. Mursell,² which is of the first importance because it shows exactly how and by what instruments those amongst the English Dissenters who confide in the London men, have been destroyed.

Allow me to congratulate you on such a continuance of health and strength as enables you to pursue with so much energy what I doubt not you believe to be for the good of Ireland. Would that our leaders were as energetic for the general benefit.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Delivered at the anti-church rates meeting in Leicester on 23 January.
- 2 Rev. James Phillippo Mursell (1799-1885), a Baptist minister at Leicester. A founder of the Voluntary Church Society, Leicester, 1836. See *Boase*.

2807

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 30 January 1841

My Dear Liberator,

I was not able to lodge the 'supplies' for your draft of £1,000 until Tuesday last. I handed the cheque to Harnett some days before and with it the Insurance receipts, that claimed by John's Trustees excepted. Harnett kindly held over the cheque until I notified that funds were prepared to meet it. Had he indeed been unfortunate I should have managed by loan or otherwise to provide the money some days earlier. He delayed however entirely from motives of friendship to press the lodgement.

Send me, if you have not already done so, a cheque for £750 to pay Morgan's acceptance in your favour for that amount due on Wednesday. I hope to be qualified to pay it and, indeed, all your engagements with which I am acquainted as they come round. To achieve this desirable object I am working vigorously though unostentatiously and, in a recent letter, I alluded to a grand effort for your 'unqualified Emancipation' from pecuniary responsibilities. I am maturing in my mind the arrangements for that end, and my expectations of a *sufficient* result are excellent. The project must at this moment be kept profoundly secret as it would cause a present loss of a fatal character were it to ooze out, by stopping the prospective supplies from the provinces applicable to the collection now in progress. *All* would be held over to accumulate for the final operation. This latter will by no means however be decided on unless its success shall be matter of unquestionable certainty and *magnitude*.

Confining my scrawl to this practical topic today, I thank you warmly for your political news, speculative and otherwise, which is of material use in the hands of

Your most devotedly
P.V.P.

[P.S.] *Burn this.*

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

2807 a

From N. Doran Maillard¹

59 George Street, Euston Square [London], 1 February 1841
Sir,

I hasten to lay before you all the documentary evidence that I have been able to collect since I had the honour of an interview with you and I beg, Sir, to draw your attention particularly to the enclosed copy of the Texan law² prohibiting free persons of colour from residing in the Republic of Texas, as directly effecting[sic] the rights and interests of British subjects of African descent; as also to the treaty between France and Texas which extends to the colonial subjects of the former (article 18) the constitutional rights enjoyed by the citizens of the United States of America; in Texas viz., the right of holding and introducing slaves into the Republic of Texas.

The civilised Indian (Mr. David Randall) who I named to you, resided on the Brazos river about 10 miles above the city of Richmond. He may be justly considered as one of the greatest ornaments of that country. He is a kind and indulgent husband and father, a good master to his slaves and, from his knowledge of various languages and urbanity of manner, must be a man of talent and an accomplished gentleman. He formerly belonged to the Cherokee tribe, and at the age of 18 he was taken to the United States, where he was educated by a Roman Catholic gentleman in which persuasion he was brought up and still continues.

Should a select committee³ be appointed I have no doubt but that I shall be able to produce sufficient evidence of importance to justify such a step being taken.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Author of *History of the Republic of Texas* (1841). Arrived in Texas in January and departed in July 1840. Called to the Texan bar. Edited the *Richmond Telescope*.
- 2 Enclosed with the copy of article 18 of the Texan law is a copy of a letter dated 15 September 1840 from Maillard to Lord Palmerston.
- 3 No such committee was appointed.

2808

From Daniel Lee

Manchester, 4 February 1841

My dear Sir,

. . . Allow me to offer you my most fervent congratulations on your various escapes¹ since you left Dublin. I was corresponded with

from Leeds on the subject, and was glad they as well as the Belfast people took such precautions as to prevent harm to you. . . . I hope you will have strength to fight the Scorpion Bill² to the last. His party show fight in a very determined manner.

My business now is the copyright question³ and am sure, when you fairly consider the matter, you will see the great want of wisdom in at all interfering with the present law.

With respect to E. Tennent and the unfair means he used all last year,⁴ I need only refer you to W. Williams or to our mutual friend, Mr. Brotherton.⁵

The Bill they seek cannot injure me but will a public. It is one of those bills which cannot possibly do good and is all but certain to do a most serious harm.

I will not trouble you more on the subject but certainly should like you to have a little conversation with Mr. Brotherton or Mr. Philips on the subject.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 On O'Connell's recent visit to Belfast a large force of military and police was required to restrain the Orange mob during his stay, and the windows of his hotel were broken by stones (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 175). For the Leeds accident, see letter 2789 nl.
- 2 Stanley's Irish registration bill. O'Connell had nicknamed Stanley 'Scorpion'.
- 3 James Emerson Tennent and O'Connell were ordered on 9 February to bring in a bill for the purpose of extending the time during which copyright of designs for woven fabrics and paper hangings might be held (*Times*, 10 Feb. 1841). The bill received its second reading on 3 March but was subsequently dropped. On 24 March O'Connell and Tennent were ordered to introduce a fresh bill (*Times*, 25 Mar. 1841). This received its second reading on 29 March but was later dropped.
- 4 In the session of 1840 Tennent and O'Connell had been ordered to bring in a design copyright bill on 21 January. It was introduced the same day but not proceeded with beyond the second reading.
- 5 Joseph Brotherton (1783-1857), nonconformist pastor and political reformer; engaged in cotton manufacture at Manchester till 1819 when he retired. M.P. for Salford 1832-57. See *DNB*.

2809

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 5 February 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . Politics. Lord Morpeth has brought in an excellent Bill.¹ *It would do – it would do*; but there is no chance of its passing the Lords. It *may* well get through the Commons between the

ministerial strength and some neutrals that it may possibly catch. It would clearly extend the franchise in a right direction. Peel is not able to go down to the House, Lord Henley,² his brother-in-law, being just dead, nor will he be in his place for a few days. We, therefore, shall not know *his* opinion for near a week. But I never saw more rueful countenances than those of the Tories when the statement was made.

There certainly is a split between the Tories of a high class and Peel. Whether the scoundrels will settle their disputes in a common agreement to plunder and persecute remains to be seen. However, a general opinion prevails that the Ministry will labour through the present session.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 258-9

- 1 The parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill (see letter 2804 n2).
- 2 Robert (Henley), second Baron Henley (1789-1841). Married 1823 Harriett Peel. See *DNB*.

2810

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 10 February 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . Political affairs look dismal enough. We have lost Monmouthshire without a struggle, though it was believed we were secure.¹ Canterbury was supposed to be certain also but the bribery was enormous. Walsall also was the scene of the most iniquitous bribery. We have carried St. Albans,² they say, by the same means. The three former seats were filled by Whigs, so that the substitution of three Tories makes a difference of six on a division. The only mitigation is that St. Albans returned a Tory, so that the substitution of Lord Listowel makes a difference of two in our favour, reducing the Tory gain to four — a number we can badly afford. The Irish Tories are, of course, exceedingly anxious for office but there are great difficulties. The Duke of Wellington insists on having the Whigs in the Ministry. There are many reasons assigned for this: his unwillingness to outrage the Queen, who is most heartily with the Whigs; his unwillingness to take up the questions of foreign policy in their present unsettled state — with France arming, America threatening, the East unsettled, war in India, war in China, distress and Chartism in England, Repeal and dissatisfaction in Ireland. In short, it is said he is waiting for 'a bed of roses', and this is not the season for such a couch.

His disorder is epilepsy. Of course, the fit once over, and its debilitating influences, he is nearly as well as before each attack; but, after all, my private opinion is that it is his illness which prevents the Tories from being in office. He *feels* that he is unfit for business and a natural jealousy prevents him from the avowal, which must be made if his party came into power without his holding a high station. In short, I believe that the peace of the country — the escape of Ireland from Tory grinding — turns on the personal debility and personal vanity or selfishness of the GREAT Duke.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 259-60

- 1 Charles Octavius Swinnerton Morgan was elected unopposed on 9 February 1841 (*Times*, 11 Feb. 1841).
- 2 On 9 February the Whig Lord Listowel was elected for St. Albans.

2811

From James A. Smith to 16 Pall Mall [London]

14 Soho Square [London], 14 February 1841

Dear Sir,

I beg to leave for you [a] copy of a letter from Dr. Polding¹ on the subject of a new emigration scheme got up at Sydney which has been referred by a special Committee of the [Catholic] Institute² to you for your consideration and advice. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John Bede Polding (1794-1877), a Benedictine, native of Liverpool. Vicar apostolic of New Holland and Van Diemen's Land 1834-42; archbishop of Sydney and metropolitan of Australia 1842-77. See *DNB*.
- 2 An organisation founded in 1838 for 'the *complete* redress of every well-founded complaint, and the removal of every impediment to the religious education of the Catholics of Great Britain.' The main activity of the institute was the publication of religious tracts. After the first few years it lost much of its vigour and came to an end in 1847 (*Dublin Review*, VIII, Feb., 1840, 248-51; Herbert W. Lucas, 'the Catholic Institute and Frederick Lucas', *The Month*, LI, June, July, Aug., 1884, 214-32, 334-45, 509-526).

2812

*From James Hogan, London, Wednesday, 14 February 1841 to 16
Pall Mall, London*

Denies that he is a physical force chartist. Rev. Dr. Magee has

informed him that O'Connell had been told he was and that he had urged such doctrines at Repeal meetings. He maintains he is a man of moral force.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2813

From Rev. David Bennett

Dungannon [Co. Tyrone], 16 February 1841

Sir,

. . . I am Presbyterian Minister of Dungannon and have a son, Thomas Anderson Bennett, who has an anxious desire to become an Officer of Police, an appointment which no other Irishman has such influence to procure as yourself. . . .

I have uniformly supported the right of the Catholics to an equality of political privileges. Thirty years ago, when the *Belfast Magazine*¹ was in existence, I wrote different papers in that publication in opposition to Orange ascendancy and in support of the Catholic Question. I afterwards signed a petition for Catholic Emancipation, by which I suffered in my popularity with my people, and by vexatious personal annoyances. By the same act I also forfeited the friendship of the present Earl of Ranfurley who was always a rank Tory. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 The *Belfast Monthly Magazine* which was published from 1808 to 1814. Bennett's name is not mentioned as an author, most of the articles being anonymous.

2814

From Joseph Sturge to 16 Pall Mall, London

Birmingham, 17 February 1841

Dear Friend,

I have a letter from N. Maillard this morning mentioning thy wish to have a public meeting on the Texas question. I am so circumstanced that I feel obliged to decline taking part in the labour of getting up such a meeting but I think it important it should be held. Send the letter to the London Anti-Slavery Office today with an offer to be responsible for part of the expence. If they concluded to hold the meeting, Saturday week appears to me a suitable day and

Freemason's Hall the place. They will however consult thee about it if they conclude to hold the meeting.¹

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The meeting does not appear to have been held. During February and March O'Connell raised the question of British-Texan relations in the Commons, but postponed any motion on the subject until the treaty between the two countries should have been ratified by Texas (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LVI, 456, 705, 1346).

2815

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 19 February 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

. . . Matters begin to have a very unfavourable aspect for the ministry. I thought we should carry Lord Morpeth's bill through its second reading, but I have now very considerable doubts.¹ It is, in my opinion, utterly impossible to speak with any confidence. The result will not give above two or three in our favour at the best and, when accidents are taken into consideration and the gross neglect of the Liberals, you will see at once that my anticipation of defeat is by no means visionary. I think you ought to prepare confidentially as many persons of weight and consideration as you are in correspondence with for the 'coming events'. I fear exceedingly the result of an approaching election. If *all* our clergy aided the Repealers we might make a noble demonstration but, alas, the Whigs while in office will allure many and even afterwards we will have a *Whig Remnant* to disturb unanimity. For my part, I will have to sustain four elections. Where shall I get money? The tribute has not been successful this year, and the second attempt² appears more inefficient in its results than the first although you are unabated in zeal, tact and friendship. It comes across my mind that my career will terminate just at the moment that Ireland ceases to have friends. I am, you perceive, disposed to be gloomy this day but it is not the first of my anxious moments though their gloom, instead of making me undervalue your exertions, only raises them the more high in my affectionate gratitude. I do believe that Ireland is capable of being made once more and thoroughly a nation and that her hour is arriving but my vanity or self-reliance makes me think that I am wanting for the completion of a bloodless and not illegal change. Pardon me, my good friend.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 260-1

- 1 The second reading of the parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill was

carried on 25 February by 299 to 294.

- 2 Sunday, 31 January 1841 had been appointed for the collection of the O'Connell tribute for 1840 from those parishes that had been 'incapacitated by circumstances' from subscribing on the original date appointed in November 1840 (*Pilot*, 20 Jan. 1841). See letter 2816.

2816

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 21 February 1841

My dear Liberator,

Your letter of Friday [19 February] reached me after the departure of the mail last night. This being Sunday I was unable to meet either the present (Symes)¹ or former agent (Richardson) to obtain the accurate information which you seek respecting the insurances at the Loan Fund office *wherein you are interested*. I am however qualified to state on my own recollection that *your* life is insured *for your own account* there for £3,000 and that the National Bank holds the policy. The premium paid by me for your account on the 13th instant (£257.2.6) applied to *that* policy, and Harnett having at length received the regular receipt, which did not arrive from London until Friday, forwarded it to the Bank by the post of yesterday. You can readily of course see the receipt at the Bank and learn further details if requisite at the London office of the Loan Fund without waiting for my letter of tomorrow. I know nothing of any insurances on your life for or by John Bourke of Cork or James McCarthy of Killarney effected at the above office but you will recollect that *I* have a *yearly* policy on your life there for £1,000.

So much with respect to your own life. As to John Scott, I hold the receipt of the Loan Fund Co. for £59.15.0, dated 29th October last, on *his* life insured for your account for £2,000. This of course covers the risk up to the corresponding period of this year, say October 29th, and thus all is right to *that extent* but I am unaware of the existence of another policy which, however, would seem from your letters to be in being covering an additional £1,000 and making up the sum you conceive to be assured upon Scott viz., £3,000. Perhaps the Norwich or some other company may have taken the *third* £1,000. I shall enquire at the Norwich as to this tomorrow. By the way, I ought perhaps to ask you whether the receipt taken up by me in October should not be deposited with Harnett?

As to matters pecuniary I think it better to await your expected arrival here *en route* to the Galway assizes² to discuss *them*, but you are most *satisfactorily* mistaken as to the Tribute now in course of

collection. It has been already *very* successful inasmuch as that I have cleared off claims which accrued since the cessation of the former collection, about the first of September last, amounting to close upon £9,000. I persevere in expecting further funds during the year to discharge all your *floating* and perhaps other responsibilities, the Bank debt excepted, which I have a kind of general hope may be put in train — heavy as it is — or being *possibly* extinguished next year. I cannot to be sure promise means for *four* elections. These never entered into my calculations which have been wonderfully verified by results in the face of the obstacles thrown in my way by the noiseless but prejudicial opposition of the Anti-Repealers. I shall perhaps lodge a fresh sum of £1,000 or thereabouts to your credit during this week, preparatory to the appearance of your bills to Fitz-Simon, the Caledonian and Norwich Assurance Companies etc. etc.

In *my* department continue to rely implicitly on the best services which can be rendered by all that I can pretend to of judgment and tact, exerted indefatigably and guided by large experience.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Richard Symes, agent to the National Loan Fund Life Assurance Society, 18 Fleet Street, Dublin.
- 2 O'Connell arrived in Galway on 18 March to act as special counsel in the case of *Rutledge v. Rutledge*, described as a great ejection case, which was due to come on on 20 March (*Pilot*, 19 March 1841). No account of the case has been traced, though O'Connell was 'incessantly engaged in court' in Galway on 22 and 23 March (*DEP*, 27 Mar. 1841).

2817

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 22 February 1841

My Dear Liberator,

I called and sent frequently to the Loan Fund office without effect in the hope of getting the particulars of your insurances there today. The agent was not to be met with and you must therefore take as a substitute the information which I obtained from Richardson, corroborating what I wrote yesterday, as the policy for £3,000, being on your own life (*not* John Scott's), and for your own account. Richardson likewise apprized me that you have John Scott's life insured at a London office for £4,000 besides the policy for £2,000 at the Loan Fund Establishment. He could not recollect the name of the Company with which the £4,000 was insured but guessed it as the European or the Globe. You will have no difficulty in ascertaining or

remembering the accurate institution.

I shall make a new lodgment during the week and will require by return of post a cheque on the Hibernian [bank] for £600 which you will not neglect to send to.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

2818

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 2 March 1841

Dear Friend,

I beg to remind thee that I finally leave home for America on the 8th and, if convenient to thee, I should be glad to have thy address to the Americans¹ and also the autographs with the motion² on or *before* that day.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 This is presumably the address described in letter 2767n6.

2 Unidentified.

2819

From Thomas Mooney

149 Francis Street, Dublin, 4 March 1841

Private

My dear Sir,

You will see by the Dublin papers of this day that the 'Board of Trade' yesterday came very near Repeal in its proceedings.¹ Depend on it that the question only needs your presence in Dublin to render it the universal question of the people, Protestant and Catholic, I mean the commercial people. The expectants of place, *Protestant*, and the occupants of place, Catholic and Protestant, are of *course* for things as they have hitherto been.

We are very anxious that you would move for a return of the manufacturers and others who stand indebted to the Government for any loans lent out to relieve manufactures and commerce under the 1st of George 4th, Cap. 39,² 8 July 1820, when £250,000 was advanced to merchants and manufacturers on the failure of the banks. We want to see who owes this money, to compel a restitution and have it re-lent to persons who are now struggling against the *monopoly of the Bank of Ireland*, and the power and jealousy of

England and Scotland.

Pray do not let the Bank of Ireland get its Lease renewed.³

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 At a meeting of the board of trade on 3 March Michael Staunton argued that Scotland had been more favourably treated in the act of union of 1707 than Ireland had been in the act of union in 1800 (*Pilot*, 5 Mar. 1841).
- 2 Entitled 'An Act for the Assistance of Trade and Manufactures in Ireland by authorising the Advance of certain sums for the support of Commercial Credit there.' It provided that loans up to an aggregate of £500,000 might be granted. Large numbers of short term loans were made under the act (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 232-3).
- 3 The question of renewing the charter of the Bank of Ireland did not arise in parliament in 1841. By an act of 1840 the charter of the bank had been extended indefinitely (Hall, *Bank of Ireland*, 190).

2820

From Joseph Pease

Feethams, Darlington [Yorks.], 10 March 1841

My much esteemed friend, D. O'Connell,

Let me acknowledge the kind attention of thy son, John O'Connell's communication. Observing by the papers the postponement of Lord Morpeth's Bill till after the recess. . . .¹ I see thou hast given notice² of bringing the Land tenures of India before the House after the recess. I would suggest whether that motion should not be founded on a petition from Manchester,³ every effort being made to obtain the greatest possible number of signatures. Thy view is excellent in confining the prayer of the petition to the granting of the land in the unsettled districts of India at a moderate fixed rent in perpetuity to the natives of the soil. I know none but thyself who is able to grapple this subject so as to draw a short, comprehensive and powerfully rousing petition. . . . In drawing this petition I can little hope, with thy long and vast knowledge of India, to put thee in possession of anything thou art not already acquainted with but I will throw together two or three undigested remarks and views which may have escaped thy memory. I have also enclosed a letter to Geo. Thompson⁴ and the Manches[ter] Committee to make the best use of their time before thou bring the subject before Parliament, for truly there is a short interval left to do much in. Please say thou to me in glancing over this letter whether thou hast any further suggestions which I can furnish them in Manches[ter] with. In this populous colliery country forty miles round us there were, I believe, 36 petitions last year which were sent to Parliament

against the Bread Tax. . . .⁵ When thou write me, pray do say something to rouse their energies for I am convinced our good friends such as John Brooks⁶ etc. will be greatly cheered on by a word from thee. The effect of a line from thee will also have a vast influence through the country for, as Brooks says in his letter to me, 'three-fourths of Manches[ter] is with O'Connell and the other $\frac{1}{4}$ of them yet wavering, we shall mostly get in the end.'

The late Governor-General of India⁷ stated that $\frac{1}{3}$, I think, or $\frac{1}{2}$ of India was laying uncultivated. Would not the delay of years, which it would certainly require by lectures by the press to enlighten the country, be obviated by confining the prayer of the petition for the granting the *waste land* only to the natives of the soil at a moderate fixed rent in perpetuity, would not every town and village throughout the Empire gladly sign a petition to take the land now in the possession of the wild beasts and grant it to the perishing population? Charles Lushington,⁸ on speaking [*sic*] to me of our presumption in supposing we could know anything of the remedy for the vast evils of the Indian Empire when the wisest and ablest men of our country had laboured for 50 years without effect and in vain to satisfy themselves what was the remedy — I simply replied to his long and elaborate hanangue [that] . . . the Governor-General of India has declared $\frac{1}{3}$ of India is lying an uncultivated, vast waste whilst millions of the people perish by famine and when this country, I observed, came to know this fact, they will say with one voice, 'the wild beasts shall no longer have this land but the wretched, starving population of India.' At this *Lushington smiled and said, 'You are right.'* This extorted confession convinced me he knew the power was in the people. . . .

Does not thou think a petition, the prayer of which was confined to the granting of all the waste, uncultivated land at moderate rents in perpetuity, would be best, not meddling with the land now in cultivation which the company charge with oppressive, ruinous rent for if the poor ryots had the vast districts of rich waste land granted in perpetuity at moderate rent, they would of course have the company's land without ceremony. If we begin to petition for a reduction of the arbitrary land tax now levied in the company's cultivated land, the mistification, which the company would throw upon the tenures and iniquity of the system, would give the House of Commons the opportunity of sitting in committee for 8 or 10 [?days] longer under the pretence of investigating them. . . .

Now, after finishing this view, I must honestly tell thee that almost everywhere our application to parliament for the single object of obtaining a permanent settlement of the land tax is much disapproved [of] for nearly all contend that the petition should be that the 100 millions of our fellow subjects in India should no longer

be governed by a joint stock company and that, by such a petition, we should carry nearly the whole country with us and by taking this stand for a just and high principle whilst we were enlightening the country to carry out this object, we should have a permanent settlement of the land tax given as a peace offering. I confess I am staggered with this view given me by some of the leading partners of the greatest banking house in London, and by the calmest, clearest headed men through the country whose judgment I much prefer to my own. . . . Do let this have thy solid consideration for I am deeply impressed with the vast importance of our first movement being right. . . . Indeed it has always been the belief of nearly the whole people of England that India belonged to the East India Company. . . .

This is an overwhelming subject, a subject involving the happiness or misery of a greater portion of the whole human race than ever before engaged the sympathies and philanthropy of man. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Committal of the parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill was on 1 March postponed to 23 April.
- 2 No record of this has been found.
- 3 No such petition was presented during the session of 1841.
- 4 George Thompson (1804-78), political reformer and anti-slavery advocate. A founder of the British India Society; M.P. for Tower Hamlets 1847-52. The Manchester Committee was the north central branch of the British India Society.
- 5 That is, the corn laws.
- 6 John Brooks, bororeeve of Manchester; a founder of the north central branch of the British India Society.
- 7 Lord William Henry Cavendish Bentinck.
- 8 Charles Lushington (1785-1866), in the service of the East India Company in Bengal from 1800 to 1827; M.P. for Ashburton 1833-41; for Westminster 1847-52; author of several works. See *DNB*.

2821

From Robert Sutton Jr.,¹ 2 Bank Buildings, London, 10 March 1841

Gives O'Connell the desired information as to how gold is transferred between London and Paris. It is done through the Bank of England and the Bank of France.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A member of the London court of directors of the National Bank of Ireland.

2822

From his son Maurice

16 Pall Mall [London], Saturday, 20 March 1841

My dearest Father,

Mr. Sutton today at the Board¹ proposed very unexpectedly by *me* but, I believe, not so by some others of the directors, the appointment of a Mr. Rickman² as director. I know nothing of the gentleman save that I found him on going into the boardroom to attend the committee some days back sitting there with [1 word illegible], Sutton, Ruding³ and Smith⁴ and looking over the books etc. and I was then told that he was a shareholder. I opposed the proposition until we could have *your* opinion and after some debate, as I was determined not to yield, and Dr. Elmore, upon whom the matter seemed also to come by surprise, supported my views, the matter was postponed to this day week and a special meeting ordered to be called for that day. I urged that the Board was as numerous as it had been since 1838, that Keene⁵ had been elected to fill a vacancy, but that in the present instance, the annual meeting being so near and there being no new vacancy, we ought to wait for the opinion of the shareholders. Mr. Sutton gave way and as mentioned before the matter stands for consideration on next Saturday. If you do not mean to return before then, write to me, and let me know your wishes which shall be acted on to the letter by my dearest father's

Most affectionate son,
Maurice O'Connell

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Of the National Bank of Ireland.
- 2 Samuel P. Rickman, a director of the National Bank of Ireland, London board from c.1842.
- 3 J. Clement Ruding, director of the National Bank of Ireland, London board from c. 1838.
- 4 Frazer B. Smith, secretary in London of the National Bank.
- 5 John J. Keene.

2822a

From his son Maurice

[20 March 1841]

Private

My dearest father,

Rickman is evidently a creature of the *anti-Irish* party and would be their tool. The affair is got up by Smith (on whom no dependence can be placed), Ruding, Sutton and that clique. Rickman appears a *stupid* old man. They waited till Keene left town before they brought this man forward but of course Keene will be here on Saturday next. There are 23 writs out against Murray who has fled to France. Old Vigne¹ is dying and I do not think Rawson² can come up. I am sorry to say that they seem to have worked upon Colonel Stanhope but your letter, desiring that the thing may be postponed until your return or until the general meeting would influence him [sentence incomplete]. The entire affair is a *job* for the worst purposes and ought to be treated as such. I dare say you have seen [?Paten] ere now. It has struck me that *her* family may set up insanity as a defence and I think this ought to be considered. . . . Do let me hear from you or Fitz-Simon stating your wishes in time for Saturday's meeting.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

1 Thomas Vigne, director of the National Bank in London.

2 John Rawson, director of the National Bank, London.

2823

From Charles McCarthy

Repeal Association, Union Arms, Union Court, Holborn, London,
23 March 1841

Renowned father of our Country,

. . . I am a member of what we term the Farringdon Repeal Association. We number about 300. The Society is about three months old. A feeling has arisen amongst some of the members that the Society is not legal. In order that this feeling may not spread and retard the progress of the Society, I on the part of the members most respectfully implore your advice.

We keep books on which appear resolutions for the government of the Association. Is this legal? The minutes of our proceedings are entered in the books. Is this legal?

We have a secretary.

We receive our cards through the Rev. Dr. McGee [*recte* Magee] who is also treasurer.

Your advice in reference to our Society will satisfy the numerous other Repeal Associations in and about London.

Most respectfully soliciting your reply by return of post.
[P.S.] I enclose my card to prove that I am a Repealer.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2824

*From Joseph Hone, Jr.*¹

16 Herbert Place [Dublin], 30 March 1841

Dear Sir,

You may recollect that about six months back I had an interview with you as one of the Trustees of the will of the late Mr. Hall² of London who bequeathed a considerable property to you and Lord Ranfurley in trust for the benefit of Simpson's Hospital.³ [Hone explains that the Trustees of Simpson's Hospital wish to compel the executors of Hall's will, who appear to have misused some of his money, to hand over accounts. He desires O'Connell's authorization, Lord Ranfurley's having been obtained, to enable the Trustees press their demand.]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Attorney; secretary and receiver, Simpson's Hospital.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 191 Great Britain Street, Dublin, founded in 1781 by George Simpson 'for poor decayed Blind and Gouty men'.

2825

From B.F. Emery, Counsellor at Law, to House of Commons

17 State St., Boston, Mass., 31 March 1841

Honoured Sir,

. . . Although an American but a Catholic I venture to enquire of you, your opinion as [to] the probable effects, good or ill, which may attend the great cause [of Repeal] by reason of the meetings which have been and still continue to be held in this country for the purpose of giving expressions of sympathy and affording pecuniary assistance to the cause.

You probably have seen from the prints in this country and more

particularly those devoted to Catholicity and the Irish interest, particularly the *Boston Pilot*, that large gatherings of the friends of Ireland have been held in this city and in various parts of the United States at which resolutions highly complimentary to yourself and favourable to Repeal, as urged by you in parliament, have been unanimously adopted. Associations under the name of the 'Friends of Ireland' have been formed and contributions made to be forwarded to the National Repeal Association in Ireland.

[The writer seeks to know O'Connell's opinion of how best the Repeal cause may be helped by activities in America, in a way most effective and which will not be likely to increase opposition to Repeal by the British Ministry].

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2826

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Merrion Square, 5 April 1841

My dear John,

I told you that I should want to pay the year's rent to the College and the fines in Easter week and that you should bring me here all the money and bills you could muster for that purpose. But as I did not repeat this lately to you I almost take for granted you have not kept it in recollection. I therefore repeat it now.

The rent and fines are just the same as the last.

You must be here as early in the next week as you can, not later than Thursday the 15th. Bring with you all the money you can. Get cash or bills from Blennerhassett and the Knight. Include their March rents but take the bills for that at four months. Make up for your neglect and mine.

SOURCE : O'Connell MSS, UCD

2827

From his son John

London, Tuesday, 6 April [1841]

My dear Father,

Sir William Somerville has spoken to me upon a franchise idea of his which he seems anxious to have your opinion upon. It is the idea of franchise *not dependant upon tenure* — but he unfortunately

clogs it with *amount* — and specifies 10, 15 or even £20. Surely the experience of the English £50 tenant at will clause¹ ought to show him that it is not *amount* that will ensure a real franchise. Still, I think it is well to have the *disconnection with tenure* come into the minds of such men as he. By and by he will give up amount also.

He gave me some faint impression by his manner, that he had an idea of moving such a clause as a '*split-the-difference*' between Lord Morpeth's proposition² and what the House might otherwise adopt in Committee. But I told him that, as a *compromise*, we could not accept of his plan, that we could in short make *no compromise*. I think he is anxious you should write to him.

Eliza³ quite well and sends love. Duck-a-day,⁴ or as he sometimes says 'Duck-a-daisy' is ruling the house absolutely. From his own room to the kitchen he invades every apartment and makes every one get up and dance 'Jim Crow' with him. . . .

We rise this evening. I will try and get up a meeting here and send over some funds to the Association, after Easter Monday.

I took the Archbishop of Tripoli to Lord Palmerston on Saturday, to detail the condition of the Syrians. I drew up a short statement of the facts — Palmerston promised *protection* and we asked a little more, viz.: money, which he did not absolutely refuse. The population stands thus: Jews 30,000: Mussulmen 800,000: Catholics *about* 410,000: Syrian and Armenian Jacobites 40,000: Greco-Russian Church 15,000. [Total] 1,295,000. I had forgotten the *Protestants, O!*

The Jacobites deny the procession of the third person of the Trinity from the first, and the Pope's authority nearly as the Greek-Russians do.

Let me hear through Morgan if you are too busy, my dear father, what you wish said to Sir W. Somerville and if you will write to him?

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 This was clause XX of the great reform act (2 Will. IV c. 45), known as the Chandos clause, which gave the vote in counties to tenants at will who paid a yearly rent of £50.
- 2 The parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill (see 2804 n2), introduced by Morpeth on 5 February, extended the franchise in counties to all £5 tenants holding on a lease of not less than 14 years (*PP*, 1841, III).
- 3 Wife of John O'Connell.
- 4 Daniel John O'Connell (1839-1872), eldest son of John O'Connell.
- 5 That is, parliament adjourns.

2828

From Daniel Lee

Osborne's Hotel, London, Tuesday morning [c. Spring 1841]
My dear Sir,

[Seeks an interview with O'Connell on the 'subject of the copyright in designs'¹].

I know it is a subject on which you are peculiarly circumstanced and therefore have not wished to press you, at the same time that you are perhaps obliged to support it by your vote, I hope your advocacy will not go beyond it. We make out so strong a case that I am sure under *other* circumstances you would go with me for *noninterference*.

I herewith send you a short work which, if you will read, I shall be obliged. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2808.

2829

From Mrs. Robert Wetherell,¹ 57 Dawson Street, Dublin, 8 April 1841

Seeks O'Connell's patronage for her book. Archbishop Murray has taken several copies and has signified his approval of its 'tone and morality.' She says she is the daughter of Major Dawson of the Royal Hospital who, though an Orangeman, promised his support and vote to O'Connell at his last election in Dublin but took ill and was thus unable to fulfil his promise, and died.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, 13649

1 Author of several works, including *Lays of the Troubadours* (Parsonstown, 1847).

2830

To Bishop Higgins,¹

Merrion Square, 10 April 1841

My dear dear Lord,

How happy should I be to adopt your suggestion if it could be available for the attainment of the desirable object I have in view! In

fact, my tenancy plan² would be the most practically useful of any that has been as yet suggested. It would in one word secure Ireland for the Irish.

But it is hopeless to bring it before our bishops *for the present*. There are three reasons for not now doing so — 1. There is no hope nor, indeed; any possibility that the English Houses of Parliament would entertain it without much more *pressure from* without than we can *at present* procure. 2. That pressure can be obtained sufficiently strong only in conjunction with the Repeal movement and it is calculated to increase the strength and rapidity of that movement to have this palpable advantage to the Irish farmers as part and parcel of the Repeal. 3. And this alas is the worst — some of our prelates are neutral on the Repeal, and there is at least one who is *actively* opposed to that measure. I do not in any degree question the purity of the motives of those who differ with me on this point or on any other. I hold the prelacy of Ireland collectively and individually in too much respect to dare to do anything but bitterly regret that they are not all Repealers. I regret it the more because of my thorough conviction that we Catholics cannot hold what we have got without the Repeal and *a fortiore* that we cannot get anything that Ireland wants without an Irish parliament. The Orangist party will — it is manifest — be soon again in power, and the Irish people will have to feel all the active and unceasing virulence of that truculent party. I could weep tears of blood at seeing that the opportunity of now making a great and powerful rally for Catholic Ireland is lost owing to the unworthy selfishness of some of our influential laymen and also owing to the mistakes of some of our otherwise most deservedly respected clergy. God help us. It is indeed heartrending to see that the opposition to the Repeal is not left to the congenial spirit of Orangism but has alas mixed up with it some of our most excellent prelates. It is the first time that the people and any part of the Irish hierarchy were divided. The people, faithful to the death, stood by the clergy in the worst of times. Oh how I deplore that any of that clergy should, in the moments of the enjoyment of power or patronage or of any other cause of apathy, be separated from the people. You, my dear Lord, have nothing to reproach yourself with. You are *for* the people and *with* the people.

For my poor part my motto includes the *audentior ito*³ in times of destitution or abandonment.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 11489

- 1 William Higgins (1793-1853), educated Paris 1812-20. Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise 1829-53; an active supporter of Repeal.
- 2 O'Connell was chairman of the committee appointed by the Repeal Association 'to report upon the best method of altering the law of landlord and tenant, so as to secure the rights of property to the

landlord and enforce the duties attached to the relation between landlord and tenant.' The committee reported on 5 April that there should be no tenure of shorter duration than twenty years; that rents should be arranged by arbitration; that the landlord should have the option of regaining possession on the falling in of a lease, but should be obliged on regaining possession to pay the 'full amount of the capital expended by the tenant in improving the lands' (*Pilot*, 7 Apr. 1841).

- 3 Part of a quotation from Virgil, *Tu ne cede malis sed contra audentior ito quo tua fata vocant*. 'Do not give way to adversity but on the other hand go forward more boldly wherever your destiny calls you.'

2831

From Daniel Lee, Manchester, 14 April 1841, to Merrion Square

Asks for letter of introduction to O'Connell's friends in Kerry for his friend, R.E. Cunliffe, an attorney and a rich man, formerly a Conservative but now a Liberal who 'saved Mr. Brotherton's election the last time.' Cunliffe wishes to spend a sporting holiday in Kerry. 'I shall no doubt see you in the course of a few weeks as I shall be in London on the *copyright question*.¹ *Precious blunders* your friends *admit* they have made in it. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See 2808 n3.

2832

To his brother John

Merrion Square, 16 April 1841

My dearest John,

This letter will be handed to you by Mr. R.E. Cunliffe of Manchester who is going to Kerry on a fishing tour. He is a gentleman of the first respectability and a decided Liberal, consequently a friend to Ireland. We owe to him principally the return to parliament of one of the very best men in it — my friend Brotherton. I know I need not ask you to be attentive to such a man, and that you will — *besides* — procure him all the information and assistance which will be necessary to promote the amusement which he seeks in our lakes and rivers.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 261

2833

From Rev. E. Smith, Chapel House, Ravensdowne, Berwick on Tweed, 16 April 1841, to Merrion Square

Complains that on 22 March 1841 the Berwick board of guardians resolved 'That the persons to be appointed to the situation of Master and Matron must be *Protestant*.' On the advice of the Hon. C. Langdale¹ he had complained to the commissioners of the poor law, asking if such a regulation had been issued by them, had the Berwick guardians the power to make it and whether such a regulation was illegal. No answer had yet been received. He asks O'Connell to give the matter publicity in Ireland and he will have O'Connell's statements published in the local English press.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Hon. Charles Langdale (1787-1868), 3rd son of seventeenth Baron Stourton; assumed the name of Langdale only in December 1814; M.P. for Beverley 1833-34; for Knaresborough 1837-41. See *DNB*.

2834

From Henry Houghton¹

6 Middle Gardiner Street [Dublin], 17 April 1841

Sir,

It affords me much pleasure to comply with your desire that I should reduce to writing such suggestions on the Bill for the new system of local taxation² as might occur to my very humble judgment. . . . I therefore suggest first that (in as much as the bill is intended to reduce taxation) a poundage rate not exceeding 4/6 in the pound according to the Poor Law valuation shall be the maximum rate to be declared by the comptroller. Secondly, that every house shall be responsible for its own amount of taxes and, thirdly, that landlords [shall not be put to expensive litigation in order to ensure that their tenants pay the taxes on their houses. Houghton thinks that the bill should be altered so that tenants of all houses, including houses under £10 valuation, should be made liable for taxes rather than have their landlords liable, the owners of such houses being mainly of modest income. He states that it is generally accepted that the poor law valuation³ is less than Sherrard's valuation.⁴ Sherrard's states that there are 1657 houses in Dublin valued above £5 up to £10 inclusive and 1554 valued at £5 and less.

The total valuations of the two classes of houses are £14,819.10.0 and £5,678 respectively].

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Probably George Henry Houghton (born c. 1810), only son of Henry Houghton. Called to the bar 1835.
- 2 A bill to arrange for the collection of poor rates in Dublin was presented on 23 March. It received its second reading on 29 March but did not proceed further.
- 3 The Irish poor law act of 1838 (1 & 2 Vict. c. 56) empowered all boards of guardians to value all property in their respective areas. They were allowed use existing valuations where deemed sufficient.
- 4 See letter 2507n5.

2835

From Charles Gavan Duffy

Private

Vindicator Office, Belfast, 17 April 1841

My dear Sir,

I have the pleasure of forwarding to you £45, the first instalment of the Repeal Fund from Belfast. I enclose a list of thirty-two members, twenty-three of whom paid £1 each and the remainder collected more than twenty associates. I send to Mr. Ray by the same post the names of nearly *five hundred associates* whose subscriptions are enclosed in the above sum.

Five intelligent active men have been appointed Repeal Wardens, who undertake to collect the Repeal rent and make monthly returns to the Association. I have sent their names to Mr. Ray.

I need not conceal from you that [about two words illegible] difficult to get even so much as [about two words illegible] sum I send you collected in Anti-national Belfast for Repeal purposes but it is some satisfaction that among the members are five Protestant gentlemen of the greatest respectability. Two of them you will recognise as the chairmen of the Dinner and Repeal meeting in Belfast during your visit.¹ It is also gratifying to know that the operative class by a vast majority are Repealers and the collection of the Repeal rent among them cannot fail to be most successful.

You will have the goodness to propose the members whose names are enclosed. I believe I am entitled to become a *Volunteer*² myself and *Ulster* ought to have somebody in that body. I hope it will have many.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The chairman of the dinner was Robert McDowell and of the Repeal meeting, John Sinclair (*Pilot*, 20 Jan., *DEP*, 21 Jan. 1841).
- 2 O'Connell launched a branch of Repealers known as the 'Revived Volunteers of 1782' on 13 April 1841. Membership of the Volunteers was open to persons collecting or subscribing £10 or more to the Repeal rent (*Pilot*, 14 Apr. 1841).

2836

From David Roche

Carass, Croom [Co. Limerick], 18 April 1841

My dear O'Connell,

I have written to Stanley¹ to get me a pair if possible for the vote on Lord Morpeth's Bill.² My poor dear wife is on her death bed . . . [Thus I have little chance] of being able to assist you or the Government against Lord Stanley's attack on this country³. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Edward J. Stanley, then secretary to the treasury.
- 2 The division on 26 April on Howick's amendment to Morpeth's parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill (see letter 2839 n2).
- 3 A reference to Stanley's registration of voters (Ireland) bill which was the Tory counterpart to Morpeth's parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill.

2837

From John Hawden, University of Edinburgh, 18 April 1841

Explains he is 21, a student of law and medicine, has become a Catholic and wishes to become a priest. He asks O'Connell for information about entering Maynooth or St. Omer or Douai. 'The interest you are well known to feel in advancing Catholicism and in promoting the education of young men for the priesthood in her seminaries must plead my excuse' for writing.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2838

From John Childs

Bungay [Suffolk], 25 April 1841

Sir,

When you honoured this place with a visit a few years ago,¹ while we yet hoped the reform Bill would work out something of good for the people. . . .

You will learn by the report of a meeting² lately held at the adjoining market town of Beccles that Sir Thomas Gooch,³ who sat for this county twenty-five years in Parliament, got up his courage to state without equivocation that it would afford him pleasure, to use his own elegant phraseology, to see you swinging in the air, and the company, amongst whom were . . . Lord Heniker⁴ and Sir B. Vere,⁵ the members for East Suffolk, Mr. Edmd. Wodehouse⁶ and Mr. Burroughs,⁷ the members for East Norfolk, with Lord Wodehouse,⁸ the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Norfolk, are reported to have received the expressions with rapturous applause. The four members are the merest imbeciles in the world or even in the House of Commons, and I do hope you will give them a benefit in the House out of which we may gather some figures of speech which will help us to remind them when the election come of their congregated brutality.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 In 1836 (see letter 2336).
- 2 At a Conservative public dinner on 16 April at which Gooch, who presided, is reported by the *Spectator* of 24 April 1841 as saying: 'He would be sorry to say harsh things of any men; but when they found a Ministry under the dictation of the champion of Popery, they must regard the Church as in danger. The Ministry was supported by Mr. O'Connell; and he would like to know what was the safety of the Church in such keeping? It was the safety of the lamb in the mouth of the wolf. (Loud cheers.) If he had his wish, Mr. O'Connell would have been hanged long ago. (A laugh.) It might be thought an uncharitable wish, but it came from the bottom of his heart. What a happy thing it would be to see him and many more dancing upon nothing! (Cheers).'
- 3 Sir Thomas Sherlock Gooch, fifth baronet (1767-1851), M.P. for Suffolk county 1806-30.
- 4 John (Henniker Major), fourth Baron Henniker (1801-70); M.P. for East Suffolk 1832-46 and 1856-66. Created Baron Hartismere in 1866.
- 5 Sir Charles Broke Vere (1779-1843), M.P. for East Suffolk 1835-43. Knighted 1815. Army officer, appointed major-general 1837. See *DNB*.
- 6 Edmond Wodehouse (1784-1855), M.P. Norfolk 1817-30 and East Norfolk 1835-55, retired June 1855. See *Boase*.
- 7 Henry Negus Burroughes (1791-1872), M.P. East Norfolk 1837-57. See *Boase*.

- 8 John (Wodehouse), second baron Wodehouse of Kimberley (1771-1846), lord lieutenant of Norfolk 1822-46.

2839

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 April 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

The motion¹ of Lord Howick succeeded by the aid of the Tories; it has, in fact, annihilated Lord Morpeth's bill. It would not be worth taking with the franchise so enhanced.² The consequence will be that the Ministry will, I believe, give up their Bill for the session. Indeed, I think they must. If they do not give it up it will be defeated as — Lord Howick pledged himself against it last night and, with his assistance, the Tories are of course able to defeat the measure.

Then comes Stanley's Bill,³ and I believe we shall be driven to the long game to get rid of that Bill, I mean the battling it from day to day in order to carry out the session.

The report of a Ministerial resignation I believe to be utterly false. I am assured that they are determined not to resign without trying another session. All the battles of this session will be won with the Irish Bills, and upon them the anti-Irish feeling is so strong that the Ministers yield to it so far as it goes, namely, in relation to any improvement in Irish affairs.

I spoke at once to Hume about J.D. Mullen and told him *his character*. There is a prisoner in correspondence with Hume but the latter has written to say he must have distinct proofs before he acts and, even then, he will — I should say would — first inform me. Of course there can be no such proofs. I told Hume that J.D. Mullen was ready to give him any explanation he may desire. My conviction is that we shall not hear of it again. If we do, you may be sure I will defend⁴ my friend Mullen.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 262

- 1 Howick's amendment on 26 April to Lord Morpeth's parliamentary voters (Ireland) bill (see below note 2). The amendment was passed by 291 votes to 270.
- 2 That is, the *qualifications* for the franchise so enhanced. Howick proposed that the value of the property out of which the tenant claimed the franchise be assessed under the poor rate. The rent paid by the tenant should be deducted from the valuation in order to ascertain the tenant's 'interest', which should be a minimum of £5. He agreed that under these conditions tenants from year to year and fourteen year leaseholders should be admitted to the franchise (*Annual Register*, 1841, 55).

- 3 Registration of voters (Ireland) bill.
 4 See letter 2841. Mullen was governor of the Four Courts Marshalsea.

2840

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 28 April 1841

My Dear Sir,

I hope to see you next week when I go over with the new peer's (Lord Caledon's)¹ return.²

I see Pigot's Chancery Bill³ in the paper for Committee for Friday.

The percentage off salaries to make a superannuation fund is most unfair.

1st. There is no such provision in the *English* superannuation acts, and the *salaries* of the Irish officers as at present are *lower* than those of England.

2nd. There is no danger of superannuation becoming a charge on the consolidated fund, as the returns sent in last week from all the Chancery officers show an accruing fund, 'the suitors fee fund,' that will amply bear the superannuations without treating Ireland so unjustly as to reduce by 5 per cent the present too small salaries.

3rd. Without any reference to myself I boldly assert the salary of 'Clerk of the Hanaper' is already too low at £600 a year, it being an office of much responsibility and of a mixed nature, legal and political, uniting in itself what is done at several *different offices* in England, viz. Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, Petty Bag and Hanaper. The return I have sent in to the order of the House, April 2d,⁴ shows the duties of this office. In addition to this, if they do not raise, they certainly should not lower this office as, by the regulations under which I was appointed government saved £1,050 a year salary, which was paid out of the *consolidated fund* to my predecessor in addition to the office fees. The consolidated fund is thus relieved of £1,050 a year by this office. There is not the least danger of our superannuation coming on the consolidated fund. Surely then the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought not thus to squeeze us! when his Exchequer can be in no way damaged by a little *apparent* liberality to Irish offices, our own Chancery fund being ample to meet all probable demands.

Should this percentage clause be persevered in, I, for one, shall not avail myself of it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 James Du Pre (Alexander), third earl of Caledon (I) (1812-1855); M.P.

for Co. Tyrone, 1837-39.

- 2 Three vacancies had arisen among the Irish representative peers which were filled by Lords Caledon, Blaney and Castlemaine (*Pilot*, 12 May 1841).
- 3 On 30/31 March the Irish attorney-general, David R. Pigot, presented a bill to make further provisions in relation to certain offices in the Irish court of chancery. It received its second reading on 24 April but was not proceeded with further. No account of debates on the bill have been traced.
- 4 On 2 April it was ordered that there be laid before the Commons by the several officers of the Irish court of chancery returns showing, amongst other things, the duties, fees, and emoluments connected with those offices and those of other employees of the court during the period 1838-41.

2841

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 29 April 1841

My dear Liberator,

First as to J.D. Mullen. He properly estimates your prompt and effective attention to the application made on his part with reference to impressions sought to be made upon Mr. Hume.¹ You had indeed a good *character* to base your representations upon when you spoke favourably of Mullen. He is perhaps the best public officer that ever filled the situation which he occupies in either country. It is one where humanity, acting upon able faculties for business, produces most gratifying results through his interference in the cases of many of his prisoners. I believe it is now pretty well ascertained that the attempt to annoy and prejudice him with Mr. Hume owes its origin to the hatred of his *Catholicity*. Mullen bids me thank you most gratefully on his part.

Pierce Mahony writes to you tonight on the subject of the franchise and requests me to intimate that he sets much value on the views he will propound. He is naturally extremely anxious that you will consider them well. Mahony has consulted many of the best opinions throughout the day on his view and finds it corroborated universally. This he bids me interpolate. Your letter was particularly seasonable and useful. The Tories were in rampant expectation that the day of their restoration had at last arrived. They are, as we gather from you, doomed to another year of deferred hope. The intrusion of the faction previous to the new municipal organisation² could not fail to have a calamitous effect upon the construction of the different bodies. This gives an additional and important reason for *keeping them out* if it can continue to be done. Another year's blockade too

can scarcely fail to reduce some part at least of the stubborn Bench. They cannot *all* maintain the cry of no surrender for any further *great* length of time.

I find by a minute of the Bank Board sent to Mr. Geraghty by C. Fitz-Simon that the application of that excellent man has been taken into consideration. It does not seem very clear whether he is to put himself in training for the duties of inspector or to consider that the Board deems him unfit for that particular appointment from want of experience. C. Fitz-Simon goes to London on Wednesday and will ascertain the meaning of the minute in this regard. He is very desirous that Mr. Geraghty's services should be secured to the concern.

I have arranged with the Bursar to pay the rent³ on the 14th May and shall prepare so to do. You will hear from me next week hereupon. . . .

All goes on well with me. Mahony bids me end by repeating that he has satisfied himself that the £20 tenant at will proposition⁴ *ought* to be accepted. Write to me often on matters political. This is very useful.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 See letter 2839.
- 2 Following the passing of the Irish municipal reform act of 1840.
- 3 For the lands in Co. Kerry leased by O'Connell from Trinity College, Dublin.
- 4 Apparently this proposition had emanated from Lord Howick. The *Freeman's Journal* of 24 April 1841 stated that he had said he would give the franchise to £20 tenants at will.

2842

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Private

London, 4 May 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

The crisis is arriving, and the debate¹ to begin on the 7th May will be decisive of the fate of the present parliament and probably of that of the Ministry. The Budget, as far as it relates to the timber and sugar duties, will be contested apparently on their own account but really on account of the corn laws.² The Ministry have set their existence on the chances of their succeeding or going before the public on the best case they can possibly make — a determination to extend free trade, to diminish sugar duties and admit good timber on cheaper terms, than [*sic*] admitting foreign corn at a cheap rate and

fighting to the last for Ireland. If they are defeated on the budget — and I believe they shall — they are determined to dissolve. This under present circumstances is destructive to me. I know not what I shall do but of this we will confer. It will be a triumph of the enemies of Ireland if I am driven from the field. So at least I think.

Stanley's Bill³ is in effect given up for this session. He reserves it for the next when he expects to have a parliament that will carry it triumphantly. I fear he is not mistaken. The fate of Ireland is miserable. I should hope that those who have been hitherto on the ministerial train, doing nothing in or for Ireland, will see their mistake but in general men do never admit and seldom correct their errors.

I drew on you at 41 days for £310. I cannot help it.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 263

- 1 On the government's budget propositions. In 1841 the chancellor of the exchequer, Francis Baring, found himself with a deficit. He proposed (working on the free trade thesis that the yield of a duty could be increased if its rate was lowered and consumption stimulated) to reduce the import duty on foreign sugar and timber. This would mean that foreign sugar, which was slave grown, could compete on more equitable terms with the sugar of the British West Indies now produced by free labour. The Conservatives determined to use this consideration for an attack on the budget, and on 7 May Lord Sandon moved an amendment raising the question of slavery against the government's sugar proposal. After eight nights of debate the amendment was carried on 18 May by 317 to 281 (Kitson Clark, *Peel*, 467-72; 474-7).
- 2 Since it could be argued that if duties were to be reduced, those on corn could not be ignored, the Whigs in their budget for 1841 determined to substitute a small fixed duty for the sliding scale duty on the import of corn (Kitson Clark, *Peel*, 469-70, 476).
- 3 The registration of voters (Ireland) bill.

2843

From George Roe

Dublin, 6 May 1841

My dear Sir,

I have been urged by some of our mutual friends to mention the name of Robert Orr¹ to you, as a candidate for the situation of 'controller of rates' under the Bill now before Parliament for the collection of taxes etc. in this city.² I believe him to be eminently qualified for the office. . . . Robert Orr has been always a steady and consistent liberal. . . .

P.S. I am sure you will be astonished when I tell you that the Treasury have declined to remit the duty in the case which you

interested yourself so warmly about this time last year notwithstanding the pledge which the Chancellor gave you. I wrote a very strong and indignant letter to Mr. Gordon on the subject but I imagine to little purpose.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Robert Orr, 5 Adelaide Road, Dublin.
- 2 This was a government bill introduced to the Commons on 22/23 March. It received its second reading on 29/30 March but on 7/8 June further consideration of it was postponed indefinitely.

2844

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 6 May 1841

My dear Liberator,

If the 'crisis' shall eventuate in a dissolution, the difficulty must be met boldly. It is considered certain that you will carry Dublin and I hope without incurring any formidable expense. As to Athlone and Tralee you must yourself be the best judge respecting prospects in those places. How an actual dissolution may act in producing the excitement necessary to secure success to the popular party is yet to be seen but at this moment I find it averred that the people were never so apathetic, generally speaking. Be of good heart however. The necessary and salutary impulse will be given by the elections and those that seem listless now will put forth all their vigour when the contingency arises.

I have accepted your dft. for £310 and will of course provide for it as well as for the College rent etc. By Saturday's or Sunday's post I will write to you on pecuniary matters when I shall have matured my arrangements.

Nicholas Mahon terminated his long and eventful life yesterday. Notwithstanding some misunderstandings (which have left no deteriorating impressions on your memory), you will not be dissatisfied at my introduction of *your* name as an evidence to the public merits of that clever and bold-minded fellow labourer in the older Catholic committees etc. I refer to a brief obituary which at the instance of his immediate friends I have thrown into the [*Dublin Evening Post*].¹ Do not fail to supply me with bulletins daily during the 'crisis' as I am looked to in a peculiar manner for intelligence by people whom it is right on many grounds to satisfy and compliment.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 This obituary declared that '... the valuable aid derived from the sound

judgment, spirited bearing, and personal liberality of this leading member of the Catholic body, has been certainly — and particularly within the last four weeks — emphatically avowed by the highest authority that can be cited — Mr. O'Connell' (*DEP*, 6 May 1841).

2844a

To Viscount Morpeth

16 Pall Mall [London], 7 April [*recte* May¹] 1841

My Lord,

I think I am *entitled* to make a respectful remonstrance to her Majesty's Ministers on the line of conduct to be adopted at the present moment. If you, my Lord, differ with me as to my being so *entitled*, at all events you will allow that the importance of the present crisis is sufficient to palliate if not to justify a departure from the stricter rules of official etiquette. I respectfully claim to be heard by reason of the undeviating support which that section of the Irish members with whom I have acted have given to this Government. We Irish Radicals differed in much from that Government but we never imitated the English in taunting or opposing them or their measures and, although my opinions on the 'Repeal' justly deprive me of personal consideration from a ministry hostile to the last degree to that measure, yet I venture to claim attention on behalf of that large portion of her Majesty's truly loyal Irish subjects whose sentiments and wishes I flatter myself perhaps not unjustly I represent.

The subjects of my respectful remonstrance are these: first, I object to the present Ministry's resigning the management of her Majesty's counsels so long as they can *possibly* hold their station at the head of public affairs. They are placed as a kind of moral promontory between the people of Ireland and that furious and fanatical party, who have so often driven a kindly and naturally faithful people to the very verge of actual rebellion and into the gulf of agrarian crimes and of local but sanguinary outrages. It seems to me to be a sacred duty which they owe as well to the Queen — the most popular sovereign in Ireland that ever reigned — as to the Irish people to protect both from the disastrous results of that just irritation which must follow from the restoration of power to the Orange faction.

Secondly, I also earnestly but not the less respectfully object to the calling of a new parliament being left in the hands of a Tory ministry. If the present Ministry dissolve, they will secure six or eight or ten seats which otherwise would be lost to what I call with truth the

cause of the Queen and of Ireland. If the Tories dissolve, the Orangists no longer restrained by superior power will come armed to each hustings, the command of the police and of the army will be in their hands. The people are now disarmed — I do rejoice to say it — and unorganized. Every election will in the larger counties be stained with blood. It was the case in many at the last election when the Tories were in power.² The people in the heat of election controversy will be easily provoked into outrage. They will be shot down like dogs. It is low to calculate 30 or 40 deaths, murders in morals, justifiable homicides in the eyes of partial judges and partisan juries. But enough of human blood will in that case be shed to render it our imperative duty as, I think, in every man of humanity to prevent the opportunity of such bloodshed being perpetrated. And will the earth cover that blood! Alas, my Lord, it may be the *last* crime in the annals of anti-Irish oppression but let me turn from the effects of the resentments which it may accumulate even up to national madness and, without being considered obtrusive, ask whether the Irish people do not deserve and whether her Majesty's service does not require, that one more opportunity may be given to the Irish people freely and fearlessly to select the men for parliament in whom they repose confidence.

. . . I do not want to promote my own peculiar opinions. I am quite certain that no supporter of her Majesty's Government would at any Irish election be embarrassed by being asked for any pledge beyond the unequivocal support of this Ministry or of opinions as, for example, respecting the Ballot which some more or less of that Ministry have avowed. . . . The only impulses which guide my determination to make this remonstrance are those of an ardent desire to preserve peace and tranquility in Ireland and to secure . . . the affectionate loyalty of her [Majesty's] grateful, her brave and her faithful people of Ireland.

. . . I intend them [these words] simply to rouse you and your colleagues to what they owe to Ireland and to the Empire at large — conciliation as long as possible to the one, consequent strength and security to the other. . . .

SOURCE: Castle Howard Papers

- 1 O'Connell was in Ireland on 7 April 1841. Internal evidence indicates that the correct date is 7 *May* 1841.
- 2 The general election of December 1834 — January 1835.

2845

From John S. Folds,¹ 5 Bachelor's Walk Dublin, 7 May 1841

Thanks O'Connell for the work he did on his behalf in regard to the malicious burning of his property; also, for the interest O'Connell took in bringing through parliament the bill² providing compensation in the event of malicious burning of property. On his loss he thus recovered £2,713 in compensation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Printer.
- 2 4 Vict. c. 10. This act, which received the royal assent on 6 April 1841, extended to Dublin city certain legislation in operation in counties concerning compensation for malicious burning of property. The bill emanated from the House of Lords, where it was sponsored by Brougham, and was sponsored in the Commons, at least in the later stages, by John O'Connell, O'Connell being then in Ireland. There is no record of debate on the bill. On 7 July 1841 the *Dublin Evening Mail* accused O'Connell of having procured acts of parliament for Sir Abraham Bradley King and Folds who were Protestants but having done nothing for the Dublin vintners the great majority of whom were Catholics.

2846

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Confidential

London, 8 May 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

I believe you may rely on this:

First, the Government is resolved to remain in power as long as they can.

Second, to dissolve Parliament when they are driven to extremity and to abide the advent of the new Parliament.

Third, their financial and free trade plan¹ is making a great excitement in their favour in England.

Fourth, if Ireland rouses itself properly in their favour *all* will be well.

[P.S.] Could you privately convey to Catholic dignitaries the propriety of assisting to agitate?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 263-4

- 1 See letter 2842.

2847

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 8 May 1841, 7 o'clock

My dear Liberator,

I have just received the enclosed under cover from John Reynolds whose letter requests me to transmit it to you after attaching my signature.

We are here in 'the agony' awaiting the Evening Packet¹ which *may* do something to remove or confirm our apprehensions.² Consequently upon your letter to David Daly,³ who called on me yesterday respecting it, a few gentlemen met today at the rooms, Fleet St., to which the Westmoreland Street 'convention'⁴ have adjourned their sittings. They have ordered circulars to be sent to a number of the most stirring men of the party, inviting them to a meeting on Monday to decide on ulterior measures according to the aspect of things as it will then exhibit itself. Some misgivings were expressed as to the effects of the Corn Law propositions upon the Irish Constituencies, and it is generally apprehended that the tithe settlement will have a prejudicial action in the event of a dissolution. Although our people are low spirited at the moment, I have no doubt of their putting forth their old vigour if an election shall arrive. To speak candidly, many of *your* immediate friends manifested the greatest indifference as to a change of government but the suggestion that, in such an event, the structure of the new municipal bodies would be likely to be altogether different to that which has been up to this moment calculated upon, has operated powerfully in changing the tone of the worthy men alluded to. It is impossible to give a more practical motive to the population of the towns for sustaining the present ministers than that which relates to the formation of the new corporations. I write from the dinner table and will have the Post Office anxiously watched for your letters this evening and *daily*. Tomorrow I will write on business. Affairs go on well.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The London mail due in Dublin each evening at 7 o'clock.
- 2 With regard to the debate on the ministry's budget proposals (see letter 2842) which could lead to the resignation of the government.
- 3 Attorney of 26 Lr. Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin.
- 4 The Reform Registry Association of 1836 (see letter 2665 n4).

2848

To P.V. FitzPatrick

House of Commons, 10 May 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

The politics of the government are, *I believe*, altered to this extent that the moment this debate¹ is over the dissolution will take place. It is coming on us sooner than I expected when I wrote last.

If the Tories carry the representation of Ireland and, in particular, of Dublin they will totally deprive us of the benefit of the Corporate Reform. I should not be surprised if the dissolution took place *this* week.

It is an awful crisis for which the Irish people are not prepared. How I regret to hear of the cruel coldness and apathy which I collect from your letter exists. If we do not struggle heartily and strongly we will have a Tory reign, to terminate in a revolution. The state of the people of this country is little understood. You would have the manufacturing districts frantic if the Tories were three months in power. What little sympathy your apathetic friends have with the people in remote counties who will be ground to powder by the restored Orange faction.

The majority against the Ministry will be about twenty-five.²

[P.S.] Ascertain if you can what *good* colleague I could get for Dublin. Mullen or Wm. Murphy might *discreetly* sound George Roe. Indeed *they* should *discreetly* prepare for the contest in the manner they think suitable to the public interests.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 264-5

- 1 On the government's budget proposals (see letter 2842).
- 2 It was in fact 36.

2849

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 10 May 1841

My dear Liberator,

By this and tomorrow's post I will communicate with several of the bishops and other dignitaries, urging them to give their assistance to such a movement as may afford strength to the present Government and impede the Tory efforts for the recovery of power. I presume David Daly will inform you of details of the meeting¹

which was held today in Fleet St., Lord Charlemont in the chair.

It was determined to hold an aggregate meeting of reformers on Thursday, for the purpose of addressing her Majesty to continue her confidence in the present ministry and imploring her not to confide power to the Tory party, the enemies of the rights and liberties of the people. On the whole there is a good and a *progressing* spirit abroad and I think you will find *all* Ireland combine on the general principle of *keeping out the common enemy*. Your immediate supporters have shown the best tendencies to amalgamate, and your *bulletin* was in my hands during *this* day invaluable in important quarters as it communicated a confidence in the firmness of ministers which showed itself to be highly useful. If all sections of *your* press could be influenced with respect to the Whigs to

Be to their faults a little blind

And to their virtues *very* kind

during the present crisis, it will be productive of excellent consequences. I write this to suggest that you might with salutary effect say as much to the press as will prevent them from assailing the Whigs during 'the crisis,' and I am induced to give the suggestion by many complaints having been made throughout the day of an attack upon Lord Fitzwilliam which I did not see but which appears in the *Freeman*.² It seems to have annoyed the Government people greatly and hence the querulousness. A conciliatory word from you to the newspaper authorities would mitigate, if it did not prevent, such matters and so far aid the disposition to coalesce which now happily exists.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 An anti-Tory meeting at which it was resolved that a meeting should be held on 13 May to petition the queen in support of the ministry (*DEP*, 11 May 1841). This meeting was held on 14 May under the chairmanship of Charlemont. Resolutions were passed to petition the queen and to call on all Irishmen to oppose the Tories (*DEP*, 15 May 1841).
- 2 In a debate on the corn laws in the Lords on 7 May Fitzwilliam said that the landlords (of the United Kingdom) owed a debt to the community (*Times*, 8 May 1841). In an editorial headed 'Aristocratic Rule' the *Freeman* referred to Fitzwilliam's statement and added: 'You do indeed [owe a debt] cold-hearted theorist, for you have been all your lifetime wringing tens of thousands of absentee rents from Ireland every year; and yet, you refused no later than yesterday, to put your name to a requisition in favour of reviving Irish manufacture' (*FJ*, 10 May 1841).

2850

From Robert Sutton, Jr.

National Bank of Ireland, 13 Old Broad Street, London, 11 May
1841

My dear Sir,

To my utter surprise a notification has been received here of Mr. John Reynolds's intention to offer himself as a candidate for the office of director of this Bank.¹ This in some degree clears away the mystery of his having applied for proxies but by no means the circumstance of his having *as alleged* taken the liberty of using the name of our 'Governor'² in procuring them. . . .

[P.S.] As we are not always sure of you at our Board on Wednesday I have taken the liberty of endeavouring to make a certainty of seeing you.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2847.

2 O'Connell.

2851

From David Doud¹

4 Henderson Row, Edinburgh, 11 May 1841

Sir,

I last night attended a private meeting of Dissenters of various shades in reference to the representation of Edinburgh and it has been resolved to dispense with the services of Sir John Campbell, the Attorney-General. Our splendid member, Mr. Macaulay, is quite safe but nothing short of an overwhelming partisan necessity can save Sir John. He is Scotsman enough to be able to demand without fear wherein he has offended but yet march he must, for nobody likes him.²

Several parties were talked of to succeed him and the majority of the meeting seemed to point at Sir Culling Smith³ or Mr. Faithful.⁴ Now as you know and can speak about these two gentlemen, may I beg the favour of your opinion and advice for the guidance of our brother Catholics and myself here. The force of circumstances and not sympathy has identified us with the Dissenters and, though not a numerous election body, we are united and therefore can double our strength — a rule we practised last November when, holding the keys of the first ward here, we forced the Dissenters to vote for and

elect me as a Town Counsellor, they taking our assistance in securing a Dissenting colleague.

The mention of Smith and Faithful will lead you to form a correct estimate of the views and character of the Edinburgh Dissenters. The Catholics participate in the general dislike to Sir John but, notwithstanding this, they would, one and all, give him their votes if you think it essential to the Ministry that he be reelected for Edinburgh and, as the conduct of the Catholics in the matter will influence very much the final resolution of the Dissenters, you will oblige us very much by counselling and advising us what to do. You are to understand that Dissenters and Catholics together cannot of themselves secure a member. The assistance of the mere Whigs is also necessary and they in their turn can do nothing without the aid of the Dissenters and Catholics — so that the common enemy might profit by our dissensions. To avoid any contingency of this sort, negotiations will be opened with the Whig leaders here but, as much will depend on the character of Sir John's intended successor, the meeting last night discussed the pretensions of several public men. Neither Mr. Hume nor Bowring nor Roebuck nor Sharman Crawford nor Ewart they thought would do. There is nobody in Edinburgh or Scotland that seemed to come up to the mark and, therefore, they look southwards for a member, and parted with the impression that Sir C. Smith or Mr. Faithful would suit. It was not considered essential that he be a Dissenter provided he represented adequately their views but they would rather have a Dissenter if he can be got. . . .

May I beg therefore a note⁵ from you and in such terms as may be laid before the next meeting either of Dissenters or Catholics if necessary.

My friend, Mr. Smith of the Institute,⁶ can testify regarding me. I had the honour of being a steward at the O'Connell banquet⁷ here and of being introduced to you on that occasion.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 David Doud, town councillor of Edinburgh. A Catholic.
- 2 Campbell did not stand for Edinburgh in the general election of 1841.
- 3 Sir Culling Eardley Smith, third baronet (1805-1863), Hadley, Middlesex.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 See letter 2868.
- 6 James A. Smith, secretary of the Catholic Institute.
- 7 On 17 September 1835. See letter 2279 n1.

2852

To P.V. FitzPatrick

House of Commons, 12 May 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

Various rumours afloat. No news. No change in the aspect of politics. It is said the ministry will resign and leave the dissolution to their successors. The Tories give this out vehemently because they desire it ardently. *But it is not true.* It cannot be true else I should know it. This is only one of many reasons. It is of the utmost importance to Ireland to have the power of the Crown to preserve, instead of aiding to break, the peace at the elections. I put this point as strongly as I could to the Ministers. I am surprised you do not, *sub rosa*, communicate the idea to the [*Dublin Evening*] *Post*.¹ Lord Morpeth would take care to have the police and army assist to prevent Orange outbreaks and every kind of outrage at the hustings. If a Tory was at the Castle it would be understood by the officials connected with the police and military force that a riot would be inoffensive to their superiors especially if the people were fired at and human blood shed.

You may rely on it that I was right when I told you the Ministers will try a dissolution *before* they resign.

Do you hear anything about a colleague for me in Dublin? I spoke to Hutton upon the Repeal and endeavoured to persuade him to consent to a mitigation of his opinions but quite in vain. I am most sincerely sorry for it. He is a most amiable excellent man. Though his opinions do not concur with mine I respect him much.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 265

- 1 An editorial pointing out the possibility of disorder and bloodshed in Ireland in the event of the anticipated general election being held under a Tory government was published in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 15 May 1841.

2853

To Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny

London, 12 May 1841

My dear Smithwick,

I received both your letters with the enclosures and am exceedingly grateful.

We are come to a fearful crisis. Toryism is rampant in England and is about to enjoy a complete triumph and that triumph is in fact

and truth over Ireland and the Irish because the only point of substantial difference between the two parties was the manner of treating Ireland. In other points they were agreed. They were equally *conservative* of abuses, equally indisposed to further though necessary reform.

Ireland is the only matter of quarrel between them, and upon Ireland the Tories are about to lay the heel of Orange domination.

I never was disposed to despair of Ireland till the present moment nor shall I now dare actually to despair.

As to Kilkenny, *we* must prepare for a dissolution which I believe to be *immediate*. I am ready to blush at the request I am about to make. It is so presumptuous of me to think of using Kilkenny as an object apparently of personal consideration. I assure my friends there that I would not do so but that I am convinced some of the fortunes of Ireland are mixed up with my personal views.

Without more preface I candidly acknowledge to you, my dear friend, that my anxious desire is to be returned for Kilkenny. I must add that my intention also is to stand for Dublin. This will have the double effect of preventing the English Conservatives from doing what they did before — giving large sums of money to keep me *out of parliament*. It also gives me an honourable retreat if I be defeated in Dublin. If I succeed in Dublin, you all will have full time to consider who shall be your permanent member, and it will delight me beyond expression that you should select my son John who I really think not undeserving some part of the high honour intended for him by so many of the real patriots of Kilkenny. I must however secure for him a seat *before we can* know whether I myself should not be the permanent member.

Will you kindly consult with other 'good men and true' of Kilkenny. Let them be assured that it is not possible for any man to hold them in higher respect than I do, nor indeed was gratitude ever more strongly felt towards mortal men than mine is for my excellent friends in your city.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2854

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 12 May 1841

My dear Liberator,

The popular spirit is rising hourly now that a general election seems inevitable. The motive supplied by the prospective

construction of and patronage connected with the new corporations will be found to act powerfully in Dublin and all the towns. As to the counties, everything depends upon the clergy and they will, I trust, do their part as heretofore. I have written to some of the 'Dignitaries,' whom it was most essential to address, and calculate on useful consequences therefrom. It is thought here that Ireland will at the worst hold her own against the Tories, nay, it is believed that the Liberals will gain by the election. It must at the same time be confessed that the people are beginning to pay off English hatred in their regard by a *cordial* return of the like description of feeling. John Bull will apparently at no distant day have to choose between doing us full justice or doing without us. The quiet saying is 'we will give one more Parliament a trial and, if it fail to *right* us, keep our hands in our pockets and bide our time.' On the whole however I believe the country will fight the election battle vigorously and successfully. I wrote to Cork today respecting the case of Bandon, which it is hoped we can recover from Jackson with the aid of an iron master of Shropshire named Emery, who has lately succeeded to considerable property there and who professes to detest lawyers and admire the Whigs.¹ Have you been made aware that the people of Kinsale express deep dissatisfaction at being charged with corruption² on some late occasion by you? Perhaps its truth rendered the inculpation more unpardonable but it has produced a sensation that will, I fear, secure the representation to the enemy. This has been impressed on me by successive letters.

I thought it best to speak to George Roe respecting Dublin myself and quite confidentially. He is altogether out of the question, the temperance movement rendering his permanent attention to his large interests in the trade, of which he is so leading a member, indispensable. This may be taken as conclusive. It would not have been right in me to consult Wm. Murphy on *this* point unless I knew that your colleague³ was inclined to 'stand by'. It was Murphy that prevailed on him to come forward as a candidate and I *believe* he will be anxious to find him such again. I shall however speak with Mr. Murphy and others on the necessity of commencing preparations for the struggle *instanter*. The mercantile people think an immediate dissolution impossible until some arrangement shall be made to meet the expiry of the *present* sugar bill⁴ which occurs in July. Lefroy is said to have written that he will be chancellor before the end of the month.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 This candidature did not materialise. Jackson was returned unopposed for Bandon in the general election on 5 July 1841 (*Times*, 12 July 1841).
- 2 In regard to the general election of 1837.

3 Robert Hutton.

4 The existing act, passed in 1840 (3 & 4 Vict. c. 23), regulating the import duties on sugar, was due to expire on 5 July 1841.

2855

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 13 May 1841

My Dear Liberator,

It is to be sure unnecessary to introduce O'Callaghan¹ of the Green Book and appendages.

He goes to London specially for your promised letter to the State Paper Office and hurried though you must be at the crisis, you will recollect that the letter *should* be given now for a thousand crying reasons. O'Callaghan's researches and facts will be invaluable to the character of Ireland.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 John Cornelius O'Callaghan (1805-83), historical writer. Son of John O'Callaghan, a Dublin attorney. Author of *The Green Book, or gleanings from the writing desk of a literary agitator*, Dublin, 1840. He wrote for periodicals, including the *Nation*; published a *History of the Irish Brigade in the Service of France*, 1854. See *DNB*.

2856

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 13 May 1841

My Dear Liberator,

I have received the three cheques for £500 each and will require *one* more of £500 to enable me to draw proceeds of Morgan's bill to renew that paid by me today. I shall put the renewal into the Hibernian Bank on Monday and I will want the cheque by *return of post* to pay the College demand.¹ Rev. Mr. Whelan calls on me for £50 which I presume I am to give him.

No news here. I have some apprehensions that the prolongation of the sugar debate, which was not anticipated in Dublin to the extent that has occurred, may operate against the amount of attendance at *our* aggregate meeting of Friday.² If postponed until a dissolution had actually taken place, the gathering would probably be much greater. Your call upon the country³ is amongst the best of your invocations and must have powerful effects. The attacks upon

Maynooth⁴ should be made large use of when appealing to the priests and the 'Bench Spiritual.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letter 2858.

2 See letter 2849 n1.

3 O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 10 May 1841 (*Pilot*, 12 May 1841). It called for simultaneous meetings throughout the country on Sunday 23 May in support of the ministry.

4 In the spring of 1841 some hundreds of petitions were presented to the Commons praying for the termination of the state grant to Maynooth College. On 2 March John C. Colquhoun moved for leave to bring in a bill for the purpose of withdrawing government sanction from the college. He claimed it taught doctrines 'the most opposed to loyalty towards the Crown, and to the peace of the state, and to religious freedom.' Colquhoun introduced his bill on 25 March but it was not further proceeded with (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXVI, 1222-73; *Annual Register*, 1841, 78-82).

2857

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 15 May 1841

My Dear Liberator,

Duffy of the *Vindicator* has at my instance undertaken to work the simultaneous meetings¹ throughout Ulster and promises that they shall be quite effective. He bids me tell you that 'Since your visit to Belfast the Whigs have come into the very terms required of them last year and which occupied them in controversy — so many "mortal columns" of the *Northern Whig* and *Vindicator*. Your health is now given at the festivals of the local liberals of all shades and responded to by those that did not join in your reception at Belfast in January.'

You must know, at least as well as I, the extreme paucity of materials for liberal candidates (out of the legal circles) in this city. To get a Repeal candidate, in every way qualified and such as could win against the Tories, is perhaps wholly impossible and it might be risking the entire representation to start *two* on that principle. Some of the votes at our side that will be had by Hutton would be lost to the Repealer, and we should recollect the great advantage which the enemy has in the kind of constituency — freemen — on which he mainly depends. These are not *damageable* by any of the *laches* which act so prejudicially upon our election force and, this being taken to account, the struggle is on the most concentrating system likely to be sharp enough. In short, those of your most capable friends with whom I have talked could not even supply a *possible*

candidate, if Hutton withdraws, save that gentleman's brother and he, although *really* a sturdy liberal otherwise, is of course no Repealer.

Edmond O'Beirne² has written to you respecting Athlone. He is there at present and believes John³ to be safe.

I sent you my proxy for the National Bank election at the request of John Reynolds who addressed me by letter to that effect. I have not seen him for some weeks. Today a lithograph letter has reached me including a form of proxy forwarded by the Board to which I am requested to add my signature and to return it to *Mr Robert Sutton*. Pray instruct me how to act. It would seem *tautology* to transmit a second proxy.

[P.S.] O'Callaghan of the *Green Book*, who is making the case of Ireland so usefully as to the military prowess (not *character*) of her people, will call upon you for a promised letter to the State Paper Office. Don't neglect to give the letter. It will be productive of valuable results.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letter 2856 n3.

2 Attorney of Dublin and Athlone.

3 John O'Connell, M.P. for Athlone.

2858

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 17 May 1841

My Dear Liberator,

I expected to have received by the post of yesterday or today, at the latest, another check for £500 for which I wrote on Wednesday last. The money for the payment of the College rent¹ stands to your credit in the Hibernian Bank and the cheque is wanted to discharge the demand. Pray send it by next post. You may as well draw for £550 as there are funds to that amount available.

I have been applied to, respecting a case for your opinion, forwarded perhaps three weeks since by Rev. Dr. Flanagan as President of the Board of Irish Manufacturers. The case applies to shipbuilding and the enquiry is made by Mr. William Willans² on the part of the Board at large. You will see the necessity of writing upon the case without delay, and the approach of an election renders attention to the matter the more imperative.

It is very gratifying to find that Ex-Sheriff Veevers has been appointed a stipendiary magistrate. He had and deserved your best

wishes and, no doubt, you served him as much as lay in your *present* power. If the election shall be postponed until after July 1st, it is understood that Carlow will be positively recovered from Bruen.³ Indeed all competent persons here are industrious in giving their opinion as to the best utility of delaying the dissolution as long as practicable. It is much wished that ministers would, notwithstanding their anticipated defeat on the sugar duties,⁴ bring each of their other propositions (timber and corn) before the House *seriatim*. The discussion must work most advantageously for them and equally detrimentally to the monopolists. I have put off the College bursar until Friday and do not allow me to disappoint him then by any neglect on your part respecting the cheque for £550.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 For the lands in Co. Kerry held by O'Connell on lease from Trinity College, Dublin.
- 2 William Willans of the firm of William and Thomas Willans, woollen manufacturers, Bridge Street, Dublin and Hibernian Mills, Kilmainham, Co. Dublin.
- 3 Col. Henry Bruen, M.P. for Co. Carlow.
- 4 See letter 2842.

2859

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 19 May 1841

My dear Friend,

The division¹ last night was not so great as I had anticipated. I reckoned it at forty-two; it was six less. There were about sixteen of the constant supporters of Government in the majority, making a difference of 32, and reducing the majority to only 4. No great triumph of Toryism after all, and nothing to dishearten the Ministry or the people, or to enable the Tories to carry on the government.

Lord John ended the debate in a manly way. He has distinctly announced the Cabinet plan. First, they are to divide and debate upon the 'corn duties' and the timber duties separately; secondly, to try a dissolution, they remaining in power. It is only after a defeat by the Tories in the new parliament.² This will keep them in power for some time, perhaps for months to come. In the meantime the Corporate Reform Bill will be ripening into maturity.³

The fact, however, is that the Ministry as a Whig party cannot longer subsist; new political combinations must spring up. A new party must be found, more radical than the Whigs, less radical than the Chartists. Out of office, the old tie of union between the Whig

nobility as borough proprietors is broken for ever. To have the least chance of regaining office they must *popularise* themselves by adopting more of popular principle and insisting on more popular measures. But keep from the press every idea of this kind. You may discreetly use the other facts I mention.

I enclose a letter from an old friend of mine, Mr. Arthur McKenna, of Thomas Street. It contained ten pounds. Charge yourself with the receipt and credit the amount by the voucher on the face of the letter. See Mr. McKenna and gratefully thank him *on my account*. Explain to him how impossible it is for me, upon principle, to acknowledge personally anything of this kind, but add that you know I am not the less sensitive to such truly kind demonstrations of feeling and sentiment as his letter displays. May the great God bless him is my fervent prayer! . . .

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 265-6

- 1 See letter 2842 n1.
- 2 This sentence is incomplete. O'Connell clearly meant to add some such clause as 'that the ministry would resign'.
- 3 Elections to the new Irish corporations were held in the autumn of 1841.

2860

From Edward Clarkson to 16 Pall Mall, London

Parliamentary Agency Office, 11 Parliament Street [London], 19
May 1841

Sir,

As a member of the committee of the Metropolitan Anti-Corn Law Association I think it my duty to draw your attention to my letter to the editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, Feby. 24, 1841 headed Pro-Corn Law Movement from which you will perceive that I was 'bought out' of the *Essex Times*, editorially founded by me four years ago and circulating in four agricultural counties, by its incorporation with the *Kent* and *Herts Mercury* and *Suffolk Express* by the pro-corn law party of Tory landlords, assisted, I may add, by the Carlton Club¹ people, . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Founded by the Tories following the reform act of 1832, the Carlton Club was the first step taken in England towards the formation of a centralised party political machine, and as such engaged in promoting Tory registration work and providing funds to fight elections (Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel*, 397-400).

2861

From Edward Horsman¹

Albany [London], 20 May [1841]

My dear Sir,

I sent for the reports² you want. At page 162 of the first report and in Mr. Hope's³ evidence, beginning at question 12201 of the second volume, you will find two remarkable cases. In the report of the Commissioners I have also marked some passages that you can look at.

The case at page 162 is this: a property is purchased and made over to 41 liferenters of £10 a year each. They don't pay the money. The purchaser of the property and maker of these votes was the present member for Selkirkshire.⁴ The rental was £445 a year including the game which was let for £15 but it is discovered that the public burdens amount to £60 a year, so £395 has to qualify 41 liferenters. The deficiency is made up by the Duke of Buccleuch⁵ taking a lease of the game at £30 instead of £15 which lease is dated the same day as the other deed, viz. the last day in January, so as to [?save] the 6 months for registration and at a season of the year most unusual for letting game. But the rental is thus made up to £410 a year and the 41 votes are enrolled. Selkirk is the d[uke] of Buccleuch's county and Pringle is his member.

At question 6586 it is admitted these votes were paid for by promissory bills. Of the nature of the bills see the passage I have marked at page 4 of the commrs.'s report.

In the other case spoken of by Mr. Hope, Lord Hopetoun⁶ let two farms to as many voters each as they would safely qualify. To facilitate the transaction the tenant made a submission of his lease to Lord Hopetoun. He conveyed the lands to the liferenters. They gave him back a lease for the whole term of their possession, and he renewed the lease to the original tenant for the 5 years it previously had to run, the tenant having remained all the while in undisturbed possession. The purchasers paid Lord Hopetoun the price calculated on annuity tables and they gave each back the interest, viz. £10 a year, and it is believed the money they paid him was his own, at least if you will look at question 7959, you will see what the system of this pretended money payment was.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Edward Horsman (1807-76) of Edinburgh and Albany, London. M.P. for Cockermouth 1836-52; for Stroud 1853-68, for Liskeard 1869-76. A lord of the treasury 1840-41. See *DNB*.
- 2 Of the select committees on Scottish fictitious voters, *Parl. Papers*, 1837, XII and 1837-8, XIV.

- 3 John Hope, writer to the signet and agent to the registration courts in the county of Linlithgow.
- 4 Alexander Pringle (1791-1857), M.P. for Selkirkshire 1830-32 and 1837-46. A lord of the treasury 1841-45. See *Boase*.
- 5 Walter Francis (Montagu Douglas Scott), fifth duke of Buccleuch (1806-84).
- 6 John (Hope), fifth earl of Hopetoun, (1803-43); lord lieutenant of Co. Linlithgow 1825-43.

2862

To Edmond Smithwick

London, 21 May 1841

Confidential

My dear friend,

I intend this letter to be used at your sole discretion. Communicate its contents or as much of its contents as you choose and to whom you choose. You are the best judge of local and personal feeling. I leave all to you.

My first business is to throw down my mind before you. I do it with perfect candour. My first object was to get my son John returned for Athlone and myself for Kilkenny, subject to my removal if I succeed in Dublin, and then having John for Kilkenny as I had provided a substitute for him in Athlone.

Upon reflection I think this plan an audacious one on my part. No man can have a just claim on such a constituency as Kilkenny to have them made parties to a transfer of that kind. I need not tell you that my motives are free from the taint of arrogance or self-sufficiency and I hope no person will impute either to me in the plan which I now propose.

It is this, to have my son John stand for Kilkenny, so soon as the dissolution takes place, and to announce himself as a candidate at as early a stage *as possible*. The difficulty is just this. He cannot publicly renounce Athlone until another liberal candidate is found for that town. The instant *that* is done he will address your electors and address them as a Repealer and the son of a Repealer — one of those who prefer Ireland to everything else.

He is gone this morning to Ireland to prepare for the coming fight. Write to him there. He is at my house. But you need not write unless your co-electors desire he should *at once* declare himself, which I submit respectfully they ought not to do without giving time to disembarass himself honourably of Athlone. Indeed this is so reasonable that I hope it will not be resisted but, if it be, why the

return for Kilkenny is *too precious* not to be taken on the terms the electors choose to dictate.

Shall I write to anybody else in Kilkenny or shall John write and to whom? Direct to John at Merrion Square. I believe I will be in Dublin on a flying visit next week.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2863

To Edmond Smithwick

London, 21 May 1841

My dear Smithwick,

My son John is now at your service, at the service of the patriots of Kilkenny.¹ But the serious question is, will those patriots accept those services? If they do, they will pay him the most glorious tribute of confidence and respect that ever was paid to mortal man. My paternal heart swells with delight at the thought but I am not without my fears also. I can hardly bring myself to believe in the reality of his success. Athlone is *now* in the hands of another candidate.² John has thus thrown himself on the proffered kindness of Kilkenny. I leave him to the Repealers there for he is as sincere a Repealer as ever stood on Irish ground. I fondly think he has talents to maintain that station.

I will be *most impatient* to hear how my dearest John is likely to be received by 'the boys of Kilkenny'.

[P.S.] I look on Dublin as safe. If not, John would resign in my favour, if permitted by the Kilkenny constituency.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 On 22 May the Kilkenny club selected O'Connell himself as their candidate (*Pilot*, 28 May 1841). On 29 May, however, in response to a letter from O'Connell, the club agreed to substitute his son John (*Pilot*, 2 June 1841).
- 2 Edmond O'Beirne. On 3 June, O'Beirne was selected as candidate at a meeting of electors of the borough (*Pilot*, 7 June 1841). O'Beirne however gave way to Daniel Henry Farrell, Beechwood, Co. Roscommon (*Pilot*, 11 June 1841) who was defeated in the ensuing election by George de la Poer Beresford. In June 1842, however, Farrell was seated on petition.

2864

To his son John

London, 21 May 1841

My dearest John,

. . . I think I *must* go to Dublin next week but in the meantime act for me and act as if I was *not* to go over — cautiously but *firmly*. . . .

First, as to Dublin City, is it *possible* to get a second Repeal candidate for that city? I fear not. I went over with some friends here the likely names but found nobody whom we could hope to prevail on to stand. Consult Ray and the Committee.¹ Ask — his advice confidentially. You will gain him so or at least disarm him. Next, submit whether in the last resort it would not be better have Mr. Hutton again if we cannot procure a second declared and desirable *Repealer*. Enquire in the most particular and most confidential way on this subject.

Secondly — Dublin City again — find out from Ray what approach he has made to ascertain the constituency of Dublin city. Let me have a distinct answer. I do not care to the value of a pint of ditch-water for the reasons which prevent the precise constituency from being ascertained. All that I want is *the fact*, the *one way* or the *other*.

Kilkenny City — I have written to Edmond Smithwick, telling him confidentially that you would address the electors of Kilkenny the moment that you were honourably disengaged from Athlone. You probably will hear from him. Do whatever he tells you it is right for you to do.

Athlone town — as soon as you possibly can, after you receive this letter, see my friend O'Beirne and tell him how you are situated as to Kilkenny but that you will arrange everything so as to aid the Liberal candidate for Athlone, that I should prefer him to any other whomsoever — a preference he certainly deserves for his disinterested attachment to us in reference to that town, that you and I will give him every assistance in our power, that there are other candidates spoken of, namely, Mr —————² (to whom I must in a day or two write), and who, if he stand, and that O'Beirne refuses (I should have the *refusal first*), will gladly employ ————— as his agent. But, above all things, see whether O'Beirne will not at once *accept the candidateship*. Urge him to it and let him go down at once and preoccupy the voters. This may be of vital importance. *Not a minute should be lost*. The Tories will spend money in handfuls and they should be forestalled in canvassing while yet there is no corruption in the market. If O'Beirne will not stand, I think he and you

should take post-horses and go down to ————. His father is dying and he may wish to be in Parliament. Do you and O'Beirne put him in the right way and give him all the aid in your power. If neither O'Beirne nor ———— will stand, there is, I believe, a candidate ready but one whom I should postpone to any faithful Irishman.

Do not read or show this letter to the Committee or to anybody save to *Ray* in whom I place unlimited confidence. Let however nothing prevent you from seeing O'Beirne at once. . . .

I enclose *you* a note I got from ————. I am sure that ———— will not, and he *must* not, under existing circumstances create a row in ————. I will, if it be necessary, go down myself to counteract him if he do, and to canvass for ————.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 10-13

- 1 Of the Repeal Association.
- 2 Daniel Henry Ferrall.

2865

From T.M. Ray to London

Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin, 21 May 1841

My dear Sir,

I have just received your letter enclosing draft No. 2927 on Hibernian Bank for £105 for outgoings, and for which I thank you much. I shall communicate to Mr. Reynolds the advice in your letter. I am very glad you have given me this direction, for I don't rightly know what to do with him nor can I understand his course; it might be more desirable that he was continuing his tour¹ but, even there, he gets us into difficulties. He was near ruining us in Kilkenny by an attack on Buggy,² only Buggy had good sense enough to pass it over; he complained greatly to me. I have just got the enclosed from Mr. Lyttleton³ of Cashel, I understand he is a highly respectable man and a leader there, most likely you know him. I think it would be prudent to answer his letter lest mischief may happen among the party there, yet I don't know what to say prudently without involving Mr. Reynolds. I am delighted that our loved friend, Mr. John O'Connell, will soon be with us. His presence will relieve us from a sea of difficulty. Poor Mr. Steele has been invaluable, and Mr. Clements's suavity and good sense have neutralised much mischievous opposition.

Your address⁴ in the *Pilot* tonight is most admirable, most opportune. It puts a stop to the senseless ravings of a troublesome set of busy mischief makers.

Being the birthday of our gracious Queen (God bless her), the Registry court has not sat.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Thomas Reynolds was dispatched as agent of the Repeal Association to organise agitation in the south where he visited among other places Clonmel, Cashel and Thurles (*Pilot*, 26 May 1841).
- 2 Kevin T. Buggy, (died 18 August 1843) sometime editor of the *Kilkenny Journal*; of the *Belfast Vindicator* 1842-3. Active in the Repeal movement. Agent for Daniel O'Connell, Jr. for Co. Carlow in the general election of 1841; secretary of the counties league fund.
- 3 Probably Patrick Lyttleton, merchant, 65 Main Street, Cashel.
- 4 O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 19 May 1841, (*Pilot*, 21 May 1841). It urged the people to prepare for the elections, at which he called on them to return Repealers in preference to Radicals, and Radicals in preference to Whigs. He advised the people to 'oppose the Tories everywhere, and in everything' (*Pilot*, 21 May 1841).

2866

From Edmond Smithwick

Kilkenny, 21 May 1841

My dear Sir,

I now enclose you 9 proxies which, with those I have already sent you, nearly complete the number of our local shareholders.

Owing to the many circulars sent from the London Board to the shareholders on this occasion, which caused some confusion, I fear there are some who have signed for Mr. Sutton who had previously signed for you, perhaps sent two proxies. This can be easily arranged by looking over the list. I regret to find that Mr. Reynolds¹ has acted so as to meet your displeasure. Calculating on a dissolution and your visit to Dublin, I did not wish to trouble you with a letter on the coming election for our city as I intended doing myself the pleasure of seeing you that everything here should be done agreeably to your wishes. Let there be no disappointment but that the electors of Kilkenny will be honoured either by yourself or your son John. It's the anxious wish of the honest portion and they are the greater number and, [I] am happy to say, the most influential.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Either John Reynolds of the National Bank or Thomas Reynolds, depending on whether this sentence refers to the affairs of the bank or to Kilkenny politics.

2867

From Daniel Lee

Manchester, 21 May 1841

My dear Sir,

. . . I understand you have promised¹ to visit our town in Whitsun week which I assure you will give us all great pleasure. Of course I shall expect you at the Crescent if you will be satisfied with our plain doings. We will try to make your stay as comfortable as we can. . . .

We are all bustle getting in order for the coming election for I suppose we shall have one and I expect it will be the most severe struggle that ever was known in this country. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 See letter 2873.

2868

From John Robertson to London

39 Princes St., Edinburgh, 21 May 1841

Sir,

Mr. Doud, the Catholic Town Councillor of this city, has favoured me with a perusal of your letter of the 18th to him and I cannot resist expressing the strong feeling of my mind of gratitude to you for the most candid, judicious and sagacious advice therein given to the Catholic electors of this city.

Having from my earliest recollection been a most decided and uncompromising advocate for Catholic freedom and equality of rights to Irishmen everywhere, and more especially of justice, full and ample justice to them in their own native land. . . .

I would to God that other men in high places would imitate your example, and counsel those over whom they have influence to adopt practical views in all things and, in public affairs as well as in private ones, to take any instalment to account of good government, in the meantime, reserving to themselves the right of withholding a receipt in full of all demands till every measure of equity and justice has been granted to an enlightened, free and independent people.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2869

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 22 May 1841

My Dear Liberator,

Daniel¹ will have informed you ere this of the safe arrival of the cheque for £500. I have paid your rents to the College account £976 and hold the proper receipt.

We have not a word of news here. Your letters are cheering and valuable and I believe Ireland will be found to do her part well at the general election. I have not yet been able to see your friend, Mr. McKenna, but hope to meet him on Monday.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 O'Connell's youngest son.

2870

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 24 May 1841

Elections

My Dear Sir,

It is feared there may be a wicked contest in Cork City unless you stop it and which you may have the opportunity of doing while now in London, where you have Callaghan and the new candidate, Stack Murphy,¹ on the spot. Beamish retires. The Murphy family are determined to carry in young Murphy. From their wealth and character and from the *clerical support* they are *certain* of having, they have every chance of success, they agreeing first to secure Callaghan's return. It is stated that Charles Sugrue is to start under your auspices. If so, from all I hear, I fear there will be a great and injurious split amongst the Liberals which might let in a Conservative.² I give you the different hints as they reach me, adding that many of them come from *government friends*.

[P.S.] Your last letter³ on the elections has given *great satisfaction*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Francis Stack Murphy (1807-60), son of Jeremiah Murphy, Cork. M.P. for Cork city 1841-46 and 1851-53. Called to the English bar 1833; serjeant-at-law 1842. See *DNB*.
- 2 Francis Stack Murphy and Daniel Callaghan were returned for Cork city on 9 July, heavily defeating the Tory candidates, Lieutenant-

Colonel James C. Chatterton and Abraham Morris (*Times*, 9, 12 July 1841). Sugrue did not stand.

3 See letter 2865 n4.

2871

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Hanaper Office, 24 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

P. Costelloe has just shown me two letters of the 14th and 18th of the month from John Scott. The first appeared inclined to a quiet arrangement¹ but saying he waited for his sister's² answer, the second letter saying that he had that answer — that she would listen to no terms under £300 a year, that she would not appear in Dublin and that she had been served with her citation. Thus I fear all hope of a quiet arrangement is over, as her demand of £300 a year, P. Costelloe himself admits, is out of the question.

The *on dit* of the day is that George Roe starts for the city.³ The Tory rumour is that you are *in extremis*, with disease of the heart!!!

The Lord Lieutenant is to be married in ten days to Lady Somerville⁴ daughter of Mr. Geale, the attorney!!!

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 On the break-up of the marriage of O'Connell's son Maurice.

2 Maurice O'Connell's wife.

3 Roe did not ultimately stand for Dublin. See letter 2854.

4 On 26 July 1841, Lord Ebrington was married at the Viceregal Lodge to Elizabeth Somerville, widow of Sir Marcus Somerville, fourth baronet, and daughter of Pers Geale.

2872

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 25 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

There are rumours here that Mr. Yates will not start again for Carlow Co. It is thought, if you spoke to him and that you started John¹ along with him, you might *ensure* the return of both, it being understood that Yates should pay the expense. The utmost expense, it is said, would be £2,000, viz. £1,000 for the actual expenses, and £1,000 to create an indemnity fund for the electors who might be pressed for their rent and much of which would be repaid. Let *me*

have a line by return of post, with your wishes and to know if Mr. Yates will stand.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 John O'Connell.
- 2 Yates did stand for Co. Carlow. In a hard fought contest he and Daniel O'Connell, Jr. were defeated by the Tories Col. Henry Bruen and Thomas Bunbury, the final count being Bruen, 705; Bunbury, 704; Yates, 697; O'Connell, 696 (*Times*, 20 July 1841).

2873

From T. Duggan to 16 Pall Mall [London]

Salford [Lancashire], 25 May 1841

Esteemed Sir,

Enclosed I send you a letter I received from the Rev. Daniel Hearne¹ who complains of me deceiving him as to your promise² of honouring us with a visit on Whitsun Tuesday. The walls of these towns are covered with large bills 5 feet long stating your positive coming. A small one I enclose, 4,000 of which we circulated. The Corn Law League are preparing to receive you by a public entry in the most splendid style and the Teetotallers are likewise doing their utmost. I have just engaged the largest building in Manchester and made every arrangement for our meeting. . . . Never was such a preparation in these towns before. You will be safe, I am sure, in the centre of 6,000 Repealers whose names are enrolled in the books of the Association from this and the neighbouring towns. Come or I never dare show my face again. . . .³

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. Daniel Hearne (1798-1865), a native of Carrik-on-Suir; educated at Maynooth. Pastor of St. Patrick's, Livesay Street, Manchester from 1831 to 1846 when he was removed by his bishop. Restored to the diocese in 1849; served on the American mission at Taunton, Mass. from 1853 until his death. See *Gillow and Irish Catholic Directory*, 1866.
- 2 See letter 2867
- 3 O'Connell did not make the requested visit to Manchester.

2874

To his son John

London, 26 [and 28] May 1841

My dearest John,

There are no news of consequence. The result of the debate on Peel's motion¹ tomorrow is not as yet even guessed at. It is thought that Lord Worsley² and other Corn Law men who voted against us on the last motion³ will vote with us upon this. The debate will, I suppose, last several days. If the Ministers are beaten it will hurry the dissolution of Parliament. That, however, is the only effect that it will have.

I have written to Kilkenny an answer to some resolutions⁴ that have been passed and published there. I concluded my letter with proposing you for their choice. You will, I make no doubt, hear the result from the Secretary. I take it almost for granted that you will be returned. . . .

I am so *torn to pieces* that I could not finish my letter to you yesterday or the day before.

The time is come when the City of Dublin must ascertain who is to be the second candidate at the approaching election. Is it not cruel at such a moment to distract our attention by [Thomas Reynold]'s personalities and bye-battles! I am exceedingly displeased at his conduct and am convinced that he must at any risk be stopped in his reckless career. Steele as usual behaved admirably in the chair, *and* I must say I am delighted with your conduct and your speech. My beloved John, you do give me ————. You were from the necessity of your position obliged to treat [Reynolds] with too much consideration. But he [? Steele] must not meddle any more with [Doheny] or [Reynolds]⁵.

It is not serving the country to make wrangles or quarrels. *What is desirable to be done can never be accomplished even by a Repeal triumph over dissentients from Repeal in this or that locality.* We want to convince, not to insult; and it would be better to do nothing than to excite a strong opposition. . . .

Speak to him calmly *but firmly* and beg of him, in my name, to give us his best energies in the struggle to save Dublin, to help us to seek out a second Repealer and, if *he* cannot and *we* cannot get one, then to get us as good a substitute as possible.

I enclose Hutton's letter to me. I am at liberty to have it published.⁶ Read it therefore at the Association meeting on Monday but prepare the speakers to treat him (Hutton) with the consideration that he deserves on every account, public and private. Impress upon them that he has a considerable following, especially

of Dissenters. Our cause needs the support of every class, and we should show them that we value their aid as well as that of other Protestants. Nothing therefore should be said to give just cause for irritation. Get a veil of oblivion thrown over such parts of his public conduct as have displeased the people. . . .

Of all men living not pledged to Repeal I would desire to see George Roe in Parliament if he could be got to stand. But that, I fear, is hopeless.

If John Ennis will declare himself a Repealer he would be a good man. I wish you to go as soon as possible to ————— and set him quite right as to my opinion respecting Lord Kildare.⁷ Indeed I wish you to know my exact thoughts on this as on other points. As far as I am personally concerned I should *wish* to have him as a colleague. It is unnecessary to say however that he should be as explicit as possible in political opinion. On the whole he would make an excellent government candidate, and I repeat that, as far as I am personally concerned, I would be very glad of his coming forward.⁸ I really have a veneration for his family, notwithstanding the apathy of the present duke.

But you must distinctly warn ————— that I am not to decide for the popular party in Dublin. They *must* be consulted. I would readily do all I could in favour of Lord Kildare but I cannot pledge myself for the party which supports me. They certainly would prefer to try the battle with *an out-and-out Repealer*. But if they cannot get such I should hope and indeed I do believe they would support the young marquis.

It will be very difficult to fight Carlow [county]. There must be a protection fund provided, otherwise the destruction of the unfortunate tenantry after the election will be terrible. If they can get no other candidate to stand along with Ashton Yates I suppose I must give them your brother Daniel though it will be very hard on me to have to bear the expense of so many elections. I will of course go down to Carlow at once when wanted and go from parish to parish *agitating*. I will write off for Dan at once and meanwhile hold myself in readiness to go down at call and work for him. But those who are urging me to this trouble, risk and expense must recollect that protection for the tenantry by some species of an indemnity fund will be absolutely necessary as there will assuredly be plenty of evictions after the struggle. My accounts from Carlow say that under the circumstances I mention we should succeed, *viz.* ultimate protection for the tenantry, immediate and extensive agitation, and a son of mine.

I entirely approve of what you have done in the matter of the elections.

Great uncertainty prevails as to what is to be the ministerial fate on Peel's motion. The majority either way will be very small. Our friends expect to have it. The public mind seems coming round. There never was such a change in their favour as on the Free Trade question.

I will write two letters tomorrow, one to be read⁹ at the Association, the other for your discretion.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 14-19

- 1 On 27 May Peel proposed a vote of no confidence in the ministry which, after five days of debate, was carried on 4 June by one vote — 312 to 311.
- 2 Charles Anderson Worsley (Anderson-Pelham), (1809-1862), styled Lord Worsley from 1837 until 1846 when he succeeded as second earl of Yarborough. M.P. for Newtown 1830-31, for Lincolnshire 1831-32; for North Lincolnshire 1832-46.
- 3 Lord Sandon's motion on the sugar duties (see letter 2842 n1).
- 4 Presumably passed by the Kilkenny club at their meeting on 22 May, selecting O'Connell as their candidate in the forthcoming general election (see letter 2863 n1).
- 5 A reference to a meeting of the Repeal Association on 24 May under the chairmanship of Thomas Steele. A dispute arose between Thomas Reynolds and Michael Doheny with regard to the former's recent tour of the south for the purpose of organising Repeal agitation. Reynolds claimed that though the people of Clonmel and Cashel wished to return Repeal candidates at the next election, certain sections of the Association, including Doheny, supported the outgoing Whig members, David Pigot and Joseph Stock (*Pilot*, 26 May 1841; see also, Doheny to the *Pilot*, undated, (*Pilot*, 2 June 1841). Shortly after this incident O'Connell published his wish that Pigot and Stock should be returned without opposition (O'Connell to his son John, 29 May 1841, *Pilot*, 2 June 1841.)
- 6 It was not published (see letter 2877).
- 7 Charles William (FitzGerald), styled marquess of Kildare till 1874 when he succeeded as fifth duke of Leinster (1819-87).
- 8 A meeting of the electors of Dublin city on 12 June convened 'to consider the best means of securing the triumph of the Liberal party' invited Lord Kildare to stand since Robert Hutton had not come forward as a candidate (*Pilot*, 14 June 1841). Kildare declined to stand (Kildare to John L. Arabin, 17 June 1841, *Pilot*, 21 June 1841).
- 9 O'Connell to his son John, 29 May 1841 (*Pilot*, 2 June 1841). The letter read at the Repeal Association meeting on 31 May was largely concerned with the forthcoming Dublin city election.

2875

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 27 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

Mr. O'Beirne, you are aware, has started for Athlone, it is said with your sanction. It is ascertained he is far from popular there. Having been a local attorney there, has made many lukewarm if not hostile to him. The two parish priests, I hear, are opposed to him. It is said the man who could carry Athlone with triumph is Cs. Arabin¹. I make this suggestion to prevent your committing yourself in promises of support without having full information. Much of such information I can let you have on hearing from you. As from my former letter, you will see I am in daily communication with high quarters on those subjects, chiefly that you may get such suggestions.

Have you decided whether it would be well to let John start for Carlow [county] or would it not be better to let John go to Kilkenny [city] and Dan to Carlow. There is much doubt as to Hutton's return, should he start. The grocers are against him.

Mullins,² the barrister, is talking of opposing Maurice in Tralee.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Charles Arabin, J.P. Moyvoighly, Moate, Co. Westmeath.
- 2 Thomas Mullins (1807-1900), eldest son of Hon. Edward Mullins, Dingle, Co. Kerry. Later a Q.C.

2876

From John Cleave

1 Shoe Lane, Fleet St. [London], 28 May 1841

Sir,

The *Globe* on Wednesday evening gave the 'Ayes' and the 'Noes' in the division on Mr. T. Duncombe's motion for release of political prisoners.¹ To the surprise of many your name is not among the 'Ayes' especially as your speech implied you would have given us the benefit of your vote. Will you be pleased to say whether you voted or not.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On 25 May Thomas S. Duncombe moved two resolutions in favour of the immediate release from British gaols of all prisoners confined for political offences, including the Chartist 'rebel' John Frost, and two of his associates. O'Connell declared his intention of voting for the

motion, arguing that since the Chartist disturbances had ceased, the prisoners ought now to be released. He is not listed as voting in the division on which the count was 58 for and against. The motion was lost when the speaker gave his casting vote against it (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXVIII, 740-65).

2877

To his son John

London, 29 May 1841

My dearest John,

I send to Ray a long letter¹ for the [Repeal] Association but I want you not to read to that body or to print Hutton's letter. He would be too far committed if that letter were published and we should leave him a *locus penitentiae* after he sees my letter to the Repealers. I have, you see, changed my mind since I wrote my last letter. . . .

Announce at the Association, as a fact I assure you of, that Ashton Yates stands again for Carlow county with my son Dan. Announce this *after* my letter is read so as not to spoil the effect of that letter. My great object is to make Carlow the Clare of the Repeal. Urge *this point*. I will send my address² for Dan tomorrow.

Tell Davis,³ with my regards, that he is not aware of the great delicacy there is in managing [Doheny] principally because jealousies amongst themselves are easily excited. Tell him the want of funds is a decisive reason for not urging the Repeal as we otherwise would. This is really the secret of our weakness. I will press the appointment of Repeal wardens⁴ until every parish is provided with the machinery.

[P.S.] Announce also that Gisborne⁵ stands for Carlow town.⁶ At least, so I have been assured. Take care that Mr. Hutton's letter does not get into print. I believe he made his peace with the grocers.⁷ They are a most valuable class of men and deserve his attention.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 19-21

- 1 See letter 2874 n9.
- 2 O'Connell delayed sending this address until 16 June when he wrote it from Dublin, addressed to the electors of Co. Carlow, on behalf of the two candidates, his son Daniel and Ashton Yates (*Pilot*, 16 June 1841).
- 3 Thomas Osborne Davis (1814-45), third son of James Thomas Davis (died 1814), an army surgeon; poet and leader of the Young Irelanders; a native of Mallow, Co. Cork; called to the bar 1838. See *DNB*.
- 4 Plans for the appointment of Repeal wardens were first projected by O'Connell at a meeting of the Repeal Association on 8 January 1841. The wardens were to be charged with collection of the Repeal rent,

organisation of petitions, promotion of Irish manufacture and electoral registration. They might be selected by meetings of the parishioners, subject to ratification by the Association. Clergymen of all denominations who were Repealers were to have power to nominate two such wardens. O'Connell aimed to have at least two appointed in each parish (*Pilot*, 11 Jan. 1841).

- 5 Thomas Gisborne (1794-1852), political reformer. M.P. for Stafford 1830-32; for Derbyshire 1832-37; for Carlow 1839-41; for Nottingham 1843-47. See *DNB*.
- 6 Gisborne did not stand for Carlow. A reformer, Captain Brownlow Villiers Layard, Upper Mount Street, Dublin, was returned for the borough on 5 July without a contest (*Times*, 7 July 1841).
- 7 See letter 2875.

2878

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 29 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

It is feared Sir D. Roche is going to retire from the City of Limerick.¹ If he do, there will be great danger of the result. It is felt here the only person that can induce Sir David to stand is yourself, and you are requested to again write such a letter to him as you did on the former occasion² and thus you may save Limerick from a contest.

G.A. Hamilton has retired from contesting the city. This may possibly give you a walk over, though I find Hutton is not at all a favourite with many. Carlow Co. is in a better state than the last election. There are 53 to be struggled against. If these can be worked on, all would be safe. It is thought your appearing in Carlow and Borris would do this. I wish I had your opinion about John or Dan standing for Carlow.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 On 5 July Roche and John O'Brien were returned for Limerick city without opposition (*Times*, 9 July 1841).
- 2 Unidentified.

2879

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 31 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

From all I hear and I have it from well informed men, Athlone will

be lost if O'Beirne starts. I find he is most unpopular there. I *know* that Barney Maguire,¹ the Tory agent, said to a friend of his that his side is certain of success if O'Beirne starts. I think you would do well to stop O'Beirne. There will be a meeting of the liberal club of Westmeath on Thursday next at Clarke's Hotel, Mullingar, to decide about Westmeath and Athlone. If Cs. Arabin be safe for Westmeath, Dan Farrell² would be an excellent man for Athlone.

I hope it is *settled* that Dan starts for Carlow with Yates.

A Capt. Leared³ or some such name, who lives in Athlone, is said would be a good man for it.

I am glad to hear that Lord Kenmare cordially supports Morgan John and his brother.⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Probably Bernard Maguire, attorney, Upper Dorset St., Dublin.
- 2 Daniel Henry Farrell, J.P., Beechwood, Co. Roscommon; M.P. for Athlone 1841-43.
- 3 See letter 2877 n6.
- 4 Morgan John O'Connell and Hon. William Browne who were elected for Co. Kerry.

2880

From John Sinclair to House of Commons

Belfast, 31 May 1841

My Dear Sir,

I am informed that you intend to move for the recommittal of the Belfast and Cavehill Railway Bill.² I feel convinced that if you were acquainted with the real nature of this Bill you would not lend your countenance to it.

During six or eight years it has been made a source of vexation and annoyance to almost every person along the line some of whom gave their land for nothing on certain conditions which have never been fulfilled. Under cover of the Bill there have been frauds committed, and every vexation and annoyance that could be given to the landowners have been given by Wallace³ acting for and in the name of the company.

If I had an opportunity of entering into the details with you I am certain I could satisfy you that it is not a Bill that should receive your countenance and support, and as the first Bill was passed nine years ago there would have been time enough to complete the railway for 2½ miles if it ever were intended to do so.

P.S. I would have written you a more satisfactory letter but I had not

heard of the fate of Wallace's Bill⁴ until this moment and I would be too late for the post.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John Sinclair, a Protestant: Survivor of the Volunteers of 1782. Chairman of O'Connell's Repeal meeting in Belfast on 19 January 1841.
- 2 This railway company was established by an act of 1832 (2 Will. IV, Local, c. 35) which was amended in 1835 (5 & 6 Will. IV, Local, c. 112). On 19 March 1841 O'Connell and William Verner were ordered to prepare a bill to 'amend and enlarge the powers and provisions of the acts' relating to this railway, and it was introduced on the same day. A committee having reported unfavourably on the bill on 28 May, O'Connell moved on 7 June to have the bill recommitted but his motion was defeated by 201 to 69 (*Pilot*, 9 June 1841). See O'Connell to John Wallace, 10 June 1841 (*Northern Whig*, 15 June 1841).
- 3 John Wallace, attorney, Belfast and Dublin, Strandtown, Ballymacarrett, Co. Down.
- 4 The above railway bill. John Wallace was named as one of the members of the railway company in the act of 1832. In June 1841 he was active in London on behalf of the bill (*Northern Whig*, 5 June 1841).

2881

From his grandson Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon

[c. 1 June 1841]

My dear Grandfather,

Papa and Mama arrived here on Wednesday quite well. We were very glad to have them home again. Sister Mary, Christie and I made our first Communion on Ascension Thursday. Cousin Charles¹ prepared us for it. I was sorry to hear of the ministers being defeated the other night but I hope they won't resign. Mama says she fears we shan't be able to go to Derrynane this year; but I hope we may, for I like greatly to be there, and I like to be with you. Mr. Macready² is acting in Dublin. Papa has promised to take us to see him this week. Mama has brought me a *camera obscura*. It amuses me very much. I am reading Queen Elizabeth's reign in Lingard's *History*.³ I think she was not a good queen, though she was very clever. Goodbye, my dear Grandfather. Give my love to Uncle Maurice, Uncle and Aunt John, and little Danny and Mr. Daunt.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Rev. Charles Connor.
- 2 William Charles Macready (1793-1873), the celebrated actor. See *DNB*.
- 3 John Lingard, *History of England*, 8 vols., London, 1819-30.

2882

From Rev. D.M. Collins¹

Mallow [Co. Cork], 2 June 1841

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ult. and to express my deep concern and pain at your deeming it necessary to apologise to me for offering any suggestion and giving any advice that may occur to your wise and capacious mind. Any views put forward by you regarding our local politics or party feeling shall be received by me . . . with perfect submission to your superior judgment.

A movement is in progress against Sir Denham Norreys, originating not with the Repealers (the political sect to which I have the honour to belong) but with the aristocratic party who heretofore were always headed by him to hunt down and break the spirit of the honest Repealers in this locality. [The Longfields are canvassing for votes in the event of an election. They are very popular landlords and only a sense of duty to their country would induce the people to vote against a Longfield. Norreys is the reverse of the Longfields 'as a landlord, a neighbour and a private gentleman.'] Hence, although they [the people] value the existence of the Melbourne administration as they do the blood in their veins, they cannot be brought to support that gentleman [Norreys]. But, above all, what is borne in mind against him are the oppressions, hardships and cruelties practised upon electors of Mallow who supported the Repeal in the year 1833.² At that period some of them *died in prison*, numbers *were driven from house and home*, contracts entered into verbally without witnesses broken, actions instituted for debts or accounts *long settled*, but for which no legal receipts were taken up, in order to crush political opponents. All this was done by the parties, now at variance, headed on by Sir Denham Norreys who cheered and shouted them to the chase when a wretched Repealer was to be hunted down. This conduct too he *defended in his place in Parliament*.³

These recollections and feelings have produced perfect apathy with regard to his continuance in Parliament but not with regard to the public questions advocated by him. No one moves in his favour. I never belonged to his party or never will. When the interests of my country required that I should be passive in his regard, I was so, and that is all the assistance I can afford to give in future. . . .⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 Rev. Denis M. Collins (died 1 May 1847), parish priest of Mallow from

- before 1836 until his death. Died of fever.
2. In the borough of Mallow in the general election of December 1832.
 3. On 18 June and 7 July 1834 Fergus O'Connor accused Norreys (then Jephson) of having taken revenge on four persons who had voted against him in the election for Mallow in December 1832. On the latter occasion Norreys defended his conduct, adding: 'What I have done is known in the county where I reside, and in the society in which I live, and there it is generally felt that no person was ever treated worse than I have been, and that I was perfectly justified in all that I did' (*Mirror of Parliament*, 1834, 2650-51).
 4. Rev. Denis M. Collins attended a meeting in Mallow on 12 June in support of Norreys and 'pledged himself to sustain Sir Denham at the election' (*MR*, 17 June 1841). Norreys defeated Longfield, the Tory candidate (*MR*, 9 July 1841).

2883

From David Doud

4 Henderson Row, Edinburgh, 2 June 1841

My Dear Sir,

I felt highly honoured — and my consequence much increased — by the judicious and greatly appreciated advice you gave in relation to our Edinburgh elections. The withdrawal of any countenance to Sir C. Smith led the way to a juster view of the nub of matters in relation to Mr. Hume, whose acceptance of the Leeds invitation¹ has saved him from much mortification. For the Dissenters would not have been true to him, the strongest ground of support from one section of whom arose from the circumstance of his having, whilst a medical student here, lodged with a humble Dissenter and attended the Sabbath exhortations of a godly Seceder in the Westport Meeting house here! and therefore well acquainted with the views and feelings of Dissenters.

The Whigs were much served by your letter to me in as much as it is not every day they can appeal to an unprejudiced and disinterested advocacy of their opinions and their conduct here.

But I almost forgot the object of this communication. I believe I may safely say the Attorney-General's return is now safe, no serious opposition being intended by the Dissenters though some of them may abstain from voting for him in the event of a contest.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 Hume unsuccessfully contested Leeds in July 1841.

2 The attorney-general, Sir John Campbell, did not stand for election since he had been appointed lord chancellor for Ireland and created a peer by the end of June.

2883a

To Richard More O'Ferrall

16 Pall Mall [London], 4 June 1841

My Dear O'Farrell,

I beg to introduce to you Counsellor Welch¹ of the County of Kilkenny. He will speak to you about Carlow Town. You may place implicit confidence in him as a gentleman of the highest honour and integrity.

More O'Farrell Esq.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward More O'Ferrall

- 1 Unidentified. O'Connell was consistent but sometimes mistaken in the spelling of proper names. Thus this barrister's name could be Walsh, Welsh or Welch.

2883b

From Richard More O'Ferrall

Copy

5 June 1841

My dear O'Connell,

I enclose you a note which Pigot sent me. I have nothing to do with such matters, which should be arranged by the candidates.

Mr. French has no authority from any one here to act in any matter nor in any place.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward More O'Ferrall

2884

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 5 June 1841

My Dear Sir,

It is stated you are satisfied as to Somers's¹ *qualification*² for Sligo. As there is much fear on the subject here, unless you are *perfectly satisfied*, it is suggested Somers should have Austen's opinion on the matter.

It is more than probable you will have a walk over for Dublin.

Unless Major MacNamara and O'Brien cordially pull together, there will be a wicked contest³ in Clare. Use your influence over

them to make them coalesce. Crofton Vandeleur⁴ would be their opponent. Make them agree to have but one *committee*.

There is hope, almost certainty, that Ross⁵ will beat⁶ Emerson Tennent.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 John Patrick Somers, J.P. (died 1862), M.P. for Sligo borough 1837-48 and 1848-52.
- 2 His property qualification as an M.P.
- 3 The anticipated close contest did not materialise. On 16 July William Nugent MacNamara and Cornelius O'Brien defeated the Tory candidate Crofton Moore Vandeleur by substantial majorities (*Pilot*, 14, 19 July 1841).
- 4 Crofton Moore Vandeleur J.P., D.L., (1808-81), Kilrush House, Co. Clare. High sheriff Co. Clare 1832; M.P. for Co. Clare 1859-74.
- 5 David Robert Ross, J.P., D.L., (1797-1851), The Lodge, Rostrevor, Co. Down, elder son of Rev. Thomas Ross, Rostrevor, Co. Down; high sheriff of Co. Down 1837; M.P. for Belfast 1842-47; sponsored Roman Catholic Oath (Ireland) Act of 1843. See *Boase*.
- 6 On 10 July the Tories James Emerson Tennent and William Gillilan Johnson defeated David R. Ross and Lord Belfast, in the election for Belfast city, the final count being Tennent 927; Johnson, 913; Belfast, 823 and Ross 794 (*Times*, 13 July 1841). See letter 2963 n1.

2885

To Edward Ellice

16 Pall Mall [London], 9 June 1841

My dear Sir,

Only one word. *It is very, very important to Irish elections to have the writ issue as late as possible.*

*If they could be kept back until the 1st of July the better.*¹

SOURCE: Ellice Papers

- 1 The writs for the general election were issued on 23 June.

2886

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 9 June 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

I keep up my spirits as well as I can but these are disastrous times to me in my pecuniary prospects. I have been literally afraid to write to you though you are my only stay in the storm.

I believe however that the present state of political affairs is one

full of hope as resulting from the present events. The great Whig party are dissolved unless they popularise themselves. They are doing so. The elements of political combination are let loose, and the new formation of parties adverse to the Tories must rest on the attachment of the people, and the people can only be canvassed for by the agitation of Liberal principles. The struggle at present in England will be close and violent, and the passions of the mercantile classes in this period of the deepest distress will be heated by the additional warmth of the reformer. There is no calculating the effect.

I am told that the dissolution will be immediate. I heard this from high Tory authority — not as yet confirmed but certainly too likely to be true. Not one moment should be lost in making arrangements for the elections.

You see that I have got rid of the expenses of the Athlone election.¹ Kilkenny costs me or John nothing. Carlow costs me or Dan nothing.² Tralee³ will cost from £100 to £150, not more. Then I hope that money will not this time be necessary for me for Dublin. But how ought my heart to sink at these contingencies, coupled with what I fear will be a failing fund! My heart is indeed sore but, I would hope, submissive.

I will, please God, be to dinner on Friday at Merrion Square. Will you come and eat your fish with me on that day? You will be able, from the weather, to calculate my time of arrival.

I have spoken to Sir J.M. Doyle and have spoken to him in strong language but he is a tool in other hands.⁴ We will on Saturday communicate with the Bishop⁵ with whom I will do all possible⁶ for Mr. Carmichael.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 274-6

- 1 Since a candidate had been found to stand in place of John O'Connell (see letters 2862 and 2863 n2).
- 2 The contest in Co. Carlow proved very expensive for both O'Connell and the Repeal Association (see letters 2921, 2926 and 2931).
- 3 Where his son Maurice was standing.
- 4 Sir John M. Doyle stood for Newry but was defeated 319 votes to 237 by Lord Newry.
- 5 Michael Blake.
- 6 Richard Carmichael appears to have intended standing for Newry as a representative of the medical profession (*MR*, 14 June; *DEM*, 14 June 1841).

2887

To Henry Brougham

Pall Mall [London], 10 June 1841

My Lord,

Whatever impediments may lie in my way, I cannot suffer them to prevent me from paying as far as I can the debt of gratitude I owe your Lordship for the most valuable service you have rendered to me and to some worthy constituents of mine by the manner you were pleased to take up and carry through the House of Lords the bill for including the city which I represent in the general law respecting malicious injuries.¹ That manner was of course in your hands able — everybody must know that — but it was under the circumstances most generous on your part, a generosity which it would be vain for me to hope to rival, but which I shall ever remember with thankfulness and admiration.

Permit me then, in the strongest terms I can use, to offer you the expression of my liveliest and warmest gratitude.

But there is one circumstance which I think will recompense you far beyond anything I could say or do. It is this. Your patronage of the bill carried it through the Lords, a result I *never could* have achieved but the consequence is that a very numerous, a very industrious family,² are rescued from inevitable and total ruin and restored to competence. Without you they would be paupers. You have restored them to competence. This is your great reward.

SOURCE: Brougham MSS, University College London.

1 See letter 2845 n2.

2 That of John S. Folds.

2887a

From Richard More O'Ferrall

Copy

11 June 1841

Dear O'Connell,

I have stated my opinion more than once as to Mayo. It is entirely out of my influence and I had refused Lord Oranmore to meddle in it.

I consider mutual understanding in political matters as sacred as a bond. We can never struggle for the common cause unless perfect good faith is maintained between those who conscientiously differ on the repeal question.

Lord Oranmore does not wish his nephew¹ to stand unless one of

the present members retires.

Lord Altamont² will contest it against all parties. No one can influence him.

Try all means to settle this matter by private remonstrance before you are forced to interfere publicly. Any disunion or appearance of bad faith on the side of anti-repealers in Mayo would be the signal for dissension all over the country. I well know the difficult position you are placed in and it is too bad to [one word illegible] you when as you justly say you are using your best efforts in the common cause.

I have written to Ellice and have requested him to assist in setting this unpleasant matter at rest.

Do not you think that Hutton³ should be called on to go over. He feels in a delicacy taking any step under present circumstances unless called on.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward More O'Ferrall

- 1 Unidentified. Lord Oranmore and Browne had several nephews.
- 2 George John (Browne) (1820-1896), styled earl of Altamont until 1845 when he succeeded as third marquess of Sligo. He did not stand in the Mayo election.
- 3 Robert Hutton.

2888

From Lord Brougham, c. 10 or 11 June 1841

Copy

Brougham thanks O'Connell for letting him know the effect of the Dublin bill,¹ it being a great satisfaction to find that the unfortunate individual, who had suffered under the former state of the law, had received relief.

SOURCE: Brougham MSS, University College London.

- 1 See letter 2887.

2889

To Frank Thorpe Porter¹

Merrion Square, 12 June 1841

My dear friend,

I implore of you to endeavour to prevent your brother² from involving himself in the charge of partiality. The important questions are, 1st, Who shall be assessor? 2nd, Who shall be

deputies? As to the first, let him, I beg of you, find a man of station and character, as little of a partisan as possible.³ Should he not consult both parties and hear objections at each side before he decides? This should however be the last resort.

As to Deputies. They should be men of station and character. As *neutral* as well as intelligent and honest as possible.

You know, my dear Porter, that I seek no favour. However long and intimate our friendship has been, I ask or seek no favour. I know you would be as far from looking for favour as I from asking.

All I require is perfect justice and fair play. Do, my excellent friend, entreat your brother to give me *that*. I would not write to you but that it is rumoured that the assessor was to be a young and violent partisan. .

SOURCE : NLI MSS 17070

- 1 Frank Thorpe Porter (1801-82), 2 Lr. Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin; fourth and youngest son of William Porter of Willmount, Rathfarnham, Co. Dublin. Called to the bar 1827; police magistrate, Dublin Castle 1840-60; author of several legal works. See *Boase*.
- 2 Joshua Porter (died c. 1865), 72 Grafton Street, Dublin. Son of William Porter of Willmount, Rathfarnham; printer, bookseller and stationer; sheriff of Dublin city 1841.
- 3 O'Connell was referring to the arrangements for the coming Dublin city election. Joshua Porter, the city sheriff, appointed John Francis Waller as assessor (*Pilot*, 7 July 1841). In the Repeal Association on 26 July O'Connell denounced Waller as having acted in a partisan spirit during the contest (*Pilot*, 28 July 1841).

2890

From his son John to Dublin

[13 June 1841]

[only latter part of letter extant]

would throw a damp and a fatal discouragement over the spirits of those disposed to support us. I finally suggested that I should canvass¹ in Dan's name on Tuesday and Wednesday (employing Monday in making out lists for you and in speaking to the market people) in the safer districts and (by placards announcing our going) perhaps get a crowd together. This at any rate is better than *idleness* or *flight*. There is, I repeat, a *hesitation*, an *irresolution* and I will plainly say something of *incapacity* only too visible here.

My suggestion was well received and is to be acted upon. Meantime it is *indispensable* that you be here at once, that is to say, on Wednesday if you would not further peril a cause sufficiently beset with difficulties of itself and rendered still more precarious by

what I must call perhaps mistakenly, a want of resolution and of energy on the part of the local men. Money too is *wanting*, at least is *said to be wanting*, to provide for getting men out of the way etc.

From what some of Bruen's voters have been heard to say, it is not impossible that an attempt will be made to return Dan *and Bruen* but this is little better than conjecture.

French goes tomorrow and will on Tuesday morning give you *details*. His position is *awkwardly undefined*. It ought to be *defined at once*.² We had an excellent meeting today at Tullow where several voters attended and all is expected to go well.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 In the Co. Carlow election.

2 Arthur French later held the position of election agent for Yates and Daniel O'Connell, Jr. in this election (*Pilot*, 19 July 1841).

2890a

To Richard More O'Ferrall

Merrion Square, 15 June 1841

My dear O'Farrell,

I enclose you a letter from Youghal, another from Archdeacon Laffan,¹ another from Ed Roche.² It is well you should know all that is said and thought.

I will neither say or do anything about Mayo without first communicating with you.

With respect to Carlow could there be a letter written to the Bishop, Dr. Healy [*recte* Haly]³, to say that *there would not be any resentment entertained against those who at this election were repealers*. A hint of *this* kind would be valuable. It should not appear to have any connection with me.

As to Youghal, why ask a requisition? It seems dragging the constituency at the chariot wheel of authority. Indeed, indeed it is not good taste. Especially as the politics and that species of religious feeling called in Ireland Biblicism on the part of young Curry⁴ lessen the influence of the Duke and create disgust where attachment might easily be produced. I write to the Rev. Mr. O'Regan⁵ urging the signing of the requisition though I deem it right to give you my *real* opinion.⁶

The county of Cork must be looked to.

I will write to Archdeacon Laffan and quiet him.

I go down to Carlow myself tomorrow. I will report progress. We must bring over 40 but bringing over 40 secures us the election. We

have every priest but one, every one of them active but one. More on my return.

I wish Fitz-Simon, my son-in-law, were here. He will I know by Thursday morning. I want him as a safe and discreet channel of communication with the government.

The Marquis of Kildare standing confounds the Tories. I think it will exclude a contest. I am content to let Hutton be his colleague. I *could* stand for Cork County or for Limerick County.⁷

More O'Ferrall Esq.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward More O'Ferrall

- 1 For identification see Letter 3124, note 2.
- 2 Edward Roche (1771-1855), Trabolgan, Co. Cork, father of Edmund Burke Roche, 'M.P.
- 3 Francis Haly (1781-1855), educated at Maynooth College, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin from 1838. See *Boase*.
- 4 Francis Edmund Currey, Lismore Castle, Co. Waterford, land agent to the duke of Devonshire, and probably a son of William S. Currey.
- 5 Rev. Patrick D. O'Regan (1808-1898), C.C. Youghal, appointed 1881 P.P. of Mitchelstown and Dean of Cloyne. He took an active part in the Repeal movement.
- 6 On 3 July Hon. Charles Compton Cavendish, a Liberal was returned unopposed for Youghal (*DEP*, 6 July 1841). A grandson of the fourth duke of Devonshire he was created Baron Chesham in 1858.
- 7 Eventually, O'Connell and Hutton stood for Dublin city but were defeated (see letter 2902n4). O'Connell was elected for Co. Cork.

2890b

From Richard More O'Ferrall

Copy

17 June 1841

My dear O'Connell,

You will receive a letter by this post on the subject of Youghal and Carlow which will remove the impression you are asking, for the requisition was well meant but it should have gone thro' another channel than Curry.¹ He was a Dublin blunder. The same person who writes to you will write to the Bishop.²

You need not fear heavy resentment for those who exert themselves unless great imprudence or violence which you would disapprove as much as anyone rendered a condemnation absolutely necessary.

A communication to that or a similar effect will be made by the person who writes to you this day.

The Marquis of Kildare will not stand. I think this fact should have been clearly understood before the requisition was put forward as we lose Hutton without having Kildare.

I do not know how far they have proceeded in Dublin but it appears to me there has been some strange misunderstanding. Would it do or would it be possible to return him without his coming forward, leaving it to himself to accept or refuse the seat?

Whatever happens I strongly urge you not to make any unkind comment on him or the Duke.

If our friends are not all we wish we must take them as they are.

I am not satisfied as to Mayo. If there is any treachery do not wait to communicate to me having satisfied yourself that it is so.

If 20 elections my own included were to be lost I would not interfere to stop you, but see Dillon³ thereon before you take any step. He may make some arrangement which will require to be explained to you.

It appears to us here that you could not leave Dublin to stand for Cork or Limerick without great danger.

The repealers would not support two opponents of that question.

I am sure a visit to the South including Cork City and County is the only way to set matters right.

I agree with Roche⁴ about Barry.⁵ Fitz-Simon will inform you on all other points.

SOURCE: Papers of Edward More O'Ferrall

1 Francis Edmund Currey.

2 Francis Haly, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.

3 Unidentified.

4 Edward Roche.

5 Garret Standish Barry.

2891

To Christopher Fitz-Simon

Carlow, 18 June 1841

My dear Fitz-Simon,

I am occupied here in the ardent struggle and have ascertained that we have material to win, abundant material, if the game be well played. *All* depends on the exertions being properly made. I enclose you a list of 'Agenda' which, if done, makes the return perfectly secure but any neglect is quite capable of spoiling all. I remain here engaged in making every possible effort.

No. 1. Relates to Lord Fitzwilliam's Protestant tenants.

2. Sir R. Ouseley's¹ Protestant tenants.

3. Sir Ralph Howard's.²

4. John Corcoran³ of Enniscorthy's tenants.

5. The Burtchalls, *deeply* grateful they ought to be to the Devon family.

Leave these memoranda with *the Government* committee or confidential persons in Dublin. If I am properly supported I will carry this county.

An intimation should be given that the Government are desirous that votes should be given to the enemies of Bruen and *his colleague*. What they want is to beat the Tories, no matter by whom the Tories may be beaten. Have *this* distinctly made known to all of the aristocracy connected with this county. Let the friends of the ministry give us the Whig party — I will answer for the people.

We yesterday bearded the Lion in his den. We attacked the stronghold of Cavanagh — St. Mollens. The day was unfavourable, a deluge of rain. Doyne,⁴ the agent, followed me to the fair with the drivers of the estate and brought away several of the voters. Others remained. He — Doyne — would have been badly used but for my son John. He went away greatly frightened.⁵ The agitation is *up* in that quarter and, before I left, I organised the parishes with the aid of *all* the priests. The priests, who were torpid last election in that district, are all alive now. I have them all at work. Even the Priest of Borris,⁶ who was worse than neutral last election, is now hearty and active in the cause.

Father Maher⁷ bids me tell you all is progressing well. We spend this day *here* organising. Tomorrow we hold a great meeting at Bagenalstown. On Sunday I go to Rathvilly where there is to be an enormous assemblage. John and Steele go to two other meetings that day. On Monday we attend another great meeting in the Barony of [lower] St. Mollens — at Newtown.⁸ On Tuesday all the county will be in this town, the fair day. We will, I hope, be making up our books. On Wednesday we make our definitive arrangements for the mode of conducting the election.

Send me the £700 you have got. I write again to Ed. Ellice for the remainder for this county, out of which remainder I am to pay £300 to *the Castle*,⁹ if that money be required. If I do not see a reasonable prospect of success I will withhold the money and return it but at present the game is perfectly capable of being won.

See Ray as soon after you receive this as possible and act for me as if I were there myself. Do not wait to consult me but act with as much authority as I *could possibly* do myself. John Smith's¹⁰ health does not allow him to conduct my election. What think you of Ford? But decide yourself. It may not be reasonable to throw the burden on Ford who is full of talent, activity and personal tenderness to me.

Speak to Sausse about William Galway's¹¹ nephew, Capt. Holmes.¹²

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Sir Ralph Ouseley (1772-1842), second son of John Ouseley of Co. Galway (or Co. Longford). Officer in British and Portuguese armies. Knighted by king of Portugal. See *DNB*.
- 2 Sir Ralph Howard J.P., D.L., (1801-73), Bushy Park, Bray, Co. Wicklow; elder son of Hon. Hugh Howard; M.P. for Co. Wicklow 1829-47 and 1848-52; colonel of the Wicklow militia. See *Boase*.
- 3 Though a Catholic, John Corcoran, who possessed property in Co. Carlow, voted for Colonel Bruen at the 1841 election. (Anonymous, *The Reign of Terror in Carlow*, London, 1841, 91).
- 4 Charles Henry Doyne (1809-67), St. Austin's Abbey, Co. Carlow, land agent to the Kavanagh family of Borris.
- 5 On 17 June, accompanied by his son John, Tom Steele, O'Neill Daunt and Thomas Reynolds, O'Connell held a meeting at St. Mullins. It was attended, according to the *Pilot*, by a crowd of between eighty and one hundred thousand. Charles Doyne tried to hold a meeting in the same field, and had to be escorted back to Carlow for safety by Steele and John O'Connell (*Pilot*, 21 June 1841).
- 6 Rev. Christopher Doyle (died 1859), P.P. of Borris, Co. Carlow 1837-59.
- 7 Fr. James Maher (1793-1874), parish priest of Killeshin, Co. Carlow from January 1841; an uncle of Cardinal Cullen and one of the most distinguished Irish priests of his time. See Patrick F. Moran, Ed., *The letters of Rev. James Maher, D.D. . . . on religious subjects* (Dublin, 1877).
- 8 Newtown was in the barony of Idrone East but close to St. Mullins.
- 9 Dublin Castle since this money was English Whig party funds (see letter 2896).
- 10 Probably John Smyth, attorney (see letter 2490n1).
- 11 William Thomas Galway, solicitor, 20 Upper Rutland Street, Dublin.
- 12 James G. Holmes, 20 Upper Rutland Street, Dublin.

2892

To ?

Extract

Carlow, 18 June 1841

. . . It is a bitter disappointment not to have Lord Kildare stand¹ but as we must quietly resign ourselves to get no work out of that family, let not one angry word be spoken nor one single reflection on the Duke's conduct. He is sadly faint-hearted but there is no use in his being told so.

We have glorious prospects here if we could but work them out. The people are rousing, and the Catholic clergy are, for the first time

for years, taking their station. One barony,² that in which the Kavanagh property is situate, was remarkable for the indisposition of the clergy to agitation. Well, we have got them *all* in active motion. If the Whig candidate got the help from the Whigs which he ought and which they can give, we should succeed gloriously.

With respect to our own affairs, the prospect is of course clouded by the refusal of the Duke to allow his son to stand. I do not believe the deputation³ will have any weight whatsoever with him. I have known him visited by several deputations to beg of him to take part in several proceedings. I never knew any deputation to succeed. He never yields. So much the worse for us. I see the parishes⁴ are meeting right well.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Recollections*, II, 25-6

1 See letter 2874n8.

2 Lower St. Mullins.

3 A deputation emanating from the meeting of 12 June (see letter 2874n8). It was understood in Dublin on 16 June that Kildare would not stand and that his father, Leinster, was opposed to his standing (*Times*, 18 June 1841). The deputation left Dublin for London on 17 June to try to persuade Kildare to stand. They were received by Leinster who said that his son was not in a position at present to enter public life (*Pilot*, 18, 21 June 1841).

4 Meetings of the Liberals of the Dublin city parishes of St. Audeon's, St. Anne's, SS. Michael and John's and St. Paul's to make arrangements for the election, had been held during the past few days (*FJ*, 15, 16, 19 June 1841).

2893

To Christopher Fitz-Simon

Carlow, 19 June 1841

My dear Fitz-Simon,

We were out at Bagenalstown this day being market day there, and are certainly *progressing*. We go tomorrow in various directions. John¹ and Father Maher take one district, I take another — that of Rathvilly.

My plan is to go again to the barony of St. Mollens on Monday. Tuesday will be the fair day of Carlow and we shall have every information the out workers can give so as to frame our future arrangements. We will thus be able to *realise* all that we have of prospect of success, with the exception of the efforts to be made on the persons named in the memoranda² I sent you last night.

You must see Kenny Purcell³ and tell him it is most important he should be here on Monday evening or early on Tuesday.

See Mr. Dwyer,⁴ the attorney in Mount Street, and get him also to come here on Monday evening or early on Tuesday.

See Arthur French and tell him I would not prematurely disturb him from his duty in Dublin but that we make our definitive arrangements on Wednesday at which he will feel that his attendance will be absolutely necessary. Indeed we cannot do without him.

Tell each of these gentlemen that I should write to them if I had time. They will easily excuse me as they know how I must be pressed.

I think we have this day ascertained a difference in our favour of near seventy say *more* than 62 at the least. But we must work double time from the encouragement of this success.

How miserably has the Duke of Leinster failed us.⁵ But we must not say a word against him, poor man!!!

[P.S.] I enclose a fuller memorandum as to the Burtchalls.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 John O'Connell.
- 2 The memoranda mentioned in letter 2891.
- 3 Solicitor, 34 Dawson Street, Dublin.
- 4 Thomas Dwyer, attorney, 13 Lower Mount Street, Dublin.
- 5 See letter 2892 n3.

2894

To Pierce Mahony, 43 Dame St., Dublin

Carlow, 22 June 1841

My dear Mahony.

I return you your Limerick documents. I have written to Sir David Roche for his views of the affair. If I hear anything interesting to you, I will write to you or go and see you.

We made a most unhappy move about that unfledged Lord Kildare.¹ Of course I will not say one word on the subject until after *all* the elections.

I wish I was fairly rid of the toil, tumult and expence of Dublin. I believe we are in the fairest way to win in this county.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 See letter 2892 n3.

2895

From Sir David Roche

Limerick, 23 June 1841

My dear O'Connell,

The state of our case is this. John O'Brien and I have started and, before I got your letter which has been just put into my hand, the united parishes of the city held their meeting and have by acclamation adopted us. I most sincerely assure you that you would confer on me a great favour by accepting of my place. My private affairs and my domestic afflictions¹ make a retirement most gratifying to me and in your favour it would give me a satisfaction that I cannot describe. John O'Brien is rather a vain man or, at any rate, wishes a seat in Parliament so much that, now he is pretty certain of one, he would not like to relinquish. But we are in a sad mess in the County. General Bourke won't stand. O'Brien,² the present member, won't pay a shilling even of his own expenses. We this day as a last resort have set up Caleb Powell.³ He takes the place sooner than we should be disgraced by submitting to FitzGibbon,⁴ and went off to Lord Kingston⁵ to Mitchelstown to get his support. The priests will bring in the parishes at their own expense, and I will give £100, and two if not put to expense in the city. I have just seen Father Costello and he is most anxious that you would take Powell's or S. O'Brien's place. Powell has no wish to stand, nor have I, so if you come here, be quite certain we have your place secured. Besides we are almost certain of losing the County if you don't come to rally us.⁶ Come then, my dear friend, and you will stop Dickson⁷ and his foolish opposition in the city and be returned for the County on the leading horse for I am pretty certain FitzGibbon will never show his face.

[P.S.] I shall let Powell [2 or 3 words illegible] away and I will be at my post but let me have your decision and I trust it will be by your appearing among us as a candidate for either county or city. D.R.

I really think that both members for the County will be lost if you don't come. Powell is an excellent man but has no weight as a County gentleman but if you come, S. O'Brien will perhaps bolt and you will take Powell in with a strong majority if O'Brien is fastidious.

I am just informed that Mr. Lloyd,⁸ a Conservative, is announced as a candidate for the County so that he and FitzGibbon will be their

men and both Liberals [will be] thrown out if you are not here.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Roche's young wife was ill (see letter 2836). She died in September 1841.
- 2 William Smith O'Brien.
- 3 Caleb Powell, J.P. (1793-1881), Clanshavoy, Castleconnell, Co. Limerick, elder son of Eyre Burton Powell. Called to the bar 1817; M.P. for Co. Limerick 1841-7. See *Boase*.
- 4 Richard Hobart Fitzgibbon.
- 5 Robert Henry (King), fourth earl of Kingston (1796-1867). M.P. for Co. Cork 1826-32.
- 6 Caleb Powell and William Smith O'Brien were returned for Co. Limerick without opposition on 12 July (*Times*, 15 July 1841).
- 7 Samuel Dickson, J.P. (died 1850), Limerick. M.P. for Co. Limerick 1849-50.
- 8 Very probably Thomas Lloyd, J.P., D.L., (1798-1873), Beechmount, Rathkeale, Co. Limerick, eldest son of Thomas Lloyd late M.P. for Co. Limerick. He became a member of the Repeal Association in September 1845 (*Pilot*, 26, 29 Sept. 1845).

2896

From Lord Duncannon

Reform Club, 29 June [1841]

Private

My dear Sir,

As I would not in any way interfere in money concerns, I gave your message to Mr. Parks,¹ almost all our friends being at present out of town. I quite agree with you on the importance of Carlow and I am sure they will try to send some further means if they can be got at, but I fear the drain has been great — some of [the] seats have been lost unexpectedly, but there has been a lavish use of money on the Tory side that surpasses anything I ever heard of. I am assured at Harwich £200 for a vote. How are you if just a poor man to remit this in such places where they never had considered it wrong to take small bribes. I am very anxious to hear of your success in Carlow and wrote to express this to the Bishop.²

[P.S.] [30 June 1841] The Tories last night contrived to have it believed that Lord John [Russell] was back in London and trumpeted their triumph by the *Post* to affect pending elections. It turns out our return was the correct one and the Sheriff has just

declared him elected.³

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD.

- 1 Probably Joseph Parkes, parliamentary agent.
- 2 Francis Haly, bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.
- 3 The London city election took place on 29 June, the return being announced on 30 June (*Times*, 30 June 1841). The *Times* of 1 July devoted a leading article to the unfounded reports concerning Lord John Russell's election.

2897

From Lord ffrench

Castleffrench, Ahascra[gh, Co. Galway], 1 July 1841

My dear O'Connell,

I wrote in haste yesterday to you, not to lose a post in replying to your letter.

On further consideration, in order to prevent the possibility of any misapprehension of Mr. Browne's¹ view of the position, in which he conceives the matter is placed, I think it advisable to confide to you the enclosed letter — as from a previous communication, I have reason to know, that Mr. Browne means to consider it 'a breach of confidence' as alluded to in his letter, if the same object be carried into effect for any other person before Mr. Browne's object² be effected.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Michael Joseph Browne, J.P., Moyne, Dangan, Co. Galway; high sheriff of Co. Galway 1847.
- 2 The appointment of Martin Joseph ffrench to a resident magistracy (see letter 2912).

2898

From Sir David Roche

Limerick, 1 July 1841

My dear friend,

I of course was aware of your disposition to keep matters quiet here, and the arrangement you have made with the deputation will completely stop all opposition. The County is going breast high with Powell and Smith O'Brien and, as yet, no one has set up to oppose them but the Knight of Glin¹ who I dare say will retire before a week. He professes Liberal opinions on every question but the Corn Laws.

If he stands he will get support from none but the Tories. The election is put off for the County until Monday week to see how you get on in Dublin but, as Lord Kingston and many others, not very friendly to you, are active supporters of Powell, it would be better for you to take my place for the city and let the County stay as it is. At the same time, Powell is only anxious for you to fight the battle if we have one in the County. Dr. Kennedy² has sent me word that all is right in Clare and that they will return their old members.³

[P.S.] I thought John O'Brien would have been more popular here but if you or even I said one word against him, he would not have a chance.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John F. FitzGerald J.P., D.L., (1791-1854), high sheriff of Co. Limerick 1830.
- 2 Patrick Kennedy (c. 1787-1850), bishop of Killaloe 1836-50.
- 3 William Nugent MacNamara and Cornelius O'Brien who were elected (see letter 2884 n3).

2899

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 1 July 1841

My Dear Sir,

Money is scarce and we are husbanding all for the City where all will be wanted. . . . I sent £300 yesterday. In a day or two, if necessary, on hearing from you again I hope to send at all events *part* of the £500, perhaps *all*, but Capt. R.¹ states the £500 was to be in the event of success.

[P.S.] It is feared in Wicklow that Howard is playing into Acton's² hands.³ John Mahon, their attorney, tells me he has written about Howard's Carlow tenants. Say if it is done or have you heard of it?

Richd. Wright, now here, I hope is so worked on as to go down and vote in Carlow town and county.

There is a circular,⁴ a satisfactory one, going tomorrow to *all* magistrates on their using the military in elections.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Very probably Captain Frederick Romilly, private secretary to the lord lieutenant.
- 2 William Acton, J.P., D.L. (1789-1854), West Aston, Rathdrum, Co. Wicklow. M.P. for Co. Wicklow 1841-48; high sheriff of Co. Wicklow 1820. See *Boase*.

- 3 On 17 July Colonel William Acton (Conservative) and Sir Ralph Howard (Liberal) were returned for Co. Wicklow, the final count being Acton, 660; Howard, 599; James Grattan, 561 (*Times*, 19 July 1841). The *Pilot* of 16 July accused Acton and Howard of having formed a 'disgraceful coalition' at the expense of Grattan.
- 4 The circular addressed to sherriffs and dated 30 June, laid down that military were to be employed at the elections only in case of disturbance, preservation of law and order to be left as far as possible to the civil authorities (*Pilot*, 5 July 1841).

2900

From Christopher Fitz-Simon

Dublin, 2 July 1841

My Dear Sir,

I have arranged about the £500. It shall be ready tomorrow but as I understand you are coming to town, unless I hear to the contrary, I shall hold it for you.

The £200 got by Rev. Mr. Maher is not charged against your claim. You received, I believe, as follows:-

Per C.F. from London	£700
Per	£300
Per C.F. on 30 June	£300
	1300

Yates' share' of indemnity	
per your memorandum	£200
	1500

Thus you see Mr. Maher's £200 is not charged against you.

Sheil is gone down to Cork via Dungarvan. We have sent Roche's letter to him, begging of him at once to set matters right between Roche¹ and Barry.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Edmund Burke Roche, J.P., D.L. (1815-74), Killshannic, Co. Cork; M.P. for Co. Cork 1837-55; created Baron Fermoy in 1855; lord lieutenant Co. Cork 1856-74.
- 2 Garret Standish Barry.

2901

From Nicholas Boylan,¹ John Burke, P.P. and Thomas Leonard, P.P.²

Dublin, 9th July 1841

Sir,

We the undersigned have been appointed to wait on you in this city for the purpose of conveying to you the intelligence most grateful to us and honourable to our county that, in consideration of the doubtful issue of the pending contest for Dublin, you have been this day unanimously elected to represent the Co. of Meath in Parliament.

Mr. Corbally³ with a feeling highly creditable to himself and honourable to his patriotic house, removed every obstacle to that great national object by withdrawing himself as a candidate.⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Nicholas Boylan, J.P. (1797-1852), Hilltown, Co. Meath.
- 2 Rev. Thomas Leonard (1794-1848), parish priest, Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath 1838-48.
- 3 Matthew Elias Corbally, J.P. (1797-1870), Corbalton Hall, Dunshaughlin, Co. Meath. M.P. for Co. Meath 1840-41 and 1842-70.
- 4 O'Connell and Henry Grattan were elected unopposed for Meath on 9 July (*Times*, 12 July 1841).

2902

From Richard Scott

Private and confidential

Ennis [Co. Clare], 9 July 1841

My Dear O'Connell,

I find from the newspapers¹ that the villainous Corporation of Dublin are determined at all hazards to return West and Grogan,² contrary to all justice, law and fair play. Before you receive this, the question will be decided: if against you, we are open here for you. *Start for Clare* and I promise you that even for a day, your country shan't lose your services in Parliament. We have as yet only one Tory candidate, Vandeleur, and your friends, MacNamara and O'Brien. MacNamara's election, I think, safe. And Vandeleur cannot beat O'Brien but by bribery — and his money is flying *freely and heavily* in all directions. *I fear for the result*³ as we are without money even for the ordinary expenses of the election, as we have no Liberal Club or bond of union amongst us. If you start, one of our men *must and*

will give way. *Let it be O'Brien.* You can induce him much sooner to do so than you can MacNamara. Besides O'Brien is not a fit representative for this County, he is detested by the gentry and dreaded by his own party, and would never be its member save for his politics which are honest. Select therefore MacNamara to go in with you and I promise you a glorious triumph over Vandeleur. MacNamara has amongst the Conservatives few personal friends and they will have less regret at your being elected if MacNamara is your colleague.

If you are to look for a seat anywhere, give Clare the preference. Recollect Clare was the first County you ever sat for. Don't go to a strange one.

If you have lost Dublin⁴ for the present and that you will start for Clare, let one of your soul-spiriting addresses appear in all the Evening papers of Saturday. Write by post to MacNamara and O'Brien. Write to our Bishop⁵ to Deerpark, Bunratty, write to some of our clergy. Start Steele (if in Dublin) and some others for Clare in post carriages. Let them travel all night. Let one or 2 carriages come into Clare by Killaloe to Ennis through Tulla etc. and one or 2 carriages through Limerick distributing your address. All this must be done tomorrow so that we must have your address and letters by the mail of tomorrow night here *at 12 o'clock on Sunday.*

Tomorrow we will only propose the candidates. Sunday will be a day for glorious agitation if you are up for Clare. On Monday we can propose you and spend a great part of the day in speaking etc. and go to work in right earnest on Tuesday but, unless you are declared a candidate on Sunday all over Clare, half our strength will be polled on Monday as 12 or 1300 only can come to poll and, if we only receive your directions on Monday, we won't have men enough left to return you unless both our men give way to you, which *they must do if necessary.* Decide therefore at once, and let tomorrow night's mail carry the glad tidings to Clare.

No person whatsoever knows of this letter, the thought has only just struck me and, least this letter should reach you too late tomorrow by the postman, I write a copy of it to be delivered to you early by my clerk in Dublin.

P.S. If you are obliged to petition against West and Grogan, can't you sit for Clare pending it and, if the petition is successful, you can elect to sit for Dublin and leave us open to return O'Brien.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 On 7 July the *Pilot* blamed the officials of the old Dublin corporation for exercising partiality in the city election, and condemned especially the sheriff, Joshua Porter.

- 2 Edward Grogan (1802-91), barrister, Harcourt Street, Dublin. M.P. for Dublin city 1841-65; created a baronet 1859. See *Boase*.
- 3 See letter 2884 n3.
- 4 O'Connell did lose Dublin city. On 11 July, the Tories John Beatty West and Edward Grogan were declared elected. The final count seems to have been West, 3,860; Grogan, 3,839; O'Connell, 3,692; Hutton, 3,662 (*MR*, 12 July 1841).
- 5 Dr. Kennedy.

2903

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Carlow, 11 July 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have had a deputation from Cork County offering me the representation. I have more than half consented as that would enable me to give back to Lord Fingall's brother-in-law¹ his own county. I think that arrangement will be made. I will then have to atone as well as I can to the noble electors of Meath. Send me back the letter² of the Meath deputation which I enclosed to you last night.

See Fitz-Simon at once if it be true that Lord Milton is arrived in Ireland, that he may be written to about his Carlow Protestant tenants.³ He can *command* them. Of course I would not use that word in speaking to him but he can *give us* their votes without interfering with his exertions in Wicklow. Tell Fitz-Simon also to get Tighe of Woodstock written to again about his vote for this county. He seems hanging back.

We certainly have a *majority* here, I say certainly.

I wrote off last night to Limerick where I was offered a *secure* seat, to suggest their giving it to Lord Morpeth. I hope I should thus satisfy everybody, that is, if I can work out my plans.

Tell Fitz-Simon I want the commission of the peace for William Finn's brother-in-law, James Brennan of Mountrath. I will write again tomorrow evening, please God, about this matter and enclose a letter for the Lord Chancellor.⁴

If Sir Ralph Howard be supported by Lord Milton he ought in return to *give us* his votes in this county. Get Fitz-Simon to look to this.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 276-7

- 1 Mathew Elias Corbally (see letter 2901).
- 2 Letter 2901.
- 3 On the estate of his father, Lord Fitzwilliam.
- 4 Lord Campbell.

2904

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Carlow, 13 July 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

The election is going on smoothly. We are fighting a good fight. I hope we shall succeed though, you know, I am apt to despond. The majority this day may be either way. It is likely it may be in favour of Bruen because he has forces in every barony whereas our gigantic strength is in one, Rathvilly. At the close tomorrow the matter will be reduced to a certainty.

You may rely on it that, as long as this election is in doubt, I will remain here. *Certain* success or *certain* defeat can alone take me away.

You said in your letter to John, and you repeated it in your letter to me, that you sent me the Meath letter¹ which, however, you omitted to do. Having said it *twice* you did not deem it necessary to do it *once*. I would have preferred the latter.

The town and country are perfectly tranquil, just excitement enough for procuring votes but not too much to be under control. It has not been sufficiently noticed that there was not the slightest disturbance at the Dublin City Election.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 277-8

1 Letter 2901.

2905

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Cork, 17 July 1841

My dear FitzPatrick,

You perceive that I am in a situation to restore Meath¹ to Mr. Corbally but it must be done without offence to my friends in that county. This is a matter of some delicacy. Consult and see how you can aid me to conciliate all parties. I wish to have Ford's advice and assistance, but discreetly and without its being known that I consulted him. The truth is I am afraid of awakening jealousies amongst the members of the club.² The seeds of jealousy already exist and therefore it requires more dexterity. I know nothing can be properly done by any hand over head manner; I trust everything to conciliation. Of course it is for this county that I will elect to sit.

I go tomorrow to Trabolgan, the seat of my colleague's father,³

and will remain there until Monday when I am to be entertained at a public dinner in this city. I intend the next day to start for Dublin. I will however consume full two days on the road as I must stay in Carlow to make the 'after-clap arrangements.'⁴

That there must be a combination in Ireland of all the friends of the country is perfectly certain. But alas, the cruel impolicy of Lord Ebrington's government renders it almost impossible to combine with the class 'place hunter'. The Repeal is the sole basis which the people will accept. Let nobody tell you the contrary. We attempted half measures — registry franchise associations — and failed although we had the patronage of Government. A cobweb association of that kind may be attempted with a colour of success while the Whigs are in but it would be at best an abortion and should be flung away as a delusion, worthless and disagreeable, so soon as the Tory power begins. No, the Repeal and the Repeal alone is and must be the grand basis of all future operations, hit or miss, win or lose. The people will take nothing short of that and I bitterly regret to tell you that the popular excitement is of so exasperated a character that they will rush into insurrection unless my influence checks and controls them, and that cannot exist or operate unless I take the highest tone and make the most constant exertions in favour of Repeal. The country is really in a most unsatisfactory state, and it will require more than human prudence to prevent sanguinary and exceedingly foolish as well as criminal ebullitions. When Conway in his editorial chair waxes so warm as the last [*Dublin Evening*] *Post* proves,⁵ you have a rough scale to measure the degrees of popular fermentation. I say there can be no other basis of association save the Repeal, the glorious Repeal.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 278-9

- 1 See letter 2901. On being elected for both Meath and Co. Cork O'Connell had chosen to sit for Co. Cork.
- 2 The Meath Independent Club. See letter 2907n2.
- 3 Edward Roche, father of Edmund Burke Roche, M.P.
- 4 A meeting of the Repeal Association on 26 July decided to establish a counties league fund to protect voters, particularly in Co. Carlow, against reprisals by their landlords; to make Edmond Smithwick its treasurer and Kevin T. Buggy its secretary and to send £500 to Smithwick for the relief of such voters in Co. Carlow (*Pilot*, 28 July 1841).
- 5 In an editorial on 15 July the *Post* declared that, though it had hitherto been the organ of moderate government, it felt that in the event of an Orange administration coming into power it would be the duty of every Irishman to resist 'not by arguments alone, but by appeals to the feeling of the country. . . .' It urged agitation against the Tories.

2906

*To Edmond Smithwick*Cork, 19 July 1841¹

My dear Smithwick,

Grieving is a folly. Hurrah for the next movement.

I intend to leave this tomorrow, to sleep at Fermoy and to be in Kilkenny by three o'clock on Wednesday. Write to Fr. Maher to Carlow and to Fitzgerald to meet me there. It is better to make our indemnity arrangements there than in Carlow. Press them to meet me. No time is to be lost in action to protect the voters who were honest.²

With affectionate respects to your dear lady and love for *my* boys.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 O'Connell erroneously dated this letter 20 July. He attended a public dinner in Cork on 19th and arrived in Kilkenny on Wednesday 21 July (*Pilot*, 26 July 1841).
- 2 See letter 2905 n4.

2907

From P.V. Fitzpatrick

Dublin, 20 July 1841

My Dear Liberator,

I have seen William Forde confidentially according to your desire.¹ He bids me say that he wrote yesterday to Navan where Dr. Cantwell and a large body of his clergy were to meet today suggesting the propriety of approaching Mr. Corbally under existing circumstances through the medium of a powerful requisition inviting him to stand anew for Meath. You will probably hear the effect of this suggestion of Forde's on the day of your arrival in Dublin. In any event there is sufficient time to arrange matters at Meath² as of course nothing can be done in the way of actual election until Parliament meets and the new writ has been issued by the Speaker. It may perhaps become advisable that you go down to the county in person to conciliate those worthy friends of yours who have apparently some misunderstandings which you beyond all others can reduce to settlement. This however and other topics can be best discussed verbally on your arrival when there will be many subjects of principle and detail to bring before you with reference to the truly critical circumstances in which this country has been placed by the success³ of the Tories.

Send me by return of post a cheque for £500 to meet bills due on Thursday and Friday.

P.S. I have of course sent £50 to your credit with the London Joint Stock Bank.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 See letter 2905
- 2 The Meath Independent Club had on 28 June selected Corbally and Henry Grattan as its candidates for the county. However, when O'Connell was defeated in Dublin, a section of the club led by Patrick Matthews persuaded him to put himself up for Meath. Corbally retired unconditionally to make way for O'Connell who was duly elected along with Henry Grattan. O'Connell chose to sit for Co. Cork. A dispute arose as to whether or not Matthews had any right in the first place to offer O'Connell the representation, and it was alleged at a meeting of the club on 26 July that he had done so out of personal enmity to Corbally, whom he hoped to displace. It was immediately agreed at this meeting that Corbally should be invited to stand again (*Pilot*, 30 June, 23 July, 4 Aug. 1841).
- 3 In the general election of June-July 1841 the Tories won 40 seats in Ireland and gained an overall majority in the Commons of 80-90 members (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 262, 299; Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 247).

2908

From Charles Meara, Bachelors Walk, Dublin, Saturday, 31 July 1841

States he was from 1822 to 1836 a joint security with the late Robert Armstrong¹ to the Stamp Office for Sir David Roose as agent to the Norwich Union Insurance Company until Roose's death in 1836. Now he has been informed by the Stamp Office that Roose left £406 arrears due to the crown and that he (Meara) must pay up that amount. He feels that his only resource is to appeal to the lords of the treasury and his memorial might be helped by a letter from O'Connell to More O'Ferrall, the secretary to the treasury.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Probably Robert Armstrong (died 1838/9), flour merchant, 20 Lt. Ormond Quay and 18 Great Strand Street, Dublin.

2909

To Rev. Nicholas Wiseman

Merrion Square, 5 August 1841

Private

My revered Lord,

Pardon me for giving you this trouble.

The fact is that I have been asked to preside at a dinner to be given in Birmingham in honour of the Rev. Mr. McDonnell. I have many motives to wish to comply — personal regard, identity of political sentiments, at least in many important particulars, and veneration for his sacerdotal functions. There is but one motive on the other side. It is the fear of appearing to countenance even the shadow of a reaction against the decision of his Bishop in removing him from Birmingham. In short I fear that I should be making the appearance of forming — or at least of sanctioning a party spirit amongst Catholics.

You, my Lord, know whether these fears of mine be groundless or if they involve any reality. No principle of mine is so fixed as never to do wilfully any act that could possibly be construed as supporting a clergyman of one rank against the commands of his spiritual superior. I am sure that the subordination in the clerical order cannot be too complete. Any oppression of the superior if it exists in any case can be redressed by appeal to the higher authority still.

I say these things that you may *see my mind*.

I anxiously desire to know whether my presiding at the proposed dinner will be in any respect inconsistent with these my firm convictions. I have perhaps no right to ask you, my Lord, but who so fit to inform me. Of this you may be quite certain that no person whatsoever shall know that I wrote or that you replied or *caused* a reply to be written. I say *caused* for this reason that a simple hint without reasoning will be sufficient. The mere saying that it is not advisable that I a stranger to the Diocese should interfere, or the mere saying it is preferable not to have such a dinner for the present, will be quite sufficient.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 17070

2910

From Daniel Supple, Junior

Tralee, 9 August 1841

My dear Liberator,

Now that the elections are over I beg to call your attention to the expenses of the Borough, the particulars of which you have at the other side [the total is £58.2.0]. . . . I am not aware of any other claims save one for printing which our Borough Member¹ settled by his acceptance.

There are several of the Borough voters rather embarrassed at present and are much inconvenienced by the existence of a Recorder's Court here which is held *once* a week. The poor people are frequently decreed before they have time to make up the sums for which they are processed. It has occurred to me that it would be desirable to lodge with Dr. McEnery £150 or £200 by way of a *loan* fund to be advanced from time to time on good security to such of the voters as may stand in need of assistance. This would protect the poor fellows and secure their votes in future. They have faithfully discharged their duty and something ought to be done to protect them.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Maurice O'Connell who was returned unopposed for Tralee on 5 July (*Pilot*, 7 July 1841). The voters had, 'discharged their duty' by presumably expressing their support for Maurice O'Connell at some time before nomination day.

2911

From Richard Aldworth to Merrion Square

10 Brandon Street, Bristol, 10 August 1841

Sir,

I have taken the liberty of sending these few lines to you, hoping that you will cause enquiry to be made of Mr. Ray about four pounds that was collected as Repeal Rent here and sent by post office order on Friday, 16th day of July. We do not have many Dublin papers to read. It ought to be in the paper of the 24th of July.¹ We have not got the least account about [it] and do not know whether it was received by Mr. Ray or not. The collectors are anxious for their cards.² It has been the cause of a very great damp being thrown on the collecting of such as the people do think that it was not sent. I sent a few lines this day week to Mr. Ray about it, and it was not answered which causes me to be so bold in troubling you

with this, well knowing that you will do it justice. We also want the wardens books³ and some printed bills of spirit-stirring kind to rouse the Irish here as we have no one to assist but a few working men, no gentleman to come forward in the cause, and our influence is but little. Anything coming from the Association in Dublin will be of great help to our endeavours to do good for old Ireland. The bills are to circulate among the Irish people here. One speech from some of our Irish gentlemen coming by Bristol would do all that is wanted to set Repeal moving here as well as elsewhere. The Catholic clergymen do not trouble about it.

I hope I have not intruded too far on you, Sir, by this letter. Hoping to have a very speedy answer.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 No mention of the remittance referred to has been traced during July or August.
- 2 Repeal Association membership cards.
- 3 Necessary for the duties of Repeal Wardens such as collecting the Repeal rent (see letter 2877 n4).

2912

From Lord ffrench

Castleffrench, Ahascra[gh, Co. Galway] 16 August 1841

Confidential

My Dear O'Connell,

Urgent circumstances will, I trust, excuse me to you for infringing on your valuable time and thus having recourse at the eleventh hour to the assistance which by your letter to me of the 28th June last, you promised to give to have the matter satisfactorily arranged hereafter.

The circumstances to which I advert are these. Mr. Bodkin, M.P. on the authority, I believe, of Mr. More O'Ferrall on the part of the government, had about three weeks before the late election¹ for the County of Galway made an unqualified promise to Mr. Browne of Moyne that the appointment of his nephew, the Honble. Martin Jos[ep]h ffrench,² to the office of a resident magistrate, would be the first which the government would make to that office.

I am informed by Mr. Browne of Moyne, to whom Mr. Bodkin made the communication confidentially in Dublin that he, Mr. Bodkin, had on the 13th instant an interview on this business with Mr. Norman MacDonald, that Mr. MacDonald at first denied his having been aware of an application in favour of my son — Mr. Browne's nephew. Mr. Bodkin was much surprised and excited at

this denial and said did I not apply? Did you not even show to Mr. Wm. McDermott Mr. Thomas Martin's³ letter on the subject? and did you not authorise another person to apply for Mr. Browne's support and make a promise to Lord ffrench for his son? Mr. MacDonald at first denied that any person had authority to make such promise but, when told that the matter would not drop here . . . , Mr. MacDonald then acknowledged that another person had authority to make a promise in favour of Lord ffrench's son but not for the first appointment. Mr. Bodkin then said that the first, second, third and fourth appointment⁴ had since taken place and yet Lord ffrench's son remains unappointed. Lord Morpeth then came forward and requested Mr. Bodkin to be calm and that things might yet be arranged, observing at the same time that it was a bad business that Mr. Edmd. Blake⁵ should have been appointed before my son. Mr. Bodkin then said, What do you mean to do even now? Mr. MacDonald replied that there was no vacancy, and after much hesitation said that the appointment in question should be the first. Mr. Bodkin said that was doing nothing and that he felt bound to call on those who made him the promise and require them to fulfil it, and that he would go direct to London for that purpose.

Mr. Bodkin sailed for England on that night in order to have an immediate interview with, I believe, Lord John Russell and Mr. More O'Ferrall. It may not be amiss here to observe that the appointment of Mr. Edmd. Blake was made not at the request of either of the members of the county of Galway but in opposition to their wishes. Mr. Edmd. Blake and his brother,⁶ the High Sheriff of this county, are considered to be Tories. Mr. Edmd. Blake was appointed mayor of Galway by Mr. James Daly, the Tory candidate for this county. Mr. Bodkin on the eve of the late election for this county remonstrated with the government against Mr. Edmd. Blake's appointment as a resident magistrate, as the rumour was then current of his appointment. But in despite of Mr. Bodkin's remonstrance Mr. Edmd. Blake was afterwards appointed. After such conduct on the part of the government and considering that since the late election for this county there were no less than four persons appointed resident magistrates, viz., Edwd. Gonne Bell⁷ (a Tory), Mr. Kelly,⁸ Mr. Francis Savage and the above mentioned Edmd. Blake of Furbough in this county, I cannot help observing that it is a most insulting mockery for a member of that government to say that there is no vacancy *now* for my son; and considering the very short tenure the government have of office, I cannot but regard it as a paltry subterfuge on their part to say that *if* a vacancy should occur, my son should be appointed. There are many districts to which the appointment of a resident magistrate would be desirable. My son is well qualified to fill the office creditably. He has efficiently

acted for the last five years as a magistrate for the counties of Galway and of Roscommon.

Just on the eve of the late election for this county Mr. Browne of Moyne heard for the first time the report then current of Mr. Edmd. Blake's appointment. The making of this appointment he (Mr. Browne) considered to be a direct breach of the promise given to him through Mr. Bodkin, and he would in consequence have given his support to Mr. James Daly but for my repeating to him the assurance that I had your promise that the thing would be done hereafter. Mr. Daly had he then obtained Mr. Browne's support would have contested the County and, I do think, he would have succeeded so that the assurance you gave me was the means of preventing certainly a contest and probably the return of a Tory.

Under the foregoing circumstances I rely on your kind assistance. I feel confident that by your immediately applying to the Government my son's appointment will no longer be delayed. . . .⁹

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On 12 July the two sitting members, John James Bodkin and Thomas Barnewall Martin, were returned unopposed for Co. Galway (*Pilot*, 14 July 1841).
- 2 Hon. Martin Joseph ffrench (1813-93), third son of third Baron ffrench. R.M. Co. Tipperary, 1846-82; succeeded his brother as fifth Baron ffrench in 1892.
- 3 Thomas Barnewall Martin (1786-1847), son of Richard Martin, M.P., Ballinahinch, Co. Galway, M.P. for Co. Galway 1832-47.
- 4 The appointments since the general election were: Edward Gonne Bell and Nicholas Kelly on 23 July; Edmond Blake and Francis Savage on 12 August (*Dublin Gazette*, 30 July, 13 Aug. 1841); Benjamin H. Holmes on 16 August and Henry Alcock on 27 August (*Ibid*, 20 Aug., 3 Sept. 1841). All six were dismissed by the new Tory government of Peel (report in the *Pilot* of 6 December 1841; none of the six appears in the list of stipendiary magistrates for 1842 in the *Dublin Almanac*).
- 5 Edmond Blake, (1803-95) second son of Colonel John Blake of Furbough, Co. Galway; mayor of Galway 1836-41.
- 6 Andrew William Blake, J.P., D.L. (born 1798), Furbough, Co. Galway; eldest son of Colonel John Blake. High sheriff of Co. Galway 1841.
- 7 Edward Gonne Bell, J.P., Ballyglass, Co. Mayo.
- 8 Nicholas Kelly appointed to Co. Westmeath.
- 9 Martin Joseph ffrench was appointed a resident magistrate in 1846.

2913

To O'Conor Don

16 Pall Mall [London] 29 August 1841

My dear O'Conor Don,

You will certainly recollect that when you, at the head of the Irish party in the House, required a peerage *in* the French family, it was distinctly understood that it was a *family* and not a mere *personal* peerage we sought and, I thought, obtained.¹ It is really ludicrous to suppose that we should have taken so much trouble and I, for one, unquestionably would not have made as many solicitations to have a peerage conferred on a gentleman circumstanced as Lord de Freyne is, with, I may say, a moral impossibility of his having legitimate issue.² What are we to do? or can we now do anything? If you think we can, command me for indeed I feel that we are not *well treated* by the result of all the efforts of the combined Irish party at a time when their services were most wanted.

SOURCE: Russell Papers, Public Record Office, London, P.R.O. 30/22/4B, ff. 136-7

- 1 On 16 May 1839 Arthur French of French Park, Co. Roscommon was created Baron de Freyne.
- 2 De Freyne had married in 1818 and had no children.

2914

To Rev. W. A. O'Meara, O.F.M.

Merrion Square, 9 September 1841

Copy

My respected friend,

I am much pleased and not a little proud that so exalted a personage as his Majesty the King of Bavaria¹ should have condescended to desire an autograph of mine. Of course my sentiments on this occasion are in some measure influenced by the reverence in which I hold a sceptered Monarch but they are much more strongly excited by the veneration in which I hold that Monarch for his commanding qualities, especially for his respect for popular institutions, but above all for the sincere piety he displays in his conduct, and for the pure and ardent zeal he manifests to protect and preserve the spiritual authority in all its effulgence of the Apostolic Sea, the centre of unity, the safeguard of the Church. That authority is assailed in our day by the spirit of absolutism in many Catholic and other sovereigns, who not content with Caesar's

portion claim what belongs to God. It is also assailed by the restless genius of false liberalism which whilst it affects to seek liberty principally desires to uproot religion. I am therefore delighted to have an opportunity of showing by any act however slight my profound admiration of a sovereign who desires to unite popular institutions with the sincerest attachment to the doctrines and the most perfect submission to the authority of the Church of God as promulgated and exercised by the Holy See. I accordingly send you some lines² out of Dryden which may be recommended to his Majesty by the sentiments they convey.

Believe me always to be
Most respectfully and faithfully yours,
Daniel O'Connell

Written with the hope that these lines may be presented to his Majesty the King of Bavaria:

But gracious God! how well dost thou provide
For erring judgments an unerring guide,
Thy Throne is darkness in the excess of light
A blaze of glory that forbids the sight:
O, teach me to believe thee thus concealed
Nor further search than what thyself revealed
But her alone for my director take
Whom thou has promised never to forsake.

Daniel O'Connell, M.P.

for the county of Cork³

SOURCE: Franciscan Fathers, Killiney, Co. Dublin.

1 Ludwig I (1786-1868).

2 From John Dryden's, *The Hind and the Panther*, Part I, lines 64-71.

3 In a short letter to Rev. W.A. O'Meara, OFM, dated 12 October 1841, acknowledging the letter from O'Connell to O'Meara, King Ludwig refers to, 'These lines written from the land of that energetical character inseparable for ever from the history of our age.'

2915

From Rev. Owen Feeny¹

Sligo [postmarked 11 September 1841]

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

In reply to your esteemed favour of the 3rd which has but just now reached me, owing to my absence from [?home] on the arrival of Dr. Murphy² amongst us, I beg leave to thank you for the invaluable aid which the Clergy and People of Sligo are likely to derive from the

cooperation of a gentleman of your own selection in their hitherto untiring though unsuccessful efforts to wipe away the only stain that disfigures the representation of our Province.³ [He goes on to say he will do all he can to forward the important object of Dr. Murphy's mission, more especially that of Repeal. They will hold a meeting on Sunday, 19 September]. The other important object shall be in the meantime attended to, as at a preparatory meeting on yesterday it was resolved that a general meeting be convened on Thursday, the 16th, at which all the clergy and all other friends to independence in the County have been requested to attend. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. Owen (Eugene) Feeny (died 9 January 1876); C.C. Sligo from before 1836 to 1841; P.P. Sligo 1841-50; P.P. Riverstown and Kilross 1850-76.
- 2 Stephen Murphy, M.D., 58 Dawson Street, Dublin. Died 1845.
- 3 On 6 September O'Connell informed the Repeal Association that Murphy had been dispatched by it to inspect the Sligo registries (*Pilot*, 8, 24 Sept. 1841). A by-election for Co. Sligo was at this time pending. On 28 September John Ffoliot, described as a 'Tory Orange candidate' was elected unopposed (*DEM*, 29 Sept. 1841).

2916

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 23 September 1841

Private

My dear Barrett,

Direct the enclosed for the Rev. Mr. Burke,¹ Drogheda, and get it sent to the Post Office. I have not told him that you sent me his letter. I only said you cited him as authority. I have (since my other letter to you) written to Alderman Smith² and O'Donegan,³ Secretary to the Trades Association, not giving them authority for the fact of the Primate's dinner but urging them to postpone the Repeal dinner for a week or a fortnight, and refusing to be any party to a collision. You may, I think, safely but privately send my letter to you to the Rev. Mr. Burke. He may make good use of it, but do not say I permitted it. Take that on yourself.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 279-80

- 1 Thomas V. Burke, O.P. (died 28 Oct. 1844), prior, Dominican Convent, Linenhall Street, Drogheda.
- 2 Henry Smith, alderman, Drogheda corporation.
- 3 John O'Donegan.

2917

From Lord ffrench, Castleffrench, Ahascragh [Co. Galway], 24 September 1841

Regrets not having received from O'Connell an expected letter which he understood O'Connell had intended to write to him on the appointment of his son to a resident magistracy.¹ Asks O'Connell to help obtain a promise in writing from Lord Morpeth to use his influence to have the appointment given as soon as he should be back in office. Mr. Browne is very indignant about the deception practised upon him over the matter of the appointment.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 See letter 2912.

2918

From Thomas Steele

London, Saturday, 25 September 1841

My dear Sir,

I hope you were pleased with the manner in which I wrote in the *Morning Chronicle* and *Sun*.¹

. . . The year I first came to London to Lincoln's Inn I sat next to him [Lord Shrewsbury] in the gallery of the House of Commons when in April or May 1812,² the latter I think, Grattan brought forward his motion on the Catholic claims. We made an acquaintance which continued until two years after when we lost sight of each other. . . . [Steele adds that Shrewsbury is a 'noisome reptile'.³

[latter part of letter missing]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Steele to the *Morning Chronicle*, 21 September 1841 (*Pilot*, 27 Sept. 1841). The letter is concerned with denying an assertion in the *Times* of 21 September 1841, that O'Connell supported a non-Repealer against a Repealer in the Limerick city election. Steele claims O'Connell had, in fact, recommended the return of the non-Repealer (John O'Brien) already in the field, and powerfully supported him as a Liberal merely to prevent the danger of a division which would have let in a Tory. The letter to the *Sun* is presumably identical.
- 2 On 23 April 1812. The debate continued on the following day when Grattan's motion was defeated by 300 to 215.
- 3 Shrewsbury had just published a pamphlet supporting Peel's ministry and containing strictures on O'Connell and Repeal (*A Third Letter to A. Lisle Phillips* (London 1842).

2919

To Bartholomew Verling¹

Merrion Square, 30 September 1841

My dear Sir,

Nobody can be more thoroughly persuaded of the merits of Mr. D. P. Ronayne² than I am. He was honest in the worst of times and he was active when others were torpid or inclined to adverse parties. He has always amidst ingratitude and bad treatment been true and sincere.

Then he has done more practical good than almost any man, perhaps than any man I know of. He has relieved the Irish farmers and dealers of every kind from tolls³ to the extent of tens of thousands of pounds annually, and he has done all this at personal hazard and at considerable expense.

The late government *ought* to have made provision for him. I cannot see the least excuse for the Whigs having neglected him. He was one of those who was prominently useful in preserving Youghal for the Liberal interest.

In short, he has the highest political merits and has met with the deepest ingratitude. It behoves the friends of Ireland to administer to his feelings all the balm that public justice to his claims can afford.

I beg to transmit my humble mite, £10.

SOURCE: Papers of St. John Verling

- 1 Bartholomew Verling (1797-1893), White Point, Cove, Co. Cork. Consul for Spain. A member of the Verling family of Oxclose, Newmarket, Co. Cork.
- 2 Dominic Philip Ronayne (died 1 June 1849 at Heytesbury Street, Dublin), an independent gentleman who lived for many years in Youghal, Co. Cork; a cousin of Dominick Ronayne, M.P. Sentenced to three months imprisonment in 1832 for resisting the payment of tithes (see letter 1930 n3).
- 3 In 1830 he gave important evidence to the House of Commons select committee on tolls and customs in Ireland (*Parl. Papers*, 1834, XVII).

2920

*From the Governor, Deputy Governor and others employed in
Cork City Gaol, 5 October 1841*

They say that it is rumoured that the city gaol will be closed,¹ its functions being taken over by the Cork county gaol, and fear losing their employment. They ask O'Connell if they are in that case entitled to compensation. If not so entitled they ask his advice on their

future course of action. Signed by Francis G. Murphy, Governor, on his own behalf and on that of the other officers of the gaol.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 The city gaol was not closed.

2921

To Edmond Smithwick

Merrion Square, 9 October 1841

My dear Smithwick,

The demands from Carlow¹ are exorbitant but, as far as we have means, they must be met. Kinsella² requires a very large sum but he must be lent it if we have the amount *in hands*. I am told that there is cash in your possession to that amount. If you are, as I suppose you are, run dry by *this* demand or nearly so, we must see and replenish your store as well as we possibly can. The Association would send you three or four times as much but for the enormous expense of *carrying* Dublin at the municipal election.³ I enclose you now three cheques which will be cash in your hands on the following days:

18th October £150: 21st October £154: 29th October £149 . . . £453

Upon these dates you will be able to supply to *that* amount Carlow claims. I already sent you from the Association £450 so that on the 29th inst. the Association will have contributed at least £903. Indeed I am sure that by that day it will exceed the thousand pounds.

Our city election is going on right well. I hope you will pay the new Lord Mayor a visit. I believe my election to that office is now out of doubt.⁴ Your friend John⁵ and his family are all in Kerry. I am bitterly sick of being detained here on public duty but, if I had not remained, the municipal force would never have been organized and the Tories would have annihilated us. . . .

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 For money to protect the anti-Tory voters (see letter 2905 n4).
- 2 Possibly the secretary or treasurer of a local league fund.
- 3 The election of councillors and aldermen to the new corporation of Dublin was at this time in progress. Of fifteen municipal wards in the city, the Liberals gained thirteen by considerable majorities (*FJ*, 16 Oct. 1841).
- 4 O'Connell was elected lord mayor of Dublin on 1 November 1841 without opposition. He was the first Catholic lord mayor of the city for 150 years (O'Keefe, *O'Connell*, II, 648-51).
- 5 John O'Connell.

2922

From Lord Clifford

Slake's Hotel [London], 16 October 1841

My dear Sir,

. . . My object is to destroy utterly the absolute dominion which is now, practically if not theoretically, attached to the office of collector and magistrate of districts in the three Presidencies of Hindustan; and to substitute at the same time, in place of that absolute dominion, the constitutional regal authority of Queen Victoria, such as the act of 1833¹ intended it to be.

I cannot do this without your cooperation. . . .

I shall leave London on Monday morning for Allerton Park near Knaresborough (Lord Stourton's) and I shall not return southwards till the 24th of this month. I write today to George Thompson, esq., 15 Duncan Street, Newington to say that in case he should wish me before that time to be present at a meeting of the Friends of India² in Edinburgh, I am at his service; and should you deem it advisable that I should be present at a similar meeting in Dublin³ at any time between the eleventh of November and the end of that month, you will greatly oblige me by sending me a line to that effect, directed to me at Allerton Park.

Meanwhile, should you have an opportunity of paying a visit to Clongowes, my friend Father St. Leger,⁴ to whom I have written at some length on this subject, will be able to communicate to you my views upon it. I have to request your acceptance of the accompanying report of my address to the House of Lords on the 23rd. ult.⁵ . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The government of India act (see letter 1988 n10).
- 2 That is, the British India Society, founded in March 1839 by Joseph Pease and George Thompson with whom O'Connell was closely associated (John H. Bell, *British Folks and British India Fifty years ago*, London, 1890, 12-24, 58-9).
- 3 According to John H. Bell's book (see above note 2) Lord Clifford spoke at a British India Society meeting in Dublin in November 1841 (p. 139). The Irish newspapers make no mention of such a meeting. Clifford was however in Dublin during the first week of December (*DEP*, 7 Dec.; *Times*, 13 Dec. 1841).
- 4 Rev. Robert St. Leger, S.J. (died 1856), rector of Clongowes Wood College 1841-2.
- 5 On 23 September Lord Clifford moved for copies of a communication made in 1835 to the British government by the governor of Hindustan, and also for a return of certain orders in council of the presidency of Madras dated 1839. Clifford's motion concerned a quarrell between

Irish Jesuits and Portuguese priests in India relative to possession of certain temporalities of the Catholic church there. Clifford's motion was agreed to with amendments (*Pilot*, 27 Sept. 1841).

2923

*From Rev. Thomas V. Burke, O.P., Linen Hall Convent, Drogheda,
19 October 1841 to Merrion Square*

Asks O'Connell to become an honorary member of the Total Abstinence Society of which he is president. On the second leaf of the sheet Burke writes a letter to O'Connell marked *private*. He discusses the matter of having a total abstinence medal combined with a card pledging to buy native manufacture.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2923a

From Ebenezer Shackleton¹

Moone Mills, Ballitore [Co. Kildare], 20 October 1841
My dear Friend,

I have to request you will take the trouble to hand in the enclosed one pound, my subscription to the Repeal Association for 1841.²

At the same time allow me to send you a copy of a petition³ to Parliament which lies in my office for signatures, and which I shall ask you to present and cause to be read next session. I cannot ask you to support its prayer — it is rather too radical for you, and even out-Stanleys Stanley; but you must allow it is impartial.⁴

At all events until their high mightinesses find it convenient to grant us the protection of the ballot, we must feel that to give the poor tenants the right of voting (which ought to mean the right of expressing their wishes or making a choice) is a most cruel humbug; almost as bad as to call the slave states the land of liberty!!!

SOURCE: *Pilot*, 29 October 1841

- 1 Ebenezer Shackleton (1784-1866), Quaker; miller and horticulturist. Great-grandson of Abraham Shackleton at whose school at Ballitore Edmund Burke was educated. Friend of Father Mathew. Author of pamphlets on socio-economic problems.
- 2 This letter was read at the meeting of the Repeal Association on 26 October 1841 (*Pilot*, 29 Oct. 1841).
- 3 This petition was not presented.
- 4 The petition was apparently designed to limit the franchise, hence the

comparison with Stanley's Irish registration bill. Shackleton seems to have felt that, since the poor tenants were easily intimidated by their landlords, taking the franchise from them would reduce the influence of landlords.

2924

From Thomas Steele

London, 21 October 1841

My dear Sir,

I last night had the happiness and honour of being called on to preside at the supper long intended to be given in compliment to our very dear friend, Father Magee, by the Repealers of London, when he should return from Ireland. . . . [At this dinner last night] I took care quietly to suggest . . . the duty to the Repeal cause, and to O'Connell, of passing *not indignant but bitterly contemptuous resolutions* on the conduct¹ of Sharman Crawford.

I desired them to be sure *not to dignify him* by any expression of indignation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 A reference to Crawford's 'Observations Addressed to the Repealers of Ireland', 14, 16 October 1841 (*Pilot*, 18, 20 Oct. 1841). In these letters Crawford makes a sweeping denunciation of the Repeal movement as a 'mere delusion in every sense of the word' and 'an attempt to bully without the power'. He asserts that Repeal will only damage Ireland's relations with England and undermine her weight in the imperial parliament. The 'Repeal supper' of which Steele says he was chairman took place in Westminster (*Pilot*, 25 Oct. 1841).

2925

From his son John

Derrynane, 22 October 1841

My dear Father,

It is a cruel disappointment to all here, as well as to yourself, that you are so likely not to be able to come down here this year. There was quite a *scene* upon the mountain yesterday when Denis McCrohan told the huntsmen you could not come. Two or three of them, led by Cormac, fairly sat down and cried. Derrynane itself is dull, as much as it can be out of doors, and very dull within. . . . Your hounds are quite well, but look lonely without you.

SOURCE: O'Neill Daunt, *Personal Recollections*, II, 15

2926

To Edmond Smithwick,

Merrion Square, 23 October 1841

My dear Smithwick,

I enclose you a list of the sums voted by the Repeal Association in aid of the counties league fund.¹ The total is £903.4.9 . . . I was the person who advanced £450 out of my own resources. This I do not *choose* to have spoken of.

You will be so good as to pass my account of payments to you with the counties league fund committee whose letter I answer by this post. Give them also a copy of the enclosed list of votes of the Repeal Association. I wish them to have authenticated by you the account as far as I am concerned.

There is justly great jealousy amongst the most influential of the Association at the manner in which money has been collected in the parishes and transmitted to the 'League's fund.' It is a breach of compact with me because it totally disables me from making that vigorous effort throughout Ireland which I had reckoned upon. It is hard to account for the manner in which *we* have been used. If they had intended to insult me they would not have acted otherwise but I do not care about *that*. If we got time at the Association I would after all guarantee from £500 to £1000 more but the enormous expenses of the municipal elections² have at present run us dry. The Committee may, if we get time, rely on the sum I speak of say at once £900 more. If it facilitated the arrangement, I would accept a draft at 91 days for £250 more, to be allowed out of the future votes of the Association.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

1 See letter 2905 n4.

2 The elections for the new Dublin municipal corporation.

2927

From Thomas Steele, London, 23 October 1841

Tells of the resolution prepared by Hogan and put to the meeting of Repeal wardens last night, Father Magee presiding. It was much too long so he induced Hogan and the others to agree to a short one prepared by himself (Steele) which was passed: 'That we have supreme veneration for O'Connell and utter contempt for Sharman Crawford.' He adds that Hogan is an honest fellow of good sense but

inexperienced in such matters as framing resolutions.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

2928

From John Smyth

62 Blessington St. [Dublin], 3 November 1841

The Attorney-Genl-v-the Corporation

My dear Lord Mayor,

The Master of the Rolls has appointed you Sequestrator in the room of Sir John Kingston James¹ on your entering into security by Recognisance, yourself and two sureties in the sum of £1,000² . . . One of your first acts should be to make provision for the payment of the alleged debt, in case the Chancellor shall pronounce his Decree in favour of Mallet³ and Halahan⁴ on the 20th inst. when the cause⁵ is set down to be heard; and, to that end, your Lordship ought to bring the matter under the notice of the Council on Friday.⁶ I would also suggest the expediency of raising money to pay off the demands⁷ of Messrs. Brady⁸ and Whistler⁹ amounting to £2,150 with interest.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 O'Connell's immediate predecessor as lord mayor of Dublin.
- 2 Smyth was reporting what had occurred that day in the rolls court (*Pilot*, 5 Nov. 1841).
- 3 John Mallett, plumbing engineer and iron-founder, 94 Capel St., Dublin; sheriff of Dublin city for the year 1830-31.
- 4 George Halahan, apothecary, 13 St. Stephen's Green North, Dublin; sheriff of Dublin city for the year 1830-31.
- 5 Mallet and Halahan were claiming expenses allegedly incurred while they were the two sheriffs for Dublin city. To ensure impartiality the master of the rolls ruled that the case be tried outside Dublin city. (*Pilot*, 3 Dec. 1841).
- 6 On 10 November O'Connell put before a meeting of Dublin corporation council a list of judgment debts which included amounts claimed by Mallett and Halahan, Brady, and Whistler (*Pilot*, 12 Nov. 1841).
- 7 See above note 6.
- 8 Sir Nicholas William Brady.
- 9 Gabriel Whistler, attorney, 13 Richmond Avenue, Fairview, Dublin.

2929

From his son John

Derrynane, 4 November 1841

My dear Father,

If ever postbag was anxiously watched for and its news *shouted for*, it was today when we at last got the news of your election as Lord Mayor. You have one more triumph before you infinitely greater indeed, that of seeing the Parliament of Ireland once more sitting in Ireland, but next to that glorious and *certain* event is your election of Monday. You have a legally recognized *lordship* from *the people*, utterly unconnected with court favour or aristocratic usage. In short a most democratic dignity, and one that gives you not only the power — which you *will use* — of being eminently serviceable to the citizens of Dublin, but also an additional power of being even yet more useful to Ireland than you have yet been, and *this I think you will also use*. We rejoice, my dear Father, that Dublin has paid you such a tribute of respect as to take you for its first freely chosen chief magistrate, but still more that you should thus have opened to you one additional and most available means of advancing that great measure which will be the compensation for all your labours and sufferings, as it is and has been the great object of your life, the raising Ireland to her proper condition as a nation. The importance to Ireland of your present position is as yet scarcely considered and known.

I can well imagine the ecstasy of the poor people — it is time for them to have some triumph — and to have a friend *and friends* in the Corporation. Ray too, must be in great delight and no man merits the pleasure of the triumph better than he, who has worked so hard to organize and carry on the struggle for it.

There are a thousand enquiries here and most anxious hopes that you will be down after this month. You ought indeed make an effort to come, and break through all minor restraints. You will want some fresh air, if only for 3 or 4 weeks and, after the wet summer and autumn that we have had, it will go very hard if we do not have good weather with the hard frosts.

I perceive by the papers that you contemplate (in council of course) the removal of some of the officers of the old Corporation, giving compensation of course.¹ Let me ask of you [?not] to forget *John Smyth*² in the new appointments. What he and I spoke to you about was the *Law Agency* to the new Corporation. It is the only favour I ask, though I ought to ask another, inasmuch as Eliza's³ sister, Mary Kearney,⁴ writes to beg that she, Eliza, seeing that she 'is such a favourite with the "Liberator", will procure for a protegee of

the aforesaid Mary Kearney's (a young gentleman of the Co. Meath,) some kind, or description of 'place under the new Corporation'. With regard to this latter application I have advised Eliza to write back, stating the plain facts, that whatever might be at disposal of the Corporation had been long ago bespoken. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 O'Connell included a statement to this effect in the speech he made on 1 November to the new Dublin corporation as soon as he had been elected lord mayor (*MR*, 2 Nov. 1841).
- 2 John Smyth (see letter 2490 n1) received the requested appointment as one of the two law agents to the new corporation.
- 3 Wife of John O'Connell.
- 4 Mary Teresa, daughter of Dr. James Ryan, Jubilee Hall, Bray, Co. Wicklow. Married 1837 Patrick John Kearney (1799-1877), Miltown House, Clonmellon and Culmullen, Dunshaughlin, both Co. Meath (high sheriff of Meath 1865).

2930

From Daniel Casserly, 3 Boat Lane, Dublin, 13 November 1841 to Merrion Square

States he is a native of Mullingar where his father and his brother taught school for seventy years. In 1798 his father was cruelly flogged by the drummer of the then Northumberland Fencibles, having been arrested by the Orange faction. He was brought to Athlone and would have been hung but for the intervention of General Barnett¹ who had compassion on his wife and seven children and his mangled condition. The writer has been teaching in Dublin but his school had to close because of the opening of parochial and other national schools. He asks O'Connell to obtain for him or appoint him to a position.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Charles Barnett (1758-1804), brigadier general, staff of Ireland, 1798-1801.

2931

To Edmond Smithwick

Merrion Square, 16 November 1841

My Dear Friend,

I enclose you my note for £310 . . . I do hope that we will be able to

save the poor voters from the vengeance of their tyrants.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2932

To his daughter Betsey Ffrench

Merrion Square, 4 December 1841

My own own Betty,

Do not, my own child, be angry with me for not writing to you. I never was worried out of my existence until after I became a great *City Lord*.

I sent forward the letters of Mr. O'Flaherty¹ and indeed, darling, did all I *could* but there has not yet been any suitable vacancy... but whenever Mr. Browne² hears of a vacancy let him send me a letter *fit* to be forwarded to the Board³ and I will transmit it with my strongest recommendation.

They are, you see, dismissing stipendiary magistrates.⁴ I do hope they will not go so far down as Ffrench.⁵ Indeed, my opinion is that he is not in any danger. They would hardly assail him. At least, that is my fixed opinion...

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

1 Unidentified

2 Unidentified

3 Possibly of the National Bank.

4 On 3 December 1841 the *Pilot* said the (Tory) government were about to dismiss up to thirty-six stipendiary magistrates. It seems that only the last seven appointed by the Whig government were dismissed. These consisted of the six appointed since the general election (see letter 2912 n4) and Hugh Gray who had been appointed on 8 June (*Dublin Gazette*, 11 June 1841).

5 Nicholas Joseph Ffrench was not dismissed.

2933

From William S. Hart¹

Saturday, 11 December 1841

[No introduction]

... Out of the money your friendship accommodated me with this time last year, a balance of between 5 and 6 remains due. A similar urgency, nay, emergency compels me again to seek your protection ... [Hart adds that he has not received any payment for his work in

the last two elections²]. If I surmount the present, sunshine is before me. Forty-six years I have laboured with you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

- 1 Much of this letter is illegible because of decay.
- 2 For Co. Dublin in the general elections of 1837 and 1841 as agent for the Liberal candidates.

2934

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 16 December 1841

Dear Friend,

I sent thee by last night's post a little pamphlet on the franchise question which probably thou would have the time to read. I saw thy kind notice¹ the other day of the suggestion made at Manchester that Mr. S. Crawford and myself should draw up a declaration in reference to the franchise. Mr. S.C. has been so ill ever since that he has been unable to answer a letter I wrote to him and I have ventured to draw it up myself. I hope to send it to my friend R. Allen² in a day or two and request him to call upon thee with it. It is not intended to ask for the signatures of M.P.s but, if Theobald Mathew would sign, it would be a great help to our object, I think.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 In the Repeal Association on 13 December O'Connell declared he 'saw, with a great deal of pleasure, that in England there was some prospect of a rally among the English reformers — that Mr. Joseph Sturge had been called upon to lay down a plan for that purpose, and that Mr. Sharman Crawford had been requested to assist him in that plan for rallying the Reformers together. He was very much rejoiced to find that Mr. Sharman Crawford was able to take an active part again in politics, for when he heard his life was in danger he felt a coldness of the heart that he should die while they were in enmity; but he hoped he would live long enough to enable them to forgive one another' (*Pilot*, 15 Dec. 1841).
- 2 Richard Allen (1803-86), second son of Edward and Ellen Allen. Quaker; secretary of the Hibernian Anti-Slavery Society; a wealthy Dublin draper.

2935

*From Frederick Warren¹ to Dublin**Manchester, 27 December 1841*

Respected Sir,

[At a meeting convened to honour Rev. D. Hearne the writer was called on to answer for O'Connell on O'Connell's health being proposed.]

We are upon the eve of a very important movement for the suffrage in this country, and I am exceedingly anxious that the best men amongst the corn law repealers should identify themselves with it. It is high time that the real friends of the people should stand forward and rescue them from those unprincipled tyrants who, in the name of Chartism, are leading them into a slavery more hateful than anything we have hitherto known. . . . I think that, if we could get up a good demonstration here in favour of free trade and another in Birmingham in favour of the franchise previous to the opening of parliament, something good might result. The same men might attend both and the same subjects might be introduced and contended for, viz., political and commercial freedom and, if you would insure us your valuable and in this case indispensable aid, I would at once proceed to make the necessary arrangements as far as our town is concerned and would write to my friends in Birmingham for the same purpose. Hoping to be favoured with your opinion on the subjects to which I have alluded in the latter parts of this epistle, I have the honour to remain, Sir,

Yours respectfully
Frederick Warren

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2936

From Rev. W.A. O'Meara, O.F.M., Killiney, Cabinteely, Co. Dublin, 10 January 1842

Tells of letter of 12 October 1841 he has received from the king of Bavaria.¹ He adds that he has sent to the king not only the Dryden lines that O'Connell had written but also the letter of 9 September 1841 which O'Connell had written to him (O'Meara).

SOURCE: Franciscan Fathers, Killiney

1 See letter 2914.

2936a

To John Reynolds

Mansion House [Dublin], 11 January 1842

My dear Reynolds,

I enclose a letter I got for you from the board.

I heard with poignant regret that you were mixing yourself up with a feud in which our manager¹ is engaged (after the fashion of Taylor in Cork) — in the town of Banagher — I do hope and believe it to be impossible that you should do so. It would certainly be a direct violation of honourable integrity of which I conceive you altogether incapable.

SOURCE: Property of Mrs. Suys, Knightstown, Valentia Island, Co. Kerry

1 John Martin.

2937

From William Murphy

Friday, 14 January 1842

[No salutation]

I wish you could manage to have a meeting of all the Deputies from the different wards and entreat them to furnish an account of the number of electors in their several districts who will support Lord M., and the number who oppose him.¹ It is of the utmost consequence to have this information furnished to the Committee in Fleet Street² as soon as possible. Without it they are going on in the dark.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 An election for Dublin city was pending following the death of its Tory representative John Beatty West. On 29 January William Henry Gregory was elected in his place, defeating Lord Morpeth by 3825 to 3435 (*Pilot*, 31 Jan. 1842). On 5 January O'Connell told the Repeal Association that he intended going from ward to ward of the city to get votes for Morpeth (*Pilot*, 7 Jan. 1842).
- 2 Morpeth's election committee was sitting at 12, Fleet Street, Dublin (*Pilot*, 5 Jan. 1842).

2938

From Edmund Burke Roche

Killshannic [Fermoy, Co. Cork] 22 January 1842

Private

My Dear Sir,

It is now fast approaching the time when we should be making preparations for defending our seats. You know well how ruinously expensive a thing of this kind is to a private individual. As far as I am concerned, it is a thing that I never could undertake out of my own resources and I am sure you neither would, nor could you be expected to do so.

Under these circumstances we must rouse the county. I fear you will not be able to come down as you intended before the meeting of Parliament. From a circumstance which occurred the other day I think the Tories here would abandon their petition¹ if they saw an intimation upon the part of the public to bear *us* harmless. The circumstance is this. A proposal was made to me by a mutual friend, one deep in the confidence of the Tories, that the petition against me should be withdrawn if I could prevail upon you not to sit for Cork, *they being satisfied to go to a new election*. My reply was that you could not give up Cork now, that even if you could, you never would and that, if you were so inclined, I would make all the influence I had with you *not* to leave us. This proposal to give up the petition upon the sorry chance of a new election shows how little they hope from the petition, and I think, if we were to make a bold display now, they would abandon it.

Let me know at your earliest convenience what you intend doing and, if you cannot come down, I will set to work myself and see if I cannot frighten them singlehanded.

The proposal above mentioned was made to me in strict confidence and I have promised that it shall not be made public in any way.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On 16 February a petition was presented in the Commons from Nicholas Philpot Leader, the younger, complaining of the late election of O'Connell and Roche for Co. Cork. A select committee, on 23rd May, declared O'Connell and Roche duly elected.

2939

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 31 January 1842

Dear Friend,

Thou wilt probably be informed ere this of the determination of our Abolition friends in France to have an anti-slavery meeting in Paris on the 21st,¹ and they are most anxious that thou would favour them with thy presence. I know the value of thy time but the present is a most critical period in this great question and I agree with Dr. Madden in the very great importance of the present meeting and that the abolition of slavery in the French Colonies must be followed by a similar movement in Cuba and Brazil and hasten its downfall in the United States.

The freedom of *millions* may under Providence in no small degree depend upon thy being at this important meeting, and I hope thou wilt excuse my pressing thy attendance in the very strongest manner that I can. Great as no doubt will be the sacrifice, I do believe thou wilt have an ample satisfaction in making it. Our London Anti-Slavery Committee have appointed a deputation to attend and I expect several will attend from the principal cities in England. I shall try to be there, though at great inconvenience.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Sturge attended the abortive Paris anti-slavery conference of 1842 when the government banned the movement for abolition of slavery in the French colonies (Hobhouse, *Sturge*, 105). O'Connell did not go to Paris for the conference.

2940

*To P.V. FitzPatrick*London, February 1842¹

My dear FitzPatrick,

Get Fitz-Simon to see Robert White again and to procure him to do something about my *alleged* bill.² Let Fitz-Simon then see the attorney and have an inspection of the bill. I do conjecture that it is a forgery. At all events White is very base if he leaves me in for it. It should be looked to at once.

The political horizon bespeaks a coming storm. There is no serving 'the Master' and Mammon. Peel cannot fill the pockets of the landed aristocracy and give cheap corn to the operatives. His fall

depends on Wednesday.³ The public expectation is raised to the highest pitch. It is indeed believed that he will give extensive relief, but the general opinion amongst the thinking part of the community is that his reign will be short. It was much remarked that the Queen, who reads admirably well and whose natural voice is musical in its tones, slurred over the speech⁴ as if she was repeating an unwelcome lesson. I am told she expresses the strongest antipathy to the present ministers, certainly she does not show them or their families any attention.

Lord Elliot⁵ is here and, they say, very angry.⁶ You may have perceived that I addressed my question about the Presbyterian marriages⁷ to him but he declined to answer and threw the reply on Peel. This is a small circumstance but may have meaning.

On the whole there are hopes of a very short duration to Tory power. Before the close of the week I may tell you more.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 280-1

- 1 W.J. FitzPatrick gives the date of this letter erroneously as the 3rd but O'Connell's query (see note⁷) was made on the 4th (Friday). Internal evidence suggests the 8th as the most likely date.
- 2 See letter 3377 nl.
- 3 Peel gave notice on 3 February that he would move on Wednesday, 9 February, for a committee to consider the corn laws (*Times*, 4 Feb. 1842). On that day (the 9th), he informed the Commons that while he supported the existing laws in principle, he proposed a modification of the existing sliding scale of duties. On 10 February Russell moved an amendment condemning the government's motion. The amendment was defeated on 16 February by 349 to 226 (*Annual Register*, 1842, 15-41).
- 4 The queen's speech at the opening of parliament on 2 February.
- 5 Edward Granville (Eliot), styled Lord Eliot 1823-45 (1798-1877). M.P. for Liskeard January 1824-32; for East Cornwall July 1837-45; chief secretary for Ireland September 1841-January 1845; P.M.G. December 1845-June 1846. Lord lieutenant of Ireland 1853-55. In 1845 succeeded as third earl of St. Germans.
- 6 Eliot, who was liberal in his views, was at loggerheads with the lord lieutenant, de Grey, an elderly high-Tory conservative (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 204-5).
- 7 Until the passing of the act of 1844 (7 & 8 Vict. c. 81) it was an open question whether a marriage in Ireland between a Protestant Dissenter and an Anglican was legal if solemnised by a Protestant Dissenting minister. The situation became critical in 1840-41 because of court decisions declaring such marriages to be illegal (James Seaton Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*, Belfast, 1867, 486-88). On 24 February 1842 a bill to validate existing marriages of this kind (but not those *sub-judice*) was introduced to the Commons and in due course enacted (5 & 6 Vict. c. 113). Two cases involving such marriages were tried by the Irish court of queen's bench in the spring of 1842 (*Queen - v - Millis* and *Queen - v - Carroll*). On 11 June 1842 the court decided that both marriages were invalid, and the decisions were

appealed to the House of Lords on 24 June 1842. On 29 March 1844 the decisions of the court of queen's bench were affirmed by the Lords (since the law lords were equally divided on the issue). The act of 1844 (7 & 8 Vict. c. 81) validated all such marriages to be solemnised in the future (and those solemnised since the act of 1842). On 4 February 1842 O'Connell in the Commons asked if the government had any intention of introducing a bill to legalise such marriages as had already taken place, and for the purpose of settling this question in future. Peel in reply declared it was the intention of the government to introduce such a bill without delay (*Times*, 5 Feb. 1842).

2941

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 February 1842

My dear Friend,

. . . I have now great pleasure in telling you that the political prospects are beginning to brighten. Peel's Corn Law speech¹ was a miserable failure. He was himself cowed and low-spirited. He never made a worse speech. Of course you have seen that he has thrown himself altogether into the hands of the landlords.² This is just what was to be desired as it has roused and will rouse popular indignation. I am a judge of agitation and I do think I perceive a movement in more than embryo which will compel the aristocracy to yield in England and to leave us Ireland to ourselves. The delegates³ are confidential with me, and it is therefore I *promise* you that there are better times in store for Ireland. The distress is appalling, and the distressed consider themselves insulted. I write strongly but I do not exaggerate. *This Ministry cannot last.*

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 281

- 1 Delivered by Peel on 9 February. It was 'an elaborate speech (which bored everybody very much) of nearly three hours long' (*Greville Memoirs*, 2nd part, II, 83).
- 2 By agreeing to uphold the principle of the corn laws.
- 3 The delegates from the anti-corn law league, who attended but did not gain access to parliament for the debate on Peel's motion (*Annual Register*, 1842, 15).

2942

From Edmund Burke Roche

Killshannic [Fermoy, Co. Cork], 12 February 1842

My Dear Sir,

What do you advise to be done with regard to the enclosed? I have just received it from James Nagle.¹ There is no doubt now that our opponents will go on with the petition,² and it behoves us to be stirring. I am making the best arrangements I can in conjunction with Victor Roche³ but, without you, it will be impossible to *rouse* the County. Unless I see an absolute necessity for my presence in Parliament I shall remain here to attend to this business. If I am wanted over, will you get somebody to drop me a line and I will start directly? But unless a vote is of great consequence I am much better employed here.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Nagle (died 11 September 1875), Midleton, Co. Cork and 5 Lr. Gardiner Street, Dublin. Crown solicitor at quarter sessions for East Riding of Co. Cork 1836-53. See *Boase*.
- 2 Against O'Connell's and Roche's return (see letter 2938 n1).
- 3 Unidentified.

2943

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 February 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

The state of politics is just this: the landed Tories are quite triumphant, greatly suspicious of Peel but perceiving that they cannot do without him. The public mind is in the first stupor of defeat on the Corn Laws¹ but I am greatly mistaken unless there be a violent reaction in favour of more extended reform. The popular sentiment is not the less strong for the apparently trivial modes of the expression of its strength. For example, Peel is burnt in effigy, but remark — in more places than any one Minister ever was before. For my own part my hopes are high. I cannot believe that the present Ministry will last. I also expect that their expulsion will be followed with the most important changes. *All shall be wanted*.

The queen is as firm as a rock.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 281-2

- 1 See letter 2940 n3.
- 2 In favour of the Whigs.

2944

From Rev. Nicholas Wiseman

St. Mary's College [Oscott], Feast of St. Felix [1 March], 1842
My dear Lord,

It is singular enough that I should have told Lucas yesterday that I much desired to write to you, and I am glad of the opportunity thus presented to me of doing so without its being an intrusion.

Respecting the two young women in the Tyrol,¹ it would be important to obtain possession of dates etc. How long is it since the examination is alleged to have been made? Where has the result been published? This would enable me to compare the statement with my latest accounts. I have enquired from persons here in a constant receipt of continental Catholic news, and they utterly disbelieve the report of any such a result. It is not, I believe, the first time that such a report has been propagated. However, to make sure of the matter I this day write to a most distinguished ecclesiastic in Bavaria, whose family reside on the spot, to request accurate information; and I will communicate to you the result the moment I receive it.

There can, I think, be only one opinion as to the importance of having a daily paper,² and one so well established as the *Courier* would be still more desirable. With regard therefore to the first point there is nothing to say. But as to the raising the sum required, I fear the present apathy of many amongst us. I think the best chance would be to raise it by shares, among the commercial part of our body, as at Manchester, Liverpool. There are many wealthy Catholics in those towns who are ready to undertake much at your bidding but I think it would be necessary to show many of them that such a paper would be a fair investment. Could this be done? I own that this is not the spirit in which the matter should be taken up, as a more generous feeling should impel those who have the means, to risk or even sacrifice somewhat for the cause of religion. But unfortunately we do not as yet abound in persons of this character. I will gladly give my feeble aid towards the undertaking if the plan you propose be feasible.

The object for which I wished to write you was to offer my humble mediation towards the reconciling of differences³ between yourself and Lord Shrewsbury. It has indeed given me pain to see two persons whose characters and influence, if united, ought to carry forward in triumph the cause of religion, divided and become, so to speak, the watchword of two sections of our body already weak by division. I am sure that, apart from political opinions, each would be willing to acknowledge the full of the others' worth and to express

sentiments which, without affecting more temporal views, might be the ground of a reconciliation honourable to the Catholic name as to the individuals engaged in it. I think that Divine Providence has consigned to us now a cause round which all may and should rally without reference to political opinions, the cause of His Church and holy Faith. We want all our strength for their advancement, we cannot afford division. It has been in order to assist this that I have refrained from the expression of political feelings that I might try to have cooperation from all parties and form in Catholic, purely religious matters a neutral centre of common interest. This too may be more of a day-dream than yours but it is a long-cherished idea, the mother of many others waiting a favourable moment for birth and gladly would I begin by trying the power of Catholic unity in restoring harmony between two of the most Catholic minds and hearts with which the Divine goodness has blessed our common cause.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Shrewsbury had recently published an account of his visit in 1841 to two female stigmatists, who he claimed, were living testimonies to divine intervention in human affairs (see *Letter from the Earl of Shrewsbury to Ambrose Lisle Phillipps . . . descriptive of the Estatica of Caldaro and the Adolorata of Capriana*, London, 1841). See letter 2954.
- 2 No information has been traced concerning this project.
- 3 During 1840-42 Shrewsbury published three *Letters to Ambrose Lisle Phillipps . . . on the present posture of Affairs*, the last of which appeared in January 1842. In these Shrewsbury attacked O'Connell and Repeal, and charged him with agitating in order to increase the O'Connell Tribute. Early in 1842 O'Connell published a reply to Shrewsbury's charges (Daniel O'Connell, *Observation on Corn Laws, . . . to . . . the Earl of Shrewsbury . . .*, Dublin, 1842).

2945

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 7 March 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

The questions you have asked me respecting the Corn and Provision Laws are just such as cannot be answered. The matters are kept, and properly kept, secret from all until they are officially communicated to all. This communication will be made on Friday next.¹ If they were known to some — if they oozed out to some sooner than to others — an advantage to a fearful extent would be obtained by those who knew the forthcoming facts over those who

remain ignorant of them. Thus, therefore, everything is left to conjecture as to the Ministerial plan beyond the already announced fact — the foreign meats, alive and dead, will be admitted at a *duty*, but at what duty² will not be known till Friday next.

In all these cases conjectures are of course made before the event is known, and amongst the multitude of these conjectures some are right, and it is supposed that the fortunate *guesser* was previously informed of the truth. That was not so, and therefore I cannot tell you anything that can be safely relied on and will not give you any conjecture of my own which may fatally deceive those who acted upon it.

The acquittal of McArdle's murderers³ has made a sensation — a thing unusual enough for anything Irish to create, but the case was indeed atrocious.

This country is in a strange state, the reaction against the Ministry apparent but still slow. It will come out in quite a storm somewhat later, and there is certainly nothing like cordiality between the parties to Peel's Cabinet and their supporters. On this you may rely. Nor is there the smallest appearance of any revival of trade whilst the foreign relations of the country are in a most menacing attitude. I need not add that, under these circumstances, the greatest anxiety prevails about Peel's fiscal and provision plan.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 282-3

- 1 Peel introduced the budget on Friday 11 March.
- 2 Peel did not say on Friday 11 March what duty he proposed to levy on imports of provisions and live animals for the coming year, but declared all information respecting duties would be published on Monday 14 March (*Pilot*, 14 Mar. 1842).
- 3 On 28 February 1842 four Orangemen were acquitted of the murder, under particularly atrocious circumstances, of a nineteen year old Catholic, Hugh McArdle, at Ballyroney, Co. Down, in December 1841. The case was tried by Judge Crampton. Lords Downshire and Roden occupied seats on the bench (*Pilot*, 2 Mar. 1842; see also, O'Connell, *Observations . . . to Lord Shrewsbury*, 26).

2946

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 12 March 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

The political aspect of affairs is quite unsettled. Peel's plan succeeded with many in the House who mistook his Income Tax¹ for a Property Tax. I have been in the City this day and find that there are elements of the deepest discontent with the plan likely to

develop. The distinction between an Income Tax and a Property Tax you, I suppose, understand perfectly but this illustration will make it familiar to those who have not thought of it before. Suppose a clerk in a merchant's office at a salary of £200 *per annum*. This situation would not sell for £100 nor be valued as property at more. Now suppose a man to have a fee simple estate of £200 a year. That would in this country sell for £6,000. The clerk will have to pay annually in tax, say, $5/8$, and the fee simple owner will have to pay only the same sum so that a property worth £100 in gross will have to pay as much as a property worth £6,000 in gross. I believe Peel has given himself a brain blow by this plan of his. The tax on cattle alone and on provisions of all sorts such as salt, meat, butter, etc., will be only six *per cent. ad valorem*. On that payment foreign cattle, alive and dead, will be admitted, to the great discomfiture of our unhappy graziers.

The Irish Distillers are struck at again. It is now admitted that they have been hitherto wronged, and now they are compelled to pay severely for that redress which was hitherto refused to them because they were Irish. I made the best battle I could for the Distillers.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 283-4

- 1 Peel faced a deficit of £2,500,000. To meet this he proposed to levy a tax of 7d. in the £ on all incomes over £150. Ireland was to be exempt from this income tax (Elie Halevy, *Victorian Years*, London, 1951, 20-21).
- 2 Peel proposed to raise the duty on spirits in Ireland by 1/-, bringing it to the Scottish level of $3/8$ per gallon. He claimed that Irish distillers would stand to gain greatly by this equalisation of duties. Under the current system, he declared, 'the Scotch distiller exports his spirits in bond, and on landing it in Ireland pays the Irish duty of $2/8$ a gallon, but the Irish distiller has no corresponding advantage in exporting his spirits to Scotland; and he pays upon its arrival there 1/- duty on account of the increased duty in that country. The consequence is that Ireland received a large supply of spirits from Scotland but sends no corresponding supply of spirits to that country'. O'Connell replied that 'he should not object if that taxation were prohibitory in its amount — but there was this danger in the present proposition, that it would increase the evils of private distilleries in Ireland. . . . The last reduction in the duty on spirits in Ireland had almost put an end to illicit distillation, but the present proposition, which was to make an increase about equal to that reduction, would probably have the effect of reviving it. . . . He was glad to find that the Rt. Hon. Baronet [Peel] had at length discovered the inexcusable wrongs that had been inflicted upon Irish distillers. The Scotch distiller could send his spirits into Ireland in bond, but the Irish distiller could not send his spirits into Scotland in the same way. Then, again, the duty on Irish spirits was taken as they came from the still, no allowance being made for evaporation or leakage. This was not the case with regard to the Scotch or the English distiller.' (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXI, 480).

2947

From Michael J. Quin

Boulogne sur Mer [France], 12 March 1842

My Dear Lord Mayor,

I have been informed that at a late meeting¹ of the 'Institute,' upon my name being mentioned as that of a Catholic to whom the editorship of the *Tablet* might be safely entrusted, you made use of words to this effect: "No. Mr. Quin will not do. He has attacked *me*. He is unpopular amongst the Clergy of Ireland."

My I request that you will have the goodness to inform me when and where I attacked you? If you allude to the postscript appended to my article² on Sir. R. Peel's Government in the last number of the *Dublin Review*, I can only say that that postscript was not written by me; and that I knew nothing whatever about it until I saw it in the *Review*.

[The writer asks O'Connell what authority he has for saying that he is unpopular with the clergy of Ireland. He says he has always defended that clergy from misrepresentation and has always had a great respect for them.]

You have not, I trust, forgotten that when the original proprietors of the *Tablet* consulted you as to the selection of a competent person for the chief direction of that journal, you, as I learned from your own lips, named me for that purpose.

Nor has it, I hope, wholly escaped from your mind that I had not long since the honour of being associated with yourself and Dr. Wiseman in the editorial department of the *Dublin Review*.

I feel, as you may well suppose, deeply grieved by the language which you are reported to have used at the 'Institute' concerning me — at the 'Institute' too! the first plan of which I framed under your dictation and with some alterations subsequently assisted you, Lord Shrewsbury and other distinguished members of our body in carrying into effect.

As to the *Tablet*, I very much regret that any circumstances should have occurred to impair the benefits it was calculated to confer upon the cause of civil and religious liberty. I shall certainly do everything in my power to sustain the original journal³ and I fervently hope that, though presiding over publications separate in pecuniary interests, Mr. Lucas and I shall both strenuously unite in promoting our holy religion and all the rights and privileges of our brethren throughout the world. He understands or will very speedily discover that the days of *personal* 'Patronage' are gone by and that the only question with the Catholic public will be, which of the two *Tablets* is

executed in the style most agreeable to their taste and most accordant with their religious and political sentiments.

Expecting from your justice, if not from your friendship, an immediate answer to this communication.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Probably the monthly meeting of the Catholic Institute held on 2 March 1842, at which O'Connell was present (*Pilot*, 7 Mar. 1842).
- 2 The article entitled 'Peel's Government' appears in the *Dublin Review* for February 1842. In a footnote to the article, however, the writer expressed regret at the tone of O'Connell's *Observations on Corn Laws* . . . (see letter 2944 n3) and voiced the hope that he (O'Connell) would withdraw or modify his expressions.
- 3 Owing to opposition from some English Tory Catholics and to a quarrel with his printers, Frederick Lucas altered the title of the *Tablet* to the *True Tablet* in February 1842. His opponents continued to publish the original *Tablet*, employing Michael J. Quin as editor. The latter paper ceased publication at the end of 1842, and in January 1843 Lucas changed the name of his journal from *True Tablet* to *Tablet* (Lucas, *Lucas*, I, 72-81; 'Frederick Lucas' in *Gillow*).

2948

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 18 March 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

How foolish of our Irish people not to see that they have got only one year's respite from the Income tax. Once it is established in England the process of *assimilation* which has been practised as to all other taxes will easily apply to this.

But what say they to the provision trade?¹ Foreign salt provisions for the use of shipping can be taken out of bond without paying *any duty* for consumption in all vessels sailing to foreign ports. In other words, all vessels except coasters will have foreign provisions duty free. The consequence will be the total loss of the *home* market to the Irish provision merchants for their home market was the provisioning of vessels bound to all the world. The coasters consume very little salt provisions.

The flame is spreading fast against the Income tax. Its inquisitorial nature and palpably unequal leaning are making it most violent enemies in every quarter. I am amused at the rage of many Tories.

Brougham, as usual, made a rascally speech² last night.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 286-7

- 1 Peel in his budget speech on 11 March proposed to include the import

- of foreign salted provisions in his general reduction of tariffs (*Times*, 12 Mar. 1842).
- 2 On 17 March Brougham delivered a long speech in the Lords in which he dwelt on the evil of an income tax but said it was necessary to meet the precarious state of the finances (*Times*, 18 Mar. 1842). Brougham was sitting with the Whig opposition but his speech, though he maintained it was non-party, was implicitly anti-Whig. It was probably this ambiguity which induced O'Connell to describe the speech as 'rascally'.

2949

From Unknown

Clarges Street [London], 24 March 1842

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I hope you will excuse my sending the enclosed Spanish paper which has been forwarded to me by a Spanish friend of mine and in which the article relating to what you said in the H of C¹ some time back is written in such a moderate spirit that I think you will not find fault with me for transmitting it to you, anxious as I am that all the friends of Spanish independence amongst whom I like and hope to rank you, should pull together in trying to uphold that independence which I for one am convinced can now only be upheld by supporting the present Government there.

I fear that you derive your information from one quarter only, viz., the *Catolico*, a paper which I understand is published in Toledo and which I am told is most violent and upheld by the ultra servile party and of those who naturally enough are sore at having lost their large benefices but which I [remainder of letter missing].

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letter 2959.

2949a

From Lord Campbell

[about 20 March 1842]

Extract

I am afraid there is no hope of amending the marriage law in Ireland as far as the Catholics are concerned, but I ought to state that I believe there never was any notion of extending the English marriage law to Ireland without important modifications. For example it could not be expected that the Irish Catholics should

agree to the presence of a registrar being made essential to the validity of a marriage and this I think I mentioned to you when I had the honor of an interview with you in the Library of the House of Lords.

But some alteration of the law seems essential to the interests of the Catholic Body, and the great object no doubt should be that the canons of the Church and the law of the land should agree as to the validity and invalidity of marriages. The statute which makes void a marriage between a Catholic and a Protestant if celebrated by a Catholic Priest is a remnant of the Penal Code and is a disgrace to the Statute Book. I believe that by the law of Ireland the marriage would be good if *per verba de praesenti*,¹ followed by cohabitation, without the intervention of any Ecclesiastic, and it is monstrous to say that the marriage is void because a Catholic Priest was present and pronounced the benediction. But this Statute being repealed the evil would still continue that the decree of the Council of Trent being now received in Ireland there are many marriages of Catholics which are good by the law of the land and which the church would not recognise. The Archbishop² points out in the most forcible manner the evils which may now arise from such a discrepancy.

To devise a plan, with the concurrence of the Catholic Hierarchy, to remedy these evils I am sure you will feel to be an object deserving your greatest efforts, and success would give you an additional claim to the gratitude of your country.

I ought to say that I believe there is a sincere wish on the part of the Lord Chancellor³ and the members of the Lords' Committee on Irish marriages⁴ to study the wishes and feelings of the Irish Catholic Body.

[P.S.] I shall make a discreet use of the Archbishop's letter and return it to you in a few days.

SOURCE: Dublin Diocesan Archives

- 1 This Latin phrase might be freely translated as 'by means of the marriage vows.'
- 2 Archbishop Daniel Murray.
- 3 Presumably the lord chancellor of England, Lord Lyndhurst. He was *ex-officio* a member of the Committee (see letter 2955 n3).
- 4 See letter 2955 n3.

2950

To Archbishop Murray

Mansion House [Dublin], 25 March 1842

My revered Lord,

I had the honour to receive the letter of your Grace and beg in return to send you a letter¹ of Lord Campbell which will show you the present state of the marriage question. I thought your former letter too valuable not to give it to Lord Campbell to use it with discretion but not to allow it to get into the public papers. I confess I was glad to be able to show the Law Lords how emphatic would the opposition be in Ireland to any alteration of the law inconsistent with Catholic discipline.

I am going to Cork this afternoon and will on my return have the honour of waiting on your Grace to consult with you on this important subject. I believe Mr. Lynch,² the master, will furnish me *privately* with the draft of a Bill³ to meet your wishes. I will show it to your Grace and leave a copy of it with you and have the matter fully considered before any *public* movement is made. We in the House of Commons may find such preparation eminently useful to meet any machinations of the enemy.

You may rely on it that no movement shall be made without your Grace having intimation in full time to organise the opposition of the Catholic Clergy. I hope I need not say that your Grace can reckon with confidence on my best attention and sincere zeal in resisting any measure you deem dangerous or unfit to be adopted.

SOURCE: Dublin Diocesan Archives

1 Letter 2949a.

2 Andrew Henry Lynch.

3 Apparently a bill designed to protect the legal validity of marriages performed by Catholic clergy (see letter 2955).

2951

From James Cannings Fuller¹ to Dublin redirected to London

Skaneateles, Ononilaga County, N.Y. [U.S.A.], 28 March 1842
Esteemed Friend, Daniel O'Connell,

When in my native land and many times since returning to that of my adoption, with pleasure and satisfaction has my mind often recurred to the pledge² thou gave in the London Convention that thou would carry into effect that which thou had long had in contemplation, that of addressing on the subject of slavery the Irish

who are settled in the United States; often in my correspondence with our mutual friend, Elizabeth Pease,³ have I queried of her when this country would be favoured with its perusal, and commissioned her to refresh thy memory. . . . [The pledge] thou gave in the assembled philanthropy which met in London sixth month [June] 1840. . . . I witnessed in Boston the reception of the Irish address⁴ signed by thyself, Theobald Mathew and sixty thousand other Irishmen . . . The foes of liberty, with shame be it said that some of them are Irishmen, are by all the means they can devise endeavouring to destroy the good produced, indeed to destroy the credibility of the address itself. Reference as to its authenticity by an adopted citizen was made to the Catholic bishop and priests of New York, and Bishop Hughes⁵ in the columns of one of the strongest pro-slavery newspapers printed in the free states: 'The New York [3 or 4 words illegible] first and decided *impression* is that, as it appears, it is not authentic.' 'Should it prove to be authentic, then, I have no hesitation in declaring my opinion that it is the duty of every naturalised Irishman to resist and repudiate the address with indignation. Not precisely because of the doctrine it contains, but because of their having emanated from a foreign source, and of their tendency to operate on questions of domestic and national policy. I am no friend of slavery *but* I am still less friendly to any attempt of foreign origin to abolish it.' . . . [This statement by a Catholic bishop is deplorable] when it is known that the bull⁶ of the Pope on slavery is not without its good effect in slaveholding Maryland. . . . [The writer quotes toasts of a pro-slavery nature at a celebration of St. Patrick's Day in Washington, D.C., Geo. Washington P. Custis⁷ presiding]. I admire thy devotion to the cause of British India and the concluding paragraph in thy letter⁸ to Joseph Pease under date of 25 May 1841. [The writer believes that the above address was not sufficient and that O'Connell should make another address to the Irish in America, of a more eloquent kind which would be productive of great good] and if Father Mathew would *simply endorse it*, no mortal can tell how powerful the action it might induce for the overthrow of slavery. . . .

[P.S.] . . . There are in the States not less than 800,000 Catholics, 478 priests and 418 churches. Why do they not recognise in faith and practice the edict of Gregory the 16th?

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Cannings Fuller (c. 1793-1847), an English Quaker who had settled in Skaneateles in 1834.
- 2 At the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's convention in London in June 1840 (see letter 2720 n2), Fuller asked O'Connell to issue an address to the Irish in America since they were among the

- principal supporters of slavery there. O'Connell in reply said he already had such an address in mind and, before the convention ended, would show it to Fuller (*Northern Whig*, 18 June 1840).
- 3 Joseph Pease's daughter Elizabeth (1807-97). She married in 1853 the astronomer John Pringle Nichol.
 - 4 This address, carried to America by Charles Lenox Remond, was read at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in Faneuil Hall, Boston on 28 January 1842. The address was denounced by prominent sections of the Irish-American press, and by Bishop Hughes, as either a fraud or an intolerable interference in internal American affairs. Appeals were made for O'Connell to send a second, personal, appeal to Irish-Americans. He did make such an appeal in a letter, dated 11 October 1843, to the Cincinnati Repeal Association. (For this information the editor is indebted to Douglas Riach, M.A., M. Litt., Edinburgh University). For an illuminating description of O'Connell's influence on American opinion concerning slavery see Owen Dudley Edwards, 'The American Image of Ireland: a study of its early phases,' in *Perspectives in American History*, IV, (Harvard, 1970).
 - 5 John Joseph Hughes (1797-1864), a native of Co. Tyrone; consecrated coadjutor bishop of New York in 1838; bishop of New York 1842-50; first archbishop of New York from 1850.
 - 6 The apostolic letter of 3 December 1839 (see letter 2673 n4).
 - 7 George Washington Parke Custis (1781-1857), stepson of George Washington and father-in-law of General Robert E. Lee. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
 - 8 This was a public letter condemning the land system in India (*Pilot*, 7 June 1841).

2952

From Cornelius MacLoughlin

Fitzwilliam Place, 31 March 1842

My Lord,

In order to take our Estate out of Chancery,¹ six liberal members:

Alderman Roe

Alderman O'Neill

Alderman Egan² and Councillors O'Brien,³ Walsh⁴ and MacLoughlin agreed to subscribe £500 each, making £3,000. Tories would give nothing.

There is an undercurrent working heaven and earth to deprive us of the pipewater establishment. It is the opinion of many that your Lordship should say something on these two subjects on Friday.⁵ Doing so will open people's eyes to the difficulties with which we are surrounded when we are obliged to advance our own money.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On the following day the corporation of Dublin passed a vote of thanks to seven of its members who had advanced £3,500 to enable the corporation to get dominion over its property (*Pilot*, 4 Apr. 1842).
- 2 Cornelius Egan, 26 Bachelor's Walk, Dublin.
- 3 Timothy O'Brien, (1790-1862), wine merchant, 92 Lower Baggot Street, Dublin. Lord Mayor of Dublin in 1844 and 1849. M.P. for Cashel 1846-59. Created baronet 1849. See *Boase*.
- 4 Michael Walsh, silk merchant, 56 Fishamble Street, Dublin.
- 5 At the meeting of Dublin corporation on Friday, 1 April, O'Connell declared that there was no danger that the corporation would lose its control of the pipewater establishment. (*Pilot*, 4 Apr. 1842).

2953

To Edmond Smithwick

Dublin, 2 April 1842

My dear Smithwick,

I enclose you a bill at 4 months for £420 which when paid will leave you £100 for Kilkenny charities for my son John and the residue you will apply to . . . your account with the Counties league fund.¹ I wish I could do better for you.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 See letter 2905 n4.

2954

From Rev. Nicholas Wiseman

St. Mary's College [Oscott], Thursday, Low Week [7 April], 1842
My dear Lord Mayor,

I have this evening received an answer to my letter of enquiry relative to the Virgins of the Tyrol,¹ and will give you the whole chain of my testimony that your contradiction of the false report may be as explicit as possible. I wrote to Count Reisach,² for many years my friend in Rome where he presided over the great College of Propaganda till the king of Bavaria, after many pressing and repeated requests, obtained his consent to be bishop of Eichstadt where he now resides though named to the future succession of the see of Munich. His letter is dated Eichstadt, 29 March 1842. He tells me that on the receipt of my letter he wrote, as I expected he would, to his uncle who holds a government situation at Innsbruck. He had that day received his uncle's reply. The latter had immediately written to a gentleman of the name of Giovanelli at Botzen who had

answered (as it was known he must) that no such examination by order of the government had been made beyond the satisfactory one at a former period. Further, that the only way to account for the false rumour is to refer it to the attempt made by a certain Dr. Ennemoser³ to account for the state of those holy women on the principles of animal magnetism. I may observe that this attempt supposes an acknowledgment of the existence of the phenomena and excludes all idea at any rate of imposture. The bishop concludes this part of his letter by assuring me that the whole report is a mere invention to throw discredit upon a splendid evidence granted to our holy religion, and begging me to treat it as such. I trust that this explanation will give you full satisfaction.

I have written to Lord Shrewsbury but have as yet received no answer.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 See letter 2944.
- 2 Karl August von Reisach (1800-69), bishop of Eichstadt 1836-41; coadjutor (1841) and (1846) archbishop of Munich and Freising; transferred to Rome and appointed cardinal 1855.
- 3 Joseph Ennemoser, M.D., author of *The History of Magic*, translated from the German by William Howitt, 1854.

2955

From Archbishop Slattery

Thurles [Co. Tipperary], 8 April 1842

Copy

My dear Lord Mayor,

... I have been made aware by Dr. Murray that in consequence of those Presbyterian marriage cases¹ which have lately made so much noise both in and out of parliament, it is supposed that some general marriage bill² for Ireland is contemplated by the government, and as is natural the idea of any legislation by them on the subject has excited the greatest alarm amongst us lest it might be shaped in such a way as either essentially to interfere with our Church discipline or at least be attended with much practical inconvenience to our Clergy.

I need not tell your Lordship that the discipline by which *all Catholic marriages* are now regulated in Ireland is that established by the Council of Trent, in virtue of which it is required for the validity of such marriages *that they be performed in the presence of the parish priest of one of the parties or of a priest deputed by him or by the bishop and also in the presence of at least two witnesses.* ... If

report be true, some change or other is contemplated for a committee of the House of Lords has been appointed³ to deliberate on the subject, and I have heard with dismay that it is intended to pass such a bill as would render *all Catholic marriages invalid* for all legal purposes *unless performed in the presence of a lay functionary* to be appointed for that purpose. . . . [Such a law] would have the effect of demoralizing the country by removing from the minds of our people the religious respect which they entertain for the sanctity of the marriage contract and in consequence of which feeling that sacred engagement is observed by them with such unexampled and inviolable fidelity.

. . . I know that some insinuations and vague assertions have fallen from persons high in office, imputing uncertainty and confusion to the laws of Ireland in this respect and suggesting the necessity of amendment. . . . The courts of justice have never got any trouble regarding the marriages of Catholics with one another by their own pastors, and with regard to *mixed* marriages, the interference of our clergy in them is sufficiently provided against by the law as it now stands which renders such marriages legally invalid unless performed by a Protestant clergyman.

But there is no necessity for my dwelling any longer on the subject in this particular point of view as I have just learned through Dr. Murray that whatever may have been the original intention of the Lords Committee, there does not appear to be a disposition at present to overturn our Trent discipline but rather to confirm it by law. This too . . . is unnecessary and might, besides, be very inconvenient.

The legal validity of our marriages has never been questioned. It has always been recognized in the courts of justice, and in those cases where the actual fact of the marriage of two Catholics is necessary to be established, the proof of its being solemnized by a Catholic priest is held to be perfectly sufficient.

What necessity then is there for any new legislation on the subject? None whatsoever. . . . We have hitherto maintained the salutary discipline of the Catholic Church on this point, in all its rigour, by the influence of our own authority. . . .

I am informed however that Mr. Lynch, the late Member for Galway, was examined before the Committee, that he recorded there his opinion *that all Catholic marriages in order to be valid should be celebrated in our churches and within certain hours in the morning* (as is the case I suppose in England), and that he, assisted by your Lordship, is to draw up a bill to that effect.

From what I heard of Mr. Lynch's character I believe him to be a most estimable person and a steadfast Catholic but at the same time

I respectfully submit that, from his long residence in England, he could not be well acquainted with our usages nor a competent judge of the measures that would be exactly suited to the peculiar wants of our mission. . . .

It was remarked, I think by Sir Robert Peel, in reference to a general marriage bill for those countries, that the measure was one which required the utmost caution, . . . that it by no means followed that a bill which worked well in England would be equally well adapted for Ireland or for Scotland. . . .

But in Ireland the circumstances are widely different. There, in the worst of times the Catholics had freedom of conscience as to their marriages and the clergy were not in this respect at least subjected to any legal restraints. . . .

[With regard to restraints on Catholic clergy] we know that such attempts have been made in other places and even in our own times. Let us only look to Prussia and with the example of that country and of the Archbishop of Cologne⁴ before our eyes, have we not good reason to deprecate any intermeddling on the part of a Protestant government with our ecclesiastical discipline and to view with jealousy and with alarm any suggestions however well intended that might possibly lead to such calamitous results. . . .

Your Lordship is not ignorant of the nature and the difficulties of our Irish mission and of the laborious duties which almost incessantly occupy the time of our clergy from morning till night. You know that our people are not located in towns and villages with a priest and a church at their very doors, as is the case in Catholic countries on the continent, but that on the contrary our rural parishes consist of a large population thinly scattered over an extensive district, and the priest as well as many of themselves residing two, three, and in some instances, four miles or more from the chapel, he perhaps without an assistant, has many duties besides that of marriages to perform. [Thus it would be very inconvenient for them to be tied to any particular time for the solemnization of marriages.]

. . . I beg then to inform you that the Clergy, at least those of the south of Ireland and of that part of Leinster with which I am best acquainted, derive their principal means of support from the offerings made to them by the people on the occasion of their marriages. From time immemorial it has been the general custom that those marriages should take place at the house where the young female to be married resides; her parents always invite a number of their friends and neighbours to the wedding dinner; and when the ceremony is performed, an offering is made to the clergyman by each person in the company. The occasion is a festive one, it is a

moment of hilarity, they give with a cheerful heart and generous hand, the offering made is a trifle to each individual yet from those spontaneous and kind-hearted contributions something considerable results to the clergyman in the course of the year which not only places him above want and relieves him from the necessity of anything like rigid exaction with regard to his other minor dues, but enables him to maintain a respectable position in society and to meet the many calls of a public and private nature which are made on him every day.

Your Lordship then cannot but at once perceive the ruinous influence which this proposed enactment [a particular time for the solemnization of marriages] would have upon the temporal interests of the clergy. You cannot but see that it would cut off their principal means of support, that they would soon become the victims of poverty and that their independence once gone, the foundation would perhaps be laid for their reluctant acquiescence in a state provision if offered at some future time.

I therefore enter my own solemn protest and that of my clergy against this contemplated enactment and I also protest against it in the name of the other bishops and clergy of the south of Ireland whose official and authorized organ I am.

. . . I think that a great deal depends upon the result of the appeal⁵ that is to be brought to the House of Lords by the Presbyterians. If that terminates successfully and the validity of the common law marriages is thereby established, it is likely that matters will be left as they are in our regard. The Government will not venture to meddle with the Presbyterians, I imagine, either in Scotland or in Ireland, and they can then have no pretext for interfering with us unless they do so for the sake of mere wanton annoyance, and this I can hardly think they will attempt in their present embarrassed position. . . .

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

1 See letters 2940 n7.

2 No such bill was introduced.

3 A select committee of the House of Lords was appointed on 7 March to inquire into the present state of the marriage laws in Ireland.

4 See letter 2508 n6 and n7.

5 A reference to the cases, *Queen -v- Millis* and *Queen -v- Carroll* (See letter 2940 n7). These were obviously presented in such a way that appeal to the House of Lords could follow if the decisions of the court of queen's bench were unfavourable, and Judge Crampton virtually stated as much in giving judgment (Edward S. Dix, *Report of the Cases of Regina -v- Millis and Regina -v- Carroll*, Dublin, 1842, 245).

2956

To Archbishop Michael Slattery,

London, 13 April, 1842

The anniversary of the signing the Catholic Emancipation Act
My respected Lord,

I had the honour of receiving your very able, powerful and most important communication on this auspicious day, a day which I trust and believe will never be tarnished by the reenactment of any penal law.

There was a scheme on foot concocted in the House of Lords to meet the difficulty of the decision on the subject of Presbyterian mixed marriages. It was to be a general marriage law for all persuasions. The instant I heard of it I saw Lord Campbell who gave all the information in his power — it extended little beyond the fact of such intention. I felt it my duty instantly to write to my own immediate diocesan on the subject placing myself in every respect at his disposal and confiding to him as of right either to communicate with the other prelates himself or to order me to give them respectively similar information with that I gave him. He as I expected adopted the former and, I am convinced, the wiser course, and his Grace did me the honour to send me a similar valuable communication with that which your Grace is now pleased to send. I had *his* permission to make use of his letter *discreetly* and *without publication*, and I solicit a similar power from your Grace.

I should however add that I am convinced the threatened danger is completely over and that we shall hear nothing further of any marriage bill respecting the Irish Catholics. It is quite true that there are two points on which an alteration in the law is very desirable. First, the Act¹ rendering invalid the marriage of a Catholic and Protestant by a Catholic priest should be repealed and the common law restored; there are two decided objections to the present. First and chiefest it gives the Protestant clergy an unjust superiority whilst it with greater inequity tarnishes the mission of the Catholic Priest. Secondly, it creates frequent litigation on the question whether for *twelve* months before the marriage both parties were undeviatingly Catholic. The second alteration in the law ought to be to give equal force in point of legal evidence to the entries of the priest in his parochial book of births and marriages as the entries of Protestant clergymen. This is especially necessary after the death of the priest and also much more so after all those who could prove his handwriting are dead. The finding the book preserved as the parochial book should be as strong evidence in the case of a Catholic

parish book as in that of the Protestant.

So far I went with Mr. Lynch and no farther but even thus far I was not to be committed unless I had the full and express sanction of all the Catholic bishops in Ireland. Thus too the Catholic Bill was to be separate and distinct from the Protestant and Dissenters Marriage Bill. It was to take nothing from us and to give us something substantial.

At present all idea of any marriage bill [?gives] up. The loose decision² of the Irish judges will be set aside and the validity of Presbyterian mixed marriages will be confirmed. This will be done by due course of law as the point respecting that validity is now *put on the record* in another case of bigamy³ tried before Mr. Justice Perrin. This will enable the case to be brought by writ of error before the Lords and I can prophesy without being a Pastorini,⁴ as we Irish say, that the Lords will get all parties out of the difficulty by affirming the marriage.

This will however create and give publicity to another grievance. A Presbyterian clergyman in Ireland is but a layman in point of law. Of course the Catholic Church does not recognize his ordination. In fact, he has none such. [About five lines illegible]. He must not even call himself reverend but if necessary he is at liberty to assume it their being no law to ascertain who may not call himself a 'minister' in Ireland.

This to be sure *is* the law as it has really existed but the public were not aware of it. Even the judges in Ireland were ignorant of it. But the decision of the House of Lords which must involve and sanction this principle will publish it to the world and will multiply unordained [the remainder of the letter is illegible].

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

1 19 Geo. II (Ireland) c. 13.

2 Apparently in *Queen -v- Samuel Smith* tried about the end of November 1841 (*DEM*, 1 Dec. 1841).

3 *Queen -v- Millis* (see letter 2955 n5). Before going to the queen's bench this case was tried by Perrin at the spring assizes for Co. Antrim in March 1842.

4 *Pastorini's Prophecies* was a reprint of an old work which was sold at fairs and markets and had a very large circulation amongst the peasantry (Michael MacDonagh, *Bishop Doyle*, London and Dublin, 1896, 78-9).

2957

*From Archbishop Crolly*¹

Armagh, 14 April 1842

My dear Lord Mayor,

A petition to the House of Commons has been forwarded to your care by the Catholics of Armagh, who entertain the hope that you will in Parliament support the reasonable prayer of their petition with your extensive influence and powerful advocacy.² From the circumstances in which all the Catholics on the panel were excluded from the jury box at the late trial of Francis Hughes for the murder of Thomas Powell, you will easily perceive that, if such an exclusive system be not altered, neither the lives nor the character of Her Majesty's loyal Catholic subjects will be safe in this part of Ireland. I am intimately acquainted with some of the respectable Catholics who were set aside by the Crown solicitor at the trial of Francis Hughes, and knowing their integrity, I do not hesitate to declare that their exclusion was calculated to fill the minds of the Catholics of Ulster with alarming apprehensions, that trial by jury will not afford impartial protection to their properties, their liberties or their lives. You have always endeavoured to obtain evenhanded justice for your fellow countrymen, and your friends in this ancient city join me in the request that you will use your most strenuous exertions to obtain from Parliament that legal redress which is so fairly claimed in the petition which will be entrusted to your care.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 William Crolly (1780-1849), bishop of Down and Connor 1825-35; archbishop of Armagh 1835-49. See *DNB*.
- 2 No such petition was presented.

2958

From Archbishop Slattery

Thurles, 15 April 1842

My dear Lord Mayor,

I was this day favoured with your obliging and satisfactory answer to the communication which I had the honour of addressing to you in the course of last week, and which you have my full permission to make such use of as in your discretion you may deem advisable.

In fact I had no other intention when writing than that you should be at liberty to avail yourself of the suggestions thrown out in my

letter, as well as of the information if any, that it contained, and if there was any expression in it which seemed to imply confidence, it had reference only to the observations I felt it necessary to make on the ruinous consequences that would result from the proposed enactment to the temporal interest of the clergy as that was a subject upon which I would not have ventured to speak so freely to any other *lay person* than to yourself.

It is most gratifying to learn from your Lordship that the threatened danger is now over, and that all idea of any Marriage Bill affecting the Irish Catholics is given up.

There is no doubt that it would be most desirable if the Act rendering legally invalid the marriage of a Catholic and Protestant by a Catholic priest was repealed, but if the repeal of that enactment was likely to lead to any new legislation on the subject of our Catholic marriages, I would rather submit to the law as it now stands, obnoxious though it be, than run the risk, perhaps, of having a more intolerable grievance inflicted on us by the occasion of its being removed from the Statute Book unless it was done in the shape of a mere simple repeal.

With regard to the other alteration in the existing law alluded to by your Lordship, viz., that of giving equal force in point of legal evidence to the Catholic as to the Protestant parochial registries [Slattery thinks it most important].

[If Presbyterian mixed marriages are to be recognized as valid surely Catholic ones ought also but only if they will remain unlogged by instructions.]

[He says he is perfectly aware of the probable consequences resulting from a decision to recognize Presbyterian mixed marriages — that each dissenting minister will have a Gretna Green establishment but he does not think this will affect Catholics since they never resorted to the Established clergy for marriages.]

If then the legislature lets us alone, I will say as you do, that I am not afraid with the divine assistance but we will be able to preserve our own. . . .

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

2959

To Rev. Dr. Paul Cullen,¹ Rector of the Irish College, Rome

Liverpool, 9 May 1842

Rev. and most respected Sir,

My first duty is to return you my respectful and cordial thanks for

sending me so soon as it was issued the allocution of his Holiness respecting the Church in Spain. I may add that my speech² in the House of Commons respecting Espartero's³ government was most inaccurately reported. I was made to say of the Archbishop of Toledo what I said of other bishops, omitting what I did say of him. I believe you know enough of the English press not to be surprised at the readiness with which the editors confound matters interesting to Catholicity.

But instead of dwelling on these secondary matters I ought to attend to what is of much greater importance, namely, to excuse myself for not having sooner returned you *these* thanks. My apology shall be the fact that so many and such various occupations absorb my time that I have been unable to give so much of it as would allow me to express myself suitably to you as well in returning you thanks for your communication as in canvassing topics of deep interest to the progress and wellbeing of Catholicity within these islands.

The first of these topics is the *elevation and authority* of Cardinal Acton.⁴ I couple both together because taken singly I have not the least reason to doubt, nor do I doubt, of his perfect fitness for high dignity in the Church of Christ. His personal qualities I question not as eminently justifying his elevation — but what I dread is the *authority* which *may* be incident to and connected with his elevation. Now, if that authority be confined to the regulation of the affairs of the Catholics in the various missions and places in England and Scotland, where there are or hereafter may be congregations of Catholics — so far I say as England and Scotland are concerned, I have not a shadow of objection to his enjoying all authority whatever it be which the Holy See may in its wisdom concede to him or entrust him with. He is in every way suited to represent England and Scotland in Rome in the court and in the church. His learning, zeal, intelligence and piety render him perfectly qualified for *that* purpose.

But where jealousy begins is with respect to Ireland. I know not whether it be intended that he should invetene in Irish affairs but I fear least he should. Perhaps the reasons for that fear are futile and unfounded. But I could not help noticing that in his reply to the addresses of the English, *Irish* and Scotch colleges he repeatedly confounded the three under the term *British* and never once separated the Irish as they ought to have been separated. For we are, thank Heaven, a separate nation still and have preserved through ages of persecution — English persecution, political as well as religious — our separate existence and so much of our royal and national station as consists in a national hierarchy complete in all its parts from our most dignified and venerated archbishops down to

the humblest acolyte who serves at the foot of our altars — of the Catholic altars of the most high God.

British!!! I am not British. You are not British. When the British north and south fell away and dissipated amongst the profligate and the renegades of Protestantism and of every species of infidelity, the inheritance of the Lord amidst the land, the Irish Nation and the Irish Church were the victims of and not the participators in these crimes. But why should I indulge in dreamy recollections of the past. It is better consider the present, to reflect on the times in which we live and to seek to discover whether the church of Ireland is not abundantly sufficient to carry on all its relations with the Holy See without the intervention or intermeddling of any British clergyman however dignified. I do not wish to have the relations of Ireland with the Holy See relaxed or diminished. On the contrary, my anxious desire is that nothing should arise to injure those relations which I most cordially wish to see strengthened and increased and confirmed for all ages. No man can be more attached to the centre of unity than I am. No man can be more entirely convinced that the stability of the faith depends on the submission to and union with the Holy See. It is because I fear least anything should occur, least any intervention between the Irish Church and his Holiness should be obtruded which might have a tendency to disgust any persons or to weaken in any way the respectful and most affectionate attachment which Ireland proudly boasts of and zealously entertains towards Christ's Vicar on earth.

You perhaps will smile at the alarms I strongly feel though I do not adequately express on this subject. I blink myself at these alarms because Ireland has a shield in the prudent zeal of her episcopacy to protect her from any intervention which *could* possibly injure the deposit of faith committed to their care. Ours are faithful shepherds who would as their sainted predecessors — many of them did — die for their flocks.

My anxiety however may tend to prove how much alive the Irish Catholics are to any British intermeddling in Irish concerns. We are more so with respect to any such intermeddling with our temporal concerns, concerns which are legitimately within the province of the laity as well as of the clergy as Irish citizens and subjects of the British Monarch. Lord Shrewsbury is now at Rome. His intimacy with Cardinal Acton is as natural as it is honourable to both parties but the noble lord has turned out to be an anti-Repealer. I do most earnestly hope that his Holiness will not interfere with any of the Irish Catholic clergy or suffer them to be interfered with on that subject. If any such interference should be intended I would most respectfully entreat of you to let me know the fact and to procure for

me from the proper authority permission to lay at the feet of his Holiness a most respectful and submissive memorial showing him as I could easily show him that the Repeal of the Union would be an event of the most magnificent importance to Catholicity, of an importance so great and so valuable that I am prevented from presenting it in its true colours to the British people least it should have its effect in increasing their hostility to that measure.

I would obtrude on you some of the heads of that memorial to use if you pleased to do so discreetly but not to transpire to the general public through the press or otherwise. Here are some of these heads:

1st. That the Catholics of Ireland were no parties to the Union. They were at that time excluded from all participation in legislation, unjustly so deprived and in violation of the Treaty of Limerick. Their right to domestic legislation therefore remains untouched.

2d. The Protestants in Ireland are not so much religionists as politicians. They are political protestants, that is, Protestants by reason of their participation in political power, by reason in fact of political power being almost entirely confided in them to the exclusion of all but very few Catholics.

3d. If the Union were repealed and the exclusive system abolished, the great mass of the Protestant community would with little delay melt into the overwhelming majority of the Irish nation. Protestantism would not survive the Repeal ten years. Nothing but persecution would keep it alive and the Irish Catholics are too wise and too good to persecute.

4th. The Union was carried in order to prevent or at all events to postpone the Emancipation of the Catholic people of Ireland. It had that effect for twenty-nine years.

5th. The Repeal of the Union would free the Catholic people of Ireland from the burden of supporting the useless Protestant Church. The tithe-rent charge alone produces near half a million sterling per annum. The Repeal of the Union would disengage this mass of property and enable the people to support their own church.

6th. The Repeal of the Union would at once disengage the Church lands from the hands to which they have been unjustly transferred by means of the so-called Reformation.

7th. The Repeal of the Union would thus at once enable the Catholics of Ireland to endow every archbishop and bishop with a suitable residence and domain, placing him in moderate and respectable independence of worldly cares.

8th. The Repeal of the Union would thus at once enable the Irish Catholic people to endow the parochial clergy in each parish with a parochial manse and glebe so necessary for the better performance of his duties as well of charity as of his ministry.

9th. It is a most melancholy fact that the people of Ireland are unable to support more than one third of the number of priests necessary for the due exercise of their functions. One priest now has the care of five or six thousand or from that to fourteen thousand souls. It is impossible to perform all the duties of such parishes.

10th. The Irish people require for their spiritual benefit three times the number of priests they now enjoy. Two thirds more priests should be added to the existing number. Nothing but the Repeal of the Union can enable the Irish Catholics to educate and provide for that number.

11th. The Repeal of the Union would enable the Catholics of Ireland to establish a diocesan seminary under the superintendence of the bishop in every diocese and to have such seminaries of sufficient capacity to supply the wants of each diocese.

12th. The Repeal of the Union would enable the Irish Catholics either to participate on strictly Catholic principles and subject to the regulation of the Irish Episcopal Synod in the present University which would be too extensive for the then naturally decreasing ranks of Protestantism or to endow under similar regulations another university.

13th. The Repeal of the Union would enable the Irish Catholics to endow in every parish schools for the education subject to ecclesiastical control and revision of the Catholic children.

14th. The Repeal of the Union would open the doors of poorhouses, hospitals and prisons to the Brothers of the Christian doctrine⁵ and to the Sisters of Mercy for the instruction and spiritual solace of the wretched inhabitants.

15th. The Repeal of the Union would enable the Irish Catholics to endow missionary houses at least two of them on a grand scale. *The one* to supply home missions to give spiritual retreats wherever the bishop and clergy of any diocese should require or sanction it. *The other* to supply foreign missions as well in the vast regions of the globe where the English language is understood as in such other places as their spiritual superiors may direct them.

16th. The Repeal of the Union would entitle Catholic Ireland to claim a resident cardinal of her own at Rome to be entrusted with all communications to the Holy See in due obedience to the Canon Law. There never was yet an Irish cardinal. Ireland of the Catholic nations of Europe stands, I believe, alone in the fact that there has never yet been a cardinal of that nation. I confess I should wish to see that anomaly cease.

These are some of the advantages which would result from the Repeal of the Union. Perhaps the moral effect would be still greater than the direct advantages. The most productive country on earth of

all the prime necessities of life, enriched by having her national income spent within her own bounds. Six millions sterling per annum *now* abstracted from her (a fact of the clearest certainty) *then* accumulating within her bounds. So rich, so prosperous a country with a legislature devoted to Religion, to Catholic truth in doctrine, discipline and submission to authority, with an undeviating attachment to the authority of the Holy See, a legislature devoted to civil liberty, to peaceful arts, to science, to the promotion of every virtue — abhorrent of crime — giving a glorious example to the nations.

Forgive me, I trust, honest enthusiasm. Am I warranted in my fond hopes of a glorious futurity? Has not the Irishman vindicated for himself the high motto, a description as well as a praise, '*Semper et ubique fidelis.*' Religious fidelity unequalled. No other nation to be named in which the government became heretical and the people continued faithful. In that, Ireland stands alone. Blessed be the great God!

Then her modern miracle of temperance. I have documents before me to show that temperance in Ireland has during the last three years diminished the revenue *arising* from spirits by eight hundred and seventy thousand pounds sterling.

Pardon me, pray pardon me for trespassing at such length upon you. You may laugh at some of my fears and give a melancholy smile to some of my hopes but *these* blessings are within our grasp if God gives us virtue to assert them.

I of course implicitly confide in your discretion in the use — if use there be — of these sentiments. I write with perhaps a vain hope of being serviceable to my native land but many of my thoughts have the crudeness of rapidity for I have consumed less time in writing this lengthy epistle than you will in reading it should you have the courage to wade through it. If you can in any way make known to his Holiness my most humble devotedness to his sacred authority and to make it so known in terms of suitable lowliness and humility, you might perhaps obtain for me that which I prize at the highest — his apostolic benediction.

To the Very Rev. Dr. Cullen

SOURCE: Irish College, Rome

- 1 Paul Cullen (1803-78), rector of the Irish College, Rome 1832-48; of the Propaganda College, Rome 1848-9; archbishop of Armagh 1849-52; of Dublin 1852-78; cardinal 1866. See *DNB*.
- 2 Probably that delivered by O'Connell on 4 March 1842 in which he condemned the Spanish government for its alleged persecution of the Spanish Catholic clergy (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXI, 65-6; *Times*, 5 Mar. 1842).

- 3 Baldomero Espartero (1793-1879), Spanish general and statesman, entered politics after his military successes in the first Carlist war. Twice head of government, 1841-3 and 1854-6. Appointed regent by the Cortes in May 1841.
- 4 Charles Januarius Acton (1803-47), secretary to the congregation of regulars 1831-42; created cardinal in secret consistory 18 February 1839, proclaimed cardinal 24 January 1842 (this was the elevation to which O'Connell refers). See *New Cath. Encyc.*
- 5 The Irish Christian Brothers founded by Edmund Ignatius Rice.

2960

From Archbishop Murray

Dublin, 26 May 1842

My dear Lord Mayor,

I pray your Lordship's kind attention to a bill now before Parliament to abolish the punishment of death in certain cases in Ireland¹ etc. and to examine if the first enacting clause may not, on account of its ambiguity, involve in serious difficulties any priest who would marry a Catholic and Protestant.

The 12th Geo. I, c. 3, to which that clause refers, has been repealed as far as regards the Catholic Clergy but this fact is not recited, in consequences of which omission it does not seem clear to some lawyers that a Catholic clergyman under the circumstances referred to, would not under the new bill if carried through Parliament, be liable to transportation.²

I have taken the liberty to call Lord Eliot's attention to this subject and it is probable that his Lordship may cause all ambiguity concerning it to be satisfactorily removed. But I beg most particularly to refer it to your Lordship's consideration.

I feel great pleasure in offering my sincere congratulations on the issue of the proceedings against the Cork Election³.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On 19 April the Irish solicitor-general presented a bill to this effect in the Commons. It was enacted on 18 June 1842 as 5 & 6 Vict. c. 28.
- 2 An act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 102) repealed all acts, including 12 Geo. I, Ireland, c. 3, providing punishment for a Catholic priest for solemnising a marriage in which one or both parties were Anglicans. The initial clause of the bill (*Parl. Papers*, 1842, II) now in parliament (see above note 1) substituted transportation for capital punishment for Catholic priests and degraded and pretended clergymen solemnising such marriages. The clause made no reference to the act of 1833 thus giving rise to the fear expressed by Murray. In the Lords on 30 May an amendment was made to this clause which stipulated that the clause contained nothing contrary to the act of 1833. The clause in its amended form was enacted.

- 3 On 23 May the Commons committee on the Co. Cork election declared O'Connell and Edmund Burke Roche duly elected.

2961

To Archbishop Murray

London, 31 May 1842

My respected Lord,

Before I was honoured with your Grace's letter Lord Eliot communicated to me the purpose of that which he had received from you and asked me to assist in obviating any such consequences as you apprehended. I accordingly conferred with the solicitor-general¹ who was not until I informed him of it aware of the Act which repealed all final provisions against the Catholic clergy for celebrating marriages between Catholics and Protestants.²

We met again yesterday and although I more than doubt the existence of any danger from the enactments of his new Bill, yet I thought it upon the whole preferable to add a provision to that bill, placing by express words our clergy out of all possible risk. I dictated the proviso which the sol-general took the trouble to write from my declaration and engaged that it should be inserted in the new law. I will take care that no mistake shall occur on this subject though indeed there is no danger as I was met, I must say, with perfect good faith by Lord Eliot and the sol-general.

I need not, I trust, add that I shall always be proud to be honoured with any commands from your Grace.

SOURCE: Dublin Diocesan Archives

1 Joseph Devonsher Jackson.

2 See letter 2960.

2962

To Rev. Dr. Fleming, Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland

London, 2 June 1842

My Rev. Lord,

You will perceive by this enclosure that Lord Stanley has brought in a Bill to 'amend' the Constitution of Newfoundland.¹ It should, I think, be rather entitled a Bill to transfer all power to the aristocracy or monopoly party. But, of course, you are a better judge of this matter than I can be. I therefore send you the Bill in order to obtain

instructions from the popular party in your island on this subject. I will give the Bill all possible opposition as well, because my own judgment condemns it, as to obtain time for the persons most interested in the matter to decide on their own course. I should not send this document to your lordship but with the certainty of obtaining the best advice on the subject.

I should hope Lord Stanley will not be able to force the Bill through the House before I can hear the sentiments on this subject of the People of Newfoundland.

SOURCE: *Irish World*, 22 June 1889

- 1 On 27 May, Stanley presented a bill to amend the constitution of Newfoundland. On 30 July O'Connell moved that the bill be postponed for three months. He declared that Newfoundland had flourished since being granted a constitution in 1832 and asserted that the government's reason for attempting to take it away was that the majority of the population were Roman Catholics. Stanley in reply claimed Roman Catholic priests had interfered unduly in elections in Newfoundland, but denied that the bill was intended to discriminate against Catholics. It was carried through all its stages by substantial majorities in poorly attended houses (*Pilot*, 1 Aug., *FJ*, 6, 8 Aug. 1842) and was enacted on 12 August 1842 as 5 & 6 Vict. c. 120.

2963

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 21 June 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

I send you the two letters as you desire. Can I do anything else?

The Belfast Committee¹ is composed of four Liberals and five Tories. This was not done by my assent but because the Tories *dictated* the selection. They insisted that, as one or other party must have the majority, the accused was entitled to it, and they have so decided a majority in the House that it was vain for me to struggle. There is this advantage, that very little is left to the discretion of the Committee as our business, our efficient business, is to take evidence. I presume I am to be Chairman.² Indeed of that there can be little, I believe no doubt, so that the Tory majority is not very material. Perhaps it is better it should be so, and I am sure that, even if I had the right and the power to nominate the entire Committee, I ought not to give it a partisan colour. You can explain *this* to all who inquire but do not put it into the newspapers, and in every case remember that the Tories *have the power* of dictation.

The Catholics who support Peel are of those who at all times are useless and, whenever the opportunity offers, mischievous. It was in

despite of them we were emancipated and in despite of them we will, after the present lull, accumulate Repealers.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 287-8

- 1 On 3 June a select committee declared the late election of James Emerson Tennent and William Gillilan Johnson for Belfast to be void (see letter 2884 n6). On 14 June Frederick Shaw moved that a new writ be issued. O'Connell moved as an amendment that a select committee be appointed to try whether a corrupt compromise had been entered into to avoid an investigation into the gross bribery and corruption which, he alleged, prevailed in Belfast. O'Connell's amendment was carried by 170 to 73 (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXIII, 1530-44). The committee was nominated on 16 June and reported on 11 July that such a compromise had been entered into but that the elected persons (Tennent and Johnson) had not been privy to it (see *Parl. Papers*, 1842, V).
- 2 The committee sat on six days in June and July 1842 on all of which O'Connell was chairman (*Parl. Papers*, 1842, V).

2964

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 June 1842

My dear Friend,

Again for politics. There is the greatest danger of an outbreak in the manufacturing districts. You can form no idea of the hopeless state of the manufacturing interests and, to crown all their misery, the Russian [Prussian] tariff¹ threatens to annihilate the Worsted trade, almost the only remaining branch of industry which is in a thriving position. The delegates have been with me just now, and their accounts are terrific. People are not awake to the danger which really exists.

Belfast Committee meets tomorrow for business. I believe the case will be fully proved though it is said that rather a general conspiracy exists in Belfast to prevent its success. But the persons who are engaged in it are very foolish. Everyone of them is liable to be compelled to disclose the entire details of their efforts to nullify the enquiry.

Roebuck's Committee² is progressing most successfully. The Harwich case has completely exploded. Only think of £1,000 for 2 votes! This case is the more curious because the votes were those of the chairman of the Liberal Committee and his son. The Tories offered them £350 each for his vote, and they tendered themselves to their own party for that sum, giving the Liberals till ten o'clock of the polling day to consider whether they would give that price. But the

Tories having been apprized of this hesitation, they agreed to raise the bribe to two of £500 each and so get the votes before nine. All this has been proved. The Nottingham case is now on and the case is fully proved. Walter of the *Times* has refused to be examined, and we³ shall, I do believe, have to send him to Newgate. He will, I believe, be this day ordered into custody.⁴

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 288

- 1 News had just been received that the members of the German customs union known as the *Zollverein* proposed in July 1842 to introduce duties for the purpose of preventing the importation of foreign woollens and worsted goods (*Pilot*, 29 June 1842).
- 2 Roebuck was chairman of a committee appointed on 13 May to inquire whether corrupt compromises had been entered into in the election petitions presented from, amongst other places, Harwich and Nottingham.
- 3 By 'we' O'Connell meant the House of Commons. He was not a member of Roebuck's committee.
- 4 On 28 June Walter apologised to the House for his failure to attend the committee, and submitted to the speaker's instruction that he attend the committee next day. O'Connell implied on this occasion that Walter had refrained from attending the committee in order to canvass its members in his favour (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXIV, 715).

2965

To Edmond Smithwick

London, 27 June 1842

My dear Smithwick,

. . . I think I can promise you that the Tories will not be long in office but the worst is that there is danger of a convulsion. You have no idea of the total and *hopeless* destitution of the English working classes in the great manufacturing towns. It is really awful.

The bribery cases¹ will be exposed to a most frightful extent. In short, Toryism is likely to get a vital blow. Heaven protect us from seeing it go out in blood. I assure you I entertain strong fears of the latter event.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

- 1 See letter 2964.

2966

From Rev. John Strain¹

St. Peter's, Dalbeattie, Castle Douglas, N.B., 29 June 1842
My Lord,

I am a Catholic clergyman to whom application has been made to sanction in my congregations the establishment of lodges of a society styling itself *Grand United Order of Catholic Brethren*. Such lodges have already been established in various places of Scotland, and England in particular, in which country it originated. My object in troubling your Lordship is to request your opinion of the legality of such lodges. [Membership involves an oath not to disclose the secrets of the society, which has passwords, signs and a grip.] Its objects are most praiseworthy. They are the relief of sick and the burial of dead members. They explicitly disavow any political object whatsoever. My question therefore to your Lordship is 'Is such a society legal or illegal?' . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. John Strain, Catholic clergyman, St. Peter's, Dalbeattie, Castle Douglas, Kircudbrightshire, Scotland.

2966a

From Gerrit Smith¹

Peterboro', Madison County, State of N. York, U.S., 2 July 1842²
Honored and Dear Sir,³

As in the case of thousands of others, who have long admired and loved you, not only my person but my character, and probably my name even, are unknown to you. . . .

It seems that you are willing to have the cause of 'Repeal' promoted by the contributions of those who uphold and apologize for American slavery,⁴ and who vilify abolitionists. I am far from saying that this is wrong. To refuse such contributions would, perhaps, savor more of intolerance and bigotry than of an intelligent adherence to principle. But that you should allow your opinion of American abolitionists to be modified by what their pro-slavery revilers say of them, very naturally inspires the fear that, after all, slavery is not so unutterably bad in your eyes but that you can confide in the testimony of its advocates against men whom scarcely any earthly testimony should suffice to convict of a want of integrity. To be an abolitionist in America is to be hated and

persecuted 'for righteousness' sake.' . . .

I am personally acquainted with hundreds — I may say, thousands — of abolitionists, and I cannot name an abolitionist who uses intoxicating liquor for a beverage or who is profane in his speech or who is licentious. We should be careful how we take up an evil report against such men.

I see by the newspapers that some of your pro-slavery American correspondents endeavour to make you believe that American abolitionists hate the Irish amongst us. Why should we hate them? Is it because they are ignorant and poor? But is the abolitionist, who makes common cause with the American slave, with the poorest of the poor, and the most ignorant of the ignorant, the man to hate persons because of their ignorance and poverty? Surely not. . . .

How greatly do I lament that ignorance of Wm. Lloyd Garrison⁵ which some of your remarks in a public meeting indicate! You refer to his views of the Sabbath and the clergy. I am not particularly acquainted with them; but I presume that they do not essentially differ from those of the Quakers on those subjects. But whatever they are, he does not obtrude them upon anti-slavery meetings; nor does he, from any evidence which I have seen, regard them as, in any degree, essential to the character of an abolitionist. Whatever else Mr. Garrison may or not be, he is certainly a true-hearted abolitionist; and, in my judgment, a decided Christian. . . .

That the Lord may ever have you in his most tender and holy keeping, and make your life and your surviving memory a blessing not only to your beloved Ireland but to the whole world, is the warm desire of

Your friend and admirer,
Gerrit Smith

SOURCE: The *Liberator*, 28 April 1843

- 1 Gerrit Smith (1797-1874), a philanthropist and reformer. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
- 2 On 29 April 1843, the *Liberator* also published a letter, dated 19 April 1843, from Smith to Garrison concerning Smith's letter to O'Connell: 'I see, by the last number of the *Liberator*, that you have heard of a letter which I wrote to Mr. O'Connell, and that you wish to publish it in the *Liberator*. The letter was not written for the public eye; nevertheless, I send you a copy of it. It remains unanswered.'
- 3 This letter has been reduced by excisions in editing to a third of its length.
- 4 For further information on this subject see letters 2951 and 2981a.
- 5 William Lloyd Garrison (1805-79), the American abolitionist and reformer. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*

2967

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 11 July 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

The political horizon lours. The distress in the manufacturing districts speaks with a thousand tongues. For my part my apprehension is that crime and destruction of property and lives are imminent. I sometimes doubt the extent of the distress, otherwise these dreadful consequences would be already produced. This, and this alone, affords hope yet *everybody* at both sides of the House admits the existence of almost universal misery. What shall be the end? If matters proceed to any extremity Ireland is my post to keep the people from any outbreak. It will be enough for the Irish to watch events and to guard against anarchy or outrage and to contrast favourably with any violence at this side of the Channel. . . .

Want is literally killing me. I have grown ten years older from my incessant pecuniary anxiety. God bless you, my dear friend.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 289

2968

To Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny

London, 20 July 1842

My dear friend,

[concerning acceptances of bills]

I am sincerely, heartily sorry for the loss of your fine boy. May the great God preserve the rest of them and their dear and respected mother to you.

[P.S.] The distress in the manufacturing districts is excessive but it has not as yet any powerful operation in London or there would be 'wigs on the green.' I do not see how *some* convulsion can be avoided. We may rejoice in the facility with which Ireland *will be preserved* in quiet. I should indeed shudder for the consequences if I was not impressed with this hope.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2969

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 25 July 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

I write overwhelmed with affliction. It almost drives me mad. The enclosed, which I send you in the strictest confidence, will explain that Smithwick's bill for £420, due on Wednesday week, *comes upon me*. I write again to him today in great anxiety. Would his endorsements to the bills I sent him, and which he has returned to me, be of any use? If so, I would get him to endorse them and send them to you. By bills I mean two notes of mine at three and four months for the amount of the bill due the 3rd of August, payable to *his order*.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 289

2970

To Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny

London, 25 July 1842

My dear friend,

I received your letter with the deepest affliction, the deepest affliction. Believe me, believe me *the cause* of your refusal to accommodate me is beyond any comparison my most cruel sorrow.

But what is to be done? I had not the least doubt that I could get that last Carlow bill renewed. Unhappily I have this month made payments to the extent of some thousands of pounds, and next month is also heavy though comparatively light. I did not however foresee or make provision for your bill, foolishly thinking it impossible that I should not get it renewed. It makes me quite unhappy lest it should go back on you for want of my being ready to take it up. The time presses so. Even if I were myself in Dublin I might be able to meet it. I really cannot describe my anxiety. What am I to do? If the bill goes back on you under present circumstances I never can forgive myself. Yet being here I fear it must. I write however to have everything done that can be but I can never repair to you the mischief of letting this bill go back under existing circumstances. . . .

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2971

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 26 July 1842

[No salutation]

I write in great despondency, but catching at a straw. I send you the two notes payable to Smithwick's order so that, if you think you could make anything of them, you may send them to him for his endorsement though indeed I think little of this scheme of mine but I know of no better.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 289-90

2972

To Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny

London, 26 July 1842

My dear Smithwick,

I am ashamed at again giving you this trouble, you who with *me* or *mine* have had nothing but trouble. God help me, I feel very unhappy.

Could it enable you to assist me to take up the £426 bill if you were to draw on me payable at a Banker's here. If so, draw on me at once and I will accept the bill payable at the bank here where I keep an account. Should P.V. FitzPatrick, who manages for me in Dublin, write to you on this business, I guarantee anything he may propose as fully as if I had done it myself.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2973

To Edmond Smithwick

London, 29 July 1842

My dear friend,

[with regard to settling the bill for £426]

I must anxiously hope that your losses will not be more than temporary. I solemnly assure you that I would not feel more anxious for my brother or my son if in your situation.

SOURCE: Papers of Mrs. Maureen Bennett

2974

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 29 July 1842

My dear FitzPatrick,

You have taken a load off my mind. May God bless you! I was actually in despair.

Stanley wants to extinguish the Constitution of Newfoundland.¹ I am the sole defender of the Catholics there and cannot leave this until that Bill is disposed of. It will come on tomorrow, and I will write by that post telling you when I can leave this but I fear, and indeed believe, I cannot leave before Monday evening at the very earliest. I will however write you a line each day till then so as to keep you exactly appraised of my position.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 290

1 See letter 2962.

2975

From Edmond Smithwick

Kilkenny, 2 August 1842

My dear Sir,

[On acceptances of bills through P.V. FitzPatrick].

Assured that you feel an interest in my welfare I must trespass on you by stating that my losses last year were considerable owing to the great reduction in the price of butter and my agents at the other side obstinately hold[ing] it over, expecting the price to improve but, thank God, with the assistance of the best of fathers I have met everything well and look forward to now something more cheering. [He informs O'Connell of his difficulties, involving an arbitration, with English merchants in regard to exporting butter to England but these difficulties have now been overcome successfully. He has two family bereavements].

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2976

To T.M. Ray

London, 6 August 1842

My dear Ray,

I am sincerely sorry that it will not be in my power to be in Dublin before Wednesday but on that day it is my intention to be there and to proceed at once to the perfect organisation of the Repeal agitation. Have for me an accurate return of the parishes and districts in Dublin and the rest of Leinster in which any exertions have been made in favour of Repeal since the 25th March last, the date of the renewed exertion for Ireland.¹ The apathy by which the spirit of patriotism is paralysed must soon give way to the conviction that Ireland has nothing to depend on but her own exertions. How foolish it is in the writers of the *Dublin Magazine* to suggest² the formation of a Liberal party in Ireland unconnected with Repeal! — foolish to the last degree. Who besides the Repealers are Liberal in Ireland? Some few barristers who dream of the restoration of Whiggism, of Whiggism that has passed by never to return. It is true that Lord Cloncurry adheres to his opinions of former days but we have no right to expect activity from him, benumbed as he must be by the wretched Toryism of his son. The house of Leinster may be called 'The Castle of Indolence,'³ where the son outsleeps the father. Alas, alas, for poor Ireland, she has indeed no friends.

But shall we despair? I will try the thrilling trumpet that has often before caused despair to hope and torpor to be roused into energy. I do not despair, nor does the chill of an ungenial Legislature diminish the glow of hope which I derive from the subdued but reviving flame of genuine Irish patriotism. The People of Ireland are true to the heart's core. The Clergy of the People are as sincere in their love of fatherland as they are eminent in Christian zeal and fervent piety. I do not despair.

So soon as I arrive in Ireland I will publish my address⁴ to my own constituents. All I desire is to make them, Clergy and Laity, understand the real position of public affairs. I want every Irishman to be convinced of this truth, that there is nothing worth looking for save the power of governing ourselves and of husbanding our national resources by the restoration of our domestic Legislature.

Have, I repeat it, prepared a list of all the parishes in Leinster, with the names of the clergy of each parish and of every layman therein, who shall have taken at any bygone time an active part in the Repeal

agitation. It is by detailed and persevering exertions that public opinion will recover its tone and energy in Ireland.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 290-1

- 1 No event which would justify this reference has been traced.
- 2 A reference to a letter, signed Dillon O'Neill, dated 12 July 1842, in the *Dublin Monthly Magazine* for July 1842. The writer suggests that Whigs and Repealers should combine in a liberal alliance in order to procure measures in which the whole people are interested.
- 3 The title of a poem by James Thomson published in 1748. Those entering this castle are overcome by a delightful torpor which leads to their ultimate ruin.
- 4 The address does not appear to have been published.

2977

From Robert Sutter, 3 Lr. Sherrard Street, Dublin, 16 August 1842

In support of his claim for compensation for the loss of his office as inspector of the pipe water revenue which he filled from 1823 to 1840. Thanks O'Connell for promising support.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

2978

To William Joseph O'Neill Daunt

Derrynane, 9 September 1842

My dear Daunt,

I enclose you the post office order with my signature. Also a letter from Galwey¹ which you will give my son John. It relates to the affairs of my daughter Mrs. French. I send another complaint, I believe, against Traill.² At all events I authorise you to dismiss him for the delinquency specified in your letter to me and to appoint Fleming if Ray deems him a suitable person in his room.

I have had some excellent hunting and feel quite renovated in health.

I do hope you are making arrangements for opening the campaign of agitation. It is time it were begun but act cautiously. Be sure to have the approval of the Catholic clergy in every place you move to. I intended to have written to you at greater length but will defer it until Sunday or Monday. Write to me fully all the prospects of the approaching campaign. Is there anything you wish me to do or say or write?

Communicate my *orders* to my dear friend, Tom Steele, to keep his bed until his physician tells him he may rise.

SOURCE : O'Neill Daunt Papers, NLI 10507

- 1 Possibly William T. Galway, attorney. Nicholas J. Ffrench died on 21 August 1842.
- 2 Presumably a Repeal warden.

2979

To Thomas Lyons, Mayor of Cork

Derrynane, 17 September 1842

My dear friend,

Your dear nephew paid me but a fleeting visit. I only wish it may tempt him to come again. He is really an interesting young gentleman.

This will be handed to you by Mr. Ray, the Secretary of the [Repeal] Association. You are aware that we have begun the provincial agitation for the appointment of Repeal wardens in every parish. My son John is in Connaught, O'Neill Daunt in Leinster and Mr. Ray is for the same purpose in Munster.¹ I know you will give him all possible countenance and support. I am very anxious about Cork especially as you know that we have some lukewarm friends there. If we succeed in Cork in commencing the agitation well, the rest of the province will take up the tone from you.

SOURCE : Harrington Papers

- 1 The departure of these individuals on their respective missions was announced in the Repeal Association on 12 September (*Pilot*, 14 Sept. 1842). The success of their mission is shown by the fact that the week before it began the Repeal rent amounted to only £48, whereas the week after they had completed their mission it was £285 (O'Keefe, *O'Connell*, II, 656-7).

2980

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 20 September 1842

My dear Friend,

You have enclosed the two bills you sent me, *accepted*.

I intend (D.V.) to be in Dublin on the 29th so as to have the 30th for preparation in my duty to revise the Burgess Roll. It will give me thirteen days' hard work.¹ I hope to be able to carry you an

assurance of the renewal of Burke's² bill.

You may be sure that all the part I shall take in the College Election³ will consist in condemnation of both parties. But I do suppose the death of Martin Curry⁴ gives an opportunity to the Government to escape the difficulty. It matters little after all.

The weather has been very favourable since my arrival here. I have exceedingly enjoyed my hunting scenes and I really feel a restoration of health and energy even beyond my expectations. I do delight in this retreat. My *pack* is beautiful and they hunt admirably. They kill with ease full six and even seven hares in a day, and this amidst the finest scenery, the most *majestic* in the world. How I wish you saw this place and saw *my hounds* hunt because it is not the men but the dogs that hunt with me. It is with bitter regret I tear myself from these mountains, and I would not consent for any offer to forfeit my prospect of being here all October in the ensuing year.

I have given nearly the last fortnight to political idleness, and from this day I *begin again*. I think I feel that the prospects of the people are less clouded than they were. I am sure events are working for the popular cause.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 292-3

- 1 As lord mayor O'Connell had to complete the revision of the burgess roll of Dublin within a fortnight, which was the limit of the time allowed him by law. Wagers were laid that he would not be able to complete the task within the specified time. However, he completed it at five minutes to midnight on the last day allotted him (O'Keefe, *O'Connell*, II, 658-60). He told the Repeal Association on 17 October that it had engaged him nine hours a day for fourteen days, and fifteen hours on the last day (*Pilot*, 19 Oct. 1842).
- 2 John Bourke.
- 3 A vacancy arose towards the end of 1842 in Dublin University due to the promotion to the bench of its representative, Joseph Devonsher Jackson. The university Tories put forward George Alexander Hamilton against the government candidate, Thomas Berry Cusac Smith, who was forced to withdraw (McDowell, *Public Opinion*, 206-9).
- 4 A mistake for *Master* Curry. William Curry (c. 1783-1842), 37 Summerhill, Dublin, son of William Curry, merchant, Co. Tyrone. Called to the bar 1806; M.P. for Armagh city 1837-40 when he was appointed a master in chancery.

2981

To Thomas Moore

[c. October 1842]

My dear Moore,

Do not be angry with me for not having sooner answered your letter. The fact is, I wanted to answer it satisfactorily but have consumed the time in vain. . . . I remember distinctly having read the facts somewhere though I cannot lay my hand upon the authority, I mean the facts relative to the Corporation of Dublin. Of this much there is no doubt, that the Irish Catholics did not persecute any Protestants in the reign of Queen Mary. Nay more, it is quite certain that many Protestants fled from England to escape persecution and received protection in Ireland from the Irish Catholics.

I cannot bring to my recollection where I found the fact of the hiring of seventy-two houses in Dublin for the Bristol Protestant refugees in Mary's reign but find it, certainly, I did, and will not cease until I find it again.

SOURCE: Russell, *Memoirs of Moore*, VII, 334-5

2981a

From James Haughton

34 Eccles Street, Dublin, 1 October 1842

My dear lord mayor,

. . . I know you hate slavery; your whole life has been one continuous act of opposition to the iniquity in all its forms. Now is the critical moment for Ireland. We must either rise in the esteem or sink into the contempt of the good and the free-hearted in America. I conjure you to put an end to the unholy alliance between Irishmen and slave-dealers in America.¹ You can do more to effect this great good than any other living man. I need not enlarge; my whole soul is with you in favour of human rights. I can in truth say, I long to see your renown increased by a continued glorious action to force their universal acknowledgment, but do not lose your moral power (the only power which can enable you to gain your object) by the acceptance of further sympathy or aid from American 'soul-drivers'. The work of your life will be marred and destroyed by such an unholy contamination. . . .

SOURCE: Haughton, *Haughton*, 59-60

1 Throughout the spring of 1842 a controversy developed in Dublin over

the question of accepting aid from Repeal Associations in America that condoned slavery. On 10 May 1842 a letter was read to the Repeal Association from James Haughton censuring the Association on this point. In defending the Association O'Connell reiterated his condemnation of slavery but declared that the best policy was to strive to convince those Americans who were assisting Repeal, of the evil of slavery but to do so in a conciliatory manner (*FJ*, 11 May 1842).

2982

To Archbishop Murray

Mansion House [Dublin], 21 October 1842

My Lord,

I have the honour to enclose to your Grace a bank note for twenty pounds, being the amount of an order transmitted to me from an anonymous person to be distributed amongst 'the labouring poor' of Dublin, and to entreat that your Grace will have the goodness to cause this money to be distributed amongst such persons coming under that description that you *in your discretion* may deem so reduced in circumstances as to be objects for charitable relief. If your Grace will take the trouble of causing this money to be so distributed the mode of distribution is left at your perfect free choice.

SOURCE: Dublin Diocesan Archives

2983

From William Coxon

Sunderland [Durham], 28 October 1842

My Lord,

I regret to perceive from a report of your late speech¹ that you seem to favour the notion of 'giving blow for blow' to foreign nations by imposing counter restrictions in retaliation for the hostile tariffs recently published against this country. I trust I have misunderstood your Lordship's meaning for I should deplore it as a great national calamity if, in the struggle for Free Trade, the monopolists should derive any the least countenance from Mr. O'Connell whose voice has hitherto been always amongst the loudest in favour of every kind of freedom.

[Coxon tells of the injury he suffered in business by reason of the import duty on timber and the export duty on coal, and finally, by Peel's income tax of 7d in the pound. He considers there should be

no import or export duties, and that income tax should be graduated from 1% to 75%. 'I think all inordinate wealth ought to be heavily taxed.']

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A reference to O'Connell's speech to the Repeal Association on 17 October. France, Portugal, America and Germany had, he declared, all raised tariffs against England. He condemned Peel for not protecting the English workers by laying on a tariff also (*Pilot*, 19 Oct. 1842).

2984

From E. Lucas¹ to Merrion Square

Dublin Castle, 2 November 1842

Immediate

Sir,

I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to inform you, that his Excellency has recommended to the Lord Chancellor to insert the name of the present Lord Mayor in the commission of the Peace for the County of Dublin and at the same time to supersede the appointment thereto of the Lord Mayor leaving office;² a course which His Excellency deems advisable to pursue upon all similar occasions.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Edward Lucas (1787-1871), Castleshane, Co. Monaghan. M.P. for Co. Monaghan 1834-41; under-secretary to the lord lieutenant 1841-45. See *Boase*.
- 2 O'Connell's year in office as lord mayor of Dublin ended on 1 November 1842 when, on his nomination, his successor, George Roe, was elected unopposed (*Pilot*, 2 Nov. 1842).

2985

From John Barclay Sheil, M.D.

Ballyshannon [Co. Donegal], 13 November 1842

Dear Sir,

Some time since I had the honour to address a letter to you stating that I was engaged in a work on the temperance movement and a memoir of the Rev. Theobald Mathew. I had not any reply to my letter and whether your silence proceeded from change of feeling or neglect I cannot tell. . . .

I venture to acquaint you that, having lately received a letter from Lord Shrewsbury and finding in it the following sentences *which* I beg to quote to you and at the same time to express my regret that any differences have arisen between Lord Shrewsbury and yourself. My acquaintance with him originated in Rome when I was there in 1826 and we afterwards met at Vienna in Austria. In reply to my letter to him lately on the temperance question he says:

'You are good enough to say that you have read my letters relative to Mr. O'Connell. You will there see that I have ascribed more signal advantages to Fr. Mathew's wonderful mission than to any other cause which has influenced Ireland for many a long year. . . . If you mention me at all in reference to the matter . . . I should wish you to do so in an extract from my third letter to Ambrose Phillips Esq., p. 88, 89, 90.¹ You may also with truth assert that his Holiness, Gregory XVI takes a very deep interest in Fr. Mathew and the success of his almost supernatural mission. . . . With respect to the printed address² from the office of the O'Connell compensation fund it is indeed a libellous production and no one knows it better than O'Connell himself. . . . Radicals and Repealers seem so very unwilling to understand anything but as they wish it to be and as it may serve their purpose. . . . In respect to others, all but Repealers think ill enough of O'Connell to justify the assertions I am *falsely supposed to have made*. . . . I cannot but express my surprise to you that men of station and character such as Sir John Power should lend their names to a document containing statements which they ought to know to be false, scandalous and libellous. . . . Of the whole of O'Connell's reply to me I never read but *two* or three short extracts I have seen in the papers. The title page was so disgustingly scurrilous that I threw the book aside and have never opened it. . . . It [my third letter to Phillips] has, I believe, been very little read in Ireland. They are determined to take a one-sided view of everything. The *note* [on] page 92 of my *third letter seems to me to set the question at rest*. . . . What I meant was to warn him against the continuance of a worse than useless agitation if it were only from the *suspensions* which it generated in the minds of many as to the purity of his motives. . .

I quote Lord Shrewsbury's letter which is written no doubt under *excited* feelings for one purpose only, viz. to show to you that he *denies and disclaims* having had the intention to make *any accusation against you*. I wish there was any possibility to reconcile men who are both so high in my esteem. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 This passage refers to the beneficial effect of the temperance movement

on Ireland (Shrewsbury, *A Third Letter to Ambrose Lisle Phillips . . . on the present posture of Affairs*, London, 1842, 88-90).

2 Unidentified.

2986

To John Barclay Sheil, M.D.

Merrion Square, 17 November 1842

[*Copy*]

Dear Sir,

I am sorry to find that you did not know that it is totally out of my power to answer letters. Everybody writes to me about everything; so that I really do not read all the letters I receive. My silence therefore should not be considered as any offence and you especially would mistake me exceedingly if you thought so.

I return you the scrap of Lord Shrewsbury's letter which you sent me. It is a precious *morceau*. The excuse must have emanated from the Irish part of the noble earl, for you know he is partly an Irishman. It is Paddy's apology when rebuked for having knocked down and broken the head of a comrade and friend, '*Why I only intended to give him a hint.*' That is the way that Paddy Shrewsbury gives a hint.

The worthy peer has manifestly forgiven himself, as we all do upon such occasions. He does not want my forgiveness. If he did, he should have it.

However that may be, I am bound to express my desire not to hear anything further *of, from* or *about* the noble earl, regarding this matter, a desire which I hope and beg you will have the goodness to recollect and respect.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

2987

To John Primrose, Jr.

Merrion Square, 22 November 1842

My dear John,

I intend to leave this at six on Thursday morning, to go before I stop to Limerick and to be in Killarney on Friday, and to reach your house¹ on Saturday to dinner. My new chaplain alone accompanies me.

Have the dogs over to meet me so as to hunt on Monday towards Derrynane.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 Hillgrove, Cahirciveen.

2988

To Richard Barrett

Derrynane, 5 December 1842

My dear Barrett,

I will write to you again tomorrow and report progress. I expect to have the draft of the prospectus¹ by Wednesday night.

Have you observed how exactly suited Peter Purcell's Agricultural Society² is to enable the landlords to combine together for the exclusion of Catholic tenants? I do not think I have seen this remark before, and it is doubtful whether it should be published now.

All well here. My hounds in great order. I have had some beautiful hunting.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 293

- 1 Presumably the prospectus for the fourth general meeting of the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland, held in Dublin on 16 December (*Pilot*, 19 Dec. 1842).
- 2 On 5 December the Dublin *Pilot* called on the Royal Agricultural Society, of which Peter Purcell was a prominent member, to advocate at their forthcoming meeting a general reduction of rents during the present depression. On 19 December it condemned the Society for having failed to do so.

2989

To Archbishop Slattery

Derrynane, 5 December 1842

My very revered Lord,

I have been just informed by a letter from Thurles that a person of the name of O'Gorman¹ had the astounding audacity to apply to your Grace for a subscription to a pretended work of mine.² I think the vile creature ought not to soar so high in his knavery. You will of course anticipate that I am about to inform your Grace that this man's story is an entire fabrication. If he has received any money on *this* pretence I will join in prosecuting him.

I deemed it an incumbent duty to put your Grace on your guard against this impudent imposter.

It is true that I have a work³ in preparation and will I hope have the first volume published in January next. I hope your Grace will do me the honour to accept a copy of it which I shall be proud to transmit to you the moment it is printed. The work itself may but little repay the trouble of perusal but the respectful motive which induces me to offer it will plead my excuse for the small value of the gift.

SOURCE : Cashel Diocesan Archives

- 1 John Francis O'Gorman, bookseller and stationer, 11 Patrick Street, Limerick.
- 2 In a letter to the editor of the *Tipperary Free Press (Pilot)*, 14 Dec. 1842 O'Connell demands to know the name of the person who has falsely advertised that subscriptions in aid of a proposed history of Ireland by O'Connell would be received at the *Press* office (see also letter 2990).
- 3 Daniel O'Connell, *A Memoir on Ireland, native and Saxon* (Dublin, 1843). It was published in February 1843.

2990

*From P. D'Arcy*¹

Sexton Street [Limerick], Sunday night, 11 December 1842
Very dear and valued friend,

I have been called upon this evening by a friend of mine, Mr. J. O'Gorman, bookseller of this city, as well to authenticate copies of letters which he encloses in his letter to you, as to assure you of my personal knowledge of the truth that he states of his impression of the tenor of the first letter from Mr. Cumming.²

It has been a subject of extreme pain to himself and to me that such a construction combined with the remarks of the editor of the *Free Press*³ should be placed on his circular. I feel it the more from the very high character which himself and [his] father, Alderman O'Gorman,⁴ hold with all the Catholic clergy of Ireland. Any error he may have fallen into about having had your authority was only designed to advance the circulation of a work which all considered advantageous to the liberal party in Ireland. [He asks O'Connell to free his friend from any obloquy he might suffer from what appeared in the *Free Press*.] I intend meeting you at Newcastle on your return.⁵

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Patrick D'Arcy (died 27 April 1850), C.C. St. Michael's, Limerick from before 1836 to 1846; P.P. Mungret 1847-50.

- 2 Probably John Cumming, bookseller, Dublin.
- 3 That is, the *Tipperary Free Press* (see letter 2989 n2)
- 4 Patrick O'Gorman, alderman of Limerick corporation.
- 5 From Derrynane en route to Dublin.

2991

To P. V. FitzPatrick

17 December, 1842

May God bless you! You are my only hope.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 295

2992

From Bartholomew Ryan to Derrynane

Tipperary, 27 December 1842

Honoured Sir,

Having been for many years employed in the parish of Solohead, Co. Tipperary, as teacher of the parish school under the patronage of Lord Stanley and having strenuously used my humble exertions to promote the collection of the National Fund,¹ I was dismissed the situation on the grounds of being a political partisan. Myself and family have been expelled from our habitation *on the above account alone* as the letter of Lord Stanley which I enclose for your perusal fully proves.

[He asks O'Connell's assistance in obtaining another teaching position].

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 The O'Connell Tribute.

2993

To P. V. FitzPatrick, 7 January 1843, from Derrynane

'I intend to spend less time in London this Session than ever I did. Events may change this determination but they must be events which I do not at present anticipate.'

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 295

2994

To P. V. FitzPatrick

9 January 1843

[No salutation]

May I ask you to call in at Brophy's¹ the dentist and inquire of him what I owe him? It must be a large sum, say thirty guineas or upwards, by reason of the quantity of gold in the plates besides exquisite workmanship. He has done ten times as much for my comfort as the London men. Ten times did I say? There is really no calculation of the difference. Pay him for me if you can.

What a glorious thing the deficiency² in the revenue is! What a blow to our scoundrel enemies! I am just finishing my first vol.³ It will be out of hands tomorrow.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 295-6

- 1 Probably John Brophy, of Brophy and Keene, surgical and mechanical dentists, 24 College Green, Dublin.
- 2 The revenue for the quarter ending 5 January 1843 showed a falling off of £1,379,057 as compared with the corresponding period of the previous year (*Annual Register*, 1843, 2).
- 3 That is the first volume of his *Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon*.

2995

From Andrew G. Drinan, Shamrock Lodge, Barbados, 10 January 1843

Asks O'Connell to use his influence with the government to have him appointed postmaster in Barbados. He says he is a Catholic, the 'only resident *Roman Catholic* who ever held the most trifling official rank in the colony from which I now write.' He adds that he was connected with the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle* in 1829 and 1830, and came to the West Indies in 1831.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

2996

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 13 January 1843

My dear Friend,

I intend, please God, to go to Tralee on Wednesday, on Thursday to Newcastle and to be in Dublin on the 20th.¹ I will write to have my letters and newspapers directed to meet me. For the present, matters will remain as they now are, nor will any alteration be necessary before Tuesday next. The weather is the most stormy I can remember, great devastation of property in houses, corn, etc. through the district but we are in shelter here and have sustained, thank God, no injury though the tempest of thunder, hail, rain and wind raged around us. You cannot conceive anything so magnificent as the ocean. I have never seen it so wild.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 296

- 1 On Thursday 19 January, O'Connell arrived in Newcastle, Co. Limerick from Tralee, to attend a Repeal meeting and banquet (*FJ*, 23 Jan. 1843).

2997

From John Barclay Sheil, M.D.

Ballyshannon [Co. Donegal], 14 January 1843

Dear Sir,

I am sorry you have refused me the permission to add your name to the list of subscribers to my little work on the *Temperance movement*, which I am publishing.¹ Mr. Machen² of 8 D'Olier St., Dublin, is printing it for me and I shall have it ready before the 26th.

I am at a loss to what cause to attribute your refusal but as you are the well known friend of Father Mathew it can only be attributed to personal feeling to myself.

Believe me with much respect,
Your sincere humble servant,
John B. Sheil, M.D.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 John Barclay Sheil, *History of the Temperance Movement in Ireland*, (Dublin, 1843). O'Connell was not among the forty-six subscribers most of whom were titled Irish Whigs to an extent that suggests that Sheil's political sympathies were Unionist.
- 2 Samuel J. Machen, bookseller, publisher and stationer.

2998

To Joseph Sturge

Dublin, 25 January 1843

My respected Friend,

Your letter went to seek for me in the country as I was on my return to Dublin. It therefore was not received until an unusual time after its date. . . .

With respect to the question you ask me, whether it be necessary to employ counsel before an election committee, the fact stands just thus: there is no law and there is no rule or order of parliament requiring the parties to attend by counsel before any committee of the House . . . but the practical difficulties are great in doing business before an election committee without the assistance of counsel. For example, our rules of evidence are very strict and technical. There are some of them abundantly absurd and many of them have been framed as if on set purpose to exclude the justice of the case, such for example as the rule that 'no question shall be asked, the answer to which *might* tend to criminate the witness'. . . .

You certainly will require an agent, a parliamentary agent, to prepare the form of your petition¹ and to go through all the other forms connected with the passing of the securities for the costs of the petition trial, should costs be awarded against you. To do these things properly, a parliamentary agent though not *legally* is, I may say, essentially and inevitably necessary. . . .

SOURCE: Papers of Joseph Sturge, British Museum Add. MSS 43,845, ff. 9-10

¹ Sturge was narrowly defeated by John Walter of *The Times* in the election for Nottingham borough in August 1842. Walter was unseated on petition. A new election was held on 5 April when Thomas Gisborne defeated John Walter, Jr. (*Times*, 7 Apr. 1843).

2999

*From Michael Madden, 3 Ormond Street, Dublin, 27 January 1843,
to Merrion Square*

States he was a member of the Repeal board of trade when O'Connell gave the order for a national medal about December 1841,¹ and has made ribbons for the medals but the ribbons have not been purchased by the Repeal Association. He is thus at a loss to the extent of £10 for ribbons. He asks O'Connell to have the association

purchase the ribbons for the proposed Repeal warden medals.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 At a meeting of the Repeal board of trade on 30 September 1841 O'Connell announced his intention of having medals manufactured for persons pledged to buy only goods of Irish manufacture (*Pilot*, 1 Oct. 1841).

3000

From Thomas Steele

London, 11 February 1843

. . . You will be highly gratified to learn that by persevering steadily I have succeeded with the aid of that very estimable and zealous Catholic gentleman, Mr. Pagliano,¹ *first*, in getting my petition² taken into consideration by the grievance committee of the British Catholic Institute and *secondly*, in obtaining a resolution of that committee recommending to send a petition to Parliament grounded upon mine. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Of Pagliano and Nind, Sabloniere Hotel, 30 Leicester Square, London.
- 2 Probably in relation to the doubt as to whether it was necessary for Irish Catholics to take the oath of loyalty prescribed by the Emancipation act of 1829 (10 Geo. IV c. 7) before voting at elections for parliament. The Irish reform act of 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV c. 88) seemed to have abolished that requirement. On 15 May David Robert Ross, M.P. for Belfast, introduced a bill for the express purpose of abolishing this (doubtful) requirement. It was duly enacted as 6 & 7 Vict. c. 28.

3001

From his son John

Loyal National Repeal Association, Corn Exchange Rooms,
Dublin, Monday, 13 February [1843], 3 p.m.

My dear Father,

As I cannot remain and therefore don't go into the meeting, I enclose you Newman's¹ 1st letter with Lord Essex's² autograph letter *and permission to use them*.

. . . I am delighted to hear you are not forced to go over.³ I would be glad to learn from Daunt your views and intentions as to going.

On second thoughts I will manage [to w]ait to see you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers NLI 13645

- 1 Unidentified. Whether he was John Henry (later Cardinal) Newman has not been established.
- 2 Arthur Algernon (Capel), sixth earl of Essex (1803-92).
- 3 That is, to London but why he might have been 'forced' to go there has not been ascertained.

3002

From Robert H. Swyny, Bruff, Co. Limerick, 16 February 1843 to Merrion Square

Encloses a petition signed by 2137 persons for the repeal of the act of union and for fixity of tenure in land. It is not signed by 'any of the great and noble of this neighbourhood.' The writer attaches the description 'Volunteer'¹ to his signature.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 See letter 2835 n2.

3002a

From his son John

[27 February 1843]

My Dear Father,

Under the idea that they may be useful to you, I enclose:

Two extracts from *recent Morning Chronicles* taking up against Peel's case *our arguments* against the Anti-Repeal case attempted to be made on our exports.

Also, the facts connected with our sheep and cattle exports before and since the Union.

I send these as you may not have what details they give, present to your mind at the moment when making your speech in the Corporation tomorrow, *opening the Case of Ireland*. . . .¹

[P.S.] You will have Staunton at your elbow for finance.

Ray has several copies of my '*taxation-petition*'² which is a brief and *handy* summary and as it were, *index*, to the financial case, for which you and Staunton have details.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 This was the three-day debate (28 February, 1 and 2 March) in Dublin

corporation on O'Connell's motion to have a petition to parliament in favour of Repeal of the Union. His motion was passed by 41 votes to 15. O'Connell's speech lasted four hours and was 'packed with facts and arguments and statistics' (MacDonagh, *O'Connell*, 257).

- 2 John O'Connell was the author of a petition to parliament which was adopted by the Repeal Association on 31 December 1842. It was published in 1843 in his pamphlet, *The 'Taxation Injustice'* (Dublin, 1843), 1-3.

3003

From Mrs. Robert Hurd Wetherell, 61 Lr. Dorset Street, Dublin, 27 February 1843

Asks for free entrance tickets¹ for her husband and servant man. Her husband, the eldest son of a great King's County magistrate, is not a Repealer but she herself is.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI, 13649

- 1 For the Dublin corporation Repeal debate. See letter 3002a n1.

3004

From his nephew Morgan John McSwiney¹ to Merrion Square

Kenmare [Co. Kerry], 10 March 1843

My dear Uncle,

I have repeatedly written about the bill you accepted for my sister Kitty which you gave my brother, Dan,² in Dublin. I stated that Mr. Quill³ refused discounting the bill which makes me doubt the stability of his Bank. As I am going to the assizes in the morning I will expect the favour of a line there to Mr. Quill to discount the bill as I do assure you we have been put to the greatest possible inconvenience in not getting it cashed so that I will expect to hear from you in Tralee.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Morgan John McSwiney (born August 1805), attorney, son of Myles McSwiney and O'Connell's sister, Bridget.
- 2 Daniel O'Connell McSwiney, later an attorney.
- 3 Thomas Quill, manager, National Bank of Ireland, Tralee.

3005

From William Ford to Merrion Square

26 Arran Quay [Dublin], 20 March 1843

My dear Sir,

I send you as you desired in the accompanying paper my views as to the amendments which should be made in the bill now progressing through Parliament to regulate the pawnbroking trade¹ and which is fixed for committee on Monday next, 27th inst.

I am of opinion that there should not be a free trade in pawnbroking and that it requires a most stringent surveillance in every department.

The rights of the Corporation under the present law are confined to the appointment of the officers known as marshal and sword bearer. The sword bearer by virtue of his office has the appointment of one of the divisional auctioneers. The marshal has several duties:

1. He is register [sic] of Pawnbrokers' licenses for all Ireland. This duty should be retained. By reference to his book are known the names of the sureties of all the pawnbrokers in Ireland, and if Sir Edward Sugden succeeds in opening his new shop for registering all Crown Bonds etc. the Marshall of Dublin should redocket all these bonds there and then. They would be a known charge on lands and be a good security for the public. For this reason alone this department of office should be preserved.

2. The Marshall is to obtain certain returns monthly from every pawnbroker in Ireland of money lent by him and such returns are to be made by [the] Marshall annually to Parliament. These returns can be of no use as a check but if enlarged by a second column showing the amount received within the month for forfeited pledges redeemed and sold, such returns would make a valuable state document showing from authentic sources the progression of wealth or poverty, the increase or decay of personal credit, and could be occasionally put in juxta position with the returns from the savings banks. For this purpose only, that of being a state document, should the system of monthly returns be continued.

3. The Marshall was bound to serve notice of forfeiture of pledges unredeemed as to all articles on which 4s. or upwards had been lent but this duty was confined to [the] city of Dublin and three miles round it.

4. He had power of appointing one of the divisional auctioneers for sale of forfeited pledges in Dublin. The sword bearer appointed another and the Government the other two, and to these four persons so appointed was entrusted the sale of all forfeited pledges in

the city of Dublin. By the present bill the vested interest of all these officers is done away with. I am for retaining the duties of the Marshall and the auctioneers but to be put under the regulations mentioned in the accompanying paper. . . .

Since preparing that document for the Council, on reflection I find I have omitted guarding against one source of fraud . . . I mean substituting an inferior article at time of sale for a superior one of the same kind pledged. [There follows an account of how this fraud could be got rid of and a statement as to which public officers should have inspection powers].

The Corporation and the Poor have much at stake in the amendment of this Law and without your assistance in Parliament to resist injustice, much injury will be done.

. . . By my desire the Law Agents have been directed to draw clauses to be inserted in the bill to meet the views contained in the petition. This is the present position. With you in Parliament to meet the bill in Committee on Monday next all will be right. Without you I am free to own all will be lost.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 A bill to amend the laws affecting pawnbroking in Ireland was presented in the Commons by Lord Eliot on 27 February. It received its second reading on 14 March and was reported from committee on 10 June. It did not proceed further. No debates have been traced. The *Dublin Evening Post* declared the bill would affect the poor 'in every large and populous city and town of Ireland', and called on the Irish members to secure certain specified improvements in the bill (*DEP*, 18 Mar. 1843).

3005a

To Richard Barrett!

Merrion Square, 23 March 1843

My dear Barrett,

I saw with great surprise in the last *Pilot* a paragraph which you certainly took from some other newspaper, headed 'O'Connell and Dickens,' and purporting to be a quotation from an alleged letter of mine to the editor of a Maryland Newspaper, published at Baltimore, and called the *Hibernian Advocate*. The thing is from beginning to end a gross lie. I never wrote a letter to that newspaper, nor am I in the habit of corresponding with the editors of American papers.

I have seen, indeed, with great contempt, but without much surprise, in several American newspapers, letters deliberately published under my signature, given to the American public as

genuine documents — all of course being forgeries, but published by the editors as if perfectly genuine.

This is a species of outrageous rascality which has been seldom attempted in this country, and seems reserved for the vileness of a great portion of the newspaper press in the United States — that portion of it which seems to exceed in every species of infamy even the basest of the base, the *London Times*.

I am surprised that you did not take notice that this forgery was published in a slave-holding state — a state in which there is that moral contamination about the press which, I think you ought to know, would preclude me from having any communication with it. *Hibernian Advocate!* Oh, miserable wretch, you are, indeed, fit to circulate fictitious documents, for even your very name must be a forgery.

Few people admire more the writings of Dickens, or read them with deeper interest, than I do. I am greatly pleased with his 'American Notes.'² They give me, I think, a clearer idea of every-day life in America than I ever entertained before. And his chapter containing the advertisement respecting negro slavery is more calculated to augment the fixed detestation of slavery than the most brilliant declamation or the most splendid eloquence. That chapter shews out the hideous features of the system far better than any dissertation on its evil could possibly produce them, odious and disgusting to the public eye.

But I cannot help deploring one paragraph in the work. It is one full of the ignorant and insolent spirit of infidelity respecting the rigid Order of Benedictine Monks — I say, *of infidelity*, because surely no *Christian* man could place upon an equality the duellist murderer with the ascetic servant of the Cross of Christ!³

SOURCE: *Pilot*, 24 March 1843

- 1 Its text suggests that this letter may have been written as a private one, even though Barrett published it in his *Pilot*. It is incompletely published in W.J. FitzPatrick's *O'Connell Correspondence*, II, 296-7.
- 2 Charles Dickens, *American Notes*, written and published in 1842.
- 3 In Chapter XIII of his *American Notes* Dickens describes Trappist monks, who had formerly had a monastery at St. Louis, Missouri, as 'fanatics' and 'gloomy madmen.' He sees their departure, and the death of some duellists who had more recently killed each other in the vicinity, as 'no great loss to the community.' The edition of *American Notes* herewith consulted is that of Chapman & Hall Limited, London, 1891 (pp. 146-7).

3006

To Charles Bianconi

Merrion Square, 24 March 1843

Private

My dear Friend,

What the deuce is Tipperary doing? What the double deuce is Clonmel doing? And especially what is its valiant Corporation doing? Sligo, Drogheda, Limerick, Cork, Waterford, Dublin — all the Liberal Corporations except Clonmel — have either given proofs of Irish patriotism or else have shown themselves alive to it. What is Charles Bianconi doing? A vivacious animal in himself but now, seemingly, as torpid as a flea in a wet blanket. So much for scolding you all. And now, my good friend, is it not a crying shame that your noble county should remain in such apathy and torpor when all the rest of Ireland is rousing itself into a combined effort for the Repeal? I want a Repeal meeting either at Clonmel or Cashel or Thurles. I want to see from 60,000 to 100,000 Tipperary boys meeting peacefully and returning home quietly, to adopt the petition¹ and to organise the Repeal rent. Now you know you *must* get into motion, there's no use at all in hanging back any longer when you set about it. I know you will do the thing right well.

I am to be at Rathkeale on Tuesday, the 18th of April² and I could be at either of the three towns I have mentioned upon Thursday, the 20th April; so now put these things together and set about working. Do nothing without the cooperation of the clergy. I need give you no further instructions.

Though you are a foreigner you have brains in your noddle and are able to perceive, even amidst the levity of my phrases, the intensity of my anxiety to bring forward Tipperary, speedily, energetically but peaceably. What will you do for the cause? Eh? Answer me *that!*

[P.S.] You may show this letter to anybody but do not let it into print.

SOURCE: Property of Hugh E. Thompson

- 1 In favour of Repeal.
- 2 On 19 April O'Connell attended a Repeal meeting and banquet in Rathkeale (*FJ*, 20 Apr. 1843).

3007

From the Limerick Repeal Banquet organisers, Repeal Wardens Club Rooms, Trades Hall, 14 Thomas Street, Limerick, 25 March 1843, to Merrion Square

The writers, Joseph Murphy and P. Lynch, state they have been appointed joint secretaries to a committee elected by a Repeal meeting that day, Rev. Mr. Darcy in the chair. The committee invites O'Connell to a banquet in his honour.¹

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 On 20 April O'Connell attended a Repeal demonstration in Limerick city followed by a banquet presided over by the mayor, Martin Honan (*FJ*, 22 Apr. 1843).

3008

From Rev. Professor P.A. Murray¹

Maynooth College, 26 March 1843

Private

Honoured and Beloved Sir,

. . . I wish to direct your attention to a letter which appeared in the *Nation* of March 25 (yesterday), page 376, on the subject of the *Dublin Review* and the undisguised *spirit* which that letter manifests.²

[the writer states that he has always been and is a staunch admirer of O'Connell].

I am sure you will on reading the letter I refer to in the *Nation* and the milk-and-water comment³ on it, see the most false and unfair and malignant spirit manifested towards the *Dublin Review*. The objections of the letter-writers may be reduced to 4: 1. That the *Review* is written by Saxons; 2. That it is printed in London; 3. That it is anti-Irish and anti-liberal in its articles; 4. That it is fanatical in its religious principles.

Now as to the *first*. I myself write as often as I can for it. . . . I am not at liberty to mention the names of others but I can say in a *private* letter to *you* that there are two others of our professors constant contributors. One of them writes an article for each number and frequently two articles for one number. I know 3 other Irish and most respectable and talented priests and one at least of them an out and out Repealer (I cannot speak positively of the other

two) who write frequently. . . . I know also two or three other Irish Catholic laymen who write literary articles for it frequently. I need not mention one at least whom you know yourself. It is true Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Lingard⁴ write for it, the former constantly. . . . Dr. Wiseman may have his own private opinions on political matters (though as far as I know, and I know something of the matter, he does not pay any attention at all to political affairs) but until he publishes them and appears openly as a political character, he is surely entitled to the reverence and esteem that is due to a Catholic bishop. . . .

As to the *second*. Everyone who knows anything of such matters . . . must know that if the *Review* were published only in Dublin or depending (as things are) upon the contributions of Irish writers *only*, it would not stand for 6 months (a good argument perhaps for Repeal).

As to the *third*. Up to the point of open Repeal, I think the *Review* is thoroughly Irish. . . . If it professed Repeal it would lose the English support. . . . If it spoke against Repeal, it would lose (and most justly lose) the Irish support. . . . [It is] the only Catholic advocat  we have . . . against the swarm of monthly and quarterly periodicals that vomit out an eternal stream of blasphemy and slander in every corner of the land. . . . My advice then to the editor was to avoid political topics unless those . . . on which all true Catholics agree, and to be cautious of the political articles he received unless (and I specified this) those which came from your beloved son,⁵ the member for Kilkenny, or some like sure quarter. It would be desirable that the *Review* would take a higher tone in politics; but better even such is it than to have no such periodical at all. You are for instalments when you *cannot* get the whole.

As to the one or two passages which the editor of the *Nation* . . .⁶ points out . . . — the passage on Lord Shrewsbury and yourself (in the end of the 23 number) is not after all so very bad.⁷ It is to be regretted that such a passage appeared but why should this be taken out and held forth and harped upon? . . . I wrote to him [the editor] after its appearance and indignant remonstrance. . . . In his reply to me . . . [he] expressed his regret that anything should appear in the *Review* that would be calculated to give you or any of your admirers the smallest offence. . . . As to the article on the Temperance movement, no such insult as the *Nation* speaks of was contained or implied in it. This is a pure fiction of the *Nation's* own.⁸

As to the *fourth*. You have no doubt read some of the articles written by Dr. Wiseman and Lingard on theological topics in the *Review*. . . . There is certainly no very intolerant tone in any of these. . . . Only think of a person calling himself a Catholic denouncing as

“fanatical” and “bigoted” dissertations written by a Catholic bishop and by doctors and professors of Theology in defence of our most holy faith . . . and this too at a time, in a country, where the annointed priests of God (it is a beautiful phrase in your mouth) are denounced as demons — jugglers — nuisances — surpliced ruffians etc. and the holy sacrifice of the Mass, our devotion to the Mother of our God, all that is most holy in our eyes, are ridiculed, blasphemed, called idolatry, superstition, trickery to deceive the people, etc. . . . I would rather see the days again return when a price would be set upon my own head, the same as upon a wolf’s, than that the base and *infidel* spirit that breathes in that letter to the *Nation*, should grow up among the people of Ireland. . . . “The purpose of the *Dublin Review* (says the correspondent of the *Nation*) is to forward theology, not freedom.” As if to forward theology were a matter of censure . . . as if to forward theology were not to forward freedom. Read, honoured Sir, the last sentence but one of the letter in the *Nation*. The writer talks of the creed of Robertson⁹ and Burns¹⁰ — Robertson, the lying historian, the bosom friend of Hume¹¹ and other infidels, an infidel himself. . . . Burns! a beautiful song writer but a fellow who had just as much of a religious creed as Rousseau¹² or Bayle¹³ . . . and as for the title of ‘qualified paganism’ by which [the writer in the *Dublin Review*] . . . designates the Presbyterianism of Scotland — why it *is* a qualified paganism and the demon spirit of Calvin and John Knox lives in it to this day. . . . What is the spirit of the *Edinburgh Review* but infidel? . . . and if the reviewer believed all this, why should he not call a spade a spade? I admit that it would not perhaps suit for you, for instance, to use such terms in addressing the people, because it is not your object or your business to denounce religious errors as such: but the reviewer was writing on the subject and he used the term that best conveyed his mind. Be assured this brace of ‘qualified pagans’ who write to the *Nation* would, if they dared, speak of your immortal letters¹⁴ to the Wesleyan Methodists in the same terms in which they speak of the *Dublin Review*. I will say more, and I speak the sentiments of more than myself, that there are traces distinct enough of an infidel pen in that same *Nation*: it was not today or yesterday I noticed this. I perceived it almost from the commencement of that paper. And this it was which prevented me from becoming a subscriber to it. I know Mr. Duffy and I believe him to be an excellent and worthy man but I more than fear that there is a cloven foot among his colleagues.

. . . In the next number [of the *Dublin Review*], please God, I mean to have an article . . . the first of a series in which I mean to exhibit in its true colours the incredibly anti-Catholic spirit of our literature, periodical and other, especially in reference to Ireland. I commence

it with an extract from your own *Memoir*.¹⁵ . . . I shall then proceed with Hall's *Ireland*,¹⁶ Carleton's *Traits and Stories*,¹⁷ . . .

I have marked it [this letter] *private*; and I wish you would *burn it as soon as you read it*. . . . You have not more staunch and ardent friends in the world than the professors of this College. We cannot of course appear in public as political characters or speak our sentiments publicly on some points, partly (besides other reasons) because the agitation produced by the public discussion of the politics of the day would take off the minds of the students from study. . . .

P.S. If you were to notice in one of your speeches, the *Dublin Review* and justify its principles and the tone it takes, you would certainly serve the good cause which the *Review* itself is designed to promote.¹⁸ This of course might be done in the same way as you spoke of the works of Carleton, Maxwell etc. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Patrick Aloysius Murray (1811-82), a native of Clones, Co. Monaghan. Professor of theology at Maynooth College, 1841-82; wrote extensively for the *Dublin Review*. See *DNB*.
- 2 The letter, signed 'A Catholic and a Protestant', remonstrated with the *Nation* for having recommended the *Dublin Review* to the Temperance Reading Societies. The *Review*, it declared was 'a zealous supporter of despotism abroad and of Toryism at Home', and only desired to see this despotism transferred from Protestant to Catholic hands. The journal was 'only sham Irish; . . . it is written by Saxons, and published in the alien's capital.' It had designated the Presbyterianism of Scotland and the north of Ireland 'qualified paganism'.
- 3 In an editorial comment the *Nation* declared the writers of this letter were unfair to the *Review*. It pointed out amongst other things that the *Review* was not written by 'Saxons' but by resident Irishmen, that it was established by Irish money, and that its publication in London was a matter of necessity since its Irish circulation 'would not pay half the expense of printing it'.
- 4 John Lingard (1771-1851), Catholic priest. Educated at Douai, 1782-93; published his *History of England*, 1819-30. See *DNB*.
- 5 John O'Connell.
- 6 Charles Gavan Duffy.
- 7 The *Nation* singled out the *Review's* comments in its 23rd number (February 1842) on O'Connell's reply to Shrewsbury (see letter 2944 n3) as an instance of the objectionable articles written by the *Review*.
- 8 This article, a review of several publications on temperance in Ireland, was published in the *Dublin Review* of May 1840 (VIII, No. 26, 448-84).
- 9 William Robertson (1721-93), the Scottish historian. See *DNB*.
- 10 Robert Burns (1759-96), the Scottish poet. See *DNB*.
- 11 David Hume.
- 12 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-78), the *philosophe*.

- 13 Pierre Bayle (1647-1706), French philosopher.
- 14 Two public letters dated 6 July and 1 August 1839 addressed to the Ministers and Office-Bearers of the Wesleyan-Methodist Societies in Manchester. They were published in pamphlet form as well as in the press.
- 15 O'Connell's *Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon*.
- 16 Samuel C. Hall and Mrs. Anna M. Hall, *Ireland, its scenery, character, etc.*, 3 vols., (London, 1841-3).
- 17 William Carleton, *Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry*, 2nd (?) ed., 2 vols., Dublin, 1843-4.
- 18 O'Connell does not appear to have referred to the *Review* in any of his public speeches immediately after this.

3009

From Charles Weil,¹ Ph.D. to Dublin

[original in French]

Stuttgart (Kingdom of Wurtemberg, Germany), 30 March 1843
Sir,

You appealed lately, at a meeting of the Repeal Association, to the sympathies of Germany for your beautiful and bountiful country against British oppression.

. . . Germany will be won for your holy cause if you speak to her directly once . . . [of] the sufferings of Ireland, the oppression of the Catholic Church, the evils that crush her because of absenteeism, the failure to redistribute the land, the ruthlessness of the landlords, the centuries of treacherous and violent conquest, and the legislative union with England. . . .

This appeal cannot be made in Ireland but rather in Germany, and it is the honour of the Constitutional and Liberal Party to offer you, for this purpose, a free and highly respected publication in order that . . . your powerful voice may reach the people of Germany. The *Constitutional Annals* (*Constitutionelle Jahrbücher*), which has replaced the *German Courier*, whose reputation for independence and liberalism will have perhaps reached you, which is legally exempt from censorship because of the format in which it is published (in issues of more than twenty pages), which is the central organ of the Constitutional Party in all Germany. It has a circulation of several thousand copies all over the Germanic Confederation and Switzerland, having as correspondents the parliamentary leaders and the presidents of the electoral chambers of all the German states, and abroad, for example, the distinguished Monsieur de Lamartine² in France.

The *Constitutional Annals*, of which I have the honour to be editor, will be proud . . . [to receive] with respectful zeal a letter from Daniel O'Connell. . . . addressed to Germany. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 A leading liberal journalist in Stuttgart; editor there, first of the *Deutsche Curier* and then of the *Konstitutionellen Jahrbücher*.
- 2 Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869), the French poet and statesman. See *Encyclopaedia Brit.*

3010

*To John Primrose, Jr.*¹

Merrion Square, 6 April 1843

My dear John,

The moment you get this letter write a note to 'Lord Adare,² care of Master Goold, Merrion Square, Dublin,' and give him the fullest information you possibly can whether he could get a house to hire for the summer season, in Valencia or Cahirciveen, or anywhere in that neighbourhood. Give him full particulars and inform him that if he specifies more particularly than *I* was able to do to you, what accommodation he wants, you will make further enquiries, and give him further information. Tell him you write at my instance.

SOURCE: Property of Miss Maureen Hardy

- 1 This letter is written by another but signed by O'Connell.
- 2 Edwin Richard Wyndham (Wyndham-Quin), styled Viscount Adare 1824-50 (1812-1871); succeeded 1850 as third earl of Dunraven and Mount Earl (I); a distinguished antiquarian. M.P. for Co. Glamorgan 1837-51; a son-in-law of Thomas Goold, master in chancery. See *DNB*.

3011

From James Haughton

34 Eccles St. [Dublin], 6 April 1843

My dear Sir,

In your more than kind allusions to my last letter to my brother Repealers¹ you made two mistakes. The first was when you stated that I wished to refuse money or sympathy from the Americans because slavery existed in their land and the second was where you inferred that I meant to upbraid you. You said I might do so if ever you ceased to cry out against slavery. My dear Sir, I can scarcely imagine it to be within the bounds of possibility that that day can

ever arrive. I would as soon suspect my own heart as yours on that matter. Thus much on what I call your second mistake. Touching the first, I never objected to receive American money and sympathy. I would gladly and thankfully accept of both, for the peaceful furtherance of our good and just cause. All I object to is the hollow sympathy and the blood-stained money of American slaveholders. Will you kindly set me right in your own mind and before my countrymen on this point? In a late letter which Mr. Conway was so good as to publish in the *Dublin Evening Post*² I defended you against a similar charge made against you by his correspondent in Philadelphia. There is a wide — aye, an infinite distance — between the high souled liberty-loving American and the degraded ‘soul drivers’ of that glorious land.

Perhaps I am wrong in my idea about refusing aid from slaveholders. I am however greatly opposed to it yet I do not intend to tease you more with my opinions about it. I leave it under the full conviction that, if ever you see it in the same light that I do, you will nobly act on your conviction.

SOURCE: O’Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 In a letter to the Repeal Association dated 17 March 1843 (*FJ*, 31 Mar. 1843), Haughton asked the Association to rescind a vote of thanks which it had passed to the son of John Tyler, president of the United States. O’Connell had given notice of a motion for this purpose at a meeting of the Repeal Association on 13 March (*FJ*, 14 Mar. 1843). Haughton accused Tyler of being a slave breeder, and called on the Association not to accept financial aid from such a source. O’Connell, in reply, at a meeting of the Association on 3 April, assured Haughton that his (O’Connell’s) views on slavery remained unchanged. He declared that the Association would have acted wrongly had it accepted American aid on condition of supporting slavery but, he declared, since American aid was proffered without any conditions attached, he did not feel at liberty to refuse it (*FJ*, 4 Apr. 1843).
- 2 James Haughton to the *Dublin Evening Post*, 18 January 1843 (*DEP*, 26 Jan. 1843). The Philadelphia correspondent of the *Post* had attempted to defend American negro slavery, and criticised O’Connell for his denunciations of Americans on these grounds. Haughton declared O’Connell differentiated between slave-owning and non-slave-owning Americans, adding that the latter were high-minded and freedom-loving and respected the principles of the American Declaration of Independence.

3012

From Nicholas Markey

Welchestown [Co. Louth], 6 April 1843

My dear friend,

I received your letter which shall meet due attention.

The book has not arrived you were so kind as to say Mr. Daunt had forwarded to me.

I hope the beautiful speech¹ of the Monaghan priest, Rev. Jn. McKenna,² has not escaped your notice. Nothing else talked of here this week. I hope we shall have him at Carrickmacross.³

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 Unidentified.

2 John McKenna (died 29 August 1857), P.P., Cushendall, Co. Down from before 1836 to 1838; P.P., Bright, Co. Down 1838-48; P.P., Lisburn 1849-57.

3 The Repeal monster meeting (see letter 3016 n1). Nicholas Markey was one of the principal guests at the banquet held after the meeting (*DEP*, 27 Apr. 1843).

3013

To Rev. James Moore, P.P.,¹ Loughmore Lodge, Mungret, Co. Limerick

Merrion Square, 13 April 1843

My dear friend,

I am sorry I cannot do myself the pleasure of complying with your request . . . but the truth is that if upon journeys² of this kind I were to stop at any one intermediate place I never could arrive at my journey's end as I should be compelled to stop at *all!* My undeviating rule therefore is to make each journey perfectly unbroken. . . .

SOURCE: NLI MSS 5759

1 Rev. James Moore, P.P., Mungret from before 1836 to 1847.

2 O'Connell was about to go to Limerick to attend the Repeal demonstration there on 20 April (see letter 3007 n1).

3014

*To Capt. Seaver*¹

Merrion Square, 14 April 1843

My dear Sir,

Allow me, I pray you, to use the familiarity of a brother-Repealer in addressing you as if we were long acquainted for indeed who ever joins in the struggle to make our beloved fatherland a nation again is dear to me; and when he who joins that sacred cause is a gentleman of your station and character, I know not how to cherish him suitably to his deserts.

I of course will have you presented to the Association in my name as I shall be in Rathkeale on the day of the meeting. But no matter, my son, the member for Kilkenny will propose you and your name will be received with acclamation.² I will be exceedingly happy to meet you at Carrickmacross³ to make your personal acquaintance and to consult with you as to the best mode of conciliating to the Repeal cause the Protestant and Presbyterian population. My own desire is very much to have as many of the gentry of these persuasions on the general Committee of Management as possible. I am anxious to regulate the progress of Repeal by their counsel and assistance. I most ardently desire to prevent the hurrying of the Repeal agitation so fast as not to give time for all classes and persuasions of Irishmen to join us. All that is wanting is time.

So soon as Protestants of all sects combine to obtain our legislative independence the utmost cordiality will prevail, as in 1782, between all Irishmen and we will be able to make the mighty change with perfect safety to person and property, and to the continuance of the connection between the two countries.

Pray excuse the exuberance of satisfaction at obtaining your public adhesion to Ireland which causes me to trespass thus long on your attention.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 423

- 1 Thomas Seaver (1788-1848), Heath Hall, Co. Armagh, eldest son of Jonathan Seaver; high sheriff Co. Monaghan 1816; formerly an Orangeman; served in the Napoleonic wars, some time after which he went to reside in France (*FJ*, 27 Apr. 1843).
- 2 Seaver was admitted a member of the Repeal Association at its meeting on 18 April. His letter was entered on the minutes, and he was praised by John O'Connell and Charles Gavan Duffy (*FJ*, 19 Apr. 1843).
- 3 See letter 3016.

3015

From Archbishop Slattery

Thurles, 14 April 1843

Invites O'Connell to stay with him while en route to public dinners in Cashel and Nenagh during May. His retiring habits for the last ten years have totally incapacitated him from appearing before the public except in the discharge of his episcopal duties. He thanks O'Connell for having made allowance for that on a previous visit. He feels a nervous timidity of appearing in public. 'If I have not courage personally to mingle in her [Ireland's] conflict, let me at all events pray for its successful issue under the illustrious champion by whom her people have been already led to a peaceful and bloodless victory'.

SOURCE: Cashel Diocesan Archives

3016

To John Primrose, Jr., Hillgrove

Merrion Square, 27 April 1843

My dear John,

Just arrived from Carrickmacross.¹ I found here a letter you sent me with a totally unintelligible signature stating that £328.15.7 had been lodged with the Bursar² for the Knight. No account of Blennerhassett's share. How is *this*? He must send at once. [the remainder of the letter is concerned with bills of exchange and rent]

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 O'Connell attended a Repeal meeting in Carrickmacross on 25 April 1843, the first such meeting to be held that year in Ulster. The meeting was chaired by Captain Thomas Seaver, and was attended by a crowd estimated at between 120,000 and 150,000. A banquet followed the meeting. (*FJ*, 27 Apr. 1843).
- 2 Of Trinity College, Dublin.

3017

From James A. Smith

14 Soho Square, London, 1 May 1843

Private

My Dear Sir,

I have been frequently asked of late if I know whether you are to appear in Parliament this session and whether there is any probability of your attending the ensuing annual meeting of the Catholic Institute? [He says he could not answer these questions]. Indeed we cannot dispense with you at the present important crisis and when you get your Repeal tour¹ accomplished, I should not be displeased to see a call of the House enforced!! The atrocious Factories Bill,² it is true, is to have effect in England only but it is an anti-Catholic measure deeply affecting the civil and religious rights of the Anglo-Irish³ more particularly, and is the opposition to such a bill to be deprived of your powerful aid? Then, as to the Institute⁴ which you fanned and brought into existence. Your absence at the annual meeting would, I am afraid, under existing circumstances be very injurious if not fatal to it. I formerly drew your attention to the hostility of the *Tablet* towards it and you will have seen the late attacks upon it in that journal. The utter unfairness of those attacks can only be equalled by those the editor made upon you on the question of Repeal.⁵ He has a singular talent for misstatement: he uniformly misrepresents those he means to assail. I am certain that his reiterated assaults upon the Institute have done much mischief and that they have tended greatly to mar your admirable plan of enrolling Associates. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 O'Connell was due to visit Sligo on 4 May, Cork on 7 May, Mullingar on 14 May, the south riding of Tipperary on 23 May and the north riding of Tipperary on 25 May (*FJ*, 28 Apr. 1843).
- 2 On 7 March Sir James Graham presented a bill to regulate the employment of children and young persons in factories, and for the better education of children in factory districts. The bill as first introduced was intended only to apply to the silk industry, but it was later hoped to extend it to all branches of textiles (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXVII, 422-4). The education clauses of the bill were strongly objected to by Catholics and Dissenters on the ground that they would give control to the Established Church. The bill did not go beyond the committee stage, but was formally abandoned by the government on 15 June. (*Annual Register*, 1843, 193-202).
- 3 That is, Irish immigrants residing in England. The term Anglo-Irish later came to mean the descendants of English settlers in Ireland.

4 The British Catholic Institute.

5 In January 1843 Frederick Lucas paid a visit to Ireland. He had formerly been strongly opposed to Repeal. After his visit, though still opposed to Repeal, he urged that the government should do everything to relieve the Irish grievances which he believed underlay the agitation. Finally in August 1843 he expressed his approval of Repeal (Lucas, *Lucas*, I, 123-34).

3018

*To Alderman Thomas Lyons*¹

Merrion Square, 11 May 1843

My dear friend,

You have placed me in an awkward dilemma. Your first letter intimating your opinion that Sunday would answer for the banquet² I have been unwise enough to act upon and have accordingly arranged to leave Cork on Monday evening to get on some thirty miles so as to be able to breakfast at Fethard on the morning of Tuesday and to go thence in procession to Cashel. Under those circumstances what am I to do?

But in the first place let me know by return of post where I am to meet the procession which is to conduct me into Cork on Sunday the 21st and as I can have an early Mass on Sunday morning, I can undertake to meet the procession³ anywhere it is thought most convenient. I should suppose somewhere about Glanmire. Wherever it be, the People will have their triumph in the expression of their concurrence with me in the absolute necessity of the Repeal of the Legislative Union.

On Monday I understand we are to have the aggregate meeting with the Mayor in the chair or some sufficient deputy. Of course it will be my duty to address that meeting which I will do at considerable length. After I have done so I do hope I shall be allowed to go on my way to Clonmel where I shall sleep *en route* to Fethard and Cashel. It is a bitter disappointment to me not to be able to attend the banquet on Monday evening but you of course perceive that it is out of my power to do so. I do most anxiously hope and implore that no person will take offence at my having even in some degree been misled into the belief that I could leave Cork after having finished all our public business on the afternoon of Monday. It cannot be imagined that I could have any intention to slight any of the Repealers in Cork or of my esteemed friends in that city. Do you, my dear friend, make the best apology you possibly can for me. I need not tell you that if I could now remedy it by postponing the

Cashel meeting I certainly should do so.

SOURCE: Harrington Papers

- 1 This letter is signed by O'Connell but written in another hand.
- 2 A great Repeal demonstration took place in Cork on Sunday, 21 May under the chairmanship of the mayor, Francis Bernard Beamish, it was attended, according to the *Pilot*, by 500,000 persons, and was followed by a banquet on the same day, attended by some 900 persons. O'Connell attended both events (*Pilot*, 24 May 1843). On Tuesday 23 May O'Connell arrived in Cashel to attend a Repeal meeting and dinner there (*Pilot*, 26 May 1843).
- 3 A procession of the various trades met O'Connell at Springhill on the Upper Glanmire road and accompanied him into the city.

3019

From Dan Molony¹ to Merrion Square

Immediate

Dundalk [Co. Louth], 14 May 1843

Dr. and Honord. Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th inst. and in reply to assure you that nothing on my part shall be wanted to affect a perfect reconciliation of all parties here engaged in the great cause of Repeal. I most respectfully beg to thank you for the expression of your approbation of the humble services of me and my fellow labourers and to promise you if any disposition to prolong local misunderstanding among us *did exist (which I can truly assert there does not)* that the slightest recommendation from you would at any sacrifice be most punctually obeyed, and every concession made to forward the national cause. I regret much that the acts of the Repealers here have been most grossly misrepresented and, though subjected to the foulest insults both publicly and in private, yet they have never assailed any party but have ever acted on the defensive, unfortunately our differences have been of a longer stand than the late P[oor] Law election.² At the Repeal demonstration³ here in January 1842 every mean effort was resorted to to cause it *a failure*. I am sure you must have observed the opposition *platform* got up to keep what might be termed the *gentlemen away*, and the extreme want of courtesy to *the Liberator* of the Irish people paid *him* on that occasion. There is scarcely any forgiveness for their conduct in joining Lord Roden at the late P[oor] Law election as the Repealers offered to return them if they only avowed Repeal and joined the movement. Yet under all circumstances we are most willing to forget all bygone differences for the sake of Ireland and Repeal and promise to leave nothing undone to carry out the objects you have in

view. We are fully sensible of the great value of Doctor Coyne's⁴ accession to the Repeal ranks and will be glad to place him in his natural position at the head of the great demonstration and movement here⁵ and be guided by his counsel. I know no people more attached to their priests than the Dundalk men and if Doctor Coyne had ever condescended to come among them he would have been received with enthusiasm. I have this day arranged that a deputation from the Repeal club should wait on him on Tuesday evening next, soliciting his cooperation and will tender to him the management of all matters connected with the Louth meeting, also that the committee shall be formed as you propose with the parochial clergy at its *head*. So, *Sir*, your fears will (*I am glad to assure you*) not be realised as to a perfect reconciliation.

As far as *the Repeal club* and *I am concerned*, we wish for nothing but to be useful to the cause of Ireland. We wish no triumph over any party professing the same principles and were we stupid enough to act otherwise, our exertions would be of little value and our motives very questionable. They deserve not the name of *Irishmen* who would not obey the advice of *him* whose mighty labours have raised them from degradation to the rank of free *men*, and I will add there is not a man among the Repeal body here that would not most willingly sacrifice *life* itself if necessary at his command. With reference to the allegation in your letter of me being a master of a masonic lodge, I am not the master of any such lodge nor will I have any connection with such a society for the remaining part of my life. 'Tis true I was unfortunately induced to become a freemason about five years ago but at the request of my brother (who is a priest⁶ in the diocese of Killaloe) I gave it up and *for ever*. As a Roman Catholic I am firmly impressed with the idea that I have no right to belong to any society the Catholic Church does not sanction. I fear I have trespassed too far on your invaluable attention. Nothing but the importance of the subject would allow me to do so. . . . Nothing on my part and on the part of the large body with whom I act shall be left undone to put an end and I hope for ever to every local difference that has occurred among us, Repealers and *liberals* in this town.

SOURCE : Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Daniel Molony, woollen draper, Clanbrassil Street, Dundalk. Repeal organiser and warden for Dundalk.
- 2 That is, the election of members to serve on the local board of poor law guardians.
- 3 The meeting took place in Dundalk on New Year's Day 1842, and was attended according to the *Pilot*, by between 50,000 and 60,000 persons. Molony acted on that occasion as secretary. A dinner followed attended by some 600 persons (*Pilot*, 5 Jan. 1842). O'Connell spoke at both events.

- 4 John V. Coyne, P.P. Dundalk 1838 until his death in 1848.
- 5 A Repeal meeting and banquet at both of which O'Connell spoke, were held in Dundalk on 29 June (*Pilot*, 30 June 1843).
- 6 There were three or four priests of this name in the diocese of Killaloe in 1843.

3020

From Henry Sugden¹

Secretary's Office, Four Courts, Dublin, 23 May 1843

Sir,

I am directed by the Lord Chancellor to inform you that it is with regret he has felt it his duty to supersede you as a Magistrate for the County of Kerry. I beg to enclose a copy of a letter, written by the Lord Chancellor's direction to Lord ffrench, which will explain to you the grounds upon which this step has been taken.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 303

- 1 Henry Sugden (1811-66), second son of Sir Edward Burtenshaw Sugden; secretary to his father as lord chancellor.
- 2 Henry Sugden to ffrench, 22 May 1843 (O'Neill Daunt, *Recollections*, II, 158-9). The letter informs ffrench of his dismissal from the magistracy of Co. Galway because of his Repeal sympathies. It declares that, though the Repeal meetings are not in themselves illegal, nevertheless, they have a tendency to create outrage and 'it is the opinion of the Lord Lieutenant that such meetings are not in the spirit of the constitution and may become dangerous to the safety of the state'. In view of this, magistrates supporting Repeal cannot be entrusted with the preservation of the peace.

3021

From C. O'B. Collins¹

15 North Richmond Street, Dublin, 2 June 1843

Dear Sir,

[Sees the flourishing condition of Ireland under Grattan's parliament as the best possible argument in favour of Repeal.]

Some time ago there was but a possibility of your getting Repeal, now there is but a possibility of your not getting it. The Duke of Wellington is praised for handling masses of men well; you have displayed as much skill in handling masses of men for political purposes as he has in handling them for military ones.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 An unidentified relative of Barry Collins, attorney and registrar to the court of bankruptcy.

3022

To John O'Hea,¹ Ex-J.P., Clonakilty, Co. Cork

Kilkenny, 9 June 1843

My dear O'Hea,

I was unable sooner to answer your letter. Ten thousand thanks for your kind invitation. I would have great pleasure in accepting of it if I could but the pressure of other engagements prevents me — engagements in which the public are involved.

One million of thanks and as many again for your direct, manly and noble slap in the face to the Lord Chancellor.² It had the sturdiness of the olden day in it when *man* was everything and *lord* not a feather. How I long to shake the honest hand which wrote that letter of letters.

My loved friend James³ has gone professionally to the north. I deceive myself much if he does not distinguish himself. The case⁴ requires legal knowledge in the criminal law, readiness of tact and perfect temper with a manliness not to be put down. James has all these qualities, and I do hope this will not be the only case *we* shall put in his charge.

SOURCE: O'Hea Papers

- 1 John O'Hea, (1804-47), Shannon Square, Clonakilty, Co. Cork, son of John O'Hea, Greenfield, Clonakilty. Died of famine fever.
- 2 On 28 May 1843 O'Hea had written to the lord chancellor resigning from the commission of the peace. He stated he was not a Repealer and had not attended any Repeal meeting but 'I have read with astonishment the removal by your Lordship of several magistrates from the commission of the peace for having attended public meetings to petition Parliament for the repeal of the Legislative Union. Such an abuse of power by any Government I hesitate not to assert is arbitrary, unconstitutional and tyrannical.' His resignation was accepted in a letter, dated 29 May 1843, from Henry Sugden, secretary to the lord chancellor (Papers of Lt.-Col. J. O'Hea).
- 3 James O'Hea (1809-82), third son of John O'Hea of Greenfield, Clonakilty, Co. Cork. Called to the bar 1838. One of the defending counsel for O'Connell and his associates in the state trial of 1844. Crown prosecutor Co. Limerick 1860-82 and the county and city of Cork 1849-82. See *Boase*.
- 4 A man named Peter Agnew was killed in an affray with the police, allegedly arising out of an attempt by the latter to post notices regarding ejections on the doors of the Catholic chapel of Magheracloon on the Shirley estate near Carrickmacross, Co. Monaghan. James O'Hea attended the inquest on behalf of the dead

man's friends. On 8 June a jury found the deceased had died as a result of a gunshot wound inflicted by a party of police and 'we find that they [the police] have not produced sufficient evidence to show that they were in imminent danger of their lives at the time they fired on the people; and that there was not proof as to the identical person who fired the shot that killed Peter Agnew' (*DEP*, 10 June 1843).

3023

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Limerick, 13 June 1843

[No salutation]

The moment I got your letter I waited on your sister. She had fortunately no occasion for my advice, and returns to Dublin this evening quite well and merry.

The *Times* you sent me made me think they were going to cut our throats but it was only a *brutum fulmen*.¹ I now see we shall carry the Repeal without one drop of blood.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 307

- 1 Presumably a reference to an editorial in the *Times* of 8 June 1843. Referring to clashes between Orangemen and Repealers around Pomeroy and Dungannon, it declared Ireland to be on the brink of rebellion, and hinted that the government should take strong measures for the preservation of the peace.

3024

From Lord ffrench

Castleffrench, Ahascragh [Co. Galway], 10 July 1843

My dear O'Connell,

I trust I need not assure you how much it would gratify me and my sons, if it would suit your convenience that you would make this house your resting place on your route from Dublin to Tuam as also on your returning from Castlebar to Dublin.¹ As this place would be little or nothing out of your route in that direction may I solicit you and through your kind medium, Thomas Steele, and any other friends who accompany you on the occasion, to grant us that pleasure?

This place is distant about eighteen miles from Tuam either by Glentane or Mt. Bellew, about the same distance from Athlone by Brideswell and Ballyforan. It is about ten miles from Ballinasloe on

the road from that town to Roscommon.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 O'Connell did not accept Lord ffrench's invitation since he slept at Ballinasloe on the night of 22/23 July and arrived in Tuam on the 23rd where a Repeal meeting and banquet were held on the following day. MacHale attended the banquet and on 30 July accompanied O'Connell to Castlebar where another Repeal meeting and banquet took place (*Pilot*, 24, 26 July, 2 Aug. 1843). Whether O'Connell stayed with Lord ffrench on his return to Dublin from Castlebar is not known.

3025

From Thomas Irving White to Tuam

10 Augustin Street, Northampton [13 July 1843]

Dear and Honoured Sir,

The writer of the present letter was once a Radical of Lambeth who always viewing Ireland as a part of his own country felt offended with you that you should challenge radicals as to their sympathy with your *Beloved Country*. [He adds that he and O'Connell discussed this matter twice and O'Connell declared they understood each other. He applauds the temperance movement in Ireland which has substituted sobriety and peaceable assembly for feuding at fairs and wakes so that virtue and right principles must prevail.]

I am now a Baptist minister in the town of Northampton, secretary to the Total Abstinence Society and to the Complete Suffrage Association here. . . .

I am to transmit to you the following resolution passed at a public meeting of our body unanimously and with much enthusiasm: 'That we, the Northampton Complete Suffrage Association, do most sincerely sympathise with Ireland in her present struggle for the right to meet and to discuss her grievances and to adopt what course the majority of her people may deem expedient (we make no reference to her demands nor to the mode adopted to obtain redress) . . . and we . . . do trust that the temperance which has made Ireland wise in council will make her peaceful in determining. Then shall her people conquer without force and be victorious without the sword for virtue and right principles are more terrible than an army with banners.

Signed Humphrey Martin, Chairman

Thomas I. White, Secy.

To the noble minded Repealers of Ireland'

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3026

From William B. MacCabe

29 Upper Belgrave Place, London, 21 July 1843

My dear Sir,

I am sure you will forgive me addressing you on a subject, in which I feel deeply, personally, and professionally interested.

In the last number of the *Monitor*, I find as quoted from the *Freeman*, the following passage in your speech at the Repeal Association, on Monday.

'... he was bound to say that of all the leading journals in England, there was none which contained worse reports, than the *Morning Chronicle*. He found it so himself; he was badly reported in it, and asked for redress, but could not get it.'

This passage is in connection with your complaint respecting the report of Mr. Roche's speech,¹ and therefore refers, as I presume to the Parliamentary reports of your speeches. It is so well known at the press, that I have had much to do with those reports of your speeches that you will at once perceive the passage I have quoted makes it necessary for me to trouble you with this letter.

I had, I conceived, established a character in Ireland, in the reporting of your speeches and when I became connected with the press here, you were kind enough to say I had sustained it. At the close of the session in 1836, it may be in your recollection, that the proprietor of the *Chronicle* sent me to Ireland, solely for the purpose of giving, as you believed they would be, by me, full and accurate accounts of your public addresses; and it has happened more than once, that with his permission and to the great inconvenience of the general arrangements of the office, I took during the session, special reports of your speeches, upon subjects on which you felt peculiarly interested — such for instance as the poor law. At other times, and by the kindness of my colleagues, I 'changed turns' with them, whenever I could, in order that a report, such as would be the most gratifying, because you would believe it to be the most accurate, might appear in the *Morning Chronicle*.

I mention these facts, not for the purpose of showing that which you will perceive them to be, inconsistent, with the quotation I have made but rather to demonstrate that neither in the proprietary of the *Chronicle*, nor in the parliamentary corps under their command has there been any disposition but that of giving satisfaction to you, as to every preeminent speaker — and to show in your case, that was done, which never was done in any other. Men far my superiors in capability have given way to me, not because they could think I

should be able to report better than themselves but because they were aware of the favourable opinion you entertained of my exertions.

Knowing what were their feelings and being perfectly conscious that they are animated but by one desire, that of giving to the world the sentiments of every speaker, fully, faithfully, and conscientiously, according to his talent, weight and influence and being fully aware how perfectly competent they are to accomplish their desire I cannot but regret the imputation you have cast upon them. I assure you it is undeserved and even in the instance of Mr. Roche, which was made the foundation for the general charge against all, it is undeserved.

If you will look again at that report, you will find that it bears not about it the slightest trace of being given loosely or carelessly, that it manifests anything but a desire in the reporter, to place Mr. Roche in an unfavourable position before the public. I know that it was written in a kindly spirit and that it cost some hours labour, while but one passage was omitted and that purposely omitted because it did not tell well in the House. It was a passage in which Mr. Roche boasted of his property and expectations.

I have troubled you with this long letter because I have often heard you declare, and I know with what sincerity, that you never wilfully did an injustice to any man, or body of men, or that if you had done injustice that you did not gladly and willingly seize the first opportunity for repairing it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Edmund Burke Roche had spoken on 12 July in the adjourned debate on Smith O'Brien's motion for taking into consideration the state of Ireland with a view to redressing grievances underlying the present discontent. The motion was defeated by 243 to 164 (*Pilot*, 7, 10, 14 July 1843).

3027

From his nephew Robert McCartie¹ to Dublin

Kanturk [Co. Cork], 23 July 1843

My Dear Uncle,

As one of the secretaries to the intended Repeal meeting and banquet about to be given to you in this town² I have the pleasure of forwarding the enclosed letter of invitation from our respected parish priest.³ . . . Mr. Steele will be invited to the dinner. I hope for the pleasure of your company at my house here and of anyone that

accompanies you.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Robert McCartie (died 1864), Egmont Place, Kanturk; son of Jeremiah and Mary A. McCartie.
- 2 A meeting in Kanturk on 16 July drew up an invitation to O'Connell to attend a meeting there (*Pilot*, 21 July 1843).
- 3 Rev. James Ryan (died 15 June 1849), P.P. Kanturk, Co. Cork from before 1836 to 1849.

3027a

From Gerrit Smith

Peterboro, Madison County, State of New York, U.S.A., 28 July
1843

To the Right Honorable Daniel O'Connell M.P.

Dear Sir,

The fears of American abolitionists had become excited — had, indeed, begun to run high — that American slaveholders would prove themselves able to gag, even Daniel O'Connell. But your late speech,¹ which has blistered these tyrants from head to foot and filled this land with their howlings and execrations, has put an end to all those fears.

You, perhaps, wonder why so little money is sent to you by American abolitionists. Be assured that it is not from the want of a lively interest in your efforts to obtain, by peaceable means, for Ireland the right of making and being governed by her own laws. Be assured too, that it is not because they think that they have not the right to express this interest. The sympathy of unsophisticated man for his brother man naturally, necessarily and, therefore, rightfully, travels across national as well as city or village boundaries; and wherever that sympathy precedes, its appropriate expressions and proofs have of course the right to follow. If I have the right to feel pity for a hungry and naked family in France; then, I have also the right to follow up the pity by sending a barrel of flour or a roll of cloth to that destitute family. The doctrine that the conventional lines which men have drawn upon the earth's surface decide the question, for whom we may and for whom we may not, feel, is utterly repugnant to an unselfish and unspoiled heart. To tell me that I may not love him who dwells on the North side of the St. Lawrence as well as him who dwells on the South side of that river; and that, because a man is a Canadian, I may feel less pity for his

woes, than if he were an American, is to tell me what my nature and the God of my nature flatly contradict.

I sympathize with your countrymen under their oppressions; for I hold that a people are grievously oppressed who, not to speak of other wrongs they may be suffering, are denied entire freedom of religious conscience. But, were the Irish suffering no oppression, I should still wish them to obtain an independent Legislature: and I should wish it because they wish it; and because I believe that every large and distinct community, like Ireland, is entitled to make its own laws.

Having said what are not the reasons, I will now say what are the reasons why the American abolitionists send you so little money. In the first place, we are generally poor. It is proverbial, as you know, that the rich feel not the need of revolutions. They are content with the present order of things. Especially, are they unwilling to embark in a revolution, so odious as that which American abolitionists, at the certain expense of having their names 'cast out as evil,' are laboring to achieve. In the second place, we cannot connect ourselves with the Repeal Associations of this country; — for, being principled and impartial lovers of Liberty, we cannot consent to associate for the advancement of her cause with those who, we know, hate her and who will never even seem to be her friends, save when some selfish calculation suggests the expediency, or when passion or prejudice impels them in that direction. I need not say to you that our Repeal Associations are generally proslavery; and, that whilst they talk *against* the oppression of the Irish — an oppression which, however sore, still leaves to its victims their manhood; they do, nevertheless, both talk and act *for* the infinitely greater oppression, which turns millions of their own countrymen from immortal God-like being into cattle and merchandize. That this is the general character of these Associations must be evident to you from the fact that many of the communications, which they make to you, abound in proslavery sentiments, and that none of them give their sanction to antislavery truth. Your speech, to which I alluded at the beginning of my letter, having called from these Associations expressions of great bitterness toward yourself and the abolitionists in general, has done much to develop the atrocious and horrible proslavery character of these Associations.

It may be, that the abolitionists of this country will form Repeal Associations. But, whether they shall contribute as associations or as individuals, I have no doubt that the little sums which they shall send you out of 'their deep poverty' will, accompanied by the power of their consistent example and the blessing of God, be worth far more to the great and good cause, which you are leading on to a bloodless and sublime victory, than the far greater sums which the

oppressors of God's poor in this land have the audaciousness to send to the oppressed in yours.

I should love to send you a donation of one *thousand* dollars: but, I am sharing so largely in American embarrassments and losses that I must content myself with sending you one *hundred*;² and, even this, is from the income of my wife's estate. She parts with it, however, willingly, gladly; — for her heart is no less true than my own to the cause of American liberty; and if she cannot say that her, as well as my maternal grandmother, was born in Cork, nevertheless such a link between her heart and Ireland is not necessary to make that heart faithful to the cause of Irish liberty also.

I leave this letter open, and request my esteemed friend, Lewis Tappan Esq.³ of the City of New York to forward it to you, after he shall have enclosed in it a bill of exchange worth one hundred dollars.⁴

If you knew the immeasurable influence of your example on our endeavours to terminate American oppression, you would pardon me for closing my letter with the earnest prayer that Daniel O'Connell may have grace given him from God to stand firm in the cause of Liberty — Of American as well as Irish Liberty.

I remain, dear Sir, with great regard,
your friend and admirer,
Gerrit Smith

SOURCE: Smith Family Papers, New York Public Library

- 1 To the Repeal Association on 10 May 1843 (*Pilot*, 12 May 1843). A special meeting was held on that day to consider an address to the Association from the Anti-Slavery Society of Eastern Pennsylvania. In their address (dated 20 September 1842 and published in the *Freeman's Journal* of 12 May 1843) the Society tried 'to correct some of the errors of fact and of argument, in relation to slavery and the abolitionists, contained in the letters addressed to your body by several persons in America.' These persons were three natives of Ireland — C.M. Brosnan, Denis Corcoran and Thomas Mooney (American correspondent of the *Pilot* 1841-2 and the *Nation* 1842-6) — whose letters, read to the Repeal Association on 21 May 1842, condoned slavery (*Pilot*, 23 May 1842). In reaction to this address O'Connell condemned slavery absolutely; and went on to say: 'I have spoken the sentiments of the Repeal Association (renewed cheers). . . . We may not get money from America after this declaration, but even if we should not, we do not want blood-stained money (hear, hear). If they make it the condition of our [*recte* their] sympathy, or it there be implied any submission to the doctrine of slavery on our part in receiving their remittances, let them cease sending it at once. . . . Those who commit, and those who countenance, the crime of slavery I regard as the enemies of Ireland, and I desire to have no sympathy or support from them (cheers).' See also Douglas Riach, 'Ireland and the Campaign against American Slavery, 1830-1860' (Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh University, 1975), 192-3.

- 2 See letter 3029a.
 3 Lewis Tappan (1788-1873), merchant in New York city: a prominent supporter of antislavery and Protestant missions. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*
 4 On the margin of this letter Smith has written: 'Letter to O'Connell. This was returned by Col. Aspinwall of England. He is a brother-in-law of L. Tappan. He was not willing it shd. pass thro' his hands.'

3028

From Joseph Hume, M.P.

London, 3 August 1843

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

The bearer of this, Mr. James Bennett,¹ is about to visit Dublin for a few days and desiring much to have the honour of making your acquaintance previous to leaving for the United States to which country he belongs, I take the liberty of presenting him to you. He is Editor and proprietor of the *New York Herald* and is a man of much influence and great information.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Gordon Bennett (1795-1872). A Catholic of Scottish birth he emigrated in 1819 to Nova Scotia and became a leading journalist and editor in U.S.A. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.* Bennett attended the weekly meeting of the Repeal Association in Dublin on 7 August. On his presence being announced O'Connell attacked him, both then and at the adjourned meeting on the succeeding day, as editor of a vile newspaper, the *New York Herald* (*FJ*, 8, 9 Aug. 1843). Bennett replied to this charge in a letter, dated 28 August 1843, to the *London Times* of 30 August 1843 in which he denounced the Repeal movement and condemned O'Connell's attacks on the American southern states.

3028a

From James Haughton

34 Eccles Street [Dublin], 5 August 1843

My dear Sir,

I have just read your fine speech¹ of yesterday with the greatest pleasure. It will do great good to the cause of freedom and humanity, but there is one matter on which I am sure you are mistaken. William Lloyd Garrison is, like yourself, 'one of the best abused of living men', and one of the noblest of God's creatures. I know little, indeed nothing, of his religious opinions — with these I have nothing to do, but that he is a sincere Christian I fully believe; he has suffered, and

he is still suffering, much in the cause of humanity. He is hated by those who oppress their fellow-men, and loved with deep intensity by his friends — another point of similarity between him and you. Do not think unkindly of this good man; he is possessed of every quality which must make you esteem him — gentleness, courage, disinterestedness, firmness — he would not quail before mortal man in any cause which he deemed right. Such men as O'Connell and Garrison should never speak of each other but in the language of kindness and respect. You are both labouring to make men happy, and however great may be your differences on religious matters² (and it is probable I differ widely from both), may you have a glorious reward for your labours.

SOURCE: Haughton, *Haughton*, 60-1.

- 1 At a meeting of the Repeal Association on 4 August O'Connell denounced slavery vehemently (*Pilot*, 7 Aug. 1843).
- 2 O'Connell's speech included the passage, 'Some of the American abolitionists were excellent men, but for others of them he entertained the most sovereign contempt. There was, for instance, one Mr. Lloyd Garrison, who on religious subjects appeared to be something of a maniac.'

3029

To Archbishop MacHale

Merrion Square, August 1843

My Revered Lord,

I take it for granted, I hope not erroneously, that your Grace has been communicated with from Loughrea and Connemara. As to the former, they sent me Mr. Tully¹ with whom I arranged for the Loughrea meeting on the 10th of September and I have just fixed the 17th for Connemara.² John O'Neill of Bunowen Castle³ travels down with me to Connemara and I think it likely that we shall be invited to Ballynahinch Castle for Saturday.⁴ At least I have reason to believe it from a letter I received some time ago from Miss Martin.⁵ And I write to your Grace chiefly to know whether you have any suggestions to give me upon these subjects. You are quite aware that any suggestion of yours is a command to me. I think I may venture to wish you joy of what is called the Queen's Speech.⁶ It has already made a most favourable sensation here and is, I think, calculated to enliven the Repeal zeal all over Ireland.

SOURCE: Burke, *Catholic Archbishops of Tuam*, 322-3

- 1 Probably Jeremiah Tully, attorney, Tuam, Co. Galway.
- 2 A Repeal meeting was held in Loughrea on 10 September and another,

- attended by MacHale, at Clifden on 17 September (*Pilot*, 13, 20 Sept. 1843).
- 3 John Augustus O'Neill, J.P. (born 1799) Bunowen Castle, Clifden, Co. Galway, elder son of John David O'Neill (formerly Geoghegan). M.P. for Kingston-upon-Hull 1826-30.
 - 4 Residence of Thomas Martin, M.P. for Co. Galway
 - 5 Mary Letitia, only child of Thomas Barnewall Martin, M.P. She inherited Ballinahinch Castle in 1847 but the estate was soon in the Encumbered Estates Court. She married her cousin Col. Gonne Bell in 1847, sailed for America and died in New York shortly after her arrival.
 - 6 The speech delivered by the queen on the prorogation of parliament on 24 August. It condemned the Repeal agitation in Ireland and expressed determination to preserve the Union while at the same time promising to support parliament in introducing necessary Irish reforms (*Annual Register*, 1843, 222).

3029a

From Lewis Tappan

New York, 15 August 1843

Dear Sir,

I deeply regretted, when in England last month, that I was unable to cross over the channel to see you. Instead of sending Mr. Smith's donation¹ to you direct I have included it in a remittance made this day to my relative, Thomas Aspinwall Esq.,² Consul of the United States, London — £20 stg. and desired him to write to you when you could draw for it. The people in this country are aroused to the state of the Irish people but many of them do not know precisely what you are aiming to accomplish, that is, what specific acts you claim from the people and Govt. of G.B.

Respy,
Lewis Tappan

SOURCE: Smith Family Papers, New York Public Library

1 See letter 3027a.

2 Thomas Aspinwall (1786-1876), colonel in the U.S. Army during the war of 1812. U.S. consul in London 1815-1853.

3030

To the Mayor of Waterford¹

Merrion Square, 30 August 1843

My dearest friend,

I introduce to you a very particular friend of mine, Mr. Woodlock, who has a favour to ask of you. I know that as my friend you will not hesitate to comply with his reasonable request.

SOURCE: O'Connell School, Dublin

1 Thomas Meagher

3031

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 30 August 1843

Private

Dear Friend,

I observe that in thy arrangements¹ for the representation of Ireland household suffrage is proposed as the qualification for voting. I do not claim any weight for my opinion or even to be a competent judge of the difference needful in the arrangements in Ireland as compared with England but I can hardly feel excused without expressing my regret that complete or manhood suffrage was not adopted especially as it is both sound in principle and has had thy cordial approbation as applied to the United Kingdom. I am very anxious that all legitimate means should be taken to promote a sympathy between the *people* on both sides of the Irish Channel and I fear your adoption of household suffrage besides its other objections will weaken this sympathy. I should not have troubled thee with these remarks but I see you have not finally settled household suffrage as a qualification for voting and the more I have considered it the more I am convinced of its great and substantial objections. With a sincere desire that the blessing of Providence may rest upon all thy efforts for the true happiness of thy country.

[P.S.] Did a copy of a resolution of the Council of the Complete Suffrage Union² ever reach thee? It was forwarded with a letter of mine soon after the first movement of the Government to check the Repeal agitation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 In the Repeal Association on 21 August 1843, O'Connell proposed that elections to the independent Irish parliament after the attainment of

- Repeal, should be by household suffrage (*Pilot*, 23 Aug. 1843).
- 2 The National Complete Suffrage Union was launched by Sturge in April 1842, its object being the extension of the elective franchise to every man over twenty-one, abolition of the property qualification for M.P.'s, equal electoral districts, the ballot, payment of all legal election expenses, annual parliaments and payment of M.P.'s (*Hobhouse, Sturge*, 72-84).

3031a

From Bishop Patrick Burke to Merrion Square

12 South Anne Street [Dublin], c. 1 September 1843

Dear Mr. O'Connell,

Had I not the highest regard and most favourable opinion of bearer, Mr. Myles Tobyn, I should not attempt to write a short letter, in my present feeble state. I beg leave to solicit your support for him to secure to him the honble. station of Town Council. He is respectable by Father and Mother, the former was possessed of a *nice* estate in the County of Galway but *nothing* compared to the large estates of which his ancestors were deprived in the County of Tipperary by the cruel-hearted Oliver Cromwell. His mother was O'Reily [sic], descended from the Princes of Cavan. I think the high feelings of his ancestors beat in his bosom.

SOURCE: American Irish Historical Society

- 1 Patrick Burke (c. 1776-1843), coadjutor 1818 and successor 1827 to Bishop George Plunkett of Elphin.
- 2 Myles Michael Tobyn, (died 1 Mar. 1855) a native of Co. Galway. Grocer, wine and spirit merchant, 61 and 113 Capel St., Dublin. Elected councillor for Linen Hall ward in 1843. Emigrated to U.S.A., and died and was buried in New York City.

3032

From Daniel Lee

Manchester, 2 September 1843

My dear Sir,

I have had several communications from some of the leading Jews in London as well as in this town on the subject of the late edict at Ancona¹ and which no doubt you are perfectly acquainted with, it having appeared in the public prints and particularly in the *Times* newspaper of the 18th ult., and on the following day in the same paper there appears a letter or remarks on the subject signed 'an observer.'²

My friends to whom I have above alluded, knowing that I had the honour of your friendship, have *strongly* urged me to solicit your assistance in their behalf, 'knowing as they say you are always an enemy to oppression and persecution wherever it may be attempted.' . . . You will see by the comments [in the *Times*] that the Tories are ready to turn it to account against Repeal.

If the decree as given here be correct, it appears a very severe proceeding but really, my dear Sir, it is a matter I do not sufficiently understand and in church matters I never like to move without high authority. Therefore I shall be glad if you will give me some notion of the true state of things. Your communication shall be strictly private *if you please* or I will use it as you may permit.

The subject is creating a strong feeling in London and in all the large towns and if anything could be done, I think it would be well. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 An edict of the inquisitor general of the papal city of Ancona dated 24 June 1843, introducing harsh repressive measures against Jews residing in the Ancona area. The text of the edict is published in the *Times* of 18 August 1843. The edict, which seems to have been issued without much deliberation, was soon suspended (see 'Ancona' in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 1901).
- 2 'An Observer' to the *Times*, 18 August 1843 (*Times*, 19 Aug. 1843). The letter declared that the edict showed what would happen if 'society and the liberties of the people were placed at the mercy of Mr. O'Connell and his Irish parliament'.

3033

To Richard Dowden, Rathlee, Sundays Well, Cork

Merrion Square, 5 September 1843

My dear Sir,

I do not advise anybody upon the subject of registry of arms¹ but of course I cannot have the least objection to tell you what I shall do myself, and that is just this — I will send in all my arms and have them registered and *branded*² and I will keep them in that condition while I live as evidence of the silly and degrading insolence of British domination,

Like the spot left bare

In Israel's Halls to tell the proud and fair

Amidst their mirth that slavery had been there.

This is my plan and do you know I think it better than *yours*, whether you imitate it or not.

Believe me, the Repeal is nearer than you think.

SOURCE: Dowden Papers

- 1 At the end of May 1843 the government introduced a draconian arms bill by which all weapons were to be registered and possession of an unlicensed firearm to constitute an offence punishable by seven years transportation. Smith O'Brien and Thomas Wyse led a concerted opposition by Irish members to the bill. When it passed at the end of August, it was to apply for only two years instead of five, and Morgan John O'Connell had succeeded in reducing the possible sentence of transportation to one year's and three years imprisonment respectively for the first and second offences (Macintyre, *Liberator*, 273-4). This act (6 & 7 Vict. c. 74) was to run for two years 'and to the End of the then next Session of Parliament', which meant, in fact, to January 1847.
- 2 Clause IX of the act provided that arms must be marked (that is, branded) with certain letters and a number when being registered.

3034

To Lord Campbell

Merrion Square, 9 September 1843

My Lord,

I beg you will accept my best thanks for your kindness in sending me the opinion you pronounced in the case of the *Queen against Millis*! I read it with sincere admiration. Nay, I am *tradesman* enough to have read it with great delight. It is really a model for a law argument. I remember Curran said of an eminent Irish lawyer that 'his mind floated in a legal atmosphere'. The figure may not be a very brilliant one but it conveys, I think, an accurate idea of the impression that your argument has made upon me as to your power of *thinking* law. Your judgment is certainly quite conclusive against the totally untenable opinions huddled together by the twelve judges.

I avail myself of this occasion to return to you, my lord, my most sincere and cordial thanks for the friendly and, at the same time, manly part which you have taken during the last session of Parliament on all subjects connected with Ireland. You really are the only efficient friend the Irish have had in the House of Lords during that session.

You of course blame my *prejudice* in wishing never to see a *Saxon* Lord Chancellor in Ireland. Yet I do not hesitate to say that the opinion is universal amongst the popular party here. And if we are to have a British Chancellor, your appointment would be more satisfactory than that of any other stranger; and you have certainly deserved this sentiment.

Allow me to say (*par parenthèse*) – and I *consent* that you shall totally forget what I say in that parenthesis — that the Whig leaders do not behave well towards their supporters. Our Irish movement has at least this merit that it has roused the English nation from slumber. There can be no more dreams about Ireland. Our grievances are beginning to be admitted by all parties and by the press of all political opinions to be afflicting and not easily endured. I ask — of course without expecting an answer — why the Whig leaders are not up to the level of the times they live in? Why do they not propose a definite plan for redressing these grievances? Peel, while in opposition, used to enliven the recess by his state epistles, declaratory of his opinions and determination. Why does not Lord John [Russell] treat us to a magniloquent epistle declaratory of his determination to abate the Church nuisance in Ireland, to augment our popular franchise, to vivify our new Corporations, to mitigate the statute law as between landlord and tenant, to strike off a few more rotten boroughs in England, and to give the representatives to our great counties? In short, why does he not prove himself a high-minded, high-gifted statesman, capable of leading his friends into all the advantages to be derived from conciliating the Irish nation and strengthening the British empire?

It will be quite plain to your Lordship that I do not expect any manner of reply to this letter. I merely seek the gratification of being permitted to think aloud in your presence. And if there be anything displeasing to you in this indulgence, I entreat your forgiveness upon this score — of its being the farthest thing in the world from my intention to say anything which I thought should displease you.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 308-9

- 1 See letter 2940 n7. Campbell's opinion was delivered to the Lords on 10 August 1843 though the House did not give judgment until March 1844.

3035

*From Archbishop Murray*¹

Rathdrum [Co. Wicklow], 14 September 1843

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

Your obliging letter of the 8th inst. has at length overtaken me in the course of my visitation through the country parishes; and I hasten to assure you that the novena of prayers which you contemplate does not by any means require my sanction. The throne of Grace is at all times open to those who seek to approach it through

the merits of Christ for such purposes as you propose, namely, the promotion of the *honour and glory of God and the good of religion*.

How far the great movement which you are directing with so much energy and skill, and for the success of which you are desirous to solicit the Divine aid, may be calculated to promote the virtuous objects which you have in view, is a question on which I do not venture to give an opinion. But this you will, I trust, readily believe that under every circumstance my humble and earnest prayers shall ascend without ceasing to the almighty Arbiter of the destinies of nations beseeching him through the infinite merits of our Divine Saviour to watch in mercy over our suffering country and to secure to it through whatever arrangements his Providence has in store for that purpose the blessings of justice, prosperity and peace.

SOURCE: Dublin Diocesan Archives

1 The letter is unsigned.

3035a

From John Maher¹

Kingstown [Co. Dublin], 12 October 1843

My Dear Sir,

The recent proceedings to repress the expression of constitutional opinion² appears to me to render it indispensable, by every possible adhesion, to increase the influence of that body, which, using judiciously under your guidance the confidence placed in it by the people, affords the best protection to the country against the evils of civil commotion. I, therefore, enclose you my present subscription of twenty-five pounds, and have to request you will propose me as a member of the Loyal National Repeal Association.

With the best wishes for your unimpaired energy in your unequalled labours, I am, my dear Sir,

Ever yours faithfully,
John Maher, Ballinkeelee

SOURCE: *The Nation*, 14 October 1843

1 John Maher (1801-1860), Ballinkeelee, Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford. M.P. Co. Wexford 1835-41.

2 The banning of the Clontarf meeting. This was the Repeal monster meeting due to be held at Clontarf outside Dublin on Sunday, 8 October. On the previous day the lord-lieutenant issued a proclamation banning the meeting on the ground that it could "only tend to serve the ends of Factious and Seditious Persons, and to the violation of the Public Peace" (*DEP*, 7 Oct. 1843). O'Connell immediately called off the meeting (*DEP*, 10 Oct. 1843).

3036

To James Pim

Merrion Square, 15 November 1843

My dear friend,

I was sincerely sorry I was not able to see the trials of the locomotive power at the atmosphere railway¹ on Monday but it was unnecessary to have seen these trials *to convince me*, as I saw and examined the entire machinery already until I arrived at the conclusion that success is certain, indeed I think, quite inevitable. Permit me to congratulate you on the skill and above all the persevering energy which have enabled you to arrive at this result.

SOURCE: Trinity College, Dublin

- 1 The building of an 'atmospheric railway' from Kingstown to Dalkey as an extension of the Dublin-Kingstown line was under way at this time. It was opened in March 1844 and closed in April 1854, being replaced by the conventional type of railway (Charles Hadfield, *Atmospheric Railways*, Newton Abbot, 1967, 107-115).

3037

To John F. Raleigh,¹ Secretary of the O'Brien Festival, 25 November 1843, from Merrion Square

Copy

Accepts invitation to banquet on 4 December in honour of William Smith O'Brien. Praises Smith O'Brien as having done 'the best possible service,² at the fittest possible time; and certainly merits to be enrolled amongst the most pure benefactors of his native land.'

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI 433

- 1 Town clerk of Limerick.
2 In opposing the arms bill.

3038

From Lord Devon¹

4 Bryanston Square [London], 2 December [1843]

Sir,

I beg to thank you for your letter of the 25th November.

The pressure of the county cess and the whole of the grand jury system as to its fiscal operations are strictly within the scope of our

enquiry² and we shall be thankful for any information which you can give us relating to that subject.

It would be very unfair to infer from your consent to be examined that you either approve the Commission or entertain any hope of a good result from it. I take it only as an evidence of your desire not to throw any obstacle in the way of any proceeding which has for its professed object an improvement in the condition of the people of Ireland.

I have written to Ireland upon the subject of your wish to see some portion of the evidence.

I will not omit this opportunity of expressing my acknowledgments for the very hospitable reception given to us at Derrynane. The fine scenery and perfect retirement of that place must be a source of great enjoyment to you.

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 William (Courtenay), twenty-ninth earl of Devon (1777-1859).
- 2 The royal commission appointed in November 1843 to inquire into the law and practice in respect to the occupation of land in Ireland, under the chairmanship of the earl of Devon, usually known as the Devon commission. It made its report in February 1845. Its other members were Sir Robert Alexander Ferguson, George Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Nicholas Redington and John Wynne.

3039

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 9 December 1843

My dear FitzPatrick,

We had a delightful journey down. I have already been out hunting two days and am glad to tell you that, although the distemper killed some noble dogs of mine, yet I have a very fair pack remaining. I already feel the immense benefit of my native air and my delightful exercise. I am regaining strength and vigour to endure whatever my sentence may be.¹ You will believe that I shall endure it without shrinking or compromise, come what may.

All is peace and quiet in this county; although the people are as ardent Repealers as any in the entire Kingdom it is understood to the most remote of the glens that there must be peace in order to succeed. I never met with more enthusiasm than I did on my journey hither from Dublin.

The death of the Rev. Mr. Tyrrell² has made what the French call a *great sensation*. May the great God be merciful to him!

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 310-11

- 1 On 11 October 1843 O'Connell, his son John, Thomas Matthew Ray, Thomas Steele, Rev. Thomas Tierney, Rev. Peter James Tyrrell (died 4 December 1843), Charles Gavan Duffy, John Gray and Richard Barrett were charged with conspiring to obtain by unlawful methods a change in the constitution and government of the country. Their trial commenced in Dublin on 15 January, 1844 and ended on 12 February in a verdict of guilty. On 30 May O'Connell was sentenced to twelve months imprisonment and a fine of £2,000, his associates (except for Tierney in whose case a *nolle prosequi* had been entered) to nine months and a fine of £50 each. The prisoners, usually styled the traversers, were allowed choose their place of detention and, in consequence, were imprisoned in the Richmond Bridewell (now Griffith Barracks), Dublin. They were not subjected to the normal hardships of imprisonment, being accommodated in comfortable apartments and able to entertain visitors. On appeal to the House of Lords the judgment was reversed on 4 September and on 6 September the prisoners were released (MacDonagh, *O'Connell*, 294-308).
- 2 Peter James Tyrrell (1793-1843), ordained in Paris, worked in Stratford, England from 1823-c. 1828; C.C. St. Audeon's, Dublin before being made parish priest of Lusk, Co. Dublin in 1841.

3040

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 13 December 1843

My dear Friend,

I gladly accept your suggestions respecting the commission.¹ They are full of good sense. The commission, formed as it is, can be nothing but a bubble. It is perfectly one-sided — all landlords and no tenants. I do not think it should have the confidence of the people. I will however sound through my own esteemed friend, Dr. Yore, an influential quarter. Much will also depend on the question of time, to know how far back they will go.

A report — a foolish and idle report I should fondly hope — of a serious illness of the Queen has got abroad. I implore of you to inquire, but most cautiously, into its truth.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 311

- 1 The Devon commission.

3041

From Rev. Nicholas Wiseman

St. Mary's College [Oscott] Oct. of Concept. of B.V. 1843
[15 December 1843]

My dear Sir,

I have long desired to write to you upon a matter upon which I will not now trouble you, but which I will reserve for some other occasion. But I should feel myself guilty of injustice, were I to delay expressing to you my sincere and warm thanks for the manner in which you have so kindly consented to give the *Dublin Review* the countenance and support which your name must secure in Ireland.

In wishing anxiously to keep up that journal, after the course it has run, I am sure I have, and can have, no motives either of interest or of gratification, for it has been only a source of endless anxiety to me, and of no small sacrifice. But I have seen the good which it has done both among Catholics and among Protestants. Many a hint thrown out in it has proved as a seed which has taken root and produced much fruit; a higher tone of religious feeling, and a higher standard of ecclesiastical practice, now most observable in the Catholic body, purer principles in Church architecture, ecclesiastical functions, fine arts, and other appliances of religion, and mainly traceable to the quiet but persevering influence of the *Review*. I have been more than once surprised at finding the practical effects of what has been there said, with little hope of any practical result. Thus, after an article¹ in which the Offices of the Church, especially Prime and Compline, were recommended as family devotions, I found that several families in different parts had acted on the suggestion and had introduced the last into their evening devotions. Some congregations have done the same with excellent effect.

I am sure that the suppression of the *Review* would create a void not easily to be filled up. As to Protestants, I know that many have been much benefited by it, for being a neutral publication as to title, they are not afraid or ashamed of being seen reading it. Mr. Lucas once told me that he owed his being a Catholic instead of a Churchman to some articles in the *Review*, though latterly he has become its principal enemy; and I believe that other conversions may be attributed to it. It is the only Catholic periodical which has ever found its way into Protestant houses, as well as into reading rooms, clubs and other places of literary resort. Were it allowed to drop, it would have nothing to take its place, and years might pass before anything like it could get into a similar circulation. Knowing, as I do, the zeal which you have for religion in this country as well as everywhere else, I feel confident of your continued interest in what you

were so mainly instrumental in first establishing, and in supporting through its first struggles.

I take this opportunity of explaining some circumstances connected with the article² on Grattan in the last number, which I find gave you pain. When the time of publication drew near, we were disappointed of several papers; our Irish friends had been on vacation, and one of our contributors had an accident which prevented his writing as he had promised. Mr. Bagshawe was confined to his bed at Harrogate, and there seemed to be no chance of getting the number out in time. I accordingly went to London, and while I wrote myself to measure, looked out for materials and found only that paper in Bagshawe's box, that I could even think of. More than once I rejected it, then tried to modify it. I cut out phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and made out of it what I could. By this means, with my own article on 'Minor Rites and Ceremonies,' I got the number out. It was to our being thus reduced, actually to desperation, that the appearance of that article must be attributed. Mr. Bagshawe wrote to me to say that he had not wished to print it.

I must apologise for troubling you with such matters at a moment when you must have much to occupy your thoughts. I trust that any past misunderstanding about the *Review* will be forgotten, and that we shall have your kind sympathy and support.

I shall have the honour of receiving the Duke of Bordeaux³ here on Monday next.

SOURCE: *Irish Monthly*, XI, 340-41

- 1 A review article in the *Dublin Review* of November 1842 (XIII, No. 26, 448-85).
- 2 This was a review article on the first four volumes of Henry Grattan, M.P.'s, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Rt. Hon. Henry Grattan* in the *Dublin Review* of September 1843 (XV, No. 29, 200-52). The writer belittles Grattan's public character and achievements. The same writer reviewed Warden Flood's *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Hon. Henry Flood, M.P.* in the *Dublin Review* of August 1842 (XIII, No. 25, 100-155). In this article he eulogises Flood. The reviewer is obviously a graduate of T.C.D., of mature years in 1843, and probably a Protestant.
- 3 Henry Charles, duc de Bordeaux and comte de Chambord (1820-83), grandson of Charles X and pretender to the French throne.

3042

To Pierce Mahony

Derrynane 17 December 1843

Copy

My dear Mahony,

I enclose you Lord Devon's letter which, so far as it goes, looks tolerably fair though I confess I think he was a very unhappy choice for chairman [of the Devon Commission]. Then again, [*one word illeg*] should not there be a member of the Commission of the tenant class. That fact coupled with the nomination of Geo. A. Hamilton, one of the most virulent of sleek-faced Orangists, deprives me of all confidence. However, if I had received your letter before I wrote and sent my letter¹ to the Association, I might have mitigated some of my phrases but as I will procure all the evidence I can for the Commission, perhaps it is better I should hold them at arm's length for, in truth, I cannot stomach G.A. Hamilton *at all*, *at all* as the children say.

What a tasteless fellow that Attorney-General was not to allow me another fortnight in these mountains!² I forgive him everything but *that*. Why, yesterday, I had a most delightful day's hunting. I saw almost the entire of it — hare and hounds. We killed five hares — the dogs ran without intermission five hours and three quarters. In three minutes after each hare was killed we had another on foot and the cry was incessant. They were never at more than a momentary check and the cry, with the echoes, was splendid. I was not in such wind for walking these five years, and you will laugh at me when I tell you the fact that I was much less wearied than several of the young men; and we had a good three miles to walk home after the last hare was killed just at the close of the day. I was not prepared for such good hunting as the 'plague' among the dogs had thinned my pack. It killed six couple of beautiful beagles of mine. I could almost weep for them. Yet the survivors seemed determined to indemnify me. If tomorrow be dry I hope to have another good day's hunt.

I intend to return to Dublin by Cork and Clonmel and am perfectly prepared to meet with good humour every event.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 O'Connell to Ray, 15 December 1843, read at the Association meeting of 18 December 1843 (*Pilot*, 20 Dec. 1843). In this letter O'Connell criticises the composition of the Devon commission, beginning with Lord Devon who, as an absentee landlord and a thorough Tory, ought not, O'Connell declared, be selected to head the commission. He also criticised the appointment to the commission of Thomas N. Redington, Sir Robert A. Ferguson and George A. Hamilton. The fact that all

were landlords made the commission seem like 'a board of foxes deliberating gravely over a flock of geese'. However, he believed the commission ought not to be abandoned by the people and urged the Repeal Association to set up a nine-man committee to collect evidence with which to furnish the commission.

- 2 In connection with his trial. See letter 3039 nl.

3043

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 17 December 1843

My dear FitzPatrick,

Do you calculate exactly the time it takes to get an answer in Dublin from this? It is right you should know it. If you write on a Monday your letter reaches Tralee by the mail-coach the afternoon say 4 o'clock, on Tuesday. It leaves Tralee by a post-office car (Bianconi) immediately after, and reaches Cahirciveen at one in the morning of Wednesday, and it arrives here at about ten the same morning (Wednesday). I write the answer that day but the post does not start until six the next morning (Thursday). That day it reaches Tralee long after the Dublin mail has started. It therefore remains that night in Tralee, leaves Tralee next morning (Friday) and reaches Dublin on Saturday.

A letter from Dublin to London with two sea voyages is answered the fourth day. A letter to Derrynane all by land is answered the sixth day at the soonest. It may be useful to you to understand this difference when you are writing to me.

I have just written to Pierce Mahony and given an account of my hunting. . . . However there is one comfort: I have not been in better wind and spirits for hunting these many a day.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 312-3

3044

From Michael Staunton to Derrynane

Dublin, 21 December 1843

Private

My Dear Sir,

I received the enclosed letter this morning from the Rev. Mr. Russell¹ of Maynooth. If you know him personally you are aware that he is one of the ablest and most accomplished members of our Church. I think our *honour* is concerned in maintaining the *Dublin Review*.

Our Lord Mayor made a great jackass of himself at the late dinner given, it would seem in consequence of an after-thought, to the Corporation and a gathering of all the newspaper clerks and reporters, orange and green, of Dublin.² For my own part, I remained intentionally away. I wish the promised vote of thanks to him was passed — and forgotten.

Sheil and Mahony have prepared me to give evidence to show that my newspaper transactions with the Repeal Association were exactly similar to those with the Catholic Association. I do for one body precisely that which I did for the other. To depose to this Moore³ also considers important, and it is a comfort to me to be in a position to do it.

You will observe that the Rev. Mr Russell's letter is urgent. I wonder they have been able to fulfil the engagement of getting out the *Review* on the 31st. Their energy deserves encouragement.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Rev. Charles William Russell (1812-1880) a native of Killough, Co. Down. Professor of Humanities 1835-45; of Ecclesiastical History 1845-57; president of Maynooth College 1857-80; a frequent contributor to the *Dublin Review* from 1836-77.
- 2 The last official dinner given by the outgoing lord mayor, George Roe, on 18 December. He made a 'jackass' of himself presumably by proposing a number of unusual and incongruous toasts, and one to the lord mayor elect but none to O'Connell as his predecessor in office (*FJ*, 19 Dec. 1843). The omission was noted by the *Dublin Evening Mail* (*DEM*, 20 Dec. 1843).
- 3 Richard Moore (1783-1857), second son of Stephen Moore, Grenane, Co. Waterford. Called to the bar 1807, K.C. 1827; solicitor-general August 1840-September 1841; attorney-general July 1846-December 1847; judge of the queen's bench from 1847 till his death. One of the defence counsel at the state trial of O'Connell and his associates.

3045

This letter is now numbered 3123a.

3046

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Cork, 3 January 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose you an order for £21 some shillings from the Rev. Mr. O'Connor. Acknowledge the receipt of it to him and let him know that this is a subject on which I am forbid to correspond. You will of course do this in the smoothest manner.

You will be glad to hear that I have broken up the establishment at Derrynane. The saving will be greater than you could calculate. I ought to have done it sooner. I have also made a general clearance of my debts, current and ancient, save what I owe the bank. I will, please God, reduce that to a manageable shape when I arrive in Dublin. There is not one single debt unpaid nor a single bill out or indeed capable of being out, that is, to represent any debt, for there is none due save one for some shillings less than £150 which will be due here in Cork on the 22nd, and for which we must send provision to Tom Fitzgerald's. This is a pleasing prospect but to make matters square I must have resort to the tribute.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 313

3047

To Charles Buller¹

Merrion Square, 9 January 1844

Copy

Confidential

My dear Buller,

I yesterday received your letter dated Decr. 5th, 1844 [sic] in which, notwithstanding all your comicality, I see no joke at all. The truth, however, is that you are a witty man and I unfeignedly add, a wise one too. And I cheerfully confess you have solid claims on the confidence of every man of the liberal party in both countries. As to Mr. Hawes,² I sincerely declare that I have the highest opinion of his judgment and right feeling. You both deserve that I should speak to you without the least reserve, leaving it entirely to your discretion to make use of my communication — if it can be useful — with the single reserve of *non-publication*.

This premised, I begin by expressing my total dissent from your opinion that there is a *great* or *strong* party in England favourable to justice to Ireland. The utter weakness of the British Government in relation to foreign powers, whilst Ireland continues justly dissatisfied, has, I admit, created a species of restlessness amongst a number of the English. They would fain be doing *something* for Ireland in order to lessen their own apprehensions. There is no *heart* in it. If they were made to believe that coercion would serve their purposes they would prefer coercion. There are, to be sure, a chosen few, augmented in number by recent events and present circumstances, who would join you and Mr. Hawes in doing substantial justice to Ireland.

Let us, however, not wrangle about the strength of the "Justice to Ireland" party in England. I will take for granted that it is strong enough to be useful. Upon that supposition I meet at once and candidly your demand to suggest measures that would be satisfactory to the Irish people. I am not telling you what would satisfy me personally but I will tell you what I know would deprive me of many of my present adherents. As for myself, you admit that the slightest shrinking from the Repeal is at the present moment impracticable. Even my usual doctrine of instalments would under existing circumstances have the appearance of cowardice or at least of paltry timidity. But as I have no notion of keeping up a party at the expense of sacrificing any measures useful to Ireland, I will candidly tell you what I think would mitigate the present ardent desire for Repeal. These are the measures which in my deliberate and well informed judgment would have that effect.

Firstly. *Establishing perfect religious equality* which could be done in either of two ways: the one way would be the paying all religious instructors of Catholics and of Episcopalian Protestants: the *second* way would be by paying neither. The first . . . would be utterly valueless at the present moment and indeed destructive of all hope of tranquillity. The parochial Catholic clergy would lose all their useful influence and compressive power; that power which *alone* keeps the social state together in Ireland at the present moment. The people would totally desert them. The mendicant friars would multiply and become the sole spiritual guides of the masses of the population. . . .

The other way is the right one — the paying neither clergy, the having no state church. No person but one who knows the matter intimately as I do can possibly estimate with anything like accuracy the immense utility of perfect religious equality. If you reflect for one moment upon the galling nature of the infliction of making one Hierarchy inferior and degraded, and making the other Hierarchy

proud, inflated and exalted, you will not be surprised at this being the monster grievance which festers in the mind of the Catholic clergy. They believe their Church (as I do) to be the true church. . . . It is a continued source of irritation to them to witness the inferiority in the eye of the law of what they deem the true church. . . . The greatest possible relief they could get would be by creating the equality of non-payment. . . . Their masters would become their equals. Nor would they be the less gratified if the vested interests of the existing incumbents were fully respected. This is the first great measure for quieting Ireland. It would have the effect of that underground draining which is so recommended by our frightened agriculturists. It would draw away . . . much . . . bitterness and discontent. . . . Procure that and you will easily be able to achieve the other necessary measures.

Secondly. The second measure which I should propose is one that ought easily to be acceded to. It is to restore the law of landlord and tenant to the state it was in at the time of the Union. There have been since the Union (I think) *seven* Statutes passed enhancing the landlord's power of distraint and eviction, enabling the landlord to ruin the tenant at a very trifling expense to himself, enabling the landlord to distraint growing crops which before the Union he could not do in Ireland, augmenting the expenses of distraint upon the tenant etc. Now these Statutes having been passed in the United Parliament, the Irish landlords would have no just cause to complain if that Parliament should repeal them. . . . The effect would be to prevent many a hideous oppression and many a retaliatory murder.

Thirdly. The county franchise is becoming totally extinct. No construction of the existing law can be a remedy. The basis of the franchise must be extended to the people at large. It is a matter of difficulty how they shall be saved from the oppressive power of the landlord. The ballot would do; but as that won't be conceded, something else must, in the nature of a considerable practical extension of the franchise. . . . The county of Cork which I now represent has a rural population of about 750,000. After the Irish Reform Bill the registration gave about six thousand voters, showing that the basis of the franchise was miserably stunted. But what will you think of it *now* when I tell you that my conviction is that 1,500 voters could not be mustered for that county. Nor is this an isolated case, for the franchise is in a similar manner perishing in the other counties and was always too limited.

Fourthly. The Corporate Reform Bill for Ireland should be made equally potential with the corporate reform for England and Scotland. . . .

Fifthly. Our town constituencies should be rendered more

extensive; and the old Freemen — an ancient Protestant nuisance — should be abolished. . . .

Sixthly. The income tax upon Irish absentees should be increased five-fold.

Seventhly. The question of fixity of tenure should be taken into the most deliberate consideration. The present humbug committee³ should be turned into a real, efficient, searching enquiry, and the commission entrusted with that enquiry should be composed of tenants as well as landlords.

I have thus, my dear Buller, candidly given you the elements of the destruction of my political power and for the diminishing the demand for the Repeal. . . . But I do not expect any important result from your exertions. The British people will think of doing justice to Ireland, as they did to America, when too late, and perhaps they could not do a more unwise thing than by imprisoning me to deprive me of the superintending power which during my day would make a revolutionary movement impossible. . . . But the important thing now is to see how you can make up a party sufficiently strong to give respectability to any exertions in favour of Ireland. The Whigs won't do it. The principal part of them will necessarily be under the control of Lord John Russell and he will never permit anything like justice to be done to the Catholic people of this country. I know him well. He has a thorough, contemptuous, Whig hatred of the Irish. He has a strong and I believe a conscientious abhorrence of Popery everywhere but I believe particularly of Irish Popery. His conduct since he came into opposition in shielding the present ministry against my demand to have the Catholic clergy allowed to *look after* Catholics in prisons and workhouses bespeaks a foregone conclusion of anticatholicity in his mind. In fact you have not the least chance of doing anything to conciliate Ireland. . . . I am sure chains of iron or of adamant cannot bind us much longer.

. . . You cannot succeed — it is impossible — your countrymen are too deeply imbued in national antipathy to the Irish. You have injured us too deeply, too cruelly, ever to forgive us. And then there is a bigotted anti-catholic spirit embittering, enhancing and augmenting the English hatred of the Irish nation. . . .

SOURCE: Russell Papers, Public Record Office, London, P.R.O. 30/22/4C, ff. 132-7

- 1 Charles Buller (1806-48), liberal politician and pamphleteer; M.P. for West Looe, Cornwall 1830-31; for Liskeard 1832-48; secretary to governor-general of Canada, 1838; chief poor law commissioner 1847. See *DNB*.
- 2 Benjamin Hawes (1797-1862), M.P. for Lambeth 1832-47; for Kinsale 1848-52; under-secretary for the colonies 1846-51. Knighted 1856. See *DNB*.
- 3 The Devon commission.

3048

From Charles Buller

London, Tuesday, 16 January 1844

Private

My Dear Mr. O'Connell,

On my return to town I got your letter and most gratified was I to find the communication which I had ventured to make to you, answered . . . with an openness and fulness that leave me no doubt as to the points on which your English friends may count on your assistance. . . .

The great question . . . is that of establishing entire religious equality in Ireland. I do not say that it will be *easy* to effect this by abolishing the state church: and I certainly have very fervently hoped that the end might be attained by endowing *all* churches instead of *none*. But that is out of the question at present: and I see no practical mode of producing religious equality except by abolishing the existing establishment.

On the other points as far as you yourself speak precisely I am prepared to concur with you except *perhaps* on the comparatively unimportant one of the tax on absentees. My doubt here is solely as to the means: for I am perfectly convinced of the necessity of taking strong measures to discourage absenteeism.

. . . Be assured that when the session begins I will not shrink from acting on the views which I now express to you. . . .

Recent news respecting your trial has been very discouraging to us. I certainly did hope that the Government would instead of stretching the law to the most undue lengths against you, have themselves contrived to avoid laying the foundation of deadly and enduring hatred on the part of the Irish people by imprisoning you. . . .¹

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

¹ See letter 3039 nl.

3049

From Charles Langdale

29 January [1844]

Private

Dear Mr. O'Connell,

You may have heard that an aggregate meeting¹ of the Catholics of Gt. Britain is in contemplation on the insult offered to Catholics

generally by the officer of the crown on the Queen's Bench, Dublin. Many stumble over the affidavit produced by the Attorney General that all the eleven Catholics were Repealers. Sheil proposed to bring forward a counter affidavit but which has not appeared. Can this be done? And proof given that some of the eleven were not members of the Repeal Association? If you have *time*, send me a line on this subject addressed No. 10 Mansfield Street. My brother, Lord Stourton, would recall to your recollection (if you want reminding) a passage in Mr. Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol in 1780. Speaking of the riots in London he alludes to what would have been the consequence of retaliation on the part of the Irish Catholics in these words: 'Had a conflict once begun, the rage of their persecutors would have redoubled, thus fury increasing by reverberation of outrages, house being fired for house, and church for chapel, I am convinced that no power under Heaven could have prevented a general conflagration, and at this day London would have been a tale.' *We fancy* you must have been quoting from this when you talked of Lord Beaumont's² house etc.³ *A little more* and I shall be at least a *Federalist*.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 A meeting of English Catholics, to protest against the exclusion of Catholics from the jury in the Irish state trials, took place at Freemason's Tavern in London on 7 February 1844. A memorial to the queen on the matter was adopted (*Times*, 8 Feb. 1844).
- 2 Miles Thomas (Stapleton), eighth Baron Beaumont (1805-54), Carlton Towers, Yorkshire.
- 3 In his opening address on 16 January the attorney-general had quoted a speech made by O'Connell at Longford on 28 May 1843 in which he attacked the English Catholic peer, Beaumont, for making anti-Repeal statements. In this speech O'Connell allegedly maintained that, if Ireland were laid waste by British troops, London and Beaumont's castle would be laid waste by the Irish in England (*Nation*, 20 Jan. 1844).

3050

From Rev. M. V. Ryan

Mount Melleray Abbey, 6 February 1844

My Dear Friend and Illustrious Liberator,

In forwarding by Mr. Clarke my subscription to the Repeal Association for this present year, permit me to offer you likewise the renewed expression and tribute of my gratitude, admiration and tender sympathy. . . . I request here, as in my first letter and remittance to allow the veil under which I at that period concealed my name to remain unremoved. You recollect that in our religious

character we are a proscribed race, existing purely by sufferance but under the ban of an odious, bigotted, intolerant code. The sword that we behold suspended over our heads might possibly soon or late be precipitated upon us and destroy that existence which is even now so precarious. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3051

To Lord Normanby

Trafalgar Hotel [London], 16 February 1844

My Lord,

You will not I trust so misunderstand me as to suppose that I make any complaint. I do not do so. I can know and feel that conduct has been adopted towards me which I cannot explain but I complain not on that account.

Will you permit me, respectfully, to make this statement — that I no less than three times in my place in the House of Commons, once when the transaction was recent and twice afterwards, declared — and that declaration appeared in the reports of the debate — that you had offered me the alternative of the office of Chief Baron or that of Master of the Rolls.

May I take the liberty to remind your Lordship that your colleagues in office were present and that I was not contradicted *then* either by any of them or by your Lordship by letter, message or other communication.

It is clear that I have been *thus* placed in a disagreeable predicament but I have no person to blame but myself for a credulity which is now, I presume, justly, punished.¹

I have not in London your Lordship's first letter but I think it does admit that I *might* have mistaken you to intend to offer me the alternative of the office of Chief Baron or Master of the Rolls. Indeed to my duller sense it does seem strange that I should have discussed the unfitness of my being Chief Baron when that office was not offered me. I respectfully repeat that it does seem strange that I should give reasons for not taking a place which was not offered.

On the whole, my Lord, you will not understand me to contradict any assertion of yours. Neither do I complain. I think I have not been well treated that my mistake was not corrected when I first publicly announced it. Yet I do not complain but I do think that the feeling which places me above complaint is one which is not

unworthy even of your Lordship's respect.

SOURCE: Normanby Papers

- 1 The meaning of this reference has not been ascertained. On 13 February Normanby made a long speech in the Lords attacking government policy towards Ireland, in the course of which he denied that O'Connell had exercised any undue influence on the distribution of patronage in Ireland under the Melbourne ministry (*Times*, 14 Feb. 1844).

3052

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 16 February 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

You read the debates in the Houses.¹ They are interesting but of course favourable to anti-Irish power. On the other hand the popular sentiment is strongly with us — more strongly than I would have imagined. I was admirably received in the House and outside the House, and my name was cheered to the echo at the Corn Law League meeting.²

The debate will last this night and Monday night, and I will then return to Ireland to assist in preserving the public peace which, indeed, I now am sure will not be violated.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 318

- 1 On 13 February Russell introduced a motion for a committee to take into consideration the state of Ireland. The debate continued for nine days, when the motion was defeated on the morning of 24 February by 334 to 225 (*Annual Register*, 1844, 56-85). In the Lords on 13 February Normanby introduced a motion to examine into the causes of Irish discontent with a view to their removal. It was defeated by 125 to 78 (*Ibid.*, 54-6).
- 2 At the weekly meeting of the anti-corn law league, three cheers were given for O'Connell (*Times*, 16 Feb. 1844).

3053

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 17 February 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

... Now as to present politics. I am glad I came over, not so much on account of the Parliament as of the English people. I have certainly met with a kindness and a sympathy which I did not expect

but which I will cheerfully cultivate. As to the Houses of Parliament you will read with astonishment the recklessness of assertion which pervades them, and you will see with regret the absurd credulity of our friends. The Ministers will of course have an overwhelming majority¹ but, after all, the minority of the Lords had something consolatory about it. Upon the whole, we must trust to God, and in his protection of the religion and liberty of the Irish people. It is utterly insignificant what becomes of me if the Irish public, clergy and laity continue true to their principles. It is impossible that England should not soon want *our* support, and when she does she shall have it on our own just terms. You perceive how directly Lord Howick has attacked the Protestant establishment.² The fact is that the grasp of the English which that Church has so long firmly held is much relaxed and, really, these trials appear destined to sever *that* connection for ever.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 318-9

- 1 On Russell's motion regarding the state of Ireland. See letter 3052 n1.
- 2 Howick spoke in support of Russell's motion. He declared the established church in Ireland to be at the root of all discord there. The government, he stated, had only three alternatives. Either they must make the Catholic church the established church of Ireland; they must abolish all state endowment in Ireland; or they must equally divide the state endowments among the different persuasions (*Annual Register*, 1844, 64-5).

3054

To P. V. FitzPatrick

London, 20 February 1844

My dear Friend,

The debate is going on very favourably. You will be glad to hear that my beloved John made an excellent speech.¹ Tone, temper, manner, matter, all were truly good. Do not think that this is paternal delusion. The fact bears me fully out.

The popular sentiment out of the House declares itself strongly in favour of Ireland. I am delighted more than I am surprised, at such a demonstration. I certainly did not expect anything half so generous or so kind.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 319

- 1 John O'Connell spoke on 19 February in the adjourned debate on Russell's motion (*Pilot*, 21 Feb. 1844).

3055

To Richard O'Gorman

House of Commons, 26 February 1844

Private

My dear Richard,

I thought the best thing I could do was to put your papers and entire case in the hands of Lord Campbell who has most kindly undertaken to show the absurdity of Lord Roden's charge against you.¹ He, Lord Campbell, was attending an appeal cause in the House of Lords but he readily came out to me and we went over the case together. He treats the atrocious charge of perjury as exceedingly unjust and shameful. He was also very much pleased with your son's² letter, and indeed I must say it gave me an affectionate satisfaction. I do not flatter when I say that the legal *tone* and tradesman-like manner of his modest though powerful judgment enable me to see that the young gentleman has about him all the materials of success. I never prophesied in vain of a young lawyer, and now I do not hesitate to declare that if he *works*, that is, if he be laborious, he cannot fail to cut a figure in his profession. I do not know whether he be diligent or not but if he be, rely on it that his professional career will be a brilliant one.

SOURCE: Universiteitsbibliotheek Van Amsterdam

- 1 In a speech in the Lords on 13 February in defence of the exclusively Protestant composition of the jury empanelled for the trial of O'Connell and his associates, Roden declared 'it was impossible to suppose that the Roman Catholics of Ireland could act upon a jury without being more or less biassed in their opinions'. He cited as an example what had taken place in the grand jury upon the finding of the bills against O'Connell and his associates: 'There were three Roman Catholics upon that jury, and one of them came into the jury-box after the bills were found, and, though he had been sworn to keep his own counsel as well as that of his fellow-jurors, declared that he for his part dissented from the finding' (*Times*, 14 Feb. 1844). This was an obvious reference to Richard O'Gorman who, as one of the grand jury, expressed his dissent from the finding of the bill against O'Connell on 8 November 1843 (*Pilot*, 10 Nov. 1843).
- 2 Richard O'Gorman (c.1820-1895), only son of Richard O'Gorman. Called to the bar 1842; a Young Irelander, he took part in the 1848 insurrection; later became a judge in the U.S.A.

3056

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Trafalgar Hotel, Spring Gardens [London], 4 March 1844
My dear FitzPatrick,

I enclose halves of two notes for £100 each. You see by the letter that accompanied them that I am not called on for any further acknowledgment. However I think you had better make that acknowledgment in the newspapers, taking care to mention that it comes from a Protestant.¹

Everything is going on well here. Public sympathy is as lively as ever. I go down tomorrow evening to Birmingham where there is to be a great meeting the next day.² I send you the invitation I got for going down there which I think might as well appear in the Dublin papers.³

I have an invitation from the Mayor of Cork for a provincial dinner in Easter week. I have a notion of accepting of it. What think you?

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

- 1 The press has no mention of this subscription.
- 2 This meeting, held on 6 March, was convened in compliance with a requisition of 28 town councillors and some 700 burgesses and others, inhabitants of Birmingham (*Pilot*, 6 Mar. 1844). A petition was drawn up condemning the government's proclamation of the Clontarf meeting, and the trial of O'Connell and his associates before a partisan jury (*Pilot*, 8 Mar. 1844).
- 3 The invitation does not appear to have been published.

3057

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 12 March 1844

Dear Friend,

My attention was yesterday called to the following passage in a document recently issued by the Irish Repeal Association: 'We wish it to be distinctly understood that we should view with satisfaction the permanent location in this country of a large proportion of whatever naval and military establishments may be required for the general defence of the empire. Their expenditure gives a stimulus to our home markets and their presence enlivens our social meetings'.¹

Such sentiments from such a quarter I deeply regret. Of course they were written in thy absence but can anything be done to

counteract the pain and grief it will, I believe, inflict on many true friends of Ireland.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The passage was contained in the first general report of the parliamentary committee of the Repeal Association and was read by Smith O'Brien at the Association meeting on 4 March (*Pilot*, 6 Mar. 1844).

3058

*To Rev. John Gordon*¹

London, 16 March 1844

My dear Sir,

I shall follow the course you suggest, that is, I will leave this in the eight o'clock train on Monday so as to be in Coventry at one.²

I will also gratefully accept Mr. Freeman's³ very polite invitation to dinner but I will not put him to the inconvenience of giving me a bed. I can easily return to Coventry that night which also will enable me to be in town the next day the more early. I beg of you as you were kind enough to convey to me Mr. Freeman's invitation to be so good as to communicate to him my reply.

SOURCE: Connolly Autograph Collection

- 1 A Unitarian minister.
- 2 On 18 March O'Connell attended a meeting in Coventry convened for the purpose of considering Irish grievances. Resolutions were passed expressive of sympathy towards Ireland, and condemning as unconstitutional the manner in which the government had conducted his recent trial (*Times*, 19 Mar. 1844).
- 3 Unidentified.

3059

From W. Simpson

Bradmore House, Hammersmith [London], 19 March 1844

My dear Sir,

As one of the first persons who volunteered to become a steward at the late dinner given to you at Convent Garden Theatre¹ I feel proud that the English public responded to the call and did honour to themselves in honouring you by one of the most enthusiastic receptions ever accorded to a public man.

The speech you made on that occasion came warm from the heart,

was straightforward and manly and must convince all right minded men that the integrity and prosperity of the British Empire is dearer to your heart than to that of any of your renegade persecutors. . . . The English people partake of the phlegmatic temperament of their German ancestors and it would be well if we could sometimes infuse into them a little of the leaven of the Irish character. But when once aroused by a sense of injustice their determination and enthusiasm is unbounded, and I will venture to say that hearty cheer which reverberated through Covent Garden Theatre on Tuesday last has never had a parallel in any other country. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 A banquet in O'Connell's honour took place in Covent Garden on 12 March, attended by some 1,000 persons, including Lords Shrewsbury, Camoys and Dunboyne and some 25 M.P.'s (*Times*, 13 Mar. 1844).

3060

From Banks Fanand¹ to Trafalgar Hotel, Spring Gardens, London

53 Dover Street, Southwark [London], [19 March 1844] 3rd mo.
19th 1844

Esteemed Friend,

I trust thou will allow me though a perfect stranger to address a few lines to thee on . . . the annual mutiny bill. [He suggests it should be opposed. Many are induced to join the army when drunk and others prefer it to the workhouse. He urges him to induce Irishmen not to join the army. He asks O'Connell to send any reply to him at 37 West Smithfield, London.]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 From the style of his letter, the writer is obviously a Quaker.

3061

To William Smith O'Brien

London, 23 March 1844

My dear O'Brien,

I have not the least objection to ask for the bank return you mention. I hope to do it on Monday.¹

I agree with you that I have been long enough in London. I therefore intend to leave this on Thursday the 28th to attend a farewell meeting at Liverpool on the 29th² and to reach Dublin on

the 30th. Ray may shape his advertisement for Monday with '*The Liberator will attend.*'

Seriously, I am afraid of the Dublin dinner.³ The only day I could give for it would be Thursday in Easter week. It is clear that of the Irish Whigs we will not get one to attend my dinner. I doubt even if we were to abandon the toast of the Repeal whether they would attend but it is clear that to abandon it now would be a shrinking to which I could not submit. Upon the whole therefore my opinion is that we had better postpone the dinner until the fate of the prosecution is finally closed.

If you differ with me in opinion I will frankly act upon yours in the place of my own. Will you see my son John and Ray and communicate your thoughts to them. I know you meet them constantly in committee else I would not ask you to take the trouble. . . .

I cannot close without offering you my most emphatically cordial thanks for the manner in which you have conducted the Repeal cause since I left Dublin. I really think your accession⁴ quite providential — nothing less. You are by your 'antecedents' and your popular talents and your rank and religion just the '*beau ideal*' of the person wanted to make the cause of Repeal keep its course against the stream of persecution on the one hand and of otherwise inevitable desertion on the other. It may perhaps gratify you a little to know that I never felt half so grateful for the exertions of any other political colleague in my long experience.

Even the casual fact of your religion is most useful to the Repeal cause. It is impossible that any Protestant who calmly thinks can imagine that you would be a party to any political movement which could deprive Protestants of their legitimate station and due sway in the state. Politically speaking I am delighted that you are a Protestant. Protestantism can never want just protection where you advise and direct. . . .

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 433

- 1 No information has been traced concerning this reference.
- 2 This meeting, which O'Connell attended, actually took place on the evening of 28 March. Resolutions were passed calling for just legislation for Ireland, condemning the government's conduct of the recent state trials, and expressing admiration for O'Connell (*Times*, 30 Mar. 1844).
- 3 See letter 3063.
- 4 Smith O'Brien had joined the Repeal Association on 20 October 1843, following his return from a tour of the continent. When O'Connell became preoccupied with preparing a defence against the state prosecution, he appointed O'Brien as his deputy in the Association (Gwynn, *Young Ireland*, 17-22).

3062

From Joseph Sturge

Birmingham, 23 March 1844

Dear Friend,

As the question of the admission of the sugars of Brazil and Cuba is likely to be warmly pressed during this session I should be obliged to thee to look over the enclosed, and if the ground taken is in thy opinion sound, I know our free trade friends, who on this occasion I think quite in error, will not have thy vote.¹ I had a letter from a poor Irishman in Limerick County the other day, written in great distress, saying he feared Brown,² who was to be executed for assisting a slave to escape, was a brother of his. I sent it to Lord Denman and suggested that the man should be claimed as a British subject. He writes me this morning that he has forwarded it to Lord Aberdeen³ but fears it is now too late to act upon it as the day named for hanging the man is the 25th of next month. I *hope* thou wilt be able to attend the anti-slavery meeting at Exeter Hall in May.⁴

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 In June 1844 Russell moved resolutions in favour of admitting foreign sugar subject to the same duty as colonial sugar. The government's sole concession was to reduce both duties while preserving a higher duty on the foreign product. Russell's motion was easily defeated and when the Commons later passed an amendment making further reductions on the duties, Peel forced it to reverse its decision (Halevy, *Victorian Years*, 100). O'Connell was in prison from May 30 to September 1844.
- 2 'The *Aurora* says: the young man (John L. Brown) sentenced to death for aiding in the escape of a quadroon slave has been pardoned by the Governor of South Carolina. He is, however, to be publicly whipped.' (*Pilot*, 12 Apr. 1844).
- 3 George (Hamilton Gordon), fourth earl of Aberdeen (1784-1860); secretary of state for foreign affairs 1828-30 and again 1841-46; prime minister 1852-55.
- 4 The anniversary meeting of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society was held on 17 May at Exeter Hall, London. O'Connell spoke at length (*Times*, 18 May 1844).

3063

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 25 March 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

Call upon my friend the Lord Mayor¹ and ask him in my name to propose me as a member of the new club² or, if it be not as yet

necessary to propose, then beg of him to put down my name and give him the entrance money. Tell him I know he will kindly excuse my not writing to him on the subject sooner, as he is aware of the pressure upon my time. Do this for me discreetly.

The plan of my returning here before the 15th April is utterly impracticable. I believe the adjournment³ will be to that day. Friday is always a Government business day so that there would be no chance of my offering my Bill even if I were here. Besides, it is utterly out of the question that I could have preparations made for offering my Conspiracy Bill⁴ at so early a period. I need not dwell upon this subject but I could give you twenty reasons all resulting in this, that your plan is *utterly impracticable*.

I may be mistaken but it strikes me that nothing could be of half the importance as the appointment of the day of 'humiliation and prayer.'⁵ If universally adopted it would have a magnificent effect upon the enemy, besides being in its own nature most desirable. The only danger in a public point of view would be its being only partial. What, for example, could we expect from that most excellent man and exemplary clergyman, our archbishop?⁶ The numbing effect of any kind of connection with the Government operates upon the best minds without their perceiving it. My most affectionate friend Dr. Yore would be a fit man to be sounded on this subject. Consider it and consult with others until my arrival in Dublin which, weather permitting, I am now able to fix for *Friday the 29th* as the Liverpool meeting⁷ will take place the preceding day.

Get Fitz-Simon to put a total stop to the Dublin dinner. I write to him this evening to set aside the dinner there. The Cork dinner⁸ will suffice for our popular movement previous to the sentence which I entertain no doubt will be much more severe than is generally expected. You perceive I have set them at complete defiance.⁹ I had no other alternative than the impossible one of submission.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 320-1

1 Timothy O'Brien.

2 The Irish Reform Club was launched at a meeting in Dublin on 12 March when it was resolved to form the Irish equivalent of the (London) Reform Club. Its purpose was declared to be the promotion of reform and social intercourse between all classes of reformers. The meeting nominated Lord Charlemont as chairman of the proposed club committee and O'Connell and many Repealers and Liberals as members. An entrance fee of ten guineas and an annual subscription of five guineas were decided upon. John O'Connell took an active part in this meeting (*DEP*, 14 Mar. 1844).

3 On 2 April the Lords announced their adjournment to 16 April, and the Commons to 15 April.

4 No such bill was presented to the Commons.

5 A day of solemn national prayer for O'Connell and his associates

prosecuted by the state was ordered by the Catholic hierarchy to be observed all over Ireland on Sunday 28 July 1844. The form of a special prayer agreed to by the hierarchy was published in an Irish translation by the *Freeman's Journal* of 26 July 1844.

- 6 Dr. Murray.
- 7 See letter 3061 n2.
- 8 On 8 April O'Connell attended a provincial banquet in his honour attended, amongst others, by the mayors and members of the corporations of Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny and Clonmel (*DEP*, 11 Apr. 1844).
- 9 A reference to his speech on 23 February in the adjourned debate on Russell's motion on the state of Ireland in the course of which he declared: 'I stand here, in the name of my country and my countrymen, to protest against an additional act of injustice to Ireland,' a reference to the recent state prosecutions (*Times*, 24 Feb. 1844).

3064

From R. Lawrenson,¹ 13 Blackhall Street, Dublin, 25 March 1844

Relates suspicious events which occurred on the morning of the day on which the verdict in the late state trials² was returned. His account suggests that the jury may have been tampered with.³ He has communicated with Ford and Cantwell.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Ralph Lawrenson, weighmaster.
- 2 Of O'Connell and his associates.
- 3 The letter is a long one and gives the impression that the writer is much exaggerating the importance of his information.

3065

To Edward Davies Davenport,¹ 28 Lower Brook St., London

Trafalgar Hotel [London], 26 March 1844

My dear Sir,

[Apologises for apparently neglecting to answer Davenport's letter.] The constant pressure of business, the perpetual consumption of time created by the intrusion of everybody respecting everything continuously made upon me, the mislaying of letters sent to me in such heaps as to render it almost impossible to keep them distinct and separate. . . .

Believe me still that I do not and never did forget the steady support Ireland received from you when you had it in your power to

give her cause an effectual support in parliament. . . .

SOURCE: The John Rylands Library

- 1 Edward Davies Davenport (1778-1847), M.P. for Shaftesbury 1826-30.

3066

To Terence Sheridan,¹ Trim, Co. Meath

London, 26 March 1844

Private

My Dear Sheridan,

I do not think it will be in my power to attend a dinner in Trim before the 15th of April, the day of passing sentence,² but if it be not asking too much I should be glad to confer with you on this subject personally on Saturday the 30th or Sunday the 31st instant.

In the meantime make no public movement on the subject. I intend to be in Dublin on Friday evening, the 29th inst., so can see you as early as you please on Saturday. Excuse me for giving you this trouble but should it be inconvenient to you to come to me to Dublin I will write to you on that Saturday.³

SOURCE: Papers of St. Columba's Abbey, Glenstal

- 1 Merchant.
2 Sentence on O'Connell and his associates was passed on 30 May (see letter 3039 n1).
3 This letter was written by another but signed by O'Connell.

3067

*To Edward Davies Davenport, 28 Lower Brook Street, London,
27 March 1844, from Trafalgar Hotel, London*

Regrets that he cannot accept Davenport's kind invitation as he leaves today for Ireland.

SOURCE: The John Rylands Library

3068

To William Smith O'Brien

Merrion Square, 2 April 1844

My dear Sir,

I am quite sure you are right. The strictness of the Protestant practice in the observance of Sunday is the safer course. You have made me change my plan.¹ I will leave town on Friday afternoon at three o'clock, and have beds bespoken at Ballitore or Carlow, the first more than thirty miles from Dublin, the second, forty. Leaving next day at half after six I will reach Cork Saturday evening before eight. This is my *determined* route and, if your arrangements are not made, I will be able to accommodate you and will feel much gratified by your accepting my present offer. At all events I have also full room for you on your return on Tuesday.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI 433

- 1 In writing to O'Brien to make arrangements for the Cork dinner, O'Connell had proposed to arrive in Cork on Sunday morning. 'He must have been disconcerted to find O'Brien suggesting that such political demonstrations on Sunday might be distasteful to some of their Protestant supporters. O'Connell immediately altered the day of his arrival, with a grateful acknowledgment of the suggestion; though it must have seemed strange after so many years of popular agitation which O'Connell had habitually conducted after Mass on Sundays' (Gwynn, *Young Ireland*, 22-3).

3069

*From Charles A.L.E. Zander*¹

Wurzburg, Bavaria (via Paris), 8 April 1844

[the letter tells of signatures being obtained for addresses to O'Connell and of difficulties in consequence with the Prussian, Wurttemberg and Bavarian governments].

[O'Connell's *Memoir on Ireland* was immediately translated into German and made a powerful impression. 'With two or three exceptions the German newspapers generally derive their information on Irish affairs only from the London journals; yet even through these party-coloured spectacles the truth appeared plain enough to rouse the public sympathy for Ireland and the "convicted conspirators".' 'The atrocious concoction of a trial for conspiracy,

the jugglery practised with regard to the jurors' list, the disgraceful insult offered to the Catholic jurors, the vexatious proceedings of the Attorney-General and lastly the crowning charge of the Chief-Justice were each and all felt as so many outrages upon public justice.' 'When under such circumstances I published in the *Augsburg Post* an article which has since been reprinted in the *Dublin Weekly Freemans Journal* of March 2, there were immediately strong calls upon me to get up an address on some similar demonstration' but Professor Walter² of Bonn tried to circulate a public address for signatures. Zander and many others did not approve of Walter's draft because it was drawn under fear of the Prussian Government and because too Catholic and therefore likely to alienate Irish Protestants from supporting Repeal. Then Walter withdrew this address.]

[Just before this withdrawal, Zander learned that some 80 Catholic priests in the Kingdom of Wurtemberg subscribed about £85 as a subscription to the Repeal cause but the money was confiscated by the police and those of the contributors whom the police could trace were fined. The priests had to limit their efforts to a letter to O'Connell signed by two of their number.]

[Zander says he amended the address, which Walter had put before the public and then withdrew, and circularised it privately for signatures. A possible demonstration in favour of O'Connell seems, according to Zander, to have been prevented by the Bavarian Government which feared offending Britain because of the Greek interests of the King of Bavaria.]

[Despite all the difficulties, Zander's address gained signatures from persons of all classes and from many Protestants. He secretly sent these signatures to the address, and the address from the above-mentioned priests in Wurtemberg, to Frederick Lucas of the *Tablet*. The parcel containing them 'ought to have reached London yesterday and will, I trust, be remitted to your hands at all events before the end of this week'.³ Since his withdrawal of his address Professor Walter had issued a new one which seemed to be meeting with success and to which he (Walter) had given full publicity but there was a danger that the Prussian Government might stop it.]

I shall feel deeply obliged if in favouring me with an acknowledgment of the addresses, you will be so kind as to enclose a separate answer to the Wurtemberg clergymen which I have been requested to forward immediately to the Rev. Dr. Lichtenstein.⁴ Any reply with which you will be pleased to honour *our* address will of course be made public here, and therefore I feel anxious that it may not contain any strictures and otherwise natural animadversions on the condition of this country, as they would only

serve to exasperate our rulers and under present circumstances do us more harm than good but when

'... Erin's sad winter is past

And the hope that lived through it, shall blossom at last,'

We may greatly need a moral support from you in more than one respect, and we doubt not, we shall receive it.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 Sometime editor of the *Neue Wurzburger Zeitung*. Originally a Jew, he became a Protestant and then a Catholic.
- 2 Ferdinand Walter (1794-1879), jurist and champion of church rights against civil encroachment. See *New Cath. Ency.*
- 3 In the Repeal Association on 17 April O'Connell read two laudatory communications received by him from Germany, one from Berlin, dated 23 March 1844, from seven persons (Dr. Heinrich Ludwig Boltze, Ebrebreich Eichholz, Julius Berenas, Franz Marggrast, Wilhelm Pzterke, Heinrich Runge, Wilhelm Scheele) and a second from Bonn, dated 28 February 1844, from Ferdinand Nano Walter, professor of civil and canon law at the University of Bonn.
- 4 Rev. Dr. Charles Lichtenstein.

3070

To Miss Margaret O'Mara,¹

Merrion Square, 22 April 1844

My dear Margaret,

I wish to pay my respects to *your* Nuns tomorrow but as the Association sits at one I find I must go to you early, so I will go down by the half after nine train. I will go down without my breakfast so that unless you give me a cup of tea before ten I must starve till I return at one to the Association. If *your ladies* choose to come up with me I will have places kept for them.

My respectful and affectionate regards to your dear mother.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 13660

- 1 Margaret Cecilia O'Mara (died 1874), daughter of Thomas O'Mara and Margaret (née Callan) formerly Mrs. T. Fitz-Simon. Half sister of Christopher Fitz-Simon, M.P., Margaret married, 1 July 1845, James Netterville Blake, M.D. (died 1847), sixth son of Capt. Netterville Blake, Bermingham House, Tuam and Newborough, Co. Galway. Margaret married secondly in 1854 William Bowman.

3071

From Pierce Mahony

22 April 1844

Extract

I have just come from a dinner-party at Lord Anglesey's where he and all his circle expressed the greatest possible anxiety for your success and delight at the prospect of it. His parting words were: 'I greatly regret any differences between me and O'Connell and let him know that I sincerely wish him success and if I had power I would exert it on his behalf.' Mr. Blake and Lord Cloncurry were of the party.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.* II 321-2

3072

To Miss Margaret O'Mara

Friday the 3rd May 1844

Admit Miss O'Mara and her party into the seats
reserved for my family. Daniel O'Connell
To the Gallery Keeper
Conciliation Hall

Merrion Square, 1 May 1844

My dear Margaret,

Miss McDowell¹ told me you had expressed a wish to go to the next meeting of the Association as you had been disappointed on the last day. I therefore send you the above pass. It will answer for four ladies. I beg my kindest respects to your dear mother, to Miss McDowell and Alecia Lawless.

I do not know when I spent so delightful a day as I did on Sunday last.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 13660

- 1 Rose McDowell (c. 1821-1902), eldest daughter of Robert McDowell of Belfast. She died on 17 November 1902 at 45 Mespil Road, Dublin. Robert McDowell seems to have been the Protestant who acted as chairman of the Repeal banquet in honour of O'Connell in Belfast in January 1841 (see letter 2835).

3073

To Richard Lalor Sheil

Richmond Bridewell [Dublin], 19 June 1844

My dear Sheil,

I do not care a twopenny ticket for Wyse's motion.¹ The Irish people do not care a rush for it. They expect nothing from the English Parliament and have a vivid contempt for its proceedings but, besides this hatred of England, ought not commonsense be looked to? What in point of commonsense *can* possibly be the result of a night or two night's talk on such a motion? Certainly the Whigs this time are right. All Wyse will accomplish will be a knitting together once more the *disjecta membra* of the present party in power. Mind, I do not advise the motion to be given up because I do not advise at all on the subject. It is to me one of perfect indifference.

You express surprise and regret that the Irish members are not in London and, yet, you yourself, the long-admired 'pillar and glory' of Irish agitation, are absent from Dublin where Ireland is 'mewing her young strength.' You are absent in person and in *deed!* I, your once co-leader, am in gaol,² by a packed jury and most partial judge and, instead of at least enrolling *your name* amongst the Irish, you are calculating what you owe to the Whigs for having given you a place, and forgetting the ten hundred thousand claims Ireland has upon you. Sheil! Sheil! this will never do. I say it in the bitterness of sorrow but in the absence of disrespect. It will never do. The man who does not rally *with us* against the Attorney-General and the Trial is really *against us*. Now what have the Irish section of the Whigs done under such unparalleled circumstances, with the people boiling up at every side but still obedient as if they were under military command? Not the least shadow of danger of an outbreak or of any violence — tranquillity the most perfect. What is the Irish section of the Whigs doing? Nothing. Yet those of Belfast — the Whigs of Belfast — have set them an example.³ Could not your other Irish Whigs follow even that example? But no! Oh; plague take the shabby set! the Duke of Leinster — his name operates like a vomit — is getting up with Peter Purcell dinners for pig feeders and calf fatteners!⁴ Lord Miltown sent me a salmon — good for Friday — and Lord Cloncurry sent me his card. I am amused at condescending to have even the appearance of being angry with such beings. The Irish Orangemen are more friendly to Ireland than the Irish Whigs. But I have cheerfully done with them.

I am bound to say, and I say it readily and gratefully, that Lord John Russell has behaved exceedingly well respecting these trials.

I certainly will not advise Smith O'Brien to go over. He is doing

infinitely better where he is. He has as little taste for the Whigs as I have after the *exclusion* of Repealers. It would have been wiser not to insult us. You however may be assured that the Irish people will in future look to nothing but themselves. They will not revolt nor rebel but they are and will be in an attitude to avail themselves of the first day of peril to England to require conciliation. Adam appears in a Dutch play in boots and spurs, fully equipped at all points, coming on ———— *to be created*. The Irish are peaceably waiting ———— *to be conciliated*.

This plan, you may say, will not succeed. Be it so, for argument's sake. But there is no other that has any chance of success. I however must say that this plan, if persevered in, must be successful. The continued *pain* arising from such a state of things will overcome the strongest resistance. The Irish people are conscious of their strength, and that safety as well as strength consists in continued pacific exertion; and they know that success must result from both strength and safety.

You see we have opened the door to admit Federalists⁵ amongst us, and I never knew any man in private who was not a Federalist at the least. I no longer presume to advise you to join though surely the Whigs might permit you to go *so far*.

Adieu, my dear Sheil. God bless you! Be assured of my friendship and personal regard. I am sorry, sincerely sorry, we part in politics but I am ever alive to the many claims you have on my gratitude as a private friend and a public man.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 322-4

- 1 On 19 June Wyse gave notice that on 2 July he would move for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the formation of the special jury list at the late state trials of O'Connell and his associates (*Pilot*, 21 June 1844). On 25 June Wyse consented to a request from Peel to postpone his motion pending a decision concerning the verdict of the trial by the law lords (*Pilot*, 28 June 1844). On 29 July Wyse received a vote of thanks from the Repeal Association for his parliamentary endeavours on behalf of the state prisoners (Auchmuty, *Wyse*, 192).
- 2 For an account of O'Connell's trial and imprisonment see letter 3039 nl.
- 3 A meeting of reformers was held in Belfast on 7 June at which an address was voted to O'Connell, expressing disapproval of his prosecution and imprisonment. Several of the speakers at the meeting were Protestants (*Northern Whig*, 8 June; *Times*, 11 June 1844).
- 4 A few days previously the Dublin newspapers carried an advertisement for an agricultural show in Dublin in August organised by the Royal Agricultural Improvement Society of Ireland of which Leinster was president and Peter Purcell a prominent member. The events being organised included a public banquet.

- 5 Probably a reference to the weekly meeting of the Repeal Association on 27 May when O'Connell stated that Federalists and Repealers were both opposed to the Union. He intimated that he regarded Federalists as political friends (*DEP*, 28 May 1844).

3074

To Miss Margaret O'Mara

Richmond Bridewell, 21 June 1844

My dear Margaret,

Many thanks for your kind reply to my note. I am exceedingly grieved that there should be any coolness between any of my family and your dear mother or your dear self. At all events there is nothing on my part but esteem and regards for you both.

If Wednesday about two o'clock suited yours and your dear mother's convenience I should take care to have you at once admitted. I need not tell you that I should be most gratified if Rose¹ would condescend to accompany you *here*. She is indeed all you describe her and more both in head and heart. In fact she is *one* of the most superior women I ever met with intellect, sound judgment and fascinating sweetness. Unless she comes with you I suppose I shall never see her again.

I am anxious to know how I can *make up* the species of quarrel between my family and yours if you and your mother permit me.

Present my most affectionate respects to your dear mother and believe me always, my dear Margaret, your affectionate kinsman,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 13660

- 1 In his *Young Ireland*, (530-31) Charles Gavan Duffy writes: 'During the whole period of his imprisonment O'Connell was an unsuccessful wooer. He was labouring under the most distracting influence that can possess a man of his years, a passionate love for a gifted young girl who might have been his granddaughter.' Duffy was referring to Rose McDowell.

3075

*To Roger Read and Charles Magee and Co. Banbridge, Co. Down,
25 June 1844, from Richmond Bridewell, Dublin*

Gratefully acknowledges receipt of 'splendid present of damask table linen of superb beauty from Roger Read and Charles Magee and Co. Banbridge, and begs leave to recommend their native manufacture to the friends of Ireland.'

SOURCE: National Museum of Ireland, H29-1948

3076

From William Fagan

Feltrim, Cork, 21 July 1844

Copy

My Dear Sir,

I have received your valued present and kind note accompanying it. Be assured that I will during my life cherish both the one for its extraordinary fidelity as the portrait of one for whom on public and private grounds I feel so much respect and gratitude, the other as a memorial of your friendship for so humble an Irishman as myself. . . .

Before this reaches you you will have read in the [*Southern*] *Reporter* the report of the meeting for the erection of the conciliation hall in Cork. You will agree with me that there was not much tendency to conciliation in the proceedings. I went there in the spirit suggested by the *Nation*, that is, anxious to merge minor differences in the common object of 'Domestic Legislation,' and wholly divested of any personal feelings either of pique or hostility on one side, or partiality on the other, as regards the two sections of *Liberals* in this city. I felt I was risking the compromise of the public station I have the honour to fill¹ by giving to a meeting about which I was not consulted, and the calling of which by three influential gentlemen without any reference to me, was undoubtedly a slight and an indirect vote of want of confidence in me. . . . I know that two of the gentlemen who signed the requisition had no intention to slight me, and the third is too high minded and straightforward to do anything indirectly or to disguise any motive for any act of his; and at the meeting he disclaimed any such intention.

Well — I went to the meeting. Whether the prominent speech of the evening was arranged under the impression that my absence was *recused* by the plan adopted I do not know but this is certain that the

greater portion of it was a covert attack against myself without any foundation whatever for the insinuations of the reverend gentleman —² But let that pass.

It was stated by Mr. Hayes that he received a message from a high quarter (I suppose from you) to sign the requisition. There can be no question of his receiving such message for he is incapable of stating what is not true. If you advisedly recommended that no requisition to call such meeting should be presented to me, but that private citizens should do so, you must have done this under the influence of misinformation regarding me. . . .

I entered the agitation maintaining, as you know, certain opinions. I have since honestly cooperated with you. If the policy suggested by the *Nation* was to be sincerely carried out in Cork, I was from those known opinions the very best instrument to be employed but very estimable men here are annoyed that I do not join them against Serjeant Murphy. Now in my opinion . . . our prudent course is not to coerce — to leave circumstances to convince Serjeant Murphy, as they did Smith O'Brien, . . .

I certainly am disappointed with the reply lately made by Serjeant Murphy. It was exceedingly injudicious. Still I do not despair of his coming completely round. If he does not, and persists in offering himself again to represent Cork, I fear the result will be the loss of the city to the popular party. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 As mayor of Cork for 1844.

2 Rev. William O'Sullivan (died 27 Feb. 1878), C.C. St. Patrick's, King Street, Cork from before 1836 to 1872; parish priest and canon of Blackrock, Cork, 1873-78.

3077

From John Primrose, Jr.

Denny Street, Tralee, 30 July 1844

My dear Liberator,

I this day paid the premium of the policy on John Scott's life. I send you the voucher I got from the agents. They have not yet got the regular receipt from London but expect it daily. When they do receive it they will forward it to me. In the meantime preserve the enclosed with care. . . . I had a letter from J. Sugrue saying I need *not* go to Cork. Thank God you are rid of that terrific responsibility.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13647

3078

To his daughter Betsey Ffrench

Richmond Bridewell [Prison], [Dublin], 1 August 1844
My darling Betty,

I had great pleasure in receiving your letter as it told me of your good health. . . . Do not think of leaving Derrynane whilst it continues to agree with your children. . . .

We all enjoy excellent health and spirits. We are quite gay and cheerful as larks. One entire sixth of my imprisonment is over. I call it one sixth because I have no rational expectation of the writ of error being decided in our favour.¹ . . .

SOURCE: Kenneigh Papers

- 1 That is, the appeal to the House of Lords against the judgment in the state trials (see letter 3039 nl).

3078a

To Thomas Lyons

Richmond Bridewell, 1 August 1844, 3rd Month of the Captivity
My Dearest Friend,

I sent you by the mail a proof print of my portrait by Carrick.¹ I ask your acceptance of it because it is a likeness of the most sincerely attached friend you have living. It is a token of affectionate regard, of gratitude, of respect. I know no man to whom I am more indebted or who brings so great a weight of personal character and of private worth to the service of his unjustly afflicted country.

SOURCE: Property of Mr. Thomas J. O'Shaughnessy, Ballyard, Tralee, Co. Kerry

- 1 Thomas Carrick. On 26 June 1844 an engraving of Carrick's recently painted portrait of O'Connell was published in London. A native of Carlisle, Carrick (1802-1875) was a celebrated miniaturist.

3079

From Richard Dowden

Rathlee, Sunday's Well, Cork, 3 August 1844
My dear Sir,

. . . All your franks are long gone from me all over the world, and I

have no notion of being cajoled out of three or four of your private letters which I possess and as you love to live again in your family so I can leave to my daughter your letters as a memorial of one whom she honours and indeed has loved since she was an infant. I must tell you as you can feel a parent's pride, this girl of mine at fifteen, her present age, has both a mind and heart. She has bought a Repeal button and although I am content to work the cause, she bravely amidst some small sneering and petty ridicule wears the badge, quietly but steadily defending her right to be national. This girl does me instead of a son. She is a firm teetotaller and without pride or rudeness quietly appears wherever Father Mathew is carrying on his great work. . . .

At present we are not half as divided as some things would lead you to suppose¹. Our friend the mayor² is very sensitive and the Rev. Wm. [O'] Sullivan forgets sometimes that obedience to the church does not in our notion go into civil things. However, these little explosions, experimental balloons, being let off, our atmosphere will clear and I have no doubt of fair breezes and easy sailing for the future.

SOURCE: Dowden Papers

- 1 See letter 3076.
- 2 William Fagan.

3080

From Richard Dowden

Rathlee, Sunday's Well, Cork, 11 August 1844

My dear Sir,

Permit me to thank you for enabling me to give your two autographs to my fair friend and one to my daughter. I found it hard to read to her your too kind note, and it cost her blushes and tears ready to fall, but she managed that part of her emotion cleverly: however *your* words are, I think, stored up where such praise is not in vain. As for me I wish my desert came near your estimation, and I would pay you by more zeal and diligence. I feel sincere misgivings however that you do not know half the wants which ought to be supplied by your co-workers in the great object of 'making those a people who were not a people'. . . .

How few men can be so unselfish, so self-forgetting in one way and so chary of his honour too as to rejoice in imprisonment which is a step to his country's enfranchisement. I own when I visited you *within the walls of a prison*, my sense of what you were working out

forsook me, and I only saw in grief and indignation our country's true servant and eminent leader a prisoner because of his power and his virtue. I am not nor cannot get free of those feelings. I fully believe your imprisonment has done twenty years work in leading us to full and unembarrassed nationality, and that you are above all regrets in the joy of your 'magnificent' labour. Yet denied your heart-prized freedom of action, animally, intellectually loving to be free, the imprisonment is severe and but for your country's cause I know not how you could endure it unbroken. Your sermons on peaceful and enduring energy are sermons of deeds and are worth a world of words to us and to our times.

What an infamous system is this security for good behaviour! Why the fines seem to be contrary to *Magna Carta* and seven years security is the surveillance of more than continental tyranny. . . . Even in civil things a clerk of £50 a year has to give security of two fiftys and himself in a hundred often. . . .

As respects Repeal, this country must be yet as free of England as it is of France. Except commercial intercourse and the rational *bonds* of free nations we want no 'ligature.' Our insular position, our growing opulence of mind and property all say we ought [be] adult free men, not children or serfs; and it would be England's interest as well as ours. . . .

I was speaking to Dr. Gray¹ about Canada. England ought to make Canada a present to Canada. She costs too much to keep her half manacled. A discussion on the subject would be an abstract form in which Ireland's case would among many get a temperate examination. The lust of *imperiates* is dragging down England, it prostrated Napoleon and all his warlike hosts. Canada would be the exemplar of sound policy. For Ireland its nationalism ought be discussed for England's, Ireland's and Canada's sakes.

SOURCE: Dowden Papers

- 1 John Gray, M.D. (1816-1875), Protestant, third son of John Gray and a native of Claremorris, Co. Mayo. Editor and part-proprietor of *Free-man's Journal* from 1841, sole proprietor, 1850. Convicted with O'Connell for conspiracy and imprisoned in Richmond Bridewell, May-September 1844. M.P. for Kilkenny city 1865-75; knighted 1863. See *DNB*.

3081

*From J. Sheridan*¹

[Morning] Advertiser Office, London, 12 August 1844
My dear Mr. O'Connell,

In offering to you, which I do from my heart, my profoundest sympathy in your position and my deepest indignation at the unfair and unconstitutional means by which you have been placed in it I take the liberty of introducing to you a friend of mine, Mr. Grant² — a gentleman not unknown to literary fame — long associated with liberal principles and who now visits Ireland as I believe with a view of laying an impartial statement of her condition, physical, moral, social and political before the general public.

The conduct of the government in the late prosecutions has I am truly gratified to perceive created amongst the middle classes of this country a most acute sense of the persecuting spirit which has characterised its Irish policy and indeed I have on more than one occasion heard the Irish policy of Peel denounced in stronger terms than I would myself venture to give utterance to. I hope however that all will turn out for the best. Yet with all our admiration of moral force to which only our judgment tells us that [we] can appeal with advantage, it is you must admit difficult to look at the present state of affairs and keep our temper.

With heartfelt wishes for your triumph and that of our country over the common enemy I am, my dear Mr. O'Connell, with a zeal which nothing less than the tyranny of which you are the victim could have excited

Most faithfully,
J. Sheridan

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Sheridan, an Irish journalist and one of the parliamentary reporters of the London *Times* who stated in 1833 that they would not report O'Connell's speeches (see letter 1996 note 2; *The History of the Times, 1785-1841*, London, 1935, 314).
- 2 James Grant (1802-79), Scottish Calvinist and journalist; editor of the London *Morning Advertiser*, 1850-71. Author of many books including *Impressions of Ireland and the Irish*, (two vols., London, 1844). This work contains an interesting account of his visit to O'Connell in prison. See *DNB*.

3082

To his son Maurice

Richmond Bridewell [Dublin], 17 August 1844

My own dearest Maurice,

I am extremely satisfied with your proceedings. It was monstrous in Primrose to keep the lands in Carhen on hands. I never knew any man less qualified for agency than he is. Let them at the best secure rent you can. Give abatements to the tenants wherever you deem it necessary. Continue the statements [*sic*] in the manner you have done. I give you the greatest latitude as to every person on my lands.

...

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

3083

From Stephen Murphy

58 Dawson Street [Dublin], 17 August 1844

My dear and venerated Liberator,

Pardon me for a moment trespassing upon your attention.

Mr. John Reynolds having announced himself as a candidate for St. Andrew's ward in opposition to our present representative in the town council, Mr. Wm. Reynolds.¹

I in common with the vast majority of the burgesses disapproved of such opposition, conceiving that Mr. William Reynold's conduct and public services to be such as to deserve *our continued* support.

Mr. John Reynolds has however thought proper to speak in no very measured terms of myself, and yesterday . . . threatened . . . that he would on the first public opportunity hold the private characters [of] my brother and myself up to public odium, that he had marked us well. I hold such a threat in perfect contempt but I feel that I could not pass over in silence an attack on my private character.

I therefore deem it my duty to abstain from any course which you would disapprove of, and place myself entirely in your hands and in strict obedience to your oft repeated commands, I decline taking any step in the matter except under your guidance.²

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

1 William Reynolds, silk mercer, 81 Grafton Street, Dublin.

2 William Reynolds retained his position as town councillor for St. Andrew's ward. John Reynolds was not elected in 1844.

3083a

To M. O'Dwyer,¹ Esq.

Richmond Bridewell [Dublin], 17 August 1844

My dear O'Dwyer,

For heaven's sake answer one question that I may know whether you be the man I have so long known and regarded. *What has Peel done to conciliate Ireland?* I implore of you to say something.

The Charities bill² — worse than humbug. I solemnly assure you it does nothing but insulting mischief.

Are you a man to be caught by a little — scarcely plausible — hypocrisy?

SOURCE: American Irish Historical Society

1 Unidentified.

2 The charities donations and bequests bill (see letter 3100, note 5).

3084

From John Hackett,¹ 6 Lr. Ormond Quay, Dublin, 19 August 1844

Sends O'Connell the present of a map of Ireland that he has charted and has superintended its preparation at the Ordnance Survey office.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 Civil engineer and land surveyor.

3085

From James A. Smith

14 Soho Square, London, 19 August 1844

Private

My dear Sir,

I beg to send you in a separate envelope an address¹ to you from Lords Shrewsbury, Camoys² and other English Catholic Noblemen and Gentlemen, three of our Bishops and a few priests, chaplains of some of the gentlemen to whom the address was sent for signature. As it would have been inconvenient to have sent the engrossed address over all England for signatures I have added the names obtained to it, and have enclosed the papers with the original signatures in an envelope now also sent.

Lord Camoys and I went over a list of names and we selected those only of such gentlemen as we thought should be applied to. Lords Clifford and Arundell of Wardour³ are the only Peers applied to who have made no return and a *few* gentlemen have acted in like manner. Of the clergy none but the *English* Bishops were applied to. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The address is not extant. It expressed a strong condemnation of the recent state prosecution of O'Connell by prominent English Catholics (*FJ*, 24 Aug. 1844).
- 2 Thomas (Stonor), third Baron Camoys (1797-1881).
- 3 Henry Benedict (Arundell), eleventh Baron Arundell of Wardour (1804-62).

3086

*From James Whiteside*¹

The Granby, Harrogate [Yorks], 5 September 1844

My dear Sir,

Let me congratulate you on the result of the appeal to the Lords. It has ere now released you in time to enjoy a stag hunt on the mountains. I hope the confinement has not impaired in the least your health. You had in your favour Baron Parke,² equal to any gown of the English Bench; Lord Denman, the head of the Bench, whose integrity nobody can question; and Lord Cottenham,³ the best Chancellor since Lord Eldon.

I consider Lord Denman's judgment in the challenge to the jury panel⁴ as the most important of the whole. Your case will have the effect of reforming our existing system of criminal law as to appeals.

It appears to have been borrowed from Rhadamanthus,⁵ who punished first and enquired afterwards.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 327

- 1 James Whiteside, Q.C. (1804-76), made a notable speech in defence of O'Connell at the state trials in 1844; leading counsel for William Smith O'Brien, 1848; Tory M.P. for Enniskillen 1851 and Dublin University, 1859-66. See *DNB*.
- 2 James Parke (1782-1868), knighted 1828. Baron of the court of exchequer. Created Baron Wensleydale, 1856. See *DNB*.
- 3 Charles Christopher (Pepys), first Baron Cottenham (1781-1851); lord chancellor of England 1836-41 and 1846-50. See *DNB*.
- 4 In his judgment Denman declared 'that if it is possible that such a practice as that which has taken place in the present instance should be allowed to pass without remedy . . . trial by jury itself, instead of being a

security to persons who are accused, will be a mockery, a delusion, and a snare' (*Lords Journal*, LXXVI, 1844, appdx. 4, 54). The *Times* of 5 September 1844 prints all the judgments but has the above quotation from Denman's judgment in a slightly different form though the same in substance.

- 5 Greek mythological figure, one of a tribunal who judged the souls of the dead on their arrival in Hades.

3087

To William Smith O'Brien

Merrion Square, 11 September 1844

My dear O'Brien,

I return you the letters. If I had any intimation that you were coming here I would have waited for you. Of course I am *never* denied to you.

My opinion is that no notice of the transaction should be taken. *That* would I think give the matter a fictitious importance — just what Vokes¹ would like. The flag which had little about it, has been removed at once by the people and is not to be *erected* again. I would let the affair drop. If, however, you think otherwise I will do anything you deem useful. Indeed I should prefer acting in such a matter on your opinion than on my own. My general lecture² next Monday will *cover every* disposition to outrage.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 434

- 1 Thomas Philips Vokes, a stipendiary magistrate for Limerick city.
2 In the Repeal Association on 16 September O'Connell, appealing to the people to remain tranquil, declared: 'Our doctrine is that no revolution is worth the sacrifice of one drop of human blood — that no amelioration of human institutions is worth the sacrifice of one human life' (*FJ*, 17 Sept. 1844).

3088

*From Morgan O'Connell*¹

Liverpool, 13 September 1844

My Dear Sir,

Allow me to tender to yourself and through you to your fellow martyrs my sincere congratulations for the great constitutional victory you have obtained over the enemies of Ireland. Looking at the past events and considering the advantages to be gained by a union of the whole liberal party, I take leave to submit a few reflections

which would very much tend to accomplish that most desirable object if they could be carried out with due regard to the feelings and opinions of a very large and influential body in this country who feel deeply in the happiness of Ireland.

I think after a little while the whole liberal party in this country would unite to get Ireland a federal government but of the Repeal they entertain the strongest objections.

Monster Meetings — These meetings alarmed the nervous and wealthy classes of reformers and they almost to a man united in opinion upon the necessity of putting them down, and the minister had their countenance and support in doing so. County Aggregate Meetings — These meetings convened by mayors or sheriffs and held in the public courts would meet the support of all shades of liberals and would have equal good effect.

Calling Names — The British people were sorely galled by the term “Saxon”. The liberals were as much incensed as the Tories and they withdrew from taking any part in public meetings convened on Irish affairs. Depend upon it that coarse names damage the cause.

Anti-Slavery — The abuse of the Americans have done great harm to Irish feeling in that country. Several American gentlemen told me that £50,000 or more would have been sent from that country to assist the Repeal cause but for this abuse of the people of the southern states. At meetings called for anti-slavery purposes it would be right enough to speak one’s opinion but the Americans say that it has often been dragged before meetings for Repeal unnecessarily and of this they complain most bitterly.

King of the French — Every abuse of this monarch gave more strength to the British government to crush Ireland and gained his assistance towards it. I am firmly convinced that we should have been at war with France at this moment but for the great assistance Peel knew he would receive from that monarch if he stood in need of it to conquer Ireland.

Union is strength — Make all the friends you can. Conciliate those who differ from you. Peel would not have dared to prosecute with the venom he did, did he not know that the offensive term, *Saxon*, brought to his support the wealth and thinking men of this country without distinction of politics. Abuse and coarse names have no moral might. They damage any cause.

Orangemen — These men can only be conciliated by the heads of their own party. As yet they have no confidence in anything promised by the Catholic people. . . . The Presbyterians of the North have a conscientious dread that if the Catholics got the power they would be crushed by penal statutes etc. . . .

Conciliation and Federal Government. — Never was there a more fitting time to bring about a union of liberals. For the last three years

they have dwindled into apathy in this country. A firm caution was never more necessary. . . .

Ireland has now a proud position. Let her strive to maintain it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 J. Morgan O'Connell, merchant, Liverpool, otherwise unidentified.

3089

From Thomas Collins, 10 Great College Street North, Camden Town, London, 16 September 1844, to Dublin

Tells of the neglect of duty of the lord-lieutenant¹ when ambassador at Lisbon. He made no effort to help the writer, a merchant at Lisbon (formerly a commissary in the British army during the Peninsular war) when legally victimised in Portugal and ruined.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 William (A'Court), first Baron Heytesbury (1779-1860), ambassador to Portugal from August 1824 to November 1827; lord lieutenant of Ireland from July 1844 to July 1846. See *DNB*.

3090

From Bishop William Walsh¹

Hotel de B. Fontaine, Rue de Grenelle, F. St. Germain, Paris,
18 September 1844

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

Business, connected with my distant mission, having detained me at Rome for some months past, I received before my departure, a most cordial and affectionate message for you from the Holy Father, which I hoped to have communicated in person long before now. But, two rigorous winters in Nova Scotia, and the excessive heats of an Italian summer, had so enfeebled my delicate constitution, that I was obliged to travel overland, and by easy stages, from the Eternal City.

When I had my audience of leave, I mentioned to his Holiness that on my return to America, I intended paying a visit to my beloved and venerated friend, the Liberator of Ireland, in his prison at Dublin. The Father of the faithful was pleased to speak of you in such warm terms as gladdened my heart. He desired me to convey to you his best wishes, to express his deep condolence for your captivity, and his earnest hope of your speedy liberation.

He also commissioned me to give you in his name his paternal and pontifical benediction. . . .

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 William Walsh (1804-58), a native of Waterford; educated St. John's College, Waterford and Maynooth. Ordained 1828; C.C. Clontarf 1828-34, C.C. Kingstown 1834-41; coadjutor to the bishop of Halifax 1842-44; bishop (archbishop from 1852) of Halifax 1844-58.

3091

To Dr. Henry Maunsell¹

Merrion Square, 21 September 1844

My dear Sir,

I am ashamed of, and ask your pardon, for leaving your important letter so long unanswered but its importance is the cause of my delay. I waited for a leisure moment to reply but, as that leisure never comes, I must give the best answer I can.

I wish — I most heartily wish — I *could* support your plan.² It really would be an important day for Ireland when a resolution respecting the state of legislation in Ireland could be proposed by *you* and seconded by me. But I cannot accede to your resolutions. You intend them, or, at least, they are calculated, as a substitute for Repeal and therefore cannot be adopted. That should be no reason why *you* should not bring them forward. You may be quite certain of a full, a fair, a most respectable hearing, and a candid and most courteous reply. I have seen the Lord Mayor,³ and if you could bring forward a discussion on your motion on Wednesday I should be there to procure the waiver of any technical objection, and to ensure that you and your friends should be fully heard. I confess I am anxious for a discussion before I leave town. I think we should, on all sides, express sentiments which it would be valuable to have circulated at the present moment. I think it would be better you should bring on the motion without any previous personal interview with me, but command me if you think otherwise.

If there is anything else I could do to facilitate the coming on of the discussion on Wednesday, I say again, command me.

What a country would ours be if 'idle jealousies and fears' did not prevent our universal combination for her restoration to self-government! I know those jealousies and fears *are* idle. Oh how anxious I am to demonstrate that fact!

Truly and sincerely grateful to you for the spirit in which your

note is written — I have, &c.,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 327-8

- 1 Henry Maunsell, M.D. (1807-79), 13 Molesworth Street, Dublin. Town councillor, Merrion Ward; author of several medical works; succeeded Remigius Sheehan as editor and proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Mail* in 1847. See *Boase*.
- 2 Henry Maunsell made a motion on 25 September in the Dublin Corporation which attracted wide notice. He proposed an address to the queen, praying her to hold her court and parliament once at least every three years in Dublin. He argued the scheme as a measure of self-defence for Irish Protestants, who, he declared, Peel was preparing to betray, and declared that his proposal if effected, 'would cut the unhappy ties that bound Irishmen to the tail of either English Whigs or English Tories'. The *Dublin Evening Mail* gave unqualified approval to Maunsell's proposal. O'Connell was present for Maunsell's motion in the corporation which failed to find a seconder. He declared he concurred in a great part of Maunsell's arguments, which, he said, only wanted the proper conclusion — Repeal (*F.J.*, 26 Sept. 1844; Duffy, *Young Ireland*, II, 87-8).
- 3 Timothy O'Brien.

3092

To William Smith O'Brien

Derynane, 1 October 1844

My dear O'Brien,

I had the honour to receive your kind note on my route through Rathkeale and at a time when I could not reply. Be assured I should have had great pleasure in paying you my respects at Cahirmoyle had time permitted. . . .

It delights me to tell you that when I left Dublin there was the best prospect of a powerful and influential rally for federative Repeal. It may break off without any effectual assistance to the great cause. The first step will be for the Federalists to display themselves. The second to appoint a committee of arrangement at which you and my son John should attend to secure us all from any compromise tending to render precarious the right of Ireland to 'legislative self-protection'. I do believe the men who are *about* to be prominent are sincere and inclined to go the full necessary length with us. Of course our duty is to avoid every delusion. And as to any compromise, *that* is not to be thought of. And indeed I do not hesitate to pledge myself to you most unequivocally not to consent to any arrangement which shall not have your full consent. This is the basis for our future action. Your judgement *must* be satisfied or mine *will* not. . . .

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 434

3093

From Timothy Byrne, 82 Grafton Street, Dublin, 1 October 1844 to Derrynane

Tells of his son, James Byrne, merchant, St. John's, Newfoundland, who desires the prayer books that have the prayer for O'Connell,¹ and many dozen of his 'late likeness'.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

1 See letter 3063 n5.

2 Probably that described by the *Dublin Evening Post* in July 1844 as 'a small but finely executed engraving, from a likeness by [Thomas] Carrick, painted but a few months ago.' (*DEP*, 13 July 1844). The engraver was William Holl, the younger.

3094

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 3 October 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

... I found everything in the best order here. I am in truth a great farmer and have certainly the best crop of hay in proportion to extent of ground or beyond it of any farmer in the province. The potato crop in this vicinage is excellent, considerably beyond the consumption of the growers and on that account a very probable source of wealth as the inhabitants of other districts are deficient in that necessary article of Irish food.

I found my pack in the high pride of beauty. It would delight any strong being capable of delight to see them and hear them *trail*. I had a splendid hunt yesterday.

All here are in perfect health and spirits. I am deeply indebted to my merciful God for my health and strength.

I am becoming very impatient to hear *authentically from 'the Federalists'*. *Are they at work?*

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 329

3095

To Christopher Fitz-Simon

Derrynane, 4 October 1844

My dearest Fitz-Simon,

I have not had any account of my sweet O'Connell¹ these last two days. Somebody ought to have written to me about him. I hope in God he is recovering.

As my darling Ellen is not to go to the Continent, surely you will give her the benefit of the Derrynane air so soon as she can leave O'Connell. Of course the sooner she comes the better.

SOURCE: Fitz-Simon Papers

- 1 His grandson, Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon, who died of typhus within a week.

3096

From Bernard McGarry, 141 Baggot Street, Dublin, c. 4 October 1844

Recommends Charles White for O'Connell's support in obtaining a post. Signs himself 'your faithful and devoted friend.'

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

3097

From Charles White, Donnybrook, Dublin, 4 October 1844, to Derrynane

Seeks a position as a newspaper printer or compositor and asks O'Connell to use his influence with Mr. Duffy, Dr. Gray or Mr. Staunton, the newspaper proprietors and editors. 'Now-a-days the business being monopolised by a few to the exclusion of the many.'

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

3098

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 8 October 1844

My dear Friend,

I have had great hunting. My pack is splendid: they killed six hares yesterday.

I do not agree with you as to a flippant designation of federation. The longer such a question is kept open the better. When you enter into details you give *handles* to your enemies to trace out difficulties and start objections. Instead of discussing whether there should or not be a federal connection quarrels would arise and parties would be formed and inflamed on the fitness of each minuter branch of the plan. Besides the objectors to the principle, men would start angry bye-battles on the *machinery*. We shall *first* ascertain that we have sufficient support to carry the principle. You think you will conciliate many by beginning your plan. I am sure you will create additional opposition and enmity. O'Hagan¹ will do well to ascertain, *and in writing*, the views of as many as possible but he ought to be cautious as to publication.

I am writing a letter² that will contain the *principles* of federation, leaving the details for future consideration.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 331

- 1 Thomas O'Hagan (1812-85), only son of Edward O'Hagan of Belfast. Called to the Irish bar, 1836. From 1836-40 he resided in Newry where he edited the *Newry Examiner* and in 1840 he removed to Dublin. Lord chancellor of Ireland 1868-74. Created Baron O'Hagan 1870. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 3100 n2.

3099

From his daughter Betsey Ffrench to Derrynane

Merrion Square, 9 October [1844]

My dearest Father,

Our poor little sufferer¹ still holds out but nothing more. He is dying, and this night or perhaps tomorrow morning will end his earthly career. He has received the rites of our Holy Church and surely no boy of his age was ever more fit to be called to the presence of his merciful God. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13645

- 1 Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon.

3100

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 12 October 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

The fatal news has reached me of the loss of my sweet boy,¹ one of the noblest creatures that ever lived. May the good God mitigate the sorrows of his dear wretched mother. My heart is heavy and sore.

My resource is to labour for Ireland. I had finished a long letter² for the Association on Monday and sent it off last night. I mean *to work* the rest of this day. My letter calls on the Federals to come forward now and gives them every encouragement. I hope O'Hagan will *act* on that letter. Shall I write to him? I most anxiously wish that *anybody* could get 'honest Tom Hutton'³ to take the matter up zealously. It ought to be the rallying point of *all* the Irish Liberals. Do *all* you can to rouse this spirit. The truth is that a strong Federal display made by and with men hitherto non-Repealers would induce the Ministry to strike and to canvass the terms on which the Irish legislature should be reestablished. You know the iron duke already assented to alter the basis of the connection between the two countries. Lord Cloncurry's letter⁴ is decisive of the fact.

But for my family affliction *all* would be well. This place is delightful. John, who alone suffered from imprisonment, has got *stout*. What a cruel blow to that best of men, poor Fitz-Simon!

[P.S.] I cannot *volunteer* on the charities bill⁵ circumstanced as matters are. Pray cut out and send me O'Malley's⁶ *first* letter.⁷

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 332

- 1 His grandson, Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon.
- 2 O'Connell to the Repeal Association, 12 October 1844 (*FJ*, 15 Oct. 1844). In this long letter O'Connell advances arguments to allay Protestant fears of Repeal, and declares that Repealers and Federalists share many of the same aims. The letter could be interpreted as a retreat by O'Connell from the full programme of the Repeal Association.
- 3 Thomas Hutton (died 1865), Elm Park, Nr. Drumcondra, Co. Dublin and Grange Foyle, near Strabane, Co. Tyrone; a rich Presbyterian coachbuilder; later a J.P. and D.L. for the city of Dublin.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 The charitable donations and bequests bill introduced by the government in the Lords on 18 June. It was a considerable improvement on existing legislation being more favourable to Catholic interests, but certain clauses in it were disliked. MacHale, accordingly, led an attack on the bill and a public denunciation of the measure was signed by thirteen members of the hierarchy and many of the clergy. From prison, O'Connell had let it be known that he regarded the bill as

- an insidious attempt to influence the doctrine, discipline and usages of the Catholic church, and the Repeal Association supported the dissenting bishops. The bill, however, was enacted on 9 August as 7 & 8 Vict. c. 97 (Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 66-8; Macintyre, *Liberator*, 281-2).
- 6 Thaddeus O'Malley (1796-1877), Catholic priest and political writer. Born at Garryowen, Co. Limerick, a Federalist and opponent of O'Connell on the poor law. See *DNB*.
- 7 O'Malley to the *Freeman's Journal*, 23 September (*FJ*, 27 Sept. 1844). This letter expressed support for the charitable donations and bequests bill.

3100a

To Pierce Mahony¹

Confidential

Derrynane, 12 October 1844

My Dear Mahony,

I expected to have heard from you on the subject of a Federal Declaration. It would serve yourself in some respect but it would serve the country infinitely if you would get up a Declaration similar to that of the Leinster Anti-Repeal.² Of course it could not be expected that you would get one by any means as numerous signed as the former; but circumstanced as the country is a Declaration in favour of Federalism by even a small number of *influential* persons would be of the utmost value, and would do you the highest honor. You know that things cannot possibly remain as they are; you know that if the People were not kept in hopes and under control, their natural tendency would be to a revolutionary convulsion; — you certainly understand this as well as I do; and you must feel how incumbent it is upon *us* to save the Country from any convulsion, and give it the benefit of a resident Nobility and Gentry.

Bestir yourself therefore I beg of you. You will see in the Paper of Tuesday next my Letter to the Association strongly suggesting to the Federalists to come forward. My heart is sore at a Domestic calamity³ but it would relieve me if I were able to contribute towards a movement so *suited* at the present moment, and so calculated to be of use to Ireland.

I mark this confidential because I shall consider it so; but I leave you at liberty to make any use of it which you may in your discretion deem available to the great purpose in view.

It is perfectly certain that the Aristocratic Federalists if they came forward *now* would be allowed to lead and conduct the cause; — a station which they may find it impossible to acquire hereafter;

especially in *any* event injurious to the power of the British Government; an accident which nobody can tell how soon it may occur.

At all events you may rely on my *discretion* as well as my anxiety to place the property and rank of Ireland at the head of the repeal Cause — federalist or otherwise.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 The word 'confidential' and the final paragraph and signature are in O'Connell's handwriting, the remainder of the letter in the hand of another.
- 2 The 'Leinster Declaration' in favour of the Act of Union which was organised by Pierce Mahony in 1830 (see letter 1721 n1).
- 3 The death of his grandson, Daniel O'Connell Fitz-Simon.

3101

From Pierce Mahony to Derrynane

Copy

3 Clifton Terrace, Monkstown [Co. Dublin], 15 October 1844

Private

My dear O'Connell,

The enclosed printed letter will make you aware of my position at this moment and since you left Dublin I have been day by day exclusively occupied *here* with Mr. James Kernan,¹ the barrister, preparing my answer to Mrs. Mahony's² bill against me and my cross bill against her.³ It is the heaviest professional matter I ever engaged in and I will not be released from it for another week. I then mean to devote my utmost energies to the getting up of a declaration⁴ such as you propose. I have not as yet had time to read your letter but I will do so this night.

I spent an hour with Lord Fortescue on the day he left this for England. He is decidedly in favour of Dr. Maunsell's plan⁵ and thinks that there are no substantial difficulties in the way and finding that it appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* some months ago,⁶ I suspect that it is a Whig project. He is opposed to a Federal Parliament.

Two days ago I received a letter from Mr. Francis Wyse asking me if I was engaged in such a declaration as you suggest, and if so, desiring his name to be affixed to it. I quite agree with you and so does Lord Fortescue, in thinking that things cannot remain as they now are and that the dangers you point out are quite visible. You

shall receive from me the most zealous and cordial support because I am convinced that you and I have only the one object in view, namely, the prosperity and happiness of the British Empire and Ireland in Particular. Besides, I like to follow a great leader and not men with mere titles and without energy or talent.

P.S. I forgot to state that I have heard from good authority that Peel intends to found a Catholic College within the walls of old Trinity — 10 clerical Catholic fellows with the Catholic Primate and Catholic Archbishop of Dublin as visitors and one Common Senate as at Cambridge for the 2 colleges.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 James Kernan (1819-1900), 29 Upper Dorset Street, Dublin. Sixth son of George Kernan, Dublin; called to the bar 1840; Q.C. 1859; later a colonial judge. See *Boase*.
- 2 Margaret, widow of David Mahony.
- 3 Very probably in the case *Mahony-v-Mahony* which dealt with the estate of Pierce Mahony's deceased brother David (*Nation*, 7 Dec. 1844).
- 4 Concerning Federalism. In the beginning of November 1844 Thomas Davis wrote William Smith O'Brien a letter which included the passage: 'Of course you heard of his letter to Pierce Mahony to get up a Federalist Declaration. This converted Pierce, who showed the letter all over Dublin.' (Duffy, *Young Ireland*, 616).
- 5 See letter 3091 n2.
- 6 In the *Edinburgh Review* of January 1844 (LXXIX, No. 49, 189-266).

3102

To his son Maurice

Derrynane, 17 October 1844

My dearest Maurice,

[On payment of the college rents amounting to £713.16.7 to Rev. Dr. McDonnell,¹ bursar.]

... Be not uneasy about FitzPatrick. Say not one word about my letters to him. They are always *visible* letters.

Do not argue with anyone who says I have given up Repeal. Read the last words² of my letter and laugh at anybody who says I am not a Repealer. Remember '*Qui s'excuse, s'accuse*'. Good humouredly call anyone a blockhead who does not see that if the federalists of fortune and rank join us the Ministry will be driven to come to terms and grant an Irish parliament. All I want is to have some great Whig leaders join us.

Your darling boys are quite well. God bless you. Pray for me.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Rev. Richard MacDonnell, F.T.C.D. (1787-1867), bursar of Trinity College, Dublin, 1836-46; provost from 1852 until his death. See *Boase*.
- 2 O'Connell ended his letter on Federalism (see letter 3100 n2) by calling on the members of the Repeal Association for renewed activity, assuring them that Repeal was 'a mere question of time — the Repeal itself is certain. Hurrah, then, for the Repeal!' (*FJ*, 15 Oct. 1844).

3103

To William Smith O'Brien

Derrynane, 21 October 1844

My dear O'Brien,

It was only yesterday I received the paper of which you have enclosed a copy. It is the '*first project*' of the *Federalists*.¹ Its history or its contents are not to reach the press *from us*, nor is there to be any commentary in the papers until it has appeared authentically as the act of subscribing Federalists. Subject to this caution I submit it with the least possible delay to you for consideration. The principal *actor* in Dublin in the arrangement of this document is William Murphy, called of 'Smithfield'. He is a man who has acquired enormous wealth and has long been a principal 'brains carrier' of the Irish Whigs. A most shrewd, sensible man, Thomas Hutton, the very wealthy coachmaker, has assisted and is assisting. I could mention other influential, highly influential men. There is to be a Federalist meeting at Belfast on the 26th.² Caulfield,³ brother of Lord Charlemont, leads or presides. Sharman Crawford, Ross, the member for Belfast, and other notabilities attend. Hutton, who is a Presbyterian, goes there and passes through Armagh to muster as many important Presbyterians as he can, or at least to procure their signatures. O'Hagan, the barrister, attends the registry and will be at the meeting on the 26th. I do not know whether it will be a public meeting, but a publication will emanate from it. In short, the movement is on foot. The effect must in any case, as it strikes me, be useful. It annihilates mere Whiggery.

I had nothing whatsoever directly or indirectly, to do with the composition or the *material* of this document. I was merely sent a copy of it by a *third* person as soon as it was put into publication, and to you alone do I send a copy of it. I do not further *adjudge* its contents than considering them as a mere sketch. But this I say to

you, that your accession to the Repeal cause has been the efficient cause of this advance, and I do not hesitate to say further, and to *pledge* myself, not to assent to any plan for the restoration of the Irish parliament or to any of the details of any such plan that meets your disapprobation. *We* go together, that is, you go with me because I certainly will not go a single step without you. No man living has been more fortunate than you in the opportunities of showing personal independence. Whatever you do will be the result of your own judgment and, differ with me who may, I will not differ with you. If you were in my opinion so wrong as to violate principle I would *retire*. I would cease to act and would do so rather than join in any course I deemed unjust or injurious. But while I *do* act I will act with you. I am thoroughly convinced that without your accession to the Repeal cause years upon years would elapse before we made any impression upon the general Protestant mind. Ireland owes you an unlimited debt of gratitude, and the popular confidence in you can never be shaken. Consider then the document I send you attentively. Be prepared for its authentic publication. You probably will not commit yourself respecting its contents without *conference* as well as mature consideration. It is but a skeleton and wants nerve and sinew and flesh. There is enough for conference and there are some promising limbs but there must be more before we can consent to give it vitality.

I will not take one single step about it without giving you *previous* intimation and consulting with you fully and deliberately.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI 434

- 1 An extract from this declaration is published in Duffy's, *Young Ireland*, 609. It appears to have been the declaration which O'Connell had asked Pierce Mahony to set about drawing up (see letter 3101 n4).
- 2 See letter 3110 nl.
- 3 Hon. Henry Caulfield, D.L. (1779-1862), Hockley, Armagh. Younger son of first earl of Charlemont; M.P. Co. Armagh 1802-7, 1815-18 and 1820-30. See *Boase*.

3104

*To James Haughton*¹

Derrynane, 26 October 1844

My dear Friend,

Father Mathew must be relieved from all his difficulties —² difficulties brought on in the performance of that astonishing moral miracle of which he has been, under Providence, the instrument. It would be the basest ingratitude in the world not to make him

perfectly independent in pecuniary circumstances. It must not be.

Let us set about at once affording the remedy. I think you had better at once write to Mr. Purcell, and procure from him a list of those who have already contributed, and we will publish that list. This is the more necessary as it appears from a letter of Mr. Purcell's in the newspaper that several persons who signed the former requisition for the Mathew Testimonial, as it is called, did not subscribe; and it is but justice to such of us as signed that requisition, and also subscribed, to have the fact known. I do not want the names of those who did not contribute; we will give them the opportunity of doing so now especially as the present subscriptions ought to be an augmentation of the fund, though small, in the hands of Mr. Purcell's bankers — that is, the new contribution to be paid to the same account.

I cannot be in Dublin sooner than about the 24th of November. The moment I arrive I will join you actively in every arrangement for collecting the contributions. If in the interim any committee be appointed, pray do me the favour of putting my name upon it. I will assist you as much as I can from this place and will join you heartily the moment I arrive in Dublin, for the thing must be done. If Mr. Purcell's health permits him to join³ he will be of great use, as we must have no division or jealousy.⁴ *In short, the thing must be done.* I need not add that I will contribute again in addition to my former donation.

SOURCE: *Dublin Evening Post*, 31 October 1844

- 1 Though published, this letter was obviously not written as a public one.
- 2 Lavish expenditure and financial incompetence in the running of his temperance movement had by 1843 involved Fr. Mathew in debts amounting to some £7,000. Peter Purcell organised a collection in early 1843 but it yielded a net figure of little more than £1,000. In November 1844 a collection was inaugurated by a Cork committee which grossed £8,300. A meeting was held on 19 December at Exeter Hall, London, attended by Lord John Russell at which a subscription for Fr. Mathew was opened. Though saved by these means from destitution and despite a government pension of £300 a year granted him in 1847, Mathew continued in financial difficulties until his death (Patrick Rogers, *Father Theobald Mathew, Apostle of Temperance*, Dublin, 1943, 91-101; see also Samuel Haughton, *Memoir of James Haughton*, Dublin, 1877, 62-3, 69-70).
- 3 Purcell was at this time undergoing a 'severe and protracted illness' (*DEP*, 22 Oct. 1844).
- 4 Purcell and the Repealers appear at this time to have been at loggerheads (see *Pilot*, 25 Oct. 1844, quoting *Waterford Chronicle*).

3105

From P.V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 26 October 1844

My Dear Liberator,

... I have a letter from O'Hagan by this day's post stating that a meeting¹ of a few influential people is fixed to take place at Belfast today and that we shall then be able to judge definitively how far we may hope that the north will originate a Federal movement. Until the result of the meeting is known it is impossible to speak with any confidence on the subject. I give you the *ipsissima verba* from his letter, and he concludes by saying that he will be in town in the beginning of the week and call upon me early. I forgot to give you Dr. MacDonnell's note of the College rents² before you left town. He wrote to remind me of them and I now send his letter.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

1 See letter 3110 n1.

2 Due for the lands held by O'Connell from Trinity College:

3106

*To William Joseph O'Neill Daunt*¹

[Derrynane, c. 27 October 1844]

... I am exceedingly anxious that the subject of Federalism should not be introduced into the Association until I arrive. Do not enter into any vindication of me. Leave every misconception now afloat to continue to float until I reach the Association. We are on the very eve of knowing whether or not the Federalists will make a public display. If they do not do so *within a week*, I will again address the people, not to vindicate or excuse but to *boast* of the offer I have made and the spirit of conciliation we have evinced.

If, on the other hand, Ross, Crawford, Caulfield and Grey Porter² prepare a Federal plan, what a step will not that be in the Repeal cause — even if *we* continue *our* efforts without being actually joined by them? Let me then implore 'the charity of silence' until my experiment is worked out and that I take the lead in the field again. Silence then I *entreat* for the present.

SOURCE: O'Neill Daunt, *Personal Recollections*, II, 217-18.

1 According to O'Neill Daunt in his *Personal Recollections* (II, 215-17) O'Connell states in the unpublished part of this letter that his purpose

in writing his letter of 12 October 1844 on Federalism (see letter 3100 n2) was in part to test the sincerity of some prominent and influential Federalists; and dwells on the mischief which he fears will result from any interference with this experiment.

- 2 John Grey Vesey Porter, J.P., D.L. (1818-1903), Belleisle, Co. Fermanagh; elder son of Rev. John Grey Porter, Kilskeery, Co. Tyrone; high sheriff of Co. Fermanagh, 1844; joined the Repeal Association in April 1845.

3107

To Richard Dowden

Derrynane, 28 October 1844

My dear friend,

I enclose you the strongest letter I *could* write to Sir John Easthope. I heartily wish I could be of use to your friend but 'the good merry Lady' whom you quote, will, I much fear, find out as a fact that I am not *potential* with the worthy newspaper Baronet. We were once or twice on the point of not speaking to each other but it is quite true that he does what he pleases with the business of the paper. It is quite possible that at present he *may* chance to desire to lay me under a personal favour. I wish he may as that, I believe, is the only chance we have. There was another person of the name of Haynes¹ on the London press of whom I could not write in such satisfactory terms though I know nothing bad of him. But I am quite sure you would not get me to write for an undeserving person. I pin my faith on your sleeve.

I am delighted that they have elected you Mayor.² I hope to see you in your glory.

I beg my most respectful compliments to the dear "heiress".³ You know how I admire her powers of thought and honesty of determination. May the great God bless her.

SOURCE: Dowden Papers

- 1 Matthew Priestman Haynes, journalist, a native of Leicestershire. Educated at Oscott. In 1832 editor and proprietor of *Birmingham Political Union Magazine*; from Birmingham he settled in to the west of Ireland where he edited the *Mayo Telegraph*, *Connaught Journal* and the *Irishman* successively. He then worked as a reporter for the *Freeman's Journal* which he left after P.M. Lavelle's death which occurred in 1837, and joined the London press. See *Boase*.
- 2 Of Cork for 1845.
- 3 Dowden's daughter (see letter 3079).

3108

From William J. O'Neill Daunt

Loyal National Repeal Association, Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin
1844 [printed stationery], 29 October [1844]

Private

My dear Liberator,

Do not think me factious, for I premise by saying I will either *act* or *not act* as you think best. I am not so unwise as not to know that *you* see farther than *I* do.

I was desirous (subject to your approval) to speak in the Conciliation Hall to the effect that my own impressions gave a distinct preference to 'simple Repeal' as compared with Federalism, that having already given the reasons for such preference, which remained unaltered, I would not now repeat them but that, notwithstanding my unequivocal convictions on this head, I was not the less sensible of the wisdom of expanding the basis on which a struggle for local legislation could be made and that *this* was the policy of your recent letter on the subject. I meant to work out this last idea somewhat in detail. The utility of such a speech would in my mind consist in showing how an out-and-out 'simple Repealer' could yet consistently concur in the *policy* of your letter. It is on this head principally there are misconceptions afloat.

Federalism is not new in the Association. But a *preference* for it on the part of our leader is new. For when I made the speech¹ last winter sustaining the superiority of simple Repeal to Federalism, you then distinctly told me you thought I argued conclusively.

I think you may trust my discretion in not doing mischief. At all events I shall be guided by your judgment.

[P.S.] Richard O'Gorman said he did not wish me to publish the anecdote in my book.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Delivered by Daunt in the Repeal Association on 11 December 1843 (*Pilot*, 13 Dec. 1843).
- 2 The book was probably Daunt's *Saints and Sinners: A Romance Illustrating the Origin of Irish Outrage*, (Duffy, 1844). The anecdote has not been identified.

3109

To Thomas Davis

Derrynane, 30 October 1844

My dear Davis,

My son John has given me to read your Protestant philippic from Belfast.¹ I have undertaken to answer it because your writing to my son seems to bespeak a foregone conclusion in your mind that we were in some way connected with the attacks upon the *Nation*.² Now I most solemnly declare that you are most entirely mistaken. None of us has the slightest inclination to do anything that could in anywise injure that paper or its estimable proprietor, and certainly we are not directly or indirectly implicated in the attacks upon it.

With respect to the 'Italian Censorship' the *Nation* ought to be at the fullest liberty to abuse it; and as regards 'the State Trial miracle', the *Nation* should be at liberty to abuse not only that but every other miracle from the days of the Apostles to the present.

But we Catholics, on the other hand, may be permitted to believe as many of these miracles as we may adopt either from credulity or convincing proofs; at the same time that I see no objection to a Catholic priest arguing any of those points or censuring, in suitable and civil terms, opinions contrary to his own.

As to the Cork attack upon a Protestant proselyte you know that I publicly and most emphatically condemned it, as did the Catholic press of Cork.³ With respect to the *Dublin Review* the word 'insolence' appears to me to be totally inapplicable. All the *Review* did (and I have examined it again deliberately) was to insist that a man, who from being a Catholic became a Protestant, was not a fair or faith worthy witness in his attacks upon the Catholic clergy.⁴ Now, independent of that man's religion, of which I care nothing, there never lived a more odious and disgusting public writer; with one single exception, and that is the passage in which he praises you.⁵

The 'insolence' of the *Dublin Review* consisted, as I have said, of merely stating that a pervert from Catholicity who abused the Catholic clergy was a suspicious witness in declaring their guilt. Would you not have a right, if a person who from being a Protestant became a Catholic and abused the Protestant clergy, to state that his evidence against them ought to be considered as suspicious or even unworthy of belief? Yet for no greater offence than that the *Review* is attacked, and a high and a haughty tone of threatening assumed in speaking of it.

I really think you might have spared the insinuation that you and other Protestants were 'pioneering the way to power' for men who

would establish any sort of Catholic ascendancy. I know this, and I declare it most solemnly, that in the forty years I have been labouring for the public I never heard one bigoted expression, not only in our public meetings but in our committees and private discussions, from a Catholic but I have often felt amongst *some* of the liberal Protestants I have met with that there was not the same *soundness* of generous liberality amongst them as amongst the Catholics.

I hate bigotry of every kind, Catholic, Protestant or Dissenter, but I do not think there is any room for my interfering by any public declaration at present. I cannot join in the exaltation of Presbyterian purity or brightness of faith. At the same time I assert for everybody a perfect right to praise both the one and the other, liable to be assailed in argument by those who choose to enter into the controversy at the other side. But with respect to the *Dublin Review* I am perfectly convinced the *Nation* was in the wrong. However I take no part, either one way or the other, in the subject. As to my using my influence to prevent this newspaper war I have no such influence that I could bring to bear. You really can much better influence the continuance or termination of this bye-battle than I can.

All I am anxious about is the property in the *Nation*. I am most anxious that it should be a lucrative and profitable concern. My desire is to promote its prosperity in every way I could. I am, besides, proud as an Irishman of the talent displayed in it, and by no one more than yourself. It is really an honour to the country; and if you would lessen a little of your Protestant zeal and not be angry when you 'play at bowls in meeting rubbers', I should hope that this skirmish, being at an end, the writers for the *Nation* will continue their soul-stirring, spirit-enlivening strains and will continue to 'pioneer the way' to genuine liberty, to perfect liberality and entire political equality for all religious persuasions.

If I did not believe that the Catholic religion *could* compete upon equal and free terms with any other religion I would not continue a Catholic for one hour.

You have vexed me a little by the insinuations which your letter necessarily contains but I heartily forgive you. You are really an exceedingly clever fellow, and I should most bitterly regret that we lost you by reason of any Protestant monomania.

We Papists *require* cooperation, support, combination, but we do not *want* protection or patronage.

I beg of you, my dear Davis, to believe, as you may do in the fullest

confidence, that I am most sincerely.

Your attached Friend,
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: NLI MSS 129

- 1 Davis was in Belfast conducting negotiations with the federalists there (Gwynn, *Young Ireland*, 34).
- 2 This matter is dealt with by Charles Gavan Duffy in his *Young Ireland*, (II, 125-32). Denis Gwynn in his *O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill* (Cork University Press, 1948, 10-27) presents an interpretation which conflicts with that of Duffy.
- 3 The incident referred to concerned John Meagher, a schoolmaster, who had become a Protestant. On his first attendance at church in Cork city he was alleged by the *Tory Cork Constitution* to have been hooted and pelted by a Catholic mob, while his wife was assaulted and beaten. In the Repeal Association on 12 August, William McNevin, quoting this account in the *Constitution*, called on the Association to investigate its truth, and delivered a long speech in defence of liberty of conscience (*Pilot*, 14 Aug. 1844; see also *Pilot*, 19 Aug. 1844, quoting the *Cork Southern Reporter*, which states that the incident has been exaggerated).
- 4 This reference is to a footnote to pages 2 and 3 of an article in the *Dublin Review* of September 1844 (XVII, No. 33, 1-34) reviewing Parts I and II of Daniel Owen Madden's *Ireland and its Rulers since 1829* (London, 1844).
- 5 One section (pp. 247-55) of Part III of Madden's work praised a certain 'Dormer', a pseudonym for Thomas Davis.

3110

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 31 October 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

I am most impatient to have *some* conclusion to the Belfast Conference.¹ Of course, had O'Hagan written to you again, you would have let me know the details. I did indeed feel mortified this morning at finding that neither you nor the [*Dublin*] *Evening Post* gave me one word of intelligence of the Belfast Meeting. I suppose it has gone off upon some crotchet of Sharman Crawford. Perhaps I wrong him but I am afraid of his pertinacious attachment to his own opinion.

I am impatient to put an end to all *chaffing* about Federalism. It is surprising how stupidly the greater part of public talkers and writers take up a cry even when set on foot by the enemy as in the present case. My *explanatory* letter will be ready for Monday.² I do not say my *exculpatory* because I have no apology to make, and I remember

always the French proverb, *qui s'excuse s'accuse*. On the contrary I intend to boast of what I have offered and done, and in this instance I am convinced I was perfectly right.

See Quinlan³ and find out for me what is to be done relative to the full statement of *my case* which was to have been drawn up by Mr. Peacock.⁴ Mr. Leahy's book,⁵ though *highly highly* useful as far as it goes, is no adequate substitute for the full legal account of the entire case which Peacock was, I thought, to draw. I am the more uneasy respecting this statement because I myself wrote to Sir Thomas Wilde⁶ on the subject, urging the drawing of it and telling him that I would readily send a fee of from one to two hundred pounds to induce so able a man as Mr. Peacock to draw the case in the most careful manner. I have had no reply from Sir Thomas Wilde which, I own, surprises me. I beg of Quinlan to write to his correspondent and urge him to put me in the way of having the matter achieved in the manner most delicate to the professional feelings of Mr. Peacock. I will be impatient to have a reply from London.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 340-2

- 1 A small private conference of Federalists, including Hon. Henry Caulfield and William Sharman Crawford took place at the Royal Hotel, Belfast on 26 October. A Federal declaration was drawn up and sent to Dublin for the consideration of the Federalists there (*Northern Whig*, 5 Nov. 1844).
- 2 O'Connell to T.M. Ray, 8 November 1844 (*DEP*, 12 Nov. 1844). In this letter O'Connell declared that his experiment of wooing the Federalists had not so far proved successful, that they had not come forward with any specific plan or made any public movement. He added that it would be 'much better to lend our exertions to simple Repeal.' This letter was viewed by the *Nation* as an abandonment of Federalism, which, in fact, it proved to be (B.A. Kennedy, 'Sharman Crawford's Federal Scheme', in *Essays in honour of James Eadie Todd*, 249.)
- 3 John Quinlan, 14 Rathmines Mall, Dublin, journalist. Later editor of the *Dublin Evening Post*.
- 4 Barnes Peacock (1810-90), one of the counsel for O'Connell and his associates in their appeal to the Lords in 1844. Knighted 1859. See *DNB*.
- 5 David Leahy, barrister in London, only son of Thomas Leahy, late of Newcastle, Co. Limerick deceased. Editor, *Judgment of Lord Denman in the case of O'Connell and others against the Queen, as delivered in the House of Lords, Sept. 4, 1844* . . .
- 6 Leading counsel for O'Connell and his associates in their appeal to the House of Lords.

3110a

To John Faris¹

Derrynane, 31 October 1844

Sir,

I certainly did not intend *you* any offence by not answering your letters and if you be offended I am sorry for having occasioned it and ask your forgiveness. But you would not be angry if you knew how writing anything about that 'Lady' fills me with disgust. She as usual affected perfect readiness to execute the deed you prepared until she got my money and then according to her equally usual practice refused to be bound by her bargain. I own I felt unconquerable vexation on this last occasion. Yet I now tell you my definitive determination.

I mean to be in Dublin about the 23rd November. I *must* preside at the municipal election of my Ward² on the 25th. I shall then be glad to see you. I will at all events *then* pay you your costs and also execute the deed on my part if you can deliver it to me perfected on her part. If the matter be not *closed* by you I will never again listen to any proposal on her part.

SOURCE: Office of Public Works, Dublin.

1 John Faris, solicitor, 6 Henrietta Street, Dublin.

2 O'Connell was an alderman for the Four Courts ward.

3111

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 2 November 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

I cannot well describe the anxiety I feel to hear from you. You broke off by telling me that O'Hagan was busied at Belfast arranging some federal demonstration.¹ There the intelligence stands still. Off and on I ought to be apprised before *now* of *the fact*. I suppose indeed that the movement for federalism has been quashed by the Whigs in the Murphy² line and by the Tories and *crotchets* in the Protestant and Radical sections. Be it so. But I should know *the fact*. I do indeed collect that fact from your and Conway's emphatic silence. But I ought to be informed of the details, as it is my duty to address the 'hereditary bondsmen' as speedily as I possibly can.

Do you know that I have feelings of despondency creeping over me on the subject of this year's tribute?³ It seems to have dropped

almost stillborn from the press. In former years, when the announcement appeared, it was immediately followed by crowded advertisements in the Dublin papers to meet and arrange the collection. The Cork, Waterford, Limerick, &c., newspapers followed but there is not one *spark* alight.

Can you help to dissipate these gloomy apprehensions?

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 342

1 See letter 3110 n1.

2 William Murphy. See letter 3103.

3 It was announced by advertisement in the Dublin newspapers in the last week of October that the O'Connell Tribute for 1844 would be taken up in all Irish parishes on Sunday 17 November.

3112

To P.V. FitzPatrick

3 November 1844

[No salutation]

It has just struck me that you must be ill, else I should have heard something from you. Pray let me hear from somebody of you and let me implore of you to take care of yourself. You are not at all sufficiently careful of yourself. Perhaps I may be said to be selfish in my anxiety for your health.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 342-3

3113

From P.V. FitzPatrick¹ to Derrynane

[c. 4 November 1844]

[*Part of letter missing*]

[Sharman] Crawford is most active, sincere and hopeful as regards Federalism. Hutton is, I have reason to think, especially and you know how honestly so. Your projected letter² seems however indispensable. Not a moment should be lost in issuing it and it should be of such a character as to rouse the sluggish and satisfy the doubters, two classes now unfortunately too large. The press has not tended to diminish their numbers. Conway knows nothing of the proceedings of the Federalists.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

1 Writer of letter identified by handwriting.

2 See letter 3110 n2.

3114

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 6 November 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

I clearly see now that the fault was mine, else I should sooner have heard from you. For my part, the illness¹ of the Fitz-Simons necessarily interfered with me, and since the expectation that I was to hear from you. Excuse me, you know I meant no disregard. I perceive the tribute to me will be to a considerable extent a failure this year: the fault certainly is not yours. Blessed be God's will.

I remain in this country near a fortnight longer. I intend to go to Tralee on the 18th, to Newcastle the next day, to Limerick the day following.² I believe I must travel slowly from that to Dublin, if the people recollect that on my way down I promised to go up slowly. But these things are easily forgotten, and I may be in Dublin on the 23rd early, if not the evening before.

All well here. I had some delightful hunting yesterday, one of the finest day's sport I ever saw.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 343

- 1 See letter 3099. Miss Fitz-Simon was also ill (see unpublished part of letter 3105).
- 2 O'Connell was received by large crowds in Tralee on 18 November. On 19 November he proceeded in triumphal procession to Newcastle, and on 20 November arrived in Limerick for a provincial banquet to the late state prisoners. The banquet was attended by Archbishop MacHale and Bishop Browne of Elphin, and amongst the attendance were eight M.P.'s, the mayors of Limerick, Cork, Clonmel, and Waterford; letters apologising for non-attendance were received from nine members of the Catholic hierarchy (*Pilot*, 20, 22 Nov. 1844).

3114a

To John Pigot Esq.,¹ Barrister at Law, at the Right Honble D.R.
Pigot's Merrion Square So., Dublin

Derrynane, 6 November 1844

My dear John,

I heartily congratulate you on your admission to the bar and most sincerely wish you success. If you make yourself master of *the Practice* of the Courts you will succeed but otherwise I think you can not.

I wrote many weeks ago to David² with a request that he would either personally or by you — who I thought was about to go to London — cause a search to be made in the British Museum respect-

ing a Memoir of an uncle of mine Count O'Connell. Will *you* do me the kindness to find out whether David got my letter, and if he did pray excuse me to him for having thought of giving him so much trouble and will you be so good as to let him know that I will write to another friend in London to do the job for me.

I beg my kind regards to your father and my respects to your mother and sister.

SOURCE: Property of Professor John Dillon, Drumnigh, Portmarnock, Co. Dublin

- 1 John Edward Pigot (1822-1871), a son of David R. Pigot. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin; called to the bar 1844. A Young Irelander he studied Irish music and old Irish literature. Practised law in India 1865-70. His obituary is in the *Nation* of 8 July 1871.
- 2 David Richard Pigot, Jr. (c. 1824-1906), brother of John Edward Pigot. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin. Called to the bar 1846. Sometime master of the court of exchequer.

3115

*To Thomas M. Ray*¹

Derrynane, 7 November 1844

My dear Ray,

I send you a letter² from New York, and an address to me from the Repealers of that city, together with a draft on Baring Brothers for £500. I wish I could be personally present to reply to the address and to speak of the splendid support we receive from the true-hearted friends of old Ireland in New York.

Pray get Maurice to make commemoration of the generous liberality of our American friends.

It will delight them to hear of the bright prospects that open before us of restoring the nationality of our beloved fatherland by a combination of Irishmen of every sect and persuasion in the cause of Irish legislative independence. Pay all honour to our friends in New York.

I intend, please God, to be in the Association on Monday, the 25th, in full health and renewed anxiety to forward the cause of old Ireland.

We had glorious hunting on Tuesday, 5th, and today nothing could be more splendid. The weather fine, the scent lying, and cry magnificent, and continued from the start to the death — near two hours.

In my letter about the Rechabites³ the word 'tents' is printed 'tenets'. The Rechabites call their lodges *tents*. Correct the copies to

send to Scotland.

SOURCE: *Pilot*, 13 November 1844

- 1 Though Ray read this letter to the Repeal Association on 11 November (*Pilot*, 13 Nov. 1844), O'Connell clearly intended it as a private letter.
- 2 At the Repeal Association on 11 November, Maurice O'Connell read this letter from the United States Repeal Association, New York City, enclosing £500 (*Pilot*, 13 Nov. 1844).
- 3 The Independent Order of Rechabites founded in 1835 were a British temperance organisation (the original Rechabites were a nomadic religious group in the Old Testament who abstained from wine). At the Repeal Association on 4 November 1844 a letter from O'Connell to the Association, dated 28 October, was read. In it he asked the Association to inform Catholic clergy and Repeal wardens in Scotland that the Rechabites were a worthless and illegal organisation. He described them as 'calculated to do very great mischief and to introduce a very bad spirit amongst the working classes,' and urged Repeal wardens not to accept subscriptions from them. O'Connell's letter was widely published and provoked a reply, dated 12 November 1844, from the editor of the *Rechabite Magazine* published in its issue of December 1844.

3116

To William Smith O'Brien

Derrynane, 9 November 1844

My dear O'Brien,

I entirely agree with you that if the Repeal of the Union were to bring about such a state of things as would prevent any one Protestant or Catholic from believing or saying whatever he might think consistent with truth I would resist that repeal to the uttermost. In point of religion our struggle is to obtain perfect religious freedom for all. This is the principle I have avowed and acted upon for near fifty years of my political life — perfect freedom of conscience for *all* and for *every* one.

I do not believe there is the least danger of any bigotry tainting 'the Association' not the least. I am thoroughly convinced that any sentiment of that kind would be scouted with unanimous execration.

It is not *so* with the newspapers — personal interests are involved in them. As long as I have been an *agitator* I have observed much acrimony amongst the public writers. They use every topic to annoy one another and to *transfer* circulation. But the course of the Association seems plain. It is most cautiously to avoid involving ourselves in the newspaper squabbles. We must not be identified with any of

them and they will the sooner cease their mutual recrimination. I am quite sure you agree with me that the Association ought not to be directly or indirectly a party to *these feuds*. . . . The *Young Ireland* quarrel is, I believe, at an end. The writers at both sides in that strife were contributors to the same paper, *The Vindicator*. I do believe we shall hear no more from them.¹

But it will be more difficult to appease the anger of the *Nation* and 'the Irish Priest.'² I had a letter from Davis written to my son John on that subject³ and I candidly told him my opinion that in the attack on the *Dublin Review* he was much in the wrong. I have of course lost all influence with him and you will have perceived by the *Nation* of Saturday the 2nd that the writer is in *no good temper* with me.⁴ What then can I do? I believe nothing but to keep clear of the adverse parties and obtain your assistance to keep the Association quite disengaged from the controversy. On the details of that controversy I will gladly talk with you when we meet if you permit me.

I am anxious if possible to confer with you before the report of the Charitable Bequests bill is published. The Catholic bishops meet on the subject of that act on the 12th inst. Their meeting will last three days. I could wish their meeting were over before we published. We might easily give offence if we were to publish at this particular moment. What we say or what we omit to say may be taken in bad part. Our not more emphatically condemning the bill *may* be attributed to a bad motive or at least to a desire to furnish an argument in its favour. I do therefore pray you to allow the report to stand over for another week or ten days.⁵

Sharman Crawford is certainly about to publish his plan⁶ and Grey Porter has his nearly ready.⁷

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 434

- 1 The *Vindicator* had accused the Young Irelanders of indifference in matters of religion.
- 2 The nom-de-plume of Rev. Professor Patrick A. Murray of Maynooth College in his undated letter to the *Weekly Register* (republished in the *Pilot* of 21 October 1844). Murray attacked the 'unCatholic' and 'infidel' spirit of the *Nation*. Charles Gavan Duffy replied in a letter dated 25 October 1844 (republished in the *Pilot* of 28 October 1844).
- 3 See letter 3109.
- 4 The *Nation* of 2 November declared that one of the factors creating confusion in the public mind was that 'O'Connell declared a preference for Federalism over Repeal.' It remarked that even if O'Connell did support Federalism, 'what reason is that for discouragement? Ireland is for Repeal; the Association is, and will remain, the Repeal Association, and if the people go on organising and educating, they can carry Repeal'.
- 5 On 18 November the *Pilot* published a lengthy editorial stating it had refrained from comment on the charitable bequests act pending the

conference of the Catholic hierarchy on that measure. It now came out in support of those bishops who opposed the act.

- 6 Crawford published a series of letters outlining his proposed federal scheme for Ireland (see Crawford to the *Freeman's Journal*, 7, 9, 14 Nov., *FJ*, 9 13, 16 Nov. 1844).
- 7 An undated pamphlet, *Ireland — the Union . . . A Federal (the only fair) Union . . .* (London and Dublin). It is reviewed in the *Quarterly Review* of December 1844 (LXXV, No. 149, 222-92).

3117

To P. V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 10 November 1844

[No salutation]

Ten thousand thanks for your most cheering intelligence. I will make my triumphant entry into Limerick on the 20th.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 348

3118

Public letter dated 10 November 1844 to John Gray. Withdrawn.

3119

To his son Maurice

Hillgrove [Cahirciveen, Co. Kerry], 15 November 1844

My dearest Maurice,

I am quite satisfied with your *services* since I left Dublin.¹ If you wish you can come down to the Limerick dinner on your way to Derrynane.²

See Ray and see that he does not forget to have my papers and letters sent me according to the minute directions I have given him.

[P.S.] I will be, please God, in Dublin on the 22nd early.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Maurice was very active at the weekly meetings of the Repeal Association during this period.
- 2 Maurice did not attend the dinner.

3120

To Charles Bianconi

[early December 1844]

My dear Mayor,

If you wish to discharge the duties of the mayoralty¹ with perfect satisfaction, act upon your own sound common sense and do not look into any law book.

SOURCE: O'Connell, *Bianconi*, 169-70

- 1 Bianconi was elected mayor of Clonmel on 1 December 1844 and immediately wrote to O'Connell for general advice and for instructions as to which law books he should study (Mrs. Morgan John O'Connell, *Charles Bianconi*, London, 1878, 169).

3121

To Miss Margaret O'Mara

Merrion Square, 2 December 1844

My dear Margaret,

What am I to do? What can I do? I had in October last appointed to preside at a great Charity dinner¹ and I totally forgot that tomorrow, Tuesday, was *that day*. I do not know how to apologize to you and to your mother, and never felt more grieved and vexed with myself. I solemnly assure you if afflicts me more than I can express but I am left without remedy.

Will you send me Peter Grady tomorrow before eleven.

Will you endeavour to obtain your mother's pardon for me though indeed I do not deserve it for being *so* stupid.

SOURCE: NLI MSS 13660

- 1 O'Connell presided at the annual dinner of St. Bridget's Female Orphan Society (see letter 2772 n4) in Dublin on the evening of 3 December (*Pilot*, 4 Dec. 1844).

3122

Public letter dated 27 December 1844 to Richard Barrett. Published in the *Pilot* 30 December 1844.

3123

To P.V. FitzPatrick

Derrynane, 29 December 1844

My dear FitzPatrick,

I have received the letter of our reverend friend¹ and will pay it the strictest attention. I love and revere him. I will implicitly obey his wishes. There is a person² in Paris to whom I will send my letters³ to the Pope, to be posted in that city.

I enclose a letter from Pierce Mahony respecting a trial⁴ in London.

Could you get the report taken from the *Times* and inserted in the [*Dublin Evening*] *Post*? Conway would, I think, gratify me by giving it full space in his paper.

I will return to Dublin sooner than I wish, and in the meantime work here as much as I can.

I had a glorious hunt yesterday. The ground was wet yet nothing could baffle the skill of my beautiful pack. They hunted and killed in the finest style.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 348-9

- 1 Possibly Rev. Francis J. Nicholson.
- 2 Andrew O'Reilly (died August 1862), the Paris correspondent of the *Times*.
- 3 These may have been sent as part of O'Connell's application to the Pope for a plenary indulgence (see letter 3144).
- 4 Unidentified.

3123a

To William Smith O'Brien

Derrynane, 1 January 1845¹

My dear O'Brien,

I enjoy this place and this weather exceedingly but I see I must *pack up* for Dublin.

I agree with you entirely as to Mr. Fitzgerald's² fitness for Tipperary.³ I am *sensitively* alive to the reproach of dictation yet I will tomorrow venture to suggest his name. How I regret that Hutchinson⁴ refuses to stand.

I will write more fully tomorrow.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 433

- 1 O'Connell dated this letter erroneously as 1 January 1844.

- 2 Richard Albert Fitzgerald, Muckridge House, Youghal, Co. Cork; ex-J.P. and Repealer. M.P. for Co. Tipperary from February 1845 to 1847.
- 3 There was a vacancy in Co. Tipperary owing to the death of Robert Otway Cave. A meeting of electors in Cashel on 13 January nominated Fitzgerald for the county. On 21 February he was returned unopposed (*Tipperary Free Press*, 15 Jan., 22 Feb. 1845).
- 4 Hon. George Hely-Hutchinson (c. 1792-1845), fourth son of Francis Hely-Hutchinson, M.P. and brother of the third earl of Donoughmore. The brothers and sisters of the third earl obtained by patent the precedence of an earl's children. He died in France on 17 November 1845, two days after sending to the Repeal Association his annual membership fee for 1846 (*Pilot*, 24 Nov. 1845). A meeting of electors at Cashel offered him the nomination for Co. Tipperary but he declined it owing to ill-health (*Tipperary Free Press*, 1, 15 Jan. 1845). In his letter declining the nomination he stated: 'My motto is and ever shall be, Repeal! Repeal!! Repeal!!!'

3124

To William Smith O'Brien

Derrynane, 10 January 1845

My dear O'Brien,

"Aux ordres" as they say in France! I cheerfully obey your commands; for your wish is to me a command. I intend to be in Killarney, my first day's journey, on Thursday next; Limerick on Friday, so as to be certain of being in Dublin in the afternoon of Sunday, from Maryborough, which place I will leave as soon after Mass as I can. Reckon therefore on my meeting you at the Association on Monday and returning you thanks for your inestimable services.¹ You literally are "a living treasure" to the cause.

With respect to Tipperary, I got a long letter from Mr. Hutchinson, as I already mentioned to you, relinquishing the representation of that county for only one avowed reason, namely, ill health. There were in his letter other reasons of a family nature which he wished me not to communicate to anybody but to you. I could not therefore send his letter to the Tipperary men as I could not give the entire of it publication. Neither could I have announced to the County his renunciation on the score of ill health without sending them the entire letter which, as I have already said, I was not at liberty to do.

My opinion is that you should announce the relinquishment of the County by Hutchinson, with the *great* reason for it, ill health. This duty I think falls upon you as it was you wrote to him on the subject and not I. The announcement I should think should be made by a

letter to Nicholas Maher, or rather to Archdeacon Laffan² of Fethard. However, if you differ from me, act upon your own suggestion till we meet, which I hope will be in little more than a week.³

The Bequests Act occupies much of the public attention in Ireland. It is a kind of stumbling block in our way for the present but I strongly expect that there will be a reaction highly favourable to Repeal.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 434

- 1 O'Connell does not appear to have formally thanked Smith O'Brien at the meeting of the Repeal Association on Monday, 20 January though he did make a complimentary reference to him in his speech (*Nation*, 25 Jan. 1845).
- 2 Rev. Michael Laffan (c. 1791-1861), a native of Co. Tipperary; P.P. of Fethard and Killusty from before 1836 to 1861 and archdeacon and vicar-general of Cashel and Emly; prominent locally in the campaign for Catholic Emancipation.
- 3 An election for Co. Tipperary was pending following the death of Robert Otway Cave. At a meeting of electors in Cashel on 13 January a letter was read from George Hely Hutchinson pleading ill health for not coming forward as a candidate. Richard Albert Fitzgerald was nominated instead and was returned unopposed on 21 February (*Pilot*, 15 Jan., 24 Feb. 1845).

3125

To Pierce Mahony

Derrynane, 10 January 1845

My dear Mahony,

I should at once have given you my opinion of the article¹ in the *Quarterly Review* if I could see that article. But, as it does not reach this country, I have no chance of seeing it until I return to Dublin. When there I will have great pleasure in conferring with you upon the subject.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 A review article in the *Quarterly Review* of December 1844 (LXXV, No. 149, 222-92) on pamphlets on Repeal and Federalism.

3126

From John Lanigan,¹ Richmount, Templemore, Co. Tipperary, 17 January 1845

States that he proposed O'Connell's son Daniel at a meeting of the electors of Co. Tipperary in Cashel held to select a candidate to succeed their late representative, Robert Otway Cave. The proposal would have been adopted unanimously but for the fact that a few people said that O'Connell did not want his son elected². Lanigan asks O'Connell if this assertion is true.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John Lanigan, only surviving son of Stephen Lanigan. M.P. for Cashel 1859-65.
- 2 The reports of the Cashel meeting in the *Pilot*, *Freeman's Journal* and *Nation* make no reference to Lanigan's proposal.

3127

From Bishop McGettigan¹

Letterkenny [Co. Donegal], 29 January 1845

My dear Mr. O'Connell,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your kind favour of the 25th inst.² and in reply I beg to say that the three first suggestions are of so difficult and complicated a nature and with regard to which there is such a diversity of opinion that I could not give my own until I have an opportunity of consulting those prelates with whom I am in the habit of acting.

On the 4th and last, all I think will agree that each church should have their clergy educated in an exclusively ecclesiastical institution.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. Patrick McGettigan (c. 1785-1861), bishop of Raphoe, 1820-61.
- 2 See letter 3129.

3128

*From James Haughton*¹

35 Eccles Street [Dublin]. 29 January 1845

Copy

My dear Sir,

. . . I wish you had given Tyler² the thrashing he so richly deserves. The system³ sustained by him and his compeers is so infernal that it is difficult even to think of it with christian patience. For my part I think sheep stealing a much more honourable occupation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 This copy was written on the third and fourth pages of letter 3133.
- 2 John Tyler (1790-1862), president of U.S.A. 1841-44.
- 3 Negro slavery. Tyler was a slaveowner. At the Repeal Association meeting on 27 January, O'Connell had paid tribute to Haughton as an uncompromising opponent of slavery (*Nation*, 1 Feb. 1845; see also letter 3133).

3129

From Bishop Kennedy

Deerpark, Sixmilebridge [Co. Clare], 30 January 1845

My dear Sir,

My absence from this for a few days has prevented me from replying sooner to your very obliging letter of the 25th. There can be no doubt that in the present position of our affairs the utmost vigilance and the most perfect unanimity are essential to the success of our endeavours to improve the wretched condition of our unhappy country. I cannot therefore but highly applaud the resolution you have taken to ascertain the sentiments of the prelates on the propositions¹ submitted by you to the Repeal Association for consideration etc. before you would ground on them any application to Parliament.

The principles contained in those propositions are so plainly laid down and so obviously just that, in my humble judgment, there can be no second opinion about them among practical Catholics. I therefore most cordially approve of them and of none of them more strongly than of that which asserts the necessity of combining religious instruction with secular education.

Leaving you at perfect liberty to make what use you please of this expression of my opinions.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 At their meeting on 2 December 1844 the Repeal Association adopted O'Connell's resolution that a committee be appointed to watch over the progress of any new university which might be set up and declared that 'in whatever college was made, every religion should be free' and that 'education in literature and religion should not be separated, but each persuasion should have the means of partaking of both' (*FJ*, 3 Dec; *Nation*, 7 Dec. 1844). Although the subject was debated at subsequent Repeal meetings (on 10 December 1844, 12, 26 May 1845) the report of this committee does not appear to have been published.

3130

To Thomas Rodney Purdon¹

Merrion Square, 31 January 1845

Copy

Private

My Dear Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter and should be most happy to acquiesce in your wish if I could do so. You well know I have no government interest but if you can point out any other channel through which I may be able to serve you *you shall command my best exertions*. To whom would you wish me to apply with a probable prospect of success? Do but show me the mode in which I can be of use to you and I will *anxiously try to meet your views*.

SOURCE: Property of Miss D.M. Johnston

- 1 Son of the governor of the Richmond Bridewell, South Circular Road, Dublin. See letter 3138a.

3131

From Bishop Cantwell

Mullingar [Co. Westmeath], 2 February 1845

Private

Dear Mr. O'Connell,

On my return I find your communication *marked private* with the suggestions of the Repeal Association on the subject of Education. . . . My unbounded confidence in your enlightened and *truly Catholic* views on this question. . . .

I will content myself with assuring you that I tremble at the very idea of the projected colleges¹ and at the *mixed system* of education

which it is, I believe, intended to establish among the *middle* and *higher classes*. My alarm is grounded on my experience of the working of the national system into a *toleration* of which we were, in an evil hour, entrapped. I am firmly convinced that, if the Tories of Ireland and more especially the Established clergy, were once conciliated to approve and patronise the national system, it could not be sanctioned or *tolerated* in Ireland for three months. The hitherto warm opposition of Protestants and the almost exclusive management of the schools which in consequence devolved on the Catholic clergy was, and is, our only security.

This protection we would lose in the contemplated system. The Protestant party could not be expected to adopt or to persevere in the same determined hostility. They would, very generally at least, endeavour to profit of the patronage and other advantages connected with or derivable from such institutions. Our middle and high Catholics are not always the most amenable to the salutary influence of the clergy. They are more selfish and less religious than the poor. Government patronage would become a powerful but dangerous engine of seduction etc. Hence, I fear, the harvest of immorality, irreligion and infidelity among the youth of Catholic Ireland would be quick and abundant. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 The academical institutions (Ireland) bill (better known as the colleges bill) was introduced by Sir James Graham at the beginning of May. It provided for a scheme of provincial universities (the later Queen's Colleges) where Catholics and Protestants should be educated together, provision being made for separate religious instruction. The subject became one of major controversy between O'Connell and the Young Irishmen. See also letter 3129.

3132

From James Haughton

4 February 1845

My dear Sir,

I annex copy of my note which has gone astray¹. I do not wonder that amid your multifarious avocations such small matters should often escape your notice. The wonder is how you attend to all you do.

If you wish for a copy of my letter of 22 Jany. in which I speak of Tyler as a slave breeder and a seller of his own children, I will have pleasure in sending it you.

My man will wait your answer about Mr. Spear.²

SOURCE : O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 That is letter 3128.
- 2 Charles Spear (1801-63), an American Universalist minister, interested in the welfare of prisoners. Secretary of the Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. See *Dict. Amer. Biog.*

3133

To James Haughton

Merrion Square, 4 February 1845

My dear Friend,

I beg your pardon for not having sooner acknowledged your kindness in sending me Charles Spear's admirable work on the abolition of the punishment of death.¹ May I beg of you, when you write to that gentleman, to present him my respects and to assure him of my gratitude for his kind present of that work which I admire very much. There may be some shades of difference between him and me on certain principles enunciated in his book, none at all upon the practical abolition of the punishment of death, totally and without reserve. With respect to the principles of President Tyler on the subject of Negro slavery I am as abhorrent of them as ever I was. Indeed, if it was possible to increase my contempt of slaveowners and the advocates of slavery, my sentiments are more intense now than ever they were, and I will avail myself of the first practical opportunity of giving utterance to them, especially in connection with the horrible project of annexing Texas to the United States. But at the present moment the public mind is so engrossed by other topics of local interest that an anti-slavery speech would excite no such attention as it ought. I will however avail myself of the first favourable opportunity to express my indignation on the subject so as to give my sentiments circulation in America.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 349-50

- 1 *Essays on the Punishment of Death* (1844).

3134

To Archbishop MacHale

Merrion Square, 19 February 1845

Most confidential

My revered Lord,

I am exceedingly alarmed at the coming prospect. I am truly afraid that the ministerial plans are about to throw more power into the hands of the supporters of the Bequests Bill. A fatal liberalism is but too prevalent, and these pseudo-liberals are extremely anxious to have an opportunity of assailing the party of the sincere and practical Catholics as being supporters of narrow and bigoted doctrines. I should not take the liberty of troubling your grace with a letter if I were not deeply alarmed lest the friends of truly Catholic education should be outmanoevred by their enemies. What those enemies most desire is that a premature movement should be made on our part. They say — and I fear the public would and, perhaps, ought to go with them — that to attack Peel's plan before that plan was announced and developed would be to show a disposition inimical to education and a determination not to be satisfied with any concession. I do not wish to give our enemies any pretext for avoiding the real question that may and perhaps, must arise, by any bye-battle as to the time of commencing our attack; that is to say, if we shall find it necessary to attack at all. I say this because, however strongly I believe that we shall have occasion to attack, yet that occasion cannot arise legitimately until the plan is known in all its details. It is possible, though not very probable, that the appointment of professors to instruct the Catholic youth may be given to the Catholic Prelates; and in that case, though the principle of exclusive Catholic education may not apply, yet I should think there could be no objection to Protestants attending the classes, if all the professors were nominated by the canonical authorities of the Catholic Church.

Besides, by waiting until the plan is out and known in its details, we shall have an opportunity of attacking its defects without leaving any room for a charge of hostility to education generally. I do therefore most respectfully and with perfect humility suggest to your Grace whether it be not the wisest course not to make any attack upon academical institutions until we know what those institutions are going to be. I need not inform your Grace that my opinion is decidedly favourable to the education of Catholics being exclusively committed to Catholic authority.

I hope and trust your Grace will have the goodness to excuse this intrusion upon you. What I am anxious about is to prevent our

antagonists from having any advantage as to the *period* of the discussion or to any collateral circumstances extrinsic of the real merits.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 741

3135

*From Robert Cane*¹

Kilkenny, 23 February 1845

Private

Dearly respected Sir,

We have had a public meeting here to make all necessary arrangements for the banquet to be given to you, the member for Kilkenny [John O'Connell], etc. on Easter Tuesday, the 25th March.²

Active preparations are being made to make it a demonstration worthy of you and becoming of the city of the Confederates.

I am instructed to write to you to say that the managing committee are determined to receive you with a suitable procession of corporation, trades, &c. and that they therefore wish to know *the hour* at which you will arrive in Kilkenny so that the procession may meet you outside the town in proper time.

I am further desired to ascertain whether you would wish that a *public meeting should be held previous to the dinner* and, if so desirous, to know what you would advise to be the subject of the resolutions in addition to Repeal.

May I hope that at your *earliest convenience* you will reply to these two enquiries and thus enable the Kilkenny boys to work effectively and as becomes Irishmen at a moment when Peel's insidious tax reduction policy³ threatens our national agitation.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Robert Cane, M.D. (1807-58), surgeon in Kilkenny city 1832-58; mayor of Kilkenny 1845 and 1849; author. See *DNB*.
- 2 On 25 March O'Connell, accompanied by his son John, William Smith O'Brien, Robert Dillon Browne, Rev. Thomas Tierney, T. M. Ray and Richard Barrett were met at Castlecomer by Robert Cane and others, and escorted into Kilkenny. En route they were met by a procession of the trades and by a group led by General Thomas Cloney. There was no public meeting. The banquet took place in St. John's Catholic church, a new building not yet fitted up for religious services (*DEP*, 27 March 1845).
- 3 In his budget introduced on 15 February Peel proposed to devote the

anticipated surplus revenue to reducing or abolishing duties on a wide range of articles (*Ann. Reg.*, 1845, 24-8).

3136

To his son Maurice, care of Miss Ellen Connor, Denny Street, Tralee

Merrion Square, 7 March 1845

My dearest Maurice,

In the first place I have paid your bill amounting to £59.3.0 and I make you a present of that sum as a token of my perfect satisfaction at the manner in which you are going on respecting my property. How I wish you were out of debt with a determination never to owe a shilling again.

2ndly you have carefully sent me the return of rents received to the 1st of this month. Primrose of course has omitted to do the like. He is the drowsiest creature alive, and you must stimulate him into exertion.

3rdly [details concerning rent return]

4thly [re payment of College rents and renewal fines]

5thly That unfortunate Tom O'Connell will I see infallibly be a beggar. I have long foreseen it. He began by borrowing £74 from me with the most positive promise of returning the money, which of course he never thought of doing. He however soon asked me for another and a larger loan which I of course refused, forgiving him however, as I well might, the £74. I made him a short time ago a donation of twenty pounds and his wife now writes to me for £40 to redeem all their plate which it seems is pledged for that sum, offering the plate as a security. This is a dealing with which I could not possibly have anything to do. If I could afford from the numerous and pressing demands of my own family — which indeed I cannot — I would make it as a present and not as any kind of a loan. I write to you on this subject that you may make some arrangement for the unhappy man. If the plate be really worth more than the amount borrowed on it, you might arrange with the pawnbroker and become his security so as to have the plate sold in Dublin or in Cork where it would be likely to fetch its full value whatever that be and have the surplus returned to the unfortunate fellow. . . .

6thly There must be no species of unnecessary harshness towards the tenants. Wherever the rent is too high, do not hesitate to make an abatement and forgive the arrears so as to enable the tenant to keep his head above water.

7thly I am greatly pleased at the prospect of your making money of hay and potatoes. Take care to keep enough for home consumption and wherever you give potatoes in payment of labour be sure to give a full shilling's worth at the least for every day's hire. I like to pay for labour in that way, that is in provisions, taking care that the labourer shall be perfectly satisfied with the value he gets.

See Mr. Donovan — John D. and Sons¹ and tell them I expect within two or three days to give them further information on the subject of the glass duties.²

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 John Donovan and Sons, merchants, The Square, Tralee.
- 2 Peel's budget proposed to relieve glass of all excise duties (*Ann. Reg.*, 1845, 27).

3137

From Richard Scott

16 Middle Gardiner St., Dublin, 21 March 1845

My dear Liberator,

Will you keep me in your recollection about your picture which you so kindly promised to send me with a certificate in your own handwriting that I acted as your leading agent at the great Clare Election and contributed by my exertions to the success of that important move in Irish politics.

. . . I want it to hand down to my children and their children as an heirloom. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3138

From Henry Warburton

Reform Club, 2 o'clock in the morning, 8 April 1845

Extract

I think I see that the ex-Ministers and their immediate adherents, while they apparently give support to Sir Robert Peel's Maynooth measure,¹ have agencies at work to render that support precarious and equivocal. As they want to make use of the Catholics of Ireland as an engine for restoring themselves to power, they do not like that

justice should be done the Catholics by any other party than their own.

If you can come into the House on Friday and there meet with perfect calmness and indifference those noisy expressions of dislike which are sure to come from some quarters, and to speak in commendation of the measure, I think your presence will do good; and though you are excitable, I think you have that command over yourself not to lose your temper under any provocation, when by remaining calm you can effect a great good.²

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.* II, 353

- 1 The government bill for increasing the annual grant to Maynooth, which provoked major controversy and division in political parties (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 281).
- 2 O'Connell did not speak in the debate on the Maynooth grant on Friday, 11 April.

3138a

*To John Hubert Plunkett*¹

Merrion Square, 10 April 1845

My dear Plunkett,

I beg leave to introduce to you the bearer of this letter Mr. Thomas R. Purdon — a young gentleman in whose fortune I take deep interest, for this reason that he is the son of Mr. Purdon the Governor for many years of the *Richmond Penetenciary* [*sic*] in which capacity I received from him the kindest and most constant attention during our unjust imprisonment. Every thing that could be done to alleviate the irksomeness of confinement was done by this excellent and aimable [*sic*] family. There does not live a more worthy gentleman than his father, the Governor, and you will find the young gentleman himself to be a person of unblemished honour and integrity and every way worthy of confidence.

If you can in any manner promote his interests you will confer a great personal favour on

Your very faithful
and affectionate friend
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: Melbourne Archdiocesan Historical Commission

- 1 John Hubert Plunkett (1802-1869), son of George Plunkett, Mount Plunkett, Lecarrow, Co. Roscommon. Educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and called to the bar in 1826. Member of the Catholic Association. Solicitor-general of New South Wales 1831-36 (appoint-

ed in 1831 and arrived there in 1832) and attorney-general 1836-56. A prominent Catholic in Australian public life. See *DNB*.

3139

From Owen Markey

Reynoldstown, Clogherhead, Drogheda, 15 April 1845

Dear Sir,

Our friend Nicholas Markey has been very ill for the last six weeks with some rheumatic affection. I may say he is now nearly recovered although still very weak. I am just after visiting him. I see a great improvement in him for the last three or four days. I am sure it would gratify him very much if you could spare time to write him a few lines on affairs of the day. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3140

To Patrick or Pierce Mahony¹

[19 April 1845]

[extract]

Sir James Graham's speech² was delightful. I heartily forgive him everything past — trial, persecution, sentence and all. The Ministry appear to be really sincere in their determination to do something for Ireland. They have raised hopes infinitely beyond the Maynooth grant.

SOURCE: Parker, *Graham*, II, 9

- 1 Patrick seems to be an error for Pierce.
- 2 In the adjourned debate on the Maynooth grant on 17 April. Replying to a speech of Frederick Shaw, Graham declared that if he (Shaw) 'really believed that the days of "Protestant ascendancy" in the old sense, can be maintained . . . I must tell him that those days *ARE PAST* . . . and that I for one will not be responsible for any attempt to govern Ireland upon those principles!' He also stated that Cromwell 'did all but try to extirpate the Roman Catholic population of Ireland', but that he had failed (*Times*, 18 April 1845).

To Pierce Mahony, Reform Club, London

Merrion Square, Dublin, 25 April 1845

Confidential

My dear Mahony,

I am indeed glad to hear that you are engaged in preparing Bills intended if not calculated to alleviate the misery of the Irish People. I am also glad that Leahy is called on to assist you. He is an intelligent and quite trustworthy person, and all the assistance that I can possibly give to you and to him shall be cheerfully given but I will not go to London until I see a paramount necessity for doing so, if any such there shall be. In truth, if there are to be really conciliatory measures for the Irish People, it is much more important that I should be here to keep matters steady and to prevent any unreasonable opposition than that I should be in London. You surely know that I have constant difficulty in keeping *matters* and *men* steady.

I will now go through the Bills you mention and tell you *seriatim* my candid opinion upon them.

First. The Bill to amend the Registry of Deeds¹ is certainly desirable and above all things desirable to set out the entire Deed as the Memorial of Registry. Perhaps it would be better to have one part of the Deed deposited in the Registry Office as wills are deposited in the Ecclesiastical courts. But these are matters of detail . . . this is not a *conciliatory* measure. It will be called and will be a *good* measure but it has nothing to excite popular sentiment in its favour.

Recollect that it is the mass of the nation that we want to conciliate — by doing them some substantial good. The Registry Bill will really advantage only the wealthier classes; and, as to the knowledge of leasing powers, the truth is that you must relax leasing powers altogether, leaving no other limit than that the lease should be made at such a rent as a solvent tenant could *bona fide* afford to pay at the time of making the lease. . . .

Secondly. A Bill to amend the Fines and Recoveries Act² is a good but not a *conciliatory* measure in the sense I have mentioned. Do you mean in enabling all persons to bar the Crown, to include tenants for life? If so, that is right but would it not be better to extinguish Crown claims altogether as I remember the Irish Parliament *attempted* to do that which the present Ministry would have no difficulty in doing.

Thirdly. The Bill enabling tenants for life to improve their estates³ is good for the landlords directly and only remotely and feebly for the tenants.

The Bill to enable landlords to make exchanges and partitions⁴ is in the same category, useful rather to landlords than to tenants. However, giving landlords the power to make leases, subject to no other restriction than that which I have mentioned, would be a popular, a conciliatory because a useful measure to the people.

Fourth. The Bill to regulate hospitals and dispensaries⁵ will be useful and may be conciliatory if the taxation for these measures be placed altogether upon rents and none upon occupiers of small farms. Occupiers of large farms should of course be taxed as if they received rents out of the lands they occupy. No change however will be very conciliatory unless public hospitals and dispensaries are supported out of the Consolidated Fund.

Fifth. The Bill to regulate the office of sheriff⁶ has a title too vague for me to form any judgment upon it. You know that partisan sheriffs are one of the curses of Ireland. Nothing but a government disposed to reject every man from the place of sheriff who is an Ascendancy partisan can alleviate the system, unless indeed in the at present impossible case of making the sheriffs of counties at large elective by the secret ballot of the ratepayers of the county. You will smile at this idea as a dream but there is the justice of commonsense in it, and I never despair in such a case.

The other Bills which you suggest have not, I perceive, obtained any sanction from the [Devon Commission] Commissioners. I therefore shall not discuss them for the present especially as . . . they leave the great overwhelming plague spots unmitigated and without prospect of cure.

The two great evils are the absentee drain and the situation of the occupying tenants. Everybody admits that the tenantry are fading and growing worse from year to year. Agrarian disturbance has reached Fermanagh, and if the occupiers of land in the north of Ireland shall universally or even generally feel the pressure that the Tipperary tenants feel, you will have such an insurrection, such a servile war in Ireland as has been unknown since the days of the French *Jacoterie*⁷ or of the English *Jack Cade*⁸ with more of skill and perseverance on the part of the people.

Now I don't care what is said of me but I feel that the tenor of my life is directed to prevent such a consummation. Depend upon it that all the measures mentioned in your letter will have no substantial effect in conciliating the popular mind of Ireland. On the contrary, they will be received with bitter disappointment and no small disgust.

The Report⁹ of the [Devon Commission] Commissioners has created sensations of the kind that I have mentioned. It is accused of being meagre and one-sided, favourable to landlords and doing

nothing substantially for the people. You may, according to the Irish phrase, as well think of "whistling jigs to milestones" as of talking to the people about conciliation from such measures as you detail.

Something substantial must be done and this is just the time to do it. The *manner* of the Maynooth grant has put the people into good humour; and the effect of really good measures would be unmingled by any querimonious disposition with respect to details but the measures *must be substantially good measures*.

First, there ought to be a large absentee tax, the proceeds to be applied in alleviation of the local rates.

Secondly, the tenant-right should be taken up and confirmed by law as far as it ought to be sanctioned.

Thirdly, all tenants in occupation of lands where the tenant-right does not subsist should, whether holding by lease or not, be entitled to register all improvements made by them for the last ten, twelve or fifteen years. Nothing however to be considered an improvement but that which enhanced the actual value of the lands. This right should also be made prospective.

Fourthly, the power of distraining should be taken away unless in cases where a lease shall or does exist.

. . . There is no great prospect of any solid or substantial good emanating from the *Commissioner's Report*. . . .

Surely the Ministry, after their speeches upon the Maynooth question, ought to give us political ameliorations at all events, the extension of the franchise, not to speak of the increase of our members, ought to be taken into immediate consideration. Recollect that to be satisfactory the extension must be in the right, that is, the popular direction. . . . There is one measure which the Ministry may carry in a week and render themselves really popular by it. I mean the recasting of our Corporate Reform Act and making it equivalent with the English Act. It is a bitter insult and a palpable injustice and a direct contradiction of anything deserving of being called a *Union* that the people of Ireland should not have the same corporate powers in point of law with the people of England and Scotland. . . . All that would be necessary would be to redress the injustice done by Recorder Shaw and by Lord Lyndhurst in spoiling the Irish Municipal Act. This would include the nomination of sheriff. . . .

Upon the whole, you see how ready I am to assist you but let it be impressed upon your mind, there is no use in oiling a broken bone — skin-deep remedies will not do. . . . The occupying tenant is the "Hamlet left out by special desire" from the [Devon] Land Commission Report. He must be relieved, or depend upon it, depend upon it, he will go mad.

Would it not be right to restore at once to the Commission [of the

peace] all the magistrates superceded *merely* because they were Repealers.¹⁰ You see I do think the Ministry sincere. Yet it is not impossible, nay perhaps not improbable that I delude myself. *Nous verrons*.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

- 1 No such bill was introduced during 1845. On 17 August 1846, however, Morgan John O'Connell introduced a bill 'for altering and amending the Mode of registering Deeds and Instruments affecting Real property in Ireland.' The bill, which was printed, did not receive a second reading.
- 2 No bill for this purpose was introduced this session. The act which it was proposed to amend was 6 & 7 Vict. c. 56, entitled 'An Act for the better collection of Fines . . . in Ireland', enacted on 17 August 1843.
- 3 No bill for this purpose was introduced during 1845. On 17 August 1846, however, Morgan John O'Connell presented a bill 'to enable Tenants for Life and Mortgagors in possession of Lands in Ireland to grant Leases, and to enable Tenants for Life of Lands in Ireland to make Exchange, and for giving a summary Remedy for Partition of Lands in all cases in Ireland.' The bill did not receive a second reading, nor, apparently, was it printed, though ordered to be so.
- 4 No such bill was introduced in 1845. Morgan John O'Connell's bill of 1846 (see note 3, above) probably contained provision for this purpose also.
- 5 No such bill was introduced this session nor in 1846.
- 6 No such bill was introduced this session nor in 1846.
- 7 Another name for the *Jacquerie*, the traditional term for rebellious peasants in France.
- 8 A rebel leader in fifteenth century England. See *DNB*.
- 9 Issued early in 1845, the report was 'a rather timid statement offering few constructive suggestions on which effective legislative action could be taken'. Nevertheless, the evidence it provided 'did do good by drawing attention to the plight of cottiers and labourers and made it clear that much more was required as a solution to the Irish land question than giving security of possession to Irish tenant farmers' (Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 90-1).
- 10 See letter 3020 n2.

3142

To Pierce Mahony

Merrion Square, 26 April 1845

Private

My dear Mahony,

I am very impatient and uneasy about your Bills.¹ I will be most unhappy if nothing be done for the tenantry. I implore of you to remind Lord Devon that agrarian murders have increased from year

to year. There were 19 agrarian murders between Tipperary and the King's county last year. The most recent agrarian murder was, as you know, in Fermanagh. Besides these assassinations the wholesale slaughter of the clearance system did of course in every instance precede the individual murder.

Impress upon Lord Devon that these things *cannot* last. He probably would laugh if he thought that I was convinced (which I am) that it is the Repeal Association and the hopes it excites which prevent a rebellion. But no matter for that — the mischief is most pressing, and a powerful remedy is alone applicable to the case. Recollect also the hideous picture given in Lord Devon's report of the state of the greater part of the agricultural population. In comparing that state with the crimes upon both sides in the clearance system, ask yourself whether it is possible that things should remain as they are?

The more I think of your list of bills in preparation the more am I convinced that they will rather irritate than appease. At best they are homeopathic remedies for the national disease. Do not expect the least alleviation of popular discontent from them. Nothing will do but giving some kind or other of fixity of tenure to the occupiers; and especially an absolute right of recompense for all substantial improvements. I am ready to take (as to the security of tenure) as mitigated a measure as is consistent with the principle. I cannot conclude without once more reiterating the necessity of doing something substantial for the occupying tenants. I know well how unpalatable such a system would be to the landlords, especially to the absentees, but in truth unless something be done the people will slip out of my hands and the hands of those who like me look for peaceful amelioration; and they will operate a 'fixity of tenure' for themselves with a vengeance.

SOURCE: Rathcon Papers

1 See letter 3141.

3143

To O'Conor Don,

Merrion Square, 18 May 1845

My dear O'Conor,

Many thanks for your and Blake's¹ kind attention. I owe him two letters which I did not answer simply because all I *could* say was that I could not agree with him as to *our* petitioning.

He has not written to me again so that I am utterly ignorant as to what the 'narrow escape' was or who was the narrator of the account you so kindly listened to. I submit to you that you ought to tell me *all* as you told me so much.²

I never before heard of the 'Sceptre' and would of course put an end to such a farce.

As to a *levée* it has nothing royal about it. The Chancellor holds four *levées* each year, so do the chief judges. Foreign princes and *royal* hold *levées* in London.³

Allow me to assure you that I warmly cherish the affectionate interest you express. I am indeed proud of it and you may believe me it is reciprocal.

Pray convey my thanks cordially to Blake.

SOURCE: Clonalis Papers

1 Unidentified.

2 No information has been traced with regard to this reference.

3 These remarks are probably concerned with the forthcoming *levée* held in Dublin in the round room of the Rotunda on 30 May 1845 to commemorate the anniversary of O'Connell's imprisonment. The celebrations included processions through the city, and were attended by deputations from some thirty Irish cities and towns (*DEP*, 31 May 1845).

3144

From Rev. F.J. Nicholson to Merrion Square

Rue St. Honore, No. 333, Paris, 24 May 1845

[no salutation]

This morning, my dearest friend, I received from Cardinal Franchoni,¹ the prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide, the enclosed apostolical rescript, granting to you, as you desire, a plenary indulgence *on every day* you may wish to obtain one, on compliance with the specified conditions. This indulgence, as you will perceive, is applicable by way of suffrage to the suffering souls in purgatory.

I congratulate you, my beloved friend, on your thus attaining your wishes. To have succeeded, especially with the present Pope,² who is exceedingly stringent on these points, *was exceedingly difficult*. I have been struggling to get it *more than three months*. I believe there is no record of any person whatever having obtained this very great privilege, with the exception *of one other*. I have applied for many favours for many persons, ecclesiastical as well as lay, and I never had such difficulty in obtaining what I prayed for as

I have had on this occasion. I had to write several official and several unofficial letters for it, and Cardinal Frasoni's letter just received has been the third to me about it. He wrote me several that were not official. His Eminence took *a great deal of trouble about it*, and were it not for him, we could not possibly have succeeded. As I shall be obliged to write a warm letter of thanks for this extraordinary privilege, I will have to add yours, and not only the station of the cardinal prefect, especially as the direct representative of his Holiness as to Ireland but his exceeding kindness in exerting himself so much and so efficaciously in your regard, require that I shall tell him you expressed to me your sentiments and feelings on the subject. It will be absolutely necessary therefore that you take the trouble of enabling me to say that you duly acknowledged the receipt of the accompanying papal rescript *and in your own handwriting*. It will be an additional gratification to you to know that his Eminence, Cardinal Frasoni, is renowned for his great *sanctity*. You ought to be rejoiced indeed to have the benefit of his holy prayers.

Adieu, my ever dear friend. Recommend me and my intentions constantly to almighty God; give my best regards to each of your dear family.

SOURCE: Property of Maurice R. O'Connell

- 1 Cardinal Giacomo Filippo Frasoni (1775-1856), Prefect of Propaganda 1835-56.
- 2 Gregory XVI.

3145

*From J. McCarthy*¹

[Co. Kerry] 26 May 1845

Private

My dear Sir,

[States that about four weeks ago Bourke² and he went to Dr. McEnery to ask him to apprise the people that they intended to collect the O'Connell tribute the following week. He replied that he had a more urgent collection on hand that was nearer home and then one for the schools. They reminded him that they had already postponed theirs in deference to the collection for Killarney cathedral. The writer considers Dr. McEnery's action shameful]. Pray try and get us something, as grants for education are the order of the day. Not a word about banishing rags, filth, misery and lumpers³ from the hovels of the great mass of our people. . . . With such an advocate [as O'Connell] I have great hope for Tralee, and you will see we

shall not disappoint you nor reflect discredit upon your recommendation. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 John McCarthy, treasurer for Tralee of the O'Connell Tribute.
- 2 J. Bourke.
- 3 A coarse variety of potato.

3146

To William Smith O'Brien

Cork, 9 June 1845

My dear O'Brien,

Write to me as soon after you receive this letter as *possible*. I will wait *here* your reply as I yield at once to your reasoning and example. But I see that the bill¹ has already been in committee and at least two clauses adopted. Under *these* circumstances are *we* to go over. Decide for me as well as for yourself and if that decision be in favour of action, I mean of course, in favour of going over, I will leave this for Dublin immediately after I get your answer. I will be all impatience until I get that answer. It will be no small sacrifice to give up my visit to my loved mountains but if you *continue* to think that sacrifice necessary I will readily make it.

I am very strongly for throwing out the Colleges Bill this session. If we could do so we should get a better, nay a decidedly good one next year. So I think.

The exhibition² here was truly magnificent. It actually exceeded that in Dublin.³

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 434

- 1 The colleges bill.
- 2 A public demonstration had been held in Cork in honour of O'Connell on 8 June. Amongst the attendance were the corporation, the trades, and deputations from various county towns. O'Connell made his entry on a magnificent triumphal car, and received an address in Irish by an old harper (*Nation*, 14 June 1845).
- 3 See letter 3143 n3.

3147

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 21 June 1845

Private

My dear Friend,

Take care that Dr. MacHale has the enclosed letter as soon after you receive it as possible.

The Ministry are ready to submit if Ireland holds out firm. The change, even as to Repeal, in the minds of very many is to me astonishing. As to the Bishops, they have the ball at their foot, literally at their foot. If they hold out firmly on the truest Catholic principles, believe me, everything will be conceded. I had no notion of the ripeness of things here. How I wish I could venture to write to Dr. Murray. I wish he knew of what pliable materials the present Government are made. They would *for him* remodel the Bequests Act. I have reason to believe that they *will* allow the 'regulars' to be emancipated.¹ Certainly they would yield it to Dr. Murray. In short, if the value of this moment were duly appreciated great good might be achieved. But I sigh in vain for that which I cannot control but which others *might* manage.

We shall be detained here ten or twelve days longer. Stanley's Bill² is laughed at. No other efficient measure this session simply because they think they have established a feud in our camp. They shall find themselves mistaken.

SOURCE: Fitzpatrick, *Corr.*, II, 354

- 1 The Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 (10 Geo. IV c. 7) included several provisions hostile to the regular clergy and forbidding such clergy to admit new members to their orders. These provisions had little effect.
- 2 Early in June Lord Stanley had introduced to the Lords the compensation to tenants (Ireland) bill which the government intended as the first of a series of measures based on the recommendations of the Devon Commission. This bill proposed that dispossessed tenant farmers should be given compensation for permanent improvements they had made to their holdings. Encountering heavy opposition in the Lords the government abandoned the bill (Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 91-2).

3148

To Archbishop MacHale

London, 21 June 1845

Private

My ever revered Lord,

My heart is heavy and my fears are great lest seduction should accomplish what force and fraud have failed to achieve. But my confidence is unshaken in the wisdom and virtue of our Prelates. Why, then, do I write? Because I wish to disburden myself of *two* facts. The *first*, that Sir James Graham's amendments¹ will make the Bill worse, simply by increasing and extending the power and dominion of the Government or of persons appointed by and also removable *at will* by that Government over a wider space and over more important and more delicate matters, including perhaps *all* religious details. The *second* fact is that if the prelates take and continue in a high, firm and unanimous tone, the *Ministry will yield*. Believe me that they are ready to yield. You have everything in *your* own power. By *your*, of course, I mean the Prelates or the majority of them.

You will have from the Ministry abundance of words, sweet words and solemn promises. If however then, by just caution on the part of the Prelates, *they can dictate their own terms*, the danger is that the Prelates, judging of others by themselves, will disbelieve in designed deceit and so yield to empty promises that which could ensure, if withheld for a while, substantial performance.

My object is that your Grace should know to a certainty that the game is in *our* hands if the Prelates stand firm, as I most respectfully believe they will, to all the Church sanctions relative to Catholic education.

I mark this letter 'Private' merely because I do not wish to have it appear in the newspapers. If the facts I mention are of use, you can use them. Pray pardon my intrusion.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 743

- 1 On the second reading of the Colleges bill on 2 June Sir James Graham proposed to insert a clause giving the crown a power of appointing visitors, who would have power to inquire into and remedy any abuses which might occur. In addition he proposed to grant facilities for the erection of halls in which religious instruction could be given to students by pastors of their own religion (*Annual Register* 1845, 156-7).

3149

To P.V. FitzPatrick

London, 27 June 1845

My dear FitzPatrick,

I send as a parcel by this conveyance 25 copies of the Irish Colleges Bill as altered, for I don't think it amended by Sir James Graham. It gives all dominion over every branch and detail of the colleges to the Ministry for the time being. It is true it permits, subject to the 'visitation of Government' the erection of separate halls, by subscription or donation, for separate religious instruction. See what an advantage this gives to the Protestants who are rich over the Catholics who are poor! You will of course, have Protestant halls rapidly, and with difficulty will there be found money to erect even one Catholic hall. Perhaps I am mistaken in my opinion of Catholic zeal, but nothing can be more clear than this, that the Protestants are much richer, and at present are very much disposed to use their wealth for the purpose of perversion.

Sir James Graham has intimated that the visitorial power — that is to say, the absolute dominion over colleges, halls, and all — is to be vested in three visitors, one a Catholic archbishop or bishop; secondly, a Protestant archbishop or bishop; and thirdly, a confidential office bearer, probably the moderator of the Presbyterian church. This avowed scheme will always give two Protestant voices among the visitors to one Catholic voice. If our venerated prelates omit this opportunity of insisting on fair play for the Catholics, or a due control over Catholic education, it is impossible but that the consequences should be, to say the least, highly injurious to Catholicity.

You will, as speedily as possible after receipt of this parcel, present, with my profound respects, a copy of the Bill to each of the archbishops and bishops, also a copy to the Very Revd. Dr. Hamilton,¹ and another to my beloved friend the Rev. Dr. Miley.

My son and I will remain here for the discussion² on Monday, and unless in the interval we receive (which is not likely) some *orders* from any of our prelates, we will leave this on Tuesday. *There is not the least use* in our staying here, and we would incur some responsibility for the details, if we were to remain uselessly to battle upon the subject. The Ministry have a most overwhelming majority, especially in favour of any measure opposed by the *old Irish*. In fact, though you may think it vanity, I cannot but assert that the Ministry *seem pleased* to have me so completely in their power, as I necessarily am in the present House of Commons.

SOURCE: FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 358-9

- 1 Rev. John Hamilton (1801-62), ordained at the Irish College, Paris in 1824; joined the staff of St. Mary's, Marlborough Street, Dublin that year; administrator, 1833-53; P.P. St. Michan's, 1853-1862
- 2 On the colleges bill.

3150

To Miss Margaret O'Mara

London, 27 June 1845

My dear Margaret,

You will readily believe that I should most readily have acceded to your kind request and performed the paternal office at your wedding if I could be in Dublin in time. But as that is impossible I can only assure you that should you during my life require a father's advice or assistance you will not apply for it to me in vain.

May the great God guide, direct and bless you, my dearest Margaret, is my sincerest wish and fervent prayer.

Present my affectionate respects to your dear mother, and *do* believe me to be with the most sincere regards, dear Margaret,

Your ever affectionate kinsman,
Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: NLI MSS 13660

3151

To Alderman Thomas Lyons

Merrion Square, 17 July 1845

Private

My dearest friend,

Your letter has caused me many an unhappy moment. I thought we were quite secure in Cork.¹ If I understand your schedule, it is quite the reverse. I should hope that there is room for improvement.

At present it seems absolutely necessary to keep the Serjeant² in until you have time to augment your force. Alexander McCarthy³ is an excellent man and of course I would do all I could to advance his interest so long as you think that his banner is one likely to lead us to victory but I repeat that I have every confidence in him and a very sincere regard for him. Yet after all there is but one man I should de-

sire to see represent Cork and that is yourself but I would not for the wealth of Cork itself have you incur expense nor above all things run any risk of defeat.

You could easily do *the duty* of a member as at the very utmost three or four weeks in a session is all that could possibly be necessary until we are safely lodged in College Green where you *must* take your seat. In the interval I do think you are the person most likely to win in Cork but you cannot — shall I say must not — stand if there be a *possibility* of defeat.

What are we to do? But before we determine, let me know if the Serjeant will certainly resign at the end of this session. How stand his family? Give me full information as to the present aspect of affairs and of the prospect of improvement in the registry.

SOURCE: Harrington Papers

- 1 Alexander McCarthy was elected for Cork city on 31 January 1846, *vice* Francis Stack Murphy, who had resigned.
- 2 Francis Stack Murphy.
- 3 Alexander McCarthy (1800-68), 37 Upper Fitzwilliam Street, Dublin and Currymount, Buttevant, Co. Cork; eldest son of Alexander McCarthy, merchant, Cork; called to the bar 1826; M.P. for Cork city 1846-7, Co. Cork 1857-59.

3152

From William H. Geary, M.D. Mayor of Limerick

Limerick, 31 July 1845

My dear Sir,

When I requested of you to do me the honour of dining at the Town Hall and meeting the Corporation of Limerick . . . my own idea was to unite with the Corporation a numerous body of the sincere friends of the cause of Repeal . . . whose judicious availing of the occasion would have the happy effect of removing whatever crotchety differences may exist among the popular party here. For myself I can truly say that my best and most anxious endeavours have been at all times directed to cement such differences as may arise among our own party, and to promote social cordiality and kindly feeling among all classes of politicians and religionists in this city. . . .

It is hard under such circumstances that my motives should be misconstrued and one's acts taken exception to. . . . My course in soliciting the honour of your presence at a Corporation Dinner has already been misrepresented. One of our local priests has given

aversion to it which has made it necessary for me to call a special meeting of the Corporation to set the matter right. . . .¹

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- I As mayor, Geary seems to have given offence to the Repealers of Limerick, first by failing to support a motion in favour of Repeal introduced in the Limerick board of guardians, and secondly, by entertaining the two assize judges to dinner, one of whom, Burton, had passed sentence on O'Connell the previous May. For this reason most of the Repeal members of the bar and corporation had boycotted the dinner (*Pilot*, 1 Aug. 1845). When O'Connell was in Limerick on 30 July, Geary 'solicited the honour of his dining with me, to meet the corporation of Limerick'. The members of that body, however, claimed Geary had no authority to invite O'Connell on behalf of the corporation, and could only have done so in his private capacity. Geary admitted that he had tendered the invitation in his private capacity. At an extraordinary meeting of the corporation on 2 August it was agreed to await O'Connell's reply before taking further action (*Limerick Chronicle*, 6 Aug. 1845). At a further meeting of the corporation on 11 August, a letter was read from O'Connell to Geary, dated 7 August 1845, apologising for being the cause of any confusion, stating he had understood the mayor to invite him on behalf of the corporation, appealing to the Repealers of Limerick to make up their differences, and refusing to express any opinion as to the propriety of holding the dinner (*Nation*, 16 Aug. 1845)

3152a

*From Henry C. Leahy*¹

I[rish] Society², [26 Suffolk Street], Pall Mall, London, 31 July
[1845 or 1846]

Dear Sir,

You will find herewith an account of the Vice-Chancellor's³ opinion of the Irish.⁴ I think it quite in keeping with Lord Lyndhurst's Aliens in blood, etc. etc.⁵ It was well for him that he was appointed before the Reform Bill for if so he never would. This *handsome* Beef headed person never would have been appointed for if what was then current was true he was appointed by Miss Laurence,⁶ the proprietor of Ripon rotten Boro' before she would return Mr. *Prosperity* Robinson.⁷ He would not of course call this an *abhorrent* system, but if it occurred in Ireland of course it would be designated by him an abhorrent system. It only shews that Ireland is treated and looked upon in the same light by almost all English and that the terms applied by Junius⁸ 76 years [ago] that she was 'robbed, insulted and oppressed'⁹ still remain true and hold good.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Possibly Henry Cane Leahy, 5 St. Jame's Square, London.
- 2 Unidentified.
- 3 Sir Lancelot Shadwell, Kt. (1779-1850), M.P. for Ripon 1826-7. Appointed 1827 vice-chancellor of England. See *DNB*.
- 4 Unidentified.
- 5 His speech against Irish Catholics (see letter 2616 nl).
- 6 Miss Elizabeth Sophia Lawrence (died July 1845), who owned the borough of Ripon. She bequeathed £30,000 to Shadwell.
- 7 Frederick John Robinson (1782-1859), M.P. for Ripon 1807-27. Created 1827 Viscount Goderich and 1833 earl of Ripon. See *DNB*.
- 8 The pseudonym of the author of a series of anti-government letters in England 1769-72.
- 9 Incorrectly quoted. It should read 'plundered and oppressed,' and occurs in the letter of 19 December 1769.

3153

*From Rev. John Moore*¹

London, 1 August 1845

Beloved Liberator,

I have glorious news for you. . . . The London Repealers one and all are friends again. . . . Last night the projected meeting convened by advertisement in the *Tablet*, for unpleasant and perchance, angry discussion and complaint was, thank Heaven, converted into a magnificent demonstration of self denial, harmony and peace. . . . The day previous to the meeting, William John² called upon me, expressed his apprehensions that the affair would prove a source of grief to the friends of Ireland and injurious to the movement here and entreated me to devise some plan of conciliation without compromising principle, consistency or honour. I accordingly penned a letter expressive of my sentiments on the subject. . . . I gave William John permission to use it in any way he might think proper. He forwarded it to the parties alluded to. They read it in Committee. . . . All matters were amicably arranged and finally I was invited to preside at the meeting and empowered to declare it an assemblage of Repealers whom no personal consideration could ever induce to separate from the parent association. . . . I beg to request, Beloved Liberator, that you will be pleased to crown our efforts for the restoration of perfect harmony by moving, as early as possible, that Messrs. Dunn, O'Malley, Daley and Roache be placed in their former honourable position as Repeal Wardens of the Association.³

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Rev. John Moore (died c. 1860), C.C. Virginia Street, Ratcliffe Highway, London. Repeal Warden in London since January 1845.
- 2 William John O'Connell, kinsman of O'Connell; inspector-general of Repeal Wardens in London.
- 3 A serious dissension had taken place among London Repeal wardens arising from a quarrel between Rev. John Moore and Patrick Roache, a Repeal warden. The matter was discussed at several meetings of the Repeal Association in the summer of 1845. In the Association on 14 July O'Connell declared that the recalcitrant wardens had the choice either of obeying the rules or withdrawing from the Association (*Nation*, 19 July 1845). On 11 August the Association in Dublin acting partly on the advice of William John O'Connell, decided to close several of the London branches because of their alleged refusal to obey the rules of the Association (*Nation*, 16 Aug. 1845).

3154

From J. Kelly,¹ Erina House, Castleconnell, Co. Limerick, 2 August 1845

Concerning an invitation given to O'Connell by the mayor of Limerick² to attend a dinner in the town hall to which he would ask the members of the corporation.³ The members were not told of the invitation and only learned of it when one of them, Martin Honan,⁴ had a conversation with O'Connell who told him of it. For fear that O'Connell might be placed in an embarrassing position the writer proposed a motion to the corporation which was largely negatived by an amendment. He maintains that his action had the approval of Steele, Capt. Brodrick⁵ and Honan.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Kelly, son of John Kelly, merchant, Limerick. M.P. for Limerick city July 1844 to 1847. A Repealer; and a wealthy landowner.
- 2 William H. Geary.
- 3 See letter 3152
- 4 Martin Honan, 8 Charlotte Quay, Limerick, woollen, wholesale and retail merchant; town councillor, Limerick.
- 5 Edward Broderick, Maryborough House, Co. Cork, late captain in the 34th regiment. Joined the Repeal Association 1844.

3155

From Rev. P. Cooper¹

Dublin, 3 [and 4] August 1845

Dear Mr. O'Connell,

Dr. Murray has addressed you and thereby in the opinion of very many here laid himself open to a raking fire.

The question all along was, in main part at least, were the powers conferred on the Bequests' Board or on the Catholic section of it by the Crown *uncanonical*. That question we all thought, misled it seems by the newspapers, was at last conceded by the representation of the Catholic Comrs. to Government, as reported by Sir James Graham. But in place of that doubtful concession we now have in this letter of the A.B.'s the more authentic and direct one of these prelates themselves who, to guard against the uncanonical powers conferred by the Act on these nominees of the Crown, have had to use the safeguard of a bye-law to neutralise and prevent the exercise of those powers.² Thereby the question that without such precaution the exercise of the powers of the Board would be uncanonical is conceded. The only question remaining is, whether this safeguard be an adequate one. You as a lawyer can settle that. Indeed you have done so already in your overwhelming argument of January last.³ . . . No bye-law can take away powers conferred by act of parliament. But the idea in Dr. Murray's mind is that it will prevent the Commissioners as *men of honour* from exercising their undoubted right to decide, without referring to the proper ecclesiastical authority, the claim of legatees coming before them. But then is it not clear that it is to their sense of honour and not to the act of parliament that the bishops will be indebted for this recognition. . . . I entreat that you do not allow yourself to be checked in the vigour of your reply by any chilling sense of respect towards the person [Archbishop Murray] who has thus challenged you to the defence of your views. . . . Are not the partisans of this Board the very same persons who too are partisans of the new scheme of Education? . . .
4 August 1845

I did not post my letter yesterday under the impression — I am now informed an erroneous one — that there was no post on Sundays. I avail myself of the circumstance to add that Dr. M. has by his letter weakened, as far as in him lies, the power of the Ministry to carry their amendments of this law next year. For may not the opposition cry out — Are we here to humour every absurd prejudice? Is the time of the House, which should be devoted to the real wants of the country, to be spent in altering what has been declared by a competent authority (Dr. Murray) a very good law in defer-

ence to the 'oversensitive' whims of a few old men?

Again, if these amendments are not called for by any 'necessity'— if the sole motive of their introduction be the very unfounded and extraordinary scruples of these oversensitive gentry, how comes it that this same Dr. M should have said in December last⁴ that it had defects which he deplored? What has removed these deplorable defects? Or, has the monster ceased to be ugly by dint of being gazed at? But suppose again, that the bishop of the legatee should reply to an application from the Commissioners to be informed who should receive the bequest to this effect, that he regarded the Commissioners' function as most detrimental to the Church and that therefore he would hold no communication with them *as commissioners*? In that case of what use would the 'declaration' be? The claimant would demand his money; the bishop would not give the evidence; the episcopal Commissioner would be sued, and the law would order the Commissioner to pay the money without the bishop's sanction. The Catholic Commissioner should either resign or violate the canons. Dr. M. never thought of this case. Yet I know that *many* of the bishops would decline answering the Commissioners' application. The case of a bishop being himself a legatee is not thought of.

Dr. M. says that bishops have been placed on that Board that they might in the first instance draw up a rule to guide the future practice of the Board. I read the proceedings at the time very carefully and can say that anything to indicate such was the purpose of their nomination does not appear in the reports. Their presence seemed to be desired only that they might decide in the individual case that should arise, and not that they should make any authoritative rule; and in fact such rule could not be authoritative with anyone who should be disinclined to respect it.

Dr. M. calls the bishops on the Board 'The *authorized expounders* of what the discipline should be.' His lordship mistakes. These prelates have not a particle of authority beyond their respective jurisdictions. In Munster and Connaught their authority as bishops is zero. If by authority they mean their *weight of character* to sway opinion, that they have in proportion to the credit they have for theological lore, and a professor of theology (which Dr. MacHale was) has more; but that authority is not of jurisdiction which is the only one applicable here and which does not extend an inch beyond their respective dioceses; whereas their duties as Commissioners extend to all Ireland.

In short, the very first case of two claimants for the same bequest that shall arise will expose the real character of the Board. The unsuccessful claimant will sue the Commissioners. The Commissioners will plead they acted under the bishops' authority. That, it

will be replied, is the very thing we object [to]; the bishop should by the act have no authority in the allocation of the money for it has been left to the Commissioners and to them alone. They *alone* have authority. Oh well! it will be replied, be it so, the Commissioners have decided by their own authority and only in conformity with the evidence of the bishop, *as a witness*. A witness, not a superior! A witness, not in such case a judge!

But the division, the unhappy dissension it has caused! Can anything compensate for that? No, were it all Dr. M. contends for, it were a poor compensation for the loss of our once cordial union. If the episcopacy were cordially united would the Ministry have dared to spread their educational snare for our youth? . . .⁵

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Rev. Peter Cooper (c. 1800-52), a native of Dublin; educated at Maynooth. C.C. St. Audeon's, Dublin c. 1823-34; St. Mary's, Marlboro Street, Dublin 1834-52. Author of articles particularly on education.
- 2 This refers to a letter from Murray to O'Connell dated 1 August 1845 (*Nation*, 9 Aug. 1845). O'Connell had referred in the Repeal Association on 21 July to a speech by Sir James Graham in the Commons on 18 July, in which Graham claimed the Catholic commissioners of the board of bequests had objected that the powers conferred on them by the board were uncanonical. O'Connell said he took this as a proof that Murray now agreed with him in his opposition to the board. In his letter, Murray pointed out that this was not the case, and that in fact he still supported the board.
- 3 O'Connell to the bishop of Meath, 6 January 1845, (*Nation*, 11 Jan. 1845). An extremely long letter, it contains an elaborate statement of O'Connell's objections to the bequests act. He states that the act gives power to three Catholic prelates and two Catholic laymen (members of the board) to decide, in case of dispute, who is the rightful bishop or priest to receive a bequest. This, O'Connell claims, confers on these persons an uncanonical power of interference in the affairs of the diocese of another bishop.
- 4 In his undated pastoral published in the *Freeman's Journal*, of 26 December 1844.
- 5 A reference to the colleges bill.

3156

From Margaret C. M. Netterville Blake

17 Donegall Place, Belfast, 7 August 1845

My ever dear Sir,

Yesterday James¹ and I heard you were to be in Tuam² and near our future home. I cannot tell you how much *we both* regretted not

being there to welcome you and to have made you as happy and comfortable as we could, as I am sure you would not have refused *me* and my darling husband the great pleasure of entertaining you. The truth is we have been detained here by dearest Rose McDowell who day after day has something new for us to see and so keeps us on I gave her a good scolding yesterday when I heard of your being in Galway but we made friends on condition that whenever you came to the country next she is to be with me to receive you and I hope I need not say how gladly we shall occupy ourselves in trying to make you happy. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Netterville Blake (died of typhus 24 August 1848), son of Capt. Netterville Blake; husband of Margaret, nee O'Mara, whom he married on 1 July 1845.
- 2 See letter 3157.

3157

To Margaret C. M. Netterville Blake,

Derrynane, 12 August 1845

My very dear Margaret,

Many, many thanks for your kind invitation to your house. I should be delighted if it were in my power to accept of it but my next trip to Connaught will not take place until *about* the 20th of next month, September, and I fear even if I were to go there sooner my route is too remote from your place to enable me to pay you a visit however desirous I should be to see my dear Margaret at home. I go by Tuam to Castlebar.¹

I should also be truly gratified to meet with you one² whose memory I most respectfully cherish in my innmost heart but whom I have long thought I should never see again. Will you give her my most respectful complts.

I beg my kind regards to your husband.

SOURCE: NLI, MSS 13660

- 1 The great Repeal meeting and banquet which O'Connell was to attend in Castlebar did not take place until 12 October (*FJ*, 15 Oct. 1845).
- 2 Rose McDowell. See letter 3156.

3158

To Archbishop MacHale

Derrynane, 12 August 1845

My revered and loved Lord,

Many and many hearty thanks for your kind letter, and the suggestions it contains. I am preparing my answer¹ to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray. It ought to be considerate and most courteous, without betraying any want of proper firmness. I do not know whether I shall succeed in writing such a letter, and I anxiously hope that, at all events, you will not be displeased at what I shall write. It would be to me a cruel punishment to merit your disapprobation.

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 744

1 This letter has not been traced.

3159

From T.M. Ray to Derrynane

Loyal National Repeal Association, Corn Exchange Rooms,
Dublin, 25 August 1845

My dear Liberator,

The meeting¹ today is a good average one, select and attentive. Mr. J. O'C [John O'Connell] did not remain long, having some engagements to attend. Captain Broderick finished the documents Mr. J. O'C had to read. We have passed an address to the Orangemen,² and a further address is to be brought up next week to the Repealers of the North.³

We have just received a return from the Registry,⁴ today 19 Repealers to O, so the Tories are run out. We are working the wards well. I had an admirable meeting in James' ward on Friday night; the *Rev. Mr. Canavan P.P.*⁵ in the chair. Rev. Mr. Gilligan⁶ and T.Crs. [Town Councillors] Shannon⁷ and Gavan⁸ attended, first time Rev. Mr. Canavan appeared, and he made an out and out Repeal speech and said he would be constantly with them. I composed some jealousies and left them all in good humour. I had other excellent meetings during the week. Captain Broderick is indefatigable, and doing great good in the northern wards. We report weekly, and the publicity is exciting exertion.

John Reynolds' conduct⁹ is creating general disgust and doing a good deal of mischief among ignorant and ill disposed persons; however it will recoil upon himself.

I received the Bills and check for Dalton.¹⁰ I was not aware he had sent down any papers or Mem[orand]a. I shall be particular about these matters hereafter.

We are doing all we can to work out the Registry Plan.¹¹ We have sent the enclosed circular to the Clergy to get 'Registry Wardens' named, and the Instruction Papers etc. are printing in quantity.

The Rent is £207.13.7

We are all delighted to hear that you, beloved Liberator, and all our dear friends with you are in choice health and spirits.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 The weekly meeting of the Repeal Association (*Nation*, 30 Aug. 1845).
- 2 An address, signed by John O'Connell, to the Protestants and Presbyterians of Ulster from the Repeal Association. It appealed for unity amongst Irishmen of all creeds in order to redress the grievances which, it claimed, accrued to Ireland from the Union (*Nation*, 30 Aug. 1845).
- 3 John O'Connell stated that the address to the Repealers was being deferred for a week to await the outcome of a forthcoming Orange meeting in Belfast (*Nation*, 30 Aug. 1845). See letter 3163 n3.
- 4 The Dublin city electoral registry (*Nation*, 30 Aug. 1845).
- 5 Rev. George Canavan (died 24 June 1851), formerly C.C. St. James. P.P., Naul. Co. Dublin 1832-42; P.P. St. James, Dublin 1842-51.
- 6 Probably Rev. P.J. Gilligan (died 26 March 1866), C.C. St. James, Dublin from before 1836 till his death.
- 7 Cornelius P. Shannon, 6 Mountbrown, Dublin; tanner; town councillor, St. James' ward, Dublin, from 1843; poor law guardian, Dublin.
- 8 Alderman Charles P. Gavin, 38 James' St., Dublin; corn and flour merchant.
- 9 In Dublin corporation on 6 August John Reynolds objected to the proposed imposition of a borough rate to pay off certain debts, claiming the demand for it was based on a grossly exaggerated estimate of expenses for the coming year. He said that many wealthy citizens were allowed evade taxation (*FJ*, 7 Aug. 1845). His statements sparked off a debate in the corporation lasting 13 days (see *FJ*, 21 Aug. 1845 *et seq.*). Reynolds was bitterly assailed by the great majority of the corporation including many prominent Repealers, and he claimed that all the liberal press with the exception of the *Dublin Evening Post* was opposed to him (*FJ*, 2 Sept. 1845; see also letter 3163 n2).
- 10 Unidentified.
- 11 This plan was developed by O'Connell in a letter to the Association dated 8 August (*Nation*, 16 Aug. 1845). He declared it was his aim to secure the return of 60-70 Repealers to parliament at the next election. He appealed to every parish to appoint wardens, who would be entrusted with the task of promoting registration of voters in the Repeal interest.

3160

*From the Trades of Limerick City, Trades Hall, 4 Charlotte's Quay,
Limerick, 26 August 1845*

A letter, addressed to 'Beloved Liberator' and written by John Nunan,¹ secretary to the trades, inviting O'Connell to a public banquet in Limerick city when it shall be convenient for him. Their resolution making the invitation mentions that 'we regret that any local misunderstanding should arise to impede the progress' of the holding of the banquet.² Nunan refers to 'our journey to nationality'.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 John Nunan, Secretary of the Trades of Limerick city and Secretary to the Mechanics Institution.
- 2 See letter 3152 note 1. O'Connell's reply, accepting the invitation and dated 29 August 1845 is published in the *Dublin Evening Post* of 4 September and the *Limerick Chronicle* of 6 September 1845.

3161

From Bishop Egan, Killarney, 29 August 1845

Asks for O'Connell's legal advice on some property, bequeathed by the late Dr. O'Sullivan to Maynooth College, with regard to the rights of the bishop of Kerry therein.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3162

From Thomas Steele to Derrynane

Dublin, 30 August 1845

[He thanks O'Connell for having praised his work as O'Connell's 'missionary in Tipperary.' He believes his visit to Enniskillen will do ultimate good.]¹ . . .

Sir John McNeill² on the moment promised when I gave him your communication, that he would not only give Mr. Hurry³ immediate employment when he presented himself but that 'he would take care of him according to his merit.'

Sir John is to be in Mallow on Tuesday and in Killarney on Wednesday, about the Railway proposed between these two towns.

Does not your heart throb with exultation at the manner in which John is doing his work among us as your representative in your absence. His reply⁴ to Scott and his [sic] were each masterpieces in their way.

[Steele says how it pained him to have as head-repeal warden, to deal with Corney O'Brien 'but if the mere creation of your influence after the part he took in 1828 chose to oppose himself to the movement of his leader and party, and that opposition given too through a very gross piece of political incivility (attempting to obstruct a public compliment)⁵, he had no right to expect to come off any better.']

A pretty scoundrel I'd be, if I were last winter to assail Major MacNamara for his infamous vote for espionage in the post office for a foreign tyrant,⁶ and let Corney O'Brien and my cousin-german off scott-free in this summer. . . .

P.S. John Reynolds, whose conduct in the town council⁷ has been an absolute public outrage, is getting hⁱmself blown out of the water.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Steele claimed in the Repeal Association on 1 September that he had 'within the last three months been in every county and through almost all the principal towns of Ulster' as O'Connell's missionary for peace and conciliation with the Orangemen. He had visited Enniskillen on the occasion of a great Orange meeting in the town on 12 August, on the night of which the windows of his host, Ralph Copeland, a Protestant, were broken by stones. He remarked that 'Enniskillen was the only place where I found ruffian violence' (*FJ*, 2 Sept. 1845). O'Connell had earlier declared that the present tranquillity of Tipperary was a personal triumph for Steele, who had lately undertaken a peace mission to that county (O'Connell to Ray, 8 Aug. 1845, *Nation*, 16 Aug. 1845).
- 2 Sir John Benjamin MacNeill, Kt. (c. 1793-1880), professor of civil engineering at Trinity College, Dublin 1842-52; engineer to the Great Southern and Western Railway. See *DNB*.
- 3 Unidentified.
- 4 In the Repeal Association on 4 August Richard Scott declared that the Association should either reject American donations or refrain from making sweeping attacks on American slavery. An acrimonious exchange followed between him and John O'Connell (*Nation*, 9 Aug. 1845). Of this incident Gavan Duffy writes that 'a respectable solicitor' (Scott) was asked 'how dare he come there' to controvert an opinion of Mr. John O'Connell's on the question of Negro slavery (Duffy, *Young Ireland*, II, 195-6). Duffy's comment is out of accord with the account of the debate in the Dublin press including the *Nation*.
- 5 Unidentified.
- 6 On 21 February 1845 William Nugent MacNamara voted against a motion to set up a select committee to inquire into the opening of letters by the post office. (*Hansard*, 3rd Ser., LXXVII, 1024). Political

refugees from European continental governments were the subject of concern.

7 See letter 3159.

3163

From T.M. Ray

Loyal National Repeal Association, Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin, 8 September¹ [1845 printed]

My Dear Liberator,

Upon your letter² being read John Reynolds seconded the motion for its insertion in the minutes! and said if he had a couple of hours conversation with you, he would convince you he was right!

Mr. J. O'Connell replied that that might be a difficult task when he could not after occupying many days and filling 30 or 40 columns of a newspaper, succeed in making a particle of a case.

Capt. Broderick brought up an address to the people of the north³ and made an excellent speech in which he turned to good account the mawkish sensibility about the shooting of the German deer, as contrasted with the utter disregard for the slaughter of human beings at Ballinahassig etc.⁴

Mr. J. O'Connell made as usual an admirable, brave, argumentative speech.⁵ The meeting is very well attended. There are at least two thousand present.

Mr. Smith O'Brien has had an interview with the *Limerick wardens*. There is as usual sad disorganisation there. I fear the materials are too discordant to expect much good. Their object is to keep in separate knots and bodies and he felt constrained to yield to that desire but told them unless in connection with a Reading Room the Rules forbade the allowance of any drawback.⁶

Still I greatly dread the relaxation of our Rules. There is hardly a place where troublesome spirits are not anxious to break through and the great danger is that, if it transpired that any privilege was allowed to Limerick, we would risk speedy disorganisation elsewhere. I enclose copy of Mr. O'Brien's Report. There seems to be a strong feeling of jealousy towards *Raleigh*.⁷ They don't like him to be inspector, I think if you could get him to resign it would be well, and have no inspector at all, and I believe it would be a good arrangement in future to appoint none but clergymen as inspectors, for the people soon get jealous of laymen exercising control. However, you, my dear Liberator, alone can make them agree to whatever plan you think most judicious.

Fr. Furlong⁸ has published in the *Tablet* a long letter which he says he sent to Mr. John O'Connell but which never came to hand. I suppose he will be satisfied now as he has got the opportunity of stating his case according to his own notions. Mr. J. O'C[onnell] determined that no notice should be taken of this or any other publication from London. Things are beginning to go on very well there again; we got £18 from them this week.

The Rent today is low⁹ [*remainder of letter is missing*]

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 This letter was erroneously dated 8 *August*.
- 2 O'Connell to Ray, 5 September 1845 (*Nation*, 13 September 1845). In this letter O'Connell gives notice of a motion to express the gratitude of the Repeal Association to the reformed corporation of Dublin, and 'our confidence in the intelligence and integrity of that respected body'. He declared this motion necessary because of the 'recent most unfounded attack upon that corporation' (see letter 3159 n9).
- 3 An address, undated, to the people of the north of Ireland, drawn up by Broderick at the request of O'Connell and the Association. It contrasted the peaceable behaviour of the Repealers with that of the Orangemen, and appealed to the latter as descendants of the Volunteers of 1782 to support Repeal (*Nation*, 13 Sept. 1845). See letter 3159 n3.
- 4 At the fair of Ballinahassig, Co. Cork on 30 June 1845 police fired on a crowd, killing six and wounding twenty-five. A jury brought in a verdict of 'justifiable homicide'. (For an account of the inquest see *FJ*, 7 July 1845 *et seq.*). In the course of his speech in moving the address, above, Broderick declared that while the English papers contained long diatribes against the queen for having recently attended a *battue* or deer slaughter in Germany, the same papers neglected to utter a word against the slaughter of human beings by the police at Ballinahassig.
- 5 John O'Connell spoke mainly in condemnation of the colleges bill and on the evils which he claimed accrued to Ireland from the Union (*Nation*, 13 September 1845).
- 6 Presumably the withholding for local purposes a portion of the money collected locally as Repeal rent.
- 7 A communication from John F. Raleigh of Limerick, dated 8 December 1844, was, at O'Connell's instigation, inserted in the minutes of the Association on 9 December 1844. In this Raleigh expressed the view that the Association should suppress local clubs and unite the entire movement under its leadership (*Nation*, 14 Dec. 1844).
- 8 Rev. Jonathan Furlong, 1 Russell Street, Liverpool, 6 August 1845 to J. O'Connell, M.P. (*Tablet*, 6 Sept. 1845). Furlong, who appears to be a native of Co. Clare, says he has been resident for the past two and a half years in London, engaged in religio-literary pursuits. He writes in support of the dismissed Repeal wardens whose case, he considers, has been misunderstood by the Association in Dublin. He describes Rev. John Moore as 'young and inexperienced'. See letter 3153.
- 9 It amounted to only £173.2.11 (*Nation*, 13 Sept. 1845).

3164

From William O'Donnell

Cottage [Carrick-on-Suir, Co. Waterford] 9 September 1845

Private

My dear friend,

I just returned from Thurles where we met in good numbers and arranged everything in a manner suitable to you. . . . The procession is to form at Holy Cross. . . . I promise you faithfully all Tipperary will be at their post and show with sincerity their true feelings towards you.¹

You can't go to Doheny's. It would not answer. . . . I don't know him sufficiently but his house I would not consent to have you at. I am writing to Nick Maher this post who I hear is just returned. Don't engage anywhere as I expect you'll either get an invite from Dean McDonnell,² Cashel or Dicky Howley,³ Tipperary, if not from Maher and by going to the latter you need not go near Thurles and can come to us another road to Holy Cross from where we can proceed *through Thurles* to our place of meeting. . . . If you agree to this it would be well to write Doheny you can't point out for the present your route as he may be going to some expense in the matter. . . .

I send you Nick Maher's answer at foot [O'Donnell has copied Maher's letter.]

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 On 26 September O'Connell attended a great Repeal meeting and banquet in Thurles (*Nation*, 27 Sept. 1845). Despite O'Donnell's advice, O'Connell did spend the previous night at Michael Doheny's house in Cashel (*Pilot*, 26 Sept. 1845).
- 2 Rev. James McDonnell, P.P. Cashel. Died 12 September 1855.
- 3 Unidentified.

3165

From T.M. Ray to Derrynane

Loyal National Repeal Ass., Corn Exchange Rooms, Dublin, 9
September 1845

My dear Liberator,

I have received Mr. Daunt's letter enclosing your draft on the Hibernian Bank for £727 to pay our Accounts etc. and for which we are much obliged. Tho' the printing account has been unusually heavy this month the work has been unusually useful for it comprised the Edition of Mr. J. O'Connell's Repeal Dictionary.

Everything here continues perfectly quiet. Few of the more talkative members come to committee now. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

3166

From Denis Shine Lawlor¹

Castlelough, Killarney, 10 September 1845

Private

My dear and respected Liberator,

We thank you from our hearts for your magnificent answer to our invitation.² As you leave the selection of the day to us and we are desirous that the demonstration should be worthy of you, we will take the 6th October. . . . We do not find that the higher powers of this neighbourhood are exerting any secret influence to distract us; and as some evidence, notwithstanding my personal exertions in the matter, I dined at Muckcross³ on Monday to meet the Dwarkanath Tagore,⁴ who spoke loudly of you and of Ireland.⁵ We will not publish your answer until next week as Lord Kenmare returns here on Friday and it may be bad taste to meet him on the very day of his arrival with a Repeal dispatch. . . .

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Denis Shine Lawlor (1808-87), eldest son of Denis Shine and Ellen, daughter of Martin Lawlor whose name he assumed by royal license. High sheriff for Co. Kerry 1840. See *Boase*.
- 2 O'Connell's reply, dated 8 September 1845, to the committee, of which Lawlor was a member, appointed to organise a Repeal meeting and banquet in Killarney appears in the *Pilot* of 1 October 1845. These events took place there on 6 October (*Pilot*, 10 Oct. 1845).
- 3 Residence of Henry Arthur Herbert.
- 4 Dwarkanath Tagore (1794-1846), a very rich Hindu merchant manufacturer, landowner and philanthropist of Bengal. Frequently styled Prince Tagore.
- 5 Tagore arrived at Derrynane on 6 September accompanied by his physician, Sir James Murray, and the sculptor, John Edward Jones. They departed the following morning for Killarney (*Pilot*, 12 Sept: *FJ*, 11 Sept. 1845). 'Of his interview with our own Prince O'Connell he [Tagore] speaks in terms of the highest satisfaction' (*Pilot*, 15 Sept. 1845).

3167

From P.V. Fitzpatrick to Derrynane

Dublin, 11 September 1845

My dear Liberator,

. . . The little I may have to say or suggest respecting things political, or politico-ecclesiastical, I advisedly reserve until your return to town at the end of the month. You are therefore to ascribe the *visitation* of this scrawl to my unavoidable acquiescence in the desire of a remarkable Editorial *enemy* of yours (Rev. N. Halpin,¹ one of the conductors of the *Evening Mail*) who *requires* me to get his brother's name mentioned by you to the oriental Prince Merchant — Tagore, if that personage should as the papers state be actually staying at Derrynane at this moment.² It appears that he has been making enquiries for a person to superintend a deaf and dumb institution in the East and Mr. F.J. Halpin,³ brother of the Reverend Tory Editor, would readily accept such an appointment for the duties connected with which he is I believe highly qualified, if his religion be no bar in your estimation. . . . Independent of other considerations it may be no harm to lay him under the obligation of submitting his brother's pretensions to the 'Prince Merchant'. The prospectus of the latter will give you facility for this.

I have returned to town this week for the purpose of arranging my machinery for the coming Tribute. The comparatively prosperous state of the country ought to make it very successful and *I* need not assure you that no exertion to that end shall be wanting on the part of, my dear Liberator,

Yours always most devotedly,
P.V. Fitzpatrick

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Rev. Nicholas John Halpin (1790-1850), 14 Seville Place, Dublin, took orders in Church of Ireland; sometime editor of the *Dublin Evening Mail*. See *DNB*.
- 2 See letter 3166.
- 3 Frederick James Halpin, deaf and dumb academy, 11 Northumberland Avenue, Kingstown, Co. Dublin.

3168

To William Smith O'Brien, Cahirmoyle, Rathkeale, Co. Limerick

Derrynane, 17 September 1845

My dear O'Brien,

Your letter of Saturday I received only today and I thank you exceedingly for your kind invitation though I can only partially accept it. I will cheerfully *lunch* and talk with you on Tuesday the 23rd about the hour of 3 o'clock. It would require a barrack and not a house to accomodate my family for the night. Besides it is absolutely necessary for me to be in Limerick that night to meet 'the Trades Deputation' respecting the dinner you speak of. You must have perceived in my answer to their invitation that I have given myself time to play the long game and I therefore can postpone the dinner till there is a prospect of unanimity amongst all Repealers in Limerick!. This is a topic on which I want to confer with you and to confer with you before I meet the Trades Deputation. So that your invitation comes quite apropos for this business. You may be quite certain beforehand that I will do nothing but what has your perfect approbation.

As to the County of Clare the delicacy that prevents your interference is obvious and must be approved of by everybody but it cannot prevent your listening to my plan for rousing the county because roused it must be.

As you have a notion of attending the Kerry dinner² I would venture to suggest to you not to derange yourself by going to Thurles. Kerry wants a stimulant. Tipperary, if anything, wants restraint.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 435

- 1 O'Connell to John Nunan, secretary, Limerick Trades, 29 August 1845 (*Nation*, 6 Sept. 1845). In this letter O'Connell said he proposed to come to Limerick before mid-September to meet a deputation of the trades to make arrangements for the dinner. See letters 3152 n1 and 3160.
- 2 Smith O'Brien was present at the Repeal meeting and banquet in Killarney on 6 October (see letter 3166 n2).

3169

To Thomas M. Ray¹

Derrynane, 17 September 1845

My dear Ray,

I do not know what to write. My mind is bewildered and my heart afflicted. The loss of my beloved friend, my noble-minded friend,² is a source of the deepest sorrow to my mind. What a blow — what a cruel blow to the cause of Irish nationality! He was a creature of transcendent qualities of mind and heart; his learning was universal, his knowledge was as minute as it was general. And then he was a being of such incessant energy and continuous exertion. I, of course, in the few years — if years they be — still left to me, cannot expect to look upon his like again, or to see the place he has left vacant adequately filled up; and I solemnly declare that I never knew any man who could be so useful to Ireland in the present stage of her struggles. His loss is indeed irreparable. What an example he was to the Protestant youths of Ireland! What a noble emulation of his virtues ought to be excited in the Catholic young men of Ireland! And his heart too! It was as gentle, as kind, as loving as a woman's. Yes, it was as tenderly kind as his judgment was comprehensive and his genius magnificent. We shall long deplore his loss. As I stand alone in the solitude of my mountains, many a tear shall I shed in the memory of the noble youth. Oh! How vain are words or tears when such a national calamity afflicts the country. Put me down among the foremost contributors to whatever monument or tribute to his memory shall be voted by the National Association. Never did they perform a more imperative or, alas, so sad a duty!

I can write no more — my tears blind me — and — after all,

*Fungar inani munere.*³

Yours ever,

Daniel O'Connell

SOURCE: *Freeman's Journal*, 23 Sept. 1845

- 1 This letter was read to the Repeal Association on 22 September (*Nation*, 27 Sept. 1845). Its importance justifies its publication even though it was probably intended as a public letter.
- 2 Thomas Davis.
- 3 A quotation from Horace which can be translated as 'I discharge a fruitless task.'

3170

To William Smith O'Brien

Merrion Square, 1 October 1845

My dear O'Brien,

I received your letter only this morning and hasten to reply to it

I hope to be at Newcastle [West] very soon after twelve on Saturday. I will wait for you there as long as you please. It is quite out of my power to go to Cahirmoyle as I have to see the Limerick Trades that morning and discuss their *present* differences.¹

My son Maurice will most readily accompany you on your tour.² I wish I could be of the party.

I will have accomodation secured for you at Tralee and Killarney.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 435

- 1 See letter 3168.
- 2 Smith O'Brien and Maurice O'Connell visited Kenmare, Co. Kerry on 11 October, where they met with a warm reception from some 2,000 persons (*DEP*, 16 Oct. 1845).

3171

From P. V. FitzPatrick

Dublin, 4 October 1845

My Dear Liberator,

It is stated today from private sources that Peel intends to give the Irish quit rents to the Catholic bishops as a fund for the building and repairs of our churches. They are valued aggregately at about £30,000 a year.

I hope that the miserable weather which prevails here has not accompanied you on your journey. Conway will do his part in showing up the *Times* commissioners. He is infuriate at Foster's¹ impudence and will punish it ruthlessly.²

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13646

- 1 Thomas Campbell Foster (1813-82), barrister and legal writer; son of John Foster, proprietor and editor of the *Leeds Patriot*; a native of Knaresboro, Yorkshire, parliamentary reporter for the *Times*. See *DNB*.
- 2 In 1845 the *Times* commissioned Thomas Campbell Foster to visit Ireland and report on the social condition there. During the autumn and winter of 1845 his articles appeared regularly, occupying a whole page

of the paper. O'Connell denounced Foster as 'the gutter commissioner' of 'the infamous *Times*'. Foster then inspected O'Connell's estate in Kerry and published in the *Times* 'a minute and merciless description of the squalor in which the *Liberator's* tenants lived.' The *Times* then sent William Howard Russell to Kerry, and he confirmed Foster's charge that there was 'not a pane of glass, not a window of any kind in half the cottages' at Derrynane Beg in the vicinity of Derrynane (*History of the Times: the Tradition Established 1841-1884*, London, 1939, 9-10). O'Connell's refutation of these statements proved, according to his laudatory biographer, O'Keeffe, so effective that even the Irish Tory journals declared he had been slandered (O'Keeffe, *O'Connell* II, 744-8). According to Macintyre 'while O'Connell was not a model or improving landlord his main fault seems to have been the indulgence which allowed his tenants to subdivide their holdings unchecked.' He was, besides, 'habitually short of capital for agricultural improvement' (Macintyre, *The Liberator*, 293 n1). In his autobiographical notes Russell later wrote: 'I believe the tenants of Derrynanebeg were squatters, the evicted refuse of adjoining estates, who flocked to the boggy valley where they were allowed to run up their hovels of soddened earth and mud, with leave to turn out their lean kine and cultivate patches of potatoes on the hillside, paying as many shillings as the agent could squeeze out of them' (John B. Atkins, *The Life of Sir William Howard Russell*, London, 1911, I, 33-34.).

3172

To Archbishop MacHale,

Killarney, 7 October 1845

My revered Lord,

I had the honour to receive an invitation from your Grace for Saturday and have the greatest pleasure in accepting. I will, I trust, wait on your Grace by four in the afternoon of Saturday. It will, I know, be necessary to leave Tuam very early on Sunday. I can offer your Grace *two* seats in my carriage to Castlebar.¹

We have had a glorious meeting here. Meeting and banquet were gloriously and most usefully carried out.²

SOURCE: Cusack, *Liberator*, 744

- 1 O'Connell arrived in Tuam on 11 October for the Castlebar Repeal meeting (*Pilot*, 13 Oct. 1845).
- 2 See letter 3166 n2.

3173

To Martin Madden, Sligo, 8 October 1845 from Killarney

Accepting kind invitation to stay with him when in Sligo.¹

SOURCE: Property of Mrs. Therese Delamer

- 1 On 15 October O'Connell attended a Repeal meeting and banquet in Sligo (*Nation*, 18 Oct. 1845).

3174

From Rev. John Sheehan

Waterford, 30 October 1845

My Dear Mr. O'Connell,

I sent you a few days ago the *Waterford Freeman* containing a letter written by me and I put asterisks at the commencement and termination of that letter in the hope that it might thereby attract your notice. But the report of your speech at the Conciliation Hall on last Monday¹ inclines me to think that the letter escaped your attention for I could not easily bring myself to believe that you would treat with silence and contempt my statement in reference to public matters made by me. With this impression in my mind I shall send you a number of the paper by this day's post.

There is no part of your doctrine as an agitator which I admire more than your saying that you would not bring about the greatest possible good at the expense of one drop of human blood. This is the true principle of the moral force revolutionist, and the announcement of it has secured for you the active cooperation of thousands amongst those who, looking only to their eternal interests, would not on any other terms consent to be implicated in the turmoil of political agitation.

I am sure that however just may [be] my own abhorrence for the spilling of blood, it is not stronger than your detestation of any course which would bring the bishops and the Catholic clergy into contempt amongst the people. . . . Read, I pray you, my letter and I ask if I have not established incontestably a case against Mr. Delahunty,² my own parishioner whom, under an erroneous impression no doubt, you are now sustaining against the Bishop and the two parish priests of Waterford. What can you think of a party who cast the vilest and most contumelious imputations upon such a man as Dr. Foran? He was lately closing a series of most instructive lectures and he found it necessary to advert in very strong terms to

the dissensions created in this city by the uncharitable and vituperative speeches made at the nocturnal meetings of the Waterford Repeal Association. . . . He was replied to by one of the party whom you are now sustaining: 'What a pity it is that Dr. Foran does [not] take the pledge from Father Mathew.'³ . . .

Your correspondent mentioned that the present divisions are the working of a Whig Party amongst us. I know Waterford well. There is no such thing as a Wyse Party here.⁴ The Ballybricken people have no understanding with him or his friends. It is equally untrue that there is any infidel Colleges Bill party. . . .

If Mr. Delahunty says that without following up the course he is pursuing, you cannot have two Repeal members for this city, he is making an unfair representation. The public feeling is too deeply imbued with the necessity of Repeal to allow the slightest chance to any others save candidates supporting that principle. . . .

P.S. My health, thank God, is improving daily.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 At the weekly meeting of the Repeal Association on 27 October, O'Connell announced that dissensions among Repealers in Waterford city were now at an end and he described the position there. He expressed approval of Alderman James Delahunty (*DEP*, 28 Oct. 1845).
- 2 James Delahunty (1808-85, son of Tobias Delahunty, Waterford, merchant; alderman of Waterford 1842-45; M.P. for Waterford city 1868-74; for Co. Waterford 1877-80. See *Boase*.)
- 3 A dispute had arisen among the Waterford city Repealers, apparently concerning the propriety of establishing a Repeal reading room at Ballybricken, which proposal was opposed by Delahunty and his supporters, acting, it appears, as representatives of the Association. (For some account of this affair see *Waterford Mail*, 4, 18 Oct., 1845). In the Repeal Association on the previous Monday, 27 October, O'Connell had said he would move a vote of thanks to Delahunty for securing a large majority of Repealers on the Burgess roll of Waterford only that it might make it appear he was taking sides in this quarrel (*Nation*, 1 Nov. 1845). In the Association on 3 November, he declared that while each party in the quarrel 'is in the wrong to a certain extent' he had been informed of the disrespectful language used by the popular party towards Bishop Foran, and, since then towards another local clergyman as well, and he called on the popular party to apologise. At the same time he expressed the hope that Delahunty and his followers would not be calumniated. He offered to settle the disputes between the parties or, failing this, that he and Fr. Sheehan together should do so (*Nation*, 8 Nov. 1845).
- 4 O'Connell had said at the Repeal Association on 27 October that there were three parties in Waterford — 'the Wyse party, including an infidel Colleges party — the Barron party and the popular party'. In the Association on 3 November, he explained that by a Wyse party he had meant a small group of personal friends of Thomas Wyse, who though an excellent man was no Repealer. He had since learnt from a source in

which he placed 'implicit reliance' that no such party existed. He also retracted his statement that a colleges bill party existed in Waterford (*Nation*, 8 Nov. 1845).

3175

From Mrs. Jane Simmonds, Castlegregory, Co. Kerry, 12 November 1845

The writer states she is an Englishwoman, widow of Lieut. Simmonds who came to Castlegregory to join the coastguard service and died in it in 1840, Owing to a malicious report that she had married again she has lost her widow's pension. She asks O'Connell to intercede for her with the admiralty in order to have it restored.

'The Rev. Mr. Weir,¹ formerly curate of Castleisland [Co. Kerry], could also satisfy you of my case. Your former kindness to him will never be forgotten by him. He has by your kindness the living of Ballyquin² three miles from this place.'

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 James Weir (c. 1791-1867), rector of Cloghane, 1839-67 and Ballyduff, 1858-67, both Co. Kerry.
- 2 A village, six miles north of Dingle.

3176

From the Catholics of Celle, Kingdom of Hanover, 14 November 1845, to London redirected to Dublin

A letter from the wardens and congregation of the Roman Catholic Church in Celle enclosing a petition (not extant) seeking funds. They praise O'Connell's work for oppressed Catholics in Ireland.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

3177

From Justin Supple,¹ Tralee, 17 November 1845

Describes himself as brother of Dan Supple, Jr., who has died leaving property in the form of debts due to him and which cannot be collected soon enough to meet creditors' demands. Asks for a loan of £300. As he can't pay his brother's debts without this loan, he will be ruined if he does not obtain it.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Attorney, Dublin and Tralee.

3178

From Edmond Smithwick, Kilkenny, 21 November 1845

Asks O'Connell again to arrange about the payment of election expenses in Carlow, particularly to Peter Flood¹ of Carlow who has been distrained and who states he is owed £18. Rev. Dr. Lawler,² Rev. Mr. Walsh³ and others had undertaken to prepare a certified statement of the debts but have not yet furnished it.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Peter Flood, publican, Wellington Square, Carlow.
 2 Rev. Denis Lawler or Lalor, V.G. (died 10 Feb. 1855). P.P. Bagenalstown from before 1836 to 1855.
 3 Unidentified.

3179

*From Mrs. B. Somers,¹ Roristown, [? near Trim, Co. Meath]
 22 November 1845*

The writer, a widow, of the house of Connolly's and Somers, is impoverished and appeals to O'Connell to head the list of subscribers to a publication of translations² which she had prepared.

SOURCE: O'Connell MSS, UCD

- 1 Probably the widow of Alexander Somers, 1 Upper Mount Street, Dublin, of the brewing firm of Connolly and Somers (or Summers), 28 South King Street, Dublin.
 2 *Selections from the modern Poets of France* (published by Churton, 1845).

3180

From William Smith O'Brien

Cahirmoyle [Co. Limerick], 18 December 1845

Private

My Dear Mr O'Connell,

I cannot describe to you the solicitude which I feel with respect to the policy of the Repeal Party in connection with the recent change of Government.¹ I entertain the most sincere conviction that upon the conduct which we shall adopt during the next three months depend not only our chance of witnessing the accomplishment of the Repeal of the Union but also the character of the Irish nation. If all our exertions, our pledges may I say, our *sacrifices* are to end in placing the Irish nation under the feet of the English Whigs, I own I cannot justify to myself the part which I have acted nor do I think that the Repeal agitation will have conferred upon Ireland anything but injury and disgrace.

Assuming that in these sentiments you agree, it becomes a question what policy is most honourable to the national character, what most conducive to the end which we profess to have in view.

I confess that after much consideration I can arrive at no other conclusion than that we ought to observe a strict neutrality between the two great English factions, supporting good measures according as they may be proposed by either, but creating for ourselves an Irish national party entirely independent of both. By such a party every question would naturally be considered not with reference to the interests of Lord John Russell and Mr. Labouchere² etc. but with a regard to its bearing on the welfare of Ireland and specially on the promotion of the main object which we have in view — the legislative independence of Ireland.

Sir Colman O'Loghlen³ has sent me a copy of resolutions which he says have been adopted by the Committee. If they be acted upon firmly and consistently they will have the effect of creating such an independent party as I have described. We shall go to the House of Commons or we shall stay at Conciliation Hall. With a phalanx of fifty or sixty men, bold, earnest, resolute men of good character and abilities and with such a body active upon high and independent principles we shall not only command the respect of all parties but we shall hold under our control the destinies of the Empire. I confess I am exceedingly careless who may be the minister in England. I believe it to be for the interest of Ireland that administration after administration should be shipwrecked until England shall have learned that it would be wise on her part as well as just to conform to

the wish and the determination of Ireland by acceding to our demand for a national parliament. In the meantime we will accept, nay we will insist upon receiving as much useful legislation as we can extort from the British Parliament: but the alternative which ought be presented to the minister is in my opinion not 'If you give us these measures we will support you' but 'If you do not give us these measures we will oppose you.'

I hope that you will avoid the trap which the English Whigs have laid for us in making the Repeal of the Corn Laws their party cry. I know how strong an opinion you entertain in favour of their total and immediate repeal and it is quite natural that you should earnestly advocate the opinion which you have so long entertained but any attempt to force the convictions of others by making the support of immediate Repeal of the Corn Laws a party cry in Ireland will have the effect which the Whigs so earnestly desire it should have — of creating dissension amongst us. Speaking with reference to my own personal interests and my own private feelings I am perfectly indifferent whether the Corn Laws be repealed or not but looking to the interests of those whom I represent and of the nation at large I, in common with a large proportion of the Liberal party, formed an opinion that whatever may be the ultimate fate of the Corn Laws it is wiser under present circumstances to commence with a moderate fixed duty than to adopt a total Repeal. I am not disposed to change that opinion merely because Lord John Russell finds it convenient for party purposes to abandon the ground which he formerly occupied, and for the sake of rallying a great party, to announce himself a convert to the opinion of Mr. Cobden. But even if I were personally willing to sacrifice my own persuasions on the subject I do not believe that I should be sustained by my constituents who would justly reproach me if they were to find their future injured, perhaps ruined, by a total repeal of the Corn Laws. If the question of their immediate abolition were put to the poll in any county in Ireland I am convinced that nine out of every ten of the electors would vote against their Repeal. Under all these circumstances in the formation of an Irish national party the Corn Laws must be left *an open question*. Your personal example and influence will bring many to the support of your views. To the operation of such influences no one can fairly object but if those who honestly entertain a different opinion are held up to public odium it will be impossible to avoid collisions which I am sure that you are as anxious as I am to avert.

I perceive that the Dublin conservative papers are as usual labouring in their vocation and endeavouring to raise jealousy between you and me.⁴ I trust sincerely that they will fail in their ignoble efforts and it is because I know no mode so effectual for obviating

misapprehensions as frank, unreserved and timely explanations that I have ventured to trouble you with the perusal of so long a letter.

I am afraid that you have forgotten a request contained in my last letter (written respecting the registration of Repealers in Armagh) to the effect that you would kindly send back the extract from Mrs. Caulfield's⁵ letter relative to Col. Rawdon which I transmitted to you.

SOURCE: O'Connell Papers, NLI 13649

- 1 Peel had decided to repeal the corn laws. He failed to secure sufficient support from his cabinet and on 6 December tendered his resignation to the queen. The news of his resignation became public on 10 December. On 8 December the queen asked Russell to form a government. After much hesitation, Russell decided on 18 December to form a cabinet but did not succeed in doing so. On 20 December Peel was recalled and within three days had reconstituted his cabinet (Halevy, *Victorian Years*, 113-21).
- 2 Henry Labouchere (1798-1869), liberal M.P. from 1826; chief secretary for Ireland, July 1846-47; created Baron Taunton in 1859. See *DNB*.
- 3 Sir Colman Michael O'Loughlen, second baronet (1819-77), son of Sir Michael O'Loughlen, master of the rolls; called to the bar, 1840. See *DNB*.
- 4 Probably a reference to an editorial in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of the previous day, which claimed O'Connell and O'Brien were now rivals, and that the former would have to put down the Young Irelanders in the Repeal Association which was becoming 'O'Brienised'.
- 5 Probably Elizabeth Margaret, wife of Hon. Henry Caulfield and daughter of Dodwell Browne of Raheens, Co. Mayo.

3181

To William Smith O'Brien, Cahirmoyle

Merrion Square, 20 [and 22] December 1845

Private

My dear O'Brien,

You do not know me, I have passed 50 years of my life in agitation and I never was jealous of any man. I differed from many of my co-agitators on various points but I never had a feeling of jealousy to anybody — the more any of my fellow-labourers earned the popular applause and the good opinion of wise men, the more I rejoiced and this feeling it is that makes me exult in your present popularity, a popularity most honourably achieved and which I ardently desire to see daily increase and would myself increase it if that were possible.

Give me credit through life for the perfect sincerity of this policy and you will do me but simple justice.

I do not read the Conservative newspapers, and even if I did, their contents would no more govern or influence my conduct than would the barking of a cur dog.

I entirely agree with you that none of the Repeal Party should ever give a single vote as a preference to the Whigs beyond the Tory's or the reverse, and so firmly am I convinced that this is our present policy that if the Jamaica question¹ were tomorrow to arise again, I would vote as you did on that question though it were to turn the Whig minister out of office the next hour.

And now I have to say that no political document ever gave me such heartfelt affliction as your letter announcing your support of the Corn Laws in a qualified shape. You do not take up any opinion lightly and therefore I abandon in despair any attempt to argue with you on the subject but my sorrow is not on that account the less bitter and poignant. The fact is this — that my attendance on the Mansion House Committee² has made me acquainted with the frightful certainty of an approaching famine; and you know pestilence always follows famine, the prospect is really frightful especially in the north of Ireland. If the Government does not act promptly and most bountifully in affording ample means of employment and placing within the reach of the labouring classes a sufficient quantity of food, to be paid for out of the money they receive as wages, unless, I say, that Government comes forward energetically with some plan of this kind, it is impossible to calculate the number of people that will perish in Ireland within the next twelve months of famine and pestilence.

But, how can we insist upon the Government finding employment and food or to do anything respecting these objects if we vote in favour of the Corn Laws and thereby prevent food being as cheap as it otherwise would be. How can we on the one hand complain of starvation and on the other vote against provisions being as cheap as they might otherwise be.

I support the Whig Government only for the Repeal of the Corn Laws and my support is strictly limited to the Corn Law question.

However, as you require that the Corn Law question should be an open question in the Association, I of course at once comply. You are most completely entitled to have your opinion respected to the extent of having no question considered as *closed* which you are convinced ought to be open.

I exceedingly regret your support of the Corn Laws but I know perfectly well that your opinion is founded on principles that consist with perfect political integrity and high honour, therefore I leave the matter, as you desire, undecided by the Association.

I entirely concur with you that the Repeal members should not

give one party vote during the next session. However, our neutrality ought not to be a *sulky* neutrality but we ought to vote for every good measure the Government propose and against every bad measure the Tories propose. I would reverse the sentiment and vote against every bad measure the Government propose as well as support every good measure the Tories propose so that, you perceive, we are perfectly agreed upon everything except the unfortunate Corn Laws; and it is more unfortunate that you should entertain the opinions you do on that subject adverse to the great majority of the Repealers as I think there cannot be the least rational doubt but that those Laws are irretrievably doomed to destruction.

I am quite ashamed to tell you that I have mislaid Mrs. Caulfield's letter. I have searched for it painfully but in vain. I do implore of you to forgive me though I certainly do not deserve forgiveness.

22nd December

I had my letter written *thus* far on Saturday when it became too late to finish it and send it by that post. I did intend to have touched upon several other topics which were of interest then, yet are now inapplicable to our present position.

Lord Grey it was that broke up the projected Cabinet by insisting that Lord Palmerston should not be minister of War. This fact you may rely on but do not spread it.

You may also rely on this, that even in his state of uncertainty, Lord John took preliminary measures to have a bill for the extension of the suffrage in Ireland prepared without any kind of delay. This is confidential but I have it from the first authority.

If we could have managed to play our cards well in Lord John's Government, we should have *squeezed out* a great deal of good for Ireland without for one moment merging or even postponing Repeal but on the contrary advancing that measure.

Every popular concession, as I know, advances the cause of Repeal. I could satisfy you on this point and will when we meet.

SOURCE: Smith O'Brien Papers, NLI MSS 435

- 1 See letter 2608 n2. Smith O'Brien was one of a small number of government supporters who voted against the ministry on the Jamaica bill in May 1839 thus bringing about the government's resignation (see letter 2611).
- 2 The Mansion House Committee was set up by Dublin corporation on 21 October 1845 to inquire into the causes of the potato failure. It was from the outset very much under O'Connell's influence, and was subsequently enlarged to include Whigs, such as the duke of Leinster and Lord Cloncurry, and Liberals and Repealers. At O'Connell's suggestion it sent a deputation to the lord lieutenant, urging the necessity of restricting the use of grain in brewing and distilling, and of imposing some limitation on the export of foodstuffs. The committee 'served as a useful clearing house for information relating to the spread

of the potato blight, and it helped to contradict the protectionist claim that there was no serious food crisis in Ireland' (Nowlan, *Politics of Repeal*, 96-7; Macintyre, *Liberator*, 284-5).

3181a

To his daughter Kate O'Connell, Aghada [Cahirciveen, Co. Kerry]

Merrion Square, 24 December 1845, Christmas Eve
My own dearest darling Catty,

Many and many a happy Christmas to my *dearest* Child, to her dear Husband and to their dearly loved girls and boy — of all of whom my heart doats.

You and I, sweet Catty, had always *a secret*, and now in strict secrecy I give you a cheque for one hundred guineas and which I send you as your Christmas box but you may, if you please, give to Charles as a new year's gift with my most affectionate love. But this must be a secret as others would *perhaps* be jealous.

I fear much that rascally politics will prevent me from seeing your darling family until summer, which will afflict my heart sorely. But God's will be done.

I mean at Easter to go to Liege to see Nell and her darlings. She is, I regret to say, in indifferent health.

I do not think Peel will be able to form a permanent ministry. We are near strange scenes, darling, favourable I do believe to poor Ireland.

What report can Charles make of the state of the potatoes in the country generally as well as his own crop.

[P.S.] *Any* Tralee or Killarney bank will cash this cheque. Pray for me *all* of you.

SOURCE: Professor Andrew B. Myers, Fordham University

3182

To Lord Cloncurry

Merrion Square, 27 December, 1845

My Lord,

You have encouraged me to make a suggestion, which I do with great diffidence and with the hope that, if you do not concur with me, you will not think it necessary, as it certainly is not, to tell me why we now differ.

The suggestion is, that you will be so good as to write a letter to the Knight of Kerry, inquiring of him, first, whether to his knowledge I am a good landlord; secondly, whether I treat my tenants with kindness and care; thirdly, whether my tenants are not as well off and as comfortable as the tenants of any other landlord in that county.

What I could wish would be that YOU, my Lord, should take the additional trouble of informing the Knight of Kerry that it was intended to publish his letter, and when you receive it I should be greatly gratified were you to enclose it to me in a letter stating your own impressions of my conduct as a landlord derived from your visits to that county.

I enclose the Knight of Kerry's letter, which I return to you with my most cordial thanks. I am greatly indebted to the Knight for his very handsome *conduct* to me on this occasion.

SOURCE : FitzPatrick, *Corr.*, II, 365-6

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.

- Aberdeen, 4th earl of, *see* Gordon,
George Hamilton-
A'Court, William, 1st Baron Heytesbury
3089
Acton, Charles Januarius, Cardinal, 2959
Acton, William, 2899
Adare, Viscount, *see* Quin, Edwin Rich-
ard Wyndham Wyndham-
Agnew, Peter, 3022
Albert, Prince, 2804
Alcock, Henry, 2912
Aldworth, Richard, 2911
Alexander, James Du Pre, 3rd earl of
Caledon, 2840
Allen, Richard, 2934
Alsager, Richard, 2804
Altamont, earl of, *see* Browne, George
John
Anglesey, 1st marquis of, *see* Paget,
Henry William
Arabin, Charles, 2875, 2879
Armstrong, Robert, 2908
Arundell, Henry Benedict, 11th Baron
Arundell of Wardour, 3085
Aspinwall, Col. Thomas, 3027a
Atkinson, Mr., 2795
Auckland, 2nd Baron, *see* Eden, George
Austen, *see* Austin, Charles
Austin, Charles, 2884
- Bagshawe, Henry R., 3041
Baines, William, 2796
Ball, Nicholas, 2799
Baring, Francis Thornhill, 2842
Baring Bros., 3115
Barnett, General Charles, 2930
Barrett, Richard, 2916, 2988, 3005a: 2800,
3039, 3135
Barry, Garret Standish, 2890b, 2900
Bavaria, king of, *see* Ludwig I
Bayle, Pierre, 3008
- Beamish, Francis Bernard, 2870, 3018
Beaumont, 8th Baron, *see* Stapleton,
Miles Thomas
Belfast, earl of, *see* Chichester, George
Hamilton
Bell, Col. Gonne, 3029
Bell, Edward Gonne, 2912
Bennett, Rev. David, 2813
Bennett, James Gordon, 3028
Bennett, Thomas Anderson, 2813
Bentinck, Lord William Henry Cavendish
2820
Berenas, Julius, 3069
Beresford, George de la Poer, 2863
Bianconi, Charles, 3006, 3120
Blake, —, 3143
Blake, Andrew William, 2912
Blake, Anthony Richard, 3071
Blake, Edmond, 2912
Blake, James Netterville, 3156-57
Blake, Margaret C.M. Netterville (née
O'Mara), 3156-57
Blake, Rev. Michael, Catholic bishop of
Dromore, 2886
Blayney, Cadwallader Davis, 12th Baron
Blayney, 2840
Blennerhassett, Sir Rowland, decd. reps.
of, 2826, 3016
Bodkin, John James, 2912
Boltze, Heinrich Ludwig, 3069
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 3080
Bordeaux, Henry Charles, duc de Bord-
eaux and comte de Chambord, 3041
Bourke, J., 3145
Bourke and Son, John, 2816, 2980
Bourke, Major-General Richard, 2895
Bowring, John, 2796, 2851
Boylan, Nicholas, 2901
Brady, Sir Nicholas W., 2928
Brennan, James, 2903
Broderick, Capt. Edward, 3154, 3159,

- 3163
 Brooks, John, 2820
 Brophy, John, 2994
 Brosnan, C. M., 3027a
 Brotherton, Joseph, 2808, 2831-32
 Brougham, Henry Peter, 1st Baron
 Brougham, 2887, 2888: 2845, 2948
 Brown, John L., 3062
 Browne, Mr., 2932
 Browne, Dominick, 1st Baron Oranmore
 and Browne, 2887a
 Browne, George John, *styled* earl of Altamont, 2887a
 Browne, George Joseph, bishop of
 Galway, *later* bishop of Elphin, 3114
 Browne, Michael Joseph, 2897, 2912, 2917
 Browne, Robert Dillon, 3135
 Browne, Valentine, 2nd earl of Kenmare,
 2879, 3166
 Browne, Hon. William, 2879
 Bruen, Col. Henry, 2858, 2872, 2890,
 2891, 2904
 Buccleuch, 5th duke of, *see* Scott, Walter
 Francis Montagu Douglas
 Buggy, Kevin T., 2865, 2905
 Buller, Charles, 3047-48
 Bunbury, Thomas, 2872, 2891
 Burke, Edmund, 2923a, 3049
 Burke, Rev. John, P.P., 2901
 Burke, Bishop Patrick, 3031a
 Burke, Thomas V., O.P., 2923: 2916
 Burns, Robert, 3008
 Burroughes, Henry Negus, 2838
 Burtchalls, the, 2891, 2893
 Burton, Charles, 3152
 Butler, James, 13th Baron Dunboyne,
 3059
 Byrne, James, 3093
 Byrne, Timothy, 3093
- Cade, Jack, 3141
 Caledon, 3rd earl of, *see* Alexander,
 James Du Pre.
 Callaghan, Daniel, 2870
 Calvin, John, 3008
 Camoys, 3rd Baron, *see* Stonor, Thomas
 Campbell, John, 1st Baron Campbell,
 2949a, 3034: 2851, 2883, 2903, 2950,
 2956, 3055
 Canavan, Rev. George, 3159
 Cane, Robert, 3135
 Cantwell, John, bishop of Meath, 3131:
 2907
 Cantwell, John MacNamara, 3064
 Capel, Arthur Algernon, 6th earl of Essex
 3001
 Carleton, William, 3008
 Carmichael, Richard, 2886
- Carrick, Thomas, 3078a, 3093
 Carroll, —, 2940, 2955
 Casserly, Daniel, 2930
 Castlemaine, 3rd Baron, *see* Hancock,
 Richard
 Caulfield, Elizabeth Margaret, 3180-81
 Caulfield, Francis William, 2nd earl of
 Charlemont, 2849, 3063, 3103
 Caulfield, Hon. Henry, 3103, 3106, 3110
 Cave, Robert Otway, 3123a, 3126
 Cavendish, Hon. Charles Compton, 2890a
 Cavendish, William George Spencer, 6th
 duke of Devonshire, 2890a
 Celle, Catholics of, 3176
 Chandos, Lord, *see* Grenville, Richard
 Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-
 Charlemont, 2nd earl of, *see* Caulfield,
 Francis William
 Charles, C.A., 2799
 Chatterton, James Charles, 2870
 Chichester, George Hamilton, *styled* earl
 of Belfast, 2884
 Childs, John, 2806, 2838
 Clarke, Mr., 3050
 Clarkson, Edward, 2860
 Cleave, John, 2876
 Clements, Edward, 2865
 Clifford, Hugh Charles, 7th Baron Clif-
 ford of Chudleigh, 2922: 3085
 Cloncurry, 2nd Baron, *see* Lawless,
 Valentine Browne
 Cloney, Thomas, 3135
 Cobden, Richard, 3180
 Collins, C. O'B., 3021
 Collins, Rev. Denis M., 2882
 Collins, Thomas, 3089
 Cologne, Catholic archbishop of *see* von
 Droste zu Vischering, Clemens,
 Colquhoun, John C., 2856
 Connolly's and Somers, 3179
 Connor, Charles, 2881
 Conway, Frederick William, 2805, 2905,
 3011, 3111, 3113, 3123, 3171
 Cooke, Rev. Henry, 2801
 Cooper, Rev. P., 3155
 Copeland, Ralph, 3162
 Copley, John Singleton, 1st Baron Lynd-
 hurst, 2949a, 3141, 3152a
 Corbally, Matthew Elias, 2901, 2903, 2905
 2907
 Corcoran, Denis, 3027a
 Corcoran, John, 2891
 Cork City Gaol, Governor *et al* of, 2920
 Cormac (huntsman), 2925
 Costello, Patrick, 2871
 Costello, Rev. Thomas O'Brien, 2895
 Cottenham, 1st Baron, *see* Pepys,
 Charles C.
 Courtenay, William, 29th earl of Devon,

- 3038: 3042, 3142
 Coxon, William, 2983
 Coyne, John V., P.P., 3019
 Crampton, Philip Cecil, 2945, 2955
 Crawford, William Sharman, 2789, 2851,
 2924, 2927, 2934, 3103, 3106, 3110,
 3113, 3116
 Crolley, William, Catholic archbishop of
 Armagh, 2957
 Cromwell, Oliver, 3031a, 3140
 Cullen, Rev. Paul, 2959: 2891
 Cumming, John, 2990
 Cunliffe, R.E., 2831, 2832
 Curnin, John, 2797
 Curran, John Philpot, 3034
 Currey, Francis Edmund, 2890a, 2890b,
 Curry, William, 2980
 Custis, George Washington Parke, 2951
- Daley, —, 3153
 Dalton, —, 3159
 Daly, David, 2847, 2849
 Daly, James (Dunsandle), 2912
 D'Arcy, Patrick, C.C., 2990: 3007
 Daunt, William Joseph O'Neill, 2978,
 3106, 3108: 2881, 2891, 2979, 3001,
 3012, 3165
 Davenport, Edward Davies,
 3065, 3067
 Davis, Thomas, 3109: 2877, 3101, 3116,
 3169
 Dawson, Major Thomas, 2829
 de Freyne, 1st Baron, *see* French, Arthur
 De Grey, 2nd Earl, *see* Grey, Thomas
 Philip
 Delahunty, James, 3174
 Denman, Thomas, 1st Baron Denman,
 3062, 3085
 Devon, 29th earl of, *see* Courtenay,
 William
 Devonshire, 6th duke of, *see* Cavendish,
 William George Spencer
 Dickens, Charles, 3005a
 Dickson, Samuel, 2895
 Dillon, —, 2890b
 Doheny, Michael, 2874, 2877, 3164
 Donovan, John and Sons, 3136
 Doud, David, 2851, 2883: 2868
 Dowden, Richard, 3033, 3079-80, 3107
 Downshire, 3rd marquis of, *see* Hill,
 Arthur Blundell Sandys
 Doyle, Rev. Christopher, P.P., 2891
 Doyle, Sir John Milley, Kt., 2886
 Doyne, Charles Henry, 2891
 Drinan, Andrew G., 2995
 Dryden, John, 2914, 2936
 Duffy, Charles Gavan, 2835: 2857, 3008,
 3014, 3039, 3074, 3097, 3109, 3116, 3162
 Duggan, Timothy, 2873
- Dunboyne, 13th Baron, *see* Butler, James
 Duncannon, Viscount, *see* Ponsonby,
 John William.
 Duncombe, Thomas S., 2875
 Dunn, —, 3153
 Dwyer, Thomas, 2893
- Easthope, Sir John, Bt., 2796, 3107
 Ebrington, 2nd Earl, *see* Fortescue, Hugh,
 Eden, George, 2nd Baron Auckland, 2797
 Egan, Alderman Cornelius, 2952
 Egan, Cornelius, Catholic bishop of Kerry
 3161
 Eichholz, Ebrenreich, 3069
 Eldon, 1st Baron, *see* Scott, John
 Eliot, Edward Granville, *styled* Lord Eliot
 2940, 2960-61, 3005
 Ellice, Edward, 2885: 2887a, 2891
 Ellis, Wynn, 2796
 Elmore, John Richard, 2822
 Emery, —, 2854
 Emery, B.F., 2825
 Ennemoser, Joseph, 2954
 Ennis, John, 2874
 Espartero, Baldomero, 2959
 Essex, 6th earl of, *see* Capel, Arthur
 Algernon
 Ewart, William, 2851
- Fagan, William Trant, 3076: 3079
 Faithful, Mr., 2851
 Fanand, Banks, 3060
 Faris, John, 3110a
 Farrell, Daniel Henry, 2863, 2879
 Feeny, Rev. Owen (Eugene), 2915
 Ferguson, Sir Robert Alexander, 2nd
 baronet, 3038, 3042
 Ffoliot, John, 2915
 Ffrench, Betsey, *see also* O'Connell, Eliz-
 abeth Mary (Betsey) (daughter), 2932,
 3078, 3099: 2978
 Ffrench, Charles Austin, 3rd Baron
 Ffrench, 2896, 2912, 3024: 3020
 Ffrench, Hon. Martin Joseph, 2897, 2912,
 2917
 Ffrench, Nicholas Joseph, 2932, 2978
 Fingall, 9th earl of, *see* Plunkett, Arthur
 James
 FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick, 3rd duke
 of Leinster, 2890b, 2892-93, 3073, 3181
 FitzGerald, Charles William, *styled* mar-
 quess of Kildare, 2874, 2890a, 2890b,
 2892, 2894
 Fitzgerald, Edward Michael, 2906
 FitzGerald, John F., knight of Glin, 28
 FitzGerald, Maurice, Knight of Kerry,
 2826, 3016, 3182
 Fitzgerald, Richard Albert, 3123a
 Fitzgerald, Thomas (Cork), 2805, 3046

- Fitzgibbon, Hon. Richart Hobart, 2895
 FitzPatrick, Miss, 3023
 FitzPatrick, Patrick Vincent, 2802-05, 2807, 2809-10, 2815-17, 2839, 2841-42, 2844, 2846-49, 2852, 2854-59, 2869, 2886, 2903-05, 2907, 2940-41, 2943, 2945-46, 2948, 2963-64, 2967, 2969, 2971, 2974, 2980, 2991, 2993-94, 2996, 3023, 3039-40, 3043, 3046, 3052-54, 3056, 3063, 3094, 3098, 3100, 3105, 3110, 3111-14, 3117, 3123, 3147, 3149, 3167, 3171: 2972, 2975 3102
 Fitz-Simon, Christopher, 2840, 2870-72, 2875, 2878-79, 2884, 2891, 2893, 2899-2900, 3095: 2816, 2822a, 2841, 2881, 2890a, 2890b, 2903, 2940, 3063, 3100
 Fitz-Simon, Christopher O'Connell, 2881
 Fitz-Simon, Daniel O'Connell, 2881: 3095 3099, 3100, 3100a
 Fitz-Simon, Ellen, *see also* O'Connell, 2881, 3095, 3100, 3181a
 Fitz-Simon, Mary, 2881
 Fitzwilliam, Charles William Wentworth-, 3rd Earl Fitzwilliam 2849, 2891, 2903
 Fitzwilliam, William Thomas Spencer Wentworth-, *styled* Viscount Milton, 2903
 Flanagan, Rev. Matthew, 2858
 Fleming, —, 2978
 Fleming, Michael Anthony, Catholic bishop of Newfoundland, 2962
 Flood, Peter, 3178
 Folds, John S., 2845: 2887
 Foran, Rev. Nicholas, Catholic bishop of Waterford and Lismore, 3174
 Ford, William, attorney, 3005: 2891, 2905, 2907, 3064
 Fortescue, Hugh, 2nd Earl Fortescue, 2871, 2905, 3101
 Foster, Thomas Campbell, 3171
 Fransoni, Cardinal Giacomo Filippo, 3144
 Freeman, Mr., 3058
 Fremantle, Sir Thomas, 2802, 2804
 Fremantle, Sir William, 2804
 French, Arthur, 1st Baron de Freyne, 2913
 French, Arthur (General Association), 2883b, 2890, 2893
 Frost, John, 2876
 Fuller, James Cannings, 2951
 Furlong, Rev. Jonathan, 3163
 Galway, William Thomas, 2891, 2978
 Garrison, William Lloyd, 2966a, 3028a
 Gavin, Charles P., 3159
 Geary, William H., 3152
 Geraghty, Mr., 2841
 Gibson, Jack, 2799
 Gilligan, Rev. P.J., 3159
 Gillon, William Downe, 2796
 Giovanelli, —, 2954
 Gisborne, Thomas, 2877, 2998
 Glin, knight of (1791-1854), *see* FitzGerald, John F.
 Gooch, Sir Thomas Sherlock, 5th baronet 2838
 Goold, Thomas, 3010
 Gordon, George Hamilton-, 4th earl of Aberdeen, 3062
 Gordon, Rev. James J., 2795
 Gordon, Rev. John, 3058
 Gordon, Robert, 2843
 Grady, Peter, 3121
 Graham, Sir James Robert, 2nd baronet, 3017, 3131, 3140, 3148-49, 3155
 Grant, James, 3081
 Grattan, Henry, Jr., 2901, 2907, 3041
 Grattan, Henry, Sr. 2918, 3021, 3041
 Grattan, James, 2899
 Gray, Hugh, 2932
 Gray, John, 3039, 3080, 3097
 Gregory XVI, Pope, 2951, 2985, 3090, 3123, 3144
 Gregory, William Henry, 2937
 Grenville, Richard Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-, *styled* Lord Chandos, 2827
 Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl Grey, 3181
 Grey, Henry George, *styled* Viscount Howick, 2836, 2839, 2841, 3053
 Grey, Thomas Philip, 2nd Earl de Grey, 2940, 2984, 3020
 Grogan, Edward, 2902
 Hackett, John, 3084
 Halahan, George, 2928
 Hall, Mr. (London), 2824
 Hall, Samuel C. and Anna M., 3008
 Halpin, Frederick James, 3167
 Halpin, Rev. Nicholas John, 3167
 Haly, Francis, Catholic bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 2890a, 2890b, 2896
 Hamilton, George Alexander, 2878, 2980, 3038, 3042
 Hamilton, Rev. John, 3149
 Handcock, Richard, 3rd Baron Castlemaine, 2840
 Hare, William, 2nd earl of Listowel, 2810
 Harnett, William, 2807, 2816
 Hart, William Sterne, 2933
 Haughton, James, 2981a, 3011, 3028a, 3104, 3128, 3132-33
 Hawden, John, 2837
 Hawes, Benjamin, 3047
 Hayes, Joseph, 3076

- Haynes, Matthew Priestman, 3107
 Hearne, Rev. Daniel, 2873, 2935
 Henley, Robert, 2nd Baron Henley, 2809
 Herbert, Henry Arthur (1815-66) 3166
 Heytesbury, 1st Baron, *see* A'Court, William
 Higgins, William, Catholic bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise 2830
 Hill, Arthur Blundell Sandys, 3rd marquis of Downshire, 2945
 Hogan, James, 2812: 2927
 Holl, William, the younger, 3093
 Holmes, Benjamin H., 2912
 Holmes, Capt. James G., 2891
 Honan, Martin, 3007, 3154
 Hone, Joseph, Jr., 2824
 Hope, John, 2861
 Hope, John, 5th earl of Hopetoun, 2861
 Hopetoun, 5th earl of, *see* Hope, John
 Horsman, Edward, 2861
 Houghton, George Henry, 2834
 Howard, George William Frederick, *styled* Viscount Morpeth, 2844a: 2809, 2815, 2820, 2827, 2836, 2839, 2852, 2903, 2912, 2917, 2937
 Howard, Sir Ralph, 2891, 2899, 2903
 Howick, Viscount, *see* Grey, Henry George
 Howitt, William, 2954
 Howley, Dicky, 3164
 Hughes, Francis, 2957
 Hughes, John Joseph, Catholic bishop of New York, 2951
 Hume, David, 3008
 Hume, Joseph, 3028: 2789, 2796, 2839, 2841, 2851, 2883
 Hurry, —, 3162
 Hutchinson, Hon. George Hely-, 3123a, 3124
 Hutton, Robert, 2852, 2854, 2857, 2864, 2874-75, 2877-78, 2887a, 2890a, 2890b, 2902
 Hutton, Thomas, 3100, 3103, 3113
- Jackson, Joseph Devonsher, 2854, 2961, 2980
 James, Sir John Kingston, 1st baronet, 2928
 Jocelyn, Robert, 3rd earl of Roden 2945, 3019, 3055
 Johnson, William Gillilan, 2884, 2963
 Johnston & Co., H. & J., 2805
 Jones, John Edward, 3166
- Kavanagh, Thomas MacMorrough, 2891
 Kearney, Mary, 2929
 Keene, John J., 2822, 2822a
 Kelly, James, 3154
 Kelly, Nicholas, 2912
- Kenmare, 2nd earl of, *see* Browne, Valentine
 Kennedy, Patrick, Catholic bishop of Killaloe, 3129: 2898, 2902
 Kernan, James, 3101
 Kerry, knight of, *see* FitzGerald, Maurice
 Kildare, marquess of, *see* FitzGerald, Charles William
 King, Abraham Bradley, 2845
 King, Robert Henry, 4th earl of Kingston, 2895, 2898
 Kingston, 4th earl of, *see* King, Robert Henry
 Kinsella, —, 2921
 Knox, John, 3008
 Knox, Thomas, 2nd earl of Ranfurly, 2813, 2824
- Labouchere, Henry, 3180
 Laffan, Archdeacon Michael, 2890a, 3124
 Lamartine, Alphonse de, 3009
 Langdale, Hon. Charles, 3049: 2833
 Lanigan, John, 3126
 Lawler, Rev. Denis, 3178
 Lawless, Alecia, 3072
 Lawless, Valentine Browne, 2nd Baron Cloncurry, 3182: 2976, 3071, 3073, 3100, 3181
 Lawlor, Denis Shine, 3166
 Lawrence, Elizabeth Sophia, 3152a
 Lawrenson, Ralph, 3064
 Layard, Captain Brownlow Villiers, 2877, 2879
 Leader, Nicholas Philpot, 2938
 Leahy, David, 3110, 3141
 Leahy, Henry C., 3152a
 Leahy, Rev. Patrick, 2798, 2800
 Lee, Daniel, 2808, 2828, 2831, 2867, 3032
 Leeds Parliamentary Reform Association, 2789
 Leeson, Joseph, 4th earl of Milltown, 3073
 Lefroy, Thomas Langlois, 2854
 Leinster, 3rd duke of, *see* FitzGerald, Augustus Frederick
 Leonard, Thomas, P.P., 2901
 Lethbridge, John Henry, 2805
 Lichtenstein, Rev. Charles, 3069
 Limerick City, Trades of, 3160
 Limerick Repeal Banquet Organisers, 3007
 Lingard, Rev. John, 3008
 Listowel, 2nd earl of *see* Hare, William
 Lloyd, Thomas (1798-1873) 2895
 Longfields, the, 2882
 Louis-Philippe, king of the French, 3088
 Lucas, Edward, 2984
 Lucas, Frederick, 2944, 2947, 3017, 3041, 3069

- Ludwig I, king of Bavaria, 2914, 2936, 2954, 3069
- Lushington, Charles, 2820
- Lynch, Andrew Henry, 2950, 2955-56
- Lynch, P., 3007
- Lyndhurst, 1st Baron, *see* Copley, John Singleton
- Lyons, James D., 2792
- Lyons, Thomas, 2979, 3018, 3078a, 3151
- Lyttleton, Patrick, 2865
- McArdle, Hugh, 2945
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 2851
- MacCabe, William Bernard, 3026
- McCarthy, Alexander, B.L., 3151
- McCarthy, Charles (Holborn, London), 2823
- McCarthy, James (Killarney), 2816
- McCarthy, John (Tralee), 3145
- McCartie, Robert, 3027
- McCrohan, Denis, 2925
- McDermott, William, 2912
- MacDonald, Norman Hilton, 2912
- McDonnell, Rev. James, 3164
- Mac Donnell, Richard 3102, 3105
- McDonnell, Rev. Thomas Michael 2909
- McDowell, Robert, 2835, 3072
- McDowell, Rose, 3072, 3074, 3156-57
- McEnnery, Rev. John G., 2910, 3145
- McGarry, Bernard, 3096
- MacGettigan, Patrick, bishop of Raphoe 3127
- MacHale, John, Catholic archbishop of Tuam, 3029, 3134, 3148, 3158, 3172: 3024, 3100, 3114, 3147, 3155
- McKenna, Arthur, 2859, 2869
- McKenna, Rev. John, 3012
- MacLoughlin, Cornelius, 2952
- MacNamara, William Nugent, 2884, 2898, 2902, 3162
- McNeill, Sir John Benjamin, Kt., 3162
- McNevin, William, 3109
- Macready, William Charles, 2881
- McSwiney, Dan, 3004
- McSwiney, Kitty, 3004
- McSwiney, Morgan John, 3004
- Machen, Samuel J., 2997
- Madden, Daniel Owen, 3109
- Madden, Martin, 3173
- Madden, Michael, 2999
- Madden, Richard Robert, 2939
- Magee, Rev. Anthony, 2812, 2823, 2924, 2927
- Maguire, Barney, 2879
- Maher, Rev. James, 2891, 2893, 2900, 2906
- Maher, John, 3035a
- Maher, Nicholas, 3124, 3164
- Mahon, John, 2899
- Mahon, Nicholas, 2844
- Mahony, Margaret, 3101
- Mahony, Patrick, 3140
- Mahony, Pierce, 2894, 3042, 3071, 3100a, 3101, 3125, 3140-42: 2841, 3043-44, 3103, 3123
- Maillard, N. Doran, 2807a: 2814
- Major, John Henniker-, 4th Baron Henniker, 2838
- Mallet, John, 2928
- Marggrast, Franz, 3069
- Markey, Nicholas, 3012: 3139
- Markey, Owen, 3139
- Martin, Humphrey, 3025
- Martin, John, 2936a
- Martin, Mary Letitia, 3029
- Martin, Thomas Barnewall, 2912, 3029
- Mary Tudor, Queen, 2981
- Mathew, Rev. Theobald, 2923a, 2934, 2951, 2985, 2997, 3079, 3104, 3174
- Matthews, Patrick, 2907
- Maunsell, Henry, 3091: 3101
- Maxwell, —, 3008
- Meagher, John, 3109
- Meagher, Thomas, 3030
- Meara, Charles, 2908
- Michie, John, 2797
- Miley, Rev. John, 3149
- Millis, —, 2940, 2955-56, 3034
- Milltown, 4th earl of, *see* Leeson, Joseph
- Milton, Viscount, *see* Fitzwilliam, William Thomas Spencer Wentworth-,
- Molony, Daniel, 3019
- Mooney, Thomas, 2819: 3027a
- Moore, Rev. James, P.P., 3013
- Moore, Rev. John, 3153: 3163
- Moore, Richard, 3044
- Moore, Thomas, 2981
- Morgan, Charles Octavius Swinnerton, 2810
- Morpeth, Viscount, *see* Howard, George William Frederick
- Morris, Abraham, 2870
- Mullen, Joseph D., 2839, 2841, 2848
- Mullins, Thomas (barrister) 2875
- Murphy, Francis G., 2920
- Murphy, Francis Stack, 2870, 3076, 3151
- Murphy, Joseph, 3007
- Murphy, Stephen, 3083: 2915
- Murphy, William (Smithfield), 2937: 2848, 2854, 3103, 3111
- Murray, Daniel, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, 2950, 2960-61, 2982, 3035: 2829, 2949a, 2955, 3063, 3147, 3155, 3158
- Murray, Sir James, 3166
- Murray, Rev P. A., 3008: 3116
- Murray, T. Lamie, 2822a
- Mursell, Rev. James Phillippo, 2806

- Nagle, James, 2942
 Needham, Francis Jack, *styled*
 Viscount Newry, 2886
 Newman, —, 3001
 Newry, Viscount, *see* Needham,
 Francis Jack
 Nicholson, Rev. Francis Joseph,
 3144: 3123
 Normanby, 1st marquess of, *see* Phipps,
 Constantine Henry
 Norreys, Sir Denham Jephson,
 formerly Jephson, Charles
 Denham Orlando, 2882
 Nunan, John, 3160, 3168
- O'Beirne, Edmond, 2857, 2864, 2875,
 2879
 O'Brien, Cornelius, 2884, 2898, 2902,
 3162
 O'Brien, John (Limerick), 2878,
 2895, 2898, 2918
 O'Brien, Timothy, 2952, 3063, 3091
 O'Brien, William Smith, 3061, 3068,
 3087, 3092, 3103, 3116, 3124, 3146,
 3168, 3170, 3180-81: 2895, 2898,
 3026, 3033, 3037, 3057, 3073, 3076,
 3086, 3101, 3135, 3163
 O'Callaghan, John Cornelius, 2855,
 2857
 O'Connell, Catherine (Kate,
 daughter), 3181a
 O'Connell, Charles (son-in-law),
 3181a
 O'Connell, Charles (Ennis), 2792
 O'Connell, Daniel (son), 2865, 2869,
 2872, 2874-75, 2877-78-79, 2886,
 2890, 3126
 O'Connell, Lt. Gen. Daniel Charles,
 Count, 3114a
 O'Connell, Daniel John (son of John
 O'Connell M.P.), 2827, 2881
 O'Connell, Eliza (daughter-in-law),
 2827, 2881, 2929
 2881, 2929
 O'Connell, John (brother), 2832
 O'Connell, John (son), 2827, 2864, 2874,
 2877, 2890, 2925, 2929, 3001, 3002a:
 2793, 2799, 2807, 2820, 2845, 2853,
 2857, 2862-63, 2865-66, 2872, 2875,
 2878, 2881, 2886, 2891, 2893, 2904, 2921,
 2953, 2978-79, 3008, 3014, 3039
 3054, 3061, 3063, 3092, 3100
 3109, 3116, 3135, 3159,
 3162-63, 3165
 O'Connell, Mary Frances (daughter-in-
 law), 2871
 O'Connell, Maurice (son), 2822-22a,
 3082, 3102, 3119, 3136: 2875 2881,
 2886, 2910, 3115, 3170
- O'Connell, Morgan John, 2879, 3033,
 3141
 O'Connell, Morgan P. (son), 2799,
 3088: 2803, 2805, 2807, 2827, 2856
 O'Connell, Thomas, 3136
 O'Connell, William John, 3153
 O'Connor, Rev. Mr., 3046
 O'Connor, Feargus Edward, 2802, 2882
 O'Connor, Denis, 2913, 3143
 O'Donegan, John, 2916
 O'Donnell, William, 3164
 O'Dwyer, M., 3083a
 O'Ferrall, Richard More, 2883a-83b,
 2887a, 2890a-90b: 2908, 2912
 O'Flaherty, Mr., 2932
 O'Gorman, John Francis, 2989-90
 O'Gorman, Alderman Patrick, 2990
 O'Gorman, Richard, 3055: 3108
 O'Gorman, Richard, Jr., 3055
 O'Hagan, Thomas, 3098, 3100, 3103,
 3105, 3110, 3111
 O'Hanlon, Philip, 2792
 O'Hea, James, 3022
 O'Hea, John, 3022
 O'Loughlen, Sir Colman M., 2nd Bt.
 3180
 O'Malley, —, 3153
 O'Malley, Rev. Thaddeus, 3100
 O'Mara, Margaret, 3070, 3072, 3074, 3121,
 3150
 O'Meara, William Aloysius, O.F.M., 2914,
 2936
 O'Neill, Dillon, 2976
 O'Neill, John, 2952
 O'Neill, John Augustus, 3029
 Oranmore and Browne, 1st Baron,
 see Browne, Dominick
 O'Regan, Rev. Patrick D., 2890a
 O'Reilly, Andrew, 3123
 Orr, Robert, 2843
 O'Sullivan, Dr., 3161
 O'Sullivan, Rev. William, 3076, 3079
 Ouseley, Sir Ralph, Kt., 2891
- Paget, Henry William, 1st marquis of
 Anglesey, 3071
 Pagliano, —, 3000
 Palmerston, 3rd, Viscount, *see*
 Temple, Henry John
 Parke, Sir James, kt. 3086
 Parkes, Joseph, 2896
 Pastorini, 2956
 Peacock, Barnes, 3110
 Pease, Elizabeth, 2951
 Pease, Joseph, 2820: 2922, 2951
 Peel, Sir Robert, 2nd baronet, 2809,
 2874, 2912, 2918, 2940-41, 2943, 2945-
 46-47-48, 2955, 2963, 2983, 3002a, 3034,

- 3062, 3073, 3081, 3083a, 3088, 3091, 3101, 3134-35-36, 3138, 3171, 3180, 3181a
- Pelham, Charles Anderson Worsley
Anderson-, *styled* Lord Worsley, 2874
- Pelling, Charles, 2794
- Pepys, Charles Christopher, 1st Baron Cottenham, 3086
- Perrin, Louis, 2956
- Philips, Mark, 2808
- Phillips, Ambrose Lisle, 2944, 2985
- Phipps, Constantine Henry, 2nd earl of Mulgrave, *later* 1st marquess of Normanby, 3051: 3052
- Pigot, David Richard, 2840, 2874, 2883b
- Pigot, David Richard, Jr., 3114a
- Pigot, John, 3114a
- Pim, James, Jr., 3036
- Plunkett, Arthur James, 9th earl of Fingall, 2903
- Plunkett, John Hubert, 3138a
- Polding, John Bede, 2811
- Ponsonby, John William, *styled* Viscount Duncannon, 2896
- Porter, Frank Thorpe, 2889
- Porter, John Gray Vesey, 3106, 3116
- Porter, Joshua, 2889, 2902
- Powell, Caleb, 2895, 2898
- Powell, Thomas, 2957
- Power, Sir John, Baronet, 2985
- Primrose, John, Jr., 2826, 2987, 3010, 3016, 3077: 3082, 3136
- Pringle, Alexander, 2861
- Purcell, Kenny, 2893
- Purcell, Peter, 2988, 3073, 3104
- Purdon, Thomas Rodney, 3138a
- Purdon, Thomas Rodney, Jr. 3130: 3138a
- Pzterke, Wilhelm, 3069
- Quill, Thomas, 3004
- Quin, Edwin Richard Wyndham
Wyndham-, *styled* Viscount Adare, 3010
- Quin, Michael J., 2947
- Quinlan, John, 3110
- Raleigh, John F., 3037: 3163
- Randall, David, 2807a,
- Ranfurlly, 2nd earl of, *see* Knox, Thomas
- Rawdon, John Dawson, 3180
- Rawson, John, 2822a
- Ray, T.M., 2865, 2976, 3115, 3159, 3163, 3165, 3169: 2802, 2835, 2864, 2877, 2891, 2911, 2929, 2978-79, 3002a, 3039, 3042, 3061, 3110, 3119, 3135
- Read, Roger and Magee and Co., Charles, 3075
- Redington, Thomas Nicholas, 3038, 3042
- Remond, Charles Lenox, 2951
- Reynolds, John, 2936a: 2847, 2850, 2857, 2866, 3083, 3159, 3162-63
- Reynolds, Thomas, 2802, 2805, 2865, 2866, 2874, 2891
- Reynolds, William, 3083
- Rhadamanthus, 3086
- Rice, Edmund Ignatius, 2959
- Richardson, William, 2816, 2817
- Rickman, Samuel P., 2822, 2822a
- Ritchie, Rev. John, 2801
- Roach, Michael, 2805
- Roache, Patrick 3153
- Robertson, John, 2868
- Robertson, William, 3008
- Robinson, Frederick John, 1st Viscount Goderich, *later* 1st earl of Ripon, 3152a
- Roche, Sir David, 2836, 2895, 2898: 2791, 2878, 2894
- Roche, Edmund Burke, 2938, 2942: 2900, 2905, 2960, 3026
- Roche, Edward, 2890a, 2890b, 2900, 2905
- Roche, Victor, 2942
- Roden, 3rd earl of, *see* Jocelyn, Robert
- Roe, George, 2843: 2848, 2854, 2874, 2952, 2984, 3044
- Roebuck, John A., 2789, 2803, 2851, 2964
- Romilly, Frederick, 2899
- Ronayne, Dominick Philip, 2919
- Roose, Sir David C., Kt., 2908
- Ross, David Robert, 2884, 3000, 3103, 3106
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 3008
- Ruding, J. Clement, 2822, 2822a
- Runge, Heinrich, 3069
- Russell, Rev. Charles William, 3044
- Russell, Lord John, 2788: 2859, 2896, 2912, 2940, 3034, 3047, 3052-53, 3062-63, 3073, 3104, 3180-81
- Russell, William Howard, 3171
- Rutledge-v-Rutledge*, 2816
- Ryan, Bartholomew, 2992
- Ryan, Rev. James, 3027
- Ryan, Dom. Michael Vincent, 3050
- Ryder, Dudley, *styled* Viscount Sandon, 2842, 2874
- St. Leger, Robert, S.J., 2922
- Sandon, Viscount, *see* Ryder, Dudley
- Sausse, Matthew Richard, 2891
- Savage, Francis, 2912
- Scheele, Wilhelm, 3069

- Scott, John, 1st Baron Eldon, 3086
 Scott, John Bindon, 2816-17, 2870, 3077
 Scott, Richard (attorney), 2902, 3137: 3162
 Scott, Walter Francis Montagu Douglas, 5th duke of Buccleuch, 2861
 Seaver, Thomas, 3014: 3016
 Shackleton, Abraham, 2923a
 Shackleton, Ebenezer, 2923a
 Shadwell, Sir Lancelot, kt., 3152a
 Shannon, Cornelius P., 3159
 Shaw, Frederick, 2963, 3140-41
 Sheehan, Rev. John, 3174
 Sheehan, Remigius, 3091
 Sheil, John Barclay, 2985-86, 2997
 Sheil, Richard Lalor, 3073: 2900, 3044, 3049
 Sheridan, James, 3081
 Sheridan, Terence, 3066
 Sherrard's valuation, 2834
 Shipwrights of Dublin, 2790
 Shrewsbury, 16th earl of, *see* Talbot, John
 Simmonds, Lt., 3175
 Simmonds, Jane, 3175
 Simpson, W., 3059
 Simpson's Hospital, 2824
 Sinclair, John, 2880: 2835
 Sirr, Major Henry Charles, 2801
 Slattey, Rev. Michael, P.P.
 Catholic archbishop of Cashel, 2798, 2800, 2955-56, 2958, 2989, 3015
 Smiles, Samuel, 2789: 2793
 Smith, Sir Culling Eardley, 3rd baronet, 2851, 2883
 Smith, Rev. E., 2833
 Smith, Frazer B., 2822, 2822a
 Smith, Gerrit, 2966a, 3027a: 3029a
 Smith, Alderman Henry, 2916
 Smith, James A., 2811, 3017, 3085: 2851
 Smith, Samuel, 2956
 Smith, Thomas Berry Cusac, 2980
 Smithwick, Edmond, 2853, 2862-63, 2866, 2906, 2921, 2926, 2931, 2953, 2965, 2968, 2970, 2972-73, 2975, 3178: 2864, 2905, 2969, 2971
 Smyth, John, 2928: 2891, 2929
 Somers, Mrs. Alexander, 3179
 Somers, John Patrick, 2884
 Somerville, Elizabeth, 2871
 Somerville, Sir William Meredyth, 5th baronet, 2827
 Spear, Charles, 3132-33
 Stanhope, Hon. Leicester FitzGerald Charles, 2822a
 Stanley, Edward Geoffrey Smith, 2798, 2800, 2802-05, 2808, 2836, 2839, 2842, 2923a, 2962, 2974, 2992, 3147
 Stanley, Edward John, 2836
 Stansfeld, Hamer, 2793
 Stapleton, Miles Thomas, 8th Baron Beaumont, 3049
 Staunton, Michael, 3044: 2819, 3002a, 3097
 Steele, Thomas, 2791-2, 2918, 2924, 2927, 3000, 3162: 2865, 2874, 2891, 2902, 2978, 3024, 3027, 3039, 3154
 Stock, Joseph, 2874
 Stonor, Thomas, 3rd Baron Camoys, 3059, 3085
 Stourton, William Joseph, 18th Baron Stourton, 2922, 3049
 Strain, Rev. John, 2966
 Sturge, Joseph, 2814, 2818, 2934, 2939, 2998, 3031, 3057, 3062
 Sugden, Sir Edward Burtenshaw, kt., 2984, 3005, 3020, 3022
 Sugden, Henry, 3020: 3022
 Sugrue, Charles (butter merchant), 2870
 Sugrue, James, 3077
 Supple, Daniel, Jr., 2910: 3177
 Supple, Justin, 3177
 Sutter, Robert, 2977
 Sutton, Robert, Jr., 2821, 2850: 2822, 2822a, 2857, 2866
 Swyny, Robert H., 3002
 Symes, Richard, 2816-17
 Tagore, Dwarkanath, 3166-67
 Talbot, John, 16th earl of Shrewsbury, 2918, 2944, 2947, 2954, 2959, 2985-86, 3008, 3059, 3085
 Tappan, Lewis, 3029a: 3027a
 Taylor, John, 2936a
 Temple, Henry John, 3rd Viscount Palmerston, 2807a, 2827, 3181
 Tennent, James Fmerson, 2808, 2884, 2963
 Thompson, George, 2820, 2922
 Thomson, James, 2976
 Tierney, Rev. Thomas, 3039, 3135
 Tighe, William Frederick Fownes, 2903
 Toby, Myles, 3031a
 Toledo, archbishop of, 2959
 Traill, —, 2978
 Tripoli, archbishop of, 2827
 Tully, Jeremiah, 3029
 Tyler, John, President, 3128, 3132-33
 Tyler, President John, son of, 3011
 Tyrrell, Rev. Peter James, 3039
 Unknown Correspondents, 2892, 2949
 Vandeleur, Crofton Moore, 2884, 2902
 Veevers, John, 2858

- Vere, Sir Charles Broke, Kt., 2838
 Verling, Bartholomew, 2919
 Verner, William, 2880
 Victoria, Queen, 2804, 2810, 2844a, 2865,
 2922, 2940, 2943, 3040, 3091, 3163
 Vigne, Thomas, 2822a
 Virgins of the Tyrol, 2944, 2954
 Vokes, Thomas Philips, 3087
 Von Droste zu Vischering, Clemens,
 Catholic archbishop of Cologne, 2955
 von Reisach, Karl August, bishop of
 Eichstadt, 2954
 Walker, Charles, 2791
 Wallace, John, 2880
 Waller, John Francis, 2889
 Walsh, Rev. Mr., 3178
 Walsh, Michael, 2952
 Walsh, William, bishop of Halifax, 3090
 Walter, Ferdinand, 3069
 Walter, John, 2964, 2998
 Warburton, Henry, 3138
 Warren, Frederick, 2935
 Weil, Charles, 3009
 Weir, Rev. James, 3175
 Welch, Counsellor, 2883a
 Wellesley, Arthur, 1st duke of Wellington
 2810, 3021, 3100
 Wellington, 1st duke of, *see* Wellesley,
 Arthur
 West, John Beatty, 2902, 2937
 Wetherell, Mrs. Robert Hurd, 2829, 3003
 Whelan, Rev. William J., 2856
 Whistler, Gabriel, 2928
 White, Charles, 3097: 3096
 White, Robert (Fleet St., Dublin) 2940
 White, Thomas Irving, 3025
 Whiteside, James, 3086
 Wilde, Sir Thomas, kt., 3110
 Willans, William, 2858
 Williams, William, 2808
 Winks, J.F., 2796
 Wiseman, Rev. Nicholas Patrick
 Stephen, 2909, 2944, 2954, 3041: 2947,
 3008
 Wodehouse, Edmond, 2838
 Wodehouse, John, 2nd Baron Wode-
 house of Kimberley, 2838
 Wodehouse, John,
 Woodlock, William, 3030
 Worsley, Lord, *see* Pelham, Charles
 Anderson Worsley Anderson-
 Wright, Richard, 2899
 Wright, Selby & Robinson, bankers, 2805
 Wynne, John, 3038
 Wyse, Francis, 3101
 Wyse, Thomas, 3033, 3073, 3174
 Yates, John Ashton, 2872, 2877, 2879,
 2890, 2900
 Yore, Rev. William, 3040, 3063
 Zander, Charles A.L.E., 3069

