

Irish Issues and Unionist M.P.'s, 1832-1846.

Volume II

## Chapter 7

## The Poor Law

One of the major elements in the Melbourne Government's legislative programme for Ireland was the introduction into that country of a poor law. More than any other issue in the 1830's, this question caused confusion and division among both Irish Tory and liberal members. However, it is clear from the events of 1837-8 that the majority of the Irish Tory members and a considerable number of the liberal-unionists adopted what was essentially a cautious, conservative approach to the issue, with the likely expense of the Government's proposed measure contributing in no small part to their fears.

From the 1820's pamphleteers and members of Parliament commented on the fact that while in relatively prosperous England there was a system of compulsory poor relief, in Ireland the destitute had to rely on various sources of relief, notably grand jury presentments, Parliamentary grants and voluntary contributions. The result was a 'system' of relief which was hardly commensurate with the scale of Irish poverty. In particular, there was inadequate provision for able-bodied adult paupers. And in the poorer West of Ireland especially there were deficiencies in all classes of relief.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the most important advocate of a poor law in the early years of Whig rule was the Lord Lieutenant, Anglesey, who pressed continually for a provision for 'the aged and helpless poor' and 'a labour rate' (tax) for employment of the able-bodied. His friend Lord Cloncurry shared these views and probably influenced Anglesey. But they met with resistance from Grey, Melbourne, Stanley and Lansdowne, who<sup>2</sup> were discouraged by the abuses under the English system of poor laws. The 1830's also saw a spate of activity from both English and Irish members in favour of an Irish poor law, with the liberal-unionists Smith O'Brien, James Grattan and Sir Richard Musgrave particularly prominent. O'Brien's pamphlet of 1830 and the resultant bill of 1831

envisaged a system of outdoor relief for the aged, helpless and infirm  
 - that is, for those physically unable to work.<sup>3</sup> This combination -  
 outdoor relief, given only to the impotent - was to be the policy of  
 the majority of Irish poor law enthusiasts at least until the Government  
 took the initiative in 1837, and characterized all of the poor law  
 measures proposed by Irish members until that date, though some of them  
 did permit relief of the able-bodied in times of 'general distress.'

The cause was apparently advanced in August 1831 when Sadler's motion  
 in favour of the principle of a poor law for Ireland was defeated by only  
 12 votes and Althorp refused to give it a direct negative. Wyse voted  
 for the motion though he did not 'exactly know why - but it is only the  
principle, and that is so vague (it) may be considered without going very  
 far.' Sadler was 'in great glee.' And James Grattan, who, like almost  
 all of the Irish speakers, supported the motion, thought the division  
 'carried the question', a view which he also imputed to Althorp and  
 Lansdowne.<sup>4</sup> In fact Stanley reported to Anglesey that the debate 'virtually  
 carried Poor Laws for Ireland', so small was the Government majority and  
 impressive the turnout of the Irish members.<sup>5</sup> In September 1831 James  
 Grattan and Sir Richard Musgrave brought in another Irish poor law bill.<sup>6</sup>  
 In June 1832 a substantial body of Irish liberal members supported  
 Sadler's second attempt to pledge the House on the question.<sup>7</sup> Later in  
 the year O'Brien tried to form a national society to promote an Irish  
 poor law.<sup>8</sup>

In May 1833 the English Tory John Richards moved in favour of an  
 Irish poor law. James Grattan seconded the motion, which was also supported  
 by the repealer Henry Grattan and (later) by William O'Reilly. The motion  
 led to a compromise proposal from Althorp, the appointment of a Royal  
 Commission on the condition of the Irish poor.<sup>9</sup> Stanley and Grey  
 had come to the conclusion that 'some provision .. for the poor, strictly  
 confining it to those who are disabled by age & infirmity, might ... be  
 useful', if only, thought Stanley, because it 'will keep the liberals  
 quarrelling among themselves and save them from the necessity of abusing



the Government every night.<sup>10</sup> James Grattan, however, was moved to suspicion and disappointment by the decision to appoint a Commission. He complained in his journal that, 'The Irish took no part & were glad to get rid of the question by means of Althorp's motion, which is (I fear) getting rid of it... We agreed to the Commission with too much facility'.<sup>11</sup> And he claimed that he had been dishonestly upstaged by Richards. Grattan's own motion on the question had been in the pipeline for some time.<sup>12</sup> But Richards had persuaded him to allow him to move it instead 'by telling me a pack of lies. He said Peel would support him, & a number of English members. Now not one of them did. He is a forward, strong talker & did the question mischief'.<sup>13</sup>

Though Archbishop Whately was made its Chairman, the Liberal-unionist More O'Ferrall was regarded in Government circles as 'the head of the Commission' until his resignation from it in August 1835 after taking office.<sup>14</sup> The recommendations of the Commission were not to appear for nearly three years. Meanwhile, after the 1835 election, the pressure from Irish and British liberals was stepped up, following the return of O'Brien and Musgrave to Parliament along with another poor law enthusiast, Sharman Crawford. These and other members expressed their impatience with and distrust of the Royal Commission and the Government respectively. Various bills were introduced, including one in 1835 from O'Brien, James Grattan and Musgrave, the same bill resubmitted in 1836 by Grattan and Musgrave,<sup>15</sup> and another in 1836 from O'Brien, Wyse and Crawford.

Attempts were made to rouse opinion in Ireland. O'Brien tried to organize support in Limerick for a poor law.<sup>16</sup> Another enthusiast, Thaddeus O'Malley, felt that O'Connell had sought early in 1837 to put O'Brien 'hors de combat', mainly and chiefly because you were a distinguished advocate of a poor law.<sup>17</sup> Crawford courted danger directly by seeing his role as being 'to push Dan upon the poor laws'.<sup>18</sup> This approach led to an open rift between Crawford and O'Connell on the issue in the General Association in December 1836, when O'Connell opposed Crawford's efforts



to commit that body to the principle.

The abuses of the unreformed English system lent ammunition to opponents of an Irish poor law, at least until the Amendment Act of 1834. Many Irish liberals, though probably a minority, were opposed to the idea. George Evans, liberal-unionist member for Co. Dublin from 1833, wrote in 1829 that in England the paupers had 'spent what they got without care, knowing that when their own means of support should fail, they had the produce of the industry of others to recur to...' He contended that such a system in Ireland would corrupt those who received relief and ruin those taxed for its provision, and that the English advocated an Irish poor law in order to keep the Irish poor in their own country. Standish O'Grady doubted that a poor law could even begin to cure Ireland's problems. O'Connell and Spring Rice were, generally speaking, opposed to a poor law, both stressing that it would mean the application of resources to unproductive purposes and both particularly hostile to relief of the able-bodied. O'Connell's vacillation on the subject possibly owed much to the favour with which the Catholic hierarchy regarded the idea; indeed one of the bishops, James Doyle, publicly upbraided O'Connell for his opposition.

The efforts of individual Irish liberals were not matched by the Tory members. They were not responsible for any of the initiatives of the 1830's. Indeed, though individual members vacillated somewhat and the party was clearly divided, the majority of Irish Tories appeared to regard the introduction of an Irish poor law with some unease. John Musgrave wrote in 1832 that 'the landed proprietors are generally unfavourable to the principle' and one of Wyse's correspondents felt that 'the rich are against them in general'. Between 1831 and 1833, Bateson, Shaw and Conolly made much of the abuses of the English system, though Bateson's conditional response contrasted with the outright opposition of Lefroy and Shaw. The Irish Tory Lord Dunraven wrote to O'Brien in March 1833 of his fear that the abuses of the English system would creep

in - 'the primary, & to many an insuperable, objection'- and that it  
 26  
 would 'bring constant collision between Protestant & Catholic.'

Some felt very strongly on the issue. In March 1834 the Inspector General of Police in Ulster reported that 'on a late occasion a Petition was got up in favor of the Union, when four gentlemen, whose joint incomes amounting (sic) to £50,000 a year, refused to sign it, declaring that Repeal was preferable to Poor Laws. The Grand Jury of Fermanagh passed resolutions or a Petition in favour of (the Union), which Lord Belmore  
 27  
 refused to sign upon the same ground.' In fact, Belmore wrote to Roden in October 1834 that if the Irish were given poor laws 'similar to those which have proved so fatally injurious in England',<sup>he</sup> would advocate Repeal of the Union. A measure which included relief of the able-bodied would 'check the labouring poor of Ireland from seeking industrious employment in other parts of the Empire' by encouraging them 'to remain as paupers  
 28  
 in idleness at home.'

In 1835-6, several of the Irish Tories opposed the private bills then before Parliament, but expressed a willingness to hear the Government's proposals. They, too, were particularly opposed to any suggestion of relief being extended to the able-bodied. Only the Earl of Limerick  
 29  
 declared that he was opposed to any poor law in Ireland. Downshire, happy with the status quo, reported that the old and infirm were well cared for under existing, voluntary relief schemes, and that 'the able bodied need but little help except occasional relief in sickness or accidents'; there was so much employment in Down and Antrim that 'no  
 30  
 person need be idle if he chooses to work.' Wellington was prepared to sanction only a measure which would exclude the able-bodied, with safeguards against control of the system by the priests, and Peel was 'sure that the utmost caution will be requisite to prevent the transfer bodily of the whole landed property of Ireland from its present possessors to  
 31  
 the poor.'

32  
 Under pressure from an impatient Russell, the Royal Commission



finally issued its recommendations in April 1836. Extensive public works and emigration facilities were advocated and the new English workhouse-centred system of ~~poor~~ relief rejected. The Government found the proposals too far-reaching, however, going as they did beyond the relief of the destitute to envisage measures to remove the causes of destitution.<sup>33</sup> Russell sent George Nicholls, a poor law commissioner in England, to Ireland to assess the applicability of the English measure of 1834<sup>34</sup> to Irish needs. After a notoriously brief visit, in September-October 1836, Nicholls concluded that conditions in Ireland were well suited to the general principles of the English Act.<sup>35</sup>

He recommended the establishment of a national system of relief for all classes of the destitute, including the able-bodied. Relief was to be strictly confined to the workhouse in order to apply one of the leading principles of the English Act, the workhouse test of destitution. The system was to be funded by means of a compulsory rating of the landlords and occupiers of Ireland. It was to be administered by a Commissioner seconded from the English Board of Commissioners, and, locally, by boards of guardians. These boards - apart from a proportion of ex officio members<sup>36</sup> chosen by and from the magistracy - were to be elected by the ratepayers.

This plan divided the Government. Howick, Duncannon, Morpeth and Mulgrave approved the plan, and Russell, his preconceptions apparently vindicated,<sup>37</sup> accepted it in its essentials. But Melbourne was unenthusiastic: 'I rather accede to Poor Laws in Ireland than approve of them', he subsequently informed Russell.<sup>38</sup> And, ominously, most of the Irish in the Government were unhappy. O'Ferrall was adamantly opposed to the restriction of relief to workhouses and was later to claim, regarding the plan as a whole, that he 'with all his humble but strenuous efforts had sought to prevent its imposition on the country.'<sup>39</sup>

Lansdowne was full of foreboding and saw 'the necessity of making the Irish poor measure as strictly experimental as the case admits.' Spring Rice, on reading Nicholls's report, wrote that 'the objections to any



scheme for Irish poor laws appear to me insuperable. No step taken by any Government involves such very serious consequences.' After consenting 'reluctantly & without hope', he joined Lansdowne in working to limit the extent of the Government's commitment to 'an experiment' which they felt would probably have to be aborted. Months later Rice still expressed reluctance and insisted that the measure was only an experiment -- and one which 'will unquestionably fail.'<sup>40</sup> It is interesting to note also that in December 1836 the Whig Duke of Leinster was still hoping that the recommendations of the Commissioners would be 'attended to' before Easter.<sup>41</sup>

In spite of such reservations among leading Irish Whigs, Nicholl's views were adopted almost en bloc by the Government and embodied in the bill which was brought in by Russell on the 13th of February 1837.<sup>42</sup> In the subsequent debates many benefits were claimed for a poor law, by some even of those Irish members who received the measure coldly and went on to oppose it at the third reading. It would alleviate distress; the outrages associated with vagrancy and destitution would diminish, and additional capital would be drawn to Ireland as a result; indiscriminate, wasteful aid to vagrants would be reduced; it would ease the burden on the poorer classes by taxing the landlords, who had previously been beyond the reach of the mendicant; and fear of a high rate would induce landlords to take an interest in the welfare of their tenants, in order to keep the latter out of the ranks of the destitute. These points closely resembled those forwarded in Nicholl's Report. In fact they were the arguments used by liberal proponents of the poor law in previous years and represented a fund of well-established ideas. One factor which was not openly acknowledged by supporters of the measure in 1837-8 was the pressure from English sources to give sufficient relief in Ireland to reduce Irish immigration.<sup>43</sup>

The hope that landlords would be induced to care better for their tenants was expressed by many members, of all parties.<sup>44</sup> It represented one of the principal mechanisms by which the proposed measure was

envisaged as a means to permanent improvement in Ireland, as opposed to merely a redistributive assault on destitution. And as such it was used to counter the common criticism - often made with the Royal Commission's ambitious recommendations in mind - that a measure which did not directly create employment could not effect substantial good. The liberal-unionist Lord Clements took a special interest in that aspect of the question. His pamphlet of 1838 contained a full description of the developments which he envisaged - developments which, he believed, would invigorate the Irish economy without the problems of the widely expected transition from Ireland's small rented farms to the English large-farm system, and without recourse to Government-assisted public works.<sup>45</sup>

Though Clements believed that the poor law would bring improvements within the framework of Ireland's small-farm system, some political economists hoped that it would actually expedite the transition to larger holdings. It would provide an alternative means of support to poorer tenants and cottiers and thereby ease the process of consolidation of small holdings.<sup>46</sup> Nicholls shared this view. In Parliament some English members, notably Charles Buller, took this view. Irish members went no farther, however, than expressing a hope that the measure would act to diminish the violence following evictions.<sup>47</sup>

The debates on the poor law saw much self-congratulation among the members over 'the absence of party spirit'. Such comment was certainly justified if by it was meant the frequency of divisions within parties and of improbable alliances between the likes of Sir Robert Bateson and Daniel O'Connell. Voting behaviour in the 39 divisions reflected the differences within the Irish parties.<sup>48</sup> Irish Tory disunity was not circumscribed by the existence of forceful leadership on the part of Sir Robert Peel, who supported the measure without enthusiasm and whose part in proceedings was minimal. He and the other leading British Tories (and Shaw ?) were no doubt influenced by the need to enact a poor law as part of the settlement of the corporations question. Those in a position<sup>49</sup>



to influence the Irish liberals, the Government and O'Connell, adopted more clear-cut stances, but in opposition to one another. O'Connell, after initial hesitancy, bitterly attacked the bill. He argued that the extent of poverty was so great the rate would press hard on the landlords and farmers, and would diminish their capacity to provide employment; many paupers would have to be refused relief, and these would react violently on discovering the poor law's detrimental effect on the charitable instincts on which they had previously relied; and the workhouse would constitute an undeserved and much resented punishment for those who did succeed in obtaining relief. O'Connell, in fact, displayed a great readiness to consider the interests of the destitute, though he also made a strong appeal to the interests of the ratepaying farmers and landlords.<sup>50</sup>

The measure had a fairly easy passage through Parliament, albeit one interrupted by the King's death and the resultant dissolution of Parliament.<sup>51</sup> With most English members of both parties in favour of it, there was in the Commons 'not the least alteration of any importance in the Bill',<sup>52</sup> the Government making few concessions and winning all of the divisions. In the Lords the bill was altered in some important details, as shown below, but not in its essential framework. There was, however, much criticism of and a considerable degree of outright opposition to the measure in both Houses, particularly from the Irish members. In the early stages of the bills, O'Brien, Crawford, Clements, Wyse, French and Redington, liberal-unionists, expressed serious reservations, and Gibson of Belfast condemned the measure outright. James Grattan was the only liberal-unionist to express any real enthusiasm - 'a triumph' was his characterization of the measure in his journals - though he too had acquired reservations by the time of its reintroduction in December 1837. For the Irish Tories, Young and Litton were enthusiastic in the early debates; Conolly, Shaw and Lucas gave the measure a qualified welcome; and Bateson was especially critical.<sup>53</sup>



Table I Irish Tories.

	I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Viso. Cole	0	X	0	0		X	X	X	X	X
Cooper						X				
Coote	0	X	0		0	X			X	
Corry	0	X	0	0	0	X			X	
Hayes	X	X	0	0	X	X	X		X	
Jones	0	X	0	0	X	X	X		X	X
A.Lefroy			0			X				
Lucas	0		0		X	X	X	X	0	
Perceval	0	X	0	0		X		X	X	X
Archdall			X			X				
F.Bruen						X				
Damer						X		X		0
Dunbar		X				X				X
Fox			0			X				
C.Hamilton						X				
G.Hamilton			0			X				
Jackson	0		0	0		X	X		X	
Longfield						X				
Vesey			0			X				
Bateson			X	X	X		X	X		X
A.H.Cole		X			0		X		X	
Meynell		X					X		X	
O'Neill	X	X					X	X		X
Verner	X	X	X				X		X	
Litton	0				0		X	X	X	0
Castlereagh		X	X					X	X	X
Conolly	0	X						X	X	X
Maxwell	X							X	X	X
Hillsborough	0	X						X		X
Kirk		X			X	0		X		X
T.Lefroy			0			0		X	X	X
West			0			0				
Bateman	0						0		X	
Ellis	0				X		0		0	
Tennent		X			X					
Blennerhasset	0	0							X	
Alexander	0									
Young	0		0	0	X	0	0	0	X	0
Shaw	0			0	X	0	0	0	X	0

I. Postpone Committee. 2. Postpone Third Reading. 3. Outdoor Relief(i). 4. Outdoor Relief(ii). 5. Omit £5 clause. 6. Law of Settlement(i). 7. Law of Settlement(ii). 8. Electoral Rating. 9. Exclude Able-bodied. 10. Local Option.

X-For motion, against Government.  
O-Against motion, for Government.

Table 2 Liberal-Unionists.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
O'Connell	X	X	X	X	0	0	X		X
Maj. Ir. Tories	0	X	0	0	X	X	X	X	X
← @O'Ferrall	0		0			0			
R.Howard		0						0	
Gibson	X								
Jephson	0		0		X	0	0		X
@Woulfe			0	0	0	0	0		
Stuart	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0
French		X	0		X	0	0	0	
Curry	0			0	X		0	0	X
Chapman	0	X	0	0		0	0		X
Ferguson	0	X	0	X		X	X	X	X
Acheson		X				0			
Wyse	0	0	0	0		X	0		0
Fitzgibbon		X	0	0		0			
H.R.Westenra	X	X			X	0	0		X
Redington	0	0		0	X		0	0	0
Barry	0		0	0		0	0		0
S.O'Brien	0	0	X	X	0	0	0		0
Clements		0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0
Yates	0	0		X			0	0	0
Hutton	0	X		0			0		X
Chester	X				X		0		X
J.Grattan	0	0	0	0		X	0		0
F.J.Howard	0	0		0				0	0
Somerville	0	0		0	X		0	0	0
O'Callaghan	0	0		0			0	0	0
Maule	0	0		0			0		0
J.C.Westenra				0					X
Hume	0	0		0			0		0
Musgrave			0						
S.White	0	0			0	0	X		X
Evans	X	X	0			X			X
Crawford			X			X			
Brady			X						
Bryan		0			X			0	
Archbold	0	X		0	0		0	0	X
Bodkin	X			X		0	X	0	
← Bridgeman	X		X	X	0	0	X		
T.B.Martin			0			0			
John Power						0			
Lord Brabazon		0		0			0		X
Mahony				X			0		0
Cave	0								
Ball	0								

1. Postpone Committee. 2. Postpone Third Reading. 3. Outdoor Relief(i). 4. Outdoor Relief(ii). 5. Omit £5 clause. 6. Law of Settlement(i). 7. Law of Settlement(ii). 8. Electoral Rating. 9. Exclude Able-bodied.

X-For motion, against Government.

0-Against motion, for Government.

**@-Officeholder.**

The principal objections of these members are considered below, in conjunction with evidence drawn from events in Committee. No-one ventured to divide the House on the first or second reading of either bill. However, on the 9th of February 1838, O'Connell opposed the motion to go into Committee. This step - coming as it did before the bill could be fully examined - was generally regarded as a mistimed move and was not well supported. Four Irish Tories voted with O'Connell; 16 opposed him, including seven who were later to join him in opposing the third reading. And the motion was supported by only a minority of Irish liberals. Six of O'Connell's 12 Irish liberal supporters were unionists; but so too were more than half of the 40 Irish liberals who opposed O'Connell.<sup>54</sup>

It is clear that the full weight of Irish Tory opposition was not brought to bear until after the defeat of some important Tory amendments. In Committee, most Irish Tories supported the Government more often than not, the majority of the 37 divisions having followed amendments from the liberal side of the House. Some of the divisions concerned issues in which traditional radical and conservative interests were reasonably clear. The proposal to make magistrates ex officio guardians, and thereby to guarantee the influence of the landed gentry and aristocracy was divided<sup>55</sup> upon four times. And there were four divisions concerning the system of election of guardians - two on plural voting, and one each on voting by<sup>56</sup> secret ballot and voting by proxy.

In addition, the House divided on O'Brien's motion to make landlords pay a larger share of the rate (two-thirds instead of the proposed one-half, though it was provided that landlords charging excessive rents would have to pay more than one-half), on O'Connell's proposal to exempt from the rate all tenants below £10, and on Shaw's proposal to exempt ministers' money as rateable property.<sup>57</sup> On all of these issues the likely Tory point of view is fairly clear; and in all eleven divisions that point of view<sup>58</sup> received the unanimous support of the Irish Tories. On the other hand, three of the twelve Irish Tories who voted did not share Stanley's



Table 3 Liberal-Unionists.

	I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	II
Conservative											
@O'Ferrall	0	0	0								
J.Martin	0	0	0								
R.Howard					0						
Gibson				0							
Jephson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	0	
@Woulfe	0	0	0		0	0		0	0	0	X
Stuart	0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0	X
French				0	0	X	0	0	0	0	
Curry				0	0	X	0	0	0	0	X
Chapman	0	0	X	0							
Ferguson	0	0	0	0	X						X
Acheson	0				0						X
Wyse				0	0		0	0	X	X	X
Fitzgibbon				0	X						
H.R.Westenra				X	X	X	0		0	0	
Redington				0	X	X	0	0	0	X	X
Barry	X	X	X	X	0		0	0	0	0	X
S.O'Brien	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	X	0	X	X
Clements	0	0	X	0		X	X	X	0	0	
Yates				X			0		0	X	X
Hutton				X	0						X
Chester				X		0					X
J.Grattan	X		X	X	0						X
F.J.Howard					X		X	X	X	0	X
Somerville				0		X	X	X	X	X	X
O'Callaghan											X
Maule				X							
J.C.Westenra				X							
Hume				X							X
Musgrave	X	X									
S.White				X			X				
Evans				X							X
Crawford	X	X	X								
Brady	X	X	X								
Bryan					X	X	X	X	X	X	
Archbold				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Bodkin	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	
Bridgeman	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Liberal											

1. No ex officio guardians(1837). 2. Reduce ex officio guardians. 3. Popular election of ex officio guardians. 4. No ex officio guardians(1838). 5. Landlords pay more. 6. Exclude tenants under £16. 7. Plural voting principle. 8. Plural voting amendment. 9. Voting by ballot. 10. Voting by proxy. II. Ministers' money.

X-Radical/liberal side of issue.

0-Conservative side of issue.

@-Officeholder.

objection to the paying of Catholic priests for providing religious instruction to Catholics in the workhouses. Five out of eleven Irish Tories voted to postpone the clause which threw the rate entirely on the occupier in the first instance (with the landlord's share to be held back out of the rent), Lucas and Conolly arguing that such a provision would cause difficulties for poor tenants.<sup>59</sup> And, as shown below, there was other evidence that Irish Tories did not invariably subscribe to the apparently obvious Tory line.<sup>60</sup>

Liberal voting in Committee followed a pattern roughly similar to that which it was to follow on the third reading - that is, repealers and unionists both divided, but unionists much less prepared than repealers to oppose the Government. In the 37 divisions in Committee the majority of liberal-unionists supported the Government more often than not, while O'Connell and the repealers were generally in opposition. The individual voting records of the liberal-unionists in the eleven divisions which demonstrated Irish Tory unity in defence of conservatism are provided in Table 3. It is clear that, with the exception of the ministers' money question, issues which would appear to be fairly good indicators of the members' position along a radical-conservative dimension consistently led to division among the liberal-unionists - while O'Connell and most, often all, repealers united at the radical end of the dimension and Irish Tories united at the conservative end. So, the liberal-unionists cannot be designated 'radical' or 'conservative' on this evidence. Table 3 shows that while the group had a radical wing (Bridgeman, Bodkin, Archbold, Bryan, etc.) and a conservative wing (Jephson, Woulfe, Stuart, to take those who voted often), a number of members cannot - on this evidence - be ascribed to either wing (Barry, O'Brien, Wyse, Clements, H. R. Westanra, Redington).

Other issues divided both Tories and liberals. There follows a discussion of the questions of outdoor relief, the £5 clause, settlement, electoral rating, relief of the able-bodied, and, briefly, the motion to



permit areas to opt out of the operation of the bill. These issues, particularly outdoor relief and exclusion of the able-bodied, were central to the poor law question, and consideration of them will serve to highlight the attitudes and preoccupations of the members. Voting in the divisions is given in Tables 1 and 2. The liberal-unionist members are listed in Table 2 according to the radical-conservative spectrum tentatively suggested above (with the addition of six members who did not vote in the divisions on which the spectrum was based).

In May 1833, Lynch wrote that, 'the limitation of relief to work-houses seems to be the main object of aversion with opponents of the measure in Ireland.'<sup>61</sup> It was clearly the main objection with O'Ferrall; according to Morpeth he 'said that if Mr Nicholls intended to confine relief to the work-houses, it would produce a rebellion in Ireland.'<sup>62</sup> O'Brien, consistent with his views before 1837, attempted to remove this limitation, twice moving that guardians should be given discretionary power to provide outdoor relief. He argued that the workhouses represented an unwarranted punishment of the destitute, be they physically incapable of working for their own subsistence or part of the notoriously large surplus of Irish labour. And, setting the Royal Commission's estimate that 2,385,000 people would require relief at some time each year against Nicholls's opinion that 80,000 workhouse places prove sufficient,<sup>63</sup> he claimed that the number of destitute was so great either the majority of paupers would be ignored or the property of the country would be confiscated in order to house all in (relatively expensive) workhouses.<sup>64</sup> O'Connell and Crawford were the other principal supporters of outdoor relief.

However, Russell felt that 'no vigilance of enquiry .. could prevent imposition if a system of outdoor relief was to be resorted to'.<sup>65</sup> Morpeth felt that confinement of relief to the workhouse 'supplies the check which the experience of England and the character of Irishmen give every one reason to believe would prove effective.'<sup>66</sup> The prohibition of outdoor relief helped to secure Lansdowne's acquiescence in the bill.<sup>67</sup> The



majority of both Irish Tories and liberal-unionists in Parliament opposed O'Brien's motions. They and the Government speakers contended that in the absence of the workhouse test of destitution, almost all would seek aid, as had been the case in England. Clements wrote, in a sense bearing out O'Brien's argument, that 'such is the poverty of the parishes along the coast that I consider out door relief .. would end in <sup>68</sup> confiscation', though he did favour outdoor relief for the sick. For Irish liberal support O'Brien had to rely heavily on the repealers. On his first motion, in 1837, only three of his Irish liberal supporters were fellow unionists; 15 liberal-unionists opposed the motion. In 1838, <sup>69</sup> five liberal-unionists supported O'Brien; 19 voted against.

Shaw shared the view that without the workhouse test the measure would lead to a 'virtual confiscation of the whole landed property' of Ireland. In 1837, 15 Irish Tories voted for restricting relief to the workhouse, but Bateson, Castlereagh, Verner and Archdall - all Ulster Tories - supported O'Brien's motion. In the following year, Bateson found himself in a minority of 8 to 1 among the Irish Tories, with his former allies failing to vote (Table 1, Nos. 3-4). Only scattered remarks exist to explain the readiness of some Irish Tories to forgo the apparent economies of a workhouse test of destitution. Castlereagh contended that outdoor relief had sufficed in the North of Ireland and that, far from providing a useful test against expensive abuse, workhouses there would be a highly unnecessary expense. Bateson claimed that only by means of <sup>70</sup> outdoor relief would mendicancy be eliminated.

It is probably fair to conclude that in opposing outdoor relief the majority of Irish Tories and liberal-unionists were primarily concerned with the interests of the ratepayers, as opposed to those of the destitute. Certainly the principal argument against outdoor relief - the need to limit the number of claimants - was a direct appeal to the immediate interests of the ratepayer. It is significant that, apart from O'Brien's advocacy and Ferguson's mixed response, the support - such as it is - for

outdoor relief came very much from the radical end of the spectrum of liberal-unionist members depicted in Table 2. There was strong opposition among those who reacted conservatively or ambiguously in the divisions used to suggest the ideological spectrum (Table 2, Nos. 3-4).

The issue of exemption from the rate of tenants under £5 again divided Tories and both groups of liberals. Clause 71 provided that occupiers of tenants of less than £5 annual value could deduct all of the poor rate from their rent; in other words, their landlord would be liable for all of the rate. The clause was defended on grounds which did not betray a humanitarian interest in the plight of the poorer tenants, though Clements considered that this factor would influence some.<sup>71</sup> Russell was worried that the poorer tenant 'would not be so intelligent in working the bill', and that the collection of rates from them would 'give rise to constant disputes and vexations.' At a later stage he explicitly stated that the clause was introduced for these reasons and not 'with the view of exempting those persons as being a class which ought to be free from such a demand' (for poor rates). Spring Rice, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, feared that enfranchisement of the poorer tenants would admit<sup>72</sup> 'a set of voters directly interested in the mismanagement of the measure.' According to Clements, writing about the clause's likely reception in the Lords, it would be supported because of the 'mistaken apprehension<sup>73</sup> of the danger of an extended constituency.' The danger was not merely that of popular control of the administration of the poor law. Sweeney has contended that conservatives were concerned about the spectre of poor law guardians exercising a local influence extending far beyond poor law matters, subverting the traditional pre-eminence of the gentry.<sup>74</sup>

Nevertheless, a majority of both liberal-unionists and Irish Tories<sup>75</sup> voted against the clause. The opponents of the clause did not state openly that they wished to tax the poorer tenants in order to ease the burden of the better-off. Crawford, Lynch, French, Lefroy, Lucas and Bateson all went to the opposite extreme and contended that exemption of



the poor tenants would induce landlords to clear their estates off small holdings or to raise rents of existing holdings above £5. Lucas also claimed that a high rent level owed much to local circumstances and did not necessarily indicate prosperity, that the provision would divide farming communities, and that it would discourage the unrated tenant<sup>76</sup> from improving his property lest his rent be raised as a result.

Though he did not speak on the debate on the clause, Clements opposed it vigorously outside Parliament. His pamphlet at the beginning of 1838 contained a denunciation of the clause, and, in the spring, he wrote to both Russell and Nicholls in an attempt to secure its abandonment. Like Lucas he felt that 'the constituency above £5 cannot be supposed to be essentially elevated in circumstances above the smaller tenants.' He complained that in the West of Ireland, where 'perhaps nine-tenths of the farmers' occupied land at below £5, 'the exemption of the many will cause the arbitrarily selected few to feel their poor rate as a great burthen.' And he considered that Nicholls intended to encourage<sup>77</sup> consolidation by means of the clause. But Clements's chief objection was that even tenants under £5 could give more employment if they could be induced, by the poor rate, to adopt better agricultural methods. Given the situation in the West of Ireland, by this clause, he told Nicholls, 'the whole fabric of self improvement which I have been fondly rearing<sup>78</sup> up crumbles under me.' Russell, in fact, later acknowledged Clements's<sup>79</sup> views and treated them with some deference.

As on the issue of outdoor relief, the immediate interest of Irish landlords was fairly clear; it lay in rejection of the exemption of the poorer tenants. For all that the members claimed to be concerned with the long-term welfare of the exempted tenants, it is at least possible that in opposing the clause the majority in both unionist groups were strongly influenced by the threat to landlord interests. Significantly, opposition to the clause was particularly strong in the conservative and middle sections of the spectrum of liberal-unionist members (Table 2, No. 5).

And it is probably significant that the clause was removed in the (more conservative ) House of Lords.

Though there was again disunity, on the law of settlement there were clear majority views among both Irish Tories and liberal-unionists, the former in favour of and the latter opposed to such a provision. A law of settlement would mean that a pauper could be relieved only in or by the union in which he normally resided. As the bill stood, a pauper could claim relief in any workhouse. Several Irish Tories - Lucas, Litton, Jackson, Bateson - protested that this would mean the good landlord and the rich district would be burdened by an influx of paupers from the estates of bad landlords and poorer areas. Some of these members clearly had protection of the relatively pauperless North in mind, though there is very little suggestion in the divisions that the Irish Tory split on this issue occurred on a regional basis. Downshire wrote that the opposition of some Western members to settlement reflected their desire 'to lessen the population of their districts. I do not however see how the North can be invaded as it were by the hordes of poor people from these parts...'

Cooke spoke in similar terms at an anti-poor law meeting in Belfast in February 1838.

Lucas's two motions for a settlement provision were both supported by the majority of Irish Tories, 19-5 and 11-4 respectively, with Shaw and Young ever-presents in opposition.

Opponents of settlement, including Nicholls, pointed to the litigation and the restraints on the movement of labourers which the law of settlement had caused in England. And there were factors which made it especially necessary to forgo such a law in Ireland. Unlike his English counterpart, the Irish pauper would have no legal right to relief - dispensation being at the discretion of the guardians. It was generally accepted that a law of settlement would mean concession of the right to relief, since it would prove impossible to force a pauper home and then refuse him relief there. But denial of a right to relief was an important safeguard against



the possibility that the system would sink beneath the weight of Irish pauperism. Russell cited this as the key difference between the English system and that proposed for Ireland. He and Shaw stated in Parliament that concession of such a right was tantamount to large-scale confiscation of property. The contrast between Shaw's determination to preserve the safeguard of discretionary relief and the view of Lucas and Hayes that in practice the safeguard would be inoperative obviously contributed to the division in Irish Tory ranks on the settlement question.

While most Irish Tories wanted a settlement law, a majority within both sections of Irish liberals opposed the proposal. The liberal-unionists divided 17-5 and 23-4 against the proposal (Table 2, Nos. 6-7). Wyse's original position - in favour of a settlement law - he ascribed to a desire to make each district support its own poor and every absentee pay for his neglect; and he feared that without such a law cities like Waterford - his constituency - would have to support mendicants from adjoining counties. His argument, then, was essentially the same as that used by the majority of Irish Tory speakers. But in 1838 he and James Grattan, who had also supported Lucas in 1837, changed their votes in the belief that simultaneous enactment of the poor law throughout Ireland would automatically restrict the movement of paupers. Crawford advocated the law of settlement as a necessity if landlords were to be rewarded according to their treatment of their tenants and given an interest in their tenants' welfare. But Clements, who, of course, strongly desired the latter end, did not agree that a law of settlement was necessary. The discretionary power of the guardians would be wielded in favour of local paupers. This 'practical settlement' would mean that the landlord would be induced to keep his tenant out of the ranks of the destitute, but without the inconvenience of restricting the labour market and the injustice of denying relief to persons who might have a moral but not a legal entitlement. Lynch, O'Brien and (belatedly) Wyse agreed that the guardians' discretion would amount to 'a practical settlement.'



Those liberal-unionists at the conservative end of the spectrum (Table 2, Nos. 6-7) were as much opposed to the settlement law as those at the radical end - in fact slightly more opposed - in spite of their being closer ideologically to the pro-settlement Irish Tories. The tendency of this issue not to generate hardened opinions among many Irish liberals - witness the vacillation of Wyse, Grattan and several others - may have induced liberal-unionists simply to follow the Government line. It is interesting to conjecture, however, that it was an argument possessing some appeal for those mindful of landlord interests - the need to deny a right to relief - which swayed conservative-leaning Whigs against settlement.<sup>92</sup>

Closely related to the settlement issue was the question of electoral rating - meaning the charging of the cost of relief in the union workhouse against the (smaller) electoral division in which the pauper was resident. A provision to that effect was inserted in the bill by the Lords.<sup>93</sup> Nicholls described the results as 'a sort of quasi settlement as between the different divisions.'<sup>94</sup> It did not involve the power of removal between unions, those not resident in the union being chargeable against the union at large. In other words, the object of many Tories - prevention of the movement of paupers into areas relatively free of destitution - was not attainable by means of this provision. However, its effects proved advantageous to the landlord interest. The tendency of paupers to drift into towns and eventually to come upon the rates there meant 'the landlords, by a coup de main, cleverly succeeded in getting rid, to a large extent, both of their poor and their poor-rates, the burden of maintaining their evicted and poverty-stricken tenants falling, mainly, not on them .. but upon the ratepayers of the urban divisions.'<sup>95</sup> Though landlords owned urban property too, they probably did benefit from the disparity which grew up between the rates in urban and rural divisions.

Lucas had moved a similar provision in the Commons - involving



parishes instead of the electoral divisions. It won the support of 13 out of 15 Irish Tories, Shaw and Young again standing apart from their colleagues (Table 1 No. 8). Only Ferguson out of 14 liberal-unionists voted for the motion (Table 2, No. 8), though Crawford, agitating outwith Parliament, advocated a similar amendment. The only speakers after Lucas, Shaw and Morpeth, stressed the practical difficulty of locating so precisely a pauper's origins, and Shaw felt the provision was an attempt to establish a settlement principle.<sup>96</sup> Regarding the motives of those involved, it should be noted that, though the issue became extremely controversial in the ensuing decade, those who advocated the provision in 1837-8 were not accused of deliberately favouring landlord interests; it was generally recognized as a genuine if misguided attempt to ensure local responsibility.

The issue of whether or not relief should be extended to the able-bodied destitute caused heated discussion. The debate generated many of the same arguments as arose over outdoor relief, with opponents claiming relief of the able-bodied would bankrupt Irish property, and supporters claiming that to deny it would be to discriminate against the blameless unemployed and cause a dangerous degree of resentment. Irish Tory members repeatedly protested against the inclusion of the able-bodied. They contended that it 'would prove by far too oppressive for the land to bear', and that the bill, by raising expectations it could not meet, would do more to induce discontent than the hoped-for tranquillity. Shaw was particularly adamant, clearly regarding this as the single most objectionable aspect of a measure of which on most other important points he approved. He moved exclusion of the able-bodied and was supported in the division by 18 other Irish Tories; only two, Lucas and John Ellis, dissented (Table 1, No. 9). Ellis expressed faith in the workhouse test to exclude all but the truly destitute, and Lucas contended that to discriminate against the able-bodied would be to ignore much genuine need.<sup>97</sup>

The motion divided Irish liberals 25-20 against, with liberal-



unionists voting against by 14-12 (Table 2 No. 9). Clements opposed the motion on the grounds that the calculations of the extent of destitution were 'mere waste paper'; the poor law would not be overwhelmed by weight of numbers because it would operate to increase employment and thereby to reduce the number of destitute. But he also had faith in the more direct mechanisms which were much emphasized in the House - the stringency of the workhouse test and the right of the guardians to refuse<sup>98</sup> relief. Some felt, like Lucas, that common justice demanded relief of the able-bodied - justice to the blameless unemployed, and to the poorer classes on whom mendicants would continue to prey if they were not offered<sup>99</sup> relief.

O'Connell strongly advocated exclusion of the able-bodied, like Shaw contending that the property of Ireland could not maintain all the Irish destitute and that there would be disappointment and irritation if<sup>100</sup> the hope was held out that it could. Rice, privately, regarded this as the most objectionable part of the measure and informed Russell that,

'To adopt any plan undertaking the relief of the able-bodied poor of Ireland will in my mind strike a blow at the whole social system of the country, check industry, retard civilization & introduce an uncertainty with respect to all property. It supplies the only element of mischief from which we have hitherto been protected'.<sup>101</sup>

According to Wyse's diary the liberal-unionist member Nicholas Ball felt that restriction of the Irish poor law to the impotent poor was 'the<sup>102</sup> secret wish of many who support' the bill. Twelve liberal-unionists, none of whom spoke on the issue, supported Shaw's motion. O'Connell, it may be noticed, was, in opposing relief of the able-bodied and supporting<sup>103</sup> outdoor relief, though possibly inconsistent, at least in line with the majority opinion of before 1837 - unlike O'Brien who now took a 'liberal' line on both issues.

Exclusion of the able-bodied won support from all parts of the spectrum, particularly at the two extremes, of liberal-unionist members (Table 2 No. 9), perhaps not so surprisingly given that the issue brought agreement between the Irish Tories and O'Connell. The Lords later inserted



a provision which resembled Shaw's proposal; by it 'a preference' was<sup>104</sup> given to 'the aged and infirm poor, and the destitute children.' However, this provision fell far short of excluding the able-bodied; indeed, Nicholls had approved the principle of such a preference in his First<sup>105</sup> Report. Relief of the able-bodied was the issue which brought the greatest censure on the bill in the Lords, when Fitzwilliam's motion for their exclusion was supported by Fitzgerald, Carbery (Irish Tories), Fingall and Clanricarde (Irish Whigs) in much the same terms as had been used by<sup>106</sup> Shaw and O'Connell in the lower House. Lord Downshire, too, felt that the measure should concern only 'the aged & infirm', but 'I imagine that this proposition will be too simple & moderate in expense to admit of<sup>107</sup> adoption.'

Finally, it is necessary to notice an amendment which demonstrated that some Irish Tories felt that conditions in the North especially did not warrant a measure like the one proposed. Castlereagh moved an additional clause to empower the Commissioners 'to exempt from the operation of the Act such parishes as were willing to take upon themselves the care of their own poor', because in much of the North existing relief had been found sufficient. Bateson strongly supported the amendment, hoping it would allow the continuation of outdoor relief. Though most Tories had opposed the latter, the amendment won the support of 12 of the 16 Irish Tory members taking part (Table 1, No. 10), not all of them Northern members. Shaw opposed the clause, expressing the fear that it would permit outdoor relief and reiterating his view that the workhouse was the bill's most important check against abuse. This was the occasion of a particularly strong attack by Bateson on Shaw, demonstrating both the strength of feeling and the seriousness of the rift in Irish Tory ranks. Only Somerville out of 18 liberal-unionists taking part voted<sup>108</sup> for the amendment.

On the third reading of the bill, the oppositionist cause fared<sup>109</sup> quite well among the Irish members. 22 Irish liberals voted against

the measure, 24 for. A clear majority of liberal-unionists (16-9) supported the measure (Table 2, No. 2). A similar proportion of repealers (13-6) voted against. O'Brien and Clements, two of the liberal-unionists most interested in the subject, submerged their disapproval of some aspects of the bill and supported the third reading. Clements felt he could support the bill because its most objectionable provision, the £5 clause, would, he believed, soon be repealed. He was the only liberal-unionist to speak in the third reading debate. O'Brien said later that he too accepted the measure in the hope it would be amended at a future date. James Grattan, according to his journal, was pleased with the measure; he noted that 'we are getting what we asked' for and commented angrily on O'Connell's conduct; he was 'only activated by faction, his policy (is) to prevent any beneficial measure, so he opposed the poor bill, & that I will remember.' Crawford, no longer in Parliament, publicly denounced the bill on the grounds that his objections regarding settlement and outdoor relief had been overruled.

The third reading division saw an almost unanimous expression of Irish Tory disapproval of the bill, only Blennerhassett of the 17 Irish Tory members voting supporting the Government (Table 1, No. 2). And the chief characteristic of the debate was the barrage of Irish Tory condemnation of the measure. However, their solidarity in the division was somewhat deceptive. Lucas, Young and Shaw, who had earlier shown themselves to be particularly sympathetic to the measure and defiant of their comrades, did not vote. Lucas was disappointed that the Government had maintained the £5 clause, the intention to establish large unions, and their opposition to the law of settlement. He stated that he did not know how he should vote. Shaw did not speak on that occasion, but it is possible he shared Lucas's dilemma, particularly given his strong and unsuccessful advocacy of exclusion of the able-bodied. Castlereagh cited two grounds for his vote against the bill: feeling in the North of Ireland, where, he claimed, a workhouse system was not necessary, was against 'this



grievous measure of taxation'; and there was a temptation to jobbing inherent in the Commissioners' powers to appoint paid officers. Verner, Hayes, Young, Corry and Conolly all stated that the measure would prove too expensive a burden on the land, with the latter two particularly unhappy about inclusion of the able-bodied.<sup>115</sup>

The apparent hardening of unionist opposition to the bill towards its final stages raises the suspicion that members were influenced by opinion in Ireland. The opponents of the bill in Parliament made much of the 'public clamour' against the measure. Monteagle wrote of his 'brother Squires, who of all parties and creeds are alarmed at the measure.'<sup>116</sup> Roden and Mac Hale described 'the obnoxiousness of the measure to the feelings and the interests of the Irish people.'<sup>117</sup> Even those favourable to the measure, including Nicholls himself, conceded its unpopularity.<sup>118</sup> On the other hand, Drummond wrote in January 1838 that, 'With regard to the whole plan I do not think it has excited much interest here. The people .. know nothing of it; the farmers and cottiers who are to pay know as little - and at present care little ...'<sup>119</sup> Mac Hale also felt that the people were too 'tired of petitioning' to express their opposition.<sup>120</sup> O'Connell later admitted that his opposition to the measure in 1837-8 'made no impression on the public mind.'<sup>121</sup> In the general election of 1837, which interrupted consideration of the bill in Parliament, the poor law issue played very little part.

The evident division within the Irish Tory ranks clearly restricts the extent to which one can generalize about their attitude towards the Irish poor law. However, the weight of evidence does suggest that, for all their liberal pretensions on some aspects of the issue, the majority of Irish Tories were primarily concerned with the interests of the rate-payers in general and the landowning ratepayers in particular. They wished to limit the scope (that is, expense) of the poor-law by opposing outdoor relief and relief of the able-bodied; they would have required paupers to possess a residence qualification; and at the third reading stage in



particular there was an impressive and instructive Tory consensus to the effect that the bill's principal fault was its expense. On such issues on the £5 clause, the right of magistrates to become ex officio guardians, plural voting, voting by ballot and proxy, and the proportion of the rate which landlords should pay, all or most of the Irish Tories voted according to the immediate interests of the landowning class. It would be wrong totally to ignore the evidence that Irish Tories were mindful of the interests of the destitute and the lower classes of rate-payers, but their response when these interests conflicted with those of the landowners was generally clear-cut and often unanimous.

The liberal-unionists were even more divided, and clearly differed along more fundamental lines than did the Irish Tories. In divisions in which the landlord interest is clearly identifiable (Table 3), while the Irish Tories united behind that interest, the great majority of liberal-unionists showed, at least occasionally, some propensity to serve the lower classes in ways which challenged the immediate interests of the landowning class. A small majority of liberal-unionists supported inclusion of the able-bodied. And a considerable majority resisted the ratepayer-orientated appeal of the Irish Tories on the third reading. On the other hand, the response of most liberal-unionists to outdoor relief and the £5 clause, and of a large minority to relief of the able-bodied, was essentially conservative. And Table 3 also shows the propensity of several liberal-unionists to react conservatively. Furthermore, notwithstanding the majority decision on the third reading, there was a particular tendency among these conservative-minded liberal-unionists, all of them landlords, to rebel on the third reading (Table 2, No. 2), suggesting perhaps some common feeling between the Irish Whigs and Tories.

In incidental discussion in 1837 the Irish Whig Lord Clanricarde and several Irish Tory peers had expressed their dislike of the bill, though Roden merely stated his belief that a poor law was required in Ireland.<sup>122</sup> When it was sent up to the Lords in the following year the Irish Tory



**TEXT CUT  
OFF IN  
ORIGINAL**

peers made a determined effort to 'prevent the infliction' of 'this most objectionable measure' upon Ireland, 'in its present shape.' Roden wrote to Wellington that,

'There is not a man, woman or child in the country who is not opposed to it. No benefit can be derived from it, but the power & the taxation will be excessive & oppressive in establishing a staff which cannot make the proposed measure efficient.'

Roden was especially worried that the failure of the taxation proposals to allow for the effect on incomes of debt charges 'must have the effect of ruining some of our resident proprietors', while the system as a whole 'would be of no benefit to the poor in proportion to its tremendous cost.' And it was 'a bill giving a power to Commissioners which might at a future day fall into hands that would complete the downfall of the Protestant aristocracy of Ireland.' He urged the outright rejection  
123  
of the bill.

Twelve Irish peers - including Downshire, Londonderry, Limerick and, in the chair, the Whig Clanricarde - and 5 or 6 'commoners' met in the Carlton Club on the 5th of May to discuss the issue. There was 'a decided feeling against the bill as to the Workhouse system, but all admitted that there should be a poor law for the relief of the aged & infirm, the widows  
124  
& orphans.' A second meeting on the 9th sent a deputation to Wellington. The Knight of Kerry wrote to Wellington on the 12th to express his 'strong  
125  
alarm' at the measure and urge its rejection in the Lords. However Lord Clancarty wrote to the Duke specifically to counter the influence of the other Irish Tory peers and to express his approval of the bill. He even favoured the inclusion of the able-bodied, on the grounds that the system  
126  
could not 'effect any real good' if they were excluded. Lord Devon also supported the bill and Wellington was aware that 'the great body of the English proprietors' favoured it. He urged the Irish to propose 'reasonable amendments.' But he rejected as 'impracticable' a proposal of voluntary assessment which was sent by an increasingly frantic Roden, scolded the latter for the failure of the Irish Tories to consider the



question until the last minute, and reminded him of the widespread approval of the bill in the Commons and the ambiguous behaviour of the Irish Tory members. Roden admitted that the 'peril' they were in was 'greatly caused' by 'the supineness & ignorance of our Representatives  
127  
in the House of Commons, who cannot be too much blamed.'

The most important amendments made in the Lords have already been discussed - the removal of the £5 clause and the introduction of rating by electoral division - as has the particularly strong opposition to relief of the able-bodied. The measure as a whole was denounced in the somewhat restricted debates by the Whig Lords Clanricarde and Fitzwilliam and by Tories like Londonderry, Westmeath, Roden, Fitzgerald and Glengall. However the view taken by Large and Mac Intyre that in the Lords the measure 'elicited the only serious demonstration made by the "Irish interest" as a whole in the thirties' needs qualification. According to both the debates and divisions a considerable majority of Irish Whig peers were for the bill. And though most Irish Tories were opposed, there were  
128  
notable exceptions in Lords Wicklow, Downes and Downshire.

The Dublin Evening Mail was critical of Wellington for having 'set at nought the unanimous opinion of the landed interest of Ireland' by accepting  
129  
the essence of the measure. But the Duke's course ensured the passage of the bill. In June 1838 the moderate Irish Tory Lord Clare wrote that, 'The Poor law is a fearful experiment, but as it is the law it is my duty to  
130  
assist its operations.' The Irish Whig Charles Brownlow wrote to Russell in August that the bill 'comes forth from Parliament as an honest experiment of benevolence & charity .. I entertain sanguine hopes that it will work  
131  
its way & prove the great legislative measure of your administration.' French, remarkably for one who had opposed the third reading, declared that,

'when the ameliorations derived by Ireland from Whig Government shall be hereafter recorded in the page of history, the measure which will be described as the great corner-stone upon which the goodly pile of Irish civilization shall have been reared is the Poor Law Act - that great political adjustor between the duties of the rich and the natural rights of the poor.'  
132

Nicholls was appointed resident commissioner to administer the introduction of his own scheme, in spite of Drummond's fears that his tactlessness would cause resentment. In February 1839 Smith O'Brien<sup>133</sup> protested at the delay in putting the measure into operation, but in June the Lord Lieutenant informed Russell that,

'The Poor Law Unions are growing up rapidly under the wise & active guidance of our excellent Nicholls who will have told you more fully than I can how entirely the opposition which was made to the measure in Parliament has disappeared after it were become law.'<sup>134</sup>

Nicholls himself, on the same day, made precisely the same claim.<sup>135</sup> In March 1840 he informed Normanby that they were 'proceeding very satisfactorily' with the poor law, and by August he had 'seen much to confirm & nothing to weaken' his opinion that it would succeed, with most of the unions formed, workhouse construction and the valuation 'progressing satisfactorily', and the first collections of rates, in Cork and Dublin, producing 'no difficulty.'<sup>136</sup> In January 1840 Jackson called the poor law a 'good' measure, 'the most valuable' introduced by the Whigs. But Tory opposition in Parliament revived in 1840, when various administrative malpractices came to light. In 1840 and 1841 the Irish Tories Glengall and Westmeath led the Upper House in continual sniping at various aspects of the working of the poor law, particularly the alleged influence of priests and 'agitators' in the election of guardians, the appointment of a liberal partizan, Denis Phelan, as an assistant commissioner, and the falsification of returns to Parliament by one of the poor law officials. Wicklow alone of the Irish Tories defended the poor law administrators, with the assistance of the Irish Whigs Fingall and Headfort. Wellington stated in 1841 that he was 'altogether disappointed' in the way in which the measure had been brought into<sup>137</sup> operation.

The Duke was in fact under considerable pressure from the Irish Tory Lords Carbery and, especially, Westmeath on the above-mentioned 'evils' in the working of the poor law. Clancarty, an advocate of the



measure in 1838, attempted to rebut the accusations; in Ballinasloe the poor law, he said, had been 'the means of harmonizing the commonly discordant elements of Irish society & of directing attention to the general improvement of the country.' <sup>138</sup> The likelihood that a Tory Government would subvert the system alarmed James Grattan, who considered that the poor law was one of the Whigs' beneficial measures, one which had been 'eminently successful'. <sup>139</sup> And in September 1841, on the accession to power of the Tories, Nicholls, concerned at the line taken by Wellington and the other critics, approached members of the Government to ask for a declaration in favour of the poor law. At that time 26 work-houses had been completed and 100 more were 'in hand'. Nicholls told De Grey 'that the system is generally working well, that in many of the unions there is great desire to act as guardians & that religious feelings have been in many cases no bar to different sects acting together. He contemplates perfect ultimate success.' Part of Nicholls's anxiety arose from the fact that the Irish Conservatives 'are in many instances (more especially in the North of Ireland) hostile to it (the poor law), & believing or professing to believe it was a Whig measure, & that it will now be put an end to, are the most active in refusing to raise the money <sup>140</sup> for the Union houses.'

Peel duly assured Nicholls that Wellington did not question the principle of the poor law, and in Parliament stated that 'there was no intention whatever on the part of her Majesty's Government of proposing any change in the Irish Poor-law.' Shaw expressed his 'great satisfaction' at this announcement and, though aware that the introduction of the measure had been attended with 'circumstances of much difficulty', he believed that,

'it had been, on the whole, successful, and that if it were continued to be judiciously administered, and met with a fair and reasonable general support, it would be found to conduce in a great degree to the advantage of the public without the least injury to the interests of the poor.' <sup>141</sup>

Graham was suspicious of Nicholls's part in violation of the Act

with regard to the poor law valuations, and feared that the Commissioner was influenced by the Irish radicals and would connive in the latter's domination of the system; he entertained grave doubts as to whether or not Nicholls should be allowed to stay in Ireland. <sup>142</sup> But in October 1841 the Irish Tory Lord Clancarty wrote to Eliot in terms favourable to both Nicholls and the Poor Law, and similar views were expressed by other 'country gentlemen' consulted by Eliot. Clancarty felt that Nicholls's dismissal 'would be most impolitic as regards the great measure now coming, under his auspices, into full practical operation; and both harsh and unjust as regards the man, who in my opinion has by the production of the Poor Law done more for this wretched country than was ever done before.' <sup>143</sup> Graham was impressed with Clancarty's opinion and, encouraged by Eliot and De Grey, who trusted in Nicholls's abilities and political impartiality and felt that 'the appointment of a new man would check or impede the progress which the Poor Law Commission is now making', the Home Secretary concluded that 'past minor errors must be overlooked, & some reliance must be placed on the new bias being given from the change of supreme authority.' He felt, however, that some of Nicholls's appointments were 'justly considered most objectionable by our friends' and gave instructions, eventually carried out, that Phelan and some of the other officers should <sup>144</sup> be dismissed.

Glengall approached Graham and Wellington in October-November 1841 with more complaints against the poor law administration, but Graham presumed that with both Glengall and Westmeath 'party spirit' had <sup>145</sup> 'distorted facts & misrepresented truth.' A more serious embarrassment arose when the relatively sympathetic Clancarty and Viscount Bernard, the newly-elected Tory member for Bandon, questioned the practice of paying workhouse chaplains in proportion to the number of their communicants. The result was that the Catholic priests were better paid than the Protestant clergy, a situation Clancarty thought 'unjust' to the latter and 'injurious' to the Established Church. The Government refused to



overrule Nicholls. Their considerable annoyance with Glancarty for his decision to bring the matter before Parliament was possibly mitigated when, in his speech, he went on to praise Nicholls and opine that the Irish poor law had 'generally done much good.'<sup>146</sup>

Though 'bad accounts of the feeling abroad as regards the payment of poor rate' were in circulation as early as October 1841,<sup>147</sup> the threat of resistance did not materialise to any significant degree until the end of 1842. In February 1842 the Irish Whig Lord Carew noted that there was 'as yet no disinclination to pay the rate' and volunteered that he 'was against but am now favourable to the Poor law...'<sup>148</sup> Apart from Glancarty's motion the issue was not discussed in Parliament until July, when Crawford demanded 'some relaxation' regarding outdoor relief, as had taken place in England, deprecated the effect of the poor law on voluntary effort and the harsh treatment under it of Irish paupers in England, and pronounced the experiment a failure. O'Connell stated that a poor law was inapplicable and inadequate in Ireland, agreed that workhouse relief was not enough, and predicted an unprecedented resistance to the rate; the liberal-unionist Fitzstephen French complained that 'the Poor-law had been forced on Ireland by an English majority' and called for Nicholls's dismissal on the grounds of his having greatly underestimated the expense<sup>149</sup> of the law.

Back in Ireland O'Connell, sporadically, and the Tory Evening Mail, more consistently, conducted a campaign against the poor law. The Mail deprecated the introduction of politics into the local boards - 'public spouting societies for the exhibitions of guardians returned by priests'-supported Glancarty on the chaplaincy issue, and complained that the 'enormous tax' was 'swallowing up the property of the rich' and 'industrious' poor without benefit to the destitute, most of the rate being spent on administration. The administrators, especially Nicholls, came in for most criticism, being abused as 'despotic', 'inefficient' and 'over-paid'. A revision of the system of administration was the Mail's

first priority in 1842, though they also called for settlement and vagrancy laws. Lord Bernard and the guardians of Bandon also called for such revision, but the poor law was defended by the moderate Tory Evening Packet and the Whig Evening Post. Eliot's attempt to transfer the medical charities to the poor law administration stoked the fires of discontent, as did a series of disputes between individual Boards and the Commission; but it was the resistance to the poor rate in various parts of Ireland, increasingly serious from August 1842, which brought matters to a head. The Mail opposed such resistance to a legal impost but attributed it to resentment against the fact that most of the rate was spent on administration. <sup>150</sup>

On the 20th of December 1842, O'Connell wrote to the guardians of Co. Cork that 'our present system of poor laws must be either totally abolished or exceedingly modified, or it will produce a sanguinary and general insurrection.' The Mail claimed that O'Connell's letter was 'generally admitted to be the best and most useful production that ever perhaps issued from his prolific pen' and declared that Ireland was <sup>151</sup> 'unanimous' in opposition to the poor law. Eliot had reported in November that the poor law was 'working well', a report which led Graham to feel that the Committee of Inquiry threatened by O'Connell would do more good than harm. It would uncover nothing embarrassing and constitute 'a bone which will take a good deal of gnawing and will stop the mouths of some yelping curs.' But the spread of resistance to the rate persuaded Graham of the inadvisability of granting a Committee:

'The enquiry will be mistaken for a condemnation of the system; payment of rate will be suspended; and O'Connell will claim the triumph of the defeat of another illegal impost ...on the other hand if we are firm, and resist Enquiry, and testify a resolution to defend the measure, I do not despair of its ultimate success. To a limited extent it has done good already...' <sup>152</sup>

De Grey concurred in the view of the damage which an Inquiry would do to a system which 'in many places is quietly making its way', and was confident that resistance would be overcome by unwavering support of the



law by the Government. However, De Grey also felt that Eliot's 'working well' claim was 'too sanguine a statement', and reported that O'Connell's letter was 'exciting every possible feeling of hostility to the Poor Law ...it will cause much trouble & difficulty.' And Graham saw Nicholls's decision to leave Ireland as 'a symptom that he too has misgivings' about the workability of the measure. After O'Connell's letter he expected 'a furious assault' on the poor law, with O'Connell 'joined by the Irish landlords generally .. who are beginning to feel the rate.' He feared that Nicholls had committed 'many follies and indiscretions.' In general he had 'great doubts whether the measure is not a failure', with 'mendicancy, poverty, destitution unmitigated'; and 'no change of any kind is effected', except that they had spent £1 million on workhouses, established 'a large establishment of paid officers throughout Ireland', and had to levy a rate 'not less burthensome than Tithe and hardly less odious, which will have the effect of endangering rent and which will give to that vagabond O'Connell a fearful advantage.' Nevertheless, Graham continued to oppose a Commission of Inquiry and wished to 'give the measure a trial for another year under more prudent management', though he was 'not sanguine as to its ultimate success.' By the end of January 1843, the Government had agreed to resist Inquiry and to bring in an  
 153  
 amending measure.

From November 1842, the Mail had demanded 'a searching inquiry' into the poor law, and this cry was continued into the new year in conjunction with a demand for 'a thorough revision' of the poor law, including exclusion of the able-bodied. Similar demands emanated from local meetings. Most notable of all, on the 27th of January the Duke of Leinster chaired a meeting in Dublin which resolved in favour of 'an immediate and searching inquiry into the operation of the whole system' with a view to its amendment. French was the only liberal-unionist M.P. involved, and Leinster the only Whig peer, but there were almost 20 Irish Tory M.P.'s and peers. A deputation was sent to De Grey the next day and was told

that an inquiry would delay legislation and create dangerous expectations. De Grey reported to Graham that the meeting 'could not agree upon anything specific' with regard to amendments. O'Connell, meanwhile, continued to assail the Act and to urge its entire repeal.<sup>154</sup>

Eliot's announcement on the 3rd of February that the planned amendment bill would not make 'any alteration in the fundamental provisions of the Irish Poor Law' did not please the Mail, which announced its support for the committees of inquiry to be moved for by Smith O'Brien and Lord Clanricarde. And the movement in the country for amendment or repeal of the poor law continued, winning support from Dunraven, Belmore, Enniskillen, Crofton and other leading Tories and also featuring the repealer Archbishop Mac Hale. Peel was informed by a Dublin correspondent that,

'Our Poor Law drags heavily along. I never recollect any measure for Ireland which has so much distorted and distempered the public mind.... Aristocrat, parson, priest, landlord, farmer, middle man, peasant, beggar - all are in declared hostility to the successful issue of the poor law experiment & if such general opposition to it continues I do not see how it can be made to work.'

On his election for the University, however, George Hamilton, though he urged 'revision' of the poor law, felt that an inquiry should be undertaken only if the amending measure failed, and then upon the initiative of the Government and not a private member. Five days later, on the 15th of February, the Irish Tory members met at the Carlton Club to consider their course on Smith O'Brien's motion. They sent a deputation to Eliot 'to impress upon the government their sense of the great dissatisfaction which prevails throughout the whole of Ireland in reference to the operation of the poor law.' But they offered to support the Government in resisting O'Brien's motion 'as being calculated to paralyse the whole system', provided that the Government would introduce a measure 'to meet the most flagrant defects of the law.' They added that they, too, felt that the Government itself should institute the inquiry, if the amending bill 'should fail in rendering the system efficient.'



This retreat from confrontation did not satisfy the Mail, which urged the Irish Tory members to insist on 'the immediate appointment of an impartial commission of inquiry.'<sup>155</sup>

In Parliament in 1843 the unionist members, liberal and conservative, played the major role, the majority of repealers having seceded from Parliament. A large number of liberal-unionists expressed dissatisfaction with the working of the poor law. In the Lords, Clanricarde described the expense and mismanagement attendant on the system, and the consequent 'clamour, discontent and disturbance.'<sup>156</sup> However, it was among the members of the lower House that discontent was most evident. Smith O'Brien was particularly prominent. On the 23rd of March, he moved for a Select Committee to inquire into the operation of the poor law. He claimed that there was a 'universal concurrence of opinion in opposition to the Poor-law.' He attacked the Commissioners (George Nicholls, in effect) for their administration of the law, stressing the way in which their arrogance had alienated the guardians, their extravagance the ratepayers, and their insistence on a rigorous workhouse test the destitute. And he described a number of 'defects' in the law and possible remedies which the Committee should examine, stressing above all, the rest being relatively of 'trifling importance', that an inquiry was required to examine the possibility of extending outdoor relief to orphans, widows and others, given the opposition from ratepayers to the great expense of workhouse relief and its unsuitability and unfairness as a mode of relief to these classes of pauper.<sup>157</sup>

Crawford, Ferguson, Jephson-Norreys and French spoke in favour of the motion, French and Norreys producing general denunciations of the poor law. The motion was easily defeated. In the division, 11 Irish liberals, 9 of them liberal-unionists, supported the motion; but 5 liberal-unionists voted with the Government: Howard, Stuart, Armstrong, Ross and the former (?) repealer Barron, Ross and Barron expressing a considerable degree of satisfaction with the law as it stood and Ross

content to await the Government's amendment bill. So, the pattern of liberal-unionist disunity on the Irish poor law persisted. Even O'Brien's seconder, Norreys, conceded that he did not agree with O'Brien on all points. In the Lords a similar motion from Clanricarde was opposed by the only other Whig speaker, Lord Lansdowne.<sup>158</sup>

If the liberal-unionists as a group moved from majority approval of the poor law in 1838 to majority disillusionment in 1843 (O'Brien was the only individual who voted for the third reading in 1838 and for inquiry in 1843), the behaviour of the Irish Tories was in direct contrast. 16 Irish Tories voted with the Government in 1843 and only two, Archdall and Claud Hamilton, for the motion. Hamilton dwelt in debate on the despotic conduct of Nicholls towards the guardians and the expensive mismanagement of the assistant commissioners. But, as George Hamilton and Shaw later remarked, it was already clear that few of the able-bodied were claiming relief. For all that the critics of the poor law denounced the expense - underestimated by Nicholls - of establishing the system of workhouses, it was becoming obvious that the law's safeguards against needless recourse to relief were proving effective. In January 1843, with nearly three-quarters of the workhouses open, 31,572 people were receiving relief, well short of the 80,000 which Nicholls allowed for in 1836.<sup>159</sup>

This may have been a factor in the conduct of the Irish Tory members in March 1843. The terms of O'Brien's attack, particularly his advocacy of outdoor relief, would have alienated Irish Tories; and they were no doubt influenced by party loyalty and the fact that the Government asked for forbearance until its amendment measure was disclosed. Shaw and Bernard spoke for the Irish Tory opponents of inquiry. The former admitted the law's unpopularity and its defect in providing relief for the able-bodied; but he supported the Government view that an inquiry would paralyse the working of the law, and claimed that it had not yet been given 'a fair trial'; the burden must be felt before the benefits could



accrue. Outdoor relief, he said, would mean virtual confiscation of the landed property of the country. Bernard described several defects in the law but expected that the Government's proposed measure would  
160  
prove more useful than an inquiry. The Mail lamented the defeat of the motion by 'the tribe of place-hunters or place-holders.' In opposing inquiry into a system which had plundered Ireland and driven her near to rebellion, the Irish members were accused of applying 'the Don't - Embarrass - the - Government Doctrine', and Shaw and Bernard were assailed for their friendly disposition towards Nicholls. The Mail continued to denounce the system and to point to instances of resistance  
161  
to the rate and petitions for inquiry.

The Government's bill, introduced in April 1843, proposed to exempt from the rate tenants of property under £4 annual value (£8 in certain towns) and to increase the proportion of ex officio guardians (magistrates) to one third of each board. And, in spite of the widespread criticism of the extent of the powers of the Commissioners, the bill tended in some  
162  
ways to increase them. When the second reading came up on the 5th of May, French moved its postponement with a strong, general attack on the existing law as an expensive burden which brought benefit or contentment to no class of person. And the amendment bill 'did not remedy one existing evil, but, on the contrary, gave additional grievances to complain of.' O'Brien and Crawford supported the motion, but it was withdrawn after Wyse and O'Ferrall stated that they wished to go into committee on the bill. Redington and Ferguson subsequently objected to going into Committee O'Brien wrote to the guardians of Tuam that the amending bill would only worsen the existing law and that a Select Committee of Inquiry was a necessity. In debates on the general state of Ireland in the summer of 1843, Crawford, John O'Brien, French and Smith O'Brien continued to urge the unpopularity of the poor law, 'the reckless extravagance and gross mismanagement' of its administrators and the inadequacy of the amendment bill. Wyse wrote to his brother that the amendment bill 'does very little, except on one or  
163  
two points.'

In attacking the bill, French, Crawford and O'Brien, and, subsequently, Redington, argued that the proposal to increase the proportion of ex officio members was 'calculated to stifle popular control' of the boards of guardians. And Wyse wrote that by thus 'throwing more weight into the hands of the landlords' the bill added to discontent in Ireland. French, Crawford, O'Brien, Redington, O'Ferrall, Murphy, Ferguson, M. J. O'Connell, Norreys, Archbold and Somerville all complained of the failure to check the powers of the commissioners and of their past abuses of their powers.

The liberal-unionists also objected to the £4 exemption provision. Wyse wrote that the exempted tenants 'will not ultimately be benefited by the change. It is a bribe to clearing - few landlords .. will not prefer one tenant who pays £10 and is liable to the tax to two who pay £5 each and are exempt'. Ferguson and French argued the same point in Parliament; and French said that the Government merely wished to use the landlord as an instrument to collect a tax which could not be collected under the existing law, and that the intention was to exclude the small occupiers from the poor law and municipal franchises because they tended to vote for the nominees of the Catholic clergy. Except that the municipal franchise was not mentioned, French in fact read the Government's thinking correctly. Redington moved that the landlord of an exempted tenant should continue to pay only half of the rate, instead of taking over the whole burden as proposed, but the motion was negatived without debate or division. In the Lords Lansdowne supported the £4 clause.

The system of rating by electoral division, with its unequal taxation of different divisions and overburdening of towns, was criticized by O'Brien in correspondence and by him and Norreys in the debate on the motion for inquiry, and though an attempt was made in the bill to cause more paupers to be 'chargeable to the union at large', O'Brien still moved for union rating in Committee and Norreys and Murphy joined in behind-the-scenes efforts to urge on Eliot the insufficiency of the proposed change and the necessity of union rating. However, the Whig Lord Carew urged on Wellington



the disadvantage of union rating, that it would make 'well managed  
 estates liable to an equal assessment with neglected properties.'<sup>169</sup>

O'Brien also moved an amendment to permit outdoor relief for orphans. He and Crawford had earlier advocated outdoor relief in general and were supported in the debate on the particular issue of orphans by Wyse and Ferguson. But the latter two were convinced of 'the general inexpediency of the principle of outdoor relief.' Ross had said such relief would 'swallow up the rental of Ireland', and Lansdowne in the Lords made much of the necessity of a workhouse test. In the division (unlisted), O'Brien's motion was defeated by 50 votes to 7, clearly failing to unite liberal-<sup>170</sup> unionists.

In general, then, liberal-unionist division was as evident in 1843 as it had been in 1837-8. And it was O'Connell's Repeal agitation which<sup>171</sup> benefited most from the controversy. The bill also divided and in some respects displeased the Irish Tories. Some members of the (mainly Tory) deputation to De Grey in January had wanted a clause to exempt poorer<sup>172</sup> tenants from the poor rate. However, when Eliot informed the deputation of Irish Tory members in February that the landlords would have to pay the rates on tenements under £5 it was objected that this 'would operate most injuriously' in some parts of Ireland, particularly the West, where most tenements were of low value, and it was suggested that at least 'the<sup>173</sup> landlord should never be liable for more than his moiety.' In Parliament, in advocating exemption of tenants under £5 to ease the collection problem, Bernard made the same stipulation. When the Government brought in the bill, throwing all of the burden on the landlords, Shaw welcomed the clause. But George Hamilton complained bitterly that the landlord was to be used as a rate-collector, shifting onto him 'the odium of collection ... the fairer and better plan would have been to exempt all tenants under a certain value, and to leave the landlord, as at present, liable to his<sup>174</sup> moiety of the rate.'

Before going into Committee, the Government abandoned the proposal

to increase the proportion of ex officio guardians, apparently in deference to liberal opinion; Wyse wrote that the decision was part of the Government's plan to govern 'in a more favorable and partial tone to the great mass of the people', in response to the Repeal agitation.

Bernard deprecated the concession. He felt that 'the cumulative and proxy votes (had not) afforded to the landed property that protection which was intended.'<sup>175</sup> Bernard had called in March for a general union rate because the system of rating by electoral division discriminated against towns, and when union rating was not included in the bill he conspired with political opponents to petition against the existing system.

In August it was Thomas Vesey, Tory member for the Queen's County, who seconded O'Brien's motion for a union rate.<sup>176</sup>

These were serious differences between the Irish Tory members and the Government, but the extent of difference must not be exaggerated. Shaw claimed in May that the poor law had worked reasonably well, with many workhouses efficiently run and destitution reduced, and in supporting the £4 clause in the amending measure he was concurring in what he saw as 'the main and leading object' of the bill. Acton of Wicklow was generous in praise of the poor law, its administrators and the amending bill. Even Bernard and George Hamilton, prominent in criticizing the amending bill, expressed themselves in favour of the system as a whole, denying that it had failed and echoing Shaw's earlier claim that it had not yet been given 'a fair trial.' There was no indication of strong and widespread dissatisfaction with the Government in either the debates or divisions on the amending bill.<sup>177</sup> In sum, the disaffection of the Irish Tory members on the subject of the poor law simmered but did not reach serious proportions, in spite of the Government's failure to change radically a measure which most Irish Tories had opposed in 1833.

The Mail, however, contended vigorously that the amendment bill would worsen an already 'evil' system. Only the increase of ex officio guardians and the valuation clause won the Mail's approval, and withdrawal of the



former brought a predictable rebuke. They continued, also, to assail the 'ruinous system' as a whole and to describe the continuing resistance to rates.<sup>178</sup> And the Irish Tories of the House of Lords, as in 1838, produced a stronger protest than the M.P.'s. Wicklow argued that an inquiry into the poor law would paralyse a system which had not yet had 'a fair trial', was working well in many parts, and would become more accepted when rates fell as the high initial costs ceased to have an effect. Downshire also opposed the motion for inquiry, preferring to make 'calm and temperate alterations' by means of the amending bill. But, even after introduction of the amending bill, Glengall, Mountcashell, Charleville, Carbery, Clancarty and Roden deprecated the 'despotic' and politically partisan behaviour of the Commissioners and the expense and unpopularity of the system, and advocated a Committee of Inquiry, though Clancarty was still in favour of the general principles of the system.<sup>179</sup>

As for the content of the amendment bill, Clare and Wicklow welcomed the £4 clause as an aid to collection. But Mountcashell and Clare took the initiative in urging the Government to amend or abandon the system of rating by electoral division and were dissatisfied with the compromise proposal in the amendment bill.<sup>180</sup> Glengall privately urged Wellington to allow restoration of the original clause on ex officio guardians and Charleville evidently lamented the loss of a provision to ensure 'that the distribution of the rates should be in the hands of a better class of persons.'<sup>181</sup> From Valencia, the Knight of Kerry feared 'a general and successful resistance' to the rate, endangering rents and other taxes as well; he recommended suspension of the operation of the poor law, 'with a view to revision if not retraction of the preposterous & impracticable measure. There can be no wound to Conservative pride in this course', and it would be positively popular in Ireland.<sup>182</sup>

Peel and De Grey doubted that suspension would add to the security of other 'legal obligations' and thought that resumption of collection would prove almost impossible.<sup>183</sup> However the Government were not unconscious of

the existence of opposition to the poor law in every part of the political spectrum in Ireland. Wellington in particular felt the embarrassment of supporting an amendment bill 'containing no provision to provide a remedy for the various complaints of the conduct of the Commissioners' and was aware of 'a very general feeling in the House of Lords against the Poor Law .. among our Landed Proprietors.' Pressed especially by Clanricarde and Monteagle, he was prepared to concede an inquiry of some description in the following session, and Graham favoured the appointment of Select Committees in both Houses at the beginning of the session.<sup>184</sup>

During the recess Lord Devon urged the propriety of inquiry and Clare lamented the continued unpopularity of the poor rate in Limerick and the disorganisation which the Commissioners had caused in the administration of the poor law in that county.<sup>185</sup> In November, having previously left the defence of his Government's measure to the Conservatives, Russell declared to Monteagle his continuing confidence that the poor law 'will do in time as much as I expected .. In ten years more, much good will be effected by this odious and resisted law, if it is not set aside.'<sup>186</sup>

Pressed again by Monteagle and Norreys, Wellington and Graham remained prepared to concede Committees of Inquiry during the early months of 1844, Graham most unwillingly, however, for he was confident that the recent Act would ease the collection problem, anxious that the amended system should be given 'a fair trial', and afraid that inquiry would 'unsettle men's minds on the subject at the moment when they were beginning to subside into acquiescence.'<sup>187</sup> At the same time, the liberal-unionists French and Clanricarde continued to denounce the poor law system, calling 'this odious and inoperative law' an 'entire failure' as an answer to poverty in Ireland; it was necessary to use 'an army' to collect the rate, and the system was run by a 'useless, expensive and despotic Commission.'<sup>188</sup>



However, Clanricarde felt that a Committee of Inquiry was no longer necessary, that they knew enough to revise the system immediately. And when Norreys moved for a Committee at the end of April, Bellew asked for delay and contended that the system 'worked well in some parts' and 'should be maintained.' Peel agreed to the Committee on that occasion, but by the 14th of May the Government had decided to oppose its appointment. Graham explained that the Irish in neither House had shown a desire for a Committee, that, on the contrary, 'a great many' objected to such an inquiry 'as tending to impede and throw difficulties in the way of the working of the Poor Law.' He mentioned Barron as one such member. Bellew, opposing the Committee, again spoke of the 'good results' of the poor law, and he and Russell were confident of its increasing popularity. French, O'Ferrall and Redington joined Norreys in advocating a Committee, urging the deficiencies of the poor law, and in the division the Irish liberals divided 8-3 in favour. With the Whig and Tory leaderships united, however, the motion was overwhelmingly  
189  
defeated.

The role of the Irish Tories in this turn of events was crucial. One Irish Conservative wrote to Peel in March predicting that O'Connell would turn from Repeal to agitation against the poor law, which was 'a miserable failure', and that 'in this latter agitation he will be joined by every class and denomination of persons. We are sick of such Poor laws, they will ruin us without conferring any proportionate good.' But only two Irish Tories spoke against the poor law in Parliament; Westmeath described the experiment as a failure, with rates collected by force of arms, and urged revision of the law; Gregory of Dublin called the poor  
190  
law 'the greatest of all' Ireland's grievances. The Irish Tory peers who had denounced the system and called for inquiry in 1843 remained silent. And, in the lower House, Young contended that the workhouse was 'admirably suited' to Irish needs, that Ireland should be 'most grateful' to Russell for the measure, and that it would confer 'vast advantages' on the country.

Conolly recognized the unpopularity of the law but contended that 'in that law was to be found the germ of much that was good, and in the end it would confer a real and substantial benefit to the independent poor.' Shaw spoke twice in opposition to the appointment of a Committee; it would 'paralyse' a law which was 'working well' in most unions, with relief 'afforded to considerable numbers at a moderate cost' and resistance to rates substantially overcome. Norreys ascribed the Government's change of mind to Shaw's influence. But Graham mentioned Shaw, Conolly and Vesey as being opposed to the Committee and the acts of omission and commission of the Irish Tories in general were probably decisive. In the division on the Committee, the Irish Tories divided  
191  
7-3 against Norreys. The conduct of the Government in refusing the Committee and Shaw's part in the decision were sharply criticized in  
192  
the Mail.

Norreys himself admitted that feelings in Ireland on the question did not run so high in 1844, that the 'Irish people appeared to have for a time gone to sleep on the subject of the Poor Law.' According to Nicholls, by May 1844 'resistance to the collection of the rates was in  
193  
great measure overcome.' After the defeat of the poor law's opponents in May, only Clanricarde, French and Ferguson, with brief support from the Tory Mountcashell, continued to assail the system, dwelling chiefly  
194  
on the mistakes of its administrators. Though there were later that year several bitter disputes between individual boards of guardians and the Commissioners, which saw the Government solidly behind the latter, the general picture was one of a system which had outlived most of the  
195  
administrative problems which plagued its early history. In November Londonderry, an opponent of the measure in 1838, announced to his tenantry  
196  
that he had changed his mind and approved of the system.

The session of 1845 saw French, Clanricarde and O'Brien (the latter then a repealer) again sniping at the system and demanding 'a law suited to the wants and the circumstances of the people'. But these were only



brief remarks and, on the other side, Barron described himself as 'a warm supporter' of the law, and Londonderry told the Lords of his desire to give it 'a fair trial' and his conviction that 'it would prove in the end a beneficial law.'<sup>197</sup> By January 1845, with 113 of the 130 workhouses opened, there were 43,293 inmates, of whom only 9,231 were able-bodied, and of the latter only 2,809 were male. And there was little resistance to the rates. The rate amounted to less than sixpence in the pound, which Scrope subsequently contrasted with the English rate of two shillings. At the end of 1845, when the figures were not yet affected by the Famine, 41,218 paupers were relieved in<sup>198</sup> 123 workhouses.

The year 1846 saw the poor law again subjected to considerable criticism in Parliament, largely as a result of its manifest inadequacy in view of the Famine. The latter factor was emphasized by French when he asked for a Committee of Inquiry and by Crawford, French, O'Brien and Scrope when they pressed for the adoption of outdoor relief. French, Crawford, O'Brien and the O'Connells also made clear their conviction that the poor law had failed in general, and Somerville called for 'amendment' of the system. But Shaw, Conolly, O'Ferrall, the O'Conor Don, Somerville and, at least initially, the O'Connells were unwilling to impose the extra burden of outdoor relief. Shaw, Conolly and O'Ferrall claimed that the poor law was beginning to operate successfully. Conolly in particular felt that the poor law was 'working well' and increasingly popular, and that the £4 clause had effectively ended resistance to rates, though he and O'Ferrall agreed with French that the Commissioners often acted unfairly towards the boards of guardians. Londonderry again pronounced himself 'a perfect convert' and claimed that the poor law 'would be one of the greatest blessings to Ireland that had ever been<sup>199</sup> bestowed.'

Outwith Parliament, Gregory of Dublin emerged as another Irish Tory convert, writing to Peel in February 1846 that to grant outdoor relief

during the Famine would be 'a most dangerous measure.. The poor law is at present beginning to work well but such a system as this if once introduced would unite against it all the property of the country.' In 200 May a number of leading Irish Whigs and Tories - including Leinster, Clanricarde, Monteagle, Carew (Whigs), Wicklow, Clare, Charleville, Viscount Northland, M.P., J. H. Hamilton, M.P., G. A. Hamilton, M.P. (Tories) - agreed that outdoor relief would lead directly to 'the 201 confiscation of all property.'

Lord Clancarty, in moving for a Select Committee of the Lords to inquire into the poor law, felt that even its opponents desired only amendment, not repeal. Though critical and doubtful in some respects, 202 he was generally sympathetic to the existing system. And his Select Committee, the first to inquire into the poor law as a whole since its inception, approved the existing law 'in its main principles', and noted with some satisfaction that 'the able-bodied in general .. have abstained from applying for workhouse relief.' It was claimed that resistance to the rate was much diminished as a result of exemption of 203 the poorer tenants from 1843.

The changes recommended by the Committee were not fundamental, involving emigration, vagrancy and medical relief. Witnesses like the Irish Tories Conolly, Longfield, Lucas and George Hamilton and <sup>the</sup> liberals 204 ~~the~~ Norreys, Ferguson, Crawford and Bridgeman reported that on the whole the law worked well in their own localities. Only Crawford, O'Brien and Denis Phelan found the law 'utterly inadequate', as O'Brien 205 put it, but their resultant demand for outdoor relief was rejected. The Committee also determined to persist for the time-being with the system of rating by electoral division, which was criticized in evidence by Norreys, O'Brien, Phelan and Conolly but approved by Crawford and 206 Lucas as tending to stimulate local improvement.

Irish Whig and Tory peers were both well represented on this Committee. Its conclusions smacked of the views of the chairman, however,



and it would be a mistake to impute them to old critics like Clanricarde and Charleville, both of whom were members. On the other hand their apparent acquiescence in the Report is perhaps significant. The absence of Irish Tory condemnation of the system, in evidence or in the conclusions of the Committee, conforms with the clear drift of Irish Tory opinion towards acquiescence in the poor law. No Irish Tory spoke out in Parliament against the poor law after 1844. The evidence for their motives is hardly conclusive, but the less troubled working of the law after 1843 was undoubtedly a factor; and it is perhaps fair to state that Irish Tories were mollified not by the fact that the poor law relieved Irish poverty but by the fact that it did not - that is, it did not relieve the able-bodied, whose admission was the principal Irish Tory fear in 1837-8.

The Irish liberals were as divided in the 1840's as in the earlier debates. O'Brien, Crawford and Clanricarde all regarded the rejection by the able-bodied of workhouse relief as a symptom of failure, and Clanricarde and French had an almost obsessional suspicion of the poor law administrators. But the volume of Irish liberal criticism of the system also diminished after May 1844, until its merits were again called into question by the spectre of Famine. The latter was to disrupt and transform the system, but only temporarily, and its subsequent re-establishment on the same principle is another measure of the extent of acquiescence or favour it had achieved before the disruption.



## Chapter 7

1. See George O'Brien, *The Economic History of Ireland From the Union to the Famine* (London, 1921), 162-9. George Nicholls, *A History of the Irish Poor Law* (London, 1856), 82-128. The latter work contains a detailed summary of the official reports of the period.
2. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, ff55, 140, 168, 169, 219, 228, 309, 311, 313, 315, 370; *ibid*, File of Papers on the State of the Country, ff20, 21, 27. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 1, ff1, 12, 20, 30, 32; *ibid*, D260/M/01/6, f59. Anglesey Papers, D619/27C/9-12, 26-30, 36-41, 73-8, 123-32, 156-60; *ibid*, D619/28A/70, 123, 124; *ibid*, D619/28C/129, 159, 159, 200, 206, 261, 267; *ibid*, D619/28D/47; *ibid*, D619/31I/35, 38, 39, 41, 46, 48, 50; *ibid*, D619/31J/6, 12, 37, 38; *ibid*, D619/31K/5; *ibid*, D619/31L/1, 8; *ibid*, D619/29A/83; *ibid*, D619/29B/129, 155; *ibid*, D619/31D/46. Derby Papers, 119/1, Anglesey to Stanley, 15, 18, 26 June, 6, 9, 15, 30 July, 17 Aug., 19 Dec. 1831; *ibid*, 119/2, Anglesey to Stanley, 22 Dec. 1831; *ibid*, 119/3, Anglesey to Stanley, 6 Feb. 1832. Broughton Correspondence, Add MS 36, 467, f71, Anglesey to Hobhouse, 13 April 1833. W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry*, 373-5, 401-2.
3. William Smith O'Brien, *Plan for the Relief of the Poor in Ireland; with Observations on the English and Scotch Poor Laws: Addressed to the Landed Proprietors of Ireland* (London, 1830). P.P., 1830-31, II, 163.
4. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 30 Aug. 1831. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 146, 29 Aug. 1831. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, Aug./Sept. 1831. Hansard, 6, 783-854, 29 Aug. 1831, Sadler, Althorp, Sheil, Leader, Bourke, O'Ferrall, O'Grady, J. Grattan.
5. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/59, Stanley to Anglesey, 30/31 Aug. 1831.
6. P.P., 1831, II, 583.
7. Hansard, 13, 831-73, 19 June 1832, Sadler, J. Grattan, Wyse, Sheil, Callaghan, Lambert, Ruthven, Blackney, Division.
8. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f183, John Musgrave to O'Brien, 31 Oct. 1832; *ibid*, f186, Doyle to O'Brien, 6 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, f188, Stuart to O'Brien, 18 Nov. 1832. W. J. Fitzpatrick, *Doyle*, II, 430.
9. Hansard, 17, 846-86, 2 May 1833, Richards, J. Grattan, Althorp, H. Grattan; 20, 193, 31 July 1833, O'Reilly. O'Brien and Musgrave were not in Parliament at this time.
10. Graham Papers, 16, Stanley to Graham, 8 Nov. 1832. Broughton Correspondence, Add MS 36, 467, f32, Grey to Hobhouse, 7 April 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/ 110, Stanley to Anglesey, 6 March 1833. Holland House Papers, Add MS 51, 548, f93, Grey to Holland, 12 March 1833.
11. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 2 May 1833.
12. *Ibid*, 28 March, 24 April 1833. There is no record of this in the official Commons journals.
13. *Ibid*, 3 May 1833.
14. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/13, f371, Duncannon to Littleton, 25 Sept. 1834. Home Office Papers, HO 122/16, p293, Russell to Whately, 24 Aug. 1835.



15. P.P., 1835, III, 653; 1836, IV, 617, 637. Hansard, 26, 1206-31, 19 March 1835; 27, 202-4, 24 March 1835; 29, 308-42, 8 July 1835; 31, 226-33, 9 Feb. 1836; 31, 429-31, 15 Feb. 1836; 31, 1193-1200, 3 March 1836; 33, 590-607, 4 May 1836; 33, 833-4, 11 May 1836; 33, 898-904, 13 May 1836; 34, 211-2, 8 June 1836.
16. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f330, Clare to O'Brien, 24 Nov. 1835; *ibid*, f331, Costello to O'Brien, 24 Nov. 1835; *ibid*, f336, O'Grady to O'Brien, 30 Nov. 1835.
17. *Ibid*, MS 429, f445, O'Malley to O'Brien, 23 Jan. 1837.
18. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/37, 44, 47, 50, Crawford to John Crawford, 1 Aug., 31 Dec. 1835, 5 April, 26 May 1836.
19. DEP, 10, 17, 31 Dec. 1836, 7, 14, 17 Jan. 1837.
20. G. H. Evans, Remarks on the Policy of Introducing the System of Poor Rates in Ireland: Addressed to the Society for the Improvement of that Country (London, 1829). See also, W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry, 374-5, Evans to Cloncurry, 23 May 1829.
21. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f336, O'Grady to O'Brien, 30 Nov. 1835.
22. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 345, Spring Rice to Doyle, 26 April 1829; *ibid*, MS 13, 370 (3), Doyle to Spring Rice, 23 Feb. 1830; *ibid*, MS 13, 375 (14), Spring Rice to Doyle, 18 March 1833. Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (13), Spring Rice to Bourke, 19 Feb. 1830. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, IV, 1826, O'Connell to Barrett, 11 July 1831; V, 2117, O'Connell to Barrett, 2 Oct. 1834; 2125, O'Connell to Cobbett, 2 Nov. 1834; 2324, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 1 April 1836. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Doyle, II, 285, 362-8. DEP, 17 Dec. 1836. Hansard, 5, 393, 27 July 1831, Rice; 6, 847-51, 29 Aug. 1831, Rice; 13, 849-55, 19 June 1832, Rice, O'Connell; 17, 34, 2 April 1833, O'Connell; 17, 871-9, 2 May 1833, O'Connell; 20, 191-2, 31 July 1833, O'Connell, Rice; 26, 1212-4, 19 March 1835, O'Connell; 29, 324-39, 8 July 1835, Rice, O'Connell.
23. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Doyle, II, 320, 362-70. For the remarkable inconsistency of O'Connell on this question see also A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 209-11. B. M. McGrath, Introduction of the Poor Law in Ireland, 1831-38 (M.A., University College Dublin, 1965), 23-7. NY, 16 Jan. 1841.
24. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f183, Musgrave to O'Brien, 31 Oct. 1832. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (4), Soullly to Wyse, 17 June 1835.
25. Hansard, 5, 391-2, 27 July 1831, Bateson; 5, 1107, 10 Aug. 1831, Conolly; 6, 851, 29 Aug. 1831, Lefroy; 7, 594, 26 Sept. 1831, Bateson; 13, 863, 19 June 1832, Conolly; 17, 888-90, 2 May 1833, Conolly, Shaw; 20, 194, 31 July 1833, Shaw.
26. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f240, Dunraven to O'Brien, 25 March 1833.
27. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/2059, Stovin to Gosset, 24 March 1834.
28. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f609, Belmore to Roden, 21 Oct. 1834.
29. Hansard, 28, 1201-3, 25 June 1835, Limerick; 29, 333-4, 340, 8 July 1835, Hayes, A. Lefroy; 31, 230-1, 9 Feb. 1836, Shaw, Young; 33, 606, 4 May 1836, Bateson; 33, 899-902, 13 May 1836, Downshire, Fitzgerald, Wicklow.



30. Downshire Papers, D671/C/354/113, Downshire to Gulson, 31 March 1836.
31. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f155, Wellington to Peel, 8 Sept. 1836. Wellington Papers, Port. 42, f89, Wellington to Peel, 8 Sept. 1836. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 326, Peel to Wellington, 12 Sept. 1836.
32. Home Office Papers, HO 122/16, p196, 236, 259, 314, 412. Monteagle Papers, MS 551, Rice to Drummond, 13 Sept. 1835; *ibid*, Rice to Whately, 13 Sept. 1835. E. J. Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, I, 199.
33. Russell himself described their failure in these terms (Hansard, 39, 483-4, 1 Dec. 1837). The controversial recommendations were in the Third Report from the Commissioners for inquiring into the Condition of the Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1836, XXX, 1. See also G. O'Brien, *The Economic History of Ireland...*, 177-81, Nicholls, *History of Irish Poor Law*, 130-47.
34. Nicholls, *History of Irish Poor Law*, 157. First Report of G. Nicholls, Esq., to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, on Poor Laws, Ireland, P.P., 1837, LI, 203. Home Office Papers, HO 122/17, p31, Russell to Nicholls, 22 Aug. 1836.
35. On Nicholls's progress in Ireland, his clear commitment to the English system, and the 'sovereign contempt' in which he was held by some of the Poor Law Commissioners, see Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2C, f166-7, Mulgrave to Russell, 22 Sept. 1836; *ibid*, f188-9, Nicholls to Morpeth, 23 Sept. 1836; *ibid*, f217-8, Morpeth to Russell, 5 Oct. 1836; *ibid*, f273-4, Nicholls to Russell, 17 Oct. 1836. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 382 (1), Whately to Russell, 2 Oct. 1836. E. J. Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately*, I, 360-1.
36. P.P., 1837, LI, 201. Nicholls, *History of Irish Poor Law*, 160-88.
37. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2C, f275, Howick to Russell, 18 Oct. 1836; *ibid*, f287, Duncannon to Russell, 19 Oct. 1836; *ibid*, /2D, f40, Russell memo, 16 Nov. 1836; *ibid*, f117, Mulgrave to Russell, 4 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f143, Russell memo, n.d.. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 383 (5), Morpeth memo to Cabinet, Nov. 1836.
38. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f50, Melbourne to Russell, 4 Sept. 1837 (also in Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/395). See also W. M. Torrens, *Memoirs of Melbourne*, II, 243-4.
39. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f42, Morpeth to Russell, 19 Nov. 1836. Hansard, 68, 1343, 5 May 1843, O'Ferrall; 74, 1197, 14 May 1844, O'Ferrall. These efforts were evidently covert; he did not break ranks in Parliament.
40. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f49, Rice to Russell, 20 Nov. 1836; *ibid*, f133, Rice memo, (Dec. 1836); *ibid*, f281, Lansdowne to Russell, Dec. 1836; *ibid*, /2E, f128, Rice to Russell, 16 March 1837; *ibid*, f130, Lansdowne to Russell, (March 1837); *ibid*, /2F, f195, Rice memo, 17 Sept. 1837. Monteagle Papers, MS 545, Rice to Melbourne, 13 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, Rice to Ensor, 15 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, MS 533, Rice to Whately, 26 Nov. 1838; *ibid*, MS 534, Rice to Russell, 27 Aug. 1838; *ibid*, MS 543, Rice to Horton, 7 Sept. 1838; *ibid*, MS 13, 382 (8), Lansdowne to Rice, 15 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, MS 13, 389, Rice Cabinet memo, 26 March 1838. Broadlands MSS, GC/LA/47, Lansdowne to Palmerston, Feb. 1837. And see Hansard, 68, 1386, 8 May 1843, Lansdowne.



41. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f277, Leinster to Tavistock, 21 Dec. 1836.
42. P.P., 1837, III, 451. Hansard, 36, 454-78, 13 Feb. 1837, Russell. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 222-32.
43. George O'Brien discussed this factor at length. G. O'Brien, The Economic History of Ireland ..., 169-73. Also Mc Grath, Introduction of the Poor Law in Ireland, 2-32. In earlier years it was openly advanced by English supporters of an Irish poor law.
44. Hansard, 38, 384-5, 28 April 1837, Crawford; 38, 809, 11 May 1837, Stanley; 38, 850, 12 May 1837, Wyse; 40, 777-8, 5 Feb. 1838, Style; 40, 986, 9 Feb. 1838, Conolly; 40, 1271, 1281, 19 Feb. 1838, Clements, Wyse; 42, 688, 695, 698, 703, 707, 30 April 1838, Morpeth, Conolly, Sugden, Clements, W. Roche. See also W. S. O'Brien, Plan for the Relief .. (1830), 17-8, 51. A. H. Lynch, An Address to the Electors of Galway, on the Poor-Law Bill for Ireland (London, 1838), 22, 40, 53-4, 58-63. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 256. Perceval-Maxwell Papers, D3244/G/1/103, Downshire to Maxwell, 7 April 1838.
45. Lord Clements, The Present Poverty of Ireland Convertible into the Means of her Improvement, under a well-administered Poor Law, with a preliminary view of the state of agriculture in Ireland (London, 1838). See also Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Mc Call, 16 Feb. 1838; Clements to Walsh, 29 March 1838; Clements to Binns, 6 April 1838; Clements to Russell, 6 April 1838 (also in Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f289); Clements to Goodiff, 11 April 1838; Clements to O'Beirne, 21 April 1838; Clements to Nicholls, 1 May 1838; Clements to Maguire, 11 May 1838. Clements expected that tenants, on their small holdings, would provide employment to avoid the burden of the workhouse destitute; the landlord's role would be to avoid pressing the tenant into destitution and to give him guidance and financial aid to enable him to introduce farming methods which would increase both employment of the landless and agricultural production. Fear of the rate, then, would initiate a succession of developments which would ultimately benefit landlord, tenant and labourer.
46. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 166. P.P., 1837, LI, 9.
47. See R. D. C. Black, Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870 (Cambridge, 1960), for a discussion of the theoretical background. Also McGrath, Introduction of the Poor Law in Ireland, 2-9. George O'Brien went so far as to describe consolidation as the principal object of the Government in introducing the bill. G. O'Brien, The Economic History of Ireland..., 188-92. Hansard, 38, 836, 12 May 1837, Buller.
48. At least 10% of Irish Tory members differed from the majority of their fellows in 18 of the 39 divisions, a proportion highly untypical of them in the 1830's. And the liberal-unionist members recorded this extent of disunity in 35 divisions.
49. Hansard, 36, 497-504, 13 Feb. 1837, Peel; 38, 446-50, 1 May 1837, Peel; 42, 715-7, 30 April 1838, Division; 43, 439-40, 29 May 1838, Peel. See above, chapter 6.
50. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2502, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 10 Feb. 1838; 2505, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 18 Feb. 1838. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 129, O'Connell to Barrett, 15 Feb. 1838. IEP, 19 Dec. 1837, 19 April 1838. DEM, 30 July 1838. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f187, Warburton to



- Russell, 16 Nov. 1837. Hansard, 36, 485-92, 13 Feb. 1837; 38, 360-83, 28 April 1837; 38, 1168-9, 2 June 1837; 40, 779-80, 5 Feb. 1838; 40, 947-65, 9 Feb. 1838; 42, 681-4, 30 April 1838, O'Connell. For a fuller account of O'Connell's position, see A. Mac Intyre, *The Liberator*, 209-11, 217-21, 225-6.
51. The Government re-introduced the measure (P.P., 1837-8, V, 305), with minor modifications, in December 1837.
  52. M. O'Connell, *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*, VI, 2511, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 3 March 1838.
  53. *Personal Journals* .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 13 Feb., 1 May, 22 Dec. 1837. Hansard, 36, 478-504, 13 Feb. 1837, O'Brien, Shaw, Grattan; 38, 383-445, 28 April 1837, Crawford, O'Brien, Conolly, Bateson, Clements, Shaw, Wyse, Lucas; 38, 691, 8 May 1837, Shaw, Crawford; 39, 492-501, 1 Dec. 1837, Shaw, French, Lucas, Young, Clements; 40, 778-86, 5 Feb. 1838, Shaw, Gibson, Grattan, Clements; 40, 973-89, 9 Feb. 1838, Shaw, O'Brien, Lucas, Redington, Conolly, Litton, Young, Gibson; 40, 1007-9, 12 Feb. 1838, Clements.
  54. Hansard, 40, 990-2, 9 Feb. 1838, Division. See Tables 1 and 2 for the Irish Tory and liberal-unionist voting in this division. The order in which the liberal-unionist members are listed in Table 2 is explained below.
  55. *The Times*, 29 May 1837; Hansard, 40, 1245-6, 16 Feb. 1838, Divisions.
  56. Hansard, 41, 999-1002, 19 March 1838, Divisions.
  57. Hansard, 41, 983-4, 16 March 1838; 41, 993, 19 March 1838; 41, 1185, 23 March 1838, Divisions.
  58. In ten of these divisions, the Irish Tories were voting with the Government against radical-liberal amendments. In one - on the exemption of ministers' money - they were in opposition to the Government.
  59. Hansard, 38, 1210-1, 5 June 1837, Division; 41, 975-80, 16 March 1838, Lucas, Conolly, Division.
  60. The question of who should pay the rate in the first instance was regarded by O'Connell as crucial; he warned Warburton that the Government's proposal would cause 'an agrarian convulsion, a renewal of Whiteboyism'. However, it did not emerge as one of the major issues discussed in Parliament. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f187, Warburton to Russell, 16 Nov. 1837. Hansard, 41, 974-5, 16 March 1838, O'Connell.
  61. A. H. Lynch, *An Address to the Electors of Galway* ..., 22.
  62. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f42, Morpeth to Russell, 19 Nov. 1836.
  63. P.P., 1836, XXX, 5 (Commission). P.P., 1837, LI, 239 (Nicholls).
  64. Hansard, 36, 478, 13 Feb. 1837, O'Brien; 38, 385, 395-7, 28 April 1837, Crawford, O'Brien; 38, 691, 8 May 1837, Crawford; 38, 1163-4, 1168-9, 2 June 1837, Crawford, O'Connell; 40, 978-9, 9 Feb. 1838, O'Brien; 41, 78, 23 Feb. 1838, O'Brien, O'Connell. DEP, 2 Sept. 1837, 15 Feb., 12 May 1838 (Crawford).
  65. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f143, Russell memo, n.d..



66. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 383 (5), Morpeth Cabinet memo, Nov. 1836.
67. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f281, Lansdowne to Russell, Dec. 1836.
68. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Stewart, 19 May 1838. Hansard, 38, 429, 1 May 1837; 40, 1008, 12 Feb. 1838, Clements.
69. Table 2, Nos. 3-4. The Times, 5 June 1837; Hansard, 41, 79-80, 23 Feb. 1838, Divisions.
70. Hansard, 39, 494, 1 Dec. 1837, Shaw; 40, 975, 9 Feb. 1838, Shaw; 41, 1195-6, 23 March 1838; 42, 678-81, 30 April 1838, Castlereagh; 38, 425, 1 May 1837, Bateson.
71. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Nicholls, 1 May 1838.
72. Hansard, 41, 991, 991-2, 19 March 1838, Spring Rice, Russell; 44, 578-9, 24 July 1838, Russell.
73. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Nicholls, 1 May 1838.
74. J. Morgan Sweeney, The House of Lords in British Politics, 1830-1841 (D. Phil., Oxford, 1974), 388-9.
75. Tables 1 and 2, No. 5. Hansard, 41, 993-4, 19 March 1838, Division.
76. A. H. Lynch, An Address to the Electors of Galway .., 18-19. DEP, 20 Feb. 1838 (Crawford). Hansard, 38, 426, 443-4, 1 May 1837, Bateson, Lucas; 41, 67, 23 Feb. 1838, Lucas; 41, 991-2, 19 March 1838, French, Lucas, Lefroy.
77. On this point see also T. O'Malley, A Word or Two on the Irish Poor Relief Bill and Mr. Nicholls's Report (London, 1837), 24.
78. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Russell, 6 April 1838 (also in Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f289); Clements to Nicholls, 1 May 1838. Lord Clements, The Present Poverty of Ireland ..., 140-4. See also Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Maguire, 11 May 1838.
79. Hansard, 44, 579, 24 July 1838, Russell.
80. Hansard, 38, 424-5, 444-5, 1 May 1837, Bateson, Lucas; 38, 808, 11 May 1837, Bateson; 41, 61-71, 23 Feb. 1838, Lucas, Litton, Jackson.
81. McGrath's contention that, 'the demand for settlement .. came from the more wealthy parts of the country - noticeably Ulster', is based on an analysis of the divisions which misleadingly groups members from pauperized counties like Galway, Sligo and Donegal with members from prosperous east Ulster. B. M. McGrath, Introduction of the Poor Law in Ireland, 221.
82. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, 651, Downshire to Roden, 27 May 1837.
83. NI, 13 Feb. 1838. See also Isaac Butt, The Poor-Law Bill for Ireland Examined .... (London, 1837), 16-8, 40.
84. Table 1, Nos. 6-7. Hansard, 38, 850-52, 12 May 1837; 41, 72-3, 23 Feb. 1838, Divisions.
85. First and Second Reports of G. Nicholls, P.P., 1837, LI, 25-7; 1837-8, XXXVIII, 14.



86. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f143, Russell memo, n.d..
87. Hansard, 38, 844-5, 12 May 1837, Shaw; 38, 1168, 2 June 1837, Russell; 41, 66-7, 70, 23 Feb. 1838, Lucas, Hayes. The radical member for Southwark, D. W. Harvey, asserted that the desire to protect property by denying the pauper a right to relief was 'the great source' of resistance from property-owners to the law of settlement. Hansard, 38, 843, 12 May 1837, Harvey.
88. Hansard, 38, 439, 1 May 1837; 38, 850, 12 May 1837; 41, 70, 23 Feb. 1838, Wyse. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 23 Feb. 1838. Their expectation of simultaneous enactment was not, in fact, fulfilled.
89. Hansard, 38, 384, 28 April 1837, Crawford. DEP, 10, 15, 17 Feb., 12 May, 7 June 1838.
90. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to McCall, 16 Feb. 1838. Lord Clements, The Present Poverty of Ireland..., p124-32. Hansard, 41, 69, 23 Feb. 1838; 42, 703, 30 April 1838, Clements.
91. A. H. Lynch, An Address to the Electors of Galway .., 66-70. Hansard, 38, 398, 28 April 1837, O'Brien; 38, 833-5, 12 May 1837, Lynch; 41, 70, 23 Feb. 1838, Wyse.
92. For a detailed discussion of the settlement question, see Charles Haliday, Necessity of Combining a Law of Settlement with Local Assessment in the Proposed Bill for the Relief of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1838). P.F., 1837, LX, 25-7; 1837-8, XXXVIII, 14-9 (Nicholls). Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 181, 202-3. T. O'Malley, An Idea of a Poor Law for Ireland (London, 1837), 10-15.
93. Nicholls, History of the Irish Poor Law, 220-1.
94. Ibid., 288.
95. R. Barry O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 573.
96. Hansard, 41, 1197-9, 23 March 1838, Lucas, Shaw, Morpeth, Division. See also 38, 813, 11 May 1837, Lucas; 40, 986, 9 Feb. 1838, Conolly; 42, 695, 30 April 1838, Conolly. DEP, 17 Feb., 7 June 1838 (Crawford).
97. Hansard, 38, 424, 28 April 1837, Bateson; 38, 691, 28 April 1837, Shaw; 38, 808, 11 May 1837, Shaw; 39, 494-5, 1 Dec. 1837, Shaw; 40, 779, 5 Feb. 1838, Shaw; 40, 975-6, 986, 9 Feb. 1838, Shaw, Conolly; 40, 1265-83, 19 Feb. 1838, Shaw, Conolly, Lucas, Ellis, Division; 42, 694-5, 30 April 1838, Corry, Conolly. And see Isaac Butt, The Poor-Law Bill for Ireland Examined .., 40-1.
98. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Binns, 6 April 1838; Clements to Goodiff, 11 April 1838; Clements to O'Beirne, 21 April, 19 May 1838. Hansard, 40, 1270-1, 19 Feb. 1838, Clements. Morpeth and Barron, as well as Ellis, mentioned these factors in the debate on the motion - Hansard, 40, 1268-72, 19 Feb. 1838, Morpeth, Barron. One wonders if they were as optimistic as Clements, who believed that 'some half dozen wretched objects in the course of the year may be compelled ..to take refuge in such asylums for a short time.. But these will surely be rare instances', Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to O'Beirne, 21 April 1838. In the House he said he 'did not believe that any able-bodied Irishman would ever go into a workhouse', Hansard, 38, 429, 1 May 1837.



99. A. H. Lynch, An Address to the Electors of Galway .., 4-5, 36-7, 52-4. Hansard, 36, 459-60, 13 Feb. 1837, Russell; 39, 484-5, 1 Dec. 1837, Russell; 40, 1271-2, 1281-2, 19 Feb. 1838, Barron, Russell. See also Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f143, Russell memo, n.d.; Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 383 (5), Morpeth Cabinet memo, Nov. 1836, for an argument which stresses the moral and practical difficulties of pointing out 'one class of objects as entitled in preference to another'.
100. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f187, Henry Warburton to Russell, 16 Nov. 1837. Hansard, 40, 779-80, 5 Feb. 1838; 40, 1276-9, 19 Feb. 1838, O'Connell.
101. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f149, Rice to Russell, 20 Nov. 1836; *ibid*, /2F, f195, Rice memo, 17 Sept. 1837.
102. Wyse Papers, MS 15048 (2), Wyse diary, 9 March 1838.
103. A. Mac Intyre, *The Liberator*, 220-1.
104. Nicholls, *History of Irish Poor Law*, 220.
105. P.P., 1837, LI, 33-4.
106. Hansard, 43, 364-9, 28 May 1838, Fitzwilliam, Fitzgerald; 43, 473-91, 31 May 1838, Fingall, Clanricarde, Carbery, Fitzwilliam. Also 43, 361, 28 May 1838, Clanricarde. Among Irish landlords explicitly approving their inclusion were Wicklow (Tory), Conyngham, Cloncurry and Lansdowne: 43, 354-5, 28 May 1838, Wicklow; 43, 472-3, 492, 492-3, Conyngham, Cloncurry, Lansdowne.
107. Perceval-Maxwell Papers, D324/G/1/103, Downshire to J. W. Maxwell, 7 April 1838.
108. Hansard, 41, 1195-7, 23 March 1838, Castlereagh, Shaw, Bateson, Division. Bateson forwarded a similar motion at a later stage, which was negatived without a division (Hansard, 42, 541, 9 April 1838).
109. Hansard, 42, 715-7, 30 April 1838, Division.
110. 13-9 if Barron, Lynch and Bellew are included as repealers. They are not counted here among the liberal-unionists. Classification was particularly difficult at this time.
111. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Russell, 6 April 1838; Clements to Nicholls, 1 May 1838. Hansard, 42, 703, 30 April 1838, Clements. Clements's private correspondence shows him to be more favourable to the measure than did his utterances in Parliament.
112. Hansard, 66, 1367-8, 23 March 1843, O'Brien.
113. *Personal Journals* .. by James Crattan, MS 14, 148, 16, 24 March 1838; *ibid*, MS 14, 149, 30 April, 30 May, 15 June, 26 July 1838.
114. DEP, 12 May, 7 June 1838.
115. Hansard, 42, 678-81, 703-5, 30 April 1838, Castlereagh, Young, Corry, Hayes, Conolly, Verner, Lucas.
116. Monteagle Papers, MS 543, Spring Rice to Wellington, 29 Sept. 1838.
117. M. O'Connell, *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell*, VI, 2508, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 27 Feb. 1838. Wellington Papers, Port. 50, f43, Roden to Wellington, 31 March 1838.



118. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Mortimer, 12 March 1838; Clements to Hugh Walsh, 29 March 1838; Clements to O'Beirne, 21 April 1838; Clements to Slevin, 21 April 1838; Clements to Maguire, 11 May 1838. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 390 (6), Russell to Rice, 16 Oct. 1838. Wellington Papers, Port. 51, f66, Clancarty to Wellington, 16 May 1838. Hansard, 42, 897-8, 4 May 1838, Wicklow. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 210, 241.
119. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f30, Drummond to Morpeth, 6 Jan. 1838.
120. Op. cit..
121. DEM, 22 Dec. 1842, O'Connell to the Poor Law Guardians of the County of Cork, 20 Dec. 1842.
122. Hansard, 38, 218-26, 24 April 1837, Clanricarde, Limerick, Wicklow, Roden; 38, 1446-7, 13 June 1837, Fitzgerald.
123. Wellington Papers, Port. 50, f43, 71, Roden to Wellington, 31 March, 9 April 1838; *ibid*, Port. 51, f105, 115, Roden to Wellington, 22, 24 May 1838.
124. *Ibid*, Port. 51, f17, Downshire to Wellington, 5 May 1838; *ibid*, f19, 32, Clanricarde to Wellington, 5, 9 May 1838; *ibid*, f39, Wellington to Ellenborough, 11 May 1838. DEM, 11 May 1838. DEP, 12, 15 May 1838.
125. Wellington Papers, Port. 51, f52, Knight to Kerry to Wellington, 12 May 1838. See also Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f92, Note by Knight of Kerry, 23 May 1838.
126. Wellington Papers, Port. 51, f66, Clancarty to Wellington, 16 May 1838.
127. *Ibid*, Port. 50, f43, Wellington to Roden, 3 April 1838; *ibid*, Port. 51, f39, Wellington to Ellenborough, 11 May 1838; *ibid*, f56, Devon to Wellington, 14 May 1838; *ibid*, f105, 115, Roden to Wellington, 22, 24 May 1838; *ibid*, f105, Wellington to Roden, 23 May 1838.
128. D. Large, 'The House of Lords and Ireland in the age of Peel, 1832-50', Irish Historical Studies, Vol. IX, No. 36 (Sept. 1955), 390-1. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 221-2.
129. DEM, 4, 11 June 1838.
130. Bourke Papers, Vol. 315, f381, Clare to Bourke, 19 June 1838.
131. Home Office Papers, HD 100/257, f234, Brownlow to Russell, Aug. 1838.
132. Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government Entitled to the Support of the Irish Liberal Members at the Present Crisis?... (London, 1839), 14-5. See also Hansard, 46, 318, 11 March 1839, French; 47, 141, 16 April 1839, O'Conor Don.
133. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f30, Drummond to Russell, 6 Jan. 1838.
134. *Ibid*, /30, f357, Ebrington to Russell, 26 June 1839. Hansard, 45, 347-8, 12 Feb. 1839, O'Brien.
135. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 392 (5), Nicholls to Rice, 26 June 1839. See also Hansard, History of Irish Poor Law, 241.
136. Home Office Papers, HD 100/263, f38, 39, Nicholls to Normanby, 11 March, 16 April 1840. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 393, Nicholls to Monteagle, 25 Aug. 1840.



137. Hansard, 51, 963, 31 Jan. 1840, Jackson; 53, 1004-22, 13 April 1840, Westmeath, Wicklow, Glengall, Fingall, Headfort; 53, 1165-79, 4 May 1840, Wellington, Westmeath; 55, 2-4, 23 June 1840, Westmeath, Wicklow; 55, 411-9, 3 July 1840, Westmeath, Glengall; 56, 734-41, 19 Feb. 1841, Glengall, Westmeath, Fingall; 56, 1344-5, 5 March 1841, Glengall, Wellington; 57, 3-7, 8 March 1841, Glengall; 57, 141, 12 March 1841, Glengall; 57, 290, 16 March 1841, Glengall; 57, 335-6, 18 March 1841, Glengall; 57, 452-3, 22 March 1841, Glengall; 57, 1392-1401, 3 May 1841, Glengall, Wicklow, Wellington, Westmeath; 58, 1304, 8 June 1841, Westmeath; 58, 1582, 21 June 1841, Westmeath.
138. Wellington Papers, Port. 66, f92, Westmeath to Wellington, 9 March 1840; *ibid*, Port. 67, f6, Westmeath to Wellington, 22 March 1840; *ibid*, f30, Wharncliffe to Wellington, 26 March 1840; *ibid*, Port. 68, f94, Westmeath to Wellington, 23 May 1840; *ibid*, Port. 69, f30, Westmeath to Wellington, 17 June 1840; *ibid*, f90, Carbery to Wellington, June 1840; *ibid*, Port. 74, f89, Westmeath to Wellington, 6 March 1841; *ibid*, Port. 75, f68, Clancarty to Wellington, 2 April 1841; *ibid*, Port. 76, f72, Clancarty to Wellington, 30 April 1841.
139. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, draft of Grattan's speech on 2 June 1841, not in Hansard.
140. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 489, f117, 119, Nicholls to Peel, 2, 16 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, f121, Nicholls to Wellington, 2 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 477, f19, De Grey to Peel, 18 Sept. 1841. Wellington Papers, Port. 79, f101, Nicholls to Wellington, 5 Oct. 1841. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 260-1.
141. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 489, f123, Peel to Nicholls, 20 Sept. 1841. Hansard, 59, 704-5, 711, 22 Sept. 1841, Peel, Shaw.
142. Graham Papers, 8IR, Graham to Eliot, 12, 21, 26 Oct., 5 Nov. 1841. Wellington Papers, Port. 79, f139, Graham to Wellington, 10 Oct. 1841. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f201, Graham to Peel, 6 Aug. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 446, f36, Graham to Peel, 25 Sept. 1841.
143. Graham Papers, 8IR, Eliot to Graham, 24 Oct. 1841, with extract from Clancarty to Eliot, 23 Oct. 1841.
144. *Ibid*, 8IR, Graham to Eliot, 26 Oct., 16, 17, 21, 25 Nov., 14 Dec. 1841; Eliot to Graham, 20 Nov. 1841; De Grey to Graham, 13, 25 Nov. 1841; Graham to De Grey, 27 Nov., 10 Dec. 1841; 44, Graham to De Grey, 16 Nov. 1841; Graham to Queen, 21 Nov. 1841.
145. *Ibid*, 8IR, Glengall to Graham, 17 Nov. 1841; Graham to De Grey, 27 Nov. 1841. Wellington Papers, Port. 79, f117, Glengall to Wellington, 6 Oct. 1841; *ibid*, Port. 81, f20, 102, Glengall to Wellington, 2, 17 Nov. 1841.
146. Graham Papers, 8IR, Eliot to Graham, 11 Dec. 1841; 7IR, Graham to Eliot, 16 Jan. 1842; Eliot to Graham, 18 Jan. 1842; De Grey to Graham, 8 Feb. 1842; Graham to De Grey, 14 Feb. 1842; 46, Graham to Nicholls, 15, 20 Jan. 1842; 47, Graham to De Grey, 10 Feb. 1842; Wellington to Graham, 15 Feb. 1842; 56A, Graham to Eliot, 18 Dec. 1841. Wellington Papers, Port. 84, f26, Clancarty to Wellington, 28 Jan. 1842; *ibid*, f91, De Grey to Wellington, 9 Feb. 1842; *ibid*, f92, Wellington to De Grey, 11 Feb. 1842; *ibid*, f126, Wellington to Graham, 15 Feb. 1842. Hansard, 60, 626-31, 17 Feb. 1842, Clancarty, Wellington.
147. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 462, f36, Fitzgerald to Peel, Oct. 1841; *ibid*, f33, Clare to Fitzgerald, 30 Oct. 1841; *ibid*, f40, Peel to Fitzgerald,



- 2 Nov. 1841. Graham Papers, 8IR, Eliot to Graham, 11 Dec. 1841.
148. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, Feb. 1842.
149. Hansard, 65, 606-12, 25 July 1842, Crawford, French, O'Connell.
150. DEM, 22, 29 Sept., 6, 20, 27, 29 Dec. 1841, 2, 16, 21, 25, 28 Feb., 7, 14, 28 March, 4, 27 May, 17, 20 June, 3, 19, 24 Aug., 23, 30 Sept., 12, 17, 19, 21, 26, 28 Oct., 9, 11, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30 Nov., 2, 9, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 30 Dec. 1842. See also Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 22 June, 24 Dec. 1842.
151. DEM, 26, 28, 30 Dec. 1842, 2 Jan. 1843.
152. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 9 Nov. 1842; Graham to De Grey, 28 Nov., 7 Dec. 1842; 55A, Graham to Eliot, 11 Nov. 1842; 56A, Graham to De Grey, 8, 12 Dec. 1842.
153. Ibid, 1IR, Graham to De Grey, 7 Dec. 1842; De Grey to Graham, 10, 26 Dec. 1842; 2IR, De Grey to Graham, 10, 28 Jan. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 26 Jan., 1 Feb. 1843; 56B, Graham to De Grey, 29 Dec. 1842; 57, Graham to De Grey, 2 Jan. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 8 Jan. 1843; Lewis to Graham, 23 Jan. 1843; Graham to Lewis, 26 Jan. 1843; Wellington to Graham, 26 Jan. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f152, Graham to Peel, 28 Dec. 1842. Regarding Nicholls's personal 'misgivings' see also Wyse Papers, MS 15018 (4), Wyse diary, 1 May 1843.
154. DEM, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30 Nov., 2, 9, 12, 16, 19, 26, 30 Dec. 1842, 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 20, 25, 27, 30 Jan., 1, 3, Feb. 1843. Graham Papers, 2IR, De Grey to Graham, 28 Jan. 1843.
155. Hansard, 66, 163, 3 Feb. 1843, Eliot. DEM, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 24, 27, Feb., 1, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, 22 March 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 526, f124, Peter Browne to Peel, 17 March 1843.
156. Hansard, 66, 191-2, 6 Feb. 1843; 68, 1348-64, 1389-90, 8 May 1843; 70, 1274-9, 20 July 1843; 71, 919-22, 18 Aug. 1843, Clanricarde.
157. Hansard, 67, 1347-69, 23 March 1843, O'Brien. According to a report written by O'Brien himself, when an English member tried to have the House counted out during his speech O'Brien 'protested in terms of the warmest indignation against the attempt made to get rid of a discussion upon a subject which excited much interest in Ireland, and stated that if this mode of dealing with Irish affairs were continued he should endeavour to secure their fair discussion in an Irish Parliament.' Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f930. DEM, 17 April 1843. O'Brien, of course, joined the repeal movement in October 1843.
158. Hansard, 67, 1379-1406, 23 March 1843, Norreys, Crawford, Barron, French, Ferguson, Ross, Division; 68, 1348-64, 1386-8, 8 May 1843, Clanricarde, Lansdowne.
159. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 9 Nov. 1842. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 274, 282-3.
160. Hansard, 67, 1385-1406, 23 March 1843, Shaw, C. Hamilton, Bernard, Division; 68, 1342, 5 May 1843, Shaw; 69, 1315, 9 June 1843, Hamilton.
161. DEM, 24, 27, 29, 31 March, 3, 5, 7, 10, 14 April 1843.
162. P.F., 1843, III, 501. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 291-3.



163. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1843. DEM, 15 May 1843, O'Brien to Guardians of Tuam, n.d.. DEM, 28 June 1843, O'Brien to Maher, 20 June 1843. Hansard, 68, 1324-46, 5 May 1843, French, Crawford, O'Brien, O'Ferrall, Wyse; 69, 1013-4, 29 May 1843, Crawford; 69, 1165, 31 May 1843, J. O'Brien; 69, 1305-9, 9 June 1843, Redington, Ferguson; 70, 657-8, 4 July 1843, O'Brien; 70, 1270-1, 19 July 1843, French. See also DEM, 10 May 1843 (H. Grattan, O'Connell).
164. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 May 1843. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f955, N. Mc Evoy to O'Brien, 5 May 1843; *ibid*, f954, Henry Grattan to O'Brien, 4 May 1843. Hansard, 68, 1334, 1335, 1340, 5 May 1843, French, Crawford, O'Brien; 69, 1303, 9 June 1843, Redington.
165. Hansard, 68, 1333, 1335, 1340, 5 May 1843, French, Crawford, O'Brien; 69, 1306-8, 1309, 1314-5, 9 June 1843, Redington, Ferguson, M. J. O'Connell, Murphy; 70, 1373-4, 1376, 1376-7, 1379, 27 July 1843, O'Ferrall, Norreys, O'Brien, Archbold; 71, 560, 11 Aug. 1843, Somerville, O'Brien.
166. Graham Papers, 2IR, Graham to De Grey, 26 Jan 1843; De Grey to Graham, 28 Jan., 15 Feb. 1843. Hansard, 68, 1318-20, 5 May 1843, Eliot. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 289-90.
167. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 May 1843. Hansard, 68, 1333-4, 5 May 1843, French; 68, 1387, 8 May 1843, Lansdowne; 69, 1318, 9 June 1843, Ferguson. The Times, 10 June 1843, Redington.
168. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f964, Kennedy to O'Brien, 8 May 1843. Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (10), O'Brien to Bourke, 16 April 1842. Hansard, 67, 1358-9, 1384-5, 23 March 1843, O'Brien, Norreys; 71, 228, 3 Aug. 1843, O'Brien.
169. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f17, Carew to Wellington, 3 June 1843. Also Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, 9 June 1843.
170. Hansard, 67, 1362-5, 1390, 1405, 23 March 1843, O'Brien, Crawford, Ross; 68, 1336, 5 May 1843, Crawford; 68, 1386-8, 8 May 1843, Lansdowne; 71, 322, 7 Aug. 1843, O'Brien, Ferguson, Wyse. See also, Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (10), O'Brien to Bourke, 25 May 1843.
171. See esp. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f225, Sugden to Peel, 28 May 1843.
172. Graham Papers, 2IR, De Grey to Graham, 28 Jan. 1843.
173. DEM, 17 Feb. 1843.
174. Hansard, 67, 1400-1, 23 March 1843, Bernard; 68, 1342, 5 May 1843, Shaw; 69, 1319-20, 9 June 1843, Hamilton.
175. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 12 June 1843. Hansard, 69, 1309-10, 9 June 1843, Bernard. See also Graham Papers, 61A, Graham to De Grey, 14 May 1843.
176. Hansard, 67, 1401, 23 March 1843, Bernard; 71, 228-9, 3 Aug. 1843, Vesey. See also Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f964, Kennedy to O'Brien, 8 May 1843.
177. While four Irish Tories opposed the clause to define residence, fifteen voted for it. In the only other listed division, on the



- £8 urban exemption, 24 Irish Tories voted with the Government, and none against. Hansard, 68, 1340-3, 1346-7, 5 May 1843, Shaw, Aston; 69, 1117, 30 May 1843, Bernard; 69, 1312-3, 1315-6, 1320-1, 9 June 1843, Bernard, Hamilton, Division; 71, 229, 3 Aug. 1843, Division.
178. DEM, 12, 16, 26 Dec. 1842, 30 Jan., 8, 15, 17 Feb., 1, 10, 29 March, 17, 24, 26 April, 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, 17, 24, 29 May, 7, 12, 23 June, 24, 31 July, 9, 21 Aug. 1843.
179. Hansard, 68, 1369-89, 8 May 1843, Glengall, Wicklow, Mountcashell, Downshire, Roden; 69, 663-6, 22 May 1843, Clancarty; 70, 1154, 14 July 1843, Charleville; 70, 1277-9, 20 July 1843, Glengall, Carbery; 71, 923-6, 18 Aug. 1843, Carbery, Glengall, Charleville.
180. Bourke Papers, LS 8477 (5), Clare to Bourke, 18 April, 3 May 1842, 24, 27 April, 8, 9, 16 May 1843. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f964, Kennedy to O'Brien, 8 May 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 88, f48, Clare to Wellington, 28 May 1843. Hansard, 68, 1380-1, 1383-4, 8 May 1843, Wicklow, Mountcashell.
181. Wellington Papers, Port. 109, f35, Wellington to Graham, 16 Aug. 1843 (also in Graham Papers, 64A). Hansard, 71, 926, 18 Aug. 1843, Charleville.
182. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f75, Knight of Kerry to Peel, 10 June 1843.
183. Ibid, f95, Peel to Fitzgerald, 24 June 1843; ibid, f100, De Grey to Peel, 1 July 1843.
184. Wellington Papers, Port. 109, f58, 66, Wellington to Graham, 18, 19 Aug. 1843; ibid, f81, Graham to Wellington, 22 Aug. 1843 (also in Graham Papers, 64A, 64B). Hansard, 71, 919-22, 924, 18 Aug. 1843, Clanricarde, Monteagle.
185. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 533, f1, Devon to Peel, 1 Sept. 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 111, f35, Glengall to Wellington, 25 Sept. 1843. Graham Papers, 51R, Devon to Eliot, 8 Sept. 1843.
186. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (3), Russell to Monteagle, 25 Nov. 1843.
187. Wellington Papers, Port. 116, f18, 164, Graham to Wellington, 3 Jan., 6 Feb. 1844; ibid, f158, Monteagle to Wellington, 6 Feb. 1844; ibid, Port. 119, f11, Graham to Wellington, 23 April 1844. Graham Papers, 141R, Graham to De Grey, 29 Feb. 1844. Hansard, 72, 272, 6 Feb. 1844, Monteagle, Wellington; 73, 325-6, 27 Feb. 1844, Norreys, Graham; 73, 531-2, 4 March 1844, Norreys, Graham; 73, 1530-1, 25 March 1844, Graham; 74, 204-5, 205, 23 April 1844, Wellington, Monteagle.
188. Hansard, 72, 658, 13 Feb. 1844, Clanricarde; 73, 1525-30, 25 March 1844, French; 74, 203-4, 23 April 1844, Clanricarde; 74, 508-13, 30 April 1844, French; 74, 896, 10 May 1844, Clanricarde.
189. Hansard, 74, 203-4, 23 April 1844, Clanricarde; 74, 514-6, 30 April 1844, Norreys, Bellew, Peel; 74, 1181-1201, 14 May 1844, Norreys, Bellew, Graham, French, O'Ferrall, Redington, Russell, Division.
190. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 541, f14, 105, Saunders to Peel, 3, 19 March 1844. Hansard, 72, 668, 13 Feb. 1844, Westmeath; 73, 42-3, 22 Feb. 1844, Gregory.
191. Hansard, 72, 824-5, 14 Feb. 1844, Young; 72, 1037, 16 Feb. 1844,



- Conolly; 74, 515-6, 30 April 1844; Shaw; 74, 1182, 1189, 1194-6, 1200-1, 14 May 1844, Norreys, Graham, Shaw, Division.
192. DEM, 26 April, 3, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20 May 1844.
193. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 297-9. Hansard, 74, 1183, 14 May 1845, Norreys. Also Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4C, f214, Gulson to Russell, 4 Aug. 1844, on how the mode of relief had become more acceptable to the poor and the collection of rates less difficult.
194. Hansard, 74, 1229-32, 17 May 1844, Clanricarde; 75, 222-3, 3 June 1844, Ferguson, French; 76, 1-13, 15, 27 June 1844, Clanricarde, Mountcashell; 76, 1691-2, 2 Aug. 1844, Clanricarde.
195. Graham Papers, 17IR, Eliot to Graham, 5, 15, 19 Oct., 5 Dec. 1844; Graham to Eliot, 10, 17 Oct., 3 Dec. 1844. DEM, Oct.-Dec. 1844.
196. The Times, 18 Nov. 1844.
197. Hansard, 77, 208-9, 7 Feb. 1845, French; 77, 784, 19 Feb. 1845, Barron; 78, 1423, 2 April 1845, French; 79, 684, 15 April 1845, French; 81, 1123, 24 June 1845, Clanricarde; 81, 1353, 30 June 1845, O'Brien; 82, 135, 8 July 1845, Londonderry, Clanricarde.
198. Nicholls, History of Irish Poor Law, 299-302. G. P. Scrope, How is Ireland to be Governed? A Question addressed to the New Administration of Lord Melbourne in 1834, with a postscript in which the same question is addressed to the Administration of Sir Robert Peel in 1846 (London, 1846), 49-50.
199. Hansard, 83, 418-20, 29 Jan. 1846, French, J. O'Connell, Crawford; 83, 727-36, 11 Feb. 1846, Crawford, Shaw, French, Conolly, O'Ferrall; 83, 1045-7, 17 Feb. 1846, Londonderry; 84, 1167-73, 1173-5, 1186-9, 1202-5, 1211-3, 19 March 1846, Scrope, Crawford, O'Brien, Shaw, French, Somerville, J. O'Connell; 35, 383-96, 403-6, 409, 1 April 1846, Scrope, O'Brien, O'Connor Don; 85, 723, 17 April 1846, O'Connell; 85, 1007, 24 April 1846, O'Connell; 87, 133, 8 June 1846, Somerville; 87, 821, 22 June 1846, Crawford.
200. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 584, f411, Gregory to Peel, 11 Feb. 1846.
201. Ibid, MS 40, 593, f28, A. S. O'Brien to Peel, 1 June 1846.
202. Hansard, 83, 461-86, 5 Feb. 1846, Clancarty.
203. Report by the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the operation of the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 56, and the other laws relating to the relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1846, XI, Pt 1, 885, 901-2 (Conclusion).
204. Ibid, 161 (Conolly), 189 (Norreys), 211 (Ferguson), 270 (Longfield), 361 (Lucas), 387 (Crawford), 821 (Bridgeran), 837-9 (Hamilton).
205. Ibid, 243-6 (Phelan), 388-95 (Crawford), 853-9 (O'Brien), 904-6 (Conclusions).
206. Ibid, 161-2 (Conolly), 190-5 (Norreys), 242-3 (Phelan), 365-6 (Lucas), 401 (Crawford), 866-71 (O'Brien), 887-90 (Conclusions).



## Chapter 8

## The Liberal-Unionists, 1841-3

Irish Toryism's response to the conduct of Peel's Government provides an obvious theme for this study's approach to the politics of the 1840's. No less interesting, however, if somewhat less striking, was the attitude of some liberal-unionists to Peel's Government and its handling of the repeal upsurge of 1843. That crisis produced expressions of liberal-unionist opinion unprecedented in insistence and fervour: the Arms Bill debates of May till August 1843 and the debate on O'Brien's motion on the state of Ireland in July 1843 involved remarkably wide-ranging consideration of Irish affairs, with liberal-unionists playing the leading roles; and the Remonstrance of August 1843 was no less than the manifesto of Irish liberal-unionists, who came closer on this occasion to bearing the characteristics of a coherent Parliamentary party than at any other time in the period under study.

The General Election of 1841 left the liberal-unionist group in Parliament relatively intact, in contrast with the Repealers in Ireland and liberals in Britain. And potential waverers in Ferguson and Ralph Howard joined with the rest of the Irish liberals in voting for the continuation of the Whig Government.<sup>1</sup> However, until 1843 liberals - British and Irish - were to provide ineffectual opposition to Peel's Government. This was particularly true with regard to Irish affairs. The British Whig leaders found O'Connell's repeal agitation an embarrassment and were wary of any action which might be construed as cooperation with him.<sup>2</sup> Emerson Tennent felt that De Grey's initial steps at the head of the administration in Ireland left the Irish liberals 'literally without a single pretext for dissent.'<sup>3</sup> Ferguson informed O'Brien,<sup>4</sup> perhaps in jest, that he approved of the appointments made by Peel.

The liberal-unionist Ulster Constitutional Association ceased to function and became the object of ridicule by O'Connell and the Tory Evening Mail.<sup>5</sup> O'Connell claimed that there was no Whig or liberal party



6  
in Ireland except the repealers. But his own efforts hardly prospered;  
until 1843 the Mail could 'pity the baffled demagogue' and celebrate his  
7  
'decline and fall' as he struggled to revive the 'defunct' Repeal agitation.  
Wyse wrote from London in September 1842 that, 'Everyone of any thought  
8  
here looks with pity and pain on the manner O'Connell is squandering himself.'

In January 1842, the Irish liberals, with unionists primarily  
9  
responsible, proposed Lord Morpeth for the vacant City of Dublin seat. Not  
only did his defeat by the Tory candidate underline the decline of liberal  
fortunes in Dublin but the apparent reluctance of Irish liberals to  
10  
contribute to the election fund indicated a more general malaise. The  
liberal-unionists were thrown into some disarray by the great debate in  
1842 on financial and economic questions, dividing, for example, on  
11  
Villiers' motions to repeal the Corn Laws, and on the degree of protection  
12  
to be afforded to Irish oats, and Smith O'Brien and Ferguson broke ranks  
13  
to support Peel's income tax measure. They were divided also in response  
14  
to the demands of the Chartists and on Ward's motion for the Ballot.

Though productive of motions and questions on a wide range of issues  
in 1842, the liberal-unionists did not make a significant contribution to  
the Parliamentary opposition until July, when Sheil initiated a debate on  
the conduct of the Irish Government. Sheil, Somerville, M. J. O'Connell,  
Charles Buller and Palmerston contended that 'the old system of ascendancy'  
had been 'partially restored', with important offices filled from the ranks  
of the Irish Tory party to the exclusion of Catholics, Press prosecutions,  
Catholics excluded from juries, and so on. More than 20 Irish liberals,  
15  
mostly unionists, supported the motion and none voted against. But many  
members were absent and the debate was a lack-lustre affair which hardly  
did justice to the subject, particularly when considered in comparison  
with later efforts which took place against the background of a severely  
disturbed Ireland. The Mail ridiculed Sheil and could quote even the  
16  
liberal Spectator in agreement. Russell did not think that Sheil had  
presented a strong case, and the Government were happy with 'the very  
17  
triumphant debate.'

It was with some justice that Peel taunted the Opposition in 1843 with having remained almost silent on Irish affairs during the previous two sessions.<sup>18</sup> The early stages of the session of 1843 did not see a liberal-unionist resurgence. On the Poor Law, Medical Charities and 'the Distress of the Country'<sup>19</sup> they failed to present a united front. An issue which caused uproar in Ireland in the spring of 1843 - namely, the giving of the contract for Irish mail coaches to a Scottish firm - was virtually ignored by the liberal-unionists in Parliament, though a number of them did join in extra-Parliamentary efforts to have the decision reversed.<sup>20</sup> In May and June they were still divided on the corn question.<sup>21</sup>

However, their position was in one respect promising. The decision of O'Connell and the other Repeal members to remain in Ireland left the liberal-unionists as the spokesmen of Irish liberalism in Parliament. They were thus enabled to fill the role of interpreters of the discontent of the summer of 1843, posing as well-informed and disinterested arbiters between Tory misrule on the one hand and Repeal demagoguery on the other. Furthermore, liberal-unionism remained viable as a Parliamentary force in terms of numbers. Some of the members who had supported Repeal a decade earlier had reverted to that line. But others of that ilk - notably Sheil, Bellew and probably the O'Connor Don - remained unionist, and James Power, though apparently reverting to his faith in Repeal, did not join O'Connell in the Repeal Association.<sup>22</sup> Robert Archbold of Kildare was another of these independent Repealers.<sup>23</sup> Bridgeman and Bodkin plumped for Repeal in 1840, but both had been so close to O'Connell from their entry into Parliament in 1835 it is difficult to regard them as defectors from liberal-unionism. Arguably, then, the only member who, before October 1843, clearly deserted Parliamentary and unionist politics for Repeal was Caleb Powell, O'Brien's colleague and friend from Limerick.<sup>24</sup> In May 1843 the liberal-unionist M.P.'s numbered nearly 40, at a conservative estimate. And their strength in the Lords was unimpaired.

Some liberal-unionists were so alarmed by the remarkable resurgence



of Repeal in April and May 1843 that they were driven into collusion with the Government. De Grey, the Lord Lieutenant, received 'many communications' from 'Whig & Liberal gentlemen' to the effect that 'something must be done', though he suspected that they would provide 'little support or defence' if the Government attempted to coerce the agitators. <sup>25</sup> A Whig landowner, James Naper of Co. Meath, approached the Irish Government on behalf of himself and the Duke of Leinster to propose a declaration against Repeal by unionists of every description and the establishment of a Royal Commission to consider 'improvements' in the state of Ireland. Graham welcomed the former proposal but deprecated the latter as an 'act of tame submission' to 'the Agitator.' Neither suggestion was acted upon; in fact, Leinster refused to sign an <sup>26</sup> anti-Repeal declaration organized by the Irish Tories. Sheil urged on a member of the Government the necessity of 'an immediate increase of the <sup>27</sup> military force', so great was his 'alarm' at the growth of agitation.

But most liberal-unionists were impelled by the revival of Repeal towards not collusion but collision with the Government. Thomas Wyse, who, with Smith O'Brien, played a leading role in the activities of the liberal-unionists, provided invaluable insights into this process in letters to his brother. So vivid is their portrayal, events will be described largely within the framework of an edited version of those letters. They reveal a politician possessed of clinical calculation. It emerges that the course of the liberal-unionists was planned well in advance, and that what appear at first sight to be cries of frustration - O'Brien's motion in July and the Remonstrance in August - were elements of a grand strategy which, at least for Wyse, had implications for the development of an Irish liberal party, for the future of Peel's Government, and, above all, for the way in which Ireland would thereafter be treated by the British Legislature.

Wyse realized in May 1843 that the opposition to Peel's Government was still in a somewhat disorganized state:



'Whigs there are none, at least no Whig party. All our old Treasury arrangements are given up, no circulars, no whipping, anyone speaks, fights, guerillas as he can... There is no Opposition in fact in the true disciplinarian style of the word. The time is not yet come. Our Irishmen are still more scattered. The "moderés" are the only in attendance. All the O'Connellites still away ...'

Regarding the British response to O'Connell's agitation, Wyse continued:

'Many admit local administration to be no bad thing in the abstract for any country, but they do not trust the man or his men. The instalment principle has alarmed all. They will refuse any & everything. They are not less puzzled how to put it down. All coercion measures every man of sense must see to be ineffectual - now. Pass the most stringent act you know - next day we should have to repeal this act another agitation. It would be only shifting the question a step backwards.' 28

Wyse then adverted to the Tory Lane Fox's notice of intention to move on the 11 of May 'a resolution with a view to put (sic) a stop to the agitation for the repeal of the union, and to call on the Government, if it have not sufficient power to attain that end, to ask for the necessary power.' According to Wyse the Government were embarrassed at the prospect of this motion, committing them as it did to coercion, and hoped to persuade Fox to withdraw. However, O'Brien

'very judiciously thought it was a moment not to be lost to the moderate section in Ireland ... we (Wyse and O'Brien) went over the resolutions he proposes to move in amendments together. The provocation was great, and all admit Lane Fox deserves the answer. It will embarrass government still more than the original question: and we are resolved it shall now stand as a substantive motion even should L. Fox withdraw. It is the only course which our section could take consistently with our character as Irishmen and men of temperate politics. We propose to do all we can to assist the discussion of the question in Ireland, by using all efforts to obtain our remedy first here. Should we fail, we have worked to the last, the fault, blunder or crime of the result will not be ours.' 30

Wyse fully appreciated the importance of O'Connell's absence from Parliament;

'O'C. does not wish a premature discussion. At the same time he might be tempted when the question of coercion is on the "tapis". There is no doubt, for us it would be far better he was away. We can speak with more weight in our attitude of an independent Irish party than under his wing, and say things which from us will have their effect, tho from him they would provoke little more than scoff or jeer. O'B. and others of us are determined to be explicit enough. The Arms Bill will give us another opportunity ... The Bill will appear a Bill for disarming the Catholics & leaving Orangemen armed.' 31

In the event Fox's motion was abandoned, and O'Brien's postponed.



It is clear from Wyse's letter that he and O'Brien were planning a Parliamentary role for the liberal-unionists. O'Brien wrote to his wife on the 9th of May that,

'People here are at last beginning to get a little frightened about Repeal. That is a good sign. There is never any chance of getting anything 32 in the way of conciliatory government from England until she becomes alarmed'.

There is a suggestion here that O'Brien shared Wyse's opportunistic attitude. But in public he was rather less philosophical and his disillusionment with the Union was made fully apparent. In reply to the Corporation of Limerick's request that he should advocate Repeal he described the Act of Union as an 'iniquitous measure ...

'...I am deterred from seeking its repeal - on the one hand, by a conviction that the attempt to procure its dissolution must be attended with much risk to the peace and security of both countries, and on the other, by a persuasion that if Ireland were admitted to enjoy the advantages of a perfect union with England .. there would result from such an union many benefits, as well to Ireland as to the empire at large, which could not be obtained under separate legislation and government.'

He admitted that the past treatment of Ireland did not augur well for the prospect of such a union and was 'not surprised that the Irish people look to the restoration of their legislature as the only effectual security against that system of misgovernment under which they have suffered since the union.' But he felt that the Government might, by the force of opinion, be made to give Ireland justice:

'So long, then, as a hope of obtaining good government through other means than a severance of the Legislative connexion remains on my mind, I shall adhere to the union. When that hope is extinguished, I shall not fear to contemplate the remaining alternative.' 33

O'Brien later wrote privately to the liberal-unionist General Bourke that,

'Unhappily Government never learns the errors of its legislation & management in Ireland until the country is thrown into a state of general commotion ... the people of Ireland have learnt by long experience that the only remonstrances on their part which are attended to are those which are coupled with an apprehension of disagreeable consequences in case they should be set at nought.' 34

Wyse's opportunistic view of the Government's Arms Bill was evident in the letter quoted above. His letters of the 15th and 16th of May refer to meetings of Irish members on this bill, that of the 16th under the

Table A Irish Liberal Voting in 25 Divisions on the  
Arms Bill of 1843.

	Votes against Govt.	Votes cast by member	% Vote against Govt.
@Clements	25	25	100
@S.O'Brien	24	24	100
@Wyse	22	22	100
@O'Connor Don	20	20	100
@M.J.O'Connell	19	19	100
@Collett	16	16	100
@Hatton	16	16	100
@Chapman	14	14	100
@Esmonde	13	13	100
@R.Gore	13	13	100
@Barron	12	12	100
Power	12	12	100
@W.Browne	11	11	100
@J.O'Brien	9	9	100
@Dawson	8	8	100
@Watson	8	8	100
Bodkin	7	7	100
@Cavendish	7	7	100
@Murphy	7	7	100
M.J.Blake	6	6	100
@Carew	6	6	100
@French	6	6	100
D.Roche	6	6	100
@Redington	4	4	100
E.B.Roche	4	4	100
@Armstrong	2	2	100
V.Blake	2	2	100
@Cave	2	2	100
@Layard	2	2	100
@Sheil	2	2	100
@V.Maher	1	1	100
@Somerville	1	1	100
@Ross	18	19	94.7
@J-Norreys	16	17	94.1
@O'Ferrall	12	13	92.3
@Tuite	10	11	90.9
@Pigot	8	9	88.9
Archbold	15	17	88.2
@Stuart	12	24	50
@Ferguson	6	16	37.5

@-Liberal-Unionists



35

chairmanship of Clements of Leitrim. Reference to many such meetings were to be made in the coming weeks. Sheil looked forward to the debate on the second reading of the bill with a more personal opportunism, having 'no doubt of doing better than I ever did & shall return to my little ambitious wife, I trust, with a large addition of laurels. At all events I have worked day & night at the subject. I have left nothing undone.'

36

The Arms Bill was, in Chief Secretary Eliot's words, 'a bill to amend and continue the laws relative to the registering of arms, and the importation, manufacture and sale of arms, gunpowder and ammunition in Ireland', laws which were due to expire at the end of the session.<sup>37</sup> The bill came up for second reading on the 29th of May. From then until it passed the third reading on the 9th of August, the bill was to be the vehicle, in conjunction with the debate on O'Brien's general motion in July, by which 'the state of Ireland' was maintained as an almost constant subject of debate in the Commons, so wide-ranging were the debates to prove. The Irish liberals initiated and, with the aid of their British allies, carried on this remarkable species of opposition.

The Irish liberals were responsible for almost all of the 25 divisions on the Arms Bill. Their voting record is summarized in Table A. Stuart and Ferguson clearly differed from their liberal-unionist colleagues. Their votes with the Government included support for the general principle of the bill, though neither voted for the third reading; their opposition was confined to details. Stuart stated that though he found some of the clauses 'objectionable' he thought there was 'a necessity for some such measure as this in Ireland'.<sup>38</sup> His course duly brought denunciation from O'Connell.<sup>39</sup> Ferguson spoke only in Committee, on details. In spite of these dissentients, liberal-unionist opposition to the measure was impressive and not without effect on the shape given to the bill as it passed through the House.<sup>40</sup>

The British Whig leaders were somewhat embarrassed by the whole

affair, for they found themselves being urged by the Irish to oppose a Bill the principle of which they seemed to have approved when the Melbourne government continued the arms laws, which had been in force almost continuously from 1796. Russell, therefore, admitting the necessity of some such measure, announced he could not oppose the second reading, and eventually abstained. He voted against Wyse's motion to prevent the Bill going into Committee. He announced he would support the bill if it was reduced to the existing law, and oppose it otherwise, an approach about which Wyse was not enthusiastic.<sup>41</sup> In spite of this declaration he continued to support the Government in several important divisions; on a low-turnout third reading division he did not vote. His saving grace in Irish eyes was probably his (and the other Whig leaders') full participation in the attack on the general Irish policy of the Government.

The Irish liberals were mercilessly beaten with the accusation that they now opposed what they had once supported.<sup>42</sup> However, the majority of Irish liberals were able to shrug off these accusations and vehemently pillory the Government, though they followed several different lines of approach. Those who had not sat in the Parliament of 1837-41 seemed noticeably more free to condemn the principle of special restrictions for Ireland.<sup>43</sup> M. J. O'Connell simply admitted previous negligence. Clements seemed to compromise along the same lines as Russell, though his opposition to the new provisions led him to offer a much more consistent resistance. Many argued that there was no justification in the crime figures for the new clauses proposed by the Government, and these were attacked - in particular the 'branding clause' and the increased penalties - with some vehemence.<sup>44</sup>

Various other tacks were used to evade the taunts from the Government benches. However almost all the liberal speakers resorted to attacking the Government's overall policy in Ireland, asking if this bill was the Government's only answer to the discontent. They demanded a policy of conciliation as the only effective answer to disaffection, or



even to crime. In previous chapters their demands regarding the Church, the Corporations and the poor law have been noticed, and to these were added more recent grievances such as the Government's distribution of patronage, their dismissal of repeal magistrates, the shrinking Parliamentary franchise, and problems in relations between landlords and tenants. It is clear from Wyse's correspondence that he and O'Brien were looking to bring the state of Ireland before the House, and the Arms Bill proved a suitable vehicle. By it the state of Ireland was kept before Parliament throughout the summer.

Regarding Repeal, in the course of the debates on the Arms Bill John O'Brien made it clear that he deprecated the 'present perilous agitation' as not only 'hazardous' but 'impracticable.' Listowel deplored the agitation and Ross attacked Repeal as both impracticable and ruinous. But Crawford threatened that he would support repeal if the Arms Bill were passed. It was widely asserted that the agitation was directly attributable to the conduct of the Government.<sup>45</sup>

Early in June Wyse saw the prevention of coercion as one of the primary objects of the Irish members:

'I do not think Peel will allow his party to push matters to a collision though many of his Irish supporters might desire it. (Any attack by the Orangemen will be suppressed) as long at least as Parliament are sitting and the Irish representatives are as vigilant as they now are ... If collision be avoided there cannot be a pretext for violent measures. We laugh at the idea of an Act to make it Treason or a Misdemeanour to agitate the question (repeal)... We should have another agitation to repeal this new Algerine Act ... The people are organized enough to elude the law.. In the interval the government & Legislature would day by day get more in the wrong and make more converts than O'Connell could hope to gain under ordinary circumstances.' <sup>46</sup>

His assessment of Peel's attitude to coercion was shared by most in and out of Parliament, Orange and liberal. As will be seen below, however, Wyse came to fear that there would indeed be 'collision' followed by coercion. In the same letter Wyse displayed the optimism which was an essential element in his strategy in the coming months. There was, he felt, a movement towards conciliation, with many talking of 'throwing the Church overboard, increasing the members, lowering the franchise,

re-organising law of landlord & tenant, expanding education, and providing largely for public works in Ireland ....

'... I hear them every day - Protestant & Catholic, Tory as well as Whig and Radical. They think (when we meet in society they are rational enough) that the Church is not worth the expense and trouble .. (and) now would be right glad for any plea to get rid of the whole concern. The Tory peers, for the most part, are disaffected to the present Government and pleased enough to see them in difficulties.'

Wyse went on to outline the means by which several Irish liberals hoped to maintain the apparent drift towards conciliation, revealing in the process that the Remonstrance of August was planned months beforehand as part of a general plan to engineer public opinion:

'These views are constantly present to a small section of us - O'Brien, Ross, Crawford, Reddington, (Denham Norreys to a certain degree). Under all circumstances we adhere to these great reforms, but are not indifferent to any others. Our course is to let the Repeal movement fight our battle - and when the acceptable time shall arise, and the public mind shall be ripe, to be ready with our Ultimatum in set formal terms under the name of Declaration of Rights. (Say nothing of this). O'Brien and I have had several consultations on it, and we shall not be wanting when the House & Country are ready to receive it.'

This composed, opportunistic attitude to the Repeal movement is quite striking, particularly as others spoke at this time of the danger of civil war. Wyse consistently argued that O'Connell would not risk violence. Indeed he voiced here the view that O'Connell was not sincerely committed to Repeal at all, but had been forced to agitate by the fall<sup>47</sup> of the Whig Government and the state of his personal finances. The Irish Whig Lord Carew also felt that Repeal was not really the object and that<sup>48</sup> there was no danger of 'insurrection'.

At the end of May 1843, Lord Chancellor Sugden began to dismiss magistrates who attended Repeal meetings. The dismissals caused, or at least occasioned, a number of defections to Repeal, notably those of Sir Colman O'Loughlen (son of Sir Michael, the former member for Dungannon) and nine other members of the Irish bar. Smith O'Brien and others<sup>49</sup> resigned from the magistracy in protest. O'Brien's resignation won him a letter of thanks from the Secretary of the Repeal Association; he replied that the Government had wrongly attempted 'to repress the voice of



national indignation.' He characterized the Repeal agitation as 'a great national effort originating in the highest and noblest impulses' and comprising 'many of the best and ablest of our land.' Their object was the same as his, 'to obtain for Ireland good government, to put an end, once and for ever, to the unjust, exclusive, overbearing, and anti-national system of domination by which Ireland has been oppressed for 600 years.' And though he still hoped that this was attainable within the union, he did not blame those who, looking to past experience, disagreed. 50

Wyse was aware of the advantage to be reaped from the magisterial dismissals:

'We are to a man most indignant, and who is not ?, at the most outrageous attempt to put down by arbitrary means the right of any subject of these realms to discuss public measures & move petition for Repeal of any act of Parliament, but we are consoled by the consideration that the signal imbecility of the proceeding is equal to its injustice, and working far better for us than we could do for ourselves. Our great object now is to put this in as glaring a point of view as possible before the public, house our questions, motions for returns, etc. We know intrinsically the government is weak and (eternally ?) surrounded not in Ireland only but in these countries by confusion.' 51

Liberals, particularly the Irish liberal-unionists, duly harassed the Government over their conduct on this issue, with accusations and questions over the ensuing months and, in mid-July, a set debate of the Lords in which Clanricarde, Fortescue, Lansdowne and Cottenham pressed the issue to a division. 52 The furore in Parliament clearly caused some consternation within the Government. 53

Wyse's statement of his aims put a higher priority on changing the way in which Ireland was governed than merely displacing the Conservatives. He also took pride in the efficiency of the Irish liberals' opposition to the Arms Bill:

'You now have ( ) of all our Irish progress, enough to dish them (the Government) not only from the citadel, but very considerably to re-fashion the whole concern - a far more important matter than any cheque - mating of parties. But the great difficulty .. is to take their place: our men are in a state of complete solution. No one seems to know his Brother. If it were not for these ( ) follies of the Government you would have seen this session pass through in a sleep. All the anti-corn law discussion produced nothing but weariness... The Irish members have awakened them - they alone. O'Connell's absence has been fortunate.

We have redeemed the position .. we had in 1830-31, and are now a compact, united, energetic and working body, which the House is beginning to feel and respect. All formerly done was attributed to the head showman. The quieter the man was, the more his words were left ... Our future action is very obvious. We are determined to let nothing pass, to put forward in one shape or another all our claims. Hence O'Brien's finance, and Reddington's army & my Education motions - the Provincial Colleges .. & the University (of which say nothing yet) in readiness for a fitting opportunity. The Whigs must follow. They do it reluctantly enough. Lord John excepted who has spoken out ? Many of them think too rarely. But the day will come .. there must be a total fusion of the party.' 54

The relationship of Wyse and the Irish to the Whig leadership was clarified in Wyse's next letter:

'I was this morning invited to attend a meeting at Lord John's strictly private and select - only about a dozen of the late ministry - Lords Cottenham, Lansdowne, Campbell, Monteagle, Clarendon, Clanrickarde, Minto, Morpeth, Labouchere, Buller, Sir G. Grey and self - on affairs of Ireland. Lord John particularly addressed himself to me, and asked me minutely my opinion on the subject. I told him I thought it better not to give the matter a party character, to allow the Irish members at first to meet .. and having drawn up their resolutions, or expressed their views, it would then be for the late Ministry to see how far they could adopt and support them, together with the whole of the rest of the opposition. The Irish were very jealous of being considered, especially at the present moment, as merely a portion of a party or political game, and it would lessen their influence both in the House & Country to appear, in so grave a position as the present, to follow not lead. This I knew to be the feeling of many of the most moderate and temperate (O'Brien, Ross & others so confessed themselves to me yesterday) and even for party purposes it was the most expedient course. The general tactique I thought ought to be questioning, moving for returns, &c, &c, and occasional debate, on secondary questions, so as to allow the government to convict itself as much as possible; that having done that - and the Irish members pronounced what they had in view distinctly - then Lord John should come forward before the Session terminated, & in a general motion (now I thought premature) declare his sympathy, and view of the entire policy in every particular - but on the broadest grounds - nothing less would do now for Ireland. This would go as a manifesto to the country during the recess... If anything could neutralize Repeal, such a course would do it. If it did not, at least their conscience and conduct would be clear as to specific measures ...' 55

In fact Russell had already intended a general motion on the state of  
56  
Ireland. In the event the general motion later in the Session was moved by O'Brien and seconded by Wyse - that is, the Irish members were still leading and not following. The manifesto was issued at the end of the session. Russell's general motion, which like O'Brien's called for the House to go into committee on the state of Ireland, was not brought forward until the next session, in February 1844. Wyse continued:

'By the course I suggested, the just independence and feelings of the Irish representation would be left regarded (sic), and the late



government would not have to take the initiative and prematurely commit themselves to opinions & measures from which they might wish to get loose... I am glad to say that this view was strongly approved by Lord John and adopted as the course to be pursued... I went after to the meeting of Irish members, 15 of us, and saw O'Brien (to whom I certainly mentioned this, which he highly approved) and .. we went into consideration of a letter to the absent members. We opposed anything public or remonstrant but each engaged to write to those whom he could influence. I threw out hints at a future meeting (sic) of coming to some declaration but I find there will be no occasion for this yet... Say nothing about cur government meeting.' 57

Wyse's next letter to his brother contained an accurate assessment of the Government's intention to show forbearance, after the triumph of 'the moderate section of the Cabinet.' The two scenarios which he painted - one, the attrition of the Repeal movement by a steady application of the law and, by 'governing in a more favourable and partial tone to the great mass of the people, doing nothing offensive .. without however yielding anything essential', and, two, coercion of the Repealers if, but only if, an outbreak made it easy to justify - may be taken as outcomes the avoidance of which the Wyse-O'Brien plan was designed to effect, by pressing for immediate and far-reaching remedies for Irish grievances. Of another possible outcome, Repeal, Wyse wrote:

'Here (in England) to a man they have the country with them against Repeal. I have not yet met a single Englishman, and scarcely an Irishman, for. I confess my objections so far from being weakened are stronger and stronger, and that is the case with many, many. As to the idea of persuading John Bull to this - on the ground of its being only another Catholic question - it is nonsense. J. Bull, and not the ( ) part but enlightened part of the nation, see in it nothing short of separation - and with reason - and then, as a matter of course, their own utter degradation to a second power, if not lower, in the scale of Europe. For this John will fight - as for his existence, & fight to the last. It is then simply a question which of the two is the strongest (sic) and likely to beat the other. On this head no man with two grains of brains can have a doubt.'

There was a clearly a divergence between this view and that taken publicly by O'Brien. Wyse was not optimistic at this stage that the Tory Government could be brought down:

'As to upsetting of Ministers .. it is quite as absurd. Ministers are very uncomfortable, but not half so much as we were for the last years. They will go on through their entire Parliament & the Elections will decide as to what is to follow. ... Every one of our men who know anything would be sorry we now came in .. The Whigs would have to deal with the very question - & to them it would be no comparison more embarrassing than to Tories.'

With regard to elections, Wyse expressed the fear that continuation of the present situation would see the liberal-unionists squeezed out on a massive scale by Tories and Repealers. With a view to firming up the middle ground he and O'Brien were continuing to plan the Remonstrance:

'The document we have in view must be one for which we can stand up before all men, not of declamation only but sound sense & knowledge...' 58

Two days later he wrote:

'O'Brien and I are decided .. about our declaration & we have been considering .. the various topics. As it is likely to have an important effect & to be a historic document we must take some care... This briefly is our policy - to have this document approved by the Irish members, signed by them and then followed up by the intermediates & moderates in Ireland. We shall have an alternative at the close, which in case of refusal or rejection will leave every subscriber to it hereafter with or against Repeal as he may think fit. When this is before the public some time, Lord John will be called on, as if by the Irish moderate party, to take a bold step forward, and so far from it appearing rash it will (as will really be the case) be seen as the only means left of tempering and staying the existing agitation and warding off the evils which otherwise may follow. It will place us all in our true position and will enable us to retain (a most important matter for its liberty & quiet) some control over the feelings and judgement of the country. As to topics - Church, Franchise, Representation, Public Works, Education, Grand Jury Reform, Finance and Patronage will form our head complaints. Tenure of land & Emigration shall not be neglected. In fact we intend a regular manifesto - and such as will give unity of action and opinion to our section at last, not only now but in all future sessions. O'Brien tells me my suggestions to the late Government were most judicious & their view of them great encouragement to every ( ) supporter. If acted on they would go far indeed in restoring them to the confidence of the Irish People. This observation I made at our meeting the other day of Irish members - stating that we the Representatives of Ireland - not this or that section of the late Ministry - should begin and it was for them to follow - as I was in every hope they would (I said nothing of the meeting) were we formally united - and made as I afterwards learned from conversation with them the best impression. If the matter is well managed we shall I think ultimately succeed and at all costs we shall rally together a party which it is quite obvious only require some such course to bring and keep them together.

O'F(errall) has not the confidence of our Irish M.P.'s and did not attend then or Lord John's meeting, being out of town...

Tomorrow our course of action for the Arms Bill will be settled. O'Brien and I think we should fight it at every stage. Lord John & O'Ferrall do not, lest we should have small divisions. We can't (accept?) that. Who cares for divisions now? The point is, the great point, to show that Ireland has in her representatives men on whom she can rely...' 59

This letter was a clear statement of Wyse's ambition to mould a united Irish liberal-unionist party. He went on, subsequently, to describe their Arms Bill successes, referring specifically to his motion on the 15th of June for referral of the bill to a select committee to



inquire into the justice and wisdom of continuing restrictions on the bearing of arms in Ireland:

'Our debate on my Motion ... is proceeding vigourously, the speeches excellent, and the subject well sustained.... Already two of the most objectionable clauses are struck out and others will follow. Our obstinacy, as I predicted, and shortness of time compel this. O'F(arrall) told me, the night before last, that speaking to Graham after the debate, he said they would cut down the Bill in Committee very considerably to meet the wishes of Irish members...' 60

Graham was also driven to a virtual refusal to adopt a more  
61  
conciliatory Irish policy. Wyse was delighted:

'Nothing could be more important than the latter part of last night's debate. Graham made an immense blunder. I wish you could have seen Peel's face, and Lord John's, Howick's, and Seymour's glee .. Lord John took admirable advantage of it. He followed exactly the tactique I recommended ... allowing the Irish as Irish to make themselves felt as a party - to make their own battle - to wait till the enemy assembled .. and then, as if forced, to come up with his coup de réserve.. It told admirably and he was in great delight as indeed we all were afterwards. It has done him as much good with us as with the opposite party, greatly restored confidence between the Whig section and the Irish, and given us a station and importance as such we never have had since our first campaign in 1830 & 1831, when we acted for ourselves, with Lambert, Walker, Wallace, Leader, Dawson, O'Connor Don, Chapman, &c. O'Connell's absence also has been of use. The Irish speak with a self-reliance and vigor they had not before, and are listened to not as his puppets but as interpreters of the feelings of large masses of the country... It is quite clear we are getting to close quarters on all the great questions and before the end of the session shall have the programme of our future campaign fairly traced out.'

Wyse went on to describe the Irish resolve 'to fight every inch' on the Arms Bill and his pride in their new-found 'efficiency'. His closing comments reveal the extent to which their opposition was organized: 'We are to have a meeting at two o'clock tomorrow to distribute our parts and  
62  
order of battle man by man during the Committee.' Three days later, Wyse was still jubilant and optimistic:

'All say nothing could be more judicious than both the substance & mode of the movement. We had a far larger majority (sic) than we had any reason to expect.<sup>63</sup> Remember the Whigs had continued (not indeed such a Bill as this, but a Bill) and were so far (the strenuous Whigs) somewhat hampered. I broke loose at the outset and I am quite sure had great influence in determining others, amongst them O'Ferrall, Pigot, and I almost think Lord John himself...(Even) last night he apologised to me for not voting with me. Had I asked his advice, he probably would have deterred me - indeed he hardly could have acted otherwise. It is this freedom of action I want to establish - hence my urgency with him to let us act as an Irish party and follow in honorably after with other members of the late government... We must however be allowed to push forward, allowed or not I for one will do it.'

Wyse went on to describe O'Ferrall's reluctant accession to the plan, having found no support among the Irish members for his argument that the discussions in the House would add to the flame in Ireland. Pigot was 'more frank, attends our meetings zealously, as indeed does O'Ferrall, and acts as our Attorney General in bringing our amendments into shape... On Thursday we meet to get each of our parts severally arranged (for Committee)... We have the magistrate question .. when all is ripe.'<sup>64</sup> On the 26th he reported, 'We open with the Arms Bill, and do not wish to get beyond the Branding clauses today. Our order of Battle is very good...'<sup>65</sup>

O'Brien was in much less buoyant mood. Though he again declared publicly that he was not a Repealer he claimed that he shared the Repealers' indignation and sorrow over Ireland's grievances and revealed that he had come to Parliament that session determined to try for just one year more to secure useful legislation for Ireland. Instead he found himself having to defend her interests against new assaults - the poor law bill, the arms bill, the Croal mail-coach contract, the magisterial dismissals, and so on. If he believed Graham's late speech he would turn to Repeal immediately, but he had not yet given up hope of redress within the Union. And he expected 'that the present cabinet will soon be broken up by differences of opinion with regard to Irish policy.'<sup>66</sup>

In a less despondent vein, O'Brien wrote to his wife that he did 'not think that Peel & Co. will be in a hurry to bring in measures of coercion for Ireland after the sample which he has had of our vigour' in the Arms Bill debates.<sup>67</sup> Though, as shown in chapter 10, this factor did not feature in the decision of the Cabinet against coercion in May-June, Graham did in fact note later, after the Wyse debate, that the 'resistance and delay' which had met the Arms bill was a 'foretaste of the struggle which a coercion bill would cause.' And it was the principal reason for the Cabinet's refusal early in July to propose an extension of the Processions Act to include the Temperance bands, which had become an



68

auxiliary of the repeal agitation. Caleb Powell indicated to O'Brien that the liberal-unionists' efforts were also noted in Ireland, where liberals were duly appreciative. But at the same time he put their success in a proper perspective when he claimed that 'the public demonstrations here (Ireland) have made their efforts more effective than they would otherwise have proved.'

69

On the 3rd of July Wyse expressed his opinion of O'Connell's timidity, which, he felt, precluded a deliberate recourse to violence or to so revolutionary a move as a rent strike, a move which Wyse himself viewed with horror:

'O'Connell is not the man for a coup de main or any rational measure. He has in his hands the carrying of the question - pro tem - but he is not the man to use the instrument. The government know this - for they are not ignorant of his conduct on former occasions when prosecutions were hanging over his head.'

However, although convinced of O'Connell's personal timidity, Wyse was apparently increasingly concerned that his followers could collide with the Orangemen in the North, where repeal meetings were being held:

'The very moment such a circumstance shall occur (and it depends upon our enemies) you will see the whole coercion policy developed. Already Peel has got credit from his party for forbearance. This will aid him greatly when the day for action shall arrive.'

But Wyse quietly returned to the scenario he favoured, discounting the chances of both Repeal and the status quo:

'I have not the least idea that anything even like Repeal of the Union .. can take place - but there is no doubt the Tory system, with its Church & Aristocracy, will have to bate much of their present prerogative, and Peel's Cabinet, unless we play our game very ill, crumble gradually before us....

The feeling in England is still with us on the Arms Bill. We have managed it well, on the avowal of every one. And Pigot has had great merit - but not that of first originating or organising the arrangement. That belongs to me - and that fortunate meeting at Lord John's. We have behaved with great moderation and yet firmness - and will take care we do not lose it.' 70

Some hours later he wrote again:

'Another night of fierce fighting on the Arms Bill, now two in the morning, just completed at one o'clock... We have not, after 3 nights, allowed them to get beyond 11 clauses, or rather 8 - 3 postponed, and without a single factionous move.' 71

The sympathetic Dublin Evening Post praised the opposition to the

Arms Bill and adverted to 'the practical proof it affords of what may be achieved by a united party.' Their 'Private Correspondent' wrote of 'as well-disciplined an opposition as I ever saw.'<sup>72</sup> Peel complained in Parliament of the slow progress in Committee.<sup>73</sup>

Wyse was under some pressure at this time from the Repealers in Waterford. But he informed them that, though 'by no means surprised' that others had turned to Repeal 'after the late proceedings of government', and yielding to none in 'the deepest sense of the wrongs and grievances of Ireland', his 'known and declared conscientious convictions' remained<sup>74</sup> opposed to Repeal. Carew and Murphy, the latter somewhat equivocally,<sup>75</sup> also resisted pressure from constituents to support Repeal.

On the 4th of July O'Brien brought on his motion on the state of<sup>76</sup> Ireland. After almost monopolising the business of the House for five nights it was defeated on the 12th of July. The grievances complained of were merely those already discussed in the Arms Bill debates, and the debate degenerated to some degree into a question of censure of the Government. Nevertheless, the final product was a remarkable compilation of views, for the most part calmly and lucidly expressed, on a wide spectrum of Irish issues. Freed of the difficulties involved in opposing the Arms Bill, Irish Whigs like O'Ferrall and Stuart, both of whom spoke, and the British Whigs enthusiastically assailed the appointments and measures (and, in some cases, lack of measures) of the Government.

Of the 12 Irish liberal speakers only one, E. B. Roche, was a confirmed O'Connellite Repealer. Shades of differences on this question were apparent among the others. O'Brien again described 'the wrongs inflicted upon Ireland' under the Union and sympathized with those who turned to Repeal in 'despair' of good government from Britain. Such recourse was 'natural'. The 'cry for Repeal is not the voice of treason, but the language of despair'. He felt that 'Ireland would be at this moment a more happy and more prosperous country than it now is if the Union of 1800 had not taken place... Still, however, I cling to the hope



of good government from a British Parliament. When that hope is extinct, I shall not fear to contemplate the remaining alternative', Repeal, which was both 'practicable' and 'consistent with the allegiance which I owe to my Sovereign.' Wyse agreed that it 'was only in the ordinary course of human nature' that so many in Ireland should respond to 'her present state of suffering and forced inferiority' by turning to Repeal. He and Crawford preferred a federal system. Crawford's support for the Union was conditional; it must be 'upheld by equal rights.'

O'Ferrall was still opposed to Repeal but would not 'go to war' with the Repealers, especially if conciliation were not tried. Barron said he had joined 'a Repeal association.' Norreys and Ross were forthright in stating their opposition to Repeal.<sup>77</sup> However, all of the Irish liberal speakers joined in expressing their unhappiness with the way in which Ireland was governed, and voted unanimously for the motion.<sup>78</sup> The acknowledgement by almost every speaker of the dangers of the state of Ireland - indeed the debate took place in an atmosphere of crisis - probably suited Wyse's plans to rouse British opinion in preparation for the Remonstrance. There was, then, much to make up, from the liberal-unionist point of view, for the defeat in the division and the failure to win concrete pledges from the Government of remedial measures.

In addition, the debate brought out a degree of Tory disunity. There were indications of discontent among the Irish Tories (see Chapter 10). And there was evidence of pressure from the Government's own supporters for a more conciliatory policy towards Ireland. Rous and Lascelles pressed for concessions but did not vote on the motion. The Young Englanders Cochrane, Manners and Smythe also advocated conciliation and voted with O'Brien.<sup>79</sup> Graham certainly took this development seriously. The speeches of these 'young men' were 'but samples of a lurking feeling which is widespread and which threatens fatal consequences ... our position with respect to Irish affairs is very uncomfortable ..., and we shall have an uphill battle to fight, if indeed we still retain the confidence of the House of Commons.'<sup>80</sup>

Wyse also noted the disarray in the Conservative ranks. Writing to his brother after three nights of the debate, he rejoiced at the direction it had taken and painted a remarkable picture of disunity even within the Government:

'Our debate is going on vigorously ... the speeches, from whatever side of the House they come, seem to be in favour of the motion. Rous came out last night, as Lascelles and Cochrane did the night before, for Ireland & against the Church - and tonight I understand we are to have Gregory, Monkton, ( ) and Peter Borthwick...The importance of this determination of "Young England", as the Fusey section is called, is the sense of insecurity which it has induced in the hostile camp, and the divided air it gives to the party before the public. The government seems to stand on such men as Howard Douglas only .. and their own immediate dependants, & to be almost as much at variance with their country as with ours. Even the Cabinet is not unanimous ... Last night Stanley was taking notes to answer Graham. Peel took them out of his hand. He did not speak .. and the debate went off without a single government speech, except the Attorney General's... The Government are anxious... In the meantime it is amazing how rapidly & thoroughly the Conservatives out of the House at least are coming round .. (with) daily denunciation of the Church.'

Wyse mentioned Gladstone, Hardinge and Wellington as other dissentients to their Government's policy, with Peel trying 'to keep all back, thinking  
81  
matters will mend or melt.' One of O'Brien's liberal friends in Ireland told him that, 'The debate has done great good - it has given the  
82  
Government its first serious blow - Pigot gives you great credit for it.' It certainly raised O'Brien's standing in Ireland, even among outright  
83  
repealers.

On the persistent newspaper rumours of the imminent collapse of the Government, Wyse wrote, 'Peel out! No indeed it will take some time &  
84  
effort to do that yet. Our political warfare however goes on well'. In particular the effort to rouse opinion in Britain continued. Irish members (Clements, French, Hatton, Norreys, Crawford, O'Brien, Archbold and Wyse) were instrumental in organizing a meeting of the constituents of Marylebone on the state of Ireland, but the Irish members did not  
85  
attend. Wyse reported:

'The Marylebone meeting is going off admirably .. We Irish M.P.'s have agreed not to attend; it would only look too much like imploring sympathy - like deputations from anti-slavery & ( ) charitable societies. We stand & are determined to stand on far higher ground. We speak as the organs of a Nation to a Nation and call not for favors but rights...



This however is only a portion - an offshoot of the whole movement'.

Wyse went on to describe his cooperation with O'Brien to organize a meeting of all Liberal members. Clements played a prominent role; O'Ferrall was again reluctant. Regarding the requisition:

'Its purport is short and simple - having been denied justice by Parliament & Ministers we appeal through the Representation of England & Scotland to the several Constituencies for their declaration of opinion as to our grievances, warning them of their danger, &c, &c. A series of resolutions will be adopted - & each English & Scotch member will take his ( ) to his County or Town & try his effort (sic) in stirring up their several constituencies. This done - we propose a solemn remonstrance to be formally signed before we break up, by the Irish members, and thus leave John Bull in the recess to his own ruminations. If it succeeds so much the better, if not our duty is done.' 86

O'Brien, in approaching Russell upon the subject of the meeting of liberal members, apparently explained that they wished 'to have meetings 87 in town & country in support of a liberal policy towards Ireland.' The requisition for the meeting was, in effect, an appeal to the British public to press a conciliatory policy on the Government in order to avoid 'a collision of the sister kingdoms in a struggle for the national rights 88 of Ireland.' It was drawn up by O'Brien and amended in consultation with 89 90 Wyse. Nineteen Irish members signed it. The meeting itself was attended by nearly 100 members, on the 18th of July. Palmerston, Wood, Bernal and others argued against the Irish plan of public meetings in Britain, and most of the members concurred. Russell had already shown an interest, privately, in 'moving an Address to the Crown on the subject of Ireland. 91 before Parliament separates', but when it was suggested at the meeting that he should declare in Parliament what he would do for Ireland if again in office, he was 'too cunning to commit himself in such a manner.' All this can hardly have satisfied Wyse, though 'it seemed to be the universal opinion that a document, embodying the views of the Irish Members, should 92 be prepared, in order that it should be submitted to a future meeting.'

The Irish continued to wage war in Parliament. On the Arms Bill Peel was driven to exasperation:

'... There is a certain Lord Clements in the House of Commons, an unparalleled bore and with means of obstructing public business by a



combination of ignorance and perseverance unequalled in the annals of Parliament. He took 13 divisions last night on miserable points in the Arms Bill. I was haunted throughout the remainder of the night after the business was over by the sound of his voice.' 93

Peel subsequently wrote to De Gray that he was 'deafened by the hoarse voice of Lord Clements repeating the same thing for the fiftieth time.' Graham and Brougham concurred in viewing Clements as 'mischievous' and 'contemptible' and 'a madman'.<sup>94</sup> Russell's amendment to restrict magisterial rights under the Arms Bill to force entry into private houses had 'a good minority', thought Wyse, and Cranford's motion denouncing the whole measure involved 'the assertion of the constitutional principle on which many of us originally started.' It was less successful, however, 'several having found themselves too entangled by former admissions, and support of Arms Bills, recent declarations (sic) to join him... We shall', continued Wyse, 'send it out of our House the end of the week amidst the united execrations of one section of the Irish members. There will be an animated closing discussion...' And, in addition, there was the prospect<sup>95</sup> of Ward's motion on the Irish Church.

Preparation of the Remonstrance continued. According to Wyse on the 29th of July, 'our projected Manifesto (is) still concocting between O'Brien and self.'<sup>96</sup> On the 31st he wrote:

'O'Brien and I have been indefatigable in preparing the Remonstrance - for such we now are resolved to call it - and not Address, Appeal, etc.. You have little idea of the difficulties we have had to contend with on all sides - & the patience and perseverance requisite to overcome them. I think I gave you an account of our first Committee (the Requisitionists) - in the Reform Club - after the General Meeting. They elected me Chairman, and we discussed generally the topics which were to form the subject matter of the Address. These were ordered to be embodied by a Committee of five - self, Stuart (Villiers), Ross, M. John O'Connell, and O'Brien. At our second meeting the several drafts were read, and O'Brien received charge to melt them into each other. At our (3rd?) O'Brien produced the draft, so compiled, and read a motion to have it printed, leaving large margin for alterations. Printed copies were sent to each of the members and today we met (as usual) to consider alterations - Our meeting continued from one till four - and we got through about one half, & it is to be hoped we shall terminate our labours tomorrow. I spent two hours yesterday (Sunday) with O'Brien going over carefully every paragraph and introduced several improvements. We had today a (latecall?) meeting - Wyse (Chairman), O'Brien, Ross, Gore, Power, Stuart, Carew, Archbold, Norreys, Collett, O'Connor Don, &c, &c. The whole was extremely satisfactory, every word was minutely and carefully and temperately canvassed...'



But Wyse went on to complain at length of O'Ferrall's attempts to obstruct the process:

'... He opposed not the document only, but the whole proceeding - thought it could answer no possible purpose, no one would sign it, it would be torn in pieces by O'Connell - finally were we prepared if our party came in to adopt it? ... We laughed openly at his idea of its embarrassing a future ministry - and said if they did not - whoever they might be - support these just and feasible demands - "they had no right to take office - and the right not assured, they would soon have to leave it and the sooner the better" ... He made no sort of impression .. (He is) under the tow of his master instead of above it and more servile than even what is demanded by his former and future superior.. Of course having gone so far he will not again join us .. Even O'Brien is sometimes disgusted by his paltry, truckling, insidious conduct and almost tempted to give up.

We place our solemn remonstrance on record, against the conduct pursued towards the country - call for redress - & warn this country of the consequences of refusal - We at least shall have done our duty - We have done in and out of Parliament our best. We know also there is a powerful neutral or intermediate party in Dublin who will at once find in this document a sort of confession of faith and a bond of Union.. We have taken the greatest pains with the language and opinions so as to offend none, but to be perfectly plain and incontrovertible to all - I think after much work we have or shall have succeeded. I don't care one jot what O'Connell may say or not say on the matter - and as to effect upon my claims to future office - into a Ministry I would not go on other conditions. Such a Ministry as would not carry out these views would not, nor ought to, endure a day. I at all events will never hesitate between office & my country - I never have - and respect myself far too much now to begin.' 97

There is a strong suggestion here - reinforcing the lesson of the July 18 meeting - that the Whig leadership did not approve of the Remonstrance plan - presumably because it could embarrass a future ministry, assuming the character of a manifesto to which they would become committed. While Wyse adopted a fairly independent stance vis-a-vis the Whig leaders, O'Ferrall appears to have opted for the security of following 'his former and future superior', Russell, as he had wished to do over the Arms Bill too:

'Thank God up to this time we can quote his own experience against him. Had his advice been taken on the Arms Bill discussion - or on O'Brien's motion - not one single word would have been uttered in Parliament... we saved our body & country from the disgrace of offering to Parliament our submission to an Arms Bill - provided Government withdraw theirs.' 98

Ward's motion drew attention back to the Church, on which issue Wyse  
99  
displayed his customary optimism. And the 'last debate on Lord John's  
100  
motion was capital. Ministers are certainly very much shaken.' This was a reference to Russell's motion on the 'State of the Nation' on the 28th of July. Ireland featured prominently in the speeches, though few Irishmen



took part. George Wyse did not share his brother's enthusiasm. He criticized Russell's 'gratuitous' statement about the illegality of the monster meetings in Ireland, 'clearly indicating', he thought, 'that had he been in power, similar modes of coercion would have been adopted. As regards this country (Ireland) this speech is as unfortunate as his Finality one previous to the dissolution. One almost imagines that he so expressed himself in order to keep Peel & Co. in office, until this

101

Repeal war was at an end.'

Wyse also discussed the widespread expectation of a ministerial collapse:

'Many indeed apprehend it may be too soon, I one of them - If there be a change - it must be one of principles and one that can & will be worked out. It is not worth while walking up stairs for the pleasure of being kicked down again ....

Our Remonstrance is not yet completed. I was in the Chair today from 1. to 4. O'Brien is quite out of patience & had he anticipated so much cavil & opposition would never have undertaken it. Not so I - I laugh at his want of experience. This is mere human nature ... I doubt .. whether we shall have more than 15 or 20.' 102

On the 4th of August he reported:

'We are proceeding in our good work, but am sorry to say amidst much disagreement and obstacle. O'Brien was with me early yesterday with the "Remonstrance"... Our numerous changes have greatly improved it, and I now think, tho' in many points not so strong as he and I would have desired, yet as strong as we could (to meet others) make it, and on the whole more vigorous than from what early conversations with our party & others we had reason to expect (sic). We had two paragraphs on the Financial question, which appeared to O'Brien and me very important if not essential, but after very long discussions on all its bearings, we were left by the Committee in a minority of two (he and I) and obliged to withdraw it. The paragraph also with reference to the Repeal was more precise and energetic. Villiers Stuart proposed an amendment which softened it considerably down, and which, in order to gain general acquiescence, was also conceded. It still stands however a manifesto of which no Irishman not a Tory need be ashamed, and with many points on which even Tories must coincide.' 103

The Remonstrance (see Appendix 1) has been referred to several times in previous chapters. It merely summarized the grievances discussed in Parliament. There is evidence of more agreement on Ireland's grievances than upon the required remedies, though on several points the document is remarkably forthright, albeit vague, notably in demanding 'perfect equality' between the different religions in Ireland. The remonstrants



concluded by warning that every day's delay in attending to Irish grievances added to the strength of the Repeal movement. The importance of the Remonstrance lies in its function as the manifesto of a would-be liberal-unionist party. Wyse went on to describe the next stage:

'As Chairman, and for the trouble I had taken throughout, O'Brien requested me to take the first place in signing it, and at all hazard of sounding jealous, I thought it right to do so. I fixed my name, and he his - and undertook to get the signatures of the other members in the House - We agreed also on a circular to be addressed to absent members for their names on authority to sign - We shall omit none. On going down to the House about 7 I found O'Brien much disappointed. He had been able to procure very few names. Even those who had first approved hesitated. V. Stuart, who had been with us in all the discussions, and had drawn up (a draft of) an Address himself, doubted. Lord Clements refused me plump, ... saying it was a proceeding he did not approve of, did not like parts ... Somerville .. said he agreed with every word, an excellent document, but it would do no good - it put us in a false position & ( ) would not sign. O'Connor Don, who had also taken part in our councils, had declined - Repeal cut? - (it would be attacked by O'Connell - this the true motive) - and would not sign. Sheil, who had promised the day before & had highly approved the movement to me - as well as O'Brien - "would sign if O'Brien wished it, to oblige him", but O'Brien purposely and indignantly refused. O'Ferrall of course not only will not, but is laughing and enjoying the refusals. Carew hesitated, but I succeeded in showing him how innocent at least the proceeding was - it was not more than each and all had been saying in their speeches & addresses to constituents and would have to say and much more again - he signed. Notwithstanding all this, we have succeeded in getting 15 signatures so far, and I think we may hope for 10 more. But this is not what ought to have been the case. The universal representation on our side of the House should have signed it. They will yet have to regret their pusillanimous conduct, to give it no more unkindly or truer name.

I make no comment on the conduct of these men, but I observed to O'Brien, who was much annoyed and indignant at such tergiversation, that this was too much the case with our Irish politicians & he would not be surprised if he knew them as well as I did. We have every courage but moral courage. That we want. He said, had he anticipated half what he had met or experienced from our own side, he never would have touched the subject. I would - & time will prove me right. It .. brought out the real stuff ... I am quite persuaded that whatever late or future ministers may say the mind and character of both countries will do us justice. As I often say to O'Brien, "Fais ce que dois ..." As to Ministers, they will come to us and our friends, we need not go to them.' 104

It is clear from the above that it was not 'an Irish Members of  
105  
Parliament London Conference of 29 M.P.'s' which drew up the Remonstrance. The 29 signatories consisted of 14 or 15 original adherents; Wyse said 15, but there were only 14 signatures already on the printed circular sent to  
106  
absent members. The others were added later, several in response to the circulars.

Wyse wrote a second letter on the 4th of August:



'.... think of Clements, Somerville, Sheil!, Blake!! remaining still obdurate each on their own grounds. I renewed the attack last night and this morning, without effect. Clements pleaded even disapproval of the general tenor .. had already taken too prominent a part - would assist in carrying out the measures, but did not like to afford his signature to a pledge!! ... Somerville again expressed assent to each clause - or paragraph - but it could answer no purpose here or in Ireland. Sheil stumbles at one of the paragraphs ... but approves of every other. He deprecates however the whole movement, thinks it will lead to no good - and prove very embarrassing to ministerialists.'

After making a jibe about Sheil's desire to return to the Treasury, Wyse again made it clear that he had a conception of overriding national interests:

'I said to him - "I tell you, Sheil, neither Lord John or any other can think of returning to office unless they are willing and declare themselves willing and now promise to give us these and perhaps greater demands - or if they did they would have to walk out in a month or two .. For my part, I am quite sure no Irish Representative would or ought to have a choice. Even as a party man now is the time to speak out and let there be no doubt or question of the matter" ...

In the meantime Chapman has joined - and Sir M (ontague) is strongly for it. All our letters are gone off today (printed Circulars) to the remaining liberal members, to authorize their signatures to be affixed without delay.

The point is, very few, not O'Brien himself, is sufficiently aware how parties lie in Ireland. They are ignorant of the existence certainly of the wishes and influence of the intermediate party ... depend upon it, they will join heartily - You will see every shade of Irish liberal politics - even the Federalists - will find themselves reflated ... Others again are in great fear that O'Connell will interfere and carve document and signers (sic) without mercy. My answer is always he will not - & 'quand même' - It is right, in the face of a thousand O'Connells. But we are not such fools as to leave it in doubt. O'Connor Don has been induced to write to him, in forwarding the circular, and should he not sign request at least his neutrality.

O'F(errall) I have not seen and O'Brien & I are agreed not even to ask him. O'Brien thinks he will yet sign - but this is a mere matter of accident. Had we the rest of the Irish (even intermediate) representation, he would ask leave from Lord John - get it - and boast afterwards to 107 English members that he and he only had been at the bottom .. of the whole.'

The counting out of the House on Ward's motion was another disappointment. In Wyse's next letter, the full extent of O'Brien's frustration was revealed:

'O'Brien is impatient and can't endure any longer delay. I had him with me three hours on Sunday in Kensington Gardens. We were talking over every bearing of this most momentous subject - and agreeing on all but one. He is decided on leaving Parliament and throwing himself into the Repeal movement in November, if nothing be done in the interval by the Government. Now what can! (sic) - once Parliament is up - they are simply administrative. I have done all I could to change this resolution - but he is more than firm - obstinate. He is sick of begging - and will beg no longer - ten years he has been doing, and without avail, nothing else. He will bring the matter soon to a crisis - tho' he is sacrificed & sacrificed he must be, in the attempt. I did all I could to deter him, not on private but



public ground, in vain... We shall all be considered in the House not as the intermediate party we now are but as Repealers in transition - and lose much of that influence which as moderates we hold. Our declarations will go for little more in and outside of the House, but milk and water Repeal spectres. It will sow distrust amongst our own body, as you must perceive not by any means subdued - and go far I am afraid to break us up altogether as a party. I shall feel it particularly for on him and one or two more only can I thoroughly rely. He wants me to take up the same movement anew next year, and we discussed the propriety of my giving notice at the close of the Session of a motion at the commencement of the next for a Committee of the whole House to consider a series of Resolutions carrying out the several demands of our Remonstrance, but though willing enough to take such lead on myself, were he still with us, I greatly fear it would be ineffective after such a retreat as his ....

I am greatly afraid he has more enthusiasm than experience. I expressed to him the want of heart and soul and honesty and honor and firmness of the men with whom he was about to unite. His only answer was, "Is it right? - I have been considering all that and will not be deterred from fixing a course because of its supporters. I have done my duty for two years now unceasingly.. We have no hope from anything else". I endeavoured to show how much had been gained & how much more might ere long. Nothing made impression and I am sure you will see his declaration ere long.

Should such be the case, O'F(errall) and S(heil) and the rest will set the whole down to vanity and interpret all the Remonstrance movement as a mere trick. He and I the workers - the other Irish members the dupes. No matter - they have no right to judge him. They cannot understand such a man.' 108

As Wyse anticipated, O'Connell's reaction to the Remonstrance was not altogether unfavourable. He felt he could not appear to accept anything less than Repeal, and that the English did not have enough sympathy with the Irish people to render a call on them to redress Irish grievances anything but futile. However, though for these reasons he would not sign the document, he called on other repealers to sign it if they chose, adding that all signatories were thereby committed to repeal if the grievances set forth were not remedied. George Wyse realized that O'Connell's ambiguous response could have a mischievous effect:

'By the proceedings in the Association you will see that you have judged correctly as to Dan's opposition. He accepts it as a Repeal document "in future" and calls on every one to sign it. What will O'F(errall) & S(heil) now say to it? They must sign it or bid adieu to all possible chance of office. You may rely upon its being adopted as the pledge on all future Elections, & that no Government can rule this country without pledging themselves to adopt it as their rule of conduct. I perceive that O'Connell gives the merit of it to O'Brien ... I think it just as well it should be so considered at present - as growing out of the rejection of the motion made by him. The vote which the Association has come to may possibly deter O'Ferrall & others from joining.

You must warn the English people of the dangers of refusing these demands or neglecting even their examination ....'



George Wyse also opined that O'Brien should continue in his present course for another session '& test how far this remonstrance has been received in England. So early a (junction) as November certainly places you & the rest in an unfair position.' Far from growing out of the failure of O'Brien's motion in July the Remonstrance was, of course, envisaged by several Irish members more than a month beforehand.

Meanwhile responses to the circulars were coming in from Irish liberal members. The Smith O'Brien Papers contain brief notes giving the assent of Thomas Redington, Sir David Roche, Sir H. W. Barron, Henry Grattan, Wm. Macnamara, Sir Andrew Armstrong and Benjamin Chapman (an authority of Sir Montague, his elder brother). M. Blake, Pierce Butler and Caleb Powell declined, on the grounds that the document, in Blake's words, 'contemplates continuation of the Union.' Fitzstephen French declined on other grounds; 'Tho' concurring in the greater part, I do not assent to all it contains.' The Government had made some Catholic appointments, he wrote; and he did not approve of the Wyse-Musgrave system of county boards, which the Remonstrance appeared to have recommended. And 'I also think the repeal of the present poor law should occupy a prominent position amongst our demands. This is not touched on.' The omission of any mention of the poor law is indeed surprising, given O'Brien's deep interest in the subject and the resistance it aroused in Ireland. It is perhaps reasonable to suggest that the issue proved too divisive to permit agreement.

Wyse commented that,

'Notwithstanding all croaking and (canting) - opposition from official, ex official and official expectant - Whig and Repealer, O'Brien and I have already got 30 names (out of which only two repealers) and have no doubt we should have many more had we time or patience to wait. O'Brien thinks of leaving immediately and says we ought not to delay beyond Thursday. It is not possible to get at Cave, Bellew and one or two others, and Layard (why no one understands), Clements, Somerville, Blake (repealer?) still refuse.'

The papers here have not noticed it more than in Ireland, I suppose owing to private influences ... When sent officially from us the case may be different. O'Brien tells me the Pilot is laudatory ... O'Brien and I propose to send copies to all the Dublin and principal London papers, with notes in most cases, so that we shall put to the test whether they will



insert and notice or not.... I am not very anxious on the matter, it is more in the view of a historic document, to which we may hereafter have frequently to recur, both in and out of Parliament, as justification of future proceedings, than as an appeal designed or likely to produce immediate & especially popular effect, that I think it of value.' 116

This seems at odds with Wyse's earlier hopes that the Remonstrance, as the culmination of the skilful manoeuvres of the Irish liberals in Parliament during the summer, would stimulate British public opinion to sympathy with Irish complainants.

The response of the British and Irish press was indeed meagre. The principal Whig/Liberal papers in London, The Globe and The Morning Chronicle, both carried the Remonstrance, but the former did not comment editorially and the comments of the Chronicle, though laudatory, were cursory. In Ireland the Evening Post carried the document, but editorial comment consisted of the briefest of references to 'the great importance' of 'the admirable address.' The reaction of the other leading liberal-unionist paper, the Northern Whig, to this 'important document' was even more desultory. The Pilot, probably taking a cue from O'Connell, praised 'the admirable protest of the manly band of Irish members', though they claimed that it was the Repeal agitation which was 'the moral power at their backs.' The more independent Freeman's Journal denounced the 'tame and inconclusive document' for the failure to support its demands with a threat to turn to Repeal. 'We cannot conceive anything more foolish' than a demand possessed of no sort of sanction to force compliance. The Tory Mail scoffed at O'Connell's 'dupes'. 117

Duffy subsequently wrote that,

'The address was probably as little heeded as the appeals and remonstrances of Hancock and Franklin to the British nation, two generations earlier; it was scarcely published in the Government organs and found no echo even in the Whig press.' 118

Wyse continued to plead with O'Brien:

'The course I have been suggesting to O'Brien for future proceedings is simple.... I strenuously continue to advise him to keep his position and work on at least for another session; much may occur in that time; and it is of moment for him and us & above all all our cause that everything should be done firmly, coolly, patiently, but perseveringly. We have attained, whatever some carpers may say, character on that head



already. I cautioned him as to the results of his step, even on the cause he was about to espouse. I know the men too well, whatever the mass of the people may be, their chiefs are hollowness .. the vileness and iniquity of these underhand politicians ... he has at last promised he will not only do nothing before November, but keep altogether out of the way... Should Parliament not meet however in November he means he says to join the Association... My plan is quite other (sic). I never was in less love with Repeal, or less likely to be persuaded of its advantage to Ireland.. I think its success would be a most fatal blow, and as far as I am concerned, be the signal of my instantly retiring from public life and the country. I know the hundred-headed tyranny which would be established and the thousand factions that would spring up .. under our feet. We have great enthusiasm - no moral courage - I doubt much whether we ever shall. Without that there is little permanent public virtue ... England would watch her opportunity - & conquer us again with ourselves.

We are not decided whether I shall give notice or not - but quite resolved to begin the next session with a general motion on Ireland - taking each of our demands 'seriatim' and throwing them into the form of resolutions with "It is just and expedient that &c" & proceeding. This of course after a week's debate will be negatived - and then I purpose the ~~second~~ portion of our proceedings - Each Irish member (capable of the task) to take one of our demands and give notice of some motion which will bring it forward, so that we thus should be enabled to fill the entire session with this succession of Irish questions. To do this effectively, Irish members must show great determination and coolness & concert, and the want of these qualities after late experience is what I most fear. If carried out, as I understand it - I have little doubt of its effect. I do not undervalue in the meantime O'Connell's cooperation in Ireland. He understands the question thoroughly - no better proof than the manner he has dealt with our Remonstrance ...' 120

Interestingly, Wyse's plans for the next session followed precisely  
121  
the advice given to him some weeks earlier by Thomas Davis. Wyse still resented O'Ferrall's conduct:

'O'Ferrall said characteristically a few nights since - when sitting beside me on the front benches. "The whole thing (the Rem.) depends on circumstances. If it fails, it is not only waste paper, but worse - such a production if not noticed does great harm - if otherwise, & I think (he might have added, & fear) it will (sic), it becomes historic and of great moment".' 122

George Wyse felt that O'Ferrall, Sheil, Cave, Bellew, French, Somerville and Clements all refused in order to improve their chances of office under the Whigs:

'Poor and miserable calculators!! They seem to forget that they must pass the ordeal of a vote on all & each of these questions, for I presume you will systematically put them to the test. It is not fair they should escape. Try them on each question & vote. They must declare themselves. I hope the press will not let them off... At all events you have done your duty.' 123

The Wyse letters for the next couple of months are not extant. O'Brien went to Europe on the 19th of August 1843, lest he 'should be led to form



a precipitate decision' on Repeal. He was 'anxious to get out of the way of Politics for a few weeks being tired to death after six months of unavailing toil.' He had already decided that he would not 'return to the British House of Commons after the expiration of the present year. I cannot afford to waste the whole of my life in fruitless efforts to serve my country & I have long been of opinion that I should be more useful at home.'<sup>124</sup>

By the time of his return in mid-October, the Government had proclaimed the Repeal meeting at Clontarf and begun the prosecution of O'Connell and eight other Repealers. On the 20th of October O'Brien sent in his subscription to the Repeal Association. In explaining his decision to the Secretary of the Association O'Brien described his growing sense of disillusionment over the years as Parliament treated Ireland like 'a dependent tributary province.' The 'entreaties and expostulations' addressed by the Irish liberals to the Government during the previous session were all 'in vain'. Their 'last appeal to the British people .., the friendly remonstrance of men averse to agitation and for the most part favourable to the Union, was treated with neglect, ridicule, or defiance.' But still 'a hope remained on my mind' that the Government would recall Parliament 'and submit some general system of conciliatory measures' for the 'tranquillization' of Ireland. Instead they 'have resolved to deprive us even of the liberty of complaint.' So, 'reluctantly convinced that Ireland has nothing to hope from the sagacity, the justice, or the generosity of the English Parliament, my reliance shall henceforth be placed upon our own native energy and patriotism.'<sup>125</sup>

It is clear from Wyse's letter of the 8th of August that O'Brien was almost decided on joining the repealers by the 6th of August, before the Remonstrance was made public, not to speak of Clontarf and the State Prosecutions. A possible factor which O'Brien did not publicize was his disappointment in his own colleagues. According to Wyse he was sickened by the negotiations with and eventual response of the liberal-unionists.

Also the outcome of the July 18 meeting with the British Whig leaders and their conduct on the Arms Bill can hardly have been satisfactory. There is no record of O'Brien's reaction to the defeat of his motion in July, but Wyse's triumphant account of the debate dictates caution before describing it as a disappointment.

O'Brien's mother was greatly upset by his 'selfish' and 'heartless' <sup>126</sup> decision to proclaim himself 'a Rebel and a supporter of Rebels.'

Palmerston and Monteagle were cynical about the whole affair. The former wrote,

'I see Smith O'Brien is said to have declared himself a Repealer. These Irish members from the south are obliged to yield to the feelings of their constituents, and such conversions therefore mean just nothing at all, but that the converts wish to keep their seats.'

It was an example of 'low selfishness' in Monteagle's view. <sup>127</sup> At any rate, it was a sad reflection on the prospects of the liberal-unionist campaign that one of its principal figures effectively pronounced it a failure. And O'Brien was followed soon afterwards into the ranks of the Repealers by John O'Brien, one of the members for the City of Limerick. His opposition to their 'perilous' and 'impracticable' experiment was overcome, apparently, by the Government's demonstration by the 'late arbitrary invasion of popular rights' that there was no longer hope of <sup>128</sup> 'concession of the just demands of Ireland.'

<sup>129</sup> Wyse remained aloof from Repeal. His intentions in 1843 are fairly clear from his correspondence. His object involved more than the undermining of either the Repeal movement or the Conservative Government. There was a positive side too: he wished to establish liberal-unionism as the vehicle by which conciliation of Ireland's grievances could be achieved in the British Parliament. This would involve the moulding of a cohesive liberal-unionist party. Success would stem the Repeal tide, which Wyse seems to have regarded more as an opportunity for him than a threat to the Union. Wyse generally - though he vacillated on this point - did not expect that Peel's Government would fall; but he did expect that the



Tory approach to the government of Ireland would have to be abandoned in the face of pressure from the Repealers in Ireland and from a cohesive Irish opposition in Parliament. In sum, Wyse envisaged a consolidation of the liberal-unionist party and of the liberal-unionist approach to Irish affairs.

It is difficult to estimate the extent to which other liberal-unionists shared Wyse's ends. He mentioned O'Brien, Ross, Crawford, Redington and Norreys as fellow-schemers at an early stage. <sup>130</sup> Those who refused to sign the Remonstrance were probably not enthusiastic about a forceful Parliamentary party, particularly those who were sensitive to the threat an independent group would offer to the British Whig leaders. At any rate, the mixed response of the Irish members to the Remonstrance suggests that Wyse's hopes of a cohesive liberal-unionist party capable of dictating a conciliatory Irish policy to the Government were not well founded. The effect of their Parliamentary activities on Government policy is debatable. Peel's reluctance to coerce and his decision to follow a more conciliatory course were principally a direct response to events in Ireland. Wyse, as shown in the next chapter, subsequently attempted to secure, through O'Brien, the support of the Repeal members in Parliament, possibly an admission that the independent strategy of 1843 had failed. And O'Brien's defection and withdrawal from Parliament demonstrate that he believed the strategy was not succeeding. It would, however, be a mistake to dismiss entirely the exploits of the liberal-unionists in 1843. They constituted a vigorous effort to impose a liberal-unionist solution to the greatest crisis experienced by unionism in the first three quarters of the nineteenth century.

## Chapter 8

1. Hansard, 59, 450-5, 27 Aug. 1841, Division.
2. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4B, f154, Russell to Duncannon, 8 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, f185, Palmerston to Russell, 12 Oct. 1841; *ibid*, f227, Howick to Russell, 20 Nov. 1841. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 47-50. On more general aspects of the shortcomings of the Whig Opposition, see Ellice Papers, MS 15010, f35, Ellice to Damer, 21 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, MS 15044, f74, Ellice to Parkes, 25 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, MS 15058, f77, Clarendon to Ellice, 27 Sept. 1841. The Greville Memoirs, V, 28-9, 1 Sept. 1842.
3. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 495, f379, Tennent to Peel, 25 Nov. 1841.
4. 'I am quite surprised that you are not well pleased with Peel's appointments; depend upon it that the man who gets on the shelf Lord Ellenborough and his notions on corn, Perceval with his Orangeism, Dawson with his wild indiscretion, and rides the House of Commons of Lefroy & Sugden, has either great talent or great luck', Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 431, f809, Ferguson to O'Brien, 23 Dec. 1841.
5. DEM, 20, 27, 29 Oct., 10 Nov. 1841, 11 May, 20 July, 2, 23 Nov. 1842.
6. DEM, 20 July, 10 Aug. 1842, 19 Jan., 1 Feb. 1843.
7. DEM, 29 Sept., 1 Nov., 13, 15, 22 Dec. 1841, 31 Jan., 4 Feb., 22 April, 18 May, 10 Aug., 11 Nov. 1842, 9 Jan., 3, 13, 15 Feb. 1843.
8. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 27 Sept. 1842. Also, *ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 3 July 1842. The Greville Memoirs, V, 29-30, 1 Sept. 1842.
9. DEM, 3, 26, 28 Jan. 1842.
10. DEM, 17, 24 Jan. 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f60, 70, Eliot to Peel, 8, 20 Jan. 1842.
11. Hansard, 60, 740-3, 21 Feb. 1842, Layard; 60, 814-28, 22 Feb. 1842, Crawford, Powell, M. J. O'Connell; 60, 1021-3, 1082-8, 24 Feb. 1842, Stuart, Division; 61, 362-9, 9 March 1842, Sheil; 64, 1365-7, 11 July 1842, Division.
12. Hansard, 60, 1221-3, 28 Feb. 1842, Division.
13. Hansard, 61, 1142-6, 23 March 1842, O'Brien; 61, 1253-4, 4 April 1842, Crawford; 62, 139-53, 8 April 1842, Somerville, Sheil; 62, 444-50, 13 April 1842, Division; 62, 703, 710-3, 18 April 1842, Crawford, Division; 62, 1040-3, 22 April 1842, Division.
14. Hansard, 62, 982-4, 21 April 1842; 63, 82-91, 3 May 1842; 64, 418-21, 21 June 1842, Divisions.
15. Hansard, 65, 243-315, 18 July 1842, Sheil, Somerville, M. J. O'Connell, Buller, Palmerston, Division.
16. DEM, 20, 25 July, 12 Aug. 1842.
17. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/63, Russell to Peel, 23 July 1842. Graham Papers, 11R, Graham to De Grey, 19 July 1842; De Grey to Graham, 20, 21 July 1842.
18. Hansard, 70, 316-7, 23 June 1843, Peel.



19. Hansard, 66, 887-92, 17 Feb. 1843, Division; 67, 968-70, 15 March 1843, French, O'Brien, Norreys; 67, 1347-1406, 23 March 1843, O'Brien, Norreys, Crawford, Barron, French, Ferguson, Ross, Division.
20. DEM, 10 April 1843. Ferguson, Crawford, Esmonde, Ross, Stuart, Stock and Layard were the Irish liberals involved. Ross brought the question up, briefly, in Parliament. Hansard, 68, 329-30, 3 April 1843, Ross.
21. Hansard, 69, 407-11, 15 May 1843, Division; 69, 747-51, 22 May 1843, Division; 69, 974-9, 26 May 1843, Divisions; 69, 993-5, 29 May 1843, Division; 69, 1285-8, 2 June 1843, Division; 69, 1576-8, 15 June 1843, Division.
22. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1095, Maurice O'Connell to O'Brien, (1844); *ibid*, f1116, 1117, O'Conor Don to O'Brien, 29, 30 Jan. 1844. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 2 Oct. 1845. Duffy, Four years of Irish History, 188. FJ, 8 Aug. 1843. The Times, 21 July 1843. Graham Papers, 6IR, De Grey to Graham, 25 Oct. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 27 Oct. 1843; 24IR, Smith to Haytesbury, 5 Oct. 1845, Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/54, f73-6, Pigot to Russell, 19 Jan. 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f481, Haytesbury to Peel, 4 Oct. 1845.
23. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 31 July 1843; *ibid*, (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
24. Powell did not join the Association until October 1843, but, as O'Connell then said, he had already been a 'repealer' for some time'. He chose to boycott Parliament in 1843, and was one of the first magistrates superseded for repeal activities in May 1843. DEM, 24 April, 5 June, 23 Aug. 1843. The Times, 1 June, 26 Oct. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f319, Sugden to Peel, 27 May 1843. Duffy, Young Ireland, 382.
25. Graham Papers, 60B, De Grey to Graham, 30 April 1843.
26. *Ibid*, 61C, Sugden to Graham, 25 May 1843; Graham to De Grey, 29 May 1843; Graham to Sugden, 29 May 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, Hamilton to Peel, 20 June 1843.
27. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f289, Graham to Peel, 6 May 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, I, 46.
28. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 May 1843.
29. Hansard, 68, 1001, 27 April 1843, Fox.
30. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 May 1843. On the 28th of April, O'Brien gave notice of three resolutions he would move as an amendment to Fox's motion. They asked the House to inquire whether the recent upsurge of repeal was not due to Parliament's failure to tend to Ireland's needs and to the 'overbearing, exclusive, and anti-national spirit in which the affairs of Ireland have been administered', and called for early consideration of measures for Ireland. Hansard, 68, 1027, 28 April 1843, O'Brien.
31. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 May 1843.
32. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f965, O'Brien to Lucy O'Brien, 9 May 1843.
33. DEM, 31 May 1843, O'Brien to Raleigh, Town-Clerk of Limerick, 19 May 1843.



34. Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (10), O'Brien to Bourke, 25 May 1843.
35. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15, 16 May 1843; *ibid*, MS 15018 (4), Wyse diary, 16 May 1843.
36. Sheil Papers, MS 11, 138 (2), Sheil to wife, (May 1843).
37. Hansard, 68, 1011, 27 April 1843, Eliot.
38. Hansard, 69, 1152, 30 May 1843, Stuart; 70, 19-20, 16 June 1843, Stuart; 70, 1093-4, 13 July 1843, Stuart.
39. DEM, 12 July 1843. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), George Wyse to Wyse, 11 July 1843.
40. The bill was amended in several important aspects: the omission of the blacksmiths clause, the defining of arms as firearms only, increased restrictions on the powers of search, reduction of proposed penalties, reduction of the duration of the bill to three years.
41. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 20 June, 31 July 1843. Hansard, 69, 1061, 29 May 1843, Russell; 70, 384-5, 26 June 1843, Russell.
42. Hansard, 69, 1052-3, 29 May 1843, Smith; 69, 1115, 30 May 1843, Bernard; 69, 1192-4, 1210-1, 31 May 1843, Roebuck, Peel; 69, 15 June 1843, Eliot; 70, 298-301, 23 June 1843, Peel; 71, 456, 9 Aug. 1843, Peel.
43. Hansard, 69, 1010-5, 29 May 1843, Crawford; 69, 1100, 1121, 1124, 30 May 1843, Ross, Layard, Watson.
44. Hansard, 69, 1020-1, 29 May 1843, Clements; 69, 1150, 30 May 1843, M. J. O'Connell; 70, 384, 26 June 1843, Clements. Ross and others charged, and many ~~others~~ seemed to imply, that the bill amounted to a coercive measure directed against the current repeal agitation. But the bill was simply not of that nature; in particular it did not deal with public meetings. And the bill was prepared in 1842 and notice given early in the present session, before the repeal upsurge. Hansard, 69, 1188, 31 May 1843, Listowel; 69, 1612, 15 June 1843, Ross; 70, 138, 19 June 1843, M. J. O'Connell; 70, 323-4, 23 June 1843, Ross. Graham Papers, 71R, De Grey to Graham, 7, 19 March, 27 May 1842; Graham Cabinet memo, 30 May 1842; Graham to De Grey, 2, 4, 19 June 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f105, 113, De Grey to Peel, 13, 15 July 1843.
45. Hansard, 69, 1013, 29 May 1843, Crawford; 69, 1163, 31 May 1843, J. O'Brien; 69, 1188, 31 May 1843, Listowel; 69, 1612, 15 June 1843, Ross; 70, 1359-60, 27 July 1843, Crawford.
46. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 June 1843.
47. *Ibid.*
48. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, 11 June, n.d. June 1843.
49. DEM, 29, 31 May 1843. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f988, Sugden to O'Brien, 1 June 1843.
50. DEM, 14 June 1843, O'Brien to Ray, 9 June 1843.
51. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 June 1843.
52. Hansard, 70, 1099-1189, 14 July 1843. The Government won the division by 91 votes to 29.



53. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f239, 305, Peel to Sugden, 31 May, 1 June 1843; *ibid.*, f309, 320, Sugden to Peel, 2, 4 June 1843; *ibid.*, MS 40, 448, f303, Graham to Peel, 1 June 1843. Graham Papers, 62A, Graham to De Grey, 2 June 1843; 31R, Graham to Sugden, 3, 7 June 1843.
54. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 June 1843.
55. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 8 June 1843.
56. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/73, Russell to Palmerston, 29 May 1843.
57. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 8 June 1843.
58. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 12 June 1843.
59. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 14 June 1843.
60. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 17 June 1843.
61. Speaking on Wyse's motion Graham seemed to imply that Irish Catholics were ungrateful for Emancipation and other concessions, and that conciliation in Ireland had 'been carried to its utmost limits', a blunder which liberals mercilessly for weeks. Hansard, 70, 52, 16 June 1843, Graham. (exploited)
62. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 17 June 1843.
63. On his motion for a select committee. In fact, the division went 276 to 122 against Wyse. Hansard, 70, 142-5, 19 June 1843, Division.
64. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 20 June 1843.
65. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 26 June 1843.
66. DEM, 28 June 1843, O'Brien to Maher, 20 June 1843.
67. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f1011, O'Brien to Lucy O'Brien, 24 June 1843.
68. Graham Papers, 41R, Graham to De Grey, 27 June 1843; 91R, Graham to De Grey, 9 July 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f165, Peel to Farnham, 20 July 1843.
69. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f1012, Powell to O'Brien, 27 June 1843.
70. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 3 July 1843.
71. *Ibid.*, Wyse to George Wyse, 3 July 1843 (second letter).
72. DEP, 29 June, 8 July 1843.
73. Hansard, 70, 560, 3 July 1843, Peel.
74. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to Delahunty, 3 July 1843. DEP, 11 July 1843.
75. DEP, 11, 20 July 1843.
76. 'That this House will resolve itself into a committee, for the purpose of taking into consideration the causes of the discontent at present prevailing in Ireland, with a view to the redress of



- grievances, and to the establishment of a system of just and impartial government in that part of the United Kingdom' (Hansard, 70, 630-1, 4 July 1843). It appears to be a shortened version of the resolutions which O'Brien had planned to move as an amendment to Lane Fox's coercion motion and later as a substantive motion (Hansard, 68, 1027, 28 April 1843, O'Brien; 68, 1275, 5 May 1843, O'Brien). O'Brien did say in July that he had meant to introduce the motion two months previously (Hansard, 70, 631, 4 July 1843, O'Brien).
77. Hansard, 70, 631-76, 673-82, 694-5, 4 July 1843, O'Brien, Wyse; 70, 777, 787-8, 7 July 1843, Norreys, O'Ferrall; 70, 944, 952, 11 July 1843, Crawford, Ross; 70, 1030-1, 12 July 1843, Barrow.
  78. Hansard, 70, 1088-92, 12 July 1843, Division. Benjamin Chapman voted against the motion, in fact, but later explained that this was an accident (DEP, 15 July 1843). Ferguson and Stuart supported O'Brien.
  79. Hansard, 70, 745-52, 779-80, 7 July 1843, Cochrane, Lascelles; 70, 866-9, 10 July 1843, Rous; 70, 919-24, 11 July 1843, Smythe; 70, 1060-1, 12 July 1843, Manners.
  80. Graham Papers, 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 12 July 1843.
  81. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 11 July 1843. His expectations regarding Gregory and Co. were not realized.
  82. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f1031, O'Shaughnessy to O'Brien, 18 July 1843.
  83. Ibid, f1021, Ray to O'Brien, 7 July 1843; ibid, f1025, Powell to O'Brien, 9 July 1843; ibid, f1030, John O'Connell to O'Brien, 17 July 1843.
  84. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 July 1843.
  85. DEP, 13, 20 July 1843. The Times, 18 July 1843.
  86. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, (17 July 1843).
  87. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/74, Russell to Palmerston, 15 July 1843.
  88. DEP, 25 July 1843.
  89. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, (17 July 1843).
  90. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 64, Russell to Lansdowne, 19 July 1843.
  91. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/74, Russell to Palmerston, 15 July 1843.
  92. DEP, 25 July 1843. DEN, 21 July 1843. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 64, Russell to Lansdowne, 19 July 1843.
  93. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f264, Peel to Brougham, 21 July 1843.
  94. Ibid, f266, Brougham to Peel, July 1843; ibid, MS 40, 478, f119, Peel to De Grey, 24 July 1843. Graham Papers, 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 25, 29 July 1843. Even Murphy quipped that "the penalties are bad enough, but the Clementy worse". The Earl of Ilchester, Elizabeth, Lady Holland to her son, 1821-1845 (London, 1946), 209, Holland to son, 3 July 1843.



95. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 31 July 1843.
96. Ibid, Wyse to George Wyse, 29 July 1843.
97. Ibid, Wyse to George Wyse, 31 July 1843.
98. Ibid..
99. Ibid, Wyse to George Wyse, 1 Aug. 1843. See above, chapter 3.
100. Ibid..
101. Ibid, MS 15020 (6), George Wyse to Wyse, 1 Aug. 1843. Hansard, 70, 1404, 1450-1, 28 July 1843, Russell.
102. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 1 Aug. 1843.
103. Ibid, Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1843.
104. Ibid..
105. A. Mac Intyre, *The Liberator*, 274. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 193.
106. See the circular sent to Redington on the 5th of August (Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1048c). The circular took the form of an invitation to write to Wyse or O'Brien authorizing the addition of one's signature, followed by a copy of the Remonstrance and the printed names of the 14 original signatories.
107. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1843.
108. Ibid, Wyse to George Wyse, 8 Aug. 1843.
109. DEP, 8, 10 Aug. 1843.
110. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), George Wyse to Wyse, 10 Aug. 1843.
111. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1049, Redington to O'Brien, Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1050, Roche to O'Brien, 7 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1052, Barron to O'Brien, 7 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1053, Grattan to O'Brien, 7 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1055, Macnamara to O'Brien, 8 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1056, Armstrong to O'Brien, 8 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1059, M. Chapman to O'Brien, Aug. 1843.
112. *Ibid*, f1054, Blake to O'Brien, 7 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1057, Butler to O'Brien, 8 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f1060, Powell to O'Brien, 11 Aug. 1843.
113. *Ibid*, f1051, French to O'Brien, 7 Aug. 1843.
114. As shown in Chapter 7, liberal divisions on the poor law persisted into the 1840's.
115. Only 29 signatures appeared below the Remonstrance as it was finally published. It is difficult to be sure who were the two repealers referred to by Wyse, probably David Roche and Henry Grattan, but Archbold, James Power and Barron are possibilities.
116. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 Aug. 1843.
117. *The Morning Chronicle*, 10, 24 Aug. 1843. *The Globe*, 9 Aug. 1843.

118. DEP, 8, 26 Aug. 1843. FJ, 8 Aug. 1843. Pilot, 11, 28 Aug. 1843. DEM, 9 Aug. 1843. IW, 8 Aug. 1843.
119. Duffy, Young Ireland, 335.
120. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 Aug. 1843.
121. Wyse Papers, MS 15026 (4), Davis to Wyse, 10 July 1843. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 169.
122. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 Aug. 1843.
123. Ibid, MS 15020 (6), George Wyse to Wyse, 26 Aug. 1843. There is no explanation in the Wyse or O'Brien Papers of the failure of about another dozen liberal-unionists to sign the Remonstrance. One of them, Stock of Cashel, was, in fact, at this time earnestly seeking a legal appointment - that of Judge of the Prerogative Court - from the Government. See Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f325, Smith to Peel, July 1843; ibid, f345, Stock to Peel, 26 July 1843.
124. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 18310 (2), O'Brien to Anne Martineau, 18 Aug. 1843.
125. DEP, 24 Oct. 1843, O'Brien to Ray, 20 Oct. 1843.
126. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1071, 1093, Lady O'Brien to O'Brien, 24 Oct., 25 Dec. 1843.
127. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (5), Monteagle to Napier, 7 Dec. 1843. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4C, f89, 101, Palmerston to Russell, 22 Oct., 22 Dec. 1843. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 65-7.
128. DEM, 3 Nov. 1843, J. O'Brien to Raleigh, 29 Oct. 1843. DEM, 15 Nov. 1843, J. O'Brien to O'Connell, 7 Nov. 1843.
129. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to J. O'Brien of Waterford, 9 Nov. 1843. DEM, 17 Nov. 1843.
130. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 June 1843.



## Chapter 9

## The Liberal-Unionists, 1843-6

The debates of the summer of 1843 dwelt much on the problems of landlord-tenant relations in Ireland, its prominence marking something of a burgeoning revolution in Irish priorities. A number of factors combined to bring this about : evictions increased as a result of disfranchisement of the 40 /- freeholders in 1829 and the growing profitability of larger grazing farms; the tithe reform of 1838 withdrew the clergyman from the frontier of religious warfare and, to a degree, placed the landlord there in his stead; and 1842-3 was a year of agricultural depression in which landlords generally refused to lower rents accordingly. <sup>1</sup> 'Fixity of Tenure' was one of O'Connell's principal cries as he agitated for Repeal. <sup>2</sup> The speakers in Parliament in 1843 rejected this proposal, and even Crawford, the principal agitator of the question and the 'Father of tenant-right', informed Peel that he disclaimed such 'extreme views'. <sup>3</sup> Most regarded legislation on the subject with a degree of diffidence, but some of the Irish members were ready to suggest various remedies. Peel, Graham and Stanley conceded that a Commission of Inquiry was justified by the general state of the peasantry of Ireland, and that the inquiry might show the necessity of legislative enactment to end the excesses of some landlords. <sup>4</sup>

When, on the 9th of August, Crawford brought on his bill to compensate ejected tenants for 'valuable or useful improvements', Peel promised that he would consider the whole question, and this rather vague <sup>5</sup> commitment satisfied the liberal-unionist speakers. In subsequent weeks the subject was discussed by members of the Irish and British Governments and a firm decision was taken to appoint a Commission of Inquiry under the chairmanship of Lord Devon, an English Conservative with extensive estates in Ireland. The principal actors in these discussions hoped that a Commission would 'correct some mal-practices by exposing them', that limited improvements might be effected by subsequent legislation, and that 'at all events sympathy with the sorrows of an entire people

will be evinced by the Government, and the public mind may be softened and soothed in some degree by kindness of purpose and by exposure of injustice'. There was little to suggest that the issuing of the Commission was merely a cynical ploy; indeed Peel wrote that 'the main object of it should rather be to dispel error and effect permanent good by practical and well considered suggestions than to serve any temporary purpose of allaying excitement.'<sup>6</sup>

Some difficulty was encountered in constituting the liberal part of the Commission in the manner desired: two liberal-unionist landlords of which at least one should be a Catholic. O'Ferrall, Lord Carew, Sir Patrick Bellew and William Tighe of Kilkenny all declined to serve; Graham found the refusals 'very embarrassing' and he and De Grey feared that the Irish Whigs would refuse to act through fear of the clamour excited by the subject. However, Redington and Ferguson, the liberal-unionist members for Dundalk and Londonderry, agreed to serve, though De Grey<sup>7</sup> feared that Ferguson would be considered 'a well wisher of the Government'.

O'Connell objected to the fact that the Commission was 'perfectly one-sided - all landlords and no tenants', to its being led by a Conservative, absentee landlord, and to the inclusion of George Hamilton,<sup>8</sup> 'one of the most virulent of sleek-faced Orangists.' Lord Clanricarde, writing to Monteagle, called the Commission 'a puerile mischievous absurdity. They mean, as you say, to shew nothing can be done, but the people will not bow to the authority of those Commissioners, & pro tem<sup>9</sup> they lend their sanction to the cry.' Sir Montague Chapman, former Whig<sup>10</sup> member for Westmeath, called the Commission 'a mischievous foolery.' In the debates at the beginning of the following session, Crawford, Bellew and Fortescue welcomed the Commission, but most liberal speakers were sceptical or downright hostile; many lamented the fact that it contained only landlords, claimed it would produce no new evidence and would raise false and dangerous expectations, argued that immediate legislation was necessary, and asserted that the Government had appointed the Commission<sup>11</sup> merely to evade that necessity.



In spite of the setback of Smith O'Brien's defection, liberal-unionists continued to contrive to carve out a distinctive role. At the end of October 1843, Clanricarde, Anthony Blake, Sheil, Pigot, Ross and Sir Montague Chapman, all liberal-unionists, concocted an address from Irish peers to the Queen. Clanricarde, writing to Monteagle and Palmerston, regarded the address as 'very moderate' and divested 'as far as is possible of party character, .. an expression of opinion upon the general condition of the country, not as opposition to Ministers, but apart from all party-view', though he believed that in thus bringing on 'consideration, at least, of a prudent, conciliatory & steady line of policy for an Irish Government', the address might be 'of use to the country & to the liberal party ...

'... We should shew there are persons interested in Irish affairs who are adverse to the influence & power of the Repeal association but who do not approve these capricious, blundering, fitful starts of energy of the Government that only increase the public disquiet & alarm.. Things never were in such a state as they are here (in Ireland). All classes discuss daily, & familiarly, the greater or less probability of civil war, massacres & conflagrations ... The legitimate authorities have no power or influence in the country. They hold it simply in military occupation ... The Government are supremely ridiculous & ridiculed ... the good, civil government of Ireland is a difficult matter undoubtedly & made tenfold more so by their blunders.' 12

The Address expressed 'alarm' at the 'perilous condition' of Ireland, declared the insufficiency of the 'use of force', urged 'a healing system' of 'comprehension and conciliatory legislation .. to win the attachment of the great body of the people', and prayed the Queen to call Parliament together to pursue that course. 13 Clanricarde wrote 'many letters' to Irish peers and, though Lansdowne demurred on the grounds that no such initiative should be taken before the end of O'Connell's trial, Russell approved and the Duke of Leinster and 'abt. 14 more' peers agreed to sign. Clanricarde, however, was undecided about proceeding and may have been confirmed by Monteagle in the view that as they were 'so near the certain meeting of Parliament .. it may be absurd to ask for greater hurry'. At 14 any rate the Address was apparently abandoned.

Clanricarde and Monteagle agreed that the Government were 'right to interfere' to stop the Repeal agitation, but, wrote Clanricarde, 'not by



coercion alone'; and he disapproved of the decision to prosecute O'Connell. The prosecution could succeed only by means of a 'packed' jury, rendering trial by jury 'a farce for years to come' and leading to 'murders & bloodshed'. If O'Connell were acquitted, 'what a triumph for him! & what an addition to the strength of his hold over the people.' The Government would then come to Parliament for coercive powers, but 'how can they come to accuse people who they confess have done nothing to subject them to legal blame? & whose proceedings they permitted all last session?'.<sup>15</sup>

Cloncurry publicly described his fear that a partial jury would convict O'Connell and his view that no impartial jury would convict upon the existing evidence.<sup>16</sup> The fact that the liberal-unionists Pigot, Sheil and Mahony agreed to serve as counsel for O'Connell and his fellow Traversers is further evidence that some liberal-unionists deprecated the prosecutions. Pigot and others wrote to Russell to lament the tendency of the prosecutions to drive unionists to Repeal, and Lansdowne feared that the action against O'Connell had 'much exasperated' the agitation.<sup>17</sup> Many of the British Whig leaders were concerned at the state of Ireland at this time and particularly that prosecution would merely make O'Connell 'till the end of the trial a hero, & when convicted a martyr', raising '10 repealers for 1', though Palmerston could not 'forgive him his wicked endeavours to get up hatred of peace between the Irish and the Saxon, as he calls us, and shall not be sorry if the prosecution succeeds.'<sup>18</sup>

In the meantime, Wyse continued to work on the Parliamentary strategy. He and his colleagues ('We') planned in August, as shown above, to begin the session with a general motion in Ireland and to follow it up with motions on each of their demands, 'so that we thus should be enabled to fill the entire session with this succession of Irish questions.'<sup>19</sup> In mid-November, Wyse, typically optimistic, hoped that the prosecution of O'Connell would induce him to adopt the parliamentary approach. The supposed benefits of O'Connell's absence had apparently been forgotten:

'The great chance is the Trials will be adjourned even farther than



January, perhaps sine die. The result is obvious - O'Connell would be comparatively quiet, government would get out of a serious 'embarras', but the moderate party would greatly gain - a locus .. between him and the old Irish party might be re-established, and an active series of operations devised for the session. It seems to me that it will end so..'

O'Brien had written to him about resuming his 'old line of  
20  
operations, with a view to a junction between all.' A week later, Wyse wrote to O'Brien about the latter's defection to Repeal:

'I was you know, after our ( ) confinement in Kensington gardens, quite prepared for your joining the Association, tho' not before the opening of next session - when I thought (and still think) a strong movement might be made, and with effect, for the country.'

After acknowledging the selflessness of O'Brien's decision to join the Repealers, Wyse described his own position:

'.. the course I have been compelled to take is from conviction also. I honour freedom & conscience and can never pardon fanaticism and bigotry - but for tyranny under the name of liberty, and the most shameful intrigue and corruption under the name of conscientious conviction, and protected by a popular watchword, I have no toleration ..... I will not allow you to think I yield in any one point to you in hearty devotion to Ireland, or that because I cannot go quite so far (faith, not courage, wanting) we cannot keep company many a mile yet together. I think with you a great deal, short of Repeal, might be done next and every succeeding session by proper union and system. Indeed to the want of both amongst us, more than to any other cause, I ascribe our present condition. We have been all along striving "to make ricks without straw". The arms bill debate revealed to us and the House our real power. If we could only get 60 members, as you say, to work as we did for the last two months of the last session from the first day to the last of next, we might have some hope of seeing our Remonstrance embodied in useful measures. Our program should be without respect to whispers, intrigues, backstair counsels, or timid calculations - a series of motions founded on that document, beginning with the Address and not terminating till the last vote of supply. Bull has been wakened and made to think - the prosecutions must fail - new blunders will follow, and we shall meet in February under the best possible auspices for the good cause. But to put all this to fulfil (sic), no men must work themselves. It will not do to stay away on leave of absence two thirds of the session, or spend the remainder, as some amongst us are accustomed to do, in damping every effort.'

After a short discourse on the apathy of some members - particularly the lawyers - 'until they see the doors of office more than half open', Wyse returned to making plans for next session:

'The Reform Club, a few days before the Session, would answer better. It would be out of the shadow of the Conciliation Hall, which some amongst us dread. How this is to be managed is the question. I have spoken to two or three and find them willing to cooperate, but lazy to commence. Perhaps a circular signed by some of our men, or the mere requesting the early attendance of the Irish members, would be effective. It would remove all jealousy of ministerial or other summoning, and preserve that color of a substantial Irish party irrespective of Ins and Outs, which



we were anxious to establish last session. Will you be up in Dublin before the end of January. If so, we might consult and confer here at our ease.' 21

Several references in this letter reinforce the impression that Wyse was not thinking of a junction between all Irish liberals, Repealers and unionists ( it would require both sections to muster the 60 members he hoped for, and he clearly wanted the Repeal members to end their abstentionist policy). O'Brien's reply demonstrates, however, that Wyse was seeking such a junction only on his own terms. Referring to Wyse's letter, O'Brien wrote:

'I am sorry that you do not concur in the propriety of a meeting of Irish M.P.'s in Dublin in January. If O'Connell could be induced to leave the Repeal an open question to the Irish M.P.'s in the ( ) of such a meeting I am persuaded that the Cause of Ireland would be much advanced by the assemblage in our metropolis of a majority of the Representatives of Ireland, and as there is no reason why all practical legislation should be suspended during the discussion of the Repeal question it seems to me that there are many points upon which it would be desirable that the Irish members should not only have a private understanding among themselves but announce collectively their opinion to the world. The first of them would be their determination to resist to the utmost limit of Parliamentary Privilege any measure of Coercion for Ireland. Upon the other points touched in our manifesto we might also agree upon some minimum. Without such an understanding then members who go to Parliament will merely appear as individuals, speaking their own private sentiments, without support from their constituents or from public opinion ... the great majority of the Irish M.P.'s would have gone to Dublin if O'Connell & you had agreed in thinking such a meeting desirable.

With regard to myself I must repeat what I told you in London, viz. that it is not my intention to beg any more from the British Legislature. I shall take every opportunity of letting the British Government & Parliament know what we think ought to be done but I will waste no more time in vainly seeking from Parliamentary debate measures which I am sure will only be yielded to fear. Without pledging myself to any irrevocable determination it is my present intention not to go over to the meeting of Parliament but to wait until we see what measures are proposed by the Government. If a Coercion Bill, which I fully expect, is introduced I presume that all the Irish Liberals of every shade will repair at once to London to resist it. If on the contrary useful measures are proposed I intend concurrently with the Committee of the Repeal Association .. to examine such measures in detail and unite with them in reporting our opinion upon each in succession. I am persuaded that our voice will be much more potential (sic) when reinforced by the public opinion of Ireland than it would be if spoken in the House of Commons. Experience has taught us that Government will yield nothing to reason & that the Whigs will make no move on behalf of our interests except they fancy that it conduces to their own party interests. Thus we have nothing to rely upon but the moral force of public opinion of Ireland. It shall be my endeavour to give as much weight as lays in my power to that opinion.' 22

At the beginning of January, Wyse still felt that a meeting of the Irish liberal M.P.'s in Dublin would not succeed:



'An effective demonstration I think would be good, but this I fear much cannot be hoped in our present position. I have had a good deal of communication of late with Irish members .. and the many would join, others would as certainly stand aloof... There is a growing sense on all sides of the folly, and evil, not to say peril, of the present mode of governing Ireland .. but, I doubt, notwithstanding, whether you could get together, even of liberals, any thing like a tolerable representation of their different sections ... I fear it would end either in wider rupture or a milk & water affair - both failures... A signed declaration would not fare better. None could be more precise and to the point than our Remonstrance - yet there it lies, without any other body sending in their sanction & adhesion.'

Wyse felt that some would fear a meeting would 'look very like attempting to overawe if not judge at least jury in the approaching trials', but it is fairly clear that the main problem was Whig reluctance to be associated too closely with O'Connell. Sheil and Pigot, according to Wyse, shared his doubts, and Sir Montague Chapman wrote,

'I don't think anything can be done by a public meeting - our party is too much divided ... I was in communication with many of the leading Irish Whigs & know how unwilling they would be to enter upon any course of action just now.' 23

No general meeting of the Irish members took place, in fact, though on the 13th of January an Aggregate Meeting of the Roman Catholics of Ireland was held to protest against the exclusion of Catholics from the jury to try O'Connell, attended by the liberal-unionists Wyse, Redington, 24 Sheil and Esmonde and a number of leading Repealers. Pigot, possibly through illness, was not at this meeting, but was informed that,

'the various classes of the Roman Catholic community - including those most averse to agitation and who have for years abstained from it - were never, even before 1829, better represented. The fact is that very great indignation is felt, and felt universally ...' 25

Wyse perceived an intention among the liberal members to act in the approaching session 'with vigor and union', and he welcomed Russell's decision to move for a Committee of the whole House on the state of Ireland:

'This of course will bring forward the whole question of past & future government .. and I think will afford you (O'Brien) and all of us the very opportunity we desire of carrying out the views expressed during the last session.' 26

Though Wyse was by then convinced that the Remonstrance had been a futile exercise as far as the English people were concerned - 'Had the whole Irish representation addressed the Rhinoceros, the result would

have been much the same' - he was still confident that efforts in Parliament were worthwhile, and regretted that O'Brien's ignorance of the character of his new colleagues and of the implications of Repeal had taken him onto a different path:

'Had he continued to fight the battle he had begun so well last Session with patience and endurance, he would have been nearer to the accomplishment of his desires than he can ever be under the banners under which he now serves.' 27

Palmerston acknowledged the potential of the Irish, at least for obstruction of any coercive legislation, when he observed of the Government's experience with the Arms Bill:

'(This) must have shown them that a compact body of opponents, though few in number, may, by debating every sentence and word of a bill, and by dividing upon every debate, so obstruct the progress of a bill through Parliament that a whole session may be scarcely long enough for carrying through one measure; and of course the Irish members on our side, and all the English and Scotch Radicals, would sit from morn till eve, and from eve till dewy morn, to prevent any more stringent law being enacted. The line which the members of the late Government would take in such a case would depend upon the nature of the measures taken as a whole ...' 28

Wyse duly sent out circulars to the liberal members to urge 'the necessity for Irish liberals of all shades of opinion to be present at the opening of the Session.' 29 However, O'Brien continued to hold the view that further action in the British Parliament would be useless and in a public letter advised the Repeal members to remain in Dublin and consider Irish questions within the Association, a policy to which 30 O'Connell gave his assent. The liberal-unionists refused, then, to combine with the Repealers in Dublin, and the Repealers would not join with the liberal-unionists in a Parliamentary campaign.

O'Brien was also invited to a meeting of Irish liberals at Lord Charlemont's Dublin house on the 18th of January, 31 but he and all but a few Repealers remained away. The meeting was called by Charlemont 'to take into consideration the present alarming excitement, with a view of adopting such measures as might be calculated to allay the same'. About 50 persons attended, including the liberal-unionists Clanricarde, Linstier, Kildare, Charlemont, Leitrim, Meath, Miltown, Acheson, Stuart De Decies,



Esmonde, Corbally, Wyse and Stock. Miltown warned that if the grievances of Ireland were not 'speedily remedied' he would become a Repealer, in which view Stuart De Decies and Wyse apparently expressed their concurrence. The meeting agreed to petition Parliament for redress of Ireland's grievances with respect to the corporations, the franchise, the representation, the church and the scarcity of Catholic appointments, and, most notably of all, prayed that Parliament should sit in Dublin once every three years.<sup>32</sup>

When a similar suggestion (for rotatory Parliaments) was made in the Edinburgh Review of January 1844, Monteagle had felt that the suggestion therein was 'too strongly put', but Fortescue 'laid much stress' on the idea and it was approved by Lord Lansdowne.<sup>33</sup> The latter and the British Whig leaders had conspired with Senior during the recess to produce this article, with publication delayed until January in order 'to bring it out when the season of action is about to commence.'<sup>34</sup> The article outlined proposals for the pacification of Ireland, all of them relatively minor except that for periodical sessions of Parliament in Dublin and the sweeping amendments envisaged with respect to religion. Leading Whigs like Palmerston, Normanby, Russell and Cottenham approached the session of 1844 with a determination to make Ireland a major issue in debate, Normanby and Russell apparently sincere in their desire to remove Ireland's 'real grievances' and Cottenham aware of the possibility that, with many 'moderate men' in England 'alarmed at the state to which the acts of a Tory Government' had brought Ireland, 'judgement & tact' on Russell's part in the coming session would see the Whig party benefit from the 'crisis'.<sup>35</sup>

On the first day of the session, speaking on the Address, though Normanby and Clanricarde expressed doubt as to the likely usefulness of the Devon Commission and advocated 'justice' to Ireland, both felt that a full discussion should await the end of the trials in Dublin. In the lower House, Russell and Bowick forewent comment on Ireland for the same reason, but Roebuck and Wyse rejected this position and with the O'Connor Don,

French, Barron, Murphy and a number of British members pressed for the redress of Irish grievances, deprecated the attempt to rule Ireland by force, and censured Attorney-General Smith for challenging to a duel one of the defending counsel in the Irish trials. Wyse and Barron described the exclusion of Catholics from the jury in those trials as an 'insult' to their religion. Crawford's amendment to expunge from the Address the reference to the Union, on the grounds that it might prejudice the trials, was easily defeated but won the support of all 10 Irish liberals (most of them unionists) taking part.<sup>36</sup> Wyse did not vote; he had intended to move an amendment but was 'forestalled' by Crawford and Roebuck.<sup>37</sup>

Russell's motion for a Committee of the House to consider the state of Ireland came on on the 13th of February. Though the major speeches came from the British party leaders and O'Connell, Wyse seconded the motion and the liberal-unionists O'Ferrall, Sheil, Layard, Barron (?), Bellew, Clements, Murphy, the O'Connor Don and Ross all contributed to the debate. They and the liberal members in general contended that Ireland was ruled by military force in place of the conciliatory policy which was necessary to remove discontent in Ireland. The state of the franchise, the representation and the land question, the appointment of Protestant partisans to and exclusion of Catholics from important offices, the dismissal of the Repeal magistrates, and the position of the Established Church were again presented as grievances.<sup>38</sup> However, the principal topic of debate was the Government's conduct with respect to suppression of the Repeal agitation. Liberal members ridiculed the decision to proclaim the Clontarf meeting after months of Government inaction, and much angry comment was passed upon the risk of violent collision incurred by the failure to issue the proclamation until hours before the meeting was due to take place.

Above all, the trial of O'Connell was condemned as unfair by almost every liberal speaker. The charge of conspiracy was described as a dangerous proceeding much less creditable than a charge for a specific



offence; the omission of names, a disproportionate number of them of Catholics, from the Special Jury Panel, the setting aside of all the Catholics on the Special Jury list to leave the traversers tried by a jury of Protestant 'antagonists', the obstructive and intemperate conduct of the Irish Attorney-General, and the one-sided summing up of Chief Justice Pennefather were all assailed, and it was claimed that the Government had managed only to undermine confidence in the law and boost<sup>39</sup> the agitation for Repeal.

After a debate of nine nights' duration, the motion was defeated by 99 votes, with no accessions to the Opposition ranks in spite of a readiness declared by several Conservatives, notably the 'Young England' group, to pursue a more conciliatory course in Ireland. 58 Irish liberals supported the motion, including the waverers Ferguson and Howard, and none voted against. In addition, also on the 13th of February, the Marquis of Normanby brought on a motion in the Lords for inquiry into the state of Ireland. He, Beaumont, Fortescue and the Irish Whigs Clanricarde and Monteagle spoke in terms similar to those of their colleagues in the<sup>40</sup> Commons, and incurred an equally heavy defeat.

George Wyse advised his brother during the debate:

'summon a special meeting of the liberal Irish members (who take part in this debate) after your defeat - to determine upon your future conduct during the session. It ought to be done at once before they scatter as they undoubtedly will after this discussion - probably in hopeless disgust.'<sup>41</sup>

Though there is no evidence of an orchestrated campaign, in subsequent weeks the liberal members of both Houses pressed the Government strongly on a number of Irish questions. Most notably, Crawford, Rawdon and the Repealer E. B. Roche urged the withholding of supplies until attention was paid to Irish grievances. Rawdon, Villiers Stuart, Crawford and the Repealers Somers and E. B. Roche advocated a resolution deprecating the lateness of the Clontarf proclamation as having brought 'a risk of disastrous collision' and 20 Irish liberals voted for the motion. Much was made by Wyse, Bellew and Duncombe of Finsbury of irregularities in



connection with the State Trials, and Duncombe's motion on the employment<sup>42</sup> of 'spies' in Ireland was supported by all 18 Irish liberals in attendance.

These manoeuvres met with little or no apparent success. Jephson-Norreys, the Whig member for Mallow, was not disheartened, however:

'I am always sanguine in the belief that an Irish party, however small, if composed of men whose position in society & general character removed them from the suspicion of acting for interested motives or from that lowest form of corruption & bribery - of pandering to popular passion or popular impulse - that such a party could, & would, as rapidly as reasonably men could expect, effect all for Ireland that reasonable men could devise. Even your (O'Brien's) separation from us has not disheartened us - tho' I confess it grieved me much. When I reflect on the advance which liberal opinions have made even during my short Parliamentary life, when I consider the opinions which were expressed by "the Gentlemen on the other side" in the late debate, I do not hesitate to say that our Irish prospects are beginning to brighten.' 43

Wyse conducted a correspondence with the absent O'Brien at this time, and appeared indeed to be prepared to do O'Brien's Parliamentary business, declaring that he was 'ready for any part I can serve Ireland effectually in, and leave the matter wholly to you and others.' He was referring here to his agreement to present the petition of the Repeal Association against the way in which the State Trials had been conducted. Wyse had no doubt of the unfairness of the trials:

'It is right the people of Ireland should enter their solemn protest .. (by neglecting such cases they become systems) against the iniquities of these late proceedings, and rejoiced I am that they have done it, as became them, so promptly and universally.'

He agreed also to bring forward a motion on the subject; though he was not hopeful of a good division he felt that was 'secondary to what you & I have in view, the recording the sense of the great mass of the people of Ireland on the unfair dealing they have experienced in the late trials..' Wyse described a dinner for O'Connell, in London, as a great success. Though Wyse did not attend, he claimed that,

'No man feels more strongly the injustice done him .. it was thought judicious that those directly connected with the late government should not appear .. but the great point to be demonstrated was sympathy between the patriotic in both countries, indignation at the oppression with which he and his fellow traversers have been visited - & this has been put beyond all question. To judge from private more than public declaration, there is a very cordial feeling between him and all sections of liberals - and nothing I think of that old Whig feeling is allowed to interfere at present.' 44



Barron of Waterford also wrote to O'Brien to approve the protests over the state trials and to complain that O'Connell had been tried by his political enemies. <sup>45</sup> Indeed, as Wyse makes clear, the mismanagement of the trials largely dispelled any ambiguity in the feelings of British and Irish Whigs towards the prosecution of O'Connell by a Conservative Government. When Wyse presented the petition of the Repeal Association, bearing 821,334 signatures, it 'produced no small sensation on each side of the House' and 'had its due effect.' He was in consultation not only with the liberal-unionists F. S. Murphy and Mahony regarding his motion but twice consulted with O'Connell, whose advice to postpone the motion <sup>46</sup> he accepted.

The following month, after O'Connell's return to Ireland, the liberal-unionists began ~~their~~ most successful movement of the session, in opposition to the Government's Registration and Franchise Bill. More O'Ferrall, Bellew, French, M. J. O'Connell and Wyse, in conjunction with Russell and Hume, criticized the measure on the first reading on the grounds that <sup>47</sup> it did not give a sufficiently wide and independent franchise. George Wyse had earlier advised his brother that, 'The Registration Bill will require your attendance as regularly as the Arms Bill!!!', and Wyse, though he expected Russell would not divide on the second reading, duly informed O'Brien that,

'That, however, does not affect Irish members ... we ought to constitute ourselves as last year on the Arms Bill, en Comité permanent, and under the legal auspices of Pigot... The feeling almost general here with the Irish members is to divide on the 2nd reading. The others wait to learn from us what to do.' <sup>48</sup>

Eliot was subsequently told by Charles Wood, a prominent Whig, that,

'the Irish Whig members, Wyse and More O'Ferrall included, have expressed .. their earnest hope that the Bill will not be sanctioned by the support of any portion of the Whig party, that they describe the feeling of hostility to the measure in Ireland, no matter how produced, as very strong and very general, and that in the present state of that country they think it most important that one party at least in the House of Commons should appear to sympathize with the great body of the Irish people. Wood is himself favourable to the principle of the Bill... (but) the Bill, he says, has no chance of passing this year unless the Govt. are prepared to carry it at the expense of all their other measures. The opposition to it will be as pertinacious as that which was offered to the Arms Bill ...' <sup>49</sup>



The bill was postponed several times, until the 1st of July. Two days earlier there was 'a meeting of Irish members at the Reform Club, called by Circular ... they then arranged that Morgan John (O'Connell) was to move the reading of the Bill that day 6 months - Sheil to second -  
 50  
 and a debate to be got up accordingly.' It is likely that Wyse and the liberal-unionists were behind this meeting; the repealer Maurice O'Connell  
 51  
 'knew nothing of it till the meeting was over.' Their plan was disrupted by Thomas Duncombe's successful motion to prevent a full debate on the second reading of a bill which was to be abandoned, though M. J. O'Connell, Sheil, Stuart and More O'Ferrall contrived to fire a parting salvo at the measure. Though it would be foolish to ignore the denunciation of the bill in Conciliation Hall and its apparent unpopularity in Ireland, the evident determination of the liberal-unionists to pursue again the tactics of the Arms Bill debates was probably a factor in the abandonment of the  
 52  
 bill; Peel attributed the decision to the pressure of business in the House.

In April-June 1844, liberal members - particularly Irish liberal-unionists - continued to press the Government on such issues as the practice of excluding Catholics from Irish juries, public works in Ireland,  
 53  
 the employment of Englishmen and Scots in Ireland, and the Irish poor law. Clanricarde supported Cottenham's Bail in Error bill, which, if it had passed, would have prevented the imprisonment of O'Connell before his case came before the Lords on appeal. On the 11-12th of June, the liberal-unionists, Ferguson apart, unanimously supported Ward's motion on Irish  
 54  
 Church Temporalities. Wyse, meanwhile, planned still to move for a Select Committee to inquire into the State Trials, which had resulted, on the 30th of May, in the imprisonment of O'Connell and the other traversers. In a public letter to Wyse, Sheil supported Wyse's course and described O'Connell  
 55  
 as 'the deliverer of his country ... the man to whom we owe everything.' But O'Connell's opinion of Wyse's efforts was dismissive in the extreme, and, in his letter to Sheil of the 19th of June he referred, too, to the lack of enthusiasm among the British Whig leaders:



'I do not care a twopenny ticket for Wyse's motion. 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 nights' 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.'

He went on to lament that Sheil instead of agitating in Ireland was busy 'calculating what you owe to the Whigs for having given you a place'. And he proceeded to denounce the Irish Whigs for their behaviour with respect to the trials:

'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... What is the Irish section of the Whigs doing? Nothing .... 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! 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.' 56

Russell felt that 'the violations of justice tho' important do not warrant such an interference with the conduct of the tribunal' as was involved in a Parliamentary inquiry; but he was afraid that 'merely to oppose Wyse's motion would lose us, & deservedly, any support we may have in Ireland among the popular party' and proposed to move an Address to the Queen to record their objections to 'the violations of justice', to ask for remission of the sentences, and to state the House's commitment to equality of 'political rights' between Britain and Ireland. But Palmerston opposed even this; he felt that the Government had been right to stop O'Connell, that their only mistake was in acting so late and in such 'irregular' ways, and that for all the irregularities in the prosecution 'the convictions were right and .. in the result substantial justice has been done.' 57

Ironically Russell was later to abstain on and Palmerston to vote for Wyse's motion for enquiry. 58

Wyse believed that the motion would admit 'the fullest range of



debate. This is the main point : the expression of individual opinion and its operation on the public opinion of both countries .. it is right and useful, and what we owe to ourselves and to the country.<sup>59</sup> The motion was finally brought on on the 15th of July, when Wyse claimed that the Crown had acted with 'an utter absence of that fairness and generosity' which one could reasonably expect, and dealt at length with irregularities in the constitution of the jury; he informed the Government that their proceeding had merely 'smothered' for a time the 'animosities' of the Irish people and had raised O'Connell to a new status, and he argued that contentment could only be secured by a conciliatory policy. M. J. O'Connell, Villiers Stuart and John O'Brien were Wyse's only supporters in the brief debate. Though Wyse had earlier expected that the Repeal members<sup>60</sup> would come over for the occasion, the great majority of the 26 Irish liberals in the division were unionists. No Irish liberal voted against,<sup>61</sup> but the Government's support stood firm and the motion was defeated.

Also in July-August 1844, the liberal-unionists objected vigorously to the renewal of the Unlawful Oaths (Ireland) Bill. Sergeant Murphy and other liberal-unionists pressed the issue of Ministers' Money. On the 19th of July, Wyse, supported by Sheil and Bellew, urged the elevation of Maynooth and the establishment of provincial colleges. In the Lords Clanricarde and the British Whigs questioned the decision of the Irish Chancellor to restore a delinquent magistrate, and in the lower House this issue was pressed to a division by Ross, Dillon Browne, O'Ferrall, Sheil and Bellew, in which division 19 Irish liberals supported what was virtually a motion of censure on Sugden. Wyse, Sheil and M. J. O'Connell joined in an attack on the episcopal appointments of the Government in Ireland.

On the 2nd of August, Clanricarde declared that the Repeal movement was as strong and 'dangerous' as ever and that the Government's response 'had totally and entirely failed', and with Monteagle and Campbell he issued a general indictment of the Government for its failure to win



over the Irish by means of 'measures for the improvement of the country.'<sup>62</sup>  
 A week later, Sheil, Wyse, Hume and Russell, whose aid Sheil had implored,  
 again described the unfairness of the State Trials and called on the  
 Government to free O'Connell and the other prisoners pending the Lords'  
 decision on the Appeal and in their Irish policy to 'throw aside force,  
 and conquer by generosity.' When the Law Lords found in favour of the  
 traversers early in September, Otway Cave, liberal-unionist member for  
 Tipperary, joined in celebrating 'the great event' and urged Peel 'to  
 avail himself of this golden opportunity for the commencement of a wise  
 and generous policy towards Ireland.'<sup>63</sup>

All in all, the liberal-unionists acted in 1844 with considerable  
 vitality; if far from Wyse's ideal of a compact unit capable of harassing  
 Parliament into adoption of their Irish policy, they resembled even less  
 the inert band of 1841-3. With the repealers still generally absent, the  
 liberal-unionists retained their role as the Parliamentary spokesmen of  
 discontented Ireland. Even in 1844, however, there were signs that they  
 were losing their raison d'être as the Conservative Government moved  
 towards a more conciliatory policy in Ireland. The strident denunciation  
 of 1843 of the Government's do-nothing policy was tempered in 1844 by  
 admissions, in debate or silently in the division lobby, that measures  
 like the increase of the education grant, the aborted municipal reform  
 bill, the renewal of the Party Processions Act, the Dissenters Chapels  
 and Presbyterian marriages bills, were satisfactory. In July, Sheil,  
 Bellew, Ross, Palmerston and Monteagle welcomed Peel's evident readiness<sup>64</sup>  
 to improve Maynooth and establish lay colleges. In a sense even the  
 Government's course on the registration/franchise issue frustrated the  
 liberal-unionists, as the abandonment of the bill denied the Irish the  
 opportunity, clearly relished by Wyse, to reconstitute the 'Comité  
permanent' of the Arms Bill.

The Charitable Bequests Bill, which took control of charitable  
 bequests from a large, almost exclusively Protestant board and gave it

to a smaller body of which almost half the members would be Catholics, was regarded by some liberal-unionists as part of the conciliatory policy. Monteagle and Clanricarde gave their 'entire approval' to the bill when it first came up for discussion, and though later critical of some aspects of the bill were satisfied when amendments were made to meet their objections, warmly praising the measure and thanking the Government for its introduction.<sup>65</sup> As for those in the Commons, Eliot wrote,

'The O'Connor Don does not himself object to the proposed constitution of the Board, but he thinks himself bound to respect the scruples of the clergy & to act accordingly. This is the general feeling I believe of the Roman Catholic members.'<sup>66</sup>

O'Ferrall, Bellew, Sheil, Wyse, and the Repealers M. J. O'Connell and Dillon Browne, all Catholics, and evidently influenced by the outcry against the bill which Mac Hale had stirred up among Catholics in Ireland, were extremely critical of several parts of the bill, and the only Irish liberal to welcome the measure was the Protestant member for Armagh, Colonel Rawdon. In the division on the second reading, most of the above critics abstained, but seven Irish liberals, six of them Catholics, voted against, and only three - Rawdon, Ross and Dawson, all Protestants - voted in favour.

On going into Committee, Graham announced his proposed amendments, the most important of which was the acknowledgement of the Catholic hierarchy by use of the titles Bishop and Archbishop. O'Ferrall and the O'Connor Don warmly welcomed the changes, but the latter, Sheil, Wyse, Dillon Browne and Rawdon led majorities of Irish liberals in unsuccessful divisions on other aspects of the bill. Other important concessions were subsequently made, and welcomed by Wyse. On the third reading the Repealer Dillon Browne moved the rejection of the bill, but, though he warned that the Irish members 'would have to account to their constituents for not having opposed it in a more determined manner', he could find no-one to second the motion, and M. J. O'Connell gave his warmest assent to the amended measure.<sup>67</sup>

Several of the Catholic liberal-unionists subsequently indicated



their satisfaction with the amended measure. Wyse informed O'Brien that,

'The Charitable Bequests Bill has gone through third reading greatly amended. All now will depend upon the way it is carried into execution. It looks as if it were to be the preface to some change of policy.' 68

More O'Ferrall wrote to Lord Hatherton to ask him to recommend certain men for the new Board and to stress that, "There is more in the manner of applying the law than in its actual provisions to attain the great object of attaching the Clergy to the State". Hatherton informed Peel that, 'There was much more in his (O'Ferrall's) letter on the same subject, the tone of which satisfies, as a former letter of his did, that he is sincerely grateful to you for this measure.' 69 David Pigot of Clonmel declined to serve on the Bequests Board only, he claimed, because of his reluctance to accept an appointment from the Tories, and it was a former liberal-unionist member, Sir Patrick Bellew, who agreed to take Pigot's place and act with Anthony Blake as the lay Catholic part of the Board. The Irish (Protestant) Whig Lord Bessborough declared to Russell it was 'a good Bill and .. what we had intended to propose in 1834 only we were not quite so liberal.' 70 When the Board was gazetted in December 1844 Sheil was evidently delighted that the Catholic bishops were placed above the Protestant commoners in the list. It was 'gallantly done; the effect will be extraordinary.' 71

The recess saw much disagreement within the Irish Catholic Church and the Repeal Association on the subject of the Bequests Bill. Of more relevance to liberal-unionists, however, were the fortunes of the federalists, who sought not the Repealers' independent Irish Parliament but a Parliament in Dublin to look after domestic matters only, leaving foreign and imperial questions to a Westminster to which Ireland would continue to send representatives. Such a solution, it was argued, would involve less risk than Repeal or dissolution of the connection between Britain and Ireland.

Thomas Wyse and Sharman Crawford had been federalists for many years, the former putting it forward in 1832 as an alternative to Repeal, and

72

the latter canvassing it in public letters from 1834. When the Repeal agitation revived discussion of the constitutional question in 1843, federalism too became popular in some circles. In June Thomas Hutton, brother of the former liberal-unionist member for Dublin, and Councillor James Perry conspired with Wyse to produce a federalist declaration. Sir Montague Chapman was, wrote Wyse, warmly favourable and had claimed that 'many Tories, Shaw amongst them, are of the same opinion. Ross confirms this account and adds they already amount to 17' - apparently meaning 17 Irish M.P.'s. Wyse continued:

'On the other side, O'B.(rien) is strongly against. "Repeal", he says, or "Union" - no intermediate house. Many Englishmen with whom I have consulted are of the same view - excellent in theory but rendered impracticable by O'Connell. No sort of support (of weight at least) is to be expected in the House even from (English) liberals - as matters actually stand - and out of the House the coldness with which it will be received will be urged as argument by O'Connell for Repeal & (the) folly of looking for any minor concession. I much fear therefore the time is past, or yet to come for such a measure, however abstractedly desirable, and that we must confine to another kind of operation ... there was a time when it might have been listened to. It is past - O'Connell has been the cause of that .. his late declaration that he would only use it as a means to an end, a stepping stone to an absolutely independent Parliament not only renders it hopeless to advocate it but really an imputation on a man's good sense to think of it. They regard its support as evidence that a man is a dunce or a hypocrite - either so soft as to believe O'Connell will stop there, or concurring with him in secret and afraid to speak out. He has spoilt that plan altogether. It would be now opposed in the House quite as zealously & far more scoffingly than Repeal itself.' 73

In debates and public letters that summer, Wyse, Crawford and Francis Murphy of Cork supported a federal solution, and the Whiggish Dublin newspaper, The Monitor, took up its advocacy. In September, Sir Valentine Blake, though involved in the agitation for Repeal, suggested 'a federal union' in correspondence with Peel. In November, John O'Brien, like a few others before him, joined the Repeal Association as a federalist. Towards the end of the year Ross and Colonel Henry Caulfield, Charlemont's brother, declared for federalism, and Thomas Davis later wrote that 'the wealthiest citizens of Dublin, Cork and Belfast, many of the leading Whig gentry and barristers and not a few conservatives of rank held federalist opinions.'

77



All was not plain sailing. Wyse felt that O'Connell's brief flirtation with federalism in October 1843 had 'paralyzed' the movement.<sup>78</sup> 'Their time is not yet come'. At the beginning of 1844 the proposal of periodical sessions of the Imperial Parliament gained some ground, receiving the sanction of the Charlemont-House petitioners and inducing Chapman to declare that, 'This is worth all the federalism in the world.'<sup>79</sup> Lord Charlemont and Anthony Blake subsequently canvassed this rather less ambitious proposal.<sup>80</sup> Jephson-Norreys, writing to O'Brien, deprecated the 'sickly, unmeaning' federalist course and said that if he became a Repealer his object would be 'an intelligible independence of British legislation & of the English Government. I cannot see any middle course.'<sup>81</sup>

According to Duffy, there were 7 federalists (19 Repealers, 36 'Whigs' and 43 Tories) among the Irish members during the 1844 session, though he named only three, Ross, Wyse and M. J. O'Connell.<sup>82</sup> John Grey Porter, High Sheriff of Co. Fermanagh, produced a detailed federal plan in August 1844.<sup>83</sup> In September, Graham feared that O'Connell, 'a portion of the Irish nobility and gentry', and the British Whigs would reach agreement on a form of federalism.<sup>84</sup> Peel was moved to ask Lord Heytesbury to find 'an able writer' to attack federalism, resulting in the publication of a series of 'Antifederalist' articles by Isaac Butt.<sup>85</sup> Morpeth was told 'by a cool-headed Irish authority that the Federal Party were spreading wide & fast.'<sup>86</sup> Russell, clearly alarmed by the growth of federalism, wrote to Leinster to seek his influence against any such tampering with the Act of Union; 'it cannot be compromised or cut into fragments to make repeal more easy to swallow'. Leinster concurred and promised to use his 'best endeavours' against the movement.<sup>87</sup> Lord Bessborough was also concerned:

'many of our friends who would be shocked at being supposed to be Repealers are trying to incline themselves to Federalism.. On the whole I am inclined to think the word Federalism worse & more dangerous than Repeal. One must be understood by everybody, the other may delude honest but foolish men, & give dishonest ones an opportunity of forwarding their own ends, without committing themselves.'<sup>88</sup>

On the 12th of October 1844, the eminently 'dishonest' O'Connell, in a famous letter to the Association, declared his 'preference' for

89  
 federalism over 'simple Repeal'. He hoped, in fact, that federalism would become 'the rallying point of all the Irish Liberals ... 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.' O'Connell persuaded one of these non-Repealers, Pierce Mahony, to get up a federalist declaration for signature, and hoped that a meeting of the federalists in Belfast on the 26th of October would initiate a process which would end in the eclipse of 'mere Whiggery.'<sup>90</sup>

Mahony agreed to the proposed declaration and it was duly drawn up and canvassed with the assistance of Thomas Hutton and William Murphy, the latter described by O'Connell as 'a principal "brains carrier" of the Irish Whigs.' According to Davis, however, the federalists were put off by O'Connell's support of federalism and his known connection with Mahony and the proposed declaration.<sup>91</sup> The latter apparently was never published. Wyse felt that O'Connell's letter had done more to annoy Repealers than attract federalists.<sup>92</sup> The meeting in Belfast, attended by Caulfield, Crawford and 'one or two others', was, in fact, a small, private affair, and it merely drew up a federal declaration to be sent privately for the consideration of the federalists in Dublin.<sup>93</sup>

O'Connell, under pressure from Young Ireland because of his declared preference for federalism, wrote to Ray on the 8th of November to deprecate the failure of the federalists to make a public movement and, in effect, to rededicate himself to 'simple Repeal.'<sup>94</sup> Crawford described his federal plan in a series of public letters in November 1844.<sup>95</sup> He revealed to O'Brien the full extent of his frustration:

'To say the truth I have been thoroughly disgusted both with the professing Federalists and with O'Connell's repeal shuffling. The former, speaking of them as a class, wish to make a flash of supporting local legislation for Ireland without having any defined ideas on the subject or having any intention to go forward with the principle .., except Mr. Caulfield and a very few others who would be honest and willing to go forward if they had the opportunity ... (O'Connell) wants also to take the same undefined course, humbugging both Repealers and Federalists .. keeping up a delusive joint agitation, knowing right well that whenever particulars came to be discussed they would split up like a rope of sand.'



I conceive that the principles of the constitution of 1782 and those of a Federal constitution are so essentially different that it is impossible for the supporters of each to work together, unless one gives way to the other .. my object in my late letters was to endeavour to put an end to this odious farce.' 96

Russell, and the liberal Press in Britain, continued to consider  
97  
repeal and federalism 'equally obnoxious'. Many liberal-unionists retained serious doubts about federalism, even apart from the effect of O'Connell's interference. The Northern Whig, influential in Ulster  
98  
liberal circles, was hostile. Bassborough, though not 'alarmed' about federalism, remained 'very sorry to see that some very sensible people are inclined to entertain it', as he considered it involved either independence or, according to one plan, a worthless 'double discussion'  
99  
of Irish questions, in Dublin and London. Monteagle felt that the danger of collision and separation of Britain and Ireland was as great with federalism as with Repeal, and that the antagonist Irish parties needed  
100  
'a calm & more impartial judge', Westminster, to run their affairs.

The Duke of Leinster, warned off federalism by Russell, duly exerted his influence against the movement. The Lord Lieutenant reported:

'On the breaking out of the federalist folly, Lord Cloncurry & some others of that sort proposed to the Duke a general meeting of the Whig Party & a coalition with the Federalists.. The Duke refused, & not only refused but declared that he would oppose by every means in his power, openly & publicly, any such project. The whole thing therefore evaporated in a series of silly letters from Mr. Sharman Crawford.' 101

As for those more disposed to the idea, the connection with O'Connell probably deterred many. Davis felt that, 'All chance of a federal movement is gone at present, and mainly because of O'Connell's  
102  
public and private letters.' Duffy later wrote that, 'The very suggestion that he (O'Connell) and the Repeal party would become Federalists gave  
103  
Federalism a blow from which it never rallied.' O'Connell's initiative did bring an enthusiastic response from the Dublin Evening Post and from  
104  
the Monitor. But with O'Connell forced to abandon his initiative, other potential sympathizers deterred by the O'Connell connection and the degeneration into 'odious farce', the failure of the federalists to

launch an organized movement in support of a definite, agreed plan, the hostility of Russell and leading Irish Whigs like Leinster, Bessborough and Monteagle, federalism reached its peak in 1844 and declined into insignificance thereafter.

On the 3rd of February 1845 it was agreed in the Association that  
105  
Repeal members should again absent themselves from Parliament, leaving the unionists once more as the Parliamentary representatives of Ireland. The session opened with a Government pledge to extend the system of higher education in Ireland and with the announcement that the long-awaited report of the Devon Commission would soon be presented to Parliament. Pigot, Sheil and some British Whigs had urged Russell to propose a motion of inquiry into the Irish Trials, but, encouraged by Bessborough and Cottenham, Russell felt that Lord Denham's views in upholding the Appeal had been sufficient condemnation of the trial, and that a motion would only see the Commons approving 'the iniquitous conduct of the Government.' In the debates on the Address, Russell and Lansdowne merely adverted to the 'very unjust proceedings' against the Traversers and rejoiced at the  
106  
decision of the Law Lords.

On the same occasion, several members of the Opposition, including the liberal-unionists Bellew and Sheil, lamented the fact that the Government had not consulted the Catholic bishops on the Charitable Bequests issue and pressed for amendments in the Act to meet Catholic grievances, though Sheil acknowledged that the Government had brought in the measure with the best of intentions and Bellew said that, 'Unquestionably great unfairness and misrepresentation had been resorted to, and many who opposed the measure did not do so bona fide but because that (sic) nothing should meet with acceptance.' Bellew again expressed confidence in the Devon Commission, but Normanby and Sheil did not share  
107  
Bellew's sanguine view.

The pledge on higher education induced the Irish liberal speakers to demand reform of Trinity College, and Normanby stated that 'more



comprehensive measures of justice' would be required in order to  
 108  
 tranquillize Ireland than those on offer in the Queen's Speech. However,  
 the most rancorous speech came from Russell. He declared that Irish  
 distrust of the Government's conciliatory intentions was 'just  
 retribution' for their past encouragement of anti-Catholic prejudices  
 and described their new more conciliatory policy as an admission of past  
 error. The speech succeeded in bringing Peel to state his intention to  
 propose an increased grant for Maynooth, and this announcement was warmly  
 109  
 welcomed by Wyse, Bellew and Sheil. The mixture, evident in these debates,  
 of generous approval and carping criticism was to feature again in the  
 response of some liberal members to Peel's conciliatory policy in Ireland.  
 Heytesbury felt that the Opposition leaders were determined not to 'allow  
 this country to be pacified by us... They hope to return to power by  
 110  
 increasing our Irish difficulties...'

Legislation on Irish affairs was delayed for two months as  
 Parliament concentrated on financial and commercial issues. The liberal-  
 unionists were often hopelessly divided on the income tax, sugar duties  
 and Post Office questions. Apart from Crawford, then sitting for Rochdale,  
 they united in opposition to Roebuck's motion to extend the income tax to  
 Ireland and used the occasion to urge a conciliatory attitude towards  
 Ireland. In March the Irish liberals voted unanimously for Cobden's motion  
 for a Committee of Inquiry into the effects of the Corn Laws, and only  
 111  
 Macnamara broke ranks on Miles' protectionist motion some days later.  
 Specifically Irish issues arose infrequently. Bellew, Ross and M. J.  
 O'Connell attacked the reinstatement in the magistracy of Lord Lucan,  
 earlier removed for intemperate conduct in open Court, and Normanby and  
 Fortescue, retaining a remarkable interest in Irish affairs, alleged an  
 irregular proceeding regarding an important appointment in the Irish  
 Constabulary. In both cases the debates encompassed quite general matters,  
 the Lucan affair in particular being used to support the contention that  
 popular confidence in the administration of justice and in the Government's

112

sincerity in espousing conciliatory politics had been undermined.

On the 3rd of April 1845 Peel introduced the Maynooth Bill. For most Irish liberals the issue presented little difficulty. They had invariably supported the Maynooth grant in the 10 divisions on it from 1834 to 1844. Cloncurry pressed the Government to increase the grant in 1835 but found Melbourne wary of English Protestant opinion. <sup>113</sup> In 1837 Spring Rice expressed to the King his 'deep conviction' of the need to change the 'narrow, scholastic and disputatious' course of study at Maynooth. 'If it could be enlarged and liberalized, if persons of better worth & connection could fill the office of the priesthood great good would be done.' Others - Irish liberals especially - advocated an increase of the grant in Parliament. But it was in the 1840's that an increase in the grant was demanded by a significant number of liberals in Parliament, including specific motions on the subject from Monteagle <sup>114</sup> (Spring Rice) and Wyse in 1844. The fact that it was proposed in 1845 to increase the grant without imposing objectionable conditions diminished the likelihood of liberal opposition. There were some rumblings among Repealers about the insult of this 'bribe', but in general O'Connell and his friends recognized the measure as a boon and, rather than reject it, <sup>115</sup> preferred to claim it as one of the fruits of agitation.

In Parliament the Irish liberals warmly welcomed the bill. They regarded State support of the college as a question upon which the principle had been conceded and a virtual 'contract' formed, and felt, like Peel, that the increase in the grant to meet Maynooth's needs was no more than fulfilment of that contract. Though many of the Irish said they hoped the measure would be only the first of many of a similar tendency, they readily gave fulsome praise to the Government for such a conciliatory gesture; and they warned that its rejection would be regarded in Ireland as final proof that the British Parliament was not prepared to meet the wishes of the Irish majority and would induce 'the entire nation' to 'join in one deep anathema against the Union.'



Most of the Irish liberal members would have preferred that Maynooth should have been endowed out of the property of the Irish Protestant Church, instead of the Treasury; 18 of them voted for and 6  
116  
against Ward's unsuccessful motion to that effect. Sheil had earlier approached Ward to warn him against endangering the Maynooth bill and, with Russell also concerned, Ward had withdrawn his amendment on Church property in favour of a substantive motion, of which the success would not have caused the loss of the bill. Both E. B. Roche, who supported Ward's motion, and Barron, who opposed it, regretted the introduction of the Church issue, and even those who voted with Ward also emulated him in supporting the Government measure as the best that could be obtained. The Irish liberals supported the bill in the face of radical-voluntary as well as Tory opposition, the only exceptions being Crawford, who took the voluntary line, declaring against all religious endowments, and Lord  
118  
Marcus Hill, whose reasoning was never made clear. Behind the scenes, David Pigot prepared a defence of the bill against its opponents in  
119  
Committee.

In the Lords, in the absence of a voluntary movement, the liberal party gave solid support to the bill, with Monteagle, Leinster and  
120  
Lansdowne its Irish Whig advocates in debate. Monteagle sent an interesting letter to his friend Sir Richard Bowke on the proper course to be taken by the Whigs in response to the Government's conciliatory policy. In the Maynooth debates most of the bill's supporters, British and Irish, were remarkably generous in their acclamation of the Ministers, but a few English Whig members, Macaulay in particular, taunted Peel with his past illiberalism towards Catholics. Regarding the Maynooth and Colleges bills, Monteagle felt,

'In both these questions very great steps in advance are taken, & taken not only in the right direction but firmly & boldly. I have been a little vexed that any of our friends, especially Macaulay, should .. attack the Government. Most assuredly in some respects they ( ) prove the insincerity & disingenuousness of their conduct in opposition from 1830 to 1841. But that speaks for itself & does not become more eloquent from being proclaimed by our Whig voices. Indeed I think our silence on

the subject would have been at once a rebuke more bitter & more dignified. Personal imputations we might safely have left to the Disraeli class. At all events it is unjustifiable to impede in any degree the course of improved & more liberal spirit of legislation (sic), & to make repentance more painful & more subject to reproof & punishment than a perseverance in error. Peel is now doing what we approve, what we wished & yet were unable to accomplish. This is not the time for contumely & reproach. Besides which how can we expect him to weaken himself & to quarrel with his own friends unless assured of a disinterested & generous support from us. We wish to see our measures realized but how can this be if when he adopts our suggestions we treat him with indignity. I think all this the more inexcusable because in these measures I think him at once courageous & disinterested. He is not now yielding to clamour or pressure. He is doing what he thinks right & doing so with a consciousness of the loss which he sustains.'

In July he wrote,

'The Maynooth bill is law, most fortunately, & on the whole both sides have acquitted themselves honorably. Though I love the Tories as little as most men, I think it is unwise as well as ungenerous to select the moment of their conformity to the true faith to taunt them with past heresies.' 121

Monteagle, in fact, wrote to Peel to express his 'earnest thankfulness' for his 'wise & courageous .., gracious & disinterested' course regarding Maynooth. Another of Peel's correspondents spelt out its relevance to the fortunes of liberal-unionism in Ireland:

'(The bill will) satisfy a well-deserving and highly important party - I mean the Roman Catholic gentry and others of their persuasion who have kept aloof from the agitation. Were things to remain at a stand-still this party could not long hold out against Repeal. Your present conciliatory course is now giving them a triumph and a reward for their past position, and must bind firmly to their side those who were before swerving and slipping away.' 122

As shown above, the liberal-unionists gave a general welcome to the Colleges bill, which was introduced in May 1845. On two major issues, then, the liberal-unionists could do little more than approve the efforts of the Conservative Government, and they were placed in a similar position by the Government's resistance to the renewed campaign for a grant for Church education in Ireland and the appointment of a Catholic Chief Clerk. 123 In addition, they were again unable to present a united front on the Corn Laws, when it was discussed in May and June 1845. 124 The liberal-unionists did not, however, revert to the indolence of the early days of the Administration. On both the Maynooth and College questions they were active participants in the Parliamentary proceedings and on the latter



were critical of some aspects of the measure. And if they did not set themselves clearly apart from the Conservatives on the Colleges bill, they did manage to assert their distinctiveness vis-a-vis O'Connell and the majority of Repealers. On other issues the liberal-unionists played a prominent part. For example, after meeting in private to plan opposition to the Irish Banking Bill a large contingent remonstrated, in vain, against the measure.<sup>125</sup> A number protested, in private talks with Graham and in Parliament, that the Scottish Poor Law Bill would discriminate against Irishmen resident in Scotland; on this occasion they succeeded in securing<sup>126</sup> a satisfactory alteration of the measure.

Fitzstephen French continued to criticize the Irish poor law and, with the aid of other Irish members, to press for railway extension in Ireland.<sup>127</sup> Murphy, Barron and the repealer E. B. Roche urged abolition of ministers' money, and Watson, Redington, Sheil and M. J. O'Connell (repealer) strove, with equal lack of success, for the removal of certain Catholic disabilities. Several liberal-unionists opposed the Valuation (Ireland) bill, later lost in the Lords. And in a general debate near the end of the session, Sheil pressed for franchise and ecclesiastical reform and deprecated the continuing failure to extend Government patronage to Irish Catholics. In the Lords, Clanricarde described the spread of agrarian outrage, and contradicted the Government's assertion that the State Trials had arrested agitation; the Repeal agitation, he said, was as strong as ever, and, with the expiry of the Processions Act, Protestants were<sup>128</sup> recommencing their own species of agitation.

Above all, the Irish Whig peers played a major part in securing the abandonment of the Government's Tenants Compensation Bill. The Devon Commission presented their report in February 1845, recommending a number of palliatives to counter the social ills of rural Ireland. The most radical proposal, compensation of tenants for improvements, was taken up by the Government. Their bill, introduced by Stanley in the Lords on the 9th of June, proposed that landlords should compensate tenants for some

types of improvements. Government officials were to decide whether or not a landlord might be required to pay such compensation, but in no instance would it exceed £5 an acre of improved land, nor would compensation be required unless the landlord ejected the tenant.<sup>129</sup>

Irish liberals scorned the measure. Monteagle wrote that it was 'absurd & mischievous', a 'legislative abortion'; Pigot, less scathing, approved of the compensation principle but thought it 'imperfectly unfolded' in the bill and 'accompanied with intolerable machinery'. According to Davis, 'Stanley's bill is infernal .... the worst public document I ever read in its design and in its style. It would extinguish the tenant-right', and might 'change Ulster into a Tipperary.'<sup>130</sup> In Parliament, Clanricarde, Gosford, Monteagle, Carew, Lansdowne and other Irish Whigs (in the Protest) objected to the fundamental proposal in the bill, that a Government officer could force a landlord against his will to become liable for improvements on his own property, a 'fatal interference with the rights of property'. Though other imperfections were also pointed out, it was this essentially 'conservative' objection which dominated the argument of the Irish Whig peers, in contrast to the tenant-orientated opposition of Davis's Report to the Repeal Association.<sup>131</sup> Opposed by all shades of Irish opinion, the bill was referred to a Select Committee, a step which, given that the end of the session was near, Monteagle likened to 'the old nursery process of putting a naughty child in the corner'. Stanley duly announced the abandonment of the measure on the 15th of July.<sup>132</sup>

The opposition of the other Irish interests to the bill was also important, of course. And it is, perhaps, stretching a point to include this effort of the Irish Whig peers as part of the Parliamentary endeavours of the liberal-unionists, in that, given their previous statements on the question, it is likely that most of the liberal-unionists of the lower House would not have opposed the measure on the 'conservative' grounds advanced by the Whig peers. Crawford was pressing his more



liberal bill even before the final abandonment of the Government measure, and subsequently described the latter as 'objectionable and delusive'.<sup>133</sup> At any rate, as the bill did not reach the Commons, the liberal-unionist members were again denied an opportunity to flex their muscles in opposition to the Government; and the non-appearance of the Irish franchise bill similarly denied them.

By the end of the session of 1845, at least partly as a result of Government conciliation and forbearance, Wyse's ideal of a vigorous, cohesive liberal-unionist Parliamentary party was far from realization; and, especially with the decline of the federalists, neither was there a strong liberal movement in Ireland to challenge the Repealers. Indeed the Mail claimed in July 1845 that there was 'no moderate Whig party in Ireland. There is no milk-and-water juste milieu in Irish politics: or if there be, it is too feeble to sustain itself ...' There were 'but two parties in Ireland worthy of the name ... the Repealers and the Tories.'<sup>134</sup>

The recess saw important developments which changed the course of the history of both Britain and Ireland. The 'great fact' of Irish history from the autumn of 1845 was, of course, the Famine, the first signs of potato disease in Ireland appearing in August 1845.<sup>135</sup> From the end of October, Leinster and Cloncurry acted with O'Connell to press the Government for effective measures to cope with the crisis, and Fitzstephen French urged the landlords of Roscommon to react by establishing works for the employment of the distressed. Other liberal-unionists communicated directly with the Government, though Monteagle and Bessborough were among those who attempted to play down the extent of the crisis.<sup>136</sup>

Peel's subsequent declaration for repeal of the Corn Laws sealed the fate which he had courted earlier over Maynooth. The short-lived attempt in December 1845 at the formation of a Liberal Government entailed several items of Irish interest. The Duke of Leinster called on the outgoing Lord Lieutenant to express his 'regret' at the latter's

departure and 'his approval of the course pursued in this country, & his conviction of the good that had been effected by the conciliatory conduct of the Government.'

<sup>137</sup> Russell offered Bessborough the Lord Lieutenancy, while Morpeth pressed for Somerville, like Bessborough an Irish Whig, as Chief Secretary, describing him as 'the best speaker & the most unjobbing M.P. of all the Irish, a real fine & high-minded man.' Bessborough was reluctant to accept the Lieutenancy partly because he could not 'conceive that any person can consent to have the nominal Government of Ireland while the Conciliation Hall under his nose is in fact governing ...

Conciliation Hall with all its ramifications is getting too strong for  
<sup>138</sup> the Law.'

O'Connell, however, approached Pigot and, to the latter's satisfaction, offered to call on the Repeal Members to attend Parliament again to support

<sup>139</sup> 'The Anti-Corn Law Ministry.' Bessborough approved of Russell's declaration in favour of total and immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, but Lansdowne, clearly dissatisfied, demanded massive compensation for the

<sup>140</sup> landed interest. Monteagle and Lansdowne, the only Irishmen involved, were in the minority of Whig leaders who wanted Russell to refuse the

<sup>141</sup> Government.

The session of 1846 saw the return to Parliament of O'Connell and most of the Repealers to register their views on corn and coercion. Several liberal-unionists - French, Clements, Crawford, Ross, the O'Connor Don, Barron (?), Clanricarde and Monteagle - called the attention of Parliament to the Famine in Ireland. Some, notably Crawford and French, cited the distress in Ireland as a reason for their advocacy of outdoor relief under the poor law. Barron (liberal-unionist?) complained that the grant proposed in the Public Works bill, a measure designed to relieve the crisis by extension of public works, 'would be but a drop of water in the ocean as compared with the wants of the country', and he and Clements scolded those English members who begrudged even that 'paltry sum'. Most of the Irish liberals supported the bill in the only division. The



enthusiasm of liberal-unionists for railway extension (see below) clearly owed something to their desire to give employment in the distressed districts.

However, French and Ferguson were also concerned that the Public Works bill would give the Public Works Commissioners 'unlimited' power to tax Irish landlords and with the O'Connor Don divided the House on a motion to omit the relevant clause; and O'Ferrall expressed a similar fear with respect to the County Works Bill. French objected to the Government's bill to cope with fever in Ireland, calling it 'uncalled for and unnecessary'. Somerville felt that the crisis was not so great as to require outdoor relief and O'Ferrall argued that such provision would be 'fatal to the existence of all the property of the country.'<sup>142</sup> The principal object of a memorial signed in May by four Irish Whig peers and several Irish Conservatives was to counter the cry for outdoor relief, though they also urged the Government to take other steps to meet the crisis.<sup>143</sup> And in general the liberal-unionists were less vocal, less passionate in pleading Ireland's cause in this respect than the Repealers, for whom the O'Connells and Smith O'Brien were well to the fore.<sup>144</sup>

Several of those who expressed alarm at the extent of Famine in Ireland advanced it as a reason for repeal of the Corn laws. With such a predominant agricultural interest in Ireland, even her liberal representatives might have been expected to feel wary of such a measure. In January Pigot expressed his doubts to Russell as to the support for repeal of the Corn laws among the Irish liberal members:

'the great majority - probably all - would have supported your Lordship if in office; and they probably would do so upon any vote which would restore you to power. But independently of that consideration, some of the Irish members are not inclined to go out of their way to effect a repeal of the corn law.'

The Repealer James Power he considered a protectionist, and he believed that Redington was 'not very anxious for a repeal of the present law - though I have little doubt that he will follow your lordship in a division.'<sup>145</sup> Smith O'Brien had in December stated to O'Connell his

preference for 'a moderate fixed duty' to repeal, and at the January  
 'conference' of Repeal members announced his opposition to 'total repeal.'<sup>146</sup>  
 Heytesbury reckoned that 'very few, even amongst his friends', shared  
 O'Connell's views on the question.<sup>147</sup>

In the event, in the three major divisions in the Commons on the  
 Corn bill, 53 Irish liberals, including Power and Redington, supported  
 repeal; 10 abstained or were absent, including the liberal-unionists French,  
 Sheil, Tuite and Westenra, and the Repealer Smith O'Brien; and 2 voted  
 against the measure, the independent Repealer Robert Archbold (Co. Kildare)  
 and the liberal-unionist Thomas Martin (Co. Galway). Smith O'Brien, though  
 taking no part in the proceedings on the bill itself, did rise at one point  
 to state his preference for a fixed duty and his readiness to accept a  
 temporary suspension of the Corn laws to meet the crisis in Ireland. Some<sup>148</sup>  
 of the Irish peers - Bessborough, Clanricarde and Lansdowne - were said to  
 belong to the group of leading Whigs who favoured a fixed duty compromise,  
 but, after Russell insisted on full repeal at a meeting of Whig peers on  
 the 23rd of May, Clanricarde and Lansdowne opposed the fixed duty amendment  
 and the bill passed with the Irish Whig peers even more united in its  
 support than their colleagues of the lower House.<sup>149</sup>

The liberal-unionist members were also active on other fronts. Watson  
 of Kinsale led another attempt to relieve Catholics of certain pains and  
 penalties; he had the satisfaction of seeing a Government bill of a similar  
 nature, but not including his proposal to recognize the Catholic episcopal  
 provinces, pass into law soon after the loss of his measure. Crawford<sup>150</sup>  
 urged the Government to bring on their landlord and tenant bill and  
 responded quite generously, though by no means unreservedly, when their  
 rather unambitious programme was unfurled shortly before their departure  
 from office. French, Clanricarde, Monteagle and other liberal-unionists  
 were active in urging railways extension. Ferguson, Norreys, Layard,  
 Villiers Stuart and some of the Irish Whig peers met with other Irish  
 representatives in June 1846 to promote this object.<sup>151</sup>  
<sup>152</sup>



In supporting a motion from Lord Grey on the state of Ireland, Clanricarde censured the Government for their conduct across a range of topics - the State Trials, the Church, appointments, the franchise, the corporations, the Devon Commission - and attributed the rise of Repeal to the Government's failings. Other liberal-unionists spoke up on the Church question, education, polling, waste lands, drainage, and maintenance of the police. <sup>153</sup> No liberal-unionist joined the Repeal members towards the end of April in trying to protect Smith O'Brien from a charge of contempt of the House after his refusal to serve on a Railways Select Committee. Armstrong, William Browne and Rawdon voted with his accusers, Rawdon explaining that he had to set aside 'personal motives' to do what he thought 'fit and right'. Some weeks later the liberal-unionists voted <sup>154</sup> unanimously for O'Connell's vain attempt at a compromise solution.

In March 1846, More O'Ferrall wrote two powerful, almost apocalyptic letters to Russell, urging him to commit his party to establishing in Ireland 'a system which will satisfy the feelings and embark the interests of the Irish people in its support'. Only 'perfect equality with England or perfect independence' would satisfy a people which had outgrown the ambitions of those like O'Ferrall who 'grew up during the existence of the penal code' and 'were gratified and contented with comparative justice'. He warned that 'the period of trial approaches' - Russell's forming a Government - when those who believed that the Union could be 'made beneficial to both countries' would have their 'just and moderate views' tested by results, and would be forced by failure to advocate a separate Parliament in spite of their conviction that its 'permanent success' was impossible. He went on:

'All previous Irish policy has failed on half measures, even with good men. You now find the public mind in Ireland engrossed with an exaggerated idea of the results to be expected from a repeal of the Union. Give them boldly and generously what they desire thro' a British Parliament. Be assured it would not alienate one million of protestants, but if it did you would secure the attachment of seven millions of Catholics. All men of property are fully alive to the present dangers, they .. would submit to great sacrifices thro' British legislation to ensure future security... Believe me, men without large measures will no longer succeed in governing

Ireland.. If good men can not carry good measures, they can take the first step to success by proposing them ...'

He envisaged a declaration of future policy which might obtain 'general concurrence' from Peel, at least on principles, a concurrence which would lead O'Ferrall to 'entertain for the first time in my life a confident hope of the regeneration of this country (Ireland). I fear that if political leaders continue to make Ireland the battleground of party we may live to see it the battleground of hostile armies.' By agreement in Ireland between 'the two great party leaders', all the Irish parties would 'know that whoever was minister the system would prevail', the moderates of both sides would be encouraged, and the hopes of Orangeman and repealer dashed.

The measures O'Ferrall wished to see from the basis of a 'general understanding' with Peel included reform of the Church, which he considered the first priority; renewal of 'political intercourse' with Rome; replacement of the irresponsible Grand Juries with bodies composed of both elected and ex officio councillors; and 'firm and conciliatory' administration of the law, with due deference to Irish opinion. He also proposed 'the most careful revision' of the laws regulating landlord and tenant relations, going far beyond a single measure of compensation for improvements, which would 'effect but little compared to the extent of the evil ...

'The (land) question is a large one and should be considered in all its bearings, and without too much tenderness for what is so mis-called the rights of property. I firmly believe if these rights were curtailed and their exercise defined and simplified, the landlords would be great gainers. A change in the law might wound some prejudices, but if it attached the people by the solid benefits conferred on the many at the expense of the few, it would be sufficient justification for a departure from the old system which has reduced this country to so deplorable a state.'

155

He claimed that Pigot shared this view of the land question. The Protection of Life bill of 1846 dominated the attention of the Irish members that session and brought a degree of division to the liberal-unionist ranks. From October 1844 outrages had prevailed almost constantly in several Irish counties, notably Tipperary, Limerick, Clare, Cavan,



Leitrim, Roscommon and parts of Fermanagh. These outrages - murders, assaults, attacks on property, raids for arms, etc. - were purely agrarian in nature, with little religious or political motivation. Though the Irish Tories were particularly outspoken in response this development, Irish Whigs like Clements, Tuite, Leinster, Bessborough and Clanricarde were also greatly alarmed, and even O'Connell and Crawford expressed  
156  
concern.

Several Irish Whigs clearly came to Parliament in 1846 well disposed to the idea of coercion. Speaking on the Address the O'Connor Don expressed his 'abhorrence' of the 'barbarities' being committed in Ireland and 'was glad to think that measures were to be proposed for the suppression of crime', though he hoped that there would also be remedial legislation. In  
157  
February, Clements, as he had already done in private, urged the Government to use their power under the Constabulary Act to proclaim the disturbed areas in order that the inhabitants of those areas alone could be charged with the expense of extra policing. Clanricarde accused the Government of 'great neglect' and 'supineness' in allowing outrage 'to an unparalleled extent', of failing to enforce or alter the law as the situation demanded, and in particular of rejecting unreasonably the proposal of district fines for the compensation of victims of outrage.

On the 23rd of February, St. Germans introduced the Government's  
158  
Protection of Life bill. Based upon a paper by the Prime Minister himself, it redefined the Lord Lieutenant's power to require disturbed areas to bear the expense of additional constabulary, proposed a penalty of transportation for anyone breaking the curfew which the Lord Lieutenant could enforce in a disturbed area, and included Clanricarde's suggestion of compensation for victims of outrage out of district fines. Lansdowne and Clanricarde were among those who welcomed the bill as a necessary measure of protection, though Clanricarde proposed several modifications, and the bill was given an unopposed second reading.

In Committee, Monteagle, too, warmly praised the measure and with

Lansdowne and Clanricarde helped to defeat Lord Grey's efforts to mitigate its severity. Clanricarde's principal objection was partially removed when the Government accepted Lansdowne's amendment limiting the operation of the bill to three years, and he subsequently attacked the Government for its lack of urgency in carrying so vital a measure. When Clarendon informed the Whig peers of Russell's 'difficulties' regarding the measure they were 'much annoyed' and determined to give 'proof of the sincerity of their own convictions that the measure was necessary' by supporting it even against Russell's wishes. According to Clarendon,

'Bessborough & Clanricarde both said that every one of the liberal Irish members who are now opposed to the Bill have in private expressed themselves favorably upon it & admitted its necessity.'

Bessborough in fact wrote to Clarendon that the insufficiency of the existing law made the bill a necessity, that even in Conciliation Hall the crisis was recognized, that in nearly two hours of conversation between himself and Pigot on the state of Ireland the M.P. had not expressed a single doubt as to the propriety of coercion, and that he was surprised Russell 'does not see that not one person in the House of Commons connected with Ireland opposes the Bill.' Towards the end of March Bessborough was still unhappy with Russell and the other Whigs who hesitated to follow the course of the Irish peers.

Clanricarde wrote in similar terms directly to Russell, reminding him of the 'fearful responsibility' of opposing a measure to deal with a state of disturbance acknowledged by all, even Repealers. The latter were 'anxious to embarrass the Government and to excite animosity against Imperial Parliament....'

'Their object is plain. But except More O'Ferrall & Sir W. Somerville I have not heard of one single independent M.P. who does not say that Ireland is now in a noise (sic), & politically in a more critical state than at any time within the memory of man. I assure you that in Dublin liberal old men told me that there were not half such bad symptoms visible in '97 & '98 ... no Government can exist or ought to exist in this country if it is opposed to the property, integrity, and intelligence of the country. And I know the mass of these, in an immense proportion, think it absolutely necessary that the Queen's Government should take some energetic steps to restore her & put down Molly Maguire's authority in Ireland .. O'Conor Don & F. French are both of my opinion. I know.'



He insisted, then, on the need for the bill, though he thought it 'inefficient for its purpose' and wanted to limit it to one year.

162

Speaking 12 days later in the Lords he was still unrepentantly coercionist.

The Whig George Moore felt that the people of Mayo were 'ready to break into open rebellion at the very first signal given to them by their spiritual leaders.' Graham concurred in this view and reckoned that,

'the real state of the country is known to the Irish members; nevertheless they will not dare to support our bill for the protection of life. The influence of the reign of terror haunts them even in Parliament.' 163

At a meeting at Russell's on the 9th of March, Wyse and Somerville 'declared strongly against' the bill; Somerville subsequently gave notice of an amendment to the first reading and at a second meeting of the Whigs, on the 27th, Wyse urged his British colleagues to support the amendment. 164

In his first letter to Russell, on the 17th of March, More O'Ferrall regretted O'Connell's insistence 'on remedial measures accompanying the Coercion bill ... as they will ... appear to be the fruits of crime'.

But, he wrote,

'I do not think it effective for its purpose, and may be made the instrument of great oppression and injustice, sowing the seed of future discontent.. The principal disturbance exists in Roscommon, where oppression of the poor has long been practised by the grass farmers.... They (the poor) have certainly committed great outrages, but they have long been the victims of great oppression. If the mass of the people are made subject to a coercion law to be administered by their oppressors, should not the legislature which enacts it apply some coercion to those oppression rendered the law necessary?' 165

In a hastily-produced pamphlet the Repealer Dillon Browne listed 33 Irish members as having 'met at different times in the Reform Club' to organize their opposition to the first reading. The liberal-unionists Wyse, Rawdon, Norreys, Crawford, Hatton, Emonds, Collett, Somerville, Carew, the O'Connor Don and Barron (?) feature in this list, but the large majority were Repealers. 166 24 Irish liberals spoke against the first reading; the majority again were repealers, but most of the above-mentioned liberal-unionists took part and others, Bellew and Layard, also protested against the measure. No Irish liberal supported the bill in debate. But in the final division on the first reading, <sup>three</sup> liberal-unionists, Ferguson,



William Browne and Howard, voted with the Government, and almost all of the 20 Irish liberals who failed to vote were unionists. The Irish liberal speakers generally accepted that the level of crime in parts of Ireland was intolerable, but they complained that the proposed bill gave the Lord Lieutenant unconstitutional powers and, with its harassment and taxation of innocent persons, would only aggravate the situation. They advocated strict application of the ordinary law and a conciliatory legislative programme, the latter involving the old politico-religious grievances but above all removing the agrarian grievances out of which outrage had risen. John Collett declared that the bill had persuaded him  
167  
of the necessity of repeal.

168

This 'band of patriots, the faithful body-guard of Ireland', held up the bill for over a month on the first reading. Russell at that stage supported the bill 'very reluctantly', much dissatisfied with the Irish Whig peers over their support of the measure and evidently anxious to conciliate the Irish of the lower House and to challenge a much-weakened  
169  
Government. During the month of April, however, Bessborough and Clanricarde 'entirely changed their minds' and concluded that the measure would 'do more harm than good.' Bessborough sent a message to Russell to say 'that he was no longer anxious for its success as in consequence of its having been so long delayed he did not believe that it would now be  
170  
attended by any beneficial effect.' And in May Clanricarde declared in Parliament that he 'did not think that this measure would do any good now, from the way in which it was brought before Parliament, and the way in which it was likely to pass', apparently a reference to the delays permitted by the Government both before and after the introduction of the bill.

Russell's opposition to the bill hardened during April; he determined by the 26th 'to throw out the coercion bill on the second reading' and a  
171  
month later gave notice of his intended opposition in the House. Monteagle warned Russell that Peel saw the coercion issue as one on which he could go out with advantage, and that 'an overwhelming majority of the



172

non repealing Irish' wanted the bill. But Russell replied that Bessborough and Clanricarde had changed their minds and he ridiculed the measure for its ineffectiveness during daylight hours. 173

When the liberals met on the 6th of June to consider their policy, Russell said he wished to oppose the second reading of the 'harsh and oppressive' measure. Of the 20 Irish M.P's, half of them unionists, and 50-odd British members present, only one, Lord Clements, ventured to disagree. He had taken no part at the first reading, but, 'regretting his separation from his friends', and though he too doubted if it would prove effective, convinced as he was that 'the social condition of Ireland required the application of coercive measures' he had to support the bill. Afterwards, at the Reform Club, the Irish members agreed that Somerville and Rawdon, liberal-unionists, should propose and second the amendment to the second reading. 174

The debate on the second reading resembled that on the first in that the Irish liberals, repealers and unionists, again led the assault. And there was little change in the import of their arguments. On this occasion, however, Clements and Ferguson voted with the Government, while Browne and Howard were among the absentees. 48 Irish liberal members voted against the reading. More important, the Whig leaders and over 70 Conservative Protectionists opposed the measure. The Government were defeated by 73 votes and four days later, on the 29th of June, announced their resignation. 175

Early in July, Monteagle wrote to Peel in sympathetic vein; he regretted that it was Peel's advocacy of repeal of the Corn Laws which had caused his downfall, and, evidently unable to follow the other Irish Whig peers in their change of policy on the coercion bill, added, 'Had I been in the House of Commons I should have voted with you <sup>in your</sup> last division, as I did in the other House.' 176 So, the differences within liberal-unionism on the bill were only partially resolved, for all that political expediency dictated rejection of the bill. And though the bulk of the liberal-unionist members resisted impressively throughout, it was O'Connell and

the Repealers who dominated proceedings when 'the Irish members' spelt out their position on the first reading.

Indeed it is clear that in general O'Connell was able to resume his place as the dominant influence in the Irish liberal representation on his return to Parliament in 1846. The importance of the liberal-unionists from 1843 was, of course, always derivative, in that they were able to pose as the Parliamentary representatives of liberal Ireland in the absence of her true leaders. While the liberal-unionists were always active and occasionally effective during these years, they did not seriously challenge the Repealers for the affections of Irish Catholics.

In fact, in seven by-elections between 1843 and 1846, seats held by liberal-unionists fell to repealers, with no compensating gains, not to speak of their losses from the defections of such as Smith O'Brien, Caleb Powell, John O'Brien and John Collett. Wyse, Sheil, Bellew, the O'Connor Don, Pigot and Redington, all Catholic liberal-unionists, accepted office from the Whigs in 1846, probably putting more distance between them and the majority of Irishmen. A year later, the number of liberal-unionists was reduced to 25 by the General Election of 1847, with Wyse, Barron, Monahan, Stuart and Carew among those driven out by the Repealers, the latter having an Indian summer before the heirs of O'Connell themselves drifted back to unionism and Young Ireland turned to rebellion.



## Chapter 9

1. DEP, 29 July 1843.
2. DEM, 15, 22 Dec. 1841, 2 Feb., 6, 27 April, 23 Sept. 1842, 6, 20 Jan., 7, 28 April, 17 May 1843.
3. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f14, Crawford to Peel, 8 July 1843.
4. Hansard, 70, 15-16, 16 June 1843, Crawford; 70, 297-9, 23 June 1843, Peel; 70, 669-71, 683-6, 4 July 1843, O'Brien, Wyse; 70, 777-9, 781-3, 816-7, 7 July 1843, Norreys, O'Ferrall, Graham; 70, 917-8, 943, 979-81, 11 July 1843, M. J. O'Connell, Crawford, Peel; 70, 1021-2, 1031, 1083-5, 12 July 1843, Murphy, Barron, Stanley.
5. Hansard, 71, 412-23, 9 Aug. 1843, Crawford, Peel, O'Ferrall, M. J. O'Connell, Norreys.
6. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 533, f1, Devon to Peel, 1 Sept. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 543, f65, Peel to Devon, 25 April 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 449, f27, 43, 91, Graham to Peel, 6, 21 Sept., 17 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 534, f357, Peel to Hamilton, 4 Nov. 1843. Graham Papers, 5IR, Devon to Eliot, 8 Sept. 1843; 6IR, Graham to De Grey, 13 Oct. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 15 Oct. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 16 Oct. 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 63-4.
7. Graham Papers, 6IR, Graham to De Grey, 27 Oct. 1843; 11IR, De Grey to Graham, 2, 5, 9, 14 Nov. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 4 Nov. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 534, f311, Tighe to Peel, 23 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 535, f177, O'Ferrall to Peel, 6 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f279, Eliot to Peel, 24 Oct. 1843.
8. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3040, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 13 Dec. 1843; 3042, O'Connell to Mahony, 17 Dec. 1843; 3047, O'Connell to Buller, 9 Jan. 1844. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f132-7, O'Connell to Buller, 9 Jan. 1844. Rathoon Papers, MS 18, 304, O'Connell to Mahony, 17 Dec. 1843. DEM, 20 Dec. 1843, O'Connell to Ray, 15 Dec. 1843.
9. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (1), Clanricarde to Monteagle, 10 Nov. 1843.
10. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1100, Chapman to O'Brien, Jan. 1844.
11. Hansard, 72, 18-19, 32-5, 1 Feb. 1844, Normanby, Clanricarde; 72, 203, 2 Feb. 1844, Crawford, 72, 327-8, 6 Feb. 1844, Waley; 72, 517-8, 12 Feb. 1844, Ross; 72, 630-1, 657, 722, 751-2, 13 Feb. 1844, Normanby, Clanricarde, Russell, Wyse; 72, 863, 975-7, 15 Feb. 1844, Fortescue, Howick; 72, 1046-7, 16 Feb. 1844, Murphy; 72, 1124-5, 19 Feb. 1844, John O'Connell; 72, 1234, 1255-6, 20 Feb. 1844, O'Connor Don, Gisborne; 73, 44-5, 99-100, 22 Feb. 1844, Bellew, Sheil; 73, 202-3, 261-2, 23 Feb. 1844, O'Connell, Russell.
12. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (1), Clanricarde to Monteagle, 3, 10 Nov. 1843. Broadlands MSS, GC/CL/60, Clanricarde to Palmerston, 31 Oct. 1843.
13. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (4). Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/80, Russell to Palmerston, 8 Nov. 1843.
14. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (1), Clanricarde to Monteagle, 10 Nov. 1843. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/80, Russell to Palmerston, 8 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, GC/LA/61, Lansdowne to Palmerston, 3 Nov. 1843. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Russell, I, 68, Russell to Lansdowne, 11 Nov. 1843.

15. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394(1), Clanricarde to Monteagle, 10 Nov. 1843. Broadlands MSS, GC/CL/60, Clanricarde to Palmerston, 31 Oct. 1843.
16. Cloncurry to the Editor of the Morning Chronicle, 25 Oct. 1843, in W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times, and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry*, 486.
17. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f128-31, Pigot to Russell, 2 Jan. 1844. Broadlands MSS, GC/LA/61, Lansdowne to Palmerston, 3 Nov. 1843. Gooch, *Later Correspondence of Russell, I*, 69, Russell to Lansdowne, 18 Nov. 1843.
18. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394(1), Fitzwilliam to Monteagle, 21 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, (2), Morpeth to Monteagle, 16 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, Normanby to Monteagle, 1 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, (3), Russell to Monteagle, 25 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, MS 13, 366(2), Napier to Monteagle, 1 Dec. 1843. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f89, Palmerston to Russell, 22 Oct. 1843. Gooch, *Later Correspondence of Russell, I*, 65-9, Palmerston to Russell, 22 Oct. 1843; Russell to Lansdowne, 31 Oct., 11, 18 Nov. 1843. *The Greville Papers*, V, 137-8, 146, 31 Oct., 13 Dec. 1843.
19. See above, p 90. Wyse Papers, MS 15019(10), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 Aug. 1843.
20. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 17 Nov. 1843.
21. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1085, Wyse to O'Brien, 24 Nov. 1843.
22. Wyse Papers, MS 15019(10), Smith O'Brien to Wyse, 27 Nov. 1843. J. J. Auchmuty, *Sir Thomas Wyse*, 193-4.
23. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1100, Chapman to O'Brien, Jan. 1844; *ibid*, f1102, Wyse to O'Brien, 2 Jan. 1844.
24. *The Times*, 15 Jan. 1844.
25. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f142-5, Pigot to Russell, 15 Jan. 1844.
26. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1102, Wyse to O'Brien, 2 Jan. 1844.
27. M. D. Jephson, *An Anglo-Irish Miscellany*, 230, Wyse to Jephson-Norreys, 10 Jan. 1844.
28. H. L. Bulwer, *Life of Palmerston*, II, 133-5, Palmerston to Temple, 5 Jan. 1844.
29. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1107, Powell to O'Brien, 11 Jan. 1844.
30. *The Times*, 19 Jan. 1844, O'Brien to Ray, 15 Jan. 1844. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1110, Powell to O'Brien, 15 Jan. 1844; *ibid*, f1111, Griffin to O'Brien, 15 Jan. 1844; *ibid*, f1113, Ray to O'Brien, 17 Jan. 1844.
31. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1109, Charlemont to O'Brien, 12 Jan. 1844.
32. *The Times*, 22 Jan. 1844. FJ, 2 Feb. 1844. DEP, 20 Jan. 1844. Duffy, *Young Ireland*, 445-6. Hansard, 72, 77-8, 1 Feb. 1844, Hume. Graham Papers, 131R, Eliot to Graham, 19 Jan. 1844.



33. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394(2), Napier to Monteagle, 14 Dec. 1843. (Nassau Senior), 'Ireland', The Edinburgh Review, Vol. LXXIX, No. CLIX (Jan. 1844), 259-61.
34. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 366(2), Napier to Monteagle, 30 Aug. 1843.
35. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f101-3, Palmerston to Russell, 22 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, f140, Cottenham to Russell, 15 Jan. 1840. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394(2), Normanby to Monteagle, 1 Dec. 1844. Wyse Papers, MS 15026(5), Russell to Wyse, 21 Jan. 1844.
36. Hansard, 72, 15-21, 36-5, 76-9, 85-6, 109-11, 111-3, 116-7, 117-3, 1 Feb. 1844, Normanby, Clanricarde, Hume, Russell, Roebuck, Howick, Wyse, O'Connor Don; 72, 160-2, 162, 164-5, 165-8, 170-4, 175-6, 176-7, 180-4, 187-9, 189-90, 194-5, 196, 196-8, 199-200, 200-1, 2 Feb. 1844, Crawford, French, Blewitt, Roebuck, Wyse, Bernal, Murphy, Ward, Wallace, Curteis, Barron, Bowring, Division.
37. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1102, 1119, Wyse to O'Brien, 2 Jan., 3 Feb. 1844.
38. Hansard, 72, 691-701, 704-5, 716-23, 728, 736-44, 750-9, 13 Feb. 1844, Russell, Wyse; 72, 809-10, 819-20, 840-5, 14 Feb. 1844, Leveson, Clements, Grey; 72, 930-6, 945-50, 953-6, 975-91, 15 Feb. 1844, Ross, Barron, O'Ferrall, Howick; 72, 1029-35, 1046-7, 1062-8, 16 Feb. 1835, Ward, Murphy, C. Buller; 72, 1124-6, 1134-5, 1146-7, 1153-7, 1190-3, 19 Feb. 1844, John O'Connell, Layard, Napier, John O'Brien, Macaulay; 72, 1209-19, 1231-4, 1245-7, 1253-4, 1255-7, 1270-1, 20 Feb. 1844, Hawes, O'Connor Don, E. Buller, Gisborne, Wilde; 73, 43-5, 49-50, 99-105, 22 Feb. 1844, Bellew, Hume, Sheil; 73, 170-2, 174-5, 184-5, 193-8, 202-6, 261-2, 23 Feb. 1844, Roebuck, O'Connell, Russell.
39. Hansard, 72, 698, 705-14, 728, 744-9, 13 Feb. 1844, Russell, Wyse; 72, 809-10, 834-9, 14 Feb. 1844, Leveson, Grey; 72, 950-1, 956-9, 987-8, 15 Feb. 1844, Barron, O'Ferrall, Howick; 72, 1004-5, 1019-26, 1038-43, 1053-4, 1059, 16 Feb. 1844, Bernal, Ward, Murphy, C. Buller; 72, 1106-10, 1120-3, 1134, 1157, 1184-90, 19 Feb. 1844, Horsman, John O'Connell, Layard, John O'Brien, Macaulay; 72, 1215-6, 1226-31, 1244-5, 1254-5, 1272-1305, 20 Feb. 1844, Hawes, O'Connor Don, E. Buller, Gisborne, Wilde; 73, 24-32, 43, 48, 60-1, 71-99, 22 Feb. 1844, M. O'Connell, Bellew, Hume, Powell, Sheil; 73, 176-84, 198-202, 23 Feb. 1844, Roebuck, O'Connell.
40. Hansard, 72, 602-35, 648-59, 673-80, 13 Feb. 1844, Normanby, Clanricarde, Beaumont; 72, 811-5, 14 Feb. 1844, Cochrane; 72, 859-64, 875-97, 907-19, 921-5, 936-44, 15 Feb. 1844, Fortescue, Monteagle, Normanby, Division, Borthwick; 72, 1007-17, 16 Feb. 1844, Disraeli; 72, 1116-7; 19 Feb. 1844, Smythe; 73, 266-71, 23 Feb. 1844, Division.
41. Wyse Papers, MS 15020(6), George Wyse to Wyse, 16 Feb. 1844.
42. Hansard, 73, 3-12, 16-17, 18-19, 21-2, 22 Feb. 1844, Monteagle, Normanby, Campbell; 73, 276-83, 283-5, 298-302, 26 Feb. 1844, Crawford, Rawdon, E. B. Roche; 73, 325-6, 385-7, 27 Feb. 1844, Norreys, Bernal; 73, 411-5, 415-6, 420, 420-1, 421, 421-3, 29 Feb. 1844, Rawdon, Stuart, Somers, Crawford, E. B. Roche, Division; 73, 436-48, 458-61, 461-2, 462-4, 1 March 1844, Duncombe, Bellew, Division; 73, 531, 4 March 1844, Norreys; 73, 570-4, 580, 5 March 1844, Clanricarde; 73, 845-57, 858-60, 12 March 1844, Monteagle, Lansdowne.
43. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1134, Norreys to O'Brien, 5 March 1844.

44. Ibid, f1129, 1132, 1137, 1140, Wyse to O'Brien, 22 Feb., 3, 7, 13 March 1844.
45. Ibid, f1146, Barron to O'Brien, 20 March 1844.
46. Ibid, f1147, 1150, Wyse to O'Brien, 21, 26 March 1844. Hansard, 73, 1352-5, 21 March 1844, Wyse.
47. Hansard, 73, 1705-22, 1 April 1844, French, Hume, M. J. O'Connell, Wyse, O'Ferrall, Russell, Bellew.
48. Wyse Papers, MS 15020(6), George Wyse to Wyse, 16 Feb. 1844. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1160, 1161, Wyse to O'Brien, 13, 15 April 1844.
49. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f370, Eliot to Peel, 26 April 1844. Graham Papers, 15IR, Eliot to Graham, 21 April 1844. DEM, 1 May 1844.
50. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1199, Maurice O'Connell to O'Brien, 30 June 1844.
51. Ibid..
52. Hansard, 75, 419-20, 10 June 1844, Peel; 76, 104-5, 28 June 1844, Peel; 76, 138-51, 1 July 1844, Peel, Duncombe, M. J. O'Connell, Stuart, Sheil, O'Ferrall.
53. Hansard, 74, 22-6, 16 April 1844, Wyse, French, Stuart; 74, 203-11, 23 April 1844, Clanricarde, Monteagle, Normanby, Campbell; 74, 508-14, 30 April 1844, French, Norreys; 74, 888-96, 10 May 1844, Cloncurry, Clanricarde; 74, 1181-1201, 14 May 1844, Norreys, French, O'Ferrall, Redington, Division; 74, 1229-31, 17 May 1844, Clanricarde; 75, 77-9, 31 May 1844, Normanby, Fitzwilliam; 76, 1-13, 15, 27 June 1844, Clanricarde.
54. Hansard, 74, 563-5, 2 May 1844, Clanricarde; 75, 534-63, 571-2, 583-5, 11 June 1844, Ward, Ross, Redington; 75, 587-93, 657-61, 667-71, 12 June 1844, Rawdon, Sheil, Division.
55. DEP, 20 June 1844, Sheil to Wyse, n.d..
56. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3073, O'Connell to Sheil, 19 June 1844.
57. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/82, Russell to Palmerston, 6 June 1844; *ibid*, GC/RU/972, Palmerston to Russell, 6 June 1844.
58. Hansard, 76, 871-3, 15 July 1844, Division.
59. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1208, Wyse to O'Brien, 12 July 1844.
60. Ibid, MS 433, f1165, Wyse to O'Brien, 2 May 1844.
61. Hansard, 76, 830-73, 15 July 1844, Wyse, M. J. O'Connell, Stuart, John O'Brien, Division.
62. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f216-7, Sheil to Russell, 7 Aug. 1844.
63. Hansard, 76, 152-5, 1 July 1844, O'Ferrall, M. J. O'Connell, Sheil, Rawdon, Division; 76, 286-93, 3 July 1844, Murphy, Bellew, J. O'Brien; 76, 878-906, 16 July 1844, Fortescue, Normanby, Clanricarde, Campbell;



- 76, 1026-49, 18 July 1844, O'Ferrall, Bellew, Sheil, O'Conor Don, M. J. O'Connell, Ross; 76, 1121-35, 19 July 1844, Wyse, Sheil, Bellew; 76, 1313-31, 23 July 1844, Ross, Browne, O'Ferrall, Sheil, Bellew; 76, 1684-1705, 2 Aug. 1844, Clanricarde, Monteagle, Campbell; 76, 1859-67, 6 Aug. 1844, Wyse, Sheil, M. J. O'Connell; 76, 1956-88, 9 Aug. 1844, Sheil, Wyse, Russell, Hume; 76, 2004-5, 5 Sept. 1844, Cave.
64. Hansard, 72, 1232, 20 Feb. 1844, O'Conor Don; 73, 1723, 1 April 1844, Wyse; 75, 377-83, 391-5, 6 June 1844, Sheil, Division; 75, 1221-2, 1234-7, 21 June 1844, Murphy, Collett, Divisions; 76, 116-8, 28 June 1844, Division; 76, 1129-41, 19 July 1844, Peel, Sheil, Bellew, Palmerston, Ross; 76, 1163, 22 July 1844, Monteagle; 76, 1460, 26 July 1844, Clanricarde; 76, 1653-4, 1 Aug. 1844, Rawdon.
65. Hansard, 75, 1345-7, 25 June 1844, Monteagle, Clanricarde; 76, 95-8, 28 June 1844, Monteagle, Clanricarde; 76, 911-2, 16 July 1844, Clanricarde, Monteagle; 76, 1163, 22 July 1844, Monteagle; 76, 1688, 1696-7, 2 Aug. 1844, Clanricarde, Monteagle.
66. Graham Papers, 16IR, Eliot to Graham, 6 July 1844.
67. Hansard, 76, 1516-41, 29 July 1844, O'Ferrall, Bellew, Sheil, Wyse, Rawdon, D. Browne, Division, M. J. O'Connell; 76, 1658-69, 1 Aug. 1844, Graham, O'Ferrall, O'Conor Don, Sheil, D. Browne, Wyse, Rawdon, Divisions; 76, 1714, 2 Aug. 1844, Wyse; 76, 1780-1, 5 Aug. 1844, D. Browne, M. J. O'Connell.
68. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1222, Wyse to O'Brien, 5 Aug. 1844.
69. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 550, f158, Hatherton to Peel, 20 Aug. 1844.
70. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f45-50, Pigot to Russell, 22 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f109-12, Bessborough to Russell, 10 Jan. 1845.
71. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f420, Graham to Peel, 20 Dec. 1844.
72. Wyse Papers, MS 15025(1), Wyse to the Waterford Political Union, 8 Nov. 1832. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 141, Wyse to the Electors of the City of Waterford, Sept. 1832. William Sharman Crawford, The expediency and necessity of a local legislative body in Ireland, supported by a reference to facts and principles (Newry, 1833). William Sharman Crawford, A review of the circumstances connected with the past and present state of the protestant and catholic interests in Ireland (Dublin, 1833), 31-43. NW, 1 Dec. 1831, 14 Feb. 1833, 20, 27 Jan., 21 April, 6, 9, 13, 23 Oct. 1834, 17 Oct. 1839, 12 Jan. 1841, 19, 23 Oct. 1841.
73. Wyse Papers, MS 15019(10), Wyse to George Wyse, 12, 14, 17 June 1843. See also Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f997, 1003, Potter to O'Brien, 8, 13 June 1843; *ibid*, f1001, Dunlop to O'Brien, 11 June 1843, on federalist stirrings at this time.
74. Hansard, 70, 694-5, 4 July 1843, Wyse; 70, 944, 11 July 1843, Crawford; 70, 1360, 27 July 1843, Crawford. DEP, 20 July 1843, Murphy to Hayes, 14 July 1843. NW (and DEP), 29 July 1843, Crawford to The Monitor, 22 July 1843. NW (and DEP), 8 Aug. 1843, Crawford to O'Connell, 1 Aug. 1843.
75. Peel Papers, Add MS40, 532, f388, Blake to Peel, 7 Sept. 1843.
76. DEM, 3, 15 Nov. 1843. See also Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1323, John O'Brien to O'Brien, 2 April 1845.

77. B. A. Kennedy, Sharman Crawford, 223-4. NW, 9 Nov. 1843, Ross to Belfast Vindicator, 6 Nov. 1843. NW, 30 Dec. 1843, Caulfield to Crawford, 9 Dec. 1843. C. G. Duffy, Short Life of Thomas Davis, 1840-1846 (London, Dublin, 1895), 179. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1135, Caulfield to O'Brien, 15 March 1844.
78. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1085, Wyse to O'Brien, 24 Nov. 1843. DEP, 17, 31 Oct. 1843, O'Connell in the Repeal Association, 16, 30 Oct. 1843.
79. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1100, Chapman to O'Brien, Jan. 1844. See above, p169.
80. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394(6), Charlemont to Monteagle, 14 March 1844. Wyse Papers, MS 15020(6), George Wyse to Wyse, 30 Jan. 1844; *ibid*, MS 15026(5), Sheil to Wyse, 4 March 1844.
81. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1134, Norreys to O'Brien, 5 March 1844.
82. Duffy, Young Ireland, 479.
83. J. G. V. Porter, Ireland ..., A Federal (the only fair) union between Great Britain and Ireland ... (London, Dublin, 1844).
84. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f160, 164, 195, Graham to Peel, 17, 18, 28 Sept. 1844. L. J. Jennings, The Croker Papers, III, 20, Graham to Croker, 14 Oct. 1844. Graham Papers, 77B, Graham to Peel, 18, 28 Sept. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 13 Sept. 1844; Graham to Aberdeen, 20 Sept. 1844; 77A, Graham to Wellington, 2 Oct. 1844 (latter also in Wellington Papers, Port. 123, f139).
85. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f99, 117, Peel to Heytesbury, 17, 25 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, f101, 103, 123, Heytesbury to Peel, 20, 21, 28 Oct. 1844. Graham Papers, 171R, Elliot to Graham, 27 Oct. 1844; 181R, Elliot to Graham, 9 Nov. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 122-3. T. De Vere White, The Road of Excess, 83-9.
86. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (7), Morpeth to Monteagle, 16 Sept. 1844.
87. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f242-3, Russell to Leinster, 13 Sept. 1844; *ibid*, f244-6, Leinster to Russell, 17 Sept. 1844. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Russell, I, 72-3.
88. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f252-5, Bessborough to Russell, 20 Sept. 1844.
89. DEP, 15 Oct. 1844, O'Connell to Repeal Association, 12 Oct. 1844.
90. W. J. O'Neill Daunt, A Life Spent for Ireland, being selections from the journals of the late W. J. O'Neill Daunt, edited by his daughter (London, 1896), 43. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3073, O'Connell to Sheil, 19 June 1844; 3092, 3103, O'Connell to O'Brien, 1, 21 Oct. 1844; 3098, 3100, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 8, 12 Oct. 1844; 3100a, O'Connell to Mahony, 12 Oct. 1844; 3102, O'Connell to Maurice O'Connell, 17 Oct. 1844; 3106, O'Connell to O'Neill Daunt, 27 Oct. 1844. Rathcon Papers, MS 18, 304, O'Connell to Mahony, 12 Oct. 1844.
91. *Ibid*, Mahony to O'Connell, 15 Oct. 1844. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3101, Mahony to O'Connell, 15 Oct. 1844; 3103, O'Connell to O'Brien, 21 Oct. 1844. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1282, Davis to O'Brien, 3 Nov. 1844. Duffy, Young Ireland,



- 608-9, 615-6, O'Connell to O'Brien, 21 Oct. 1844 (with declaration), Davis to O'Brien, 3 Nov. 1844. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 329-31.
92. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f267-73, Wyse to Russell, 25 Oct. 1844.
  93. NW, 5 Nov. 1844.
  94. DEP, 12 Nov. 1844.
  95. NW, 12, 14, 16, 19 Nov. 1844.
  96. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1277, Crawford to O'Brien, 18 Nov. 1844.
  97. Ellice Papers, MS 15052, f37, Russell to Ellice, 5 Nov. 1844. Duffy, Young Ireland, 587-8. DEM, 21 Oct. 1844.
  98. Duffy, Young Ireland, 588. NW, 17, 22 Oct., 5, 12, 14 Nov. 1844.
  99. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f16-3, Bessborough to Russell, 16 Nov. 1844.
  100. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (9), Monteagle to J. G. Porter, 6 Dec. 1844; *ibid* (10), Monteagle to Rev. J. G. Porter, 6 Nov. 1844.
  101. Graham Papers, 181R, Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Nov. 1844.
  102. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f895, Davis to O'Brien, (Nov. 1844). Duffy, Young Ireland, 605. Duffy, Davis, 185.
  103. Duffy, Young Ireland, 602.
  104. *Ibid*, 586-7. DEP, 15, 17, 19 Oct. 1844.
  105. DEP, 4 Feb. 1845.
  106. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f45-50, Pigot to Russell, 22 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f120-3, Campbell to Russell, 17 Jan. 1845. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/90-3, Russell to Palmerston, 15, 21, 22, 25 Jan. 1845. Hansard, 77, 34-5, 69-70, 4 Feb. 1845, Lansdowne, Russell.
  107. Hansard, 77, 18-21, 71-2, 99-100, 106-8, 4 Feb. 1845, Normanby, Russell, Bellew, Sheil. See also Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/40, f109-12, Bessborough to Russell, 10 Jan. 1845, for the view that the Commission would 'whitewash' the land issue when a measure was needed to end the ill-treatment of tenants whose expectations 'were unfairly & cruelly raised.'
  108. Hansard, 77, 17-18, 98-9, 101, 105-6, 4 Feb. 1845, Normanby, Wyse, Bellew, Sheil.
  109. The Greville Memoirs, V, 204, 6 Feb. 1845. Hansard, 77, 72-3, 83-4, 96-8, 101, 104-5, 4 Feb. 1845, Russell, Peel, Wyse, Bellew, Sheil.
  110. Graham Papers, 201R, Heytesbury to Graham, 20 Feb. 1845.
  111. Hansard, 77, 632, 634-7, 710-2, 721-5, 18 Feb. 1845, Collett, Division, Sheil, Murphy; 77, 751-824, 19 Feb. 1845, Roebuck, Sheil, Ross, Bellew, Barron, Murphy, Rawdon, Crawford, Divisions; 77, 862-6, 20 Feb. 1845, Layard; 77, 932-4, 956-67, 1022-5, 21 Feb. 1845, Collett, Watson, Division; 77, 1151-3, 24 Feb. 1845, Division; 77, 1346-50,



- 26 Feb. 1845, Division; 78, 175-7, 208-10, 28 Feb. 1845, Watson, Division; 78, 597-601, 615-7, 620-2, 10 March 1845, Sheil, Divisions; 78, 881-4, 13 March 1845, Division; 78, 1039-41, 17 March 1845, Division; 78, 1331-9, 1360-1, 1 April 1845, Sheil, Division.
112. Hansard, 77, 1221-33, 25 Feb. 1845, Bellew, M. J. O'Connell, Ross; 78, 407-29, 7 March 1845, Normanby, Fortescue; 79, 234-40, 247-52, 7 April 1845, Normanby; 79, 301-5, 8 April 1845, Normanby.
113. Cloncurry, Personal Recollections, 345-6, Holland to Cloncurry, 29 April 1835; 346-7, Melbourne to Cloncurry, 4 June 1835. W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times, and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry, 472-3, 498-9.
114. Monteagle Papers, MS 545, Spring Rice to King, 13 Jan. 1837. Hansard, 22, 970, 18 April 1834, Clements; 27, 1231, 19 May 1835, Sheil; 31, 266, 11 Feb. 1836, Cloncurry; 35, 1023, 8 Aug. 1836, Division; 36, 415, 10 Feb. 1837, Russell; 38, 1628-30, 26 June 1837, O'Brien, Division; 49, 1271-2, 5 Aug. 1839, Division; 54, 1165-6, 15 June 1840, Division; 55, 61-2, 23 June 1840, Division; 59, 668-72, 20 Sept. 1841, Bryan, M. J. O'Connell, Division; 62, 458-9, 14 April 1842, Cloncurry; 65, 379-94, 20 July 1842, Clements, O'Connell, Division; 68, 729-30, 7 April 1843, Division; 70, 61, 16 June 1843, Russell; 70, 916, 11 July 1843, M. J. O'Connell; 70, 1070, 12 July 1843, Palmerston; 71, 154, 1 Aug. 1843, Ward; 71, 447-9, 9 Aug. 1843, Sheil; 71, 899, 17 Aug. 1843, Fortescue; 72, 719, 753, 13 Feb. 1844, Russell, Wyse; 72, 896, 15 Feb. 1844, Monteagle; 72, 1146, 19 Feb. 1844, Napier; 73, 845-60, 12 March 1844, Monteagle, Lansdowne; 75, 658, 11 June 1844, Sheil; 75, 1345-7, 25 June 1844, Monteagle, Hatherton, Clanricarde; 76, 1121-9, 1134-5, 1143-4, 19 July 1844, Wyse, Bellew, Division; 76, 1698-9, 2 Aug. 1844, Monteagle. The Times, 19 April 1834.
115. The Times, 11 April 1845, O'Connell in Repeal Association. Rathoon Papers, MS, 18, 304, O'Connell to Mahony, 25 April 1845. Hansard, 79, 1298-1301, 24 April 1845, E. B. Roche. Graham Papers, 211R, Heytesbury to Graham, 8 April, 4 May 1845; 88, Mahony to Graham, 21 April 1845, with extract from O'Connell to Mahony, 19 April 1845. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 4 Oct. 1845. Duffy, Young Ireland, 644, 716. G. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, II, 9. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3140, 3141, O'Connell to Mahony, 19, 25 April 1845.
116. Hansard, 79, 1311-4, 24 April 1845, Division; 79, 1432-3, 28 April 1845, Division.
117. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f136-9, Ward to Russell, 30 March 1845; *ibid*, f140-1, Ellice to Russell, 31 March 1845. Hansard, 79, 390-1, 10 April 1845, Ward. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 563, f275, Young to Peel, 25 March 1845.
118. Hansard, 79, 76-82, 101-8, 109-11, 3 April 1845, Bellew, Sheil, Division; 79, 617-22, 14 April 1845, O'Connor Don; 79, 744-9, 756, 15 April 1845, Murphy, Ross; 79, 840-2, 16 April 1845, Redington; 79, 905-7, 17 April 1845, Tuite, Carew; 79, 939-41, 956-9, 980-9, 1042-5, 18 April 1845, Crawford, Bellew, Sheil, Division; 79, 1298-1301, 1309-11, 24 April 1845, E. B. Roche, Barron; 79, 1414-7, 1427-9, 1429-31, 28 April 1845, M. J. O'Connell, Collett, Division; 80, 113-4, 121, 127, 140-2, 2 May 1845, Division, Crawford, Wyse, Division; 80, 584, 19 May 1845, V. Blake; 80, 613-9, 623-4, 626-30, 643-4, 20 May 1845, Barron, Norreys, Rawdon, Bellew; 80, 683-91, 707-14, 720-2, 745-8, 750-3, 21 May 1845, Wyse, Sheil, Layard, Divisions. Both Crawford and Hill sat for English seats.



119. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 23 April 1845.
120. Hansard, 79, 1318-21, 25 April 1845, Lansdowne; 80, 48-81, 116-20, 4 June 1845, Monteagle, Divisions; 80, 270-1, 10 June 1845, Leinster; 80, 587-92, 16 June 1845, Lansdowne.
121. Bourke Papers, Vol. 313, f268, 282, Monteagle to Bourke, 13 May, 8 July 1845. Hansard, 79, 655-8, 14 April 1845; 79, 1194-8, 23 April 1845, Macaulay. Also on Macaulay's speech, see The Greville Memoirs, V, 214-5, 22 April 1845, noting the disapproval of Spencer and Bedford, and Recollections of Lord Broughton, VI, 143, 147, Diary, 23 April, 31 May 1845.
122. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 565, f31, Massey to Peel, 20 April 1845; *ibid*, f153, Monteagle to Peel, 23 April 1845.
123. Sheil, Blake and Clanricarde spoke of the latter appointment 'in terms of high commendation'. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f233, Graham to Peel, 26 Aug. 1845.
124. Hansard, 80, 1004-5, 28 May 1845; 80, 1423-6, 3 June 1845; 81, 381-4, 10 June 1845, Divisions.
125. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1343, Reynolds to O'Brien, 6 June 1845. Hansard, 81, 172, 5 June 1845, Ross; 81, 245-67, 9 June 1845, Ross, Redington, Ferguson, Crawford, Wyse, Somerville, O'Connor Don, Bellew, O'Ferrall; 81, 437-42, 12 June 1845, Redington, Ferguson, Division, Somerville, Norreys, O'Connor Don; 81, 625, 16 June 1845, Ross; 81, 1430-1, 3 July 1845, Clanricarde, Monteagle; 82, 2, 4 July 1845, Clanricarde.
126. DEM, 9, 11 July 1845. Hansard, 78, 1423, 2 April 1845, French; 81, 411, 12 June 1845, Crawford; 81, 1461-76, 3 July 1845, Sheil, Redington, Rawdon, Bellew, Division; 82, 418-24, 11 July 1845, Rawdon, Ross, Division; 82, 490-2, 14 July 1845, McNeill, Rawdon, Clements, Somerville.
127. Hansard, 79, 15 April 1845, French; 80, 158-80, 5 May 1845, French, Redington, G. A. Hamilton, Division; 80, 229-30, 7 May 1845, French; 80, 286-9, 8 May 1845, French, Shaw, Barron.
128. Hansard, 77, 833, 20 Feb. 1845, Watson; 79, 1411-2, 30 April 1845, Watson; 80, 1022-6, 29 May 1845, Murphy, Barron, Roche; 81, 450-8, 501-5, 13 June 1845, Clanricarde, Barron, Sheil, Wyse; 82, 279-88, 9 July 1845, Watson, Redington, Sheil, M. J. O'Connell; 82, 651-3, 668-70, 18 July 1845, Clanricarde, Clements, Ferguson, Crawford; 82, 1345-6, 4 Aug. 1845, Clanricarde; 82, 1448, 1503-8, 5 Aug. 1845, Norreys, Sheil. The Times, 11 July 1845, Division on Catholic Relief Bill. See Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f157-8, O'Ferrall to Russell, 22 June 1845, for O'Ferrall's canvassing of the Catholic Relief Bill.
129. P.P., 1845, VI, 177. Hansard, 81, 211-29, 9 June 1845, Stanley.
130. Bourke Papers, Vol. 313, f282, 286, Monteagle to Bourke, 8 July, 27 Aug. 1845. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f247-8, Pigot to Russell, 10 Sept. 1845. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 432, f891, Davis to O'Brien, n.d.; *ibid*, MS 434, f1349, Davis to O'Brien, 17 June 1845. See also *ibid*, MS 435, f1353, Maurice O'Connell to O'Brien, 21 June 1845; *ibid*, f1354, Sir David Roche to O'Brien, 26 June 1845. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3147, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 21 June 1845.



131. Hansard, 81, 229, 9 June 1845, Clanricarde; 81, 1119-52, 24 June 1845, Gosford, Clanricarde, Monteagle, Carew, Lansdowne, Protest (signed principally by Irish Whig and Tory peers); 81, 1196-9, 1203, 26 June 1845, Clanricarde. Thomas Davis, Report of the Parliamentary Committee of the Loyal National Repeal Association on the Tenants' Compensation Bill (Dublin, 1845).
132. Bourke Papers, Vol. 313, f282, Monteagle to Bourke, 8 July 1845. Hansard, 82, 493, 15 July 1845, Stanley.
133. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/81, Peel to Crawford, 9 July 1845. Hansard, 82, 622, 17 July 1845, Crawford. The Times, 24 Nov. 1845, Crawford to the Londonderry Standard, n.d..
134. DEM, 14 July 1845.
135. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 573, f182, Croker to Peel, 31 Aug. 1845.
136. DEM, 31 Oct., 3, 21, 24 Nov., 24 Dec. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 574, f366, Monteagle to Peel, 27 Sept. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 575, f282, Stuart De Decies to Heytesbury, 9 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 576, f322, Monteagle to Peel, 24 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 578, f7, Glengall to Peel, 4 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f189, Bullen to Peel, 8 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 579, f85, Monteagle to Peel, 18 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 476, f530, Peel to Fremantle, 7 Nov. 1845. W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry*, 501-4.
137. Graham Papers, 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Dec. 1845.
138. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4E, f199-200, 290-2, Bessborough to Russell, 18, 27 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f215-6, Morpeth to Russell, 19 Dec. 1845. Ellice Papers, MS 15047, f195, Bessborough to Ellice, 25 Dec. 1845. See also *The Greville Memoirs*, V, 285, 14 Jan. 1846, for Bessborough's advocacy of the Proclamation Act to curb the Repealers.
139. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4E, f159-61, Pigot to Russell, 15 Dec. 1845. Gooch, *Later Correspondence of Russell*, I, 92-3.
140. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4E, f80-1, Bessborough to Russell, 9 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f196, Lansdowne to Russell, 18 Dec. 1845.
141. *The Greville Memoirs*, V, 261, 19 Dec. 1845. MacVey Napier, Selection from the Correspondence of the late MacVey Napier, 520, Monteagle to Napier, 19 Jan. 1846.
142. Hansard, 83, 155, 162-3, 23 Jan. 1846, O'Connor Don, Crawford; 83, 184-8, 26 Jan. 1846, Barron, Clements; 83, 334-6, 28 Jan. 1846, Barron, French; 83, 432-8, 2 Feb. 1846, French, Ferguson, Division, Ross, Barron; 83, 528-9, 9 Feb. 1846, Monteagle; 83, 661, 675, 10 Feb. 1846, Crawford, Clements; 83, 727-36, 11 Feb. 1846, Crawford, French, O'Ferrall; 83, 912, 13 Feb. 1846, O'Ferrall; 84, 794-5, 9 March 1846, Crawford; 84, 993-4, 13 March 1846, Crawford; 84, 1173-5, 1207-8, 1211-2, 18 March 1846, Crawford, French, Somerville; 85, 277-8, 30 March 1846, Monteagle, Clanricarde; 85, 997-8, 24 April 1846, Bellew; 86, 132-3, 5 May 1846, Barron; 86, 447-8, 12 May 1846, Crawford; 87, 348-9, 12 June 1846, Monteagle; 87, 555, 561-2, 16 June 1846, Clanricarde, Cloncurry.
143. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 593, f28, A. S. O'Brien to Peel, 1 June 1846.
144. Hansard, 83, 333-4, 28 Jan. 1846, O'Connell; 83, 1050-68, 1077-85, 17 Feb. 1846, O'Connell, J. O'Connell; 83, 1414-5, 23 Feb. 1846,



- Fitzgerald; 84, 16-17, 24 Feb. 1846, M. J. O'Connell; 84, 780-1, 9 March 1846, O'Connell; 84, 984-5, 987-8, 992-3, 1006, 13 March 1846, O'Connell, O'Brien, J. O'Connell, V. Blake, Fitzgerald; 84, 1048, 1053, 16 March 1846, O'Brien; 84, 1186-9, 18 March 1846, O'Brien; 85, 702-32, 17 April 1846, R. D. Browne, O'Brien, E. B. Roche, O'Connell, J. O'Connell, Fitzgerald; 85, 980-4, 994-7, 1000-7, 24 April 1846, O'Brien, E. B. Roche, D. Browne, O'Connell.
145. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f73-6, Pigot to Russell, 19 Jan. 1846.
146. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3180, O'Brien to O'Connell, 18 Dec. 1845. DEM, 23 Jan. 1846.
147. Graham Papers, 26IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 25, 30, 31 Jan. 1846.
148. Hansard, 84, 349-54, 27 Feb. 1846, Division; 85, 265-70, 27 March 1846, Division; 85, 980-4, 24 April 1846, O'Brien; 86, 721-6, 15 May 1846, Division.
149. Diary of Lord Broughton, Add MS 43, 748, Vol. V, 7, 21-5 May 1846. The Greville Memoirs, V, 323-4, 1 June 1846. Prest, Lord John Russell, 214, quoting Morpeth's diary, 23 May 1846. DEM, 25, 27 May 1846. Hansard, 86, 1337-50, 1405-8, 28 May 1846, Lansdowne, Division; 87, 343-50, 12 June 1846, Monteagle; 87, 478-80, 15 June 1846, Division; 87, 550-5, 584-90, 16 June 1846, Clanricarde, Lansdowne; 87, 961-4, 25 June 1846, Protests.
150. Hansard, 83, 495-6, 5 Feb. 1846, Watson; 84, 953-7, 973, 11 March 1846, Wyse, Division; 86, 150-62, 6 May 1846, Watson, Division; 87, 918-37, 24 June 1846, Watson, Wyse, Redington, Division.
151. Hansard, 83, 213, 26 Jan. 1846, French; 83, 234-6, 27 Jan. 1846, Clanricarde; 83, 365-6, 29 Jan. 1846, Monteagle; 83, 514-22, 6 Feb. 1846, Monteagle, French, O'Connor Don; 83, 965, 16 Feb. 1846, Crawford; 83, 1255-6, 20 Feb. 1846, O'Connor Don; 84, 994, 13 March 1846, Crawford; 84, 1174, 18 March 1846, Crawford; 85, 660-5, 7 April 1846, Monteagle; 85, 844-52, 21 April 1846, French, Rawdon, Division; 85, 884-6, 908-11, 23 April 1846, Clanricarde, French; 85, 1054-9, 27 April 1846, Monteagle, Clanricarde; 85, 1340-50, 1 May 1846, Monteagle, Clanricarde; 86, 7-8, 4 May 1846, Barron; 86, 1196, 25 May 1846, Crawford; 87, 279-91, 11 June 1846, Lincoln, Crawford.
152. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 594, f85, Leinster to Peel, 22 June 1846.
153. Hansard, 83, 227-31, 26 Jan. 1846, French, Ferguson; 83, 428-31, 2 Feb. 1846, French, Ferguson; 83, 530-2, 9 Feb. 1846, Monteagle; 83, 674, 726-7, 10 Feb. 1846, Clements, Somerville; 83, 732-3, 11 Feb. 1846, French; 83, 1254, 20 Feb. 1846, Monteagle; 84, 220-1, 27 Feb. 1846, Monteagle; 84, 1206, 18 March 1846, French; 84, 1275-6, 20 March 1846, Wyse; 84, 1408-12, 23 March 1846, Clanricarde; 85, 677-91, 7 April 1846, Wyse; 85, 1206-10, 28 April 1846, Crawford, Wyse; 85, 1410-1, 1 May 1846, Somerville, Pigot.
154. Hansard, 85, 1191-3, 28 April 1846, Division, Rawdon; 86, 996-8, 22 May 1846, Watson, Division. The Times, 30 April 1846.
155. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f167-72, 175-8, O'Ferrall to Russell, 17, 26 March 1846.
156. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f109-12, Bessborough to Russell, 10 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, /4E, f6-7, Leinster to Russell, 1 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f80-1, 290-2, Bessborough to Russell, 9, 27, Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f252-4,



- 280-1, Clanricarde to Russell, 21, 23 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f321-2, Lansdowne to Russell, 30 Dec. 1845. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 7 Feb. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 9 April 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 10 April 1845; 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 29 Nov. 1845. Rathcon Papers, MS 18, 304, O'Connell to Mahony, 25, 26 April 1845. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, 3141-2, O'Connell to Mahony, 25, 26 April 1845. DEM, 4 July, 26 Nov., 3, 5 Dec. 1845. Hansard, 77, 156, 5 Feb. 1845, Crawford; 80, 1003, 28 May 1845, Clements; 81, 450-1, 13 June 1845, Clanricarde; 81, 1091, 23 June 1845, O'Connell; 82, 651-2, 18 July 1845, Clanricarde.
157. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 7 Feb. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 9 April 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 10 April 1845.
  158. Peel Papers, Add MS 4C, 452, f46, Peel to Graham, 3 Dec. 1845 (also in Graham Papers, 96A).
  159. Hansard, 83, 155, 23 Jan. 1846, O'Connor Don; 83, 674, 10 Feb. 1846, Clements; 83, 743-7, 12 Feb. 1846, Clanricarde; 83, 1348-88, 23 Feb. 1846, St. Germans, Lansdowne, Clanricarde; 84, 695-716, 6 March 1846, Lansdowne, Clanricarde, Monteagle, Division; 84, 775-6, 9 March 1846, Clanricarde. All of Grey's six supporters in the division of the 6th of March (on his motion to substitute imprisonment for transportation for infringement of the curfew) were British Whigs.
  160. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f8-9, Bessborough to Clarendon, (10 March 1846); *ibid*, f159-61, Clarendon to Russell, 11 March 1846.
  161. Diary of Lord Broughton, Add MS 43, 748, Vol. V, 25, 27 March 1846. The Greville Memoirs, V, 310, 29 March 1846. Recollections of Lord Broughton, VI, Diary, 25 March 1846.
  162. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f164-6, Clanricarde to Russell, 11 March 1846. Hansard, 84, 1410, 23 March 1846, Clanricarde.
  163. Graham Papers, 28IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 19 March 1846; Graham to Heytesbury, 22 March 1846.
  164. Diary of Lord Broughton, Add MS 43, 748, Vol. V, 9, 27 March 1846.
  165. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f167-72, O'Ferrall to Russell, 17 March 1846.
  166. R. Dillon Browne, M.P., Debate on the First Reading of the Protection of Life (Ireland) Bill (London, 1846), iv-v. See also DEP, 28 March, 7 April 1846.
  167. Hansard, 85, 288-365, 30 March 1846, Somerville, Smith O'Brien, O'Connell, Powell, Grattan, Rawdon, J. O'Connell, Division, Division; 85, 372-5, 1 April 1846, Smith O'Brien, Grattan, D. Browne, O'Connell; 85, 493-69, 3 April 1846, O'Connell, Kelly, Butler, Fitzgerald; 85, 609-51, 6 April 1846, Smith O'Brien, J. O'Connell, Carew, O'Connor Don, D. Browne, Division, Somerville; 85, 710-84, 17 April 1846, Smith O'Brien, J. O'Brien, Powell, Somerville, Collett, J. O'Connell, D. Browne, Division; 85, 1022-47, 24 April 1846, J. O'Connell; 85, 1084-92, 1131-7, 27 April 1846, Mc Carthy, Wyse; 85, 1352-1409, 1 May 1846, Somers, M. O'Connell, T. O'Brien, Bellew, Grattan, Crawford, Roche, Layard, Rawdon, Division. For Collett's joining the Repeal Association, see DEM, 4 May 1846.
  168. Browne, Debate on the First Reading .., iv.



169. Diary of Lord Broughton, Add, MS 43, 748, Vol. V, 9, 25, 27 March 1846. The Greville Memoirs, V, 304-5, 18 March 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 484, f292, Arbuthnot to Peel, 5 April 1846. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 345.
170. The Greville Memoirs, V, 312, 23 April 1846. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f235-6, Normanby to Russell, 6 June 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 484, f311, 317, Arbuthnot to Peel, 2 May, 8 June 1846; *ibid*, f321, Lady Westmorland to Arbuthnot, 7 June 1846. Hansard, 86, 976-7, 22 May 1846, Clanricarde.
171. Ellice Papers, MS 15052, f101, 103, Russell to Ellice, 8, 26 April 1846. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5A, f184-6, Russell to Duncannon, 11 April 1846.
172. *Ibid*, f233-4, Monteagle to Russell, 2 June 1846. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 396 (9), Monteagle to Russell, 2 June 1846.
173. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 396 (4), Russell to Monteagle, 4 June 1846.
174. The Times, 8 June 1846. Diary of Lord Broughton, Add MS 43, 748, Vol. V, 6 June 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 484, f315, 317, Arbuthnot to Peel, 7, 8 June 1846; *ibid*, f321, Lady Westmorland to Arbuthnot, 7 June 1846. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 190. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 351. DEM, 8 June 1846. Also on Clements, see Graham Papers, 102, Heytesbury to Graham, 2 June 1846.
175. Hansard, 87, 129-37, 173-7, 8 June 1846, Somerville, M. J. O'Connell; 87, 382-414, 12 June 1846, Ross, Redington, D. Browne; 87, 637-53, 18 June 1846, Armstrong, Layard, Barron; 87, 818-34, 22 June 1846, Crawford, Powell, Stuart; 87, 1000-31, 25 June 1846, Sheil, Division; 87, 1039-55, 29 June 1846, Wellington, Peel.
176. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 595, f142, Monteagle to Peel, 4 July 1846.

## The Irish Tories, 1841-3

Soon after the General Election of 1841 gave the Conservatives a large majority - of 80 or 90 - in the House of Commons, Charles Greville reflected on the hopes salvaged by the Whigs of a speedy return to office:

'Above all, they look to Ireland as a great and constant source of difficulty, and they evidently hope that O'Connell's influence will now be successfully exerted to render the Government of Ireland impossible. And they insist upon the certainty, almost the necessity, of the Orangemen being so exigent that Peel will have as much difficulty in dealing with them as with the O'Connellites, and between both that he will be inevitably swamped. In these fond anticipations I believe they will find themselves egregiously disappointed, especially in what they expect from the Orangemen. My own expectation is that the Orangemen will no longer aspire to an exclusiveness and ascendancy which are unattainable, and that with the protection, justice, and equality which they will obtain under a Conservative Government they will rest satisfied, and will not be fools enough to quarrel with Peel, and open a door to the restoration of the Whigs.'

Lord Fortescue believed that,

'the Orangemen will bluster & rail but .. they will in the end submit to anything the new Government shall require, consoling themselves with the reflexion that though they may get little from Peel they would get less from us.'

Such expectations of Irish Tory moderation were to prove somewhat sanguine. But though the troubled relationship between the Irish Tories and the Conservative Government was presaged in earlier events, Irish Tory apprehension was evidently submerged in the initial euphoria of victory over the Whigs, and the relationship deteriorated only spasmodically over the succeeding months. In tracing that deterioration it is proposed to pay particular attention to the editorial line of the principal Irish Tory journal, the Dublin Evening Mail. That paper cannot, of course, be accepted without question as fully representative of Irish Tory sentiment. Indeed, apart from the fringe elements of the Protestant Operative Associations, the Mail was to emerge as possibly the most sensitive and vociferous element in the Irish Conservative party. Its views were not shared by the second-largest Tory journal, the Dublin Evening Packet, which almost invariably supported the Administration and was consequently - and, strictly speaking, unjustly - branded as 'the Castle organ' by the Mail. On the other hand, the views of the Mail were often supported by other



Irish Conservatives, including the Members of Parliament, the paper did not identify at any time with the Orange, Repeal-the-Emancipation-Act fringe element, and the size of its circulation gave it some claim to be representative of a large section of the party.<sup>3</sup>

In August 1841, the Mail rejoiced in the succession of the 'great statesman', Peel, and welcomed the prospect of 'a moderate Government .. disposed to do justice to all.'<sup>4</sup> However, this harmony was soon disturbed by an issue which was greatly to exacerbate relations between the Government and the Irish Conservatives, namely the distribution of patronage. Peel's correspondence reflected the extent of expectation among his Irish supporters of reward for their loyalty in opposition. The list of Irish Tories who desired favour for themselves or a close relative or friend in 1841-2 includes such names as John Young, Conolly, Thomas Lefroy, Northland, Hillsborough, Verner, Francis Bruen, Chatterton, Coote, Mathew, Daly, Kirk, A. Lefroy, Shaw - all sitting or recent M.P.'s - and nearly a score of Irish Tory peers.<sup>5</sup> Of these applicants only Young had his wishes fully or substantially met. Other Irish appointees included Perceval, Corry, Claud Hamilton, Damer, Tennent, Lucas, Lefroy, Jackson, Fitzgerald, Hawarden and Ormonde, though some of these appointments were not made until October-November 1841.

Refusal of applications occasionally brought forth expressions of disappointment or resentment, notably from Londonderry, Donegall, Thomond, Charles Bushe, and the Lefroys.<sup>6</sup> There was a strong protest in the Mail early in September 1841 that the 'arrangements' appeared 'to exclude Ireland from her fair share of power and patronage in the administration.' The 'tide of preferment' had stopped at 'one or two minor appointments', with 'the heads of the party in Ireland' not 'fairly represented' in the various fields of patronage, 'an oversight which might tend to diminish the confidence of Ireland' in the Administration.<sup>7</sup> Greville, discussing the Household appointments, recorded that, 'The Irish Lords Glengall and Charleville are .. furious, and consider Ireland - that is, Orange Ireland

- insulted and neglected in their persons ... the Irish Lords are open-  
<sup>8</sup>mouthed and abusive.' And Shaw, in October, warned Peel that there was  
 'a growing feeling here (Ireland) that in the patronage of the present  
 Irish Government former political services will be rather considered as  
 a disqualification than a recommendation', with the failure to appoint  
<sup>9</sup>Conservative tradesmen to serve the Castle a prominent grievance. However,  
 the Mail virtually withdrew their complaint after the full list of  
 appointments was known, particularly the placing of Fitzgerald in the  
<sup>10</sup>Cabinet in October 1841.

The appointments of De Grey (Lord Lieutenant) and Eliot (Chief  
<sup>11</sup>Secretary) were also said to be 'unpopular with the Orangemen.' Certainly  
 the Mail protested strongly against the appointment of Lord Eliot,  
 dwelling on his 'defection' in 1838-9 on the issue of Irish Corporations.  
 The Mail dismissed as 'utterly groundless' the charge that they sought  
 the office for Shaw, and added that 'while we utterly and contemptuously  
 disclaim the imputed desire of setting up an ultra-Orange regime, we tell  
 the Premier and the Irish Secretary that no truckling to democracy will  
 go down here.' However, the Mail not only avoided censure of Peel over  
 the appointment but praised his conduct on the Corporations question, and  
 asserted that their confidence in his judgement induced them to allow  
 Eliot a fair trial. They subsequently warned Eliot as to the 'merited  
 obloquy' he would receive if he pursued a Whig policy but praised his  
<sup>12</sup>address to his constituents and declared, 'We do not suspect him.'

On the 24th of September, the Mail declared that in spite of the  
 above grievances the recent transfer of power was 'the consummation of  
 our dearest hopes, and the accomplishment of our most ardent aspirations...

'(The Government) shall have our warmest support, and most strenuous  
 advocacy, so long as their acts are guided by Conservative principles, and  
 their appointments made in consonance with the spirit of Conservative  
 policy. Justice to every class of her Majesty's subjects by all means ..  
 but favours in the distribution of office only to friends... We would make  
Conservatism - the holding and practising of Conservative principles -  
 together with ability for the requisite duties, the test and qualification  
 of fitness for the Government patronage.'

Subsequently the Mail urged a re-allocation of the offices in the



Castle and expressed mild disappointment that Sugden, an Englishman, had again been made Lord Chancellor in preference to Lefroy, whose political exertions, it was felt, should have been a recommendation instead of the disqualification they appeared to be. It was, then, with a wary eye that the Mail regarded the new Government; but, after the initial difficulties over appointments, Peel, Eliot, De Grey, Lucas and the Government in general were often spoken of with considerable generosity.<sup>13</sup>

Roden, writing to Peel, assured him of how 'anxious' he was 'for the success of your administration.'<sup>14</sup> In Parliament the Irish Tory peers and members naturally gave solid support to the amendments to the Address by which Peel took office. On the 20th of September four Irish Tory members voted against the grant to Maynooth, and another, Acton of Wicklow, meant to do so but entered the wrong lobby. Tennent (an office-holder),<sup>15</sup> Ker and Reade voted with the Government for the grant. Several<sup>16</sup> Irish Conservative members publicly praised the new Administration.

The first election to the reformed Corporation of Dublin in October 1841 caused the Mail, possibly seeking a scapegoat, to complain that 'the Government did not give that aid or manifest that feeling towards the Conservative candidates which they had a right to expect, to demand.'<sup>17</sup> Eliot was singled out for special criticism. A much greater storm was provoked when the Tory member for Dublin, J. B. West, was passed over for the third Sergeantcy in favour of the relatively apolitical Richard Warren. The choice of West had been urged by Shaw in correspondence with Peel,<sup>18</sup> and was confidently predicted by the Mail. Eliot, Sugden and De Grey were originally of the same opinion, but the latter two eventually settled on Warren under the impression that they had 'done enough for Parliamentary gratitude, & that we should stand better with the Bar & the Country by now looking for professional merit.'<sup>19</sup> Peel agreed. De Grey subsequently wrote of the result that,

'there is very great discontent amongst many of Mr. West's friends ... Mr. Warren's appointment gives great satisfaction at the Bar, but has excited great warmth & commotion amongst Mr. West's friends & supporters in the city. I am told that there was a meeting of one of the



Conservative Registry Associations last night at which very warm language was held ... much anger is expressed by many of that class, and some very angry & violent paragraphs have been published in some of our papers.' 20

The Mail attributed 'this gross and offensive aggression committed upon the Protestants of Dublin' to 'a root of bitterness', an 'evil principle', at work in the Government. West's services in the Conservative cause, far from bringing him 'due preference', had proved 'disqualifications' for promotion, lest political enemies be offended. It 'was the intention of the extreme liberal section of Sir Robert Peel's Cabinet to sacrifice the Irish Conservatives at the shrine of conciliation, and to prostrate the spirit of our party leaders before the idol of political expediency.' The Mail claimed that the Packet, in its 'slavish sycophancy' to the Government, was virtually alone among the Conservative journals in defending the appointment. Never, it was said, had such 'sensation' or 'excitement' been created among Irish Tories. Although the Grand Jury of Dublin withheld an Address to De Grey in protest against the appointment, the reputations of both De Grey and Eliot benefited as their conduct was contrasted with that attributed to Sugden and Blake, who were blamed for the decision, particularly when De Grey made the 'graceful reparation' which stemmed the tide of 'dissatisfaction and disgust.' He was alleged to have made an 'avowal of error' to West in their interview on the 12th of November and to have conceded the principle that political services would not impede one's prospects of advancement in public office. 21

The Mail of the 19th of November contained a speech from West in which he confirmed this account of his interview with De Grey, but the Lord Lieutenant reported that he had in fact said he would do the same again, in order to show 'that we would not be governed by party or mere political motives', and denied the imputed 'apology & submission.' Graham was happy that De Grey had 'calmed the storm which they who call themselves his (West's) friends have raised... If we yield to dictation of this sort we are no Government. Firmness is necessary.' One Irish Tory wrote that, 22

'West's affair has passed off rather satisfactorily as it brought out the declaration that it is not intended to overlook parliamentary services. 23



I fear that Sugden, 'who has been at the bottom of all these misdoings, will do us much mischief yet,... (and) Lord Eliot is a man too civil to be sincere.' 24

During the West controversy, the Mail found fault with other aspects of the Irish Government's distribution of patronage, again proclaiming 'justice to all, favour to friends', and, lamenting the continuation of outrages, claimed that there was 'an error .., a weakness and indecision' in the Executive which 'emboldens the wicked.' They complained that there was 'a vast and .. unjustifiable preponderance' of liberals among the Lord Lieutenant's tradesmen. This accusation De Grey thought particularly unjust. He alleged that a 'low unprincipled fellow named Sheehan', editor of the Mail, attacked the Government 'solely for the purpose of exciting the more rabid portion' of the Conservative party with a view to 'increasing the sale of his paper.' 25 26

The Tory Lord Donoughmore was said in December 1841 to have become disillusioned with the Government. However the storm over West receded with amazing rapidity after De Grey's supposed assurances to West. Tennent claimed that 'the conservative party are in high delight' with the Administration of De Grey. Meetings in various parts of Ireland towards the end of the year and for well into 1842 saw Peel and De Grey warmly praised by leading Tories. The Mail concurred in their high opinion of De Grey, approved of his magisterial appointments, and gave warm praise to De Grey and Eliot when a number of stipendiary magistrates were removed. The decision to prosecute William Connor for 'inflammatory language' was praised in apparent ignorance of the fact that Graham and Peel regretted the Attorney-General's rash commitment to that course believing that as Ireland was quiet the Government would do better to be, as Peel put it, 'hard of hearing.' 27 28 29 30

The death of West on the 27th of December 1841 brought a revival of ill-feeling. Judge Crampton told Sugden that discontent over the West affair was hindering the Conservative effort to retain West's seat. Graham wrote to De Grey that, 31

'West's death is an unfortunate event, for the first inevitable effect of your moderate policy, which is based on the hope of giving peace & future contentment to Ireland, has been to create heart-burnings or at all events lukewarmness in the Conservative party in Dublin, & in some measure to destroy their combined energy for such a contest.. I am <sup>32</sup> afraid that our party is at this moment lukewarm & disjointed in Ireland.'

The Mail claimed early in January that,

'There is no Conservative candidate because the heart and spirit of the Conservative party is broken in Dublin; and the man who should aspire to its representation would have to encounter not only apathy but desertion in the progress of his canvass. And why is this? Men are disgusted at the line taken by the Government, and indignant at the avowal of the principle that political services are to be held a bar to legitimate promotion.'

Indignation was fuelled by 'the impression that has gained ground' that West's death was 'accelerated' by 'the recent slight put upon him <sup>33</sup> and upon his party.' Discontent was increased by some of Sugden's magisterial appointments - 'Is the Lord Chancellor a repealer?' - and the Mail accused the Government of 'not going half far enough in exercising' their 'legitimate <sup>34</sup> influence' in the by-election. Charles Fox felt, however, that the <sup>35</sup> Government managed the contest well. And, on the whole, the election campaign clearly drew Conservatives closer to the Administration, vindicating to some extent Graham's view that 'fighting and drinking <sup>36</sup> together are the bonds of unity in Ireland.' The Mail declared that the causes for 'apathy or distrust' had been 'removed for ever', that the Government regretted their 'acts of ingratitude and impolicy' and would show due favour to Conservatives; 'confidence - full and perfect confidence - is restored... We have a good candidate and a good Government, .. a Government whose rule is just, firm, impartial and beneficent.' De Grey in particular received praise for various acts of his administration. The Conservative candidate, William Gregory, also warmly pledged his confidence <sup>37</sup> in the Government.

Eliot's report to Peel on the Dublin election was full of a foreboding which was not allayed by this kind of enthusiasm. He thought that,

'a strong Protestant, almost Orange, feeling has burst forth which however useful it may be on the present occasion will be difficult to deal with hereafter. I look on the death of West, occasioning as it did a vacancy for Dublin, as one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall your Government. The proceedings at this Election will I am afraid alienate many of the Catholics who were gradually drawing near us, and they will



strengthen & encourage the ascendancy party which was beginning to see the necessity of moderation. We shall carry this election but we shall pay dearly for the triumph.' 38

Relations between the Irish Conservatives and the Government were in a healthy state at the beginning of 1842, and had, in fact, been so from the time of the settlement of the West affair in November. With the opening of the Parliamentary session attention shifted somewhat from the Government at the Castle to the Government at Westminster, and in particular to the principal concern of the session, Peel's commercial and financial reforms. On the 9th of February 1842, Peel outlined his proposals for 'a very considerable decrease of the protection' afforded to the corn-growers of the United Kingdom. The Irish Tory members Shaw, Bateson and Christmas expressed concern for the fate of Irish agriculture and 11 Irish Tories supported an amendment to raise the proposed duty on  
39  
oats, though 18 remained loyal to the Government. The Irish Tory members  
40  
also exerted pressure behind the scenes. The Mail announced that,

'It becomes a very serious question with us, and with the interests which this journal represents, whether it were not of more advantage to Ireland - at least so far as the question of protective duties is concerned - that Sir Robert Peel and his friends should be on the opposition benches, rather than wielding the powers of state on the Government side of the House.' 41

However, the Mail's discontent was again short-lived. Peel's 'talents and character' were admired and his 'general policy' approved. The 'deep-felt and universal' consternation 'among the agricultural classes' was 'much greater, we admit, than the case seems to justify'. Above all, Peel 'immortalized himself' with his income tax plan, announced on the 11th of March, 'a plan so magnificent in its extent, so adequate .. so benevolent', and Ireland was 'so generously exempted'. Though some criticism continued, the general tenor of the attitude of the Mail had  
42  
changed markedly from that of the outbursts of February 1842. In Parliament the Irish Tory members and peers generally, though not invariably, supported the Government's commercial and financial policies  
43  
after the relatively strong protest on the oats question. In sum, the economic policies of the Government provoked a response among Irish

Tories which varied from the stridently hostile to the warmly enthusiastic, but one which was in the final analysis acquiescent.

With regard to more peculiarly Irish issues, the Mail were satisfied that church patronage had not been 'subjected to the overlaying and damaging weight of conciliatory politics' and congratulated the Government on their 'just, impartial, and firm administration of justice', though Eliot and Wharncliffe were initially assailed for their complacent replies when the question of outrages in Tipperary was raised in Parliament. Eliot ran foul of the Mail much more seriously with his 'atrocious' measure to transfer control of the medical charities from the gentry to the unpopular poor law Commission and the priest-controlled guardians. Several Tory provincial journals took the same line. Eliot's 'improvident and unadvised' fisheries measure, which seemed to threaten property rights, his alleged disposition to increase the grant to Maynooth and 'truckling' to O'Connell regarding the affairs of Dublin Corporation, and, above all, his outburst in July 1842 on the subject of National Education induced the Mail to pronounce their suspicions about Eliot fully justified by events; they denounced him for his desire for 'mob popularity' and lamented his continuation in office. The Evening Packet rallied to the defence of the Chief Secretary.<sup>44</sup>

Lord Chancellor Sugden emerged as the other principal object of the Mail's abuse. He acted 'unjustly and impolitically' in refusing to restore to the bench a Tory gentleman, Mansergh St. George, who had been dismissed by Lord Normanby. The legal profession were alienated by his 'incivilities' at the bar and Irish Conservatives by the political tendencies of his administrative acts. There was a 'general supposition' that he was influenced towards a liberal course by 'the secret and sinister advice of Mr. Anthony Blake'. Sugden and Eliot were bracketed together as the liberal wing of the Irish Government, pursuing a 'truckling and conciliatory policy', while De Grey and Lucas were praised in the Mail as the truly Conservative section and represented



as the 'intended victims' of their liberal colleagues.

The St. George affair induced the Mail to complain in more general terms that,

'The besetting fault .. of Lord De Grey's Administration is a vacillation in purpose and want of moral courage in execution.. The people at the Castle are afraid to do justice to their friends lest it might furnish cause of offence to their foes, and thus pleasing neither party - but on the contrary rendering both dissatisfied - they are, we grieve to say, running the high road to unpopularity and distrust ... tried friends (have) been neglected and steadfast supporters overlooked. .. Unless matters be differently ordered at the Castle, and the malign influence which .. works so disastrously for the Conservative interests in Ireland be got rid of, the sooner the present heads of departments are removed the better for the peace .. of the country ... scarcely a day passes here that some one act is not done calculated to give a triumph to our enemies, or some injury inflicted certain to give offence to our friends.'

The Mail claimed that their complaints gave only 'a very faint echo to the voice of public opinion.' Similar general and lengthy denunciation of the Administration was made several times in the columns of the Mail during the session of 1842, notably in response to the reform of the system of Crown Prosecutors and the appointment of several liberals in the new system, the choice of a non-Conservative for the Clerkship of the Crown in Limerick, the Government's yielding to the Grand Jury of Cork regarding the number of police in that city, the failure to bring in arms and registration bills, and the proposed law courts, drainage, limitation of actions, grand jury and medical charities bills, 'all containing provisions adverse to the Conservative party'. The law courts bill received, with the medical charities measure, the most severe criticism, as a threat to vested interests in the legal profession, and like the charities bill was subsequently abandoned.

It was the Irish Administration which attracted most censure on the above issues, but Peel was assailed in June 1842 in connection with the 'corrupt compromise' by which the Conservatives of Belfast agreed to share with the liberals the two Belfast seats in future elections in order, O'Connell alleged, to secure the abandonment of charges of bribery and personation against the Conservatives. Peel virtually dismissed Shaw's efforts in private in favour of Tennent and the Belfast Tories,



and when Shaw moved the writ for the Belfast by-election he was opposed by a Prime Minister who felt constrained by English precedents; the motion was defeated and O'Connell's motion for a Select Committee agreed<sup>47</sup> to. While Wyse exulted in Peel's apparent dishing of Tennent, the Mail warned that,

'The statesman who shows himself so unworthy to have a party will soon be without a party.. There is .. a strict limit to confidence, a boundary to forbearance, and Sir Robert Peel is not inaccessible to the reverses which punish either the weakness or the perfidy of statesmen.. Were he unseated, Conservatism could stand without him ...'

These were strong words, but the Mail also insisted that they were 'strenuous admirers of the talents, the wisdom, the general policy of Sir Robert Peel' and described the Belfast affair as 'an isolated case'. And they felt impelled to advise Orangemen that marching on the July anniversaries would be against the wishes of 'the best and most impartial Government with which the country has been favoured for the last quarter of a century.' The failure of O'Connell's Select Committee to indict Tennent had a similar effect; it was even suggested that Peel's course<sup>48</sup> was determined by his confidence that this would be the result.

The Mail conceded that in criticizing the Government they stood 'almost alone in Ireland', though several English Tory papers took the same critical view.<sup>49</sup> The Packet, the Statesman and the Warder all<sup>50</sup> denounced the Mail's attack on Peel over the Belfast affair. But the Mail could respond by pointing to the votes cast in the division by most of the Irish Tory members. Eight Irish Tories voted for Shaw's motion,<sup>51</sup> while Gore and the office-holders Damer, Corry and Young supported Peel. In general few of the Irish Tories in Parliament joined the Mail in openly expressing dissatisfaction with the Government or their measures. It occurred, as shown above, to some extent with respect to Peel's economic policy. Lefroy, Conolly, Jones, Ffolliott and several Irish Tory peers were unhappy with the Government's fisheries, drainage, medical charities, limitation of actions and law courts bills. Bateson, Verner and (in the division) seven other Irish Tories opposed the decision to continue the



52

Maynooth grant. As shown above, pressure was exerted in Parliament and at public meetings for reform of the education system.

On the other hand, Wicklow supported most of the above-mentioned bills. Jocelyn spoke in favour of continuing the Maynooth grant and Wicklow contended that it should actually be increased. In spite of considerable pressure from their Presbyterian constituents, the majority of Irish Tory members followed the Government line on the Church of Scotland and Presbyterian marriage issues. Apart from the occasion of the Eliot-Jackson row, the Irish Tory grievance regarding education was presented with considerable patience and no suggestion of censure of the Government. And there was no trace in Parliament of the general denunciation of the 'conciliatory' politics of the Government which periodically appeared in the Evening Mail.

During the session, there was formed the 'Irish Fishery Protection Society' to protest against the Government's fisheries bill. It included a considerable number of Irish Tory peers, the Irish Whigs, Clanricarde and Kenmare, and the Irish Tory M.P.'s Conolly, Archdall and Ffolliott. Of particular interest is the claim in the Mail of the 8th of June that the Society 'resolved to declare itself a permanent committee to watch over the interests of Ireland .. upon every subject of legislation'. On the 11th of July, the Mail stated that,

'The "Society of Irish Peers and Members" (was) composed of members of both Houses of Parliament - the general supporters of the Government - to act on the self-defensive system, in opposition to measures advocated by their friends but fraught with ruin to themselves. It was an anomalous state of things that called such a protective society into being, their own party being in power; but the very fact of its existence, and the necessity for its activity .. is not only a justification but an argument for the line adopted by this journal.'

It was claimed that the Society was active in opposition to the drainage and limitation of actions bills and that it had succeeded in rendering satisfactory the fisheries bill. Given, however, that the Mail had an interest in emphasizing such corroboration of its views, and that other sources contain no allusion to it, one must be sceptical as to its existence in the form suggested in the Mail.

In the autumn of 1842, the Government's decision to propose their new Solicitor-General (T.B.C. Smith) for the vacant University seat brought an outburst of protest from the Mail, the Warder, the Statesman and provincial Tory journals, with the services to the Tory cause of their favoured candidate, George Hamilton, the 'insult' to the independence of the constituency, Maynooth and education the principal issues discussed. The Mail revived old grievances over Lefroy and West and hoped the contest would show Peel that there was a party in Ireland 'who repudiate the weak and cowardly policy of a Government which makes expediency, not principle, its rule of action.' The Statesman announced that,

'The present Irish government is gone. It is gone except as a Whig government, reduced to Popish support, like its predecessor. It is gone in the confidence of the Conservatism of the land.'

It was Eliot who bore the brunt of the discontent, with the Mail venomous in denouncing his 'madness and impolicy' regarding the seat and Irish policy in general. De Grey, in contrast, was warmly praised, his absence regretted as the cause of the Government's course, and the 'glorious announcement' subsequently of Smith's withdrawal attributed to his exertions on his return to London. The affair involved more than a further deterioration in relations between the Mail and the Government, for Smith's failure indicated the existence of disaffection on the part of the University constituency; Smith was allowed to stand down because his support was inadequate. The Irish Tory Press, apart from the Packet and the Newry Telegraph, opposed the Government. And it was claimed in the Mail that 'sixteen Irish Conservative members of Parliament had placed their names on Mr. Hamilton's committee in direct and avowed hostility to Lord Eliot and his Irish policy', and in the Evening Post that Shaw led the ultras in remonstrating with the Government. Graham complained to Peel about the support Hamilton received from Primate Beresford and Shaw, the latter acting 'in spite proceeding from his most selfish motives.' Graham and Peel concurred in the promotion of Smith's



candidacy. According to Graham,

'We fight the battle in firm defence of our opinions, which are impugned by Mr. Hamilton... Unless we are prepared to abandon the scheme of education now established in Ireland and to withdraw the grant from Maynooth, I do not see how we can conciliate the cordial approbation and good will (sic) of the High Church Party. If we seek to obtain it at this price, we are involved in an Orange policy, the dangers and difficulties of which it is impossible to calculate. On the other hand, tho' I would resist the Protestant Party when they are unreasonable, as I think them on this occasion, I would avoid all bitterness of altercation with them; I would not yield to their dictation, but I would readily pardon their waywardness, and give them a large share of patronage, while I bent them to my will ... by perseverance and steadiness in a prudent course of justice and moderation we shall overcome these fiery spirits and bring them into subjection at last.' 61

Subsequent history was to show that Graham was hardly justified in this rather complacent view. Other factors exacerbated the situation. Several Tory journals lamented the passing over of Litton for the Solicitor-Generalship and Litton himself was 'very sore'. But Eliot thought Litton had 'no hold on public feeling .. the disappointment will be confined to himself & a few friends.' 62 More important, Eliot was bitterly assailed when it was revealed that he had subscribed £50 to help the defence of the radical weekly, the World, against a pending Crown prosecution. According to the Mail it was the culmination of 'the various vexations, thwarting, and mischievous undertakings' of Eliot and 63 cast doubts on his fitness for the office of Chief Secretary. Eliot had considered that the libel action was 'a malicious one .. originated in political hostility' and thought the paper 'might be of use', but Graham 64 felt that Eliot's conduct was 'indiscreet'.

After the victory on the issue of the University by-election, Irish Tory discontent appeared to recede, temporarily, with satisfaction expressed in the Mail at the Government's legal appointments in October 1842 and subsequently at the tranquillization of Ireland through firm 65 application of the law. De Grey was credited with these developments. Also in October and November Peel's economic policy was stoutly defended 66 when agricultural depression brought it under fire. One minor appointment was attacked as 'political suicide' and indicative of the Government's 67 dubious principles regarding patronage. Opposition to the medical

charities bill continued in the Mail and at meetings chaired by such as  
 the Marquis of Westmeath and Viscount Bernard, M.P..<sup>68</sup> Sugden's public  
 arraignment of Blackburne over a legal decision was attacked. The Mail  
 also deprecated the conciliatory policy towards Canada and the intention  
 to abandon the duty on Canadian corn.<sup>69</sup>

Above all, Eliot's place as the bugbear of the Mail was firmly  
 established. Their campaign was pursued with extraordinary venom. The  
 'Whiggish Irish Secretary' was denounced for his 'stupid blundering and  
 deplorable imbecility', his 'shallow and crotchety understanding', his  
 'wavering imbecility or mad folly', his 'proclivity towards Repeal' and  
 his 'Popish principles.' The Mail asked, 'What strange dimness of vision  
 has affected those who maintain Lord Eliot in his present position of  
 mischief?' This remarkable torrent of abuse in November and December 1842  
 was occasioned by Eliot's suitability as a scapegoat for the Repealers'  
 successes in the municipal elections at the end of October, rumours that  
 he was preparing a bill to relieve Dublin Corporation of its pecuniary  
 difficulties, his position on the medical charities question, his seeking  
 the views of priests in Tipperary regarding disturbances in that country,  
 his approval of the poor law, and rumours regarding his radical views on  
 various issues. The 'excellent Lord Lieutenant', De Grey, 'the chief stay  
 of Conservatism in this disturbed land', was foiled by 'the blundering  
 buffoonery of his imbecile Secretary'.<sup>70</sup>

As shown above, the Government's decision on the education question,  
 announced at the end of November 1842, was a great source of difference  
 between the Irish Tories and the Government, producing discontent far  
 beyond the columns of the Evening Mail. It was the Cabinet which incurred  
 most of the opprobrium on this occasion. Confidence was further undermined  
 by the rumour that the Cabinet were contemplating reduction or abandonment  
 of protection for corn. The Mail called on the constituents of Irish  
 Conservative M.P.'s to remind the latter that support of their party or  
 Government was not their primary duty and that the acceptance of a free



trade measure would be rewarded with defeat at the polls. On the 19th of December, the Mail welcomed the news that certain Irish peers and M.P.'s intended to 're-assemble' in London prior to the next Session 'in order to protect their interests.' Londonderry, Westmeath, Dunraven, Carbery, Charleville, Glengall, Mountcashell, Bandon, Clare, Downshire, Hawarden, Bernard, Ffolliott, Conolly, Archdall, Gregory and Grogan, Irish Tories, and 'numbers of the Irish gentry not in parliament' were said to be involved, as were Clanricarde and Burke, Irish Whigs. The Mail called on the public to support 'this country party' in its advocacy of 'Irish interests'.<sup>71</sup>

Though this report was given 'on authority - having seen a letter from a noble and influential Lord to that effect', there was no indication subsequently that the 'country party' met as predicted; but the idea of such a party was later to play a prominent part in the expression of Irish Tory discontent. In the new year Eliot remained the principal target of the Mail, censured for 'his desertion' on the Corporations question and the endorsement which his amendment bill effectively gave to the new bodies, his espousal of the medical charities bill, his defence of the poor law and the unsatisfactory nature of his amendment bill, his inadequacy in the House, his liberal course regarding the appointment of stipendiary magistrates, and his alleged sympathy with fixity of tenure ('another Whig crotchet in Lord Eliot's brain').<sup>72</sup>

The campaign against the medical charities bill was continued in both radical and Conservative circles (the Packet again excepted) until it was announced in mid-January that the bill would not be proceeded with.<sup>73</sup> This decision followed De Grey's success in resisting Eliot's desire to press on, alarmed as he was at the opposition encountered from 'all quarters'.<sup>74</sup> The Mail subsequently supported French's alternative charities bill in spite of the opposition of the Government.<sup>75</sup> With respect to economic policy, in January Mountcashell chaired a meeting at Fermoy at which the depressed state of agriculture was attributed to the Government's

corn and general tariff measures of 1842. The Mail regretted Mountcashell's course and defended the Government's economic policy, but warned against further reduction of protection and called on the Irish members to 'remonstrate' with Peel if he wavered on that point.<sup>76</sup> Dissatisfaction over the education question lingered on during the early months of 1843. When the London Standard claimed in March that the Irish Government was popular with most Protestants, the Mail replied,

'It is true that Lord De Grey is popular, and deservedly so; but we emphatically deny - and we are but echoing the opinions of all that is worthy and respectable in the Conservative party - we emphatically deny that the Irish Government, or the measures in progress, or the mode in which the business of the country is administered, is either popular or satisfactory.'

Their 'worst apprehensions' had been 'more than realized', their 'gloomiest anticipations more than fulfilled' regarding Eliot. Smith was popular until he became 'the Attorney-General of Lord Eliot', since which time he had been rejected by the Conservatives of several Irish constituencies. Smith's problems in this respect were cited by the Mail as evidence that their views were shared by many Conservatives. In addition, the defeat of the Tory candidate in the Athlone by-election was attributed to 'the line of policy adopted towards Ireland by that section of the Cabinet which attempts, through the instrumentality of Lord Eliot, to govern this country upon principles of mistaken expediency and according to a code of cowardly conciliation... Day by day, and bit by bit, they are disgusting their friends and frittering away their strength ...'<sup>77</sup> In fact, the Conservatives might well have lost Athlone regardless of any such disillusionment, for it changed hands several times after 1832, and the Conservative candidate in 1843 received more votes than any of his predecessors.<sup>78</sup>

The Government's failure to bring in registration and arms bills was commented on in the Mail with increasing bitterness. The Irish Tory members were impeached - 'What are the Irish Conservative members about? - for their silence on the registration issue.<sup>79</sup> The education, poor law, registration, and arms bill questions were cited when the Mail called



on the 20th of March for the formation of 'a country party' to protect Irish interests:

'The Government feel they can more conveniently hold their own by compromise and concession than requite the good service done by a steady adherence to principle, sound policy and justice. Ireland is now neglected - she is committed, if not to the hands of her former grooms, yet to the former regime under which she suffered... It was not for this that the Protestant Conservative party of Ireland supported the present administration. The conduct of that administration, as respects Ireland, pleases no party... It must come at last to this, that Irish members will merge all party distinctions, and combine into what may be called a country party - and then let us see the administration that will dare to neglect or trifle with the interests of Ireland.' 80

The Mail canvassed this idea a number of times during the  
81  
succeeding months. It was opposed by the Packet as a device to force the Mail's friends on the Government in place of the 'moderate and sound-  
82  
hearted men' who had been appointed to office. On most of the major issues then under discussion - education, registration, an arms bill, Corporations, Repeal - there was little possibility of united action by the Conservative, Repeal and liberal-unionist members. The Mail acknowledged this, but contended that,

'There are also other questions involving the general interests of the people that present a totally different character, and that we must say do not receive the attention due to their importance in the present distracted state of the Irish representative body ... the poor law; the fisheries; drainage; internal communication by canals, rivers, and railroads, &c, &c. All these points .. could be usefully discussed at .. meetings of members of parliament .., and upon most of them differences of opinion might be expected to be of such a nature as would warrant a frank submission to the reasonings and opinions of a majority..'83

The Mail envisaged such cooperation with O'Connell and the Repealers as well as with the liberal-unionists, but also described the  
84  
party as a potent weapon against Repeal. For all the vagueness of the proposal, however, it was a notable expression of discontent with the Government. Its impracticality and the fact of divergence between the Mail and the Irish Tory members were underlined when most of the Irish Tories followed what the Mail disparagingly called 'the Don't-Embarrass-the-Government Doctrine' and voted against O'Brien's motion for inquiry  
85  
into the poor law.

The awarding of the Irish mail-coach contract to a Scottish company

caused 'some feelings of astonishment, and great feelings of pain' to the Mail. O'Connell would benefit:

'The insane acts of our rulers are every day adding to his power, by increasing the causes for agitation; and we tremble to think that a perseverance in the reckless course which they are pursuing will leave them, and that at no distant period, without a party in this country - distrusted by those whom it was their duty to support, and despised by those whom they cannot conciliate.'

Though the Mail would 'not now affirm' that the time 'has yet arrived' for Irish Protestants to embrace Repeal, they claimed that 'the Croal contract has done much to make people of all kinds begin to doubt the benefits of unrestricted English management of Ireland', with meetings involving 'many influential gentlemen and magistrates' and many Conservative newspapers asserting that "Love of British institutions must cease the moment they are made destructive to Ireland". The Mail also opposed the decision on the merits of the case itself, and attempted to blame Eliot and exculpate De Grey. <sup>86</sup> The latter was by no means pleased that the Mail, 'that greatest of blackguards', suggested a 'want of confidence between myself & the Government, <sup>87</sup> intended I believe rather to disparage Eliot than the Government ...'

On the 8th of April, a number of Irish Tory and liberal members met in Shaw's London house and condemned the coach contract decision as unjust in itself and 'likely to cause great excitement in Ireland, and to be productive of unfortunate consequences in the present state of that country.' Their deputation saw Goulburn and Peel, but did not meet with any success. The affair was used by the Mail to support their call for 'an Irish Party', and the meeting in Shaw's house was welcomed as 'the beginning of this great end'. Referring subsequently to this joint action of the Irish members, the Mail claimed that, 'The party is formed. It will .. increase and continue until justice is done to this <sup>88</sup> misgoverned country.'

In more general terms the Mail of the 10th of April spoke of 'the political blindness' of the Government and sought to bring to the



attention of the country considerations which indicated 'the absolute necessity' of forming 'an Irish parliamentary party upon principles altogether irrespective of a blind support of any Ministry'. They pointed to the 'undeniable progress' of Repeal over 'the last few months', as seen above all in 'the altered tone of feeling' among Irish Protestants:

'On too many occasions the question now asked by loyal men is not how shall the progress of Repeal be resisted, but, what are the chances that if it were passed the destruction of our religion and our property might be effected less certainly and less speedily than is likely to be the case under the present system?'

With its conduct on education, registration and the poor law, it was clearly 'the fixed intention of the British so called Conservative Government to abandon the Protestant Church and people of Ireland.' Irish Protestants had to wonder if they had 'anything to expect from a further continuance of the faithful support' accorded to the Government. The suggestion that the rapid rise of the Repeal movement resulted largely from the Government's 'discouragement and discountenance of Protestant principles' and 'neglect' of the wishes of 'the sound and loyal portion of the population' became a major theme in the Mail. The 'Conservative Protestant party' was excepted from the 'general system of patronage and concession.' They had lifted into power 'a party ready to sell them and theirs for a short-lived truce with priests and agitators.' The Repealers were 'the favoured party ... the Government is now without a party ... by wanton perverseness and ingratitude, it has cooled its friends, while it heated its enemies.' The Packet was said to be the only Irish Conservative journal which was not critical of the Government. According to the Mail,

'the columns of the Evening Mail but reflect - and that, too, in a mitigated form - the sentiments entertained by every Conservative nobleman and gentleman in Ireland, and by the whole body of the clergy of the Established Church.'

It is clear that the Mail's sense of disillusionment with the Government was by April 1843 fairly complete. Only De Grey appeared to retain their 'unqualified confidence', but he was 'thwarted by his colleagues' in his desire to remove the Protestant grievances. The

'culpable supineness' of the Government in response to 'the most formidable agitation that Ireland has experienced since the rebellion of '98' emerged in April-May 1843 as another major grievance. The Mail urged Sugden to supersede the Repeal magistrates and contended that as a threat to the public peace the Repeal meetings were illegal and should be suppressed. Though generally of the opinion that the existing law permitted such suppression, and that recourse to coercive legislation or force was unnecessary, they did occasionally propose 'a bill for declaring it high treason to agitate a repeal of the union'. And they urged the Government to utilize the services of the Protestant yeomanry. The Arms Bill was welcomed as 'an indication of returning consciousness.' Above all, however, there had to be an end to the 'short-sighted expediency' of the Government, to their 'career of treachery to their Irish Protestant friends.' Unless Protestant discontent were removed 'the movement in favour of Repeal cannot be put down.' The 'present apathy of Protestant Ireland' would continue so long as it felt that its opposition to Repeal might be rewarded by this Government, as it was formerly by the Whigs, with conciliation of the Repealers.<sup>90</sup>

In April 1843, Jackson offered Peel 'sincere congratulations upon the successful progress' of his Administration.<sup>91</sup> Except on the education question, the behaviour of the Irish Tory members during the early months of 1843 did not reflect the discontent expressed in the Mail, though there was also evidence of dissatisfaction over the poor law, the Maynooth grant and the coaches contract. However, the rise of the Repeal agitation brought a more active response. Anthony Lefroy asked Eliot towards the end of April if he considered the Repeal meetings were legal, and whether the Government 'were prepared to take any measures to put an end to that agitation', which questions Eliot contrived to evade. On the 8th of May, Glengall expressed alarm in the Lords at the 'perilous agitation' and Wicklow urged the Government to show their determination not to allow the agitation to proceed 'with impunity.'<sup>92</sup>



Members of the Government were approached privately by George Hamilton, Northland, Claud Hamilton, the Earl of Erne and other Irish Tories 'under the impulse of excitement and alarm' over the upsurge of the agitation.<sup>93</sup>

On the 2nd of May, the magistrates of Fermanagh met, under the Earl of Erne, to voice their concern at the agitation, and unionists in Cork petitioned the Commons in favour of some sort of response. Under-Secretary Lucas, formerly the Tory member for Monaghan, wrote to Eliot to complain that the latter was responsible for the Government's failure to act.<sup>94</sup> The Reverend Mc Ghee advised Peel to act promptly on 'the alarming state of Ireland' or 'lose the confidence of the Protestants of Ireland' and drive thousands of them to Repeal; 'the Protestants begin to think that England is giving up the country to Popery & that they cannot be worse.'<sup>95</sup>

Roden and Charleville urged De Grey to dismiss magistrates who attended Repeal meetings. On the 4th of May, Roden wrote to Wellington of the 'fearful advance' of agitation and the 'natural alarm' of 'loyal subjects'. He claimed that, 'The feature which is to them most frightful is the apparent apathy which is observed on the part of the Government in not taking measures to avert its progress, or to shew the mind of the Administration on the subject'. He gave notice of a question in the Lords 'in consequence of my communication with several of the most influential and moderate persons of property throughout Ulster'. He visited Wellington a few days later to describe the state of 'alarm' in Ireland. On the 9th, Roden spoke in the Lords of 'immense masses of the people' addressed 'in language the most seditious and the most violent'. There was 'alarm and distrust' among the non-Repealers as a result not of the agitation but of 'the silence and the apparent apathy of the Government.' He called on the latter to give 'some declaration that it would support those who were anxious to maintain the public tranquillity .., to state its opinion and avow its determination to maintain the

integrity of the empire.' He pressed for the dismissal of the Repeal magistrates and contended that if the existing law proved insufficient the Government could easily obtain additional powers from Parliament. Roden's son, Lord Jocelyn, brought the subject before the Commons on the same day, simply asking if the Government were aware of 'the fearful excitement' and prepared to take steps for its 'repression', and urging Peel to affirm the Government's determination to maintain the Union 'at all risks and hazards.'<sup>97</sup>

The Government had, of course, already discussed the situation in Ireland at some length. In late April and early May, De Grey asked for 'specific enactments' to curb the 'astounding' growth of the agitation after the law officers had reported that the meetings could not be put down under the existing law. He was prepared to support the dismissal of the Repeal magistrates and urged the necessity of 'some declaration on our part as to our intention of maintaining the Union ... as a cheer to the anti repeal party ...

'... I have received many letters & communications from various quarters hoping & trusting that the Government mean to take some steps to put down this recent outbreak of Repeal agitation... Our own professed friends are out of sorts, out of spirits, & out of temper. They say they are neglected, their interests overlooked, & their opponents fostered & cherished. We know this to be untrue - but they are told it by those who unfortunately have weight with them, & they believe it. We therefore have only a lukewarm cordiality from them. Whatever support they give is more dependent upon their dislike & hatred of others than their liking for us.'

The 'impartiality' of the Government had 'almost lost (them) the confidence (at least .. enabled the organs of that party to have done their best to destroy the confidence) of that party which has usually<sup>98</sup> professed itself friendly.' Sugden and Graham were also uneasy at the state of Ireland; Graham proceeded to send military reinforcements to Ireland and favoured dismissal of the Repeal magistrates. But he balked at the thought of asking Parliament for powers which would involve 'the subversion of all the settled principles of free Government... • if Martial law be necessary, is it not wise to wait until the necessity shall be demonstrated ... until the rebellious spirit shall



have been evinced by some decided overt act.' He added that, 'The folly and perverse malice of the Conservative party in denouncing the apathy of the Government are extreme.'<sup>99</sup>

As well as Graham, Eliot and Stanley were reluctant to coerce. The latter feared that Sugden and Eliot would oppose coercion and felt that it would prove impossible to suppress the Repeal Association and absolve the Anti-Corn Law League, and that to suppress both might 'precipitate disastrous events in both countries at the same moment.' Wellington was 'bent on immediate legislation' to 'prohibit' the Repeal Association.<sup>100</sup> The Cabinet met on the 8th of May to discuss this question, but came to no definite conclusion. Peel, reporting to De Grey, was clearly far from hostile to the idea of coercion and contemplated a demand for extra powers before the separation of Parliament. But he feared that lack of care might yield an ineffectual measure or lead to 'disunion among ourselves', with Eliot's 'willing acquiescence in strong measures' especially unlikely.<sup>101</sup>

On the 9th, in reply to Roden and Jocelyn, Wellington and Peel expressed their awareness of the dangerous state of Ireland and the determination of the Government to maintain the Union. Peel said that he believed the existing law should first be tried, though he was prepared to seek additional powers if necessary, and he made his famous declaration<sup>102</sup> that he considered even 'civil war' preferable to Repeal. He informed De Grey the following day that the declarations 'were a good preliminary and preparation for increased powers, should we deem it necessary to require them.'<sup>103</sup> Downshire expressed his 'utmost satisfaction' at 'the determined front' assumed by Wellington. It would 'settle the minds of the people of Ireland.' With Mountcashell, Wicklow and several British peers, he deprecated the agitation as harmful to the prosperity of Ireland. Londonderry, however, 'did not think that Ireland could be tranquillized unless they had recourse to more determined measures', if necessary legislation to prohibit the Repeal meetings. He felt that

'the strong arm of the law' was required, as conciliation had been tried  
 104  
 and had failed. Though they themselves had suggested such a course, the  
 declarations only fuelled the Mail's desire for 'total suppression' of  
 the 'incipient rebellion'. Failing this the declarations were merely  
 'idle words', 'lambent and harmless' and 'good for nothing'. The influx  
 105  
 of troops was similarly rejected as useless in itself.

Also at this time Henry Lambert warned Stanley of the danger of  
 'an outbreak' in Ireland. O'Connell should be arrested and put in the  
 Tower. 'If there be no law to punish this traitor, make one. Parliament  
 106  
 seeing the necessity would not refuse it.' The Knight of Kerry feared a  
 Catholic rising and advised Wellington to station ships around the coasts  
 107  
 to provide refuge for Protestants. On the 13th of May Roden and Ely saw  
 Graham, and Glengall visited Peel. They addressed the Ministers in  
 language which was 'a mixture of reproach and apprehension'. They  
 complained of 'neglect of the Protestant Party and .. discouragement of  
 our friends.. Lord Roden's complaints pointed rather to Eliot' and to 'the  
 cold reserve and seclusion of the Lord Chancellor (Sugden)'. And Roden  
 said that as processions to the proposed Repeal meeting in Tipperary  
 would madden Orangemen and threaten the public peace the Government  
 should declare the meeting to be dangerous and possibly prohibit it; at  
 any rate any magistrate or Government employee attending that or any  
 108  
 subsequent meeting should be dismissed. Westmeath wrote to Peel of his  
 regret that the 'systematic ruining' of the peace of Ireland was 'allowed  
 to go on without a check', and though confident that Peel's forbearance  
 was 'founded upon an anxious consideration of the whole case' he thought  
 'no occasion so favourable for striking down that viper O'Connell and all  
 109  
 his following.'

De Grey continued to press for extra powers to suppress the Repeal  
 meetings, and the associated Temperance processions, and urged dismissal  
 of the Repeal magistrates. He was clearly influenced by 'the clamorous  
 demands of our own party to do something.. Every day makes it worse', for



it increases the confidence of the Repealers '& depresses the small remains of trust which our friends, or those wishing to be so, may repose in us.' Many of them said the Government were 'indifferent & lukewarm.' Attorney-General Smith also wanted to ask for extra powers. Sugden felt there was 'just cause for alarm' but was 'not prepared for new legislation'. Graham and De Grey, the former as alarmed as the latter, seriously considered prohibition of some of the more dangerous-looking meetings. But Graham remained convinced that 'nothing short of a demonstrated necessity' would reconcile Parliament to the sort of coercive powers which might be effective. Wellington and Graham became heavily involved in military preparations for "La Grande Guerre" in Ireland. Both contemplated calling out and arming 'the Protestant Yeomanry of the North'; Wellington wished to advise Irish Protestants to prepare their houses against attack and 'to confederate for their mutual and common security.'

On the 23rd of May, Lord Chancellor Sugden wrote to several leading Repealers to dismiss them from the magistracy as a result of their attendance at Repeal meetings. In his letter to Lord Ffrench on the 23rd Sugden virtually admitted that the meetings were not illegal. The admission was seized upon by the liberal objectors to the dismissals and was regretted by Peel and Graham; the latter nevertheless resolved to give Sugden the full support of the Government. Sugden subsequently wrote that it 'had long been matter of complaint from the loyal & well disposed that the Repeal magistrates were not dismissed.' Several Irish Tory Lords duly defended Sugden's course in Parliament. But one, Lord Wicklow, 'did not approve the wording of the letter' and contended that the meetings were illegal. The Mail heaped abuse on Sugden because of his implied admission that the meetings were legal, making him for several weeks the principal target of their tirades. Roden wrote to Peel that,

'the dismissal of the Repeal magistrates is no doubt a very important and necessary measure, but I am sorry to say the letter

written by the Lord Chancellor which accompanied that step has in a great degree nullified its good effect.' 115

However, it was in the Commons that the Irish Tory representatives proved most vocal, using the Arms Bill debates of May-August 1843, like the liberal-unionists, as an opportunity to discuss more general issues. In the long second reading debate at the end of May Bateson, Conolly, Bernard, Claud Hamilton, Shaw, Jocelyn, Verner and Brooke all spoke in favour of the bill. Most of these members cited the alarming state of Ireland as a factor in their desire for such a bill, attacked Repeal, and slammed the Repeal leaders for agitating the Irish people by, as Conolly put it, 'gross and cruel misrepresentations .. of unreal grievances and fancied wrongs'. Bateson denied that it was a coercion bill and 'was not of opinion, as many were, that it was expedient to pass some legislative enactment to put down Repeal discussion. The actual laws, if carried into effect, were at present sufficient.' New legislation 'would only be adding fuel' to a Repeal flame which he felt would soon die away. Bernard said that,

'while he strongly deprecated coercion .. he nevertheless sincerely hoped that if the time should come when such a step should be deemed necessary, the Government would take the earliest opportunity of asking Parliament for additional powers, in order to put a stop to the agitation.'

Brooke believed that the arms bill alone would not tranquillize Ireland and that members on both sides of the House 'would ere long call upon her Majesty's Government to enact laws for the preservation of tranquillity in Ireland of a much more stringent nature than that now under consideration.' Even Brooke, however, did not seem to intend censure on the Government. Shaw, on the other hand, delivered a remarkable speech in which he reflected, cautiously, many of the views of the Evening Mail. He denied that Irish Conservatives desired ascendancy of any kind. But they expected to receive the favour due to the Government's own supporters. They felt they had instead been treated with 'distrust and suspicion' by the Irish Government, and had consequently 'shrunk into themselves and in their turn become distant and reserved...



'... They looked on with wonder and amazement at the blindness of the Government to the progress of the present agitation, but they would not step uninvited beyond the limits of their own peculiar duties - they would not intrude opinions that were not sought, and were probably apprehensive that if they did, they would be unheeded and bring upon themselves the imputation of ultra politicians and of being the advocates of unnecessary coercion. (They therefore) had undoubtedly, up to a very recent period, been apathetic and almost indifferent to the present agitation, to a degree most unusual, and, indeed, unprecedented amongst them.'

This, Shaw claimed, had contributed to the 'alarming' state of Ireland. So too had the agricultural depression in Ireland, which owed much to Peel's economic measures. 'It could not be disguised either that throughout all parties in Ireland there existed a prevailing opinion that there was a want of vigour and independent power of action in the executive Government of Ireland', though he attributed this to anomalies in its position rather than to shortcomings in De Grey and Eliot. And Shaw regretted that the magisterial dismissals had not come earlier. He contended that the Repeal meetings were illegal and could, and must immediately, be put down under the existing law. He recognized, in conclusion, that what he had said 'was not entirely pleasing to either of the great parties' in the House but claimed that he had represented the views of 'the gentry, the professional men, and the educated classes of Ireland generally.'

Other Irish Tories in Parliament shared Shaw's doubts about the Government's commercial policy, the Canada Corn Bill in particular. That measure also incurred the opprobrium of the Mail, though for all their denunciation of 'the free trade extravagances' and apathetic Irish policy of the Government, the Mail urged Irish members to support the Ministry in order to keep out the Whigs, in 'the choice of evils' this course being 'the least calamitous.'

But it was the growth of the Repeal agitation which preoccupied Irish Tory minds. Many Irish Tories expressed alarm. Clancarty sought an interview with Peel to discuss 'the state of Ireland' and others urged Peel to suppress the agitation. In Parliament on the 1st of June, Lord Lorton denounced the Repeal agitation as a vast Jesuit

conspiracy, ruled out conciliation, and recommended instead the calling  
120  
out of the yeomanry. Roden wrote to Glengall from Dublin that,

'No one can form an idea of the state of alarm & anxiety felt by all classes of persons here, all looking in vain to the Government to take some decided steps. If this tardy conduct continues, rely on it the country is gone; nothing can save it but a decided course, & if something is not done by them we must only individually seek to protect ourselves.' 121

He sent a long letter to Peel describing the 'extensive conspiracy' in Ireland, the military preparations of the Repealers, the alarm of 'the loyal people of the Country', and their resentment that while Orange processions were prevented by law the Temperance bands, 'fully enlisted in the present excitement', marched without impediment. He went on:

'The loyal people of the Country are anxiously looking to the Government for some measure to check these proceedings and to prevent the collection of money for the Repeal Rent... I would take the liberty of suggesting to the Government the importance of embodying the yeomanry of the North, both with the view of preventing any in that quarter from joining Repeal as also on the one hand to give confidence to the loyal and on the other hand to keep in check the further proceedings of the Repealers ... not a moment is to be lost in taking decisive measures to arrest this growing evil. Every day that these measures are delay'd, and they must come at last, additional strength is given to the Repealers, and dismay and despair will fill the minds of the loyal.' 122

Writing to the Mail on the 6th of June, Roden warned Protestants against Repeal, which involved 'the aggrandizement of the Roman Catholic Church .. the extinction of the Protestant religion, and eventually the annihilation of the Protestant people of Ireland.' He thought the Government had 'acted wisely' in sending troops throughout the country. But he also felt that,

'It is a melancholy fact that notwithstanding the state of excitement occasioned by the large assemblies .. the meetings are permitted to proceed.. It appears an unaccountable infatuation that, whilst the danger is admitted by those in authority, no sufficient 123  
measure has yet been adopted calculated to stop the progress of the evil.'

Wellington was daily in receipt of alarming reports from Irish Tories, notably Glengall, Donoughmore, Jocelyn and Castlemaine, a considerable number of them advocating the calling out of the Protestant 124  
Yeomanry to counter the expected 'general rising'. Even the relatively moderate Tory James Stronge of Armagh expected 'a civil war .. the people are as quiet as gunpowder.' And he feared that Orange attacks on



Northern Catholics, already begun, would endanger southern Protestants.

'The Government must act with severity against these people (the Orangemen), which again will have the effect of disgusting a large part of the loyal population of the North. Altogether things are getting  
125  
into a pretty mess.' Lord Farnham, too, as his subsequent behaviour was to show, belonged to the more moderate section of Irish Conservatism. But he was no less anxious about the state of Ireland. Graham informed Peel on the 4th of June that,

'I have had Lord Farnham with me in a state of considerable alarm. He tells me that the accounts received from Ulster this morning by himself, Sir Arthur Brooke, and others, have no doubt (sic) that an immediate collision between the Protestants and Catholics in the North is inevitable. They have reason to apprehend an outbreak on or before the 13th of the present month, and Lord Farnham presses me for an Order calling on Lords Lieutenant, Deputies Lieutenant, and Irish magistrates now in England to repair forthwith to their respective counties .. he was satisfied not a moment was to be lost.' 126

Graham subsequently wrote of Farnham that,

'He holds very prudent and moderate language and declares that his first object is to restrain the Protestants in the North from being the aggressors; and that all his influence will be exerted to keep them sober and within the limits of strict obedience to the law ...' 127

George Hamilton, the member for the University, was equally cooperative. In his view,

'an extremely moderate declaration in reference to the repeal question - appealing to the good sense of men of all parties - calculated as far as possible to allay excitement, and such as might be signed by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, would have a salutary effect, at least in preventing some injudicious move ... the course to be taken by the Conservative party in that country (Ireland) is becoming a matter of very great importance, and .. an injudicious move on their part might prove embarrassing to Government ...'

He was 'most anxious' to use his own influence, in an emergency  
128  
like the present, in full cooperation with the views of Government.'

According to the High Sheriff of the City of Cork,

'It is the opinion of the well affected here that with the precautions which the Government is taking there is no great probability of an outbreak. That an imposing force of the standing army is the best security & the wisest policy ... That there would be much danger in calling out the yeomanry. That the crisis requires gentleness as well as firmness.' 129

On the other hand, one of Wellington's correspondents from the North wrote that, 'The Irish Government are losing the confidence of



the loyalists of this country, they are thought to be apathetic, and  
<sup>130</sup>  
 wavering in their politics.' De Grey wrote on the 8th of June to  
 describe the state of Irish Tory opinion:

'Of course our opponents dislike & distrust us; but alas! so do those who have called themselves our friends. Your anxious wishes & my earnest endeavours have been to act with honesty & impartiality... But the violence of the other (Tory) party, & the language of their leading organ, the Evening Mail, which whether the guide or follower of opinion matters not, is such as to make even an impartial & honest choice of any public functionary (founded upon his individual fitness) a ground of bitterness, & is urged upon them as amounting to insult, as well as injury, unless he should happen to be one of their own faction ... their dislike of Eliot & Sugden is not of recent origin. They have felt the same ever since they were appointed, but it has increased to so great a degree as now to have rendered their services, honest & well intentioned as they may be, clearly useless here.' 131

Graham and Wellington felt that Ireland was in an extremely perilous state at the beginning of June 1843; the Duke was convinced 'that an open rebellion is close at hand', anxious for embodiment of the yeomanry, and evidently frustrated that 'efficient measures are not adopted' by the  
<sup>132</sup>  
 Government. Sugden seemed to favour a demand for extra powers to suppress  
<sup>133</sup>  
 the agitation. Eliot felt that the opinion of Under-Secretary Lucas, apparently favouring suppression of the Repeal Association, was 'rather that of an Irish Tory gentleman than that of a member of a national Government.' Eliot was unwilling to 'do more than the exigency of the case requires', and felt that a measure to suppress the Association would be easily evaded, would not remove the source of danger, the Repeal meetings, and would prove more difficult to carry in the Commons than a bill to suppress those meetings. Far from opposing all proposals of coercion, however, he advocated an extension of the Processions Act to prohibit all processions with any semblance of 'military array', and he would give magistrates considerable discretionary power to dissolve or  
<sup>134</sup>  
 prohibit dangerous meetings.

Nevertheless, when the Cabinet discussed coercion on the 8th and 11th of June they decided that they should not yet seek additional powers from Parliament to deal with the Repeal agitation. Peel informed De Grey that the decision was made after much debate and 'considerable change of



opinion.' He explained it in terms of the facility with which the agitators could evade proclamation by recourse to churches, the Corporations or the Poor-law Boards; of the likelihood that coercion without conciliation would unite in opposition a wide range of British parties, from Whigs to Chartists; and of the 'formidable' excitement which 'the cry of anti-coercion' would cause in Ireland, undermining the chance that Repeal would decline as men grew fearful for their property and freedom. There remained a 'probability that it may not be safe to permit Parliament to separate without an appeal to it. All that we resolved .. was to postpone at least the demand for additional powers, not to give immediate notice of an intention to demand them.' Graham was 'well pleased' with the decision:

'our forbearance aggravates the guilt of the rebellious, and will win to our side all rational and prudent men whose judgement might be revolted by a premature effort to suspend civil government in Ireland.. (There is still) a specious semblance of tranquillity .. this organization is the strongest proof of real danger and that the whole country is ruined; but no free Legislature will consent to destroy free Government on suspicion ...' 135

De Grey wrote several times in the next week about the state of Protestant opinion:

'The Protestant part of the community .. are in a state of the greatest alarm. They say, "are we to stand quiet & to be murdered in our beds whenever it suits the other side?", & those gentry & landlords who may have influence, such as Lords Farnham, Erne, Enniskillen & Roden, however they may exert themselves, all declare that their influence is abating, & that their people are becoming daily more determined to act for themselves.'

He had written to Farnham, Roden and Downshire to implore their aid in keeping the Protestants quiet and planned to see them to explain the decision against coercive legislation, and he urged Peel to speak to Lorton, Conolly and Perceval in London. But he feared that,

'the merest trifle may set the whole in a flame ... The feeling of the Protestants in the North has been so worked upon, & only kept down by a latent hope that something would be done, that very reasonable apprehension must be entertained that on the 1st & 12 July they will break forth.'

By the 17th of June he was more confident that their leaders would succeed in averting 'any risk of outbreak' among Protestants during the



July anniversaries. But he warned again that,

'there is no concealing from ourselves that they are in a state of the greatest excitement & alarm. In some places they sit up for security at night; at other places they have established nightly patrols and are under the most serious apprehension of midnight massacre. They ask for troops, which we cannot in all cases grant them. They ask for arms, which we have invariably refused. They ask for leave to organize & arm themselves, which we equally refuse. They ask for the protection of existing laws, which we are obliged to acknowledge is not adequate; & they ask finally that we will in such case endeavour to obtain increase of power, which as yet we have not attempted.'

De Grey complained bitterly that,

'The influence of that scoundrel, the Evening Mail, is fearful amongst that class. It is not possible for me to put myself in communication with the villain, and I do not know that any one has power over him. Shaw is supposed to have it; & Lords Glengall & Charleville are his bosom friends ...'

De Grey explained that the Repeal agitation owed much to discontent over the Church and Land questions, and he believed that among Protestants,

'a fear of the Government giving way upon either or both of these subjects forms a principal ground of alarm. The Evening Mail, which has a very great circulation amongst the Protestants, & which guides them in a very great degree, has started the idea that you mean to purchase peace upon Repeal by concessions on these other subjects. And I have no doubt that thousands are now impressed with that motive ...'

A 'minor but still important part of the present cause of irritation & exasperation' was the applicability of the Processions Act to Orange marches while Temperance bands were exempt; De Grey again urged extension of the Act to cover the Temperance bands. He also found 'on all hands a most anxious desire that some declaration on the part of the Government should be made', more formal than a statement in Parliament, on the subject of Repeal. And there was a desire among 'our own friends in higher classes' to be informed of the Government's intentions so that they could work for 'union & mutual support' in the Protestant camp if they were to be 'thrown back upon their own efforts' by the refusal of Government support. De Grey had declined to sanction such initiatives on the grounds that 'union & mutual support means (sic) embodying & arming', and Government approval of such 'would be deemed a declaration of war by the opposite party ...' He wished, however, to comply with the desire for information on 'what the Government would do & what it would not do.'



Regarding the Repeal agitation, De Grey feared that 'an accidental occurrence may blow all into a flame', in spite of the intentions of its leaders. 'An outbreak would in some respects be an advantage', as it might facilitate coercion, which, however, he thought justified even by the existing position.<sup>137</sup>

Roden wrote to thank Wellington for the extensive military precautions being undertaken. But he also warned that Ireland was like 'gunpowder' which needed only 'a little spark .. to set it all in a blaze'. He was trying to keep the Protestants quiet, but they, and he himself, were annoyed that Repeal meetings, with all the 'excitement & bad feeling' they involved, were 'proceeding without any effort of the Government to put them even on a par with the loyal Protestant meetings & so to prevent their processions.'<sup>138</sup> Farnham reported on 'the excessive state of alarm of the Protestant population' of Cavan.<sup>139</sup> Glengall and Donoughmore continued to hear alarming reports from Ireland of the likelihood of a rising.<sup>140</sup> Lord Clancarty and Baron Pennefather wanted the immediate suppression of the Repeal meetings, and the Baron reflected on the 'injudicious' conduct of the Government in that respect.<sup>141</sup>

As De Grey noted, the Mail continued to denounce savagely the 'wretched and cowardly Government' for its 'blameable supineness' in failing to suppress the Repeal meetings, its alleged determination to conciliate the Repealers, and its failure to show 'common gratitude to friends.' They advised the 'betrayed, insulted, trampled, spat upon' Protestants to remain aloof from projected anti-Repeal meetings until the Government changed its policy. 'For the present they (Protestants) must maintain a strict neutrality.' The Packet, Warder and Statesman dissented from this view, but the latter two concurred in the Mail's condemnation of the Government. Several Protestant anti-Repeal meetings took place early in June, but, to the delight of the Mail, the principal meeting, in Dublin, was badly attended and saw denunciation of the Government's conciliatory politics and a call for suppression of the Repeal agitation.<sup>142</sup>



When it was learnt that the Cabinet had decided against a coercive measure the Mail declared that 'the Protestant people of Ireland have been finally flung overboard.' They alleged that many Protestants, feeling themselves abandoned, were becoming attracted to Repeal. The Irish Tory members and peers should 'admonish' Peel and if necessary bring the question to Parliament in order 'to compel the administration <sup>143</sup> to the alternative of action or retirement.' In private correspondence, too, Sheehan of the Mail was alarmed by the progress being made by the Repealers. The 'sinews of war' were accumulating, O'Connell exercised a 'despotic sway', and 'all this has been achieved by the base and cowardly truckling of a dishonest and unprincipled ministry ...' <sup>144</sup>

On the 13th of June, Londonderry informed Peel that,

'A Noble Lord called on me to ask me to join in calling a meeting of Irish peers & Commoners to wait upon you with a view of urging more decisive & energetic measures in Ireland. He stated further that this would greatly tend to fortify a party in the Government who were favourable to the adoption of this course.. He talks of giving notice of a motion on the state of Ireland.'

Londonderry decided to remain aloof from the 'meeting of Conspirators' because 'the more names they have the more consequential <sup>145</sup> they will consider themselves.' The requisition for this meeting was signed by Bandon, Wicklow, Charleville, Donoughmore, Glengall, Lorton, <sup>146</sup> Lucas, Castlemaine and Carbery, all Irish Tory peers. The meeting was held on the 17th of June in Lord Wicklow's London house and was attended by 22 peers connected with Ireland, 21 of the Irish Tory M.P.'s, 7 other M.P.'s connected with Ireland, and the former member for Sligo, Colonel Perceval. Their resolutions, though they expressed concern at the situation in Ireland, were relatively moderate, in spite of Londonderry's fears and the preposterous claim in the Evening Mail that they showed that the leading Irish Conservatives in Parliament shared the anti-Government policy of that paper. It was unanimously resolved,

'That this meeting deeply deplores the present alarming state of Ireland.

That we consider the multitudinous assemblages now taking place in different parts of Ireland to be dangerous to the public peace, and



calculated to create well founded terror in the minds of Her Majesty's well disposed subjects of all classes in that Country.

That in consequence the ordinary occupations of the population are suspended, and the public mind kept in a state of painful and dangerous excitement.

That under these circumstances we feel it our duty to declare, individually, and collectively, our anxious desire and firm determination to use our best exertions - in cooperation with Her Majesty's Government - for the purpose of upholding the law, preserving the public peace in that part of the United Kingdom, and allaying that dangerous excitement to which we have referred.

That our Chairman be requested to lay the foregoing resolutions before Her Majesty's Government.'

There was no insistence on the illegality of the meetings, no demand for coercion or criticism of Government apathy in that respect, and no accusation of Government neglect of the Protestant party.

Downshire wrote to Peel that the resolutions 'will I hope be useful to your Government', and Peel was able to report his 'satisfaction' at the promise of cooperation.  
147

There was a note of censure, however, in the resolutions passed at a meeting of 34 magistrates of Co. Fermanagh on the 16th of June. Erne, the Lieutenant of the County, called the meeting, as he explained to Peel, to address the Government on 'the very great alarm which prevails in this county .. & also for the purpose of devising means for protecting our lives & properties in a constitutional manner & as far as lies in our power, left as we are entirely to our own resources.' The Catholics, he asserted, possessed 'a great quantity of arms', were stealing lead from roofs, were being drilled by the priests, and were 'in such an inflammable state & so organized that they only await the word from their leaders to explode.' The resolutions expressed 'the lively and justifiable alarm' of the loyal population and asserted that 'rebellion and anarchy must shortly overwhelm our country if more active measures be not adopted by the Government to repress' the 'tumultuous meetings' of the repealers. They 'most strongly' called on the Government 'to take the speedy and decided measures to put down these illegal assemblies.'  
148

In addition, some Orange groups, revived according to the Mail by 'the culpable supineness of a so-called Conservative Government' in the



face of the dangerous agitation, expressed dissatisfaction with the Government's conciliatory policy and failure to act against the Repealers. 149

Wellington, Graham and Lucas remained greatly concerned at the prospect of a rising in Ireland, Graham, for instance, declaring that 'a struggle is inevitable.' However, Eliot was much less apprehensive. And the Home Secretary balked at Wellington's 'awful' proposal to supplement their ample military force by calling out the Protestant yeomanry; he thought it would be 'the signal of insurrection in the South', though, regarding the yeomanry as a force to be used in the event of rebellion - 'if it come to blows we must use the Protestant strength' - he instructed De Grey 150 to place 'arms and accoutrements' in convenient depots for their use.

Graham was aware of the Protestant role as 'our garrison of defence' and acknowledged 'the rational anxiety of the Irish Protestants amidst the threats with which they are assailed from every quarter .. they are the true supporters of British connexion and .. in a crisis such as this they must not be disheartened.' And he explained to De Grey his conviction that 'the time had arrived when Fixity of Tenure and the overthrow of the Protestant Church must be firmly disclaimed as concessions never in any degree to be contemplated by a British Government.' This view lay behind his famous declaration in the House that 'conciliation has been 151 carried to its utmost limits in Ireland.'

This declaration took place during the second great Arms Bill debate, which saw Jones, Conolly and Shaw lending support to the measure and a vigorous defence of Orangeism by Colonel Verner. Shaw again boasted of the 'moderation' of the Irish Conservatives, and claimed that they felt they had been rewarded not with the confidence of the Government but 'with some degree of jealousy and distrust - not from any ill will towards them on the part of the Government, but from the Government wanting the courage to be just and to act uprightly.' At the end of the month Carbery spoke in the Lords of his own alarm and that of the Irish Protestants at the excited state of Ireland and urged the Government



'to take some prompt and decisive steps, with the view of putting an  
152  
end to a state of things so alarming.'

Lord Clanwilliam, an Irish Conservative, returned to his estates in Co. Down to urge local Orangemen not to march on the approaching July anniversaries, representing such forbearance as the advice of 'the whole body of their London friends.' In an interesting letter to De Grey on the 28th of June, he reported that,

'the lower classes .. say that the (Processions) law is one sided, and .. harshly administered... They say (the high as well as the low) that Ministers know they can have their assistance whenever the day and hour shall come, and that they use this power ungenerously. They can't and won't understand that a strong government should look on, les bras croises, at repeal meetings, in all their accessions of treason and terrorism and even French emissaries. They say they pay the Queen's taxes and receive no equivalent in protection. The gentlemen have a dogged feeling that they will leave the government, which throws them over, to fight it out by themselves, and let them see whether they can do so without our assistance. This is nonsense, but it shows the public temper. Such is the terror .. stout hearted farmers .. sit up at nights ... nothing can be more open than the occasional language of the Roman Catholics about the speedy recovery of forfeited lands... I took some pains so far to defend Government as at least to show the extreme difficulties attendant, for instance, on putting down repeal meetings, whether as meetings or as repeal. The jealousy of parliament respecting that right; the increased difficulty now from the bungling of the Chancellor; then as to repeal, I expressed my conviction that .. O'Connell was most probably already prepared with some other topic for agitation should repeal be proscribed.'

Clanwilliam had stressed also the risk of 'collisions' if the yeomanry were re-formed. But these arguments 'fell dull on the ears of men who felt they were all but fighting for their lives and lands, which say they is the Government's business, not theirs.' They had a word of approval only for the Arms Bill, which they hoped would be used. Clanwilliam himself was worried about the Repeal agitation, fearing that 'the want of leaders puts rebellion so long and no longer out of question',  
153  
and recommending the deportation of all Frenchmen.

On the 30th, Wellington informed Graham that the Northern Protestants were 'much disheartened and in a sad state', especially over the one-sided Processions law, and that he was upset to hear that some  
154  
farmers felt they had to remain on guard at night. Boyd, the Tory member for Coleraine, sent a report that in Antrim there was Protestant alarm at



155

the 'nightly meetings' held by Catholics and the prospect of insurrection. And towards the end of June, an Irish Tory pamphleteer deprecated the Government's 'defensive' attitude to the mounting threat of insurrection  
156  
and advocated repression of the agitation. Wyse was told by Ferguson that,

'the Protestants are becoming so alarmed .. they are determined to meet the encroaching evil, before it becomes absolute invasion, by main force. They say it is just as well to be cut down by the swords of the Queen's cavalry as by the pikes of papists.' 157

Clanwilliam was not alone in exerting his influence to prevent illegal processions of Orangemen during the July anniversaries. Roden, Farnham, the M.P.'s Verner, Northland, Alexander and Kirk, Erne, Downshire, Donegall, O'Neill, Massarene, Cooke, Waring, O'Sullivan, and Sheehan of  
158  
the Mail were all involved in the same cause. The anniversaries duly  
159  
passed off without any infringement of the law. On the 3rd of July De Grey again urged the extension of the Processions Act to the Temperance Bands, on the grounds that their processions contributed significantly to the Repeal agitation and Protestants were aggrieved at the contrast  
160  
between their immunity and the illegality of the Orange marches. Graham brought the issue before the Cabinet, but it was felt there that anything short of a measure 'prohibiting or giving a discretionary power to prohibit any meeting or playing any tune' would be evaded, and that the difficulty incurred in passing the Arms Bill indicated the sort of opposition which would be offered to an attempt to extend the Processions  
161  
Act. The Cabinet accordingly decided not to alter the Act.

In Parliament the Government were forced to make many changes in the Arms Bill. Graham complained that, 'The majority of the Irish members on our side of the House are unfavourable to the proposed alterations  
162  
and give us no cordial support.' In fact, the Irish Tories unanimously supported the Government in all but one of the many divisions in Committee, albeit silently; on the third reading Verner said he regretted the concession by which the bill was restricted to fire-arms only, but  
163  
he joined the rest of the Irish Tories in voting for the measure.



Smith O'Brien's motion for a Committee on the state of Ireland at the start of July was opposed by six Irish Tory speakers. Bateson, Bernard, Tennent, Shaw and Jocelyn contended that Britain could not meet the demands of the agitators with respect to the Church, the land question, or Repeal and attacked the agitation for the dangerous excitement it had caused in Ireland. Tennent and Jocelyn were prepared, in Tennent's words, to 'resist sedition by the unswerving redress of every acknowledged wrong', and Bateson proposed taxation of absentees and investment in public employment. George Hamilton urged Ministers to attend to the 'practical' wants of Ireland - short of abandoning 'great principles' - by extension of public works and railways and the establishment of a commission to consider land improvement. There was a suggestion in these remarks that some Irish Tories saw the need to conciliate; but none followed George Smythe, the Irish Conservative who sat for Canterbury, in demanding 'large measures of conciliation', such as the improvement of Maynooth, and in attacking the Government for offering only an Arms Bill.

Bateson and Bernard were especially grateful to the Government for its pledge to uphold the Established Church in Ireland, and Bernard said that if the agitation continued 'he had the satisfaction of feeling that they had at the head of affairs a Minister not inferior in ability and statesman-like qualities to that great Minister who carried the Union.' Hamilton and Shaw, however, were more critical of the Government. According to Hamilton,

'They had mistaken the feelings of the Conservative party - instead of inviting them frankly to join with them in the great work of just conciliation, they had mistrusted their generosity or their moderation. While the attitude of the Government towards their political opponents was conciliatory, as it should be, their attitude towards their friends was that of repulsion. The inference which the Conservatives came to was this, either that their honest support was embarrassing, or else that some new and objectionable concessions were in contemplation. The motive of Government, no doubt, was a good one; but this policy was a mistake. The Government by it had estranged their friends - they had strengthened their opponents, and encouraged them to hope that something might be extorted from their weakness by clamour and agitation... He was firmly convinced that just in proportion as Government evinces firmness and strength .. in the same degree would the excitement subside.'

Though concurring in Peel's reluctance to seek new coercive powers, Hamilton urged administration of the law 'with firmness as well as temperance.' But he too welcomed the Government's determination to uphold the Church and 'the principles upon which they came into office', and he called on Conservatives to support the Government:

'Let the Irish Conservatives feel themselves no longer estranged, let moderate men of all parties have the courage to come forward and support the Crown .. for the purpose of enabling Government to bear down those physical demonstrations by an exhibition of moral and political strength.'

Shaw said that he 'could not approve of the course which her Majesty's Government were pursuing in that country', though his desire was 'not to weaken but to strengthen their hands and to give them every general support in his power.' While wanting the Government to act with impartiality and 'due forbearance', he wished also for 'a firmness becoming a strong Government' in upholding the law and in giving 'a protection which it must be confessed was not experienced at the present moment.' There were 'emergencies' when 'party and political feelings' must yield to 'higher considerations.' Normal activities and social relations were suspended in Ireland, and peaceable inhabitants lived in 'terror' of the monster meetings. The latter were 'illegal', and, though he 'wanted no coercion bills', the Government should 'uphold the existing law, and not suffer its spirit and its letter to be violated; and yet they had permitted these meetings to go on.' The Government must expect criticism if they stood by 'with folded arms' while Ireland was on the brink of 'outrage and revolution', and 'must not wonder if the loyal and peaceable subjects of the Crown felt uneasiness and alarm and a want of that confidence which, under the present circumstances of Ireland, a firm Government and vigorous administration of the law could alone inspire.'

In the division on O'Brien's motion the Irish Conservatives, apart from Smythe of Canterbury, voted solidly with the Government. Two days later the Lords debated Clanricarde's motion on the dismissal of the Repeal magistrates. Wicklow, always the most independent of the Irish



Tory peers, described the way in which the dismissals were made as 'unconstitutional and unjust', while feeling the magistrates were 'unworthy' of their commission and 'properly dismissed.' But he would not vote with Clanricarde because it would imply censure on a Government whose every act he had approved, including their refusal to seek coercive powers and their watchfulness over the situation in Ireland. Glengall, too, regretted that 'the manner' of the dismissals 'was not as .. correct as the act itself.' He urged the Government and Parliament 'to afford some better protection than mere military means' to the unionists of Ireland and felt that a coercion act was justified by 'the alarming and critical condition of the country.. Forbearance was to be commended, but forbearance had its limits.' If that policy failed the Government would find it difficult to explain 'its supineness'. He wondered if the Government was prepared to wait until the country was in a state of fully-pledged insurrection.

Clancarty regretted that the Government's conduct in Ireland 'exhibits a melancholy and a painful contrast' to their able administration in other areas; 'not only has their general policy in regard to Ireland disappointed public expectation, but more particularly has it been wanting in the present emergency in those qualities which are essential to the securing of public confidence', in the vigour necessary to end 'the very alarming state of things in Ireland.' No step had been taken to stop the 'illegal and unconstitutional' Repeal meetings, apart from one of 'such questionable propriety' and tendency to excitement as the magisterial dismissals. The meetings should be suppressed if illegal, and if necessary rendered illegal by special enactment, instead of trusting as at present to the influence of O'Connell to prevent an outbreak and to the use of military force. Charleville, too, wished that 'the law would be exercised with vigour' to end the agitation which was so dangerous and so alarming to loyal citizens and felt that the Government had been mistaken in their policy of forbearance. He too doubted the propriety of the



magisterial dismissals and especially the failure to pursue that course  
 164  
 with consistency.

Donoughmore congratulated Glengall on his 'capital' speech, and commented, 'What a shifty fellow Wicklow is, no one is sure of him on any  
 165  
 subject.' There were indications in Peel's correspondence at this time that some Irish Tories agreed with Wicklow in approving of the Government's forbearance. Lord Clare wrote to Peel that 'in neither proclaiming the illegality of these meetings nor in applying for new laws to put them down, you have acted with sound discretion. Paddy will soon have had his talk out, & then if he begins to act, why, at the worst, you must act too.' He was also confident that the widely-predicted order to withhold rents would not succeed. But even Clare was alarmed at the organization of the repealers and the extent of their expectations, and he feared that 'there will be a crisis before a cure .. there is much political danger hanging over us.'

The High Sheriff of Cork reported that the 'well affected here entirely approve of the conduct of Government in this trying emergency.' Even those who had favoured a coercive measure 'now acknowledged' the  
 166  
 'virtue of your forbearance'. Sir Arthur Brooke, Tory member for Fermanagh, assured Peel of his anxious wish not to 'embarrass' the Government 'or throw difficulties in their way.' He proposed that,

'a Commission should be appointed .. for the purpose of instituting a close and searching enquiry in to the numerous grievances which are now alleged to exist in Ireland; with a view if possible of redressing those abuses, if any such really do exist ... the Commission should comprize .. men of both parties, and Roman Catholics also if you thought proper... I am not very sanguine as to the lasting advantages to be derived from such a commission, still I feel confident that it would not only have the effect of satisfying the Country that the Government were most anxious to do all that is just & right as regards Ireland, but it would also be the means of disarming the Agitators (and) allaying the frightful state of excitement which at present exists in that Country ...' 167

Lord Farnham contrived to express 'the most implicit confidence' in the Government and to urge the redress of Protestant grievances. He considered that,

'the Protestant Press in Ireland is most culpable for the line which it has taken in misrepresenting the actions and motives of



Government; and that to it is in a great measure attributable that growing feeling of distrust which, if it should continue to spread among our Protestants, will be productive of serious injury to them and will tend more than anything else to thwart the endeavours of Government to promote the general welfare of this country. I .. see the great danger .. should these attempts to alienate the confidence of the Protestants from the Government prove successful ... I cannot too highly estimate the vast importance of having, on the side of the Government, the great moral weight & support of the Protestants of Ireland.'

But he had found 'great difficulty' in persuading his fellow Protestants 'to place the same implicit confidence (as I do) in the conduct and intentions of government.' He had 'spared no exertions to produce this result' but had to report that,

'among all classes of the Protestants, I have found distrust prevailing. They complain that the progress of Repeal agitation should have remained so long unchecked. They complain bitterly that there is one law for them, & another for the Roman Catholics; that their Processions and loyal exhibitions are put down by law .. while the others are allowed to parade their avowedly disloyal Processions... In this respect I consider the processions of the Tea<sup>l</sup>(sic) Total Bands as the most objectionable and irritating causes of offence; & as long as this prolific source of bad feeling is allowed to exist I can look for no peace or friendly feeling in this Country.'

The Government should prohibit the Temperance processions so that everyone should plainly see that Justice is equally dealt out towards all parties.' More vaguely, he opined that 'if the Repeal Agitation goes on, it is unreasonable to expect too much forbearance from the Protestants.'

Glengall and Roden complained publicly of the unequal treatment of Protestant and Catholic processions, Roden claiming that, 'This cannot be justice. Either the procession act must be repealed or this revolutionary movement must be suppressed.' Early in August Roden presented in the Lords a petition from 5,000 Down Protestants on the issue and urged repeal or extension of the act. Wicklow said that nothing could then be done, but he felt that the act should either be extended to embrace all or allowed to expire in the following session. In the Commons, Northland asked if the Government intended to repeal the act. Wellington and Peel ruled out both repeal and extension, but Peel said that Protestant forbearance in relinquishing their processions might facilitate a decision not to renew the act when it expired at the end of the next session.



Irish Tory concern and dissatisfaction was by no means limited to this issue during July and August 1843. Lord Carbery asked Peel for an interview to discuss the 'alarming condition' of Ireland and communicated his anxiety to Wellington. Lambert wrote to Stanley that, 'Matters are daily becoming worse here .. Rebellion flourishes', not least because of the 'utter inaction on the part of Government.' The latter should act immediately to suppress the agitation by 'force', for it would not 'wear itself out' or be defeated by a conciliatory approach. Donoughmore complained that, 'We have no Government & no protection.' He had lost all 'influence' over even his own servants. Ireland was full of Frenchmen claiming to be priests but looking like 'half pay officers.' The 'whole fabric of society' was disorganized, the people 'driven to madness by the harangues' of O'Connell and the other agitators. The 'real object of the repeal cry' was as 'a war hoop of extermination against the Protestants & all those who are loyal subjects to the Queen. You will have to reconquer this country', he told Wellington, 'if you mean it should remain a part of the British Empire.'

De Grey reported that,

'a very apparent sense of sullenness & disappointment in many, from (what one would wish & expect to be) good friends. It is a predominant feeling that .. (the Arms Bill) is offered as a remedy (& the only remedy) for the present state of things, and its inefficiency for that purpose is strongly commented upon ... Great alarm exists among the whole of the lower classes.'

Petitions from Grand Jurors in Leitrim, Donegal, Tyrone, Cavan, Galway and Fermanagh pressed for suppression of the Repeal meetings. Wharncliffe received a letter from Lord Erne 'which gives a melancholy picture of the feelings of the Protestants in the North of Ireland, under their present circumstances. Lord Erne is so excellent a man, and so moderate in all his views and opinions, that he is not likely to misrepresent or overstate anything.' Eneas Mac Donnell was concerned at the 'rapid progress' of Repeal in Britain and America and the efforts of the Whigs to exploit the crisis for party gain.



Sir Robert Bateson and others feared that Presbyterians were being driven towards Repeal by despair over the Church of Scotland and marriages questions. <sup>177</sup> Clancarty felt that with excitement so great 'an outbreak might at any time take place from the smallest cause even <sup>178</sup> contrary to the wishes of the Repeal Leaders.' Charleville was worried by the fact that so many people of respectability were turning to Repeal and particularly alarmed at the desire expressed at one meeting for a <sup>179</sup> general reduction of rents. Some of these reports were taken seriously by Graham and Wellington, and they continued to regard Ireland with anxiety. Graham was convinced that the 'struggle' would 'lead to bloodshed and convulse the Empire.' But he suspected that at least one 'rumour', that put out by Lady Donoughmore concerning treasonable activity among the priesthood, was 'intended to damage the Government by raising the impression that they are negligent and careless in the midst <sup>180</sup> of imminent danger and impending massacre.'

The Mail were driven to new heights of invective by the Government's concessions on the Arms Bill - evidence of the 'incompetency and vacillation' of Eliot and Peel - and above all by the conciliatory language of Peel, Graham and Stanley in Parliament. The accession of a Whig Government would be a 'grievous calamity', but, it was argued on the 7th and 19th of July, 'if Sir Robert Peel will not listen to the dictates of duty, and to the voice of reason, let another Conservative leader be chosen.' The Government intended the preferment of Catholics, 'a general confiscation of every species of property now held by Protestants', and subversion of the Church. Many Protestants were considering 'a timely compromise' with O'Connell, having lost confidence in the protection of 'their present rulers and betrayers.' Meanwhile 'the march of rebellion' went 'unchecked and unrestrained.' Eliot and Sugden remained principal targets, while De Grey was warmly praised and specifically excluded from all censure. The *Warder*, *Statesman* and *Newry Telegraph* were quoted in support of the Mail's policy, and it was claimed that only the *Herald*



and the Standard in London and the Packet in Dublin remained loyal to  
181  
Peel.

In correspondence with Charleville, Sheehan, indicating that his editorial policy reflected genuinely held views, wrote that, .

'The possession of the land, the extirpation of the gentry and the extinguishing of Protestants, either by the knife or by "starving them out", are the objects of the priests and agitators, and before 12 months are over, this object - at least as far as the non-payment of rents are (sic) concerned - will be effected. (In Parliament) you should state distinctly that nothing short of an absolute surrender would satisfy a party that no concession can conciliate, and that as the country can only be held under existing circumstances by an armed force or by a Protestant party, the time has come for a decision.

The Irish Conservatives ask for or desire no breach of the constitution, nor is any coercion bill necessary for the restoration of peace. Agitation would subside if a party interested in maintaining peace and for the British connection were encouraged plainly and avowedly. It was fully expected by the papist agitators, at the accession of Sir Robert Peel to power, that such a party would have been encouraged, and not the slightest dissatisfaction would have been expressed at such being the case...

Sir James Graham, by apologising for his "utmost concessions" speech, plainly declared the intention of granting concessions. This is great impolicy in the midst of agitation. The announcement of the destruction of the Irish Church would produce 50,000 Protestant repealers, reckless of consequences. The Orangemen are already joining the Association...

I protest to God, one is inclined to come to the opinion that a judicial blindness has seized upon our rulers; for it is utterly impossible that, if they saw the present aspect of affairs through the same medium in which they present themselves to me, and I have neither passion nor prejudice to obscure or mislead my mental vision, that they could look tamely on, and see the work of destruction progressing at the speed it is doing.' 182

In what was probably the most noteworthy of all the steps taken by Irish Tories, Donegall (Chairman), O'Neill, the Duke of Manchester (formerly Lord Mandeville), Roden, Erne, Sir Robert Bateson and others met in Belfast on the 19th and 24th of July and passed resolutions against Repeal and expressing alarm at the prospect that the 'widely-spread and dangerous conspiracy' in Ireland would lead to an outbreak of violence. They further resolved,

'That, whilst under these alarming circumstances, we can confidently repose in the power and preparation of the government, we feel that there are efforts for public safety which no government can make, and which require the unanimous and perfect confederation of the parties endangered, to guard against the machinations of those by whom they are threatened; and that we feel persuaded that if .. anything can preserve the peace of the kingdom it will be the thorough conviction of the restless agitators of Repeal that their Protestant fellow-subjects, who desire nothing so much as to live in peace, are yet fully prepared and united for purposes of self-defence.



That whilst it appears to be the manifest and bounden duty of the Protestants of Ireland generally to examine the dangers by which they are threatened and .. diligently prepare to avert them, it is the special duty of the Protestants of Ulster, upon whom, from their numbers, concentration, and moral energy, the safety of the kingdom and the unity of the empire must largely depend, to meet for deciding on the measures to be adopted for the support of the throne and the common safety of themselves and their brother Protestants in the south and west of this portion of the united kingdom.'

They accordingly planned to hold a public meeting in Belfast on the 7th of September 'for the purpose of devising a plan for organising the Protestants of Ulster and of adopting measures for the defence and support of their common faith, their property and their lives.' The requisition was signed by the above-mentioned Irish Tories, Sir A. Chichester, D. S. Ker, M.P., J. W. Maxwell, W. G. Johnson (formerly members for Downpatrick and Belfast respectively), Henry Cooke, John Bates and about two dozen other  
183  
Ulster Conservatives. It was an ominous sign that such figures should seem to contemplate the embodiment of an independent Protestant militia, with all its implications as to their confidence in the protection  
184  
afforded by the Government and the possibility of collision and civil war.

The Mail warned that at the proposed meeting there 'must be no attempt to administer cordials to a sinking government' by means of 'unconditional declarations of confidence', and they warmly approved of  
185  
the intention to unite in self-defence. Roden wrote to Wellington on the 29th to justify the above course, contending that,

'The increasing difficulties & alarm which pervade this part of the Kingdom make it necessary that something should be done by Loyal Inhabitants of Ulster for their own protection. They are in a most desponding state and cannot but consider the abandonment of the Government as the source of their danger. Such is their despair, in many instances we find it almost impossible to keep them from going over to Repeal, hoping against hope that the dangers of uniting with O'Connell may not be so imminent & that his proposition of fixity of tenure may be sincere & in their cases carried into effect. There are  
186  
no means left untried by the Repeal Wardens & agitators to get the humbler classes of Protestants over to their side. As yet their success has been but very partial, but to prevent its increase to a fearful extent it is necessary to have some meeting to express our sentiments. I have been accessory in calling a meeting on the subject at Belfast ...'

Roden also informed the Duke that he would 'refer to the present state of this unhappy country' in the Lords. His protest of the 8th of



August against the Processions Act was duly accompanied by general criticism of the Government's treatment of the crisis in Ireland. The 5,000 Protestant petitioners against the Processions law also asked the Lords 'to adopt such measures as would prevent civil war and its direful consequences.' Roden spoke of the arrestment of all improvement in Ireland and of the 'fearful anxiety' and 'feeling of alarm and apprehension' among Protestants, alarmed above all by the failure of the Government to be 'active and energetic in repressing' the agitation. Though thankful that many troops had been sent to Ireland, he felt that 'this was not sufficient'. He advised the Government to call out the Protestant yeomanry, 'if they would save the country from ruin.' Many Catholics had turned to Repeal because of 'the apparent apathy of the Government', their failure to take 'a bold and determined course'. Glengall, on the same occasion, contended that there was so much intimidation of jurors in Ireland he must support Brougham's call for revival of the Change of Venue law. Wicklow agreed with Roden as to the serious effects of the agitation on prosperity in Ireland, but he acknowledged 'the great difficulty' of coercion. He felt 'that Ministers had acted prudently and wisely, if they doubted the illegal nature' of the meetings, and that 'nothing had transpired which made it desirable to add to the power of  
187  
the Government.' Brougham agreed.

Wellington's assurances, in reply to Roden, as to the ability of the Government to suppress any disturbance in Ireland were warmly greeted by Lord Carbery in a letter to Peel; they would relieve the 'frightful apprehension' among Protestants and 'restore confidence (to) the lower  
188  
classes of Protestants.' Brougham proceeded to introduce a Change of Venue bill, but, though supported by Wicklow, it was opposed by the Government and subsequently withdrawn. The final instance of Irish Tory revolt in Parliament in 1843 arose because of Lord Lucan's dismissal from the magistracy of Co. Mayo after an affray at the petty sessions. Sugden was the principal target in the speeches of Lucan, Glengall and Charleville,



and even Wicklow, and Londonderry felt that an injustice had been done. Charleville was especially critical of Sugden's 'popularity hunting.' He and Glengall both threatened to resign from the magistracy, so 'disgusted' were they with the affair. Lucan also criticized Eliot for his approval of the dismissal and took a swipe at 'that noble Lords' please - everybody policy'. The Government's course in defending Sugden by withholding relevant papers became the subject of bitter resentment.<sup>189</sup>

The session ended without any further criticism from the Irish Tories in Parliament of the Government's handling of the crisis in Ireland. Throughout the summer they failed to echo the discontent evidently felt by many Conservatives in Ireland, particularly in the Commons where Shaw and George Hamilton were the only members to speak of that discontent. In July the Mail complained of their failure to criticize the Government, with Shaw's speech and to a lesser extent Hamilton's the only Irish Tory contributions to the debate on Smith O'Brien's motion to give satisfaction and the speeches of Bernard, Jocelyn and Bateson regrettably 'characterised by a tenderness for the feelings of Ministers ...

'What Are the Irish Conservative Members About? ... the course pursued by the Irish Conservative members of the lower house of Parliament, since the accession of Sir Robert Peel to power, has not been calculated to inspire their constituents with confidence... Much evil - more perhaps than can be repaired - has been occasioned by this feeble submission to authority.'

Their 'non-intervention system' had allowed judgement 'to go by default' regarding the alleged grievances against the Church and Irish landlords. The Irish peers were also impeached in the Mail of the 5th of July, but the subsequent efforts of Roden, Clancarty, Glengall and Charleville proved satisfactory. The Irish Tories of the Commons were advised to emulate these Lords, regardless of the frowns of Ministers.<sup>190</sup> However, no Irish Tory member of the lower House commented on the Government's response to the Repeal agitation after the close of the debate on O'Brien's motion on the 12th of July. Dissent in that House was confined almost exclusively to the poor law amendment bill.<sup>191</sup>

In August 1843 the policy of the Mail itself changed noticeably,



even dramatically. The reasons for this are by no means clear, but the evident decline in the Repeal agitation from this time may have been a factor. The assault on the Government continued on several fronts, notably their conciliatory course on the poor law and the Lucan affair and Sugden's failure to dismiss certain Repeal magistrates. But such criticism was made with much less bitterness than previously. Several of the Government's statements in Parliament - for example Peel's reply to Northland on repeal of the Processions Act and his 'most explicit' defence of the rights of property in reply to Crawford, and Wellington's assurances of military preparedness - were warmly welcomed. It was conceded that an inquiry into the question of landlord-tenant relations, 'guarded as it has been proposed by Sir Robert Peel, can scarcely fail to do good.' There was vague talk of the likelihood of 'better times.' Perhaps most noteworthy of all the Mail accepted that the Government could not then change course and suppress the Repeal agitation. They remarked that,

'It is now impossible for Government to take any step for checking agitation; and although we are still of opinion that "prevention is better than cure", we should be sorry to weaken the hands of the Executive by any observations calculated to raise a doubt in the minds of the timid as to the sufficiency of the means taken for the preservation of the peace and the maintenance of the Union.' 192

Notwithstanding the timidity of the Irish members and the late complaisance of the Mail, it is clear, looking back over the previous few months, that a great number of Irish Conservatives were deeply dissatisfied with the performance of their governors. If there is reason to doubt the extent to which others shared in the discontent of the Mail in the earlier days of the Administration, there is an abundance of evidence to show that by the middle of 1843 Irish Tory confidence in Peel and his colleagues had been severely shaken by the failure to suppress the agitation for Repeal. However, as shown below, the Irish Tories were to find many of the Government's future measures to put down Repeal just as unacceptable as the 'do-nothing' policy of the extraordinary summer of 1843.



## Chapter 10

1. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 394-5, 4 Aug. 1841.
2. Newport Papers, MS 796, Fortescue to Newport, 2 Oct. 1841.
3. The Mail claimed that in the first quarter of 1842 it sold 120,000 papers, against 76,000 by the Packet, 31,500 by the Warder and 15,000 by the Statesman; so the Mail sold nearly as many as the total of the other three Conservative newspapers in Dublin, evidence 'that the line of politics we take is not obnoxious to the Conservatives of Ireland.' DEM, 20 June 1842.
4. DEM, 4, 6, 11, 30 Aug., 1 Sept. 1841.
5. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 485, ff304, 306; Add MS 40, 486, ff22, 188, 234, 241, 243, 253, 257, 343; Add MS 40, 487, ff18, 24, 51, 58, 105, 120, 183, 259; Add MS 40, 488, ff25, 93, 143; Add MS 40, 489, ff77, 159, 237; Add MS 40, 490, f222; Add MS 40, 492, ff1, 243, 317; Add MS 40, 493, f76; Add MS 40, 494, ff184, 374; Add MS 40, 495, f93; Add MS 40, 496, ff164, 254; Add MS 40, 497, f186; Add MS 40, 500, f104; Add MS 40, 503, f172; Add MS 40, 508, f34; Add MS 40, 509, f54; Add MS 40, 510, ff55, 81; Add MS 40, 511, f51; Add MS 40, 512, f29; Add MS 40, 515, ff27, 106; Add MS 40, 516, f286; Add MS 40, 517, f263; Add MS 40, 519, f312; Add MS 40, 520, f267; Add MS 40, 521, f90.
6. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f63; Add MS 40, 487, ff265, 271; Add MS 40, 488, ff33, 39, 93; Add MS 40, 490, ff206, 210; Add MS 40, 498, f90; Add MS 40, 500, f339; Add MS 40, 501, f273; Add MS 40, 504, f107; Add MS 40, 516, ff286, 290, 295; Add MS 40, 522, f327. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 412-6, 4, 7, 17, 22 Sept. 1841. Graham Papers, 7IR, Sugden to Graham, 11 Jan. 1842. Bourke Papers, Vol. 315, f542, Bourke to Bourke, 2 Nov. 1841. Recollections of Lord Broughton, VI, 82, Diary, 28 July 1843. Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy, 226, Lefroy to Wife, 3 Sept. 1841, lamenting 'the ingratitude of politicians.'
7. DEM, 6 Sept. 1841.
8. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 412, 4 Sept. 1841.
9. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 493, f88, 270, Shaw to Peel, 23, 31 Oct. 1841.
10. DEM, 10, 20 Sept., 18 Oct. 1841.
11. T. W. Reid, The Life, Letters, and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, First Lord Houghton (London, 1891), II, 271, Milnes to Guizot, 7 Sept. 1841.
12. DEM, 3, 6, 8, 10, 20, 27, 29 Sept., 1, 4, 6, 13 Oct. 1841.
13. DEM, 24, 27, 29 Sept., 1, 4, 8, 11, 13, 18, 22 Oct., 3 Nov. 1841.
14. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 486, f347, Roden to Peel, 20 Sept. 1841.
15. Hansard, 59, 106-9, 24 Aug. 1841, Division; 59, 369-71, 27 Aug. 1841, Christmas; 59, 450-5, 27 Aug. 1841, Division; 59, 671-2, 20 Sept. 1841, Division; 59, 692, 21 Sept. 1841, Acton.
16. DEM, 27 Sept. (Corry), 29 Sept. (Ffolliott, Northland), 6 Oct. 1841 (Young). Hansard, 59, 588-90, 17 Sept. 1841, Litton.
17. DEM, 27, 29 Oct. 1841.

18. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 493, f88, Shaw to Peel, 23 Oct. 1841. DEM, 22, 25 Oct. 1841.
19. Graham Papers, 8IR, Sugden to Graham, 29 Oct., 3 Nov. 1841; De Grey to Graham, 29 Oct. 1841; Eliot to Graham, 3 Nov. 1841; Graham to Sugden, 6 Nov. 1841. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f72, Peel to De Grey, 8 Nov. 1841; *ibid*, f74, De Grey to Peel, 10 Nov. 1841.
20. Graham Papers, 8IR, De Grey to Graham, 11, 13 Nov. 1841. See also Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f28, Eliot to Peel, 10 Nov. 1841.
21. DEM, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24 Nov. 1841.
22. Graham Papers, 8IR, De Grey to Graham, 13 Nov. 1841; 7IR, De Grey to Graham, 5 Jan. 1842.
23. *Ibid*, 44, Graham to De Grey, 16 Nov. 1841.
24. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (34), Fox to Farnham, Dec. 1841.
25. DEM, 12, 29 Nov., 10 Dec. 1841.
26. Graham Papers, 7IR, De Grey to Graham, 5 Jan. 1842.
27. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 497, f68, Walzhe to Peel, 9 Dec. 1841.
28. *Ibid*, MS 40, 495, f379, Tennent to Peel, 25 Nov. 1841.
29. DEM, 15, 19, 22, 29 Nov., 1, 3, 6, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 24, 27, 29, 31 Dec. 1841, 12, 21, 28, 31 Jan., 4, 9, 14, 21 Feb., 21, 23 March, 6 April, 1 June 1842.
30. DEM, 24 Nov., 1, 3, 6, 13, 27 Dec. 1841. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 446, f231, Peel to Graham, 19 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, f233, 257, Graham to Peel, n.d., 26 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f50, 54, Peel to Eliot, 20, 27 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, f52, Eliot to Peel, 23 Dec. 1841. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 37.
31. Graham Papers, 7IR, Sugden to Graham, 6, 11 Jan. 1842.
32. *Ibid*, 46, Graham to De Grey, 2 Jan. 1842; Graham to Arbuthnot, 4 Jan. 1842.
33. DEM, 3, 5, 7 Jan. 1842.
34. DEM, 5, 28 Jan., 2 Feb. 1842.
35. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (34), Fox to Farnham, 1 Feb. 1842.
36. Graham Papers, 46, Graham to Arbuthnot, 4 Jan. 1842.
37. DEM, 5, 14, 19, 21, 24, 28, 31 Jan., 2, 9, 14 Feb. 1842.
38. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f70, Eliot to Peel, 20 Jan. 1842.
39. Hansard, 60, 201-34, 9 Feb. 1842, Peel; 60, 563, 16 Feb. 1842, Christmas; 60, 1034, 24 Feb. 1842, Bateson; 62, 70, 7 April 1842, Christmas; 60, 1198-9, 1223, 28 Feb. 1842, Christmas, Shaw, Bateson, Division.
40. DEM, 18, 21, 25, 28 Feb., 2 March 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 503, f8, Dunraven to Peel, 22 Feb. 1842; *ibid*, f277, Memorial of the landed proprietors of Co. Fermanagh, 5 March 1842.



41. DEM, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 28 Feb., 2, 4, March 1842.
42. DEM, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23, 25 March, 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 29 April, 2, 4, 13, 18 May, 11 July 1842.
43. Hansard, 60, 561-5, 16 Feb. 1842, Christmas; 60, 919-22, 23 Feb. 1842, Conolly; 60, 1199, 1221-3, 28 Feb. 1842, Christmas, Division; 61, 1274-5, 4 April 1842, Christmas; 62, 63-6, 7 April 1842, Division; 62, 741-6, 19 April 1842, Wicklow; 63, 671-5, 23 May 1842, Division; 63, 720-2, 24 May 1842, Division; 64, 65-7, 17 June 1842, Wicklow; 64, 294-5, 21 June 1842, Wicklow; 64, 969-71, 5 July 1842, Mountcashell; 64, 1092-4, 7 July 1842, Wicklow. See also DEM, 6 April 1842, Young to Clements, 17 March 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 504, f346, Daly to Peel, March 1842.
44. DEM, 28 Feb., 7, 14, 18 March, 25, 27, 29 April, 2, 4, 6, 11, 13, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 30 May, 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 22, 27, 29 June, 1, 4, 8, 13, 18, 20, 27, 29 July, 3 Aug. 1842. Hansard, 63, 565-6, 20 May 1842, O'Brien, Eliot; 63, 882-3, 27 May 1842, Dunally, Wharncliffe; 63, 964-9, 30 May 1842, Glengall, Wharncliffe; 64, 788, 30 June 1842, Verner, Eliot.
45. DEM, 13, 20, 23, 27, 30 May, 6, 8, 13, 15, 22, 29 June, 18 July 1842.
46. DEM, 21, 25, 28 Feb., 11 March, 9, 13, 23, 25, 27, 30 May, 1, 8, 22 June, 11, 18 July, 1 Aug. 1842. See also DEM, 27 June, 22 July 1842 for reviews of past grievances.
47. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 510, f126, Shaw to Peel, 11 June 1842; *ibid*, f128, Peel to Shaw, 12 June 1842. Hansard, 63, 1530-44, 14 June 1842, Shaw, O'Connell, Peel, Division.
48. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 June 1842. DEM, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, 29 June, 1, 4, 8 July 1842. On the Belfast affair, see (Durham Dunlop), A Brief Historical Sketch of Parliamentary Elections in Belfast .., 10-21. Report from Select Committee on Belfast City Election, P.P., 1842, V, 263.
49. DEM, 20 June, 20, 22, 25 July 1842, quoting The John Bull and The United Service Gazette on the Belfast question and The Times, The Liverpool Mail and The Age on Peel's liberal tendencies.
50. DEM, 20, 22 June 1842.
51. Hansard, 63, 1543-4, 14 June 1842, Division.
52. Hansard, 63, 985, 30 May 1842, Lefroy; 64, 694-8, 28 June 1842, Mountcashell, Glengall, Westmeath; 65, 223, 16 July 1842, Jones; 65, 317-21, 19 July 1842, Glengall, Londonderry, Charleville, Clancarty; 65, 380-94, 20 July 1842, Bateson, Verner, Division; 65, 752, 28 July 1842, Glengall; 65, 954-6, 2 Aug. 1842, Glengall. DEM, 13 May, 29 June, 25 July 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 513, f28, Dunraven to Peel, 2 Aug. 1842. Minutes of Proceedings of the Select Committee on the Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, P.P., 1842, XIV, 397-8.
53. Hansard, 61, 459, 14 April 1842, Wicklow; 64, 698, 28 June 1842, Wicklow; 65, 318, 19 July 1842, Wicklow; 65, 388, 20 July 1842, Jocelyn; 65, 754, 28 July 1842, Wicklow; 65, 956-7, 2 Aug. 1842, Wicklow.
54. Hansard, 60, 1008-9, 24 Feb. 1842, <sup>60, 1092, 25 Feb. 1842, Jackson;</sup> Litton, Jackson; <sup>60, 1181-3, 28 Feb. 1842, Shaw, Jackson, Division;</sup> Feb. 1842, Shaw, Jackson, Division; 60, 1374, 3 March 1842, Shaw; 61, 653-5, 15 March 1842, Division; 63, 109-10, 4 May 1842; Division. The Times, 1 March 1842. BNL, 11, 15 March 1842.



55. DEM, 8 June, 11 July, 5, 22 Aug. 1842.
56. DEM, 22 July, 26, 29 Aug., 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28 Sept. 1842, editorials and excerpts from other papers. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 10, 13, 24 Sept. 1842.
57. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f158, Graham to Peel, 16 Sept. 1842; *ibid*, f168, Peel to Graham, 18 Sept. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f114, 120, Peel to Eliot, 18, 27 Sept. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 24 Sept. 1842; Graham to Eliot, 26 Sept. 1842; 53B, Graham to Eliot, 13, 14, 16 Sept. 1842; Graham to Peel, 16 Sept. 1842; Peel to Graham, 18 Sept. 1842.
58. DEM, 21 Sept. 1842.
59. DEM, 28 Sept. 1842. DEP, 27 Sept. 1842.
60. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f150, Graham to Peel, 13 Sept. 1842.
61. *Ibid*, f120, 156, Peel to Graham, 2, 14 Sept. 1842; *ibid*, f144, 150, Graham to Peel, 12, 13 Sept. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f114, Peel to Eliot, 18 Sept. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, Graham to Eliot, 22 Aug. 1842; 52B, Graham to Eliot, 29 Aug. 1842; 53A, Peel to Graham, 2 Sept. 1842; Graham to Eliot, 6, 12 Sept. 1842; Graham to Peel, 12 Sept. 1842; 53B, Peel to Graham, 14 Sept. 1842.
62. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 24 Aug., 9 Oct. 1842. DEM, 29 Aug., 5, 7 Sept. 1842.
63. DEM, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 23 Sept. 1842.
64. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 18 July 1842; 53A, Graham to Peel, 12 Sept. 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f144, Graham to Peel, 12 Sept. 1842. See also, *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f410, Eliot to Peel, 30 July 1844.
65. DEM, 12, 21, 26, 28, 31 Oct., 2, 4, 21 Nov. 1842.
66. DEM, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 28 Oct., 4, 14, 16, 25, 28 Nov. 1842. Also DEM, 30 Sept. 1842, Viscount Bernard, M.P..
67. DEM, 14 Oct. 1842.
68. DEM, 29 Aug., 2 Sept., 17, 19, 26 Oct., 28 Nov., 2, 5, 9, 12, 16, 19, 21, 30 Dec. 1842.
69. DEM, 24 Oct., 11, 14, 21, 28 Nov., 5, 7, 12 Dec. 1842.
70. DEM, 4, 7, 11, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 30 Nov., 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 21, 23, 26, 28 Dec. 1842.
71. DEM, 14, 19, 21 Dec. 1842.
72. DEM, 30 Dec. 1842, 4, 13, 23, 30 Jan., 1, 6, 8, 10, 15, 17 Feb., 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 22, 24, 27, 31 March, 3, 7, 12, 14, 17, 19, 24, 26 April, 1, 3 May 1843.
73. DEM, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16 Jan. 1843.
74. Graham Papers, 2IR, De Grey to Graham, 5, 10, 13, 14 Jan. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 6, 10, 13 Jan. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 8 Jan. 1843; 57, Graham to De Grey, 7 Jan. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 8 Jan. 1843.



75. DEM, 10, 27 Feb., 1, 17 March 1843.
76. DEM, 18, 23, 25 Jan., 3, 6 Feb. 1843.
77. DEM, 24 March, 5 April 1843.
78. B. M. Walker, Parliamentary Election Results in Ireland, 251.
79. DEM, 20, 24 March, 3, 7, 10, 12, 14, 24, 28 April, 1, 3 May 1843.
80. DEM, 20 March 1843.
81. DEM, 27 March, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 26, 28 April, 1, 15 May, 21 June 1843.
82. DEM, 14 April 1843, extract.
83. DEM, 12 April 1843.
84. DEM, 10, 12, 17 April 1843.
85. DEM, 24, 27, 29 March 1843. See above, p 35-6.
86. DEM, 31 March, 5, 7, 10, 12, 21 April 1843.
87. Graham Papers, 60A, De Grey to Graham, 6 April 1843.
88. DEM, 10, 12, 26 April 1843. Graham Papers, 60A, De Grey to Graham, 6 April 1843.
89. DEM, 31 March, 5, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28 April, 1, 3, 5 May 1843.
90. DEM, 17, 19, 24, 26, 28 April, 1, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26 May 1843.
91. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 527, f279, Jackson to Peel, 18 April 1843.
92. Hansard, 68, 1027-8, 28 April 1843, A. Lefroy, Eliot; 68, 1376, 1381-2, 8 May 1843, Glengall, Wicklow.
93. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 528, f147, Hamilton to Peel, 2 May 1843.  
Erne Papers, D1939/21/51, Lefroy to Erne, 24 April 1843.  
Graham Papers, 60B, Eliot to Graham, 17 April 1843; Peel to Graham, 21 April 1843; Graham to De Grey, 28 April 1843; De Grey to Graham, 30 April 1843; 61B, Knaresborough to Lucas, 21 April 1843.
94. DEM, 5 May 1843.
95. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f49, Peel to De Grey, 9 May 1843.  
C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 47-8.
96. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 528, f230, 236, Mo Ghee to Peel, 8, 11, May 1843.
97. Graham Papers, 60B, De Grey to Graham, 30 April 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 101, f55, Roden to Wellington, 4 May 1843; *ibid*, f86, Wellington to Graham, 8 May 1843. Hansard, 69, 1-7, 23, 9 May 1843, Roden, Jocelyn.
98. Graham Papers, 60B, De Grey to Graham, 23, 26, 30 April 1843; 61A, De Grey to Graham, 4, 5 May 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f39, 45, De Grey to Peel, 6, 7 May 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 46-7.



99. Graham Papers, 60B, Graham to De Grey, 24, 28 April 1843; Sugden to Graham, 29 April 1843; 61A, Graham to De Grey, 2, 3, 6 May 1843; Graham to Sugden, 3 May 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f289, Graham to Peel, 6 May 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 101, f38, Graham Cabinet memo, 1 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 359-60.
100. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f39, De Grey to Peel, 6 May 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 448, f297, Graham to Peel, 7 May 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 468, f14, Stanley to Peel, 8 May 1843. Graham Papers, 61A, De Grey to Graham, 5 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 47.
101. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f47, 49, Peel to De Grey, 8, 9 May 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 468, f18, Peel to Stanley, 8 May 1843. Graham Papers, 61A, Graham to De Grey, 8 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 47-8.
102. Hansard, 69, 7-9, 23-5, 9 May 1835, Wellington, Peel.
103. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f51, Peel to De Grey, 10 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 48.
104. Hansard, 69, 11-12, 9 May 1843, Downshire; 69, 321-6, 15 May 1843, Mountcashell; Wicklow, Londonderry; 69, 569-70, 19 May 1843, Downshire.
105. DEM, 5, 8, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, May 1843.
106. Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 19 May 1843.
107. Wellington Papers, Port. 102, f26, Knight of Kerry to Wellington, 18 May 1843.
108. Graham Papers, 61A, Graham to De Grey, 14 May 1843.
109. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f194, Westmeath to Peel, 26 May 1843.
110. Graham Papers, 61A, De Grey to Graham, 10, 14 May 1843; Sugden to Graham, 13 May 1843; Graham to Smith, 14 May 1843; Graham to De Grey, 14 May 1843; 61B, Graham to De Grey, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22 May 1843; De Grey to Graham, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 May 1843; Graham to Sugden, 18 May 1843; Smith to Graham, 18 May 1843; Sugden to Graham, 20 May 1843; 61C, De Grey to Graham, 24, 25, 26, 30 May 1843; Graham to Sugden, 25 May 1843; Graham to De Grey, 29 May 1843; De Grey to Graham, 30 May 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f45, 53, De Grey to Peel, 7, 11 May 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 529, f225, Sugden to Peel, 28 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 360.
111. Graham Papers, 61B, Wellington memo. to the Quarter-Master-General of the Horse Guards, 18 May 1843; Graham to De Grey, 20, 21, 22, 23 (2) May 1843; 61C, Graham to Wellington, 24 May 1843; Wellington to Graham, 24, 31 May 1843; Graham to De Grey, 24, 25, 27, 29 (2), 30 May 1843; Graham to Prince Albert, 27 May 1843; Wellington memos., 30, 31 May 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 102, f65, 110, Graham to Wellington, 20, 21 May 1843; *ibid*, f105, Wellington to Graham, 21 May 1843; *ibid*, Port. 103, f23, Graham to Wellington, 24 May 1843; *ibid*, f25, 26, 57, 95, Wellington to Graham, 24 (2), 26, 31 May 1843; *ibid*, f60, 87, 97, Wellington memos., 27, 29, 31 May 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 360.
112. DEM, 26 May 1843. Hansard, 69, 1064-5, 30 May 1843, Clanricarde.
113. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f239, 305, Peel to Sugden, 31 May, 1 June 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 448, f303, Graham to Peel, 1 June 1843.



- Graham Papers, 61C, Graham to De Grey, 29 May 1843; 62A, Graham to De Grey, 2 June 1843; 31R, Graham to Sugden, 4, 13 June 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 51-2.
114. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f320, Sugden to Peel, 4 June 1843.
  115. Hansard, 69, 922-3, 26 May 1843, Londonderry; 69, 1071-81, 30 May 1843, Glengall, Charleville, Wicklow. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f273, Roden to Peel, 31 May 1843. DEM, 26, 29, 31 May, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16 June 1843.
  116. Hansard, 69, 1035-8, 29 May 1843, R. Bateson (jun.); 69, 1107-1112-49, 30 May 1843, Conolly, Bernard, C. Hamilton, Shaw; 69, 1158-72, 31 May 1843, Jocelyn, Verner, Brooke.
  117. Hansard, 69, 923-33, 972-3, 974-9, 26 May 1843, Mountcashell, Lefroy, Divisions; 69, 1235-8, 2 June 1843, Division; 70, 6C8-9, 4 July 1843, Division.
  118. DEM, 26, 28 April, 3, 15, 17, 19, 29 May 1843.
  119. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f367, Clancarty to Peel, 4 June 1843. Also, *ibid*, f135, R. Grattan to Peel, 31 May 1843; *ibid*, f175, Wyndham to Peel, 24 May 1843; *ibid*, f361, Stevenson to Peel, 3 June 1843.
  120. Hansard, 69, 1224-6, 1 June 1843, Lorton.
  121. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f11, Glengall to Wellington, 2 June 1843, with extract of Roden to Glengall, 30 May 1843.
  122. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f273, Roden to Peel, 31 May 1843.
  123. DEM, 9 June 1843.
  124. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f11, 25, Glengall to Wellington, 2, 3 June 1843; *ibid*, f13, Mason to Wellington, 2 June 1843; *ibid*, f15, Izod to Donoughmore, 2 June 1843; *ibid*, f26, 29, Donoughmore to Glengall, 1 (2) June 1843; *ibid*, f48, Jocelyn to Wellington, 6 June 1843; *ibid*, f54, Castlemaine to Wellington, 7 June 1843; *ibid*, f61, Ryall to Wellington, 7 June 1843.
  125. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f309, 312, Stronge to Stronge, 1 (2) June 1843.
  126. *Ibid*, f305, Graham to Peel, 4 June 1833.
  127. Graham Papers, 31R, Graham to De Grey, 6 June 1843.
  128. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 529, f369, Hamilton to Peel, 4 June 1843.
  129. *Ibid*, f379, James Morgan to Peel, 5 June 1843.
  130. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f13, Mason to Wellington, 2 June 1843.
  131. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f67, De Grey to Peel, 8 June 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 53.
  132. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f31, 47, Wellington to Stanley, 3, 7 June 1843; *ibid*, f35, 41, 60, 84, 103, Wellington to Graham, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12 June 1843; *ibid*, f40, Wellington to Knight of Kerry, 5 June 1843; *ibid*, f58, 87, Graham to Wellington, 7, 10 June 1843; *ibid*, f65, Wellington to Somerset, 7 June 1843. Graham Papers,

62A, Graham to De Grey, 1 June 1843; Wellington to Graham, 7, 10, 12 June 1843; Graham to Wellington, 10 June 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f307, Graham to Peel, 5 June 1843. Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f96, Wellington to Knight of Kerry, 5 June 1843.  
C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 361.

133. Graham Papers, 62A, Sugden to Graham, 5 June 1843.
134. Ibid, 3IR, Eliot to Graham, 10 June 1843.
135. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f79, Peel to De Grey, 12 June 1843.  
See also *The Greville Memoirs*, V, 98-9, June 1843.
136. Ibid, MS 40, 448, f317, Graham to Peel, 11 June 1843. Graham Papers, 62A, Graham to De Grey, 12 June 1843; 3IR, Graham to Sugden, 12 June 1843; 4IR, Graham to Sugden, 22 June 1843.
137. Ibid, 3IR, De Grey to Graham, 12, 16 June 1843; 4IR, De Grey to Graham, 17 June 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, f85, 87, De Grey to Peel, 15, 17 June 1843.  
(478,)
138. Wellington Papers, Port. 104, f102, Roden to Wellington, 12 June 1843.
139. Graham Papers, 3IR, De Grey to Graham, 13 June 1843.
140. Wellington Papers, Port. 105, f8, 37, 61, Glengall to Wellington, 14, 18, 21 June 1843; *ibid*, f91, Donoughmore to Wellington, 24 June 1843; *ibid*, Port. 106, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 27 June 1843.
141. Ibid, f62, Pennefather to son, n.d.; *ibid*, f90, Clancarty to Wellington, 24 June 1843.
142. DEM, 26, 29, 31 May, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16 June 1843.
143. DEM, 12, 14 June 1843.
144. Howard Bury Papers, T3069/D/20, 29, Sheehan to Charleville, 8, n.d. June 1843.
145. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f39, 41, Londonderry to Peel, 13 (2) June 1843.
146. DEM, 19 June 1843.
147. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f128, Downshire to Peel, 19 June 1843; *ibid*, f163, Peel to Downshire, 20 June 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 105, f37, Glengall to Wellington, 18 June 1843. DEM, 19, 23 June 1843. The men involved were Lords Downshire (Chairman), Thomond, Ely, Devon, Courtown, Wicklow, Clare, Lucan, Belmore, Bandon, Donoughmore, Charleville, Glengall, Stradbroke, Lorton, Beresford, Dunsany, Blayney, Carbery, Crofton, Castlemaine and Bloomfield; the Earl of Hillsborough, M.P., Viscount Bernard, M.P., Viscount Northland, M.P., Claud Hamilton, M.P., A. Lefroy, M.P., C. P. Leslie, M.P., H. Bruen, M.P., R. Bateson, M.P., E. Grogan, M.P., W. R. O. Gore, M.P., J. Irving, M.P., M. Archdall, M.P., E. Conolly, M.P., T. E. Taylor, M.P., E. Hayes, M.P., J. Boyd, M.P., J. H. Hamilton, M.P., W. Gregory, M.P., W. Verner, M.P., F. Shaw, M.P., G. A. Hamilton, M.P., Viscount Courtenay, M.P., Viscount Adare, M.P., W. O. Gore, M.P., (Charles) Wyndham, M.P., (Quinton) Dick, M.P., C. Baldwin, M.P., E. J. Shirley, M.P.; Alexander Perceval. The resolutions were proposed by Lord Devon and seconded by Shaw.



148. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f106, Erne to Peel, 17 June 1843. The signatories included the Earls of Enniskillen and Erne, Viscount Cole, Brooke and Archdall.
149. DEM, 26, 28 June 1843.
150. Graham Papers, 4IR, Graham to De Grey, 19, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29 June 1843; Graham to Sugden, 19 June 1843; Eliot to Graham, 20 June 1843; De Grey to Graham, 26 June 1843; 623, Wellington memo., 17 June 1843; Graham to Wellington, 22 June 1843; Wellington to Blakeney, 23 June 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 105, f28, 40, 66, Graham to Wellington, 16, 18, 22 June 1843; *ibid*, f32, Wellington memo., 17 June 1843; *ibid*, f96, Wellington to Graham, 24 June 1843; *ibid*, Port. 106, f3, Graham to Wellington, 26 June 1843; *ibid*, f32, De Grey to Graham, 26 June 1843; *ibid*, Port. 107, f49, Wellington to Graham, 16 June 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f319, 325, 332, Graham to Peel, 17, 18, 21 June 1843. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 361.
151. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f325, 328, Graham to Peel, 18 (2) June 1843. Graham Papers, 3IR, Graham to De Grey, 17 June 1843. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 361-2. Hansard, 70, 52, 16 June 1843, Graham.
152. Hansard, 69, 1603, 15 June 1843, Jones; 70, 29-30, 16 June 1843, Conolly; 70, 303-6, 307-9, 23 June 1843, Shaw, Verner; 70, 470-2, 30 June 1843, Carbery.
153. Clanwilliam Papers, D3044/F/18/58, Clanwilliam to De Grey, 28 June 1843.
154. Wellington Papers, Port. 106, f47, Wellington to Graham, 30 June 1843.
155. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f232, Boyd to Peel, 26 June 1843.
156. Anon., Letter to an English Member of Parliament upon the Subject of the Present State of Ireland, by an Irish Country Gentleman (Dublin, 1843).
157. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 3 July 1843.
158. DEM, 9, 16, 23, 26, 28 June, 3, 7, 12 July 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f69, Resolutions of a meeting of 'the Officers and Masters of the Orange Lodges in the County of Cavan', 15 June 1843; *ibid*, f106, Erne to Peel, 17 June 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 106, f47, Wellington to Graham, 30 June 1843.
159. Graham Papers, 9IR, De Grey to Graham, 4 July 1843; Sugden to Graham, 14 July 1843. DEM, 3, 5, 14, 19 July, 7, 11 Aug. 1843. Hansard, 70, 1138, 1150, 1173, 14 July 1843, Glengall, Downshire, Brougham; 71, 364-5, 372, 377, 388, 8 Aug. 1843, Roden, Wellington, Wicklow, Brougham; 71, 410, 9 Aug. 1843, Peel. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f162, Farnham to Peel, 16 July 1843; *ibid*, f165, Peel to Farnham, 20 July 1843.
160. Graham Papers, 9IR, De Grey to Graham, 3 July 1844.
161. *Ibid*, Graham to De Grey, 9 July 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f165, Peel to Farnham, 20 July 1843.
162. Graham Papers, 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 9 July 1843.

163. Hansard, 71, 438, 470-1, 9 Aug. 1843, Verner, Division. In the only exception to unanimous Irish Tory support in the 25 divisions on the Arms Bill, Conolly, Hayes and Vesey dissented on the 6th clause but most of the Irish Tories remained loyal. Hansard, 70, 390-2, 26 June 1843, Division.
164. Hansard, 70, 768-77, 788-96, 7 July 1843, Tennent, Shaw; 70, 899-903, 10 July 1843, Jocelyn; 70, 919-24, 944-9, 11 July 1843, Smythe, R. Bateson (jun.); 70, 1025-30, 1033-45, 1088-92, 12 July 1843, Bernard, G. Hamilton, Division; 70, 1121-30, 1134-43, 1143-7, 1150-6, 14 July 1843, Clancarty, Glengall, Wicklow, Charleville.
165. Wellington Papers, Port. 107, f66, Donoughmore to Glengall, 17 July 1843.
166. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f259, Clare to Peel, 21 July 1843; *ibid*, f339, Morgan to Peel, 26 July 1843. Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (5), Clare to Bourke, 3 July 1843.
167. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f126, Brooks to Peel, 13 July 1843.
168. *Ibid*, f162, Farnham to Peel, 16 July 1843.
169. DEM, 19 July 1843, Roden to the Loyal Protestants of Co. Down, 15 July 1843. Hansard, 70, 1138, 14 July 1843, Glengall; 71, 360-77, 8 Aug. 1843, Roden, Wellington, Wicklow; 71, 409-10, 9 Aug. 1843, Northland, Peel.
170. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f131, Carbery to Peel, 14 July 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 106, f62, Carbery to Wellington, 3 July 1843.
171. Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 1 July 1843.
172. Wellington Papers, Port. 106, f81, Glengall to Wellington, 4 July 1843, with extract of letter from Donoughmore; *ibid*, Port. 107, f22, Donoughmore to Wellington, 13 July 1843.
173. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 478, f113, De Grey to Peel, 15 July 1843. Graham Papers, 10IR, De Grey to Graham, 7 Aug. 1843.
174. DEM, 21, 28, 31 July, 4 Aug. 1843. Lord Claud Hamilton, M.P., was a signatory to the Tyrone petition.
175. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f400, Wharncliffe to Peel, 29 July 1843.
176. Eneas Mac Donnell, The "Crisis" Unmasked : Respectfully Inscribed to the British People (London, 1843). Dated 18 July 1843.
177. Graham Papers, 9IR, Bateson to Lucas, 13 July 1843; Blacker to Lucas, 13 July 1843; Reilly to Lucas, 14 July 1843; De Grey to Graham, 16 July 1843; Eliot to Graham, 18 July 1843; Graham to De Grey, 18, 23 July 1843.
178. Downshire Papers, D671/C/354, Clancarty to Downshire, 14 Aug. 1843.
179. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 532, f36, Charleville to Peel, 3 Aug. 1843.
180. Graham Papers, 63, Wellington to Graham, 19, 24, 25 July 1843; Graham to Stanley, 16 July 1843; Graham to Wellington, 26 July 1843; 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 23, 30 July 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 106, f103, Graham to Wellington, 6 July 1843; *ibid*, Port. 108, f53, Wellington to Graham, 1 Aug. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f360, Graham to Peel, 18 July 1843.



181. DEM, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28, 30 June, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 31 July 1843.
182. Howard Bury Papers, T3069/D/30, Sheehan to Charleville, (c10) July 1843.
183. DEM, 21, 26 July 1843.
184. Jacob Venedy regarded the project as an attempt by Roden to revive the Orange Order, but this view was not borne out by the subsequent statements of either the opponents or proponents of the meeting. Jacob Venedy, Ireland and the Irish During the Repeal Year, 1843 (Dublin, 1844), 321-2.
185. DEM, 21, 26 July 1843.
186. Wellington Papers, Port. 108, f30, Roden to Wellington, 29 July 1843.
187. Hansard, 71, 360-94, 8 Aug. 1843, Roden, Wicklow, Brougham, Glengall.
188. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 532, f160, Carbery to Peel, 12 Aug. 1843. Hansard, 71, 371-4, 8 Aug. 1843, Wellington.
189. Hansard, 71, 473-87, 10 Aug. 1843, Brougham, Wicklow, Lucan, Wicklow, Glengall; 71, 539-51, 11 Aug. 1843, Brougham, Peel; 71, 723-5, 15 Aug. 1843, Wicklow; 71, 912-4, 18 Aug. 1843, Lucan, Londonderry, Charleville; 71, 962-73, 21 Aug. 1843, Lucan, Charleville, Glengall.
190. DEM, 5, 12, 14, 17, 19 July, 11 Aug. 1843.
191. See chapter 7.
192. DEM, 28, 31 July, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23, 25 Aug. 1843.

## Chapter 11

## The Irish Tories, 1843-6

It is doubtful that the Mail's apparent change of course in August 1843 was determined by a sense of foreboding as to the outcome of the Protestant meeting planned for the 7th of September; they endorsed its aims when first announced and subsequently expressed the hope of seeing 'a couple of hundred thousand of the sturdy Protestants of Ulster' gathering to 'strike a wholesome terror into the rabble who bluster and gasconade of being able to cope with them in battle.'<sup>1</sup> In the meantime, the Marquis of Londonderry had indicated his opposition to the meeting. In letters to Tennent, Peel and Roden and in Parliament on the 15th of August he feared that the proceedings would involve attacks on the Government and opined that the armed organization envisaged by some would be no improvement on the precautions taken by individual landlords and much less efficient than the troops of the State. He was confident that the Government, Wellington in particular, would maintain enough troops in Ireland to meet any contingency.

Londonderry expected 'a great diversity of opinion' among Ulster Tories as to the 'prudence and utility' of the meeting, with many staying away because of 'Roden's known Ultra feelings.' They should 'not attempt to organize meetings which might only show their numerical inferiority', expose the extent of Protestant disunity as to positive action, 'evaporate in bluster and end in weak if not ridiculous defiance', and provoke a counter-demonstration from Repealers, with the possibility of 'a religious strife' or 'civil war'. O'Connell's agitation would otherwise, he thought, subside speedily. He attempted to refute 'the highly-coloured picture' of 'universal terror and alarm' among Irish Protestants which he claimed Roden had presented in the Lords. To Peel he wrote of his intention to go to Ireland to 'work against' the meeting 'all I can.' Roden replied on the 24th, denying that he had given a 'highly-coloured picture' of the fears of Irish Protestants and regretting that Londonderry



had chosen to oppose the plans of resident gentlemen who knew 'the dangers which threaten the Protestant interest in Ireland'. They were anxious 'to open the eyes of our Protestant brethern' to those dangers 'and to take all legal measures within our reach to avert the calamities which seem to hang over us.'<sup>2</sup>

Lord Farnham was another leading Ulster Tory who had reservations about the project, 'anxious' as he was that the course and language adopted 'would be completely in accordance with the views entertained by the Government.' He decided to attend because as the meeting was apparently to go ahead he felt that,

'there should be as full an attendance as possible of persons of weight and property... (My absence) might be imputed to be lukewarmness towards the interests of the Protestants; and might diminish or endanger the influence which I possess among them ... And I am most anxious that there should be present at the meeting some persons of rank who are (like myself) warmly attached to your Government, and who will do their utmost to induce the great body of our Protestants to repose confidence in those who are at present at the head of the Government.'<sup>3</sup>

The Government, in the shape of Peel, Graham and Eliot, disliked the idea of the meeting not only because of the risk of collision with Catholics but also because they thought that 'any division among the Protestants is dangerous' and perceived 'disadvantages' in 'a failure or in a partial and ineffective demonstration.' Graham approved of Londonderry's 'prudent and rational view', though he wished to avoid Londonderry's 'trap'. he seeks to commit me to the adoption of his opinions, and forthwith he will hasten over to Ireland and proclaim himself the organ of the wishes of the Government.' Like many others,<sup>4</sup> Graham attributed the project to Roebuck. The (liberal) Northern Whig warmly praised Londonderry's opposition to the meeting and claimed they were 'told that some other influential Tories fully concur with him and are determined not to attend this meeting.' The Mail deeply regretted the division in Irish Tory ranks and hoped 'fervently' that it 'may not affect either the respectability, the zeal or the determination of the meeting.'<sup>5</sup>

The Queen's Speech of the 24th of August provided a way out of the

difficulty. She expressed 'the deepest concern' over the Repeal agitation, her 'firm determination .. to maintain inviolate' the Union, and her confidence that her 'faithful Subjects who have influence and authority in Ireland will discourage to the utmost of their Power' the system of 'pernicious Agitation'. The Mail admired the 'unaffected consciousness of power' of the Speech 'and the constrained determination to use that power' to maintain the Union. 'Late though it be', this development, added to Wellington's assertion of preparedness for any exigency, 'is satisfactory to the Conservatives as showing that they have nothing to fear.' There was 'a new state of things', demanding 'a revision of our policy' of criticism of Government apathy. And it rendered unnecessary the projected meeting in Belfast, which had been the result of the previous 'want of energy' of the Government. The Mail claimed that they had never really looked favourably upon 'those self-defence movements of our Ulster friends ... preferring the ordinary operations of society and law, and unwilling to recommend a course of action to our friends which we had invariably condemned in our enemies.'<sup>6</sup>

On the 30th Donegall chaired a meeting of the requisitionists of the meeting. They welcomed the Queen's determination to uphold the Union and expressed their desire to avoid giving any pretext to the Repealers 'for continuing a system of agitation which has been now so explicitly condemned by their Sovereign'. As loyal subjects of the Queen 'and anxious to comply with the spirit as well as the letter of her expressed wishes, we feel it our duty to forego the meeting fixed for the 7th of September, lest the Protestants of Ulster should be charged by their enemies, however unjustly, as the cause of continuing political agitation.' They spoke also, however, of 'the continued and undisguised threatenings of the Repeal agitators' and 'increasing dangers by which the Protestants of Ireland are surrounded.' In order to unite Protestants behind religion, throne and Union they proposed a declaration supporting those institutions for the signature of all 'loyal Protestants'. A 'provisional committee'



was appointed to promote signature of the declaration and to have it presented to the Queen. In addition, if the Repeal agitation continued the committee should,

'call such meetings of the Protestants of northern counties as local circumstances may render most convenient and desirable and devise such means as they may deem most suitable for co-operating for common protection with our Protestant brethren of the other provinces.'

The committee had more than 70 members, including 12 M.P.s and 13  
7  
peers. It never undertook any of its allotted tasks. The Government welcomed the abandonment of the meeting, Eliot calling it 'a wiser  
8  
measure than I gave Lord Roden & Co. credit for'. The Dublin Protestant Operative Association attributed the abandonment to a fear that the Government would be attacked for their failure to repeal the Act of  
9  
Emancipation. The liberal Press duly ridiculed Roden and the rest for their 'Grand Old Duke of York' behaviour. They gave Londonderry much of  
10  
the credit for the climbdown. The Mail welcomed the decision to 'adjourn' the meeting not least because it 'effectually prevented' continuation of the difference between Roden and Londonderry. They were not slow to disapprove of the 'injudicious manifesto' of the latter (meaning his letter to Roden), though they allowed that 'its publication (was not)  
11  
sanctioned in any way by his Lordship.' Londonderry confirmed, in a speech to his tenants on the 7th of September, that he had not intended the letter for publication. The Whig commented that 'his account of the matter is very defective', as his distributing copies of the letter to  
12  
his friends was a means of covertly releasing it to the Press. Londonderry had, in fact, informed Emerson Tennent some time before that he intended  
13  
'to publish my letter & stand aloof with all the forces I can muster.'

In other respects Londonderry's speech did nothing to soften differences, for he again rejected Roden's view of the state of Ulster (it was 'never .. more tranquil and flourishing'), claimed that 'an attack' would certainly have been made on the meeting had it taken place, implied his belief that his letter was decisive in the affair, and

commented provocatively on his refusal in June to attend the 'great meeting in London of Peers and Commoners of Ireland to induce the Government to adopt more stringent and decisive measures' against the agitation, which meeting 'ended only in a resolution to support the Government of Sir Robert Peel in whatever manner he should think best.' He did think, however, that 'if Government had considered the extent to which the "monster meetings" would have gone, they might have taken early measures by arming themselves with greater power to prevent them.'

14

Hillsborough, Downshire's son and one of the Tory members for Co. Down, wrote to Peel to explain these events. Given the alarming state of Ireland, 'it was determined to hold a Provincial meeting for the purpose of concerting measures for the common safety & for petitioning the Queen ... it was determined to hold the meeting in doors for fear of a disturbance'. The Queen's Speech was unanimously welcomed by 'those whose duty it was to look after the common interest'. A 'certain number' met, including Downshire and Roden, and decided on the resolutions published. As for Londonderry,

'I never felt so strong on any subject ... Lord Londonderry had nothing to do with the postponement of the meeting either by his influence, or by his letters to Lord Roden ... it was determined upon before these precious letters were printed .. (and) is to be attributed entirely to the innate Loyalty of the Protestant body & not to the peevish pomposity & suicidal vanity of our Custos Rotulorum ... he might be vaunting his triumph (as he calls it) to you or some of the Ministers : here he is thought only fit for bedlam... The case is simply this, we were most seriously alarmed at the open violence of the R. C. body & wished by a natural impulse to beg of the Queen to interfere in their behalf. This meeting was rendered unnecessary by her answering the question before it was put (so to speak). No reason was left to them for holding the meeting & none was held. We are much relieved by this speech & it will keep up their spirits for a time, but for God's sake do act up to the meaning of the speech, do not send the poor Orangemen to Jail for taking a walk 2 days in the year when tens of thousands of Papists are meeting day & night to talk open Treason & by night to drill armed to carry that Treason into effect.'

In more moderate strain he hoped there was no foundation in rumours of Peel's 'ill health & approaching retirement from public life. Believe me you have the good wishes of a very large body in this Country, in which I heartily join.'

15

The Mail also contended that the Queen's Speech alone, and not Londonderry's letter to Roden, had caused the



'postponement', and that the committee of organizers decided on this course before publication of the letter on the 29th. <sup>16</sup> Though the requisitionists did not meet until the 30th, the claim made by Hillsborough and the Mail as to the order of events may well have been correct. However, Londonderry initially opposed the meeting in Parliament on the 15th, and his letter, written on the 19th, was in the hands of Roden, and probably of the 'friends' to whom it was circulated, before the meeting of the organizing committee. Above all, it is difficult to accept that the Queen's Speech was sufficient to justify the decision. Peel's declaration in May was, in fact, much more vigorous, and as the Northern Whig pointed out, 'the Roden party' originally urged the necessity of the meeting 'because efforts were required "which no Government can make", and now they say they abandon the meeting because <sup>17</sup> they are told that the Government will make efforts.' It seems probable that the Protestant leaders grew alarmed at the prospect of disturbance and unsure of the propriety of independent action in 'self-defence', with Londonderry's none-too-discreet opposition an additional reason for forbearance.

The decline in the Repeal agitation may have been another factor in the decision. Though the Tara meeting of the 15th of August was a formidable affair - 'a manifestation of physical force and revolutionary <sup>18</sup> intent not to be despised' - the agitation was falling away according to several accounts, and Londonderry and Clare thought that O'Connell was <sup>19</sup> puzzled as to his next move. Nevertheless, the Government proceeded to take a significant step in the conciliatory course which Graham and Peel had plotted when the agitation was at its highest point. Soon after Graham's declaration against conciliation on the 16th of June he wrote to Peel with apparent regret at his lack of discretion and anticipated subsequent Government policy with the declaration that, though the Church could not be abandoned to conciliate Catholics,

'no opportunity should be omitted of winning them to the State, of softening their resentments, of improving their education, of reconciling



their clergy, of admitting them to a share of patronage, and of giving full scope to the Act of Emancipation, of which we have incurred the dangers and have failed to reap the promised fruit.' 20

In mid-July Graham and Peel agreed on the need to 'take a new departure' in their Irish policy, turning 'the stream of patronage .. into some new channels....

'... We must look out for responsible Roman Catholics for office. There are many grounds for not rigidly acting in Ireland on that specious principle that if Protestants are better qualified for appointments that fall vacant Protestants ought to be preferred to Catholics. If no Roman Catholic shall be appointed to higher office until it be shown that he is superior to all Protestant candidates, there probably will be few Catholic appointments.'

This doctrine of positive discrimination was supported by Peel, Graham, Stanley, Sugden and Eliot in subsequent correspondence, particularly in advocating the appointment of John Howley, a Catholic barrister, to the post of Third Sergeant. De Grey resisted the doctrine and the appointment, arguing that it would not be 'wise or expedient to appoint an unfit man to an office merely because he is a Catholic. Conciliation .. is a chimera.' But he eventually gave way and the  
21  
appointment was made at the end of August.

As Howley was manifestly undeserving of the office on professional grounds, his appointment was seen by the Mail for what it undoubtedly was, an act of positive discrimination in favour of a Catholic, and the truce between that journal and the Government came to an abrupt end. In the most vitriolic terms they denounced Peel's 'supercilious neglect of the friends of his party and of his own supposed principles', and reverted to denunciation of the Government's 'supine, apathetic, and cowardly' response to the progress of the Repeal agitation. The Packet and the Whig Evening Post were the only leading newspapers to support the Howley  
22  
appointment. But the moderate Tory Lord Clare wrote of the appointment that 'the Bigots on both sides are very angry, but depend upon it all moderate & right minded men will approve of it.' Eliot believed 'that very many conservatives take the same view of Howley's promotion that  
23  
Lord Clare does.'



Glengall informed Wellington towards the end of August that, such were his fears, Donoughmore intended to sell his Irish estates and leave Ireland. Glengall, then and again in September, intimated his own fear<sup>24</sup> of a conflagration. The Duke, evidently much influenced by such communications, was still greatly alarmed at the apparently lawless state<sup>25</sup> of Ireland. On the 21st of September Roden indicated his continuing concern when he informed Eliot of his intention to train 20 or 30 of his dependants and servants to the use of the musket in order to defend his home 'in case of any attack.' Eliot replied that Roden's example would be followed by others who could not be trusted with such a power, and that 'very serious mischief must inevitably ensue' if men 'uncontrolled by discipline or by military law' were armed. Roden received this reply in better spirit than Eliot expected, and abandoned the project. But he warned that

'I .. must consider (the Government) responsible for any disastrous results which may arise from the want of preparation & precaution on my part... In making this communication to your Lordship I feel I have done my duty as a Resident Proprietor in Ireland, and I cannot but lament that more encouragement is not given to us by H. M. Govt. to use all legal means within our reach for the preservation of our properties and the well being of the country under the state of danger in which we are living.' 26

Bonham provided an interesting picture of the excited state of Shaw's mind towards the end of September 1843; he informed Peel that,

'I saw Shaw .. en route for Ireland, and he tells me "that the North means to take care of itself". He is perfectly ferocious. Nothing will satisfy him but Warren as Attorney General, who would (even more than Blackburne of old) inspire O'Connell with some apprehension.' 27

In spite of the fears of some, the continued decline of the Repeal agitation in September 1843 probably had some soothing effect on Irish Tory opinion. Lord Clare again declared that he felt convinced that the Government were being proved 'right in not taking more notice of the Repeal meetings.' Eliot and Dawson reported that many of 'the Protestant party' who had condemned the Government's 'apathy and cowardice' now recognized that their 'forbearance & caution' and military precautions had 'saved Ireland from a most fearful collision between the adverse



28 parties.' Eliot feared that a prosecution might revive the faltering agitation, but he was so convinced of its 'great moral effect on the public mind' he favoured such a move against O'Connell. The latter's 29 carelessness in a speech in the Repeal Association on the 13th of September gave the Government the opening they had sought for several months. And, before they could move against O'Connell, militaristic references in placards advertizing a monster meeting at Clontarf for the 8th of October gave the authorities an opportunity to deal the agitation a double blow.

On the 7th of October the meeting at Clontarf was prohibited. The Irish Tories Shaw and Donoughmore were among the signatories of the Privy Council's proclamation order. On the 14th O'Connell and a number of other Repealers were arrested on a charge of conspiracy. These steps were accompanied with military preparations on a massive scale, but, in spite of the fears of Glengall and Wellington of an outbreak, there was 30 no violent reaction. The Mail greeted enthusiastically both the proclamation and the prosecutions, though the Government's 'culpable' 31 delay in taking such action was not forgotten. Attorney-General Smith felt that 'the impression amongst the well disposed is very favourable to us & our proceeding.' 32 Lord Powerscourt wrote to congratulate Peel on the new-found vigour of the Government. The poorer Protestants, he wrote, had been thrown into a 'state of discouragement' by the Repeal agitation. 'The Queen's Speech was a great encouragement - & I have no doubt that this proclamation will rejoice the hearts of many a poor & desponding 33 loyalist.'

Downshire wrote to De Grey from Hillsborough that, 'Every loyal person here in this part of Ireland rejoiced at your Excellency's issue of the proclamation against the meeting.. Your Excellency has placed the weakness of the enemy in its proper light.' 34 Glengall welcomed the prosecutions and exulted in the disarray of the Repealers. But he became alarmed when fires were lit throughout the southern counties in



mid-October. They were evidence of 'much previous concert...

Unquestionably the organization of the people is most compleat & truly serious.' And, though confident that the influx of troops would prevent rebellion, he reported that many of the gentry lived in fear, particularly after an attack in November on a Protestant family in Tipperary. This attack also caused Donoughmore to fear for the safety of the Protestants.<sup>35</sup> According to Lucas in November 1843 Ireland was 'in its most natural and accustomed state, quiet on a barrel of gunpowder'.<sup>36</sup> Eliot and De Grey bore witness to the continuing alarm of the southern Protestants.<sup>37</sup>

Towards the end of October the Mail again reflected upon Peel's failure to act vigorously on Conservative principles and lamented the impunity with which the repealers could open Conciliation Hall and conduct their arbitration courts. It was subsequently alleged that Eliot was unwilling to press the prosecution of O'Connell, and the Attorney-General was attacked for his alleged misconduct of the prosecutions.<sup>38</sup> Smith was upset that,

'Mr Sheehan .. is exciting himself to the utmost to thwart our proceedings ... every thing I do is misrepresented by the Evening Mail from feelings of the sorest malignity, and the anxiety of Mr Sheehan is to excite & create discontent against every act & step of the Government amongst the Conservatives.'<sup>39</sup>

The preliminary stages of the prosecutions saw several setbacks for the Crown, some of their witnesses proving unreliable, and much doubt expressed about the capabilities of the law officers. But Smith's victory on a procedural point before the Queen's Bench on the 21st of November checked the criticism of the Mail and, according to Graham, was compensation for 'much ungenerous slander and the base desertion of friends.' The wisdom of the decision to accede to the traversers' request for postponement of the trial until January - a decision taken in the knowledge that the Special Jury Panel for 1844 would be not only less defective than that of 1843 but at least as Conservative - was apparently accepted by most Irish Tories. The English Tory Lord Ingestrie, after a tour 'through a great part of Ireland' in November, found 'a



very general satisfaction expressed at the manner in which the  
Government prosecutions have been undertaken.<sup>40</sup>

On the 20th of November the Devon Commission was appointed to inquire into relations between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Though Irish Tory members had shown a disposition to defend Irish landlordism,<sup>41</sup> the Commission was one conciliatory gesture which did not alarm the Irish Tories. In July, Sir Arthur Brooke, Tory member for Fermanagh, had mentioned the question as a principal subject for the consideration of his proposed Commission of Inquiry; he added that,

'I think I can answer for most landed proprietors in Ireland, I know I can for myself, that we should consider no sacrifice too great which could promote the prosperity of Ireland & tend to secure the tranquillity and permanent contentment of the people of that country.'<sup>42</sup>

Even the Ultra Tory Lord Glengall stated that he 'had no objection' to a Commission of Inquiry, confident as he was that it would vindicate Irish landlords.<sup>43</sup> Immediately prior to Crawford's introduction in August of his bill for compensation of evicted tenants for improvements, Wyse reported that,

'Sir A. Brooke .. is about to propose an amendment on Crawford's Bill .. to appoint a Commission .. to examine strictly into the condition of landlord and tenant with a view to redress of grievance & better arrangement of property. He tells me a large party if not all of Irish Conservatives will support him .. and wishes me to canvass on our side.'<sup>44</sup>

When Crawford brought on his bill, Brooke welcomed Peel's commitment to consideration of the question and did not press an amendment. But he said ejection without compensation for improvements was 'very hard' and 'believed very few landlords in Ireland would object to the principle of the bill.' And he agreed with Peel's condemnation of indiscriminate ejections, though he also felt that landlords were wrongly blamed for the 'wretchedness and misery so generally prevalent in Ireland.'<sup>45</sup> The Mail welcomed the proposed inquiry, which, they felt, would vindicate the landlords.<sup>46</sup> Lucas indicated in September that he was 'favourable to the appointment of a Commission.'<sup>47</sup> The principal Irish Tory representative on the Commission, George Hamilton, was convinced that inquiry would



lead to real improvement. The acceptance of the invitation to serve by Hamilton and John Wynne of Sligo, the first (and only) Irish Conservatives invited, and James Daly's application to be made a Commissioner, also<sup>48</sup> suggested Irish Tory approval of the project.

In December 1843 the Mail adverted occasionally to the 'continued neglect' of Irish Protestants by the Government, and the Conservative Registration Committee reported that disillusionment with the Government<sup>49</sup> had inhibited some from registering their claims to the franchise. But, isolated references apart, it is probably fair to state that the Mail's attitude towards the Government was more favourable during the last five months of 1843 than at almost any other time since Peel's coming to power. Many of the southern Protestants remained greatly alarmed at the danger of local outbreaks of violence, particularly after the occurrence of several murders in the midland counties. In November magistrates at Dunmanway, Co. Cork, swore in 110 Special Constables, all<sup>50</sup> of them Protestant, in apprehension of a 'sudden rising' by the peasantry. The act implied a lack of faith in the Government's will or ability to protect Protestants. On the 28th of November the magistrates of Bandon, including Lords Bandon and Carbery and Viscount Bernard, M.P., met privately to discuss 'the defenceless state of the West Riding as regards military protection.' And on the 29th over a hundred gentlemen met at Borrisokane in Tipperary to consider 'the necessity of adopting<sup>51</sup> measures for the future preservation of life and property.' Glengall wrote to Wellington of those who met at Bandon and Borrisokane that,

'Their object is to form themselves into associations for mutual defence, for it is next to impossible to expect .. that military & police can be everywhere... Organization of this nature has been carried on to a considerable extent. So has the barricading of houses. In truth there is not a man in the country who is not armed in some way or other... I have recommended the Borrisokane & Bandon gentry to propose to Government that they should swear themselves in as Special Constables. I honestly confess my object is that as anything like forming yeomanry corps is out of the question at present, that the Special Constable system should in<sup>52</sup> fact work as a yeomanry force, & evade the objections to the other system.'

On the 4th of December the Mail urged the Government to 'organise

and arm the loyal .. whether as armed yeomanry or as special constables' to ensure the 'security of the loyal against occasional outbreak.' They  
53  
approved of the steps already taken in this direction. The Government were greatly concerned, however, that if the conduct of the magistrates at Dunmanway, regarding Special Constables, became general,

'we shall have the whole people in battle array, divided by their religion, and a civil war will be inevitable... I shall be anxious to hear that the Irish Government has taken some decisive, but prudent, step to arrest the progress of these Orange magistrates in their mad career. If they be suffered to proceed, we shall have the South of Ireland in a flame before the end of the month and the people will have right on their side.'

The Government had no power under the law to prevent such a development, as the behaviour of the magistrates was quite legal; but Eliot's letter to the Lieutenant of Co. Cork, Lord Bandon, expressed 'disapproval of the appointment of special constables for general purposes.' There is no evidence that the feared extension of the practice  
54  
did, in fact, occur.

In their application of the new Arms Act, too, Protestant magistrates gave the Government cause to lament their 'downright madness.' Magistrates in several parts of Ireland denied licences to Repealers. And Lord Newry, the Tory member for Newry town, wrote to Eliot that, 'If we knew what the Government thought as to Roman Catholics being trusted it would be of great assistance. I would not trust one if I could in any way avoid it. Are magistrates obliged to state their reasons for objections ? ...' Eliot and Graham regretted that Newry's attitude was shared by many Protestants, who 'would reenact the penal laws if they could.' Graham felt the Arms Act was never intended 'to be perverted into a test of political opinions' and feared complaints in Parliament. A circular was issued to the Lieutenants of the Irish Counties to the effect that magistrates should consider the 'character & general conduct' of each claimant, 'without reference to his religious or political opinions.' This circular, reported Eliot in January, was 'taken in very good part' by the 'Lieutenants of Counties & the Magistrates generally',



though the magistrates of the Queen's County complained of the implied 'distrust in their judgement and discretion' and a discontented Mail asserted that it had 'spread consternation and dismay among the well-affected and peaceable.' Eliot was again the principal target of the Mail's abuse.<sup>55</sup>

Early in 1844 the Irish Tory Frederick Shaw was involved in the first of several controversies in connection with the State Trials. In November 1843 the Special Jury Panel from which the jurors would be balloted was drawn up in Recorder Shaw's court. Subsequently, during the collation of the parish lists, several names were wrongly omitted from the final panel, a disproportionately high number of them Catholics. The discovery of the omissions at the beginning of January caused a major storm. Shaw, as a strong partisan, was undoubtedly anxious for the success of the O'Connell prosecution, but it is unlikely that he took part in an attempt dishonestly to alter the list. Responsibility for the fraud or error was fixed on one of the clerks of his office. However, Shaw was vigorously assailed in the liberal press and later in Parliament for his failure personally to supervise the collation. He had gone to England before the commencement of that operation.

The Government, aware of the importance of securing a conviction which could not be impugned as unfair, were upset with Shaw for his 'neglect' in leaving such an important task to a subordinate. Graham, clearly bristling with anger, was convinced that Shaw 'ought not to resist an enquiry before a fair committee' of the House of Commons into 'the Fraud for which he himself is all but responsible.' De Grey, however, though agreeable to such a committee, argued that,

'we are not called upon to incur unnecessary abuse from the Radicals by a defence of Shaw on the one hand, or to win the odium of an uncalled for sacrifice of him on the other, which his friends might consider it if we were the movers or suggestors of such a mode of enquiry. I am no partizan indeed hardly an intimate acquaintance of Shaw's. He behaved ill to the Government in the matter of the Arms Bill last session, he is a disappointed man, no doubt, but he has a considerable number of adherents & supporters here ... hear his explanation, weigh his statements, & act in concert with him if it can justly & honestly be done.'



In the event, the Ministers stressed in Parliament that the Government were not responsible for the omissions and made much of the fact that the guilty clerk was a Catholic; but no-one in Government<sup>56</sup> passed comment, for or against, on Shaw's part in the affair. The Government's own role with regard to selection of the trial jury became a subject of great controversy and they were fortunate that the most questionable of their actions never became public knowledge. Part of the secret service money was given to local Conservatives to employ agents in the Recorder's court, where the rival parties fought over the claims of their partisans to appear on the Jury Panel. These funds were 'secretly supplied, but no agent on the part of the Government was<sup>57</sup> employed ... the secret was well kept.'

The refusal of the law officers to allow the striking of another Panel after discovery of the omissions came in for much criticism, but it was their securing of an all-Protestant jury which brought most opprobrium on the Government. Those in Government concurred in feeling that it would be desirable to have at least one Catholic non-Repealer on the jury; but, in the event, they could not be sure that all of the Catholics on the list were not Repealers and the Attorney-General duly<sup>58</sup> had all of the Catholic candidates set aside. The Government spokesmen in Parliament subsequently defended that course, stressing that the objections were lodged on the grounds not of the religion of those<sup>59</sup> involved but of their political sympathy with the traversers. Henry Lambert felt that the Crown lawyers had merely done their 'duty' in<sup>60</sup> objecting to the inclusion of Repealers. The Mail took the same view.

On the 2nd of February the Mail lamented 'the meagre and unsatisfactory reference to Ireland' in the Queen's Speech. Ireland 'seems destined', they claimed, 'to be ceded to the united spirits of conciliation and agitation... The hands of the Agitator are to be strengthened by an extension of the county franchise', and there was 'no promise of relief' for the problems of agriculture and banking.



'Political cowardice is the besetting sin which deprives Sir Robert Peel<sup>61</sup> of friends, and will eventually pull down ruin on his Cabinet.' These were the harshest words used in the Mail for some time. But a few days later Peel won approval for his defence of agricultural protection. And the Mail approved of the way in which the Crown lawyers in Ireland conducted the State Trials. The verdict of guilty brought expressions of delight from the Mail:

'we are bound to admit - although we were once of opinion that a movement on the part of the Crown had been culpably, almost fatally, protracted - that this prosecution was conceived and concocted with infinite wisdom, and conducted and concluded with consummate skill.'<sup>62</sup>

Irish Tories in general were evidently delighted with the conviction of O'Connell. O'Neill Daunt later wrote that the verdict caused 'a mighty uproar of delight in all Orangeland.'<sup>63</sup> Glengall seemed to envisage the crumbling of the Repeal agitation, and all his fears of a revolutionary 'movement' had gone.<sup>64</sup> According to George Wyse the 'savage exultation of the Conservatives' was 'beyond endurance.'<sup>65</sup> But the opinion of the Primate's niece that 'for a wonder Government seems to have made no blunder this time' suggests that dissatisfaction with the Ministry had not been completely dissipated.<sup>66</sup> Lady De Grey informed Peel that, 'Many of our ultras here would have preferred no verdict',<sup>67</sup> presumably in the hope of embarrassing the Government.

The great debate on Ireland in February 1844 saw the Government spokesmen stoutly defending their past conduct, particularly in relation to their appointments, the proclamation of Clontarf, and the Trials; but it also brought confirmation of the Government's resolve to rule Ireland in a more conciliatory manner. Though the Union and the Established Church were declared inviolate, reform was promised in the fields of education, landlord-tenant relations, the franchise, and the right of Catholic priests to receive land grants from sympathetic proprietors. And in Cabinet Peel urged consideration of the extension of collegiate education, municipal reform, the abolition of ministers' money and the improvement of Maynooth.<sup>68</sup>



The improvement of Maynooth was perhaps the most striking inclusion. For over two years Eliot had argued that a higher grant would facilitate a more lengthy and less dogmatic and narrowly-based education of the Catholic clergy, and would allow, as a quid pro quo, 'a real and efficient control' to replace the nominal powers of the existing Visitors. Stanley held similar views, but Peel and Graham, encouraged by De Grey and Baron Foster, originally balked before the prospect that an increase of the grant, or the Commission of Inquiry which all in Government assumed must precede such an increase, would stimulate Protestant hostility and stir up religious controversy. In October 1843, however, Graham agreed with Eliot that it was 'the moment for tempering firmness with reasonable concession' and put 'the reconstruction of Maynooth with an enlarged grant' on the agenda for consideration. The subject was discussed in Cabinet in January and February 1844 and it was virtually decided that as the grant only 'embittered' the priesthood by its 'scantiness and insufficiency', probably contributing to the prominence of young priests in the Repeal agitation, and since a larger grant would be no greater violation of principle than a small one, they should increase the vote. The proposal to begin with a Commission of Inquiry was later quietly abandoned.

Londonderry congratulated Peel on the result of the Irish debate and on his own 'stupendous effort'. The Irish Tory members voted unanimously against Russell's motion for inquiry, and their Irish colleagues in the upper House similarly opposed the motion of Lord Normanby. There was little criticism of the Government by Irish Tories. Shaw, their principal critic in the Commons in 1843, was largely preoccupied with the task of explaining the omissions from the Jury Panel. Conolly expressed his 'great satisfaction' at the conviction of O'Connell. He did not 'in every respect defend the present Government', but he had to acknowledge 'the amount of confidence reposed in them by the people of Ireland with respect to the steps which they had lately so successfully,



so constitutionally, so legitimately undertaken to put down agitation ... the present Government had had the honesty and the boldness to repress (it) in a legal manner.' Several of the Irish Tory members approved of the proclamation of Clontarf and defended or praised the law officers with respect to selection of the jury. Lord Claud Hamilton was glad that until October 'every latitude' had been allowed to the agitation, and George Hamilton, 'as the representative of many of those in Ireland who, last year, were of opinion that too great a degree of forbearance, or inertness, had been exhibited as regards the Repeal Agitation', pronounced himself fully satisfied with Graham's explanation of the Government's 'apparent supineness ... the course which Government had pursued with regard to the Repeal Agitation was marked by great moderation, great wisdom, and great firmness', and he 'rejoiced that the common law .. had been resorted to rather than any extraordinary powers sought for.'

John Young (an office-holder) produced a general defence of Government policy and praised both their forbearance in the early part of the agitation and their vigour in increasing the garrison in Ireland and instituting proceedings against O'Connell. Verner, however, spoke of the 'undeserved disfavour' shown by the Government towards Irish Protestants and clearly had Tory as well as Whig Administrations in mind when he deprecated the conciliatory course of Irish policy over the previous 15 years. In the Lords, Roden admitted that he 'had found fault with the noble Lords behind him for not having before taken measures' to suppress the Repeal agitation, but he was now 'inclined to think that Ministers were perhaps in the right in allowing things to proceed to the length they had reached before they struck the blow which now appeared to have been effected ... the old adage was good, "better late than never" ... he could not but thank noble Lords behind him for the course they, as Members of the Government, had pursued as to the late trials.'

The jubilation of the Mail quickly gave way to a degree of alarm at

the conciliatory direction mapped out by the Ministers.<sup>72</sup> Sheil wrote from Dublin that, 'The Repealers and the Orangemen here are both about equally dissatisfied: the former with O'Connell, the latter with Peel...'<sup>73</sup> The Protestant Operatives of Cork were angered by Peel's remarks on their intolerance.<sup>74</sup> Jackson was upset that the attacks on Chief Justice Pennefather were 'suffered to pass unanswered & unrebuked.'<sup>75</sup> Early in March there was speculation in the Irish newspapers, including the Mail, that the Government would not proceed to have sentence passed on O'Connell. 'Our own gossiping, professed friends', complained De Grey, 'are the loudest in the cry.'<sup>76</sup>

The Irish Tory members voted against liberal efforts to indict the Government in relation to the State Trials and the proclamation of Clontarf, and throughout the months of March and April remained fairly quiet in Parliament. Shaw withheld judgement on the Parliamentary and Municipal franchise bills introduced at the beginning of April, though he was subsequently critical of both measures.<sup>77</sup> Perhaps marking a change in attitude, Shaw actually applied to Peel for an appointment for his eldest son, the first correspondence, apparently, between the two in more than 15 months.<sup>78</sup> In April-May Shaw cooperated with the Government in dishing the projected inquiry into the poor law and was supported by most of the Irish Tories who took part in the division.<sup>79</sup> However, 10 Irish Tory members voted against the Government on the factories bill in March; and Taylor, Irving and Shirley voted against Peel in an important division on the Sugar Duties when the defeat of the Government raised the possibility of resignation.<sup>80</sup> All of the independent Irish Tory members opposed the Government's Dissenters' Chapels bill in deference to the wishes of their orthodox Presbyterian constituents, who were irate over the bill's tendency to secure to unitarians the possession of their ecclesiastical property.<sup>81</sup> Presbyterians were also greatly agitated at this time by the Government's initial failure to satisfy their desire for equality with the Establishment in the matter of mixed marriages, but were pleased



when the bill (eventually introduced, in June 1844, virtually conceded  
82  
to them the points at issue.

The Mail remained dissatisfied with the conciliatory line taken by the Government, criticizing Ministers over the Parliamentary and Municipal franchise measures, the factories and Dissenters' Chapels bills, the abandonment of registration reform, the leniency of the treatment of O'Connell in Richmond Bridewell prison, the failure to suppress the Repeal Association, and so on. Occasionally they welcomed the prospect of the resignation of the 'Conservative (!) and Protestant (!!) ministry.' In sum, though there was not yet a return to the sustained denunciation of the Government seen in the Mail in 1843, there can be no doubting the  
83  
extent of their disillusionment.

In June Farnham, Verner and other leading Irish Tories exerted their influence once again to prevent Orange processions on the July anniversaries. But in doing so Farnham publicly described the Processions Act as 'insidious and unjust', and the Orange Grand Master of Co. Monaghan asserted that, 'One trial more awaits you before the expiration of the  
84  
Processions Act.' There was evidently an expectation, arising from Peel's pledge in August 1843 to review the question, that the Act would not be renewed upon its expiry on the 1st of August. Eliot, recognizing that simple renewal of a law which acted only against Protestants was 'impossible', urged extension of the law to cover all party displays which might provoke animosity or a breach of the peace; failing that it would be 'better to let the Act expire than to continue a law which is  
85  
manifestly partial.' Graham, however, feared that an attempt to extend the law 'would lead to a protracted struggle' in Parliament and probably end in defeat. And he felt that the likelihood of a revival of Orange processions necessitated renewal of the Act. He had already informed Farnham that the Government would probably decide to continue the Act 'for one or two years.' On the first of July he announced in Parliament  
86  
that they would renew the Act until the end of August 1845. His letter



to Farnham received what he called an 'unpleasant' reply, and the Mail complained of the decision 'to perpetuate an insult upon the loyal Protestants of Ireland.'<sup>87</sup> Eliot was reconciled to the decision all the more easily by evidence in the police reports of 'a very bumptious disposition on the part of the Orangemen.' But De Grey, probably supported by Lucas, pointed out that,

'The influential men amongst the Protestants had in their public addresses urged the fact of the expiring law as one of the strong grounds for calling upon their followers to be tranquil, ... the one-sided law was an expiring one, that if ever renewed it would be so constructed as to deal justice to both sides. And I confess that I feel the truth & force of such reasoning... You are sowing seeds of discord, distrust & hatred to yourselves at this moment which may lead to the worst consequences. I do not want you to rely upon the Protestant population solely, or too much. But .. you gain no feeling of respect, esteem, love or confidence from the other party by this sort of attempt to conciliate them. And ill as you may think you are supported by those who call themselves your friends, you cannot expect to be better off when you have turned them into avowed enemies.' 88

On the day that De Grey wrote this, the 8th of July, discussions between the Government and some of the Irish Tory members led to the decision to limit the act of renewal to the 1st of June 1845, leaving the legality of the July processions of 1845 open to further consideration. This arrangement, Graham felt, was 'generally satisfactory to the Protestant members of the North of Ireland'.<sup>89</sup> The Mail remained dissatisfied, however, and Wicklow and Roden subsequently attacked the renewal of such a one-sided Act. They contended that it should be extended in scope or allowed to expire. Wicklow described the renewal bill as 'unwise, unjust and impolitic', though 'in saying this he must add that he believed that there never was a Government more anxious to do more for the benefit of Ireland than the present Government.'<sup>90</sup> The bill passed through the Commons without debate.

The Charitable Bequests Bill of 1844 was intended by ministers to be 'a boon' to Irish Catholics, and as it proposed to dismantle a Protestant monopoly Smith believed that it would 'certainly displease some of the Protestants of Ireland.' Graham, however, felt that the bill would prove 'acceptable to the Roman Catholics and not offensive to the



91  
 Protestants.' It was given the qualified approval of Wicklow and Shaw  
 92  
 and supported by the Irish Tory members on the second reading. The  
 Mail seemed initially to approve of the bill as one 'made to protect  
 the interests of the laity against the rapacity of the (Catholic)  
 clergy', but they subsequently accused Peel of giving 'Popery a fresh  
 start in her career of despotism' by conceding amendments which  
 'practically repealed the statute of mortmain in favour of the Romish  
 93  
 Church' and acknowledged the titles of the Catholic hierarchy. Later  
 in the year Primate Beresford and Lord Donoughmore agreed to serve on  
 the new Board of Charitable Donations. This Board was Gazetted on the  
 94  
 18th of December with, on Graham's instructions, the two Catholic  
 Archbishops listed immediately after Beresford and Whately. The Mail  
 pleased and surprized Heytesbury and Eliot by praising 'not only the  
 measure but the mode in which it has been brought about'; any doubts  
 were apparently submerged in their joy at the defeat inflicted on  
 95  
 O'Connell. However, Roden sent Donoughmore 'a very intemperate letter'  
 stating that it was 'a degradation of the peerage that his name should be  
 placed after those of the Roman Catholic Archbishops.' Donoughmore  
 received eight such letters from outraged Protestants. He informed all  
 that he was 'perfectly satisfied, that the Act was one of the best Acts  
 that had ever been promulgated, & that he had no wish to embarrass the  
 96  
 Government by raising difficulties upon minor points.'

Near the end of January 1845 the Mail mysteriously 'assumed quite  
 a new tone upon the subject of the Bequests Bill (which it has hitherto  
 upheld), deprecating all intercourse with Rome, referring to the  
 Coronation Oath, & touching upon all the topics which have been generally  
 falling out of use since the passing of the Emancipation Act.' In the  
 Spring they depicted the Act as part with Maynooth of a project to  
 97  
 establish the Catholic Church. The extremely low-Church Warder newspaper  
 and their allies in the Dublin Protestant Operative Association denounced  
 the measure as an elevation of 'Popery'. Gregory, the Tory member for

Dublin, and Lord Glancarty spoke in similar terms in Parliament in 1845.<sup>98</sup> There is no doubt, however, that, compared especially with the furor created among Catholics, the Bequests Act was almost a matter of indifference to most Irish Conservatives.

On the 19th of July 1844 Peel virtually promised in Parliament that in the next session the Government would reform higher education in Ireland and increase the grant to Maynooth, and he announced their intention to increase the grant to the National System of Education by 50%. In the debate which followed, Grogan indicated his suspicions regarding reform in higher education; a number of ultra Tories, including Verner, Lefroy and Hamilton, urged the grievance of the Church Education Society; and 12 Irish Tories voted against the existing Maynooth grant,<sup>99</sup> with only the office-holders Young, Corry and Damer approving the grant. Next day, the Anglo-Irish A. S. O'Brien wrote to Viscount Adare,

'You see that our precious Government is going to found a Popish college next session as well as to increase the Maynooth grant. I am afraid that all this is terribly in the wrong direction. The North must be now considered as lost to us what with this announcement and the Dissenters' Chapels Bill ...' 100

The reaction of the Mail was stridently hostile, particularly to the apparent threat to Trinity College Dublin. They declared that 'every tie of party' between Irish Protestants and the Government was 'dissolved.'<sup>101</sup> In July 1844 the new Lord Lieutenant, Heytesbury, commented on 'the ill-humor that prevails in certain quarters' as a result of Peel's speech. And he was informed 'that the ultra Tory Party in this country has begun to take alarm at the more liberal instructions with which they suppose me to be furnished.'<sup>102</sup> In fact, Peel and Heytesbury were agreed that the Lord Lieutenant should not appear to be 'a partizan', and that there should be 'a perfectly impartial administration of civil government.' The 'cry of the high Protestant Party' was for a 'monopoly of favour and confidence',<sup>103</sup> but 'the day is gone by when it overwhelmed every other argument.' Graham, however, though anxious 'to abate the jealousy & hostility of the more moderate R. Catholics', also felt that Heytesbury



must 'take' care not to estrange the Protestants, and to give no just cause of offence to this powerful body, whose loyalty is undoubted, but whose passions are violent, & whose demands are often unreasonable.'<sup>104</sup>

In August the Mail continued to criticize the Government on several fronts, notably the Bequests bill and the education grievance, and general comment was passed upon Peel's 'expediency' policy. It was claimed that the Evening Packet was 'the only professing Protestant paper in Ireland that advocated the policy of Sir Robert Peel.' Early in September O'Connell's release on Appeal induced the Mail to comment briefly on the Government's 'cowardice' or 'treachery' in refusing to allow the entire House of Lords to decide on the case, and in failing to initiate a new trial or suppress the agitation. A 'Member of the Legislature', presumably an Irish Tory (he wrote from Dublin), publicly attacked the three Whig Law Lords who had effected O'Connell's release, and pressed for legislation to put down O'Connell. He also claimed that the Government had 'vainly' and 'weakly' sought to conciliate the Repealers and had thereby 'disgusted' Irish Conservatives and thrown them into a state of sullen apathy.<sup>105</sup>

It was with some justice that Heytesbury referred early in September to 'our ex-friends of the Evening Mail.'<sup>106</sup> The Irish Tory Lord Hawarden took a leading part in an attempt, not pursued, to have the entire House of Lords vote on O'Connell's case.<sup>107</sup> Wellington, Graham believed, was influenced by Roden, Glengall and others of their ilk in pressing for additional military precautions in Ireland, including the embodiment of 'a local force.' But Graham, with Peel's blessing, dismissed the idea that there was any 'danger of an immediate outbreak' and argued that existing forces were sufficient; he would not trust Catholics in an armed force and felt that the constitution of an exclusively Protestant body would be seen as 'a declaration of war' by Catholics and destroy the Government's hopes of conciliating or dividing them.<sup>108</sup>

Notwithstanding the claims of Grey Porter and the fears of Graham and De Grey that 'discontented Orangemen' were turning to federalism it is doubtful if that movement attracted many Tory adherents. Certainly, no Irish Tory took part in the efforts to launch a federalist party, and federalism was publicly rejected by Westmeath, Londonderry, Butt and the Mail.<sup>109</sup> However, the Mail lent support to another constitutional option, rotatory sittings of Parliament. On the 25th of September, Henry Maunsell, a writer in the Mail, moved in the Corporation of Dublin that they should ask the Queen to hold her Court and Parliament in Dublin at least once every three years. The principal interest of this initiative lay in, as Duffy later put it, 'the position of the mover and the motives to which he appealed'. He argued the merits of decentralized government and, more strikingly, 'he addressed himself directly to his own party, and urged it upon them as a measure of self defence.' According to Maunsell,

'in determining his policy, and in distributing the public patronage, the minister they had raised to power not only ceased to regard but deliberately thwarted their wishes. Only two institutions in which Protestants had a special interest, the University and the Church, were permitted to survive in Ireland. How long would they remain? Let no one hope that a minister expert in manoeuvres for tiding over political shoals would not let slip these remaining anchors of Irish Protestantism whenever he considered the sacrifice useful for his ends. When this catastrophe occurred they would find themselves a weakened, denationalized, and betrayed garrison of England. Let them come to terms before the breach in their bulwarks became indefensible... If Irish Protestantism is to be sold, we ought to insist upon the bargain being made in our presence... It would enable Englishmen to learn .. the actual position of Protestants in Ireland.' 110

Maunsell had actually written to O'Connell to ask for his support, but the motion failed to find a seconder among either his fellow Conservatives, the liberal-unionists or the repealers in the Corporation. O'Connell could not accept such 'a substitute for Repeal', though he gave every encouragement to Maunsell; Davis wrote,

'I look upon Maunsell's motion as clear gain. He is an Ultra Tory. Seeking an Imperial session in Ireland as a remedy for grievances may be illogical & is impracticable (so much the better), but it is a loosening of ideas, an abandonment of the old superstition that all was right, and good will come of it if we be the men of the time ...' 111



The Mail fully concurred with both Maunsell's proposal and the reasoning with which he advocated it. Also at this time, that journal attributed Conservative failures in the registry courts and the dissolution of the Conservative Registration Society to 'the apathy and estrangement of the Conservative body', which were in turn the effect of the Government's 'mistaken policy' in Ireland.<sup>112</sup>

Near the end of September Lord De Grey passed severe comment on the Ultra Tories, who had advanced him as their especial friend within the Administration. He wrote to Graham,

'I am well aware of the impossibility of the Government's announcing what it means to do. But with the rascally party who pretend to be our friends but who are our worst foes, it is inconceivable how much mischief results from doubt & uncertainty. With the incessant efforts made by the Press to convince these friends that the Government is covertly endeavouring to get excuses for a yielding policy, thousands are induced to distrust, & at last perhaps to adhere to what they believe will be ultimately the strongest party.'

He urged Graham to reassure Protestants by displaying a readiness again to prosecute O'Connell, but concluded, 'Be strictly just to all creeds & all classes, but be stoutly bold to them all. No party in that country can be won or kept by favor, no party deserves it.'<sup>113</sup> The Government proceeded to prepare the Maynooth and Colleges measures and to constitute a Board of Commissioners under the Charitable Bequests bill. These 'healing measures', as Graham called them, were part of a design<sup>114</sup> 'to divide the R. Catholics without alienating the Protestants.' The divisions among the Catholics towards the end of 1844 on the Maynooth and Bequests issues were extremely gratifying to the Government. They regarded the successful constitution of the Bequests Board as 'a great victory' over O'Connell, who quickly 'retired to Derrynane. Agitation is at a stand still.' The papal rescript of October 1844 against clerical interference in politics was another victory for the Government, though the effectiveness of this cautiously worded document was very limited.<sup>115</sup>

One black spot, from the point of view of the Administration, was

the revival of outrage in certain counties of Ireland from October 1844. The Government took this situation very seriously, and, though Graham found comfort in the fact that the outbreaks showed the weakening of the 'political combination',<sup>116</sup> additional constabulary, troops and stipendiary magistrates were despatched to the troubled areas. Local Protestants were greatly alarmed and pressed the Government for strong measures.<sup>117</sup> Eliot and Heytesbury wished to deal with the problem by imposing fines on disturbed districts, in order to induce people to cooperate against the criminals; and, with the same end in view, Eliot approved of a plan submitted by the magistrates of the King's County to charge disturbed districts with the expense of extra policing, instead of the whole county. However, Peel and Graham rejected these proposals as unjust to innocent people and liable to be so much resented that their enforcement<sup>118</sup> would be virtually impossible.

The other problem which faced the Government was the continuing dissatisfaction of the Irish Tories. The Committee of the County Dublin Conservative Registration Society issued a circular in October 1844 which referred to 'the pusillanimous and ungrateful policy of ministers to their Irish supporters.'<sup>119</sup> According to Sugden, the Irish Conservatives<sup>120</sup> were no longer 'disposed to exert themselves' in the electoral arena. Peel and Heytesbury agreed that the Government were 'not well supported by the Press' in Ireland. According to Heytesbury,

'The general hostility of the Press cannot be denied. With the exception of the Evening Packet we have not a newspaper with us, & even there the Editor is so little trustworthy, & so much afraid of his colleague of the Evening Mail, that his milk-and-water assistance is of very little service to our cause.'

And the Packet 'has not a very extensive sale.' A subscription was raised 'by certain parties friendly to the present Government for the purpose of starting a newspaper to be conducted upon moderate Conservative principles.' Heytesbury hoped to find in it 'a powerful auxiliary', but the newspaper which was apparently the result of these efforts, the Dublin Times, lasted only a few months.<sup>121</sup>



Early in November, George Hamilton, in a public speech, attributed the 'apathy and neglect' of Dublin Conservatives regarding registration to the fact that 'many were disappointed and dissatisfied with the conduct of government in some respects.' Gregory complained to Bonham that the Government had failed to distribute sufficient patronage in his Dublin constituency. Heytesbury and the British Tory Lord Redesdale noted that there was not 'quite the right sort of feeling' among Irish Tories; they were 'not in the best of humour ...' During this period the Mail continued to deprecate the Government's 'yieldings and concessions' to the Catholics and their failure to do 'justice' to their supporters. Peel had 'identified himself with the Whig party by the adoption of Whig measures.' The result was 'apathy, discontent, and jealousy' among Irish Conservatives. The favourable reception accorded to the new Bequests Board in December by the Mail, 'which for the last four months has been in open hostility to the Government', heralded a period in which the Government were less harshly treated in the Mail. But they continued to pass the occasional critical comment, for example attributing the disturbances in some counties to 'the misgovernment of Sir Robert Peel and the truckling and timid policy of Sir James Graham.'

The new year brought other indications that many Protestants were unhappy with the Government's performance. Early in January, George Hamilton refused to seek a favour from the Government for a friend of Emerson Tennent:

'Unhappily such is now the state of things and opinions in this country, that a Conservative Member not officially connected with Government must hold himself quite independent and be prepared to act independently of Government if occasion should require it.. Perhaps it may be of use to you to know this from me, for I am not an Ultra with prejudices against a moderate policy. Neither am I a disappointed office-seeker or an expectant.'

According to Pigot the Irish Tories were 'incensed against Sir Robert Peel to a degree beyond all former example.' Peel retained a friend, however, in Galway's James Daly, who wrote that the Mail was a paper of 'whose principles & practices I highly disapprove.'

interesting result of the ministerial shuffle at this time was the appointment of Roden's son, Jocelyn, as a Secretary of the Board of Control. The appointment was seen by Graham and Heytesbury as a blow to the opposition to Maynooth; Jocelyn 'made no difficulties about  
<sup>130</sup>Maynooth, Education, or Irish Policy.' But Roden was said to be  
<sup>131</sup>'exceedingly displeased at his son's acceptance of office.'

In opening the Parliamentary session of 1845, the Queen said that, 'The Political Agitation and Excitement' in Ireland 'appear to have gradually abated', and this was clearly the prevalent view of the day, though Pigot thought that 'the Repeal feeling continues as strong as  
<sup>132</sup>ever, though not as noisy.' The Government were determined to press on with their conciliatory programme, with Peel, speaking on the Address, re-affirming his pledge with regard to higher education and announcing their intention 'to propose a liberal increase of the vote for the college of Maynooth.' Shaw, the only Irish Tory speaker, withheld comment on  
<sup>133</sup>these measures. In Ireland the Mail stated that Peel 'has avowed his policy to be one of unlimited, unconditional, and complete concession',  
<sup>134</sup>and in particular deprecated his intentions towards Maynooth. According to Heytesbury, 'Our querulous friends, the Orangemen, & the Evening Mail, are very angry, but less violent in the expression of their anger than I  
<sup>135</sup>thought would have been the case.'

The Government's financial policy took precedence over the Irish measures in the ensuing weeks. In Ireland agrarian outrage remained a major worry. At the end of January 21 Tipperary magistrates pressed the Government to ask for 'larger powers' to quell outrage. 'Any explanation', noted Heytesbury, 'of the nature of such powers is carefully avoided.' Other magistrates, including such notable Conservatives as Farnham and Ely, called loudly for 'new & more stringent laws'. According to Devon many felt 'neglected by the Government' and wished for a revival of the insurrection act. Some called for proclamations under the Constabulary Act in order to charge disturbed districts with the expense



of extra policing. However, it was felt that a coercive measure might not pass the Commons. Furthermore, Graham and Peel felt no great sympathy with the gentry, whose lack of 'firmness & moral courage' and attention to magisterial duties they blamed for much of the problem; and Graham believed that they would persecute their tenantry under the security of any coercion act, which would be unable anyway to remove  
136  
'the deep-seated disease' which lay behind the outrages.

On the 'non-Irish' questions which dominated the early part of the session - the income tax, the sugar duties, window duties, the corn laws and the opening of letters at the Post Office - the Irish Tory members acted almost invariably in unison with the Government. In one of the debates on the income tax, Viscount Bernard said that 'peace, tranquillity, and happiness had been restored' to Ireland by 'the steady  
137  
course and firmness of Her Majesty's Government.' The Mail were greatly dissatisfied with the agricultural policy of the Government and continued to deprecate Peel's 'deflection from the principles which put him into office'. And they rejoiced in the opposition to Maynooth which  
138  
was building rapidly in England.

Peel introduced the Maynooth bill on the 3rd of April, asserting Parliament's commitment to the principle of endowment of that college, describing the insufficiency of the existing grant to create other than 'disgust and discontent at our parsimony', and proposing therefore to increase the grant from £9,000 a year to more than £26,000. The visitorial system would be made more efficient, but no 'ungracious interference' in religious matters would be attempted. The result, he claimed, would be the institution of a priesthood 'better instructed and inspired with more kindly and friendly feelings towards the State.' On a subsequent occasion he stated his belief that 'a spirit of kindness, forbearance and generosity', as shown in the Maynooth bill, was necessary in order to break up the 'formidable confederacy' in Ireland  
139  
against the Union.

Even with such objects the Maynooth bill proved unacceptable to most of the Irish Tory members. They had joined only half-heartedly in the resistance in earlier years to the grant. From 1833 the number of Irish Tories who voted against it ranged between 3 in 1836-7 and 1839, and 12 in 1844. In 1836 Shaw deprecated the system of education at Maynooth but was unwilling to vote against a grant which successive governments had sanctioned and upon which many were dependent for support. After Peel's accession to power a number of Irish Tories, mostly office-holders, voted for the grant. In the Lords, Wicklow said that it was the 'height of absurdity' to demand its withdrawal and supported a call for an increase of the grant. But the Irish opposition to Maynooth actually increased from 1841; the number of Irish Tories voting against the grant was substantially higher, suspicions that Eliot wished to increase the grant stirred up Tory feelings, the issue figured prominently in the University election controversy of 1842, and the Reverend Robert Mc Ghee launched his own campaign to publicize the evil of the doctrines taught at Maynooth.<sup>140</sup>

The Irish Tory members who opposed the Maynooth bill in 1845 spoke at length about the endowment of 'error', encouragement of agitation, the tendency of making the grant permanent instead of subject to annual vote to remove Parliament's 'control' over the college and elevate the latter to the status of 'a State institution', and the likelihood that payment of the priesthood would follow. They seemed to favour a complete withdrawal of the grant. But possibly of more interest than their specific objections to the Maynooth bill, the Irish Tories frequently passed comment on the general policy of the Government in Ireland and on the state of mind of Irish Protestants. Gregory, Verner, Bernard, Taylor, George Hamilton, Major Beresford and Shaw spoke at length of the way in which Irish Protestants felt 'deserted, abandoned, and betrayed by those to whom they were led to believe they might look for countenance and protection.' Most of these members made it clear that



they shared the feelings of their constituents. Gregory's discontent was provoked by the Dissenters' Chapels and Bequests Acts as well as the Maynooth bill. Verner complained of the extension of Crown patronage to enemies of Protestantism and the Union and spoke of Protestant dissatisfaction with 'the indulgence' shown towards agitators and the 'severity' with which Protestant demonstrations were 'prohibited and suppressed.'

In a remarkable speech, Shaw complained that, particularly in 'the last few years', Ireland had been treated 'more as a Colonial dependency than as an integral portion of the United Kingdom - too long had one party in that country been played against the other, had "Divide et impera" been the Anglo-Irish motto - and though theretofore it had been the party of the Government against their opponents, he could not see that in principle the matter was much mended by the present Government playing the party of their opponents against their own.' While the Irish parties fought, the 'national character had been injured', they shared 'unpolitical' interests neglected and 'sacrificed to considerations of imperial policy', the 'highest offices filled by strangers.' And the 'so-called Irish Government' in Dublin had become a 'mockery', a 'registration court for the behests of the Home Office.'

If the Irish, he went on, were 'to lose the pride of their nationality and not gain the advantage of identification with British interests', if while 'the masses' struggled for Repeal the Protestants were made to fear for their Church, let Parliament and Government 'beware lest they should find the Irish nation for the first time united, but united in a spirit of general discontent.' On the third reading, Shaw said that in his earlier remarks he had spoken not as a partisan but as an Irishman, and accordingly rejected Graham's suggestion that he wished to maintain a Protestant ascendancy. But he referred nevertheless scathingly to the 'considerations of a spurious liberality' which dictated appointments in Ireland. And he spoke of the fears and hopes,

'both possibly exaggerated', generated by Graham's description of the Maynooth measure as the beginning of a new policy towards Ireland and retraction of his declaration of 1843 that concession had reached its utmost limits. Looking backwards, he said he had never considered the policy towards 'the monster meetings at first, or the State prosecutions after, a judicious one.'<sup>141</sup>

A few Irish Tories spoke out in defence of the bill. Castlereagh, Jocelyn and Claud Hamilton welcomed it as an attempt to replace a 'parsimonious' and 'inadequate' provision which had never won Catholic gratitude with one which would 'soften the feelings of six or seven millions of Irish Roman Catholics.' Castlereagh and Hamilton, themselves former opponents of the grant, almost ridiculed the fears of those who agitated against the granting of 'a few pounds' for the education of Catholic priests. And they approved of the general tendency in Government policy towards conciliation. However, 29 of the Irish Tory M.P.'s opposed the bill, according to the divisions on the principle of the measure. Only 8 Irish Tory members supported the measure, namely the office-holders Corry, Tennent, Young and Damer, and Castlereagh, Claud Hamilton, Coote and Irving, the latter an Englishman. Jocelyn and fellow Irish Tory 'exiles' Viscount Adare and George Smythe also supported the bill.<sup>142</sup> With almost half of the British and most of the Irish Conservatives in revolt, the Government were supported by only a minority of their friends and the measure passed the third reading on the strength of Opposition votes. A majority of independent Conservatives<sup>143</sup> voted against both second and third readings.

The Conservatives of the Upper House gave the measure an easier passage. Even among the Irish Tory peers almost half of those voting in the second reading supported the bill. Roden, Clancarty, Charleville, Manchester and the Bishop of Cashel figured prominently in the assault of the Ultras, while Rosse and Wicklow warmly defended the measure. Roden and his friends objected to the bill's endowment of the 'erroneous



doctrines' inculcated at Maynooth. But Roden also, leaving this narrow ground, claimed that while vigorous action had put down the Repeal agitation in 1843 the impression that the present bill was 'a measure extorted by fear' had encouraged a revival of agitation. And Irish Protestants, he said, felt they had been 'betrayed' by the Government, that their hopes had been 'miserably deceived.' They were 'disgusted at the policy of the Government.'

Clancarty made a general attack on 'inconsistency and tergiversation' in the government of Ireland and lamented 'the practice of successive Governments' of courting the support of the priesthood by 'weak and unavailing concessions.' He cited the Government's education policy, their payment of poor law chaplains according to the principle that 'numbers, not truth' should decide preference between religions, their Bequests Act, and the Maynooth bill as examples of this system of 'misgovernment.' He also criticized Ministers for the 'state of mute astonishment' with which they had encountered the dangers of 1843, and depicted the successful proclamation of Clontarf as having demonstrated 'that one timely act of vigour might have prevented these meetings from taking place at all.' The Government had administered well the general affairs of the Empire, 'but no such ability or foresight can be said to have characterized their administration of affairs in Ireland.'<sup>144</sup>

In Ireland the Mail took the most ultra of positions regarding the Government's 'present course of establishing the Romish religion in Ireland.' Their attitude to the Prime Minister and his Government became one of unprecedented and sustained hostility. Peel was called a 'hypocrite', 'the arch-traitor', 'the impostor', and he was assailed for his 'ingenious fraud and unparalleled treachery'. It was with relish that the Mail looked to the 'future but not distant day' when Peel's 'tyrant majority' would 'dwindle and fall from his hands or take courage and revolt against his orders.' The 'Irish party' project of 1843 was briefly revived, in reaction to 'the disregard of Irish

Protestant interests entertained by a Conservative (!) Ministry and a Protestant (!) Parliament'. The Tory members who supported the Maynooth bill, including the Irish, were threatened with vengeance at the polls, while the Irish Tories who opposed it were congratulated upon their having rendered 'due service to the constitution.'<sup>145</sup> A 'numerous and most influential body' of electors of the University<sup>146</sup> petitioned against the bill. Thousands of Protestants heard the bill denounced when they met in Belfast and Dublin in June under the auspices<sup>147</sup> of the Irish branch of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee. 2,000 of the Protestant Operatives of Dublin petitioned Parliament against State endowment of 'idolatrous' Maynooth and prayed for the impeachment of Peel for 'high crimes and misdemeanours against the laws and the condition of the realm', and 600 people in Tyrone signed an anti-Maynooth<sup>148</sup> petition in which Peel was described as 'the enemy of Protestantism.'

The education issue, brought before Parliament again by Irish Conservatives and further publicized by release of the correspondence between Peel and Beresford, added fuel to the situation, and the Mail<sup>149</sup> opposed the colleges bill. In May the Earl of Erne was urged by Wicklow, Donoughmore and Clancarty to stand for the representative peerage even if the Government decided to support Lord Belmore. Donoughmore and Clancarty felt that the Government's Maynooth and education policies made an arrangement impossible, and Wicklow and Donoughmore believed that Erne's opposition to these policies would ensure him a majority in the Irish peerage. Donoughmore assured Erne, 'Circumstances are greatly in your favour. The old argument of having been in Parliament and giving support to Sir Robert Peel will tell rather against' Belmore. And 'many will vote for you now for the express purpose of annoying' Peel. Heytesbury was aware that the education and Maynooth questions had caused 'such disorder in our ranks that the weight of the Government recommendation will not be what it used to be'. Erne decided 'to fight the good fight', and, with a majority of peers pledged to Erne, 'the Belmorites were



obliged to 'give way' when the Irish peers met at Wellington's house to  
 150  
 decide on their course.

Primate Beresford was privately hostile to the Maynooth bill. But he refused to take part in the getting up of petitions against the bill:

'Approving as I do generally of the political principles of Sir R. Peel's administration and conceding that if he were removed from power no Cabinet actuated by higher or better principles could under present circumstances be formed .., I have thought that it was not becoming my station to lend my assistance to a movement that might have the effect of removing the present Ministers ...' 151

Charles Fox apparently had the same sense of priorities when he wrote to Lord Erna that the late Lord Farnham had 'often told me he was one of those who turned out the Duke, and would never do such a thing  
 152  
 again.' There were indications, indeed, for all the vapourings of the Irish Tory members, that opposition to the Maynooth bill was not as strong among Irish Protestants as it was in England. Not only was this  
 153  
 claimed in Parliament by the bill's supporters, but Heytesbury, Peel and others remarked privately on 'the contrast between Protestant feeling in the two countries.' The Irish Tory Lord Clare, who considered the bill a 'wise measure', remarked on the dearth of anti-Maynooth petitions from  
 154  
 Ireland. Irish Tory opponents of the bill had to agree that the number  
 155  
 of petitions from Ireland was relatively small. With the arguable exception of Somerset Maxwell, formerly a member for Cavan, no prominent figure took part in the so-called 'great' anti-Maynooth meetings in  
 156  
 Belfast and Dublin.

It is possible that, while a great deal of the agitation in England was the work of voluntaryist Dissenters, the great mass of Irish Protestants, concentrated as they were in the Presbyterian and Established Churches, were embarrassed by their own receipt of the regium donum and the rent-charge; one independent Irish Protestant sect charged the northern Presbyterians with 'culpable apathy .. tongue-tied because your own clergy receive the Regium Donum.' Montgomery felt

that the Presbyterians had been silenced by the cry of "shame" on  
 157  
 them as 'Pensioners' themselves.

Peel made much of the petition in favour of the bill from a  
 number of Protestant proprietors in Galway; one of them was James Daly,  
 formerly a Conservative member, and there was perhaps a connection  
 between this and his elevation in June to the Irish peerage. Similarly,  
 the contrast between Castlereagh's 'frank & uncompromising support' of  
 the bill and the hostility of Hillsborough in the Commons and, as the  
 new Marquess of Downshire, in the Lords influenced the decision to give  
 Castlereagh the Lieutenancy of Down after the death of the 3rd Marquess  
 158  
 of Downshire in April 1845. Emerson Tennent was another whose loyalty  
 was rewarded. Towards the end of April he complained to Stanley that  
 his position in Belfast was becoming 'daily more & more embarrassing ..  
 I am now embroiled not with my enemies but with my friends.' He asked  
 159  
 for a 'permanent' post outwith Parliament. He was duly made Secretary  
 of Ceylon, and given a knighthood.

The Irish Tory members joined with the Government to defeat the  
 assaults during the summer of 1845 upon the Corn Laws and the Irish  
 Church, and they acquiesced in the Colleges bill. But, in addition to  
 160  
 Maynooth, other issues saw the Government at odds with their Irish Tory  
 supporters. The original proposals under the Scottish Poor Law Bill,  
 discriminating against Irishmen resident in Scotland, provoked the  
 161  
 opposition of several Irish Tory members and were attacked in the Mail.  
 Some Irish Tory members voted against the Government on the Scottish  
 banking bill, and one of the men organizing the opposition to its sister  
 Irish bill was hopeful that they would do so again on the latter.  
 Conolly, Verner, Acton and Northland attended 'a meeting of members'  
 called to plan such opposition. In the event, the Irish Tory members  
 162  
 split on the issue in Parliament.

In May-July, Farnham, Erne, Glengall, Lorton and many others  
 implored the Government to take stronger measures against the agrarian



outrages in their counties. Farnham described the 'growing impression' among frightened Cavan Protestants that there existed 'but little sympathy towards them on the part of the Government.' Correspondence in the Mail supported this view. The Mail claimed that 'whole districts are in open and undisguised rebellion', asserted that the law was allowed 'to remain a dead letter by a feeble and a cowardly administration', and demanded reintroduction of the insurrection act. In the Commons on the 30th of June Hayes of Donegal enquired as to what action, within or without the existing law, the Government planned against 'the system of outrage, intimidation and murder .. which had been allowed to go on for a considerable time' in some counties. In mid-July the disturbed counties called simultaneously (and possibly in concert with one another) for coercive legislation. Graham and Heytesbury would not entertain any such drastic step as a coercion bill, but by the end of June Heytesbury especially felt the need to take vigorous action as outrage worsened and there emerged a danger of Protestant retaliation. He proclaimed all of Cavan and parts of Leitrim under the Constabulary Act, principally because refusal 'would be construed into a fresh proof of the indifference of the Government to the fearful state of the country.' The Mail were by no means satisfied; but the situation improved markedly in July 1845,<sup>163</sup> with outrages diminishing and convictions obtained at the Assizes.

Irish Tories also expressed alarm at the revival of the monster Repeal meetings in the summer of 1845. In Parliament, Verner, Charleville and Westmeath pressed the Government to interfere to stop<sup>164</sup> the meetings. The Mail accused the Government of 'culpable neglect' in the face of this new threat, inducing Heytesbury to remark angrily that the Mail was 'doing every thing to encourage' the Repealers 'by constant insinuations that the Government is determined not to interfere: ... blowing the flame as much as it can in the hope of encreasing the<sup>165</sup> embarrassments of the Government.' Wellington apparently regretted that 'the Irish Government should again allow the Monster meetings to

assemble with impunity', and Graham was 'disappointed and grieved' at the revival of the meetings; 'this practical demonstration of the inefficacy of our conciliatory policy is most disheartening and inopportune.' But O'Connell probably embarked on the meetings with reluctance, his nerve affected by the suppression of 1843; they were of doubtful success and were discontinued later in the summer. <sup>166</sup>

The Compensation of Tenants Bill of June 1845 provoked the hostility of both Irish Tories and liberals. Londonderry was convinced of the virtues of the tenant right system that operated on his Irish estates, by which incoming tenants paid the incumbents for their interest in the holding, and he rejected the bill as liable to undermine that system. Essentially, however, Londonderry, Roden, Rosse, the Evening Mail and the many Irish Tory peers who signed either the remonstrance or the Protest against the bill held the same fundamental objection as their Irish Whig allies, viz. that the possibility of compulsion of the landlord was 'destructive to the rights of property'. Only Lord Wicklow of the Irish Tories supported the measure in the Lords, happy that it did not emulate Crawford's bill of 1843 in applying the compulsory <sup>167</sup> principle without even inquiry by an independent agent.

Towards the end of the session, Graham looked back on the 'long and arduous struggle' of the previous few months and congratulated himself on the Government's having laid 'the foundation of a sounder <sup>168</sup> policy' towards Ireland. However, this policy was evidently not to the liking of Irish Protestants. Lord Lorton, visiting Graham, 'opened a fierce attack on our policy .. and almost told me that if Protestant Ascendancy could be re-established by Repeal he would be a Repealer.' <sup>169</sup> Chief Secretary Fremantle was told on going over to Ireland 'that the party was dispirited, that Mr Mc Kenna's appointment as Ch. Clerk in my office had given great offence & that none of the Conservatives <sup>170</sup> would come up to register.' When leading Dublin Conservatives met in August to arrange their efforts at the registry they passed a resolution



171

expressive of their 'disapprobation' of Government policy.

The Mc Kenna appointment took place when Lucas resigned and was replaced as Under Secretary by the Chief Clerk, Richard Pennefather. Peel and Graham actually proposed to replace Lucas with a Catholic, but they were persuaded by Heytesbury that this would be too radical a step, that a Catholic Chief Clerk would be a sufficient 'concession to the Catholic party' and would 'avoid that angry rupture with the Protestant party which would be the inevitable consequence' of the appointment of

172

a Catholic Under Secretary. However Lucas informed Heytesbury that if the Government chose a Catholic Chief Clerk it "would separate us entirely from the Protestant Party & cut the ground from beneath our feet. All confidence in the Government would disappear." The Lord Lieutenant commented,

'I was not unprepared for such language, which will be repeated, no doubt, in many quarters where we shall be sorry to hear it... The question we have to decide in reference to Mr Lucas' observation is a mere party question. Are we strong enough to risk the possibility of being abandoned by the great body of the Protestants? If that possibility do not affright us (& I know not why it should, for they are not with us even now) there is nothing else to deter us from the proposed measure, which may be considered as a necessary consequence of that policy you have never been backward to proclaim.' 173

The Mail was duly outraged by the Mc Kenna appointment, dwelling on the radical politics of the new Chief Clerk and accusing Heytesbury of being a Repealer. They too, like Fremantle, attributed Tory failures at the registries to the appointment, and for the first time actually encouraged Protestants to stay away to punish the Government for their

174

'ungrateful and treacherous course of policy.'

The policy of the Government also came under challenge with the reconstitution of the Orange Order. In May the Government had to decide upon renewal of the Processions Act, due to expire on the 1st of June. Many, including Lucas, expected Orange processions to take place on the July anniversaries and that they would be 'the more numerous attended from the ill-feeling amongst the Orangemen to which some of the late measures have given rise.' On the other hand, simple renewal would be



'unjust to the Protestants', while its extension to cover the Repealers 'would no doubt be met with very fierce opposition.' So the Act was allowed 'quietly to expire'.<sup>175</sup> A succession of Irish Tory leaders, including Roden, Farnham, Enniskillen and Verner, publicly advised the Orangemen not to march in July. The Mail originally adopted an equivocal position, but on the 25th of June they advised against marching, not least because when only the Repealers agitated the 'cowardly' Government were shown to be 'in the wrong'. Peel would gladly suppress Orange processions if given a reason, 'and, by a useless display when you can do no good, you will deprive yourselves of all power when you might feel it most important to make a move'. Heytesbury thought it 'difficult to imagine anything more mischievous' than this article.<sup>176</sup>

The Orangemen of Cavan and Tyrone met and resolved 'to abstain from all public processions.' But they also made strong attacks on the conciliatory course of Government policy. The Lisburn Orangemen resolved that 'at the present time, when unprincipled expediency has gained an ascendancy in the councils of the nation, and when our best interests as Protestants are in danger, we deem it essential to take immediate steps to reorganise the Orange institution in this country', and they decided to march on the 12th of July. Londonderry wrote to the chairman of this meeting, James Watson, to deprecate their proceeding and throw his weight against it.<sup>177</sup> In spite, however, of the efforts of the great Tory leaders, the Orangemen apparently marched in substantial numbers in several parts of Ulster. The Mail declared that 'Orangeism is revived in all its power, integrity and might ... ere long it will present an armed and a banded confederacy... Sir Robert Peel's Policy has Revived the Orange System', his 'perfidy and misconduct' were the sole cause. They welcomed the prospect of an Orange march in Enniskillen on the 12th of August. Orangemen 'must make themselves feared in order to be respected by the present Government.' Such advice, they boasted, had 'stricken terror into the hearts of the basest, most unprincipled, and



treacherous ministers that ever held the reins of Government in England'. The Lord Lieutenant, disgusted by the Mail's language, felt that in Ireland 'patriotism is out of the question. Under the influence of passion, Orangemen & Repealers, when thwarted in their object, have recourse to precisely the same expedients.'

178

In a remarkable passage at the end of July the Mail called on Irish Protestants to 'combine and confederate' in one 'party' and opined that,

'However improbable, it is not impossible that better terms might be made with the Repealers than the Government seem disposed to give. A hundred thousand Orangemen, with their colours flying, might yet meet a hundred thousand Repealers on the banks of the Boyne, and .. sign the Magna Charta of Ireland's independence.'

And the Mail continued into August to encourage the Orangemen to 'agitate'. The Government proceeded to strike a blow against the Orangemen by removing James Watson from the magistracy for his having presided at the meeting of the Lisburn Orangemen which resolved to reconstitute the Orange Society. Heytesbury feared that 'in the present excited state of the Orange Party' the dismissal would cause a flood of magisterial resignations. But it was felt that 'impartial justice' required such a step after the Government's conduct regarding the Repeal magistrates. The Mail called the dismissal an 'insult' to Irish Protestants and an act of 'tyranny'. In Parliament, Verner gave notice of a motion on the subject for the beginning of the next session.

179

180

181

Heytesbury wrote to Lord Erne 'to engage him to do every thing in his power to prevent the meeting at Enniskillen.' He replied to the effect that he and 'the other leading Conservatives' were doing all they could to prevent it, but that 'those who were at one time the leaders' of the Orangemen now had 'little influence' over them. In the event, according to Heytesbury and Fremantle, the meeting 'fell very far short in point of numbers of those who were expected to attend'. Lord George Loftus was the only 'titled personage' there, and the choice of him as chairman had 'thrown ridicule and disgrace upon the whole transaction.'

182

183



John Young wrote to Peel, 'How shabbily the great people of Fermanagh shewed out. Lord Erne staid away, averse to the meeting & its objects, but he sent his band to play. Lord Enniskillen was absent, but his wife was on the platform ...' Peel agreed that Erne and Enniskillen were 'shabby fellows' for 'giving all the countenance they can to the proceedings of their inferiors, unaccompanied by any risk to themselves.' But Erne, <sup>184</sup>denied having sent his band and Heytesbury felt that he had been <sup>185</sup>'perfectly honourable & straight-forward' and had done 'every thing in his power to prevent the meeting.' <sup>186</sup>

The Mail claimed that 12-15,000 people attended the meeting. There was much Orange display, and it was resolved 'to reorganize the system of Orangeism.' The need to combine against those who committed agrarian outrages was the principal reason given for this step. In addition, there was much criticism of the 'Popish Ministers'. One resolution regretted 'the absence of many of the aristocracy.' An Irish Tory peer, Lord Lifford, pointing to some of the strong language used at the meeting, felt that there was 'some danger in the principal gentlemen withdrawing from that body, as in consequence they lose their influence with them, which hitherto has been very beneficial, & a democratic character is given to the body.' He wished that Orange demonstrations would take a less sectarian form, and thought that 'if the gentry were permitted to countenance them without loss of office they would effect this object.' However, the Government, with Graham especially insistent, proceeded to remove Edward Archdall, father of the County member, from the magistracy because of his attendance at Enniskillen. <sup>187</sup> <sup>188</sup> <sup>189</sup>

Several Northern magistrates, and the English Ultra Earl of Winchilsea, resigned their commissions in protest against the Watson dismissal. A meeting was arranged in Lisburn for the 20th of August to support Watson. The moderate Earl of Clanwilliam, though pressed by Downshire, refused to attend because he 'disapproved of W.'s conduct and because I foresaw it would be an Orange demonstration.' But the Mail <sup>190</sup> <sup>191</sup>



gave every encouragement and afterwards hailed the meeting as an assertion of 'the ancient spirit of Protestantism.' 50,000 attended, it was claimed, including Lords Downshire and Annesley and Colonel Verner. Downshire, who took the Chair, denounced the Government's 'unjust' and 'tyrannical' proceeding against Watson. Verner and others followed suit, and appropriate resolutions were adopted. The 'contempt and disregard' shown to Irish Protestants in Government policy in general was also subject of bitter complaint, and it was resolved 'that the Protestants of Ireland are deeply indebted to the Dublin Evening Mail and the Protestant Press of Ireland for their .. advocacy of their

192  
rights and privileges.' Graham felt that, 'The resolutions and the speeches, tho' violent, are harmless from their absurdity', and though he was worried about the implications for the attending magistrates of the fact that there were Orange processions to the meeting, with some men in arms, it was eventually decided to take no action against any of

193  
the participants. Early in September Roden led a smaller meeting of Belfast Protestants in attacking the Watson dismissal; Graham thought Roden's words and conduct 'foolish in the extreme. He endeavours to excite others to the utmost and to keep within the limits of safety

194  
himself.'

On the 27th of August Lord Enniskillen, the Irish Tory members Verner and Brooke, Somerset Maxwell and other 'influential gentlemen from several counties of Ulster' met privately in Enniskillen and resolved to establish a new Orange institution. They appointed a Committee to consider the form and name to be given to this body in order to evade the laws which made 'the Orange Institution, as originally constructed, illegal.' Its first decision was that their society should retain 'the ancient appellation of Orange.' The absent member for Fermanagh, Captain Archdall, fully concurred in the resolutions of the meeting; Brooke, his colleague, apparently annoyed some of those present by deprecating the 'unadvised and injudicious'

public display which occurred in Enniskillen on the 12th of August. Lord Ely, calling on Fremantle, claimed that in 'the excited state of the Orangemen in the North' it was necessary to form such a society 'to prevent the Orangemen from falling into the hands of the Repealers or other disaffected persons.' Enniskillen informed Heytesbury that,

'without some compact amongst Protestants .. that will admit of the lower orders being brought into closer connection with those who are their natural and legitimate guides, a dangerous & factious spirit of discontent will be engendered amongst them by the ill-disposed and .. the amenity to the laws that has hitherto distinguished them will be endangered.'

However, the Government, internally and in a letter from Heytesbury to Enniskillen, deprecated the movement as one 'tending manifestly to the fostering of religious dissensions & political animosity amongst Her Majesty's subjects.' It was 'an Orange Club in disguise, and the muck does not hide the face.' They were not without hope that the movement would divide and the society be disbanded, as 'the lower class of Orangemen' were said to resent the proposed 'modification' of Orangeism. Graham was anxious to 'exercise forbearance' and avoid driving the Protestants 'to despair'. But he remained determined to 'persevere in a course of kindness and of strict justice to the R. Catholics.' After some equivocation the Mail indicated its approval of the new movement as an appropriate response to Government  
195  
policy.

The Government's fears were greatly increased when Orangemen decided to hold a counter demonstration in opposition to a Teetotal meeting in Killeshandra, Co. Cavan, early in September. The serious risk of collision was eventually avoided when both Orangemen and Catholics agreed to cancel their meetings. This outcome apparently owed much to the efforts of Lord Farnham, and the Government were duly thankful for his 'zeal & activity'. They approved, too, of his refusal to attend a meeting in Belfast called by Roden for the 19th of September, Graham regretting only that Farnham had not replied to Roden in language as 'manly and direct' as that which he used in a letter to Fremantle.



Farnham was subsequently rewarded with the Ribbon of St. Patrick.

Enniskillen, O'Neill, Downshire, Mountcashell, Verner and Somerset

Maxwell were among those who called on Roden on the 19th. This meeting

was private and no formal account of its proceedings was issued. But

Heytesbury was informed that it broke up 'without that general

declaration of principles which was expected' or 'coming to any decision

with respect to the formation of a new Orange Association.' He heard that,

'my letter to Lord Enniskillen has induced some of the leaders of the Orange Party to pause in the course they are pursuing... With this difference of opinion amongst them, this party will not hold together long... Many circumstances lead me to believe that moderate counsels begin to prevail, particularly amongst the leaders. The lower ranks of Orangemen are as wild & impracticable as ever, & think of nothing but the Sword & Protestant ascendancy.'

Emerson Tennent, writing to Peel to express his approval of the Government's policy in Ireland, claimed 'that in the Protestant part of

Ireland the gentry have studiously guarded themselves from being

identified with the angry and unjust reclamations of the violent &

unreasonable section ...' Nevertheless, in Londonderry 'the Grand

Lodge of Ulster .. announced its intention of adhering to old forms &

old principles' and took 'every opportunity of declaiming against the

lukewarmness of their quondam leaders.' On the 10th of October

Enniskillen chaired a meeting of 80 men in Enniskillen town-hall to hear

their Committee report that, according to legal counsel, 'the Orange Society

may be organized consistently with law, retaining its former name, and

acting by affiliated branches', and that it was 'the constitutional

privilege of every magistrate to advise and encourage the proposed

organization.' The meeting agreed 'that immediate steps should be taken

to reorganize the Grand Lodge of Ireland.' Several speakers evinced a

desire to effect 'a union with the Grand Lodge of Ulster.' The Mail

welcomed the new body as evidence that the Irish Protestants had learnt

that they too must agitate.

On the 12th of October Palmerston wrote that, 'The Orangemen

complain that the Government has abandoned them, & are exceedingly wrath.'



He saw their re-organization as a useful check on the Repealers. In Belfast on the 17th Roden chaired the 'adjourned' meeting of leading northern Tories. Roden, Erns, Somerset Maxwell and 'Noblemen and Gentlemen from the several counties of the province of Ulster .. unanimously agreed' to an 'Address to the Protestants of the British Empire.' It spoke of the 'great danger and trial' facing Irish Protestants.' In particular it was lamented that the Government's policy did not show 'any signs of affection to the Protestant cause or any symptoms of resistance or discouragement to the march of the Church of Rome.' Given his conduct with regard to the Maynooth and education issues it was clear that 'the policy of the Minister is to attempt to govern Ireland by means of the Roman Catholic party, and to secure their influence and cooperation by continual concessions.' The dismissal of Watson and Archdall was denounced as 'an act both arbitrary and harsh.' But Irish Protestants were urged to avoid infringing 'the spirit of the laws and constitution' by the use of illegal oaths or signs and their attention was directed instead to the need for efforts at the registries. Downshire indicated his concurrence in the Address by letter to Roden, subsequently published; he also appeared to fear that there was insufficient 'caution and discretion' among 'our brethern of the lower  
201  
classes.'

The Mail rejoiced that the Address demonstrated that Protestants were 'offended and disgusted with the policy of Sir Robert Peel.' The Orangemen of the Grand Lodge of Ulster concurred in its denunciation of the Government, but continued to urge Orange reorganization. Roden subsequently wrote that the Address had 'called down the abuse of our violent friends', who apparently considered it 'a poor milk & water production ... It has however drawn together a moderate party of  
202  
Protestants who highly approve of it.' Graham and Heytesbury, though annoyed, remarked on the cautious, 'almost unintelligible' language of the Address, and Peel wondered if it was 'tantamount to an abjuration of



the Orange Society ... Lord Enniskillen's proceedings seem of a different character. They appear to contemplate reorganization in some form or other of the Orange Association.<sup>203</sup>

Roden, in fact, was greatly annoyed with Enniskillen and the Fermanagh people for having proceeded to form 'their Orange Society'. He had wished to secure Sergeant Warren's opinion as to its legality and to ascertain the 'feelings & wishes of the Down Orangemen on the subject of the Gentlemen joining in a Grand Lodge & whether they would be subservient to our opinions as to what ought to be done in rendering the Society perfectly conformable to the letter as also the spirit of the law.' He met with Verner, Somerset Maxwell and others on the 30th of October and they agreed that they could not 'at present join Lord Enniskillen's movement in Fermanagh' because Warren felt their proposed test of admittance 'would be contrary to the spirit of the law.' They intended to state this at their next meeting, in Armagh on the 7th of November. As for the Down Orangemen, they had indicated to Roden their unwillingness to dilute their Orange practices or to accept the leadership of the gentry on any other terms. Roden refused to comply with their conditions and announced to Downshire that,

'We therefore intend proposing at Armagh that a Committee of Gentlemen should be appointed to settle on what Society ought to be formed to support our Protestant Principles, & to make ourselves as acceptable as we can to our Protestant Brethern in England, which the course intended to be pursued by our O. brethern never can do ... our great object should be to interest the English people in our Favour.'<sup>204</sup>

The meeting in Armagh, which was held in private, agreed that a 'Protestant Alliance should be formed to meet the increasing dangers by which our Protestant interests are threatened', and named a Committee which included Roden, Downshire, Erne, Manchester, Enniskillen, O'Neill, Maxwell and the M.P.'s Verner, Edwin Hill and Alexander. The Alliance<sup>205</sup> was formed by the end of November. But the Armagh meeting was 'any thing but unanimous.' Watson thought it 'most unsatisfactory ...

'... Had they said in the resolutions that the Protestant Alliance was in aid of - or in conjunction with - the Orange Institution, or even mentioned their approval of the Institution and the advantages derived therefrom, it would have had a different effect. As it is, the Orangemen think, tho' erroneously, that it is meant to supersede them.'<sup>206</sup>



The Mail, which approved of the new Alliance, rebutted 'the  
 207  
 artful and false reports' of 'a schism in the party.' When the  
 committee met under Roden in January 1846 they tried to remove any  
 differences by resolving that they had 'no intention of interfering  
 with other societies having similar objects, but would avail ourselves  
 of their assistance, and cultivate a friendly cooperation with them in  
 promoting our common purposes.' These purposes, outlined in a series  
 of resolutions, amounted to little more than a general declaration in  
 favour of the Protestant religion, and marked, in Heytesbury's view,  
 'their hatred of Catholicism, & their determination to resist any  
 further concessions to Rome.' They also issued an Address complaining  
 of 'lavish and unjustifiable concessions to the Church of Rome', as  
 evinced in the Government's policy with regard to education, Maynooth  
 and patronage. The committee by this time included Lords Mountcashell,  
 Rathdowne and Lorton and the M.P.'s Bruen and George Hamilton, as well  
 as the above-mentioned and other less notable figures. It was, then, a  
 208  
 body of no little importance in terms of the personnel involved.

In the meantime the Orange lodges continued to form and to unite  
 in County Grand Lodges, those of Fermanagh, Monaghan, Cavan and Dublin  
 adhering to the revised, legal rules. Near the end of October, at a  
 meeting to express sympathy with Watson and Archdall, Enniskillen  
 referred to his election as Grand Master of the Fermanagh Grand Lodge.  
 This incident caused much earnest debate within the Government.  
 Heytesbury was afraid that removal of Enniskillen from the magistracy  
 would cause a mass of resignations by northern magistrates, 'one half'  
 of whom, he believed, were 'more or less implicated in these new  
 societies.' Their feeling that they had been 'deceived and maltreated  
 by the Government' rendered such a course all the more likely. And  
 Roden was openly threatening to lead a secession of magistrates if  
 Enniskillen were removed. Graham was not a little annoyed at Heytesbury's  
 failure, in a letter to Enniskillen, to record his 'disapprobation of



subterfuges by which it is endeavoured to perpetuate the evils of the Orange system.' However, when the question arose of a second letter to Enniskillen, Graham, as reluctant as Heytesbury to avoid 'war' with the Orangemen, agreed with Peel's advice that the Lord Lieutenant should merely express his 'sincere regret' that Enniskillen had sanctioned the new society and reserve 'final judgement' on the latter until he had 'more accurate information' as to its rules and was enabled to decide whether its 'acts & proceedings' tended to excite 'religious discord.'

209

Heytesbury concurred.

In answer to Heytesbury's first letter Enniskillen gave a full justification of his course, contending that the new society was a perfectly legal response to the threat from Catholic agitation, that it promoted 'brotherly love and social order amongst all classes', and that if 'the Protestant Gentry of Ireland were to disunite themselves without just cause from the ties of Orange Brotherhood with the humbler classes they would forfeit the salutary influence they now possess' and allow 'political demagogues' to lead the Orangemen into 'some act of indiscretion that would tarnish the moderation with which they have

210

hitherto stated their fears and grievances ...' Enniskillen did not reply to Heytesbury's second letter. But Fremantle was informed that it induced Orangemen to 'boast that the Government was not bold enough to

211

attack so great a man & that they made a bridge for him to walk over.'

The Lord Lieutenant brooked the idea of a new Processions Act which would put down both Orange and Repeal processions and, he hoped, encourage moderate Orangemen to leave their societies. A draft of such a measure was prepared, but the Government were unable to overcome the 'great difficulty' of framing a bill which would not be either 'easily evaded or inconsistent with the free exercise of popular rights', and

212

the project came to nothing. No action was taken against Somerset Maxwell for presiding over the Cavan Orangemen when they decided in December to adhere to the legal form of Orangeism. They took the



opportunity to deprecate 'the unprincipled concessions made by our present and late rulers to Popery and mob clamour.' Graham advised a wait-and-see policy.<sup>213</sup> Thus the Orange revival continued unhindered by Government. It was a movement undertaken contrary to the expressed wishes of the Government and to a considerable degree represented a protest by Irish Conservatives against Government policy.

There were other manifestations of such discontent. Discussing the chances of a moderate, Government candidate in Dublin, Young informed Peel that 'nothing is to be hoped. Repealers or Ultra Orangemen are the only acceptable candidates there, so fierce are the animosities<sup>214</sup> and so extreme the division of parties.' At a public meeting on the 4th of November the Tory members for Dublin, Gregory and Grogan, were critical of Government policy towards Ireland, Grogan complaining that the Protestants had been 'spurned and neglected' and inviting his audience to find consolation in the revival of Orangeism.<sup>215</sup> Also at this time the Evening Packet, for long the Government's only support among the Dublin papers, briefly courted opposition because of the Government's refusal to grant the editor's request for a stipend of £320 per annum, Heytesbury feeling that 'neither the talent nor the circulation of the Packet is sufficient to warrant such an expenditure.'<sup>216</sup> Gregory approached Peel at the end of November and, though 'very friendly' himself, 'spoke with great alarm of the prevailing apathy of the constituent body' in Dublin.<sup>217</sup> Fremantle confirmed that 'no one' would come up to register. George Hamilton visited Heytesbury to discuss the views of the Irish Protestants, and followed this up with a long explanatory letter. He professed to be a friend of the Government, one who had sometimes supported them 'at some risk to my own popularity among my constituents', and one who feared that,

'there prevails among the Protestants generally great alarm as regards the state of this country & great dissatisfaction with, & distrust of, the policy & the intentions of the present Government... It is the opinion of the Protestants that the present Government, in their desire to conciliate the Roman Catholics ..., have deemed it necessary to assume an attitude of hostility towards the Protestants, or at least to indicate a disregard towards those who ought naturally to be considered as their political friends & supporters.'



They thought that the conciliation policy had merely encouraged and strengthened the Repealers, and that, in a futile effort to appease, the Government would eventually 'surrender to the Roman Catholics the Established Church'. Hamilton tried to 'excuse, rather than justify,' the revival of Orangeism by describing it as a 'purely defensive' response to 'the undisturbed existence of the Repeal Association'. He wished the Government to introduce legislation to put down all processions, meetings and associations and to make agitation for Repeal illegal. With regard to agrarian outrages, he said that Protestants felt Government weakness was the cause. He and 'the landed gentry of all persuasions' regretted 'that more vigorous measures were not adopted for their suppression', preferably the Insurrection Act. As for patronage, Protestants were happy to see Catholics receive public office so long as there was no better Protestant candidate and political efforts in the Conservative cause were not made a bar to advancement. Many Protestants were alarmed at the use by Graham and Peel of 'very cautious and guarded language' when defending the Church in Parliament. In conclusion, he warned that,

'if no change shall be made in their Irish policy, (the) Government in this country will soon be left without supporters, party & religious violence will increase, the repeal agitation will become more powerful, & the return of the Conservative party to power in 1841 will prove in its results the most disastrous event in the disastrous history of this ill fated land.'

Graham felt, unfairly in Heytesbury's opinion, that,

'The manifesto of Mr Hamilton can only be regarded as a declaration of war against the Government on the part of the High Protestants of Ireland. Their accusations are vague, their suggestions are indistinct, but their anger and hostility are by no means dissembled .. they burn for an opportunity of gratifying their resentment ... but the days of Protestant Ascendancy are gone, never more to return.' 218

Hamilton was not the only Irish Tory who complained of the agrarian outrages, which became very serious in the midland counties in November 1845. Roden's addresses in connection with the Protestant Alliance lamented the fact that Ireland had become 'a land of blood and crime'.<sup>219</sup> The Cavan Orangemen justified their reorganization as a response to this

state of affairs. Between November and January a succession of Irish Tories, notably Erne, Clare, Desart, Dunraven, Lorton and Crofton, privately urged the Government to adopt 'coercive measures'.

Donoughmore presented the Lord Lieutenant with a memorial from the magistrates of Tipperary urging 'some more stringent' legislation to suppress the 'frightful system' of assassination in their county. The magistrates were said to have been 'exceedingly dissatisfied' with the Government's bland assurances in reply, and proceeded, in fact, because of their 'uncertainty of the ultimate success of the application contained' in their memorial, to describe their plight in an 'Address to the British Public.'

The magistrates of Fermanagh, Roscommon, Limerick and Westmeath also addressed memorials to the Lord Lieutenant calling for coercive measures. The Westmeath memorial described the inadequacy of the existing law, deprecated the 'spurious liberality' which allowed the stringent enactments of the past to lapse, and regretted that the two great parties endeavoured 'to outbid each other' as to which clung 'with most tenacity to the resources of the common law, in defiance of common sense and the exigencies of a distracted country'. By their 'bidding for popular favour' they put 'the very existence of civilized society in Ireland up to political auction.' Graham and Fremantle thought this memorial 'indecently violent' and the Tipperary address 'no less embarrassing'. Heytesbury recognized that the 'country gentlemen' were 'in a great state of angry excitement', but also felt that the object of the complainants was 'to embarrass & discredit the Government.' The prevalence of crime was seen in the Mail as 'evidence of the complete and disastrous failure of the Peel policy in Ireland' and the direct result of the Government's 'feeble administration of the existing law.'

The Mail remained bitterly critical of the Government. Upon the appearance, towards the end of November, of Russell's famous Edinburgh



letter on the Corn laws, they declared that if Peel intended to join with Russell to betray the agricultural interest, 'such crooked policy would be quite in accordance with the character of that truly despicable man.' And if the letter was meant as a challenge to a toppling Government the outcome of the 'faction fight' was to them a matter of indifference, except insofar as it might allow a third party 'to depose both these enemies of the true greatness of England'. Peel's fall in December was accordingly greeted with 'unmixed satisfaction .. the wretched Peel is extinguished for ever... He attained power as a TRAITOR - he abandons it as a COWARD.' His subsequent return to power 221 was regarded as a 'ruinous' development. Heytesbury wrote of the so-called 'true Conservative Party' that,

'Nothing can exceed their fury ... I was in hopes (sic) that the probable advent of a Whig-radical administration, involving the destruction of the Irish Church, would have sobered down the animosity of the Orangemen, & made them more amenable to reason; but if we may judge of the feelings of the party by the language of "the Evening Mail", the late occurrences have only tended to whet their appetite for vengeance & to encrease their fury.' 222

In the new year the Mail continued to depict 'the traitor Peel' as 'the greatest curse ever inflicted upon his party, his country and his church', and the hostility of a large part of the Irish Tory leadership to Government policy was, as shown above, spelt out in the address of 223 the Protestant Alliance on the 9th of January. On the other hand Daly (now Lord Dunsandle) and Portarlington indicated their confidence in 224 the Government. Farnham also insisted on his 'friendly' disposition towards the Government, but he retracted his agreement to second the Address because he thought his 'appearing so prominently would impair his means of serving the Government... This he can only do by preserving his own reputation for independence.' All his 'friends' in London had assured him that by seconding the Address he would 'forfeit the confidence of every friend in Ireland and lose that influence among them' which he was 'most anxious to retain and to make available .. for the support of the Government ...' And he was apparently afraid of committing

himself to the Government's course on the corn question. Young acknowledged the logic of Farnham's decision, but Peel and Graham were very angry with Farnham for his 'shabby' conduct. 'The Evening Mail', reported Heytesbury, 'now lauds his patriotic conduct to the  
225  
skies.' Farnham's reasoning says much about the state of Irish Protestant opinion.

One of the most pressing questions facing Parliament was the prospect of famine in Ireland. This threat had produced differing responses from Irish Tories in their correspondence with the Government, with such as Jones of Derry, Young, Dunraven, Clare, Roden and Mountcashell underlining the seriousness of the crisis and demanding action by the Government, and Glengall, Jocelyn, Bernard, Shirley, Vesey, Gregory and others tending to play down the danger. The Irish Government found that landlords and tenants viewed the extent of the crisis according to their opposing interests with regard to the level  
226  
of rents. The Evening Mail initially expressed 'alarm', but also tried to calm fears; they approved of the Government's commission of enquiry and generally took what Fremantle considered 'a very sober view' of the question. It was almost the only issue on which the Mail and the Government expressly approved of each other's conduct. As time passed however, there was a growing tendency in the Mail to discuss the threat almost entirely as a device of the agitators and free-traders, declaring that 'there is not the slightest prospect even of scarcity ... the cry  
227  
of famine was raised for the purposes of faction.'

In Parliament in 1846 the Irish Tories contributed much less than their liberal colleagues towards alerting others to the extent of famine. The Government's advancement of the famine as a reason for repeal of the corn laws made Irish Tory members reluctant to speak of the extent of distress. Indeed it drove many opponents of the Corn bill to dismiss the crisis as, in Bentinck's words, 'a gross delusion'. The Irish Tory Protectionists - Shaw, Conolly, Brooke, Lefroy, Verner, Wicklow and the



Mail - were the most persistent and least excusable exponents of this  
<sup>228</sup>  
 line of argument. On the other hand, Roden and Mountoashell said  
 that reports of the famine had not been exaggerated. And, though  
 Conolly and Roden objected, the great majority of Irish Tories voted  
 for the provision in the Public Works bill which allowed Commissioners  
<sup>229</sup>  
 to tax Irish landlords to support relief works. Smith O'Brien's Tory  
 brother, Sir Lucius O'Brien, regretted that 'the Irish gentlemen in  
<sup>230</sup>  
 London' made 'light of the calamity.' The Anglo-Irish Stafford O'Brien,  
 a Protectionist, came over from Ireland with no misconceptions as to  
 the extent of distress, and admitted that his friends had 'in the heat  
 of party debate' given 'too favourable views of the state of Ireland',  
 thought he too deprecated Peel's mixing up of the famine and corn law  
<sup>231</sup>  
 questions. O'Brien and a significant number of Irish Tories were  
 involved in efforts in May-June 1846 to induce the Government to do more  
 to help the destitute, though they were adamantly opposed to the  
<sup>232</sup>  
 provision of outdoor relief.

Peel's declaration at the end of January 1846 for repeal of the  
 Corn laws outraged the Mail and was attacked even in the Packet, both  
<sup>233</sup>  
 papers denouncing Peel for his 'treachery' and 'political infatuation'.  
 Whilst in 1845 there was a slight majority among British Tory members  
 in favour of the Maynooth bill and a large majority of Irish Tories  
 against, on the corn laws in 1846 the Irish Tory members behaved  
 similarly to the Parliamentary party as a whole, with about two-thirds  
 of each opposing the Government in the three major divisions. Several  
 Irish Tories - Lefroy, Shaw, Bateson, Conolly and Verner - complained  
 of Peel's departure from his past principles. According to Verner he  
 'had betrayed those friends who had stood true to him for so many years.'  
 Shaw, particularly bitter, accused Peel of 'instability of mind', with  
 'his besetting infirmity to adopt the counsel of his opponents', and  
 said that those in Government 'would be handed down to posterity as the  
 greatest political cowards that ever wielded the destinies' of Britain.

His assaults induced Graham to suggest that Shaw's hostility emanated from disappointment that the Government had rejected his application for a retiring allowance (as Recorder) and frustrated his ambition to be Chief Secretary, and from his hope that a protectionist Government<sup>234</sup> would deal more sympathetically with his claims.

Graham was genuinely outraged by the 'bitterness and malignity of Shaw', but his reply was in Greville's view 'clumsily' and 'savagely' made. The Mail approved warmly of Shaw's 'brilliant' speech and<sup>235</sup> deprecated Graham's 'cowardly and atrocious' reply. Led by Grogan of Dublin, most of the independent Irish Tory members also opposed the reduction of duty on butter and voted against many of the Government's other proposals which lowered protection. Two of the Corn bill's 12 Irish Tory supporters in the Commons spoke in debate. Gregory made a long speech in favour of repeal, viting his confidence in Peel's judgement as an important factor in his decision; Northland initially declared against the bill but subsequently supported it in order to settle the question and to keep Peel, in whom he still had 'the greatest confidence', in office.<sup>236</sup> The Mail denounced Northland, Gregory and all<sup>237</sup> of the 'rats' who supported free trade. Gregory was duly offered a Lordship of the Treasury, in spite of Young's fear that 'two or three hundred Orange fanatics standing by neuter or even giving their votes to the Repealer' might cause Gregory's defeat in the by-election in Dublin. The appointment was refused when Gregory's father objected to<sup>238</sup> his taking office.

The Irish Tory officeholders - Damer, Young, Maynell, Jocelyn and Corry - remained in office and supported the bill, Corry overcoming private doubts for the sake of securing a permanent settlement of the<sup>239</sup> question. In the Lords the proportion of Irish Tories opposed to the bill was slightly larger, with Wicklow the most vocal of the Irish Protectionists. Londonderry wrote to Peel that he was repaying a 'debt by gratitude' by supporting the bill, and regretted that Castlereagh



'had so committed himself & pledged himself to the highest agricultural protection with his constituents' that he had to oppose the bill.

Londonderry led a considerable body of Irish Tory peers in support of  
 240  
 the Government.

With respect to the other major issue of the session, the Protection of Life Bill, the Irish Tories were much more united, in that not one of them was among the 70-odd Protectionists who voted against the second reading on the 25th of June when the Government were driven from office; in fact 35 Irish Tories voted with the Government in that division, and 25 of them supported the first reading, again unanimously. Before the unveiling of the measure in February 1846, Clare and Farnham expressed satisfaction with the assistance given by the Government to local magistrates in 'maintaining the supremacy of the law.' Farnham subsequently painted a vivid portrait of the dreadful state of Caian and gave 'his most cordial assent' to the Government's application for greater powers. A number of Irish Tory peers supported the measure in its progress through the Upper House, though Wicklow and Clancarty wished to see it strengthened in some respects and Clancarty used the opportunity to make a general attack on the conciliatory policies  
 241  
 of both Whig and Tory Governments from 1829. Crofton wrote to Heytesbury to express his 'fear that the Bill will be a dead letter', as it was  
 242  
 not able to deal with crimes committed by day.

In the Commons the failure of the Government to bring on the bill immediately caused Shaw to doubt their will to protect life and property in Ireland; on the first reading he criticized them for allowing the amendment of the bill in the Lords, and, though supporting the measure, claimed it would not have been necessary 'if the existing law had been administered with a steady and temperate firmness'. He, too, assailed, but much more acrimoniously than Clancarty, the Government's Irish policy as one possessed of 'a spirit of compromise, of spurious liberality, of want of reliance on the permanent principles of truth

and justice, a passing over of the best and most competent men of their own party from unworthy fears, a tampering with an inferior class of the opposite party .. from equally unworthy hopes, in short, a trading on the generosity of their friends and the meanness of their opponents, until the Government was left without the confidence or respect of any party in the country'. He blamed Graham for this policy, and repudiated the Home Secretary's earlier charge that his antipathy to the Government was the result of disappointment. It was probably the most outspoken attack on the government of Ireland by any Irish Tory member since 1841.

Verner, too, blamed the outrages and the necessity of the bill on the Government's failure to adopt 'strong, vigorous and decisive measures' against those responsible, among whom he included the political agitators, and called for 'an end to that mistaken conciliation .., to uncalled-for concession.' Conolly, though supporting the bill, felt it 'did not go to the root of the evil' by suppressing the Repeal agitation. Major William Beresford, an Irish Tory who sat for Harwick, thought the bill would irritate the people without threatening the guilty. In addition, Hill (Down) and Maxwell (Cavan) opposed the Government in one of the adjournment divisions during the first-reading  
243  
debate.

Three weeks after the first reading, with no further progress made, Wicklow angrily accused the Government of 'mere trifling with the lives and property of the people of Ireland' by their decision to  
244  
give precedence to the corn bill. The English Protectionists decided on the 8th of June to oppose the second reading in order to record their want of confidence in the Government. George Hamilton, Conolly and Verner, at the same meeting, 'fully admitted the shameful manner in which the Government had acted with respect to the Bill; but yet, as the measure was in some degree calculated to strengthen the hands of the Executive, they could not abandon their intention of supporting



the second reading ...<sup>245</sup> A week later a meeting which included Downshire, Roden, Lucan, Bruen of Carlow, 'and several members of the House of Commons' took place at Downshire's London residence and resolved, to no avail, to attempt to change the decision of the English Protectionists.<sup>246</sup> On the same day Clancarty described the Government's Irish policy as one 'the weakness, inconsistency, and ill success of which cannot be better illustrated than by the necessity that has resulted from it for the enactment of a Bill for the protection of life.'<sup>247</sup>

In the second-reading debate, Shaw doubted if the bill would prove effective and attacked the Government's 'hesitating and unfirm manner' in allowing amendment and delay. He would vote for the bill as the only one proposed for the protection of the peaceable portion of the Irish people, but not from 'party considerations', for 'it was impossible that he could support the Bill from any confidence in the Government who promoted it ... if Whig measures were to be carried, and Whig principles acted upon, then it was better, more just, more honest, more constitutional, and safer for all interests concerned that they should be carried by Whig men.' If the Government were driven from office 'he should feel that it was a merited retribution for grievous and unprecedented political and party misconduct .., a righteous verdict, a just national judgement against public men for a great public delinquency'. He felt, too, that the Tory party could recover best in opposition, and so he 'would hail with satisfaction, upon every public and party ground, the advent of .. (Lord John Russell) and the Whigs to office.' The Government's Irish policy was their 'greatest failure', a policy in which 'they had shown themselves afraid to be just' and anxious 'to please and conciliate their political opponents .. by vexing their friends', with the result that they had become 'undoubtedly the most unpopular Government with all parties that he recollected or had heard of'. Graham, with his total ignorance of Ireland, was to blame

for this state of affairs, said Shaw, and he hoped Russell 'would be wiser and better informed in that respect.'

Verner supported the bill as an attempt to remedy the situation in Ireland but he too regretted that it had been so long delayed. Shaw and Verner, and Wicklow and Clancarty, were embittered Protectionists. The Irish Tory 'exiles', Beresford and Stafford O'Brien, also Protectionists, doubted the likely efficacy of the measure and regarded the second reading as a question of confidence in the Government, and accordingly voted against. But Bernard, Claud Hamilton, Vesey and Jones gave the bill a support which was not hedged with criticism; Bernard, though a Protectionist, even attacked Bentinck for his intention to bring down the Government on the issue, particularly as the bill was good in itself and unconnected with the Corn question.<sup>248</sup>

The Evening Mail denounced the coercion bill as inadequate, though they also defended it against the liberal assault. And they deprecated the amendments and delays allowed by the Government. They looked forward to 'retribution' at the polls for Peel's 'betrayal' over the Corn laws, with the return of a Protectionist Government; they hoped originally that the Lords would force a General Election by defeating the Corn bill and later, though unable 'to see how any Irish Conservative member can vote against' the coercion bill, welcomed the decision of the English Protectionists as conclusive of the fate of the Government. The Mail duly rejoiced at the 'great and glorious news' of Peel's 'eternal downfall'.<sup>249</sup> Conolly wrote to his agent that Peel 'did not go out until he had done the mischief.'<sup>250</sup> Peel himself recognized that the Government were 'hated with blind fury by the Irish Orangemen and Protectionists.'<sup>251</sup>

In spite, then, of their behaviour in the crucial divisions on the coercion bill, there was clearly much dissatisfaction with the Government among Irish Tories. After more than 10 years of Whig rule the Irish Tories felt that they had a right to demand a substantial



adjustment in the balance of favour under the Conservative Administration. For 18 months the relationship between Peel's Government and their Irish 'friends' was rather uneasy as hope gave way to disappointment. The year 1843 brought a serious crisis of confidence, and in 1845-6 there developed a deep rift between the Government and the majority of Irish Tories as the 'Whig policy' took shape. Indeed by June 1846 many possibly believed, as Hamilton feared, that Peel's return to power in 1841 had proved 'in its results the most disastrous event in the disastrous history' of their 'ill fated land.'

## Chapter 11

1. DEM, 16 Aug. 1843.
2. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/c/7, Londonderry to Tennent, 5 Aug. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 532, f162, Londonderry to Peel, 12 Aug. 1843. Hansard, 71, 739-41, 15 Aug. 1843, Londonderry. NW, 29, 31 Aug. 1843. DEM, 30 Aug., 1 Sept. 1843.
3. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 532, f230, 237, Farnham to Peel, 18, 25 Aug. 1843.
4. Ibid., f233, Peel to Farnham, 21 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 449, f1, Graham to Peel, 22 Aug. 1843. Graham Papers, 10IR, Eliot to Graham, 26 Aug. 1843; 64B, Graham to Eliot, 28 Aug. 1843.
5. NW, 19, 22, 24, 29 Aug. 1843. DEM, 23 Aug. 1843.
6. Hansard, 71, 1008-9, 24 Aug. 1843, Queen's Speech. DEM, 28 Aug. 1843.
7. NW, 31 Aug. 1843. DEM, 1 Sept. 1843. The committee included Manchester, Downshire, Donegal, Ely, Abercorn, Roden, Erne, Enniskillen, Clanwilliam, O'Neill, Farnham, Castle Stewart, Lord George Hill, Sir Robert Bateson, Sir Arthur Chichester; and the M.P.'s Verner, Ker, Archdall, Alexander, Bateson, George Hamilton, Brooke, Hillsborough, Newry, Northland, Jocelyn and Dungannon.
8. Graham Papers, 7IR, Eliot to De Grey, 31 Aug. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f15, Graham to Peel, 3 Sept. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 533, f85, Peel to Hillsborough, 17 Sept. 1843.
9. Two Addresses to the Protestants of Ireland, Adopted at Public Meetings at the Rotundo, by the Dublin Protestant Operative Association and Reformation Society (Dublin, 1843).
10. NW, 31 Aug., 5, 7, 12 Sept. 1843. DEP, 29, 31 Aug., 2, 9, 14 Sept. 1843. Venedy also stressed the importance of Londonderry's interference. Jacob Venedy, Ireland and the Irish During the Repeal Year, 322.
11. DEM, 1, 4 Sept. 1843.
12. NW, 7, 12 Sept. 1843.
13. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/c/7, Londonderry to Tennent, 20 Aug. 1843.
14. NW, 12 Sept. 1843.
15. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 533, f83, Hillsborough to Peel, 10 Sept. 1843.
16. DEM, 1, 4 Sept. 1843.
17. NW, 31 Aug. 1843.
18. DEM, 16 Aug. 1843.
19. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 532, f160, Carbery to Peel, 12 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f286, Lucas to Peel, 26 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f347, Clare to Peel, 25 Aug. 1843. Graham Papers, 10IR, Eliot to Graham, 24 Aug. 1843. Hansard, 71, 740, 15 Aug. 1843, Londonderry.



20. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f328, Graham to Peel, 18 June 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 363-4. See also Graham Papers, 4IR, 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 22 June, 9 July 1843.
21. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f352, 358, 331, Graham to Peel, 15, 17, 18 July 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 449, f3, Graham to Peel, 24 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f7, Peel to Graham, 31 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 478, f119, 132, 160, Peel to De Grey, 24 July, 3, 22 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f128, 150, De Grey to Peel, 30 July, 18 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f256, Peel to Eliot, 28 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f258, Eliot to Peel, 30 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 532, f360, Sugden to Peel, 25 Aug. 1843. Graham Papers, 63, Eliot to Graham, 15 July 1843; Peel to Graham, 16 July 1843; 64B, Peel to Graham, 31 Aug. 1843; 5IR, Graham to De Grey, 3 Sept. 1843. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 53-62. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 364-7.
22. DEM, 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 20 Sept., 4 Oct. 1843.
23. Graham Papers, 5IR, Clare to Eliot, 9 Sept. 1843; Clare to Howley, 14 Sept. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 16 Sept. 1843.
24. Wellington Papers, Port. 109, f92, Glengall to Wellington, 25 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 110, f110, Glengall to Wellington, 10 Sept. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 111, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 23 Sept. 1843.
25. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f23, 29, 31, Graham to Peel, 5, 16(2) Sept. 1843. Graham Papers, 5IR, Graham to Eliot, 21 Sept. 1843; 65A, Wellington to Graham, 3, 5, 6, 13 Sept. 1843; 65B, Wellington to Graham, 19 Sept. 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 109, f93, Wellington memo on state of Ireland, 25 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, f97, Wellington to Graham, 25 Aug. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 110, f43, 46, 71, 102, Wellington to Graham, 3, 6, 15, 19 Sept. 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 367-9. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 63-4.
26. Graham Papers, 5IR, Eliot to Graham, 25, 27 Sept. 1843; Roden to Eliot, 21, 25 Sept. 1843; Eliot to Roden, 23, 27 Sept. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 27 Sept. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f65, Graham to Peel, 27 Sept. 1843. The affair later caused some friction between Eliot and Wellington, who felt that the Chief Secretary's response ran counter to advice which he had earlier given. Wellington Papers, Port. 114, f40, 81, Wellington to Graham, 4, 16 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, f67, 78, Graham to Wellington, 10, 14 Dec. 1843. Graham Papers, 68A, Wellington to Graham, 4 Dec. 1843; Graham to Wellington, 14 Dec. 1843; Peel to Graham, 14 Dec. 1843; 68B, Wellington to Graham, 16 Dec. 1843; Peel to Graham, 18 Dec. 1843; 68C, Peel to Graham, 23 Dec. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 25 Dec. 1843; 12 IR, Graham to Eliot, 19, 30 Dec. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 21, 27, 28 Dec. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f263, 265, 282, 288, Graham to Peel, 17, 19, 23, 30 Dec. 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 414-6.
27. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 533, f286, Bonham to Peel, 25 Sept. 1843.
28. Graham Papers, 5IR, Clare to Eliot, 9 Sept. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 11 Sept. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 533, f253, Dawson to Peel, 23 Sept. 1843.
29. Graham Papers, 5IR, Eliot to Graham, 23, 29 Sept. 1843.



30. Ibid., 6IR, Graham to Eliot, 6, 10 Oct. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 7, 11, 12, 13, 21, 22, 25 Oct. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27 Oct. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 11, 21 Oct. 1843; 66A, Graham to De Grey, 5, 9 Oct. 1843; Graham to Stanley, 4, 7, 10 Oct. 1843; 66B, Wellington to Graham, 11, 13, Oct. 1843; Graham to De Grey, 13 Oct. 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 111, f110, Glengall to Wellington, 9 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 112, f13, 22, Glengall to Wellington, 11, 12 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, f24, 73, Wellington to Graham, 13, 19 Oct. 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 398-9.
31. DEM, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 20 Oct. 1843.
32. Graham Papers, 11IR, Smith to Graham, 9 Nov. 1843.
33. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 534, f60, Powerscourt to Peel, 9 Oct. 1843.
34. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/867, Downshire to De Grey, 12 Oct. 1843.
35. Wellington Papers, Port. 112, f13, 50, 80, 95, Glengall to Wellington, 11, 16, 20, 22 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 113, f57, 89, 96, Glengall to Wellington, 4, 15, 17 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, f94, Donoughmore to Wellington, 17 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, Port. 114, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 30 Nov. 1843.
36. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 536, f52, Lucas to Fremantle, 22 Nov. 1843.
37. Graham Papers, 11IR, Eliot to Graham, 15 Nov. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 15 Nov. 1843.
38. DEM, 25, 27, 30 Oct., 1, 6, 8, 10, 17, Nov. 1843.
39. Graham Papers, 11IR, Smith to Graham, 18, 19 Nov. 1843.
40. Ibid, 6IR, 11IR, 67A, Smith to Graham, 20, 21 Oct., n.d., 12, 18, 22, 26 Nov. 1843; 6IR, 11IR, Eliot to Graham, 20 Oct., 18, 21, 22, 23, 29 Nov. 1843; 6IR, 11IR, 67A, Graham to Smith, 23, 26 Oct., 2, 20, 24, 27, 28 Nov. 1843; 6IR, 11IR, Graham to Eliot, 23 Oct., 24 Nov. 1843; 6IR, 11IR, De Grey to Graham, 28 Oct., 18, 22 Nov. 1843; 6IR, 11IR, 67B, Sugden to Graham, 30 Oct., 19, 20, 24 Nov. 1843; 11IR, 67A, 67B, Graham to Sugden, 3, 8, 13 Nov. 1843; 11IR, 67B, Graham to De Grey, 6, 15, 20, 24 Nov. 1843; 66C, 67A, Peel to Graham, 24 Oct., 1, 2, 7 Nov. 1843; 66C, Graham to Stanley, 27 Oct. 1843; 66C, Graham to Peel, 25, 28, 30 Oct. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, ff135, 148, 156, 164, 166, 172, 176, 182, 186, 205, 212, 214; *ibid*, MS 40, 536, ff5, 52, 229, 313, 336, 338. DEM, 22, 24, 27 Nov. 1843. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 401. C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel*, III, 62, 67.
41. Hansard, 69, 1144-6, 30 May 1843, Shaw; 70, 305, 23 June 1843, Shaw; 70, 773-6, 791, 7 July 1843, Tennent, Shaw; 70, 945-6, 11 July 1843, Bateson; 70, 1029, 12 July 1843, Bernard. Also DEM, 12-28 Dec. 1842, 2, 6, 9, 16 Jan., 10 Feb., 7, 17 April, 22 May, 26 June, 12, 14, 17, 21 July 1843.
42. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 531, f126, Brooke to Peel, 13 July 1843.
43. Hansard, 70, 1139-40, 14 July 1843, Glengall.
44. Wyse Papers, MS 15019(10), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1843.
45. Hansard, 71, 421, 9 Aug. 1843, Brooke.



46. DEM, 11 Aug., 3, 8, 13, 15 Nov., 1, 6 Dec. 1843.
47. Graham Papers, 65B, Graham to Peel, 24 Sept. 1843.
48. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 534, f355, Hamilton to Peel, 28 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 535, f67, Daly to Peel, 2 Nov. 1843.
49. DEM, 1, 6, 13, 15 Dec. 1843.
50. Graham Papers, 12IR, D. Conner, J. Gillman, W. L. Shuldham, T. Gillman to De Grey, 24 Nov. 1843.
51. DEM, 1, 4 Dec. 1843.
52. Wellington Papers, Port. 114, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 30 Nov. 1843 (also in Graham Papers, 68A).
53. DEM, 4 Dec. 1843.
54. Graham Papers, 12IR, Graham to Eliot, 10, 16, 18, 30 Dec. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 13, 27 Dec. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 23 Dec. 1843; Sugden to Graham, 23 Dec. 1843; 68A, Eliot to Graham, 8 Dec. 1843; Wellington to Graham, 19 Dec. 1843; 68B, Graham to De Grey, 18 Dec. 1843; Graham to Wellington, 18 Dec. 1843; Graham to Peel, 20 Dec. 1843; 68C, Graham to Peel, 21 Dec. 1843; Graham to Sugden, 21 Dec. 1843; Graham to Stanley, 23 Dec. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 25 Dec. 1843. Wellington Papers, Port. 114, f102, Graham to Wellington, 18 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, f103, Wellington to Graham, 19 Dec. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f255, 271, 273, 284, Graham to Peel, 10, 20, 21, 25 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 478, f194, De Grey to Peel, 23 Dec. 1843.
55. Graham Papers, 12IR, Graham to Eliot, 19, 30 Dec. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 20, 21, 27 Dec. 1843, 10 Jan. 1844; De Grey to Graham, 23 Dec. 1843; Sugden to Graham, 23 Dec. 1843; Newry to Eliot, (20) Dec. 1843; 68C, Graham to Sugden, 21 Dec. 1843; Graham to Stanley, 23 Dec. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 25 Dec. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f278, 284, 288, Graham to Peel, 22, 25, 30 Dec. 1843. DEM, 27 Dec. 1843, 3 Jan. 1844.
56. Graham Papers, 13IR, Eliot to Graham, 10, 15, 16, 17 Jan. 1844; De Grey to Graham, 15, 29 Jan. 1844; Magennis to Graham, 18 Jan. 1844; Graham to De Grey, 19, 31 Jan. 1844; Graham to Smith, 22 Jan. 1844; Smith to Graham, 27 Jan. 1844; 69A, Graham to De Grey, 8, 9 Jan. 1844; Peel to Graham, 11 Jan. 1844; 69B, Graham to De Grey, 16, 17, 25 Jan. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 19 Jan. 1844; De Grey to Graham, 23 Jan. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f304, Graham to Peel, 18 Jan. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 478, f216, De Grey to Peel, 29 Jan. 1844. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 403. Hansard, 72, 641-2, 765-6, 13 Feb. 1844, Wharnccliffe, Graham; 72, 905-6, 15 Feb. 1844, Ripon; 72, 1073-4, 16 Feb. 1844, Stanley; 72, 1203, 19 Feb. 1844, Follett.
57. Graham Papers, 17IR, Graham to Eliot, 10 Oct. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 12 Oct. 1844.
58. Graham Papers, 6IR, Graham to Eliot, 7 Oct. 1843; Smith to Sutton, 10 Oct. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 28 Oct. 1843; Sugden to Graham, 30 Oct. 1843; 11IR, Smith to Graham, 9, 14, 18 Nov. 1843; De Grey to Graham, 12 Nov. 1843; Eliot to Graham, 18 Nov. 1843; 13IR, De Grey to Graham, 15 Jan. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 19 Jan. 1844; Smith to Eliot, (19) Jan. 1844; 67B, Graham to Smith, 11 Nov. 1843; 69A, De Grey to Graham, 4 Jan. 1844; 69B, Graham to De Grey, 17 Jan. 1844. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, I, 403.



59. Hansard, 72, 642-3, 764-9, 13 Feb. 1844, Wharncliffe, Graham; 72, 848-9, 14 Feb. 1844, Eliot; 72, 1074-8, 16 Feb. 1844, Stanley; 72, 1201-3, 19 Feb. 1844, Follett; 72, 1341-2, 1347-52, 21 Feb. 1844, Smith; 73, 145-9, 233, 23 Feb. 1844, Pollock, Peel.
60. Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 14 Jan. 1844. DEM, 5, 8, 10, 12 Jan. 1844.
61. DEM, 2 Feb. 1844.
62. DEM, 17, 19, 22, 26, 31 Jan., 5, 7, 9, 12 Feb. 1844.
63. W. J. O. Daunt, Eighty-Five Years of Irish History, 247.
64. Wellington Papers, Port. 117, f4, Glengall to Wellington, 13 Feb. 1844.
65. Wyse Papers, 15020(6), George Wyse to Wyse, 11 Feb. 1844.
66. Dunbar Correspondence, D664/D/8, Harriet Beresford to Dunbar, 12 Feb. 1844.
67. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f377, Lady De Grey to Peel, Feb. 1844.
68. Hansard, 72, 645-6, 778-85, 13 Feb. 1844, Wharncliffe, Graham; 73, 236-52, 23 Feb. 1844, Peel. Peel Papers, Add MS 4C, 540, f19, 26, 230, Peel Cabinet memos, 11, 17, n.d. Feb. 1844.
69. Graham Papers, 8IR, Eliot to Graham, 12, 18 Nov. 1841; Graham to Eliot, 16 Nov. 1841; Graham to De Grey, 20, 27 Nov., 1 Dec. 1841; De Grey to Graham, 28 Nov., 5 Dec. 1841; 6IR, Graham to Eliot, 20 Oct. 1843; 13IR, Eliot to Graham, 8 Jan. 1844; Graham to Eliot, 12 Jan. 1844; 55B, Graham to Stanley, 21 Nov. 1842; Stanley to Graham, 22 Nov. 1842; 71A, Graham to De Grey, 1 March 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f118, 132, 149, Eliot to Peel, 23 Sept., 14 Oct., 18 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, f120, 145, Peel to Eliot, 27 Sept., 13 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 446, f162, 245, Graham to Peel, 1 Dec. 1841, 17 Oct. 1842; *ibid*, f172, Peel to Graham, 6 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 462, f106, Foster to Peel, 3 March 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 496, f96, Foster to Peel, 4 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 540, f19, 26, Peel Cabinet memos, 11, n.d. Feb. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 467, f138, 263, Stanley to Peel, 30 Nov. 1841, 21 Oct. 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 66-7. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, 358.
70. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f407, Londonderry to Peel, 29 Feb. 1844.
71. Hansard, 72, 659-73, 13 Feb. 1844, Roden, Westmeath, Howden; 72, 820-30, 14 Feb. 1844, Young; 72, 921-5, 960-70, 15 Feb. 1844, Division, Shaw; 72, 1035-8, 16 Feb. 1844, Conolly; 72, 1126-32, 19 Feb. 1844, Verner; 72, 1219-25, 1310-2, 20 Feb. 1844, C. Hamilton, Shaw; 73, 32-43, 51-60, 22 Feb. 1844, Gregory, G. Hamilton; 73, 266-71, 23 Feb. 1844, Division.
72. DEM, 14, 16, 19, 26, 28 Feb., 1 March 1844.
73. Wyse Papers, MS 15026(5), Sheil to Wyse, 4 March 1844.
74. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f375, Shea to Peel, 28 Feb. 1844 (enclosure in Add MS 40, 612, f136). Hansard, 73, 219-20, 23 Feb. 1844, Peel.
75. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 542, f219, Jackson to Peel, 13 April 1844.



76. Graham Papers, 14IR, De Grey to Graham, 2 March 1844. DEM, 1, 8, 13 March 1844. See also, Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 541, f206, Massey to Peel, 14 March 1844.
77. Hansard, 73, 421-3, 29 Feb. 1844, Division; 73, 462-4, 1 March 1844, Division; 73, 1709-10, 1 April 1844, Shaw; 76, 147, 152, 1 July 1844, Shaw.
78. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 541, f27, Shaw to Peel, 2 March 1844.
79. Hansard, 74, 515-6, 30 April 1844, Shaw; 74, 1194-6, 1200-1, 14 May 1844, Shaw, Division.
80. Hansard, 73, 1263-6, 18 March 1844, Division; 73, 1460-3, 22 March 1844; 74, 1104-7, 13 May 1844, Division; 75, 968-72, 14 June 1844, Division. The Greville Memoirs, V, 179, 21 June 1844.
81. Minutes of the General Assembly, 277-81, 320-1, 323-5, 22 Feb., 5, 6 July 1844. BNL, 23 Feb., 9, 12 July 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 544, f264, Boyd to Peel, 15 May 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 545, f89, Cooke to Tennant, 21 May 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 547, f54, Cooke to Peel, 18 June 1844. NW, 12 July 1844, Shaw to Montgomery, 26 June 1844. Hansard, 74, 830-1, 9 May 1844, Mountcashell; 75, 391, 6 June 1844, Division; 75, 1220-39, 21 June 1844, Shaw, Verner, Divisions; 76, 112-6, 28 June 1844, Shaw, Division; 76, 807-11, 15 July 1844, Roden.
82. Minutes of the General Assembly, 305-12, 321-2, 351-2, 379, 3, 5 July, 17 Sept. 1844. BNL, 5, 9 July 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 543, f316, Cooke to Peel, 2 May 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 545, f104, 112, 114, Stewart to Peel, 22 May, 12 June, 16 July 1844.
83. DEM, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29 March, 1, 3, 5, 10, 17, 19, 26 April, 1, 3, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 31 May, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28 June, 1, 3, 5, 8, 15, 19 July 1844.
84. Hansard, 76, 136-7, 1 July 1844, Wyse, quoting public letters from Farnham and Henry J. Johnston. DEM, 24, 28 June 1844. On Farnham's efforts to establish himself 'as an "Orange Authority" cooperating with the Government to execute the Law of the Land', see Graham Papers, 15IR, Eliot to Graham, 24 June 1844; Graham to Eliot, 24 June 1844.
85. Graham Papers, 15IR, Eliot to Graham, 29 June 1844.
86. *Ibid*., 74, Graham Cabinet memo, 30 June 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f59, Graham to Peel, 29 June 1844. Hansard, 76, 137, 1 July 1844, Graham.
87. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f67, Graham to Peel, 4 July 1844. DEM, 3, 5, 8 July 1844.
88. Graham Papers, 16IR, Eliot to Graham, 1 July 1844; De Grey to Graham, 8 July 1844.
89. Graham Papers, 75, Graham to Eliot, 7 July 1844; 16IR, Graham to De Grey, 9, 10 July 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f71, Graham to Peel, 10 July 1844. DEM, 10 July 1844.
90. Hansard, 76, 876-7, 16 July 1844, Wicklow; 76, 1453-7, 26 July 1844, Wicklow, Roden; 76, 1702-3, 2 Aug. 1844, Wicklow. DEM, 10, 12, 15, 19, 29 July 1844.
91. Graham Papers, 14IR, Smith to Graham, 8 March 1844; 15IR, Eliot to Graham, 28 June 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f380, Graham to Peel, 5 April 1844.



92. Hansard, 75, 1344, 25 June 1844, Wicklow; 76, 1540, 29 July 1844, Division; 76, 1663-4, 1 Aug. 1844, Shaw.
93. DEM, 5, 26 July, 5 Aug., 13, 16 Dec. 1844.
94. Graham Papers, 19IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 2 Dec. 1844.
95. Ibid, Heytesbury to Graham, 19 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f207, Heytesbury to Peel, 19 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f211, Elliot to Heytesbury, 19 Dec. 1844. *ibid*, MS 40, 556, f273, Croker to Peel, 24 Dec. 1844. DEM, 18, 20, 27, 30 Dec. 1844.
96. Graham Papers, 19IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 24, 30 Dec. 1844.
97. Ibid, Heytesbury to Graham, 28 Jan. 1845. DEM, 27, 31 Jan., 3, 7 Feb., 26, 31 March, 23, 28 April 1845.
98. The Warder, 6, 13 July, 3, 10 Aug., 28 Dec. 1844. Hansard, 79, 60-1, 3 April 1845, Gregory; 79, 495-9, 11 April 1845, Ferrand; 79, 643, 14 April 1845, Gregory; 81, 17, 4 June 1845, Clancarty; 81, 586-7, 16 June 1845, Clancarty.
99. Hansard, 76, 1129-44, 19 July 1844, Peel, Grogan, Verner, Plumptre, A. Lefroy, Sibthorp, Clive, C. Hamilton, Division.
100. Dunraven Papers, D3196/F/4/16, A. S. O'Brien to Adare, 20 July 1844.
101. DEM, 22, 24, 26, 29 July 1844.
102. Graham Papers, 16IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 29 July 1844.
103. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f15, 23, Peel to Heytesbury, 1, 8 Aug. 1844; *ibid*, f19, 31, Heytesbury to Peel, 5, 11 Aug. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 114-7.
104. Graham Papers, 16IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 4 Aug. 1844.
105. DEM, 5, 7, 9, 12, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28, 30 Aug., 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18 Sept. 1844.
106. Graham Papers, 16IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 6 Sept. 1844.
107. Duffy, Young Ireland, 519-20.
108. Graham Papers, 77B, Wellington to Graham, 28 Sept. 1844; 77A, Graham to Wellington, 2, 9 Oct. 1844; Wellington to Graham, 5, 10 Oct. 1844; Peel to Graham, 7 Oct. 1844; Graham to Peel, 8 Oct. 1844. Wellington Papers, Port. 123, f128, 142, Wellington to Graham, 28 Sept., 5 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, f139, Graham to Wellington, 2 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, Port. 124, f15, Graham to Wellington, 9 Oct. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f217, 236, Graham to Peel, 3, 8 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, f233, Peel to Graham, 7 Oct. 1844. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 408-13.
109. J. G. V. Porter, Ireland .. A Federal (the only fair) union between Great Britain and Ireland, viii-x. Graham Papers, 16IR, De Grey to Graham, 27 Sept. 1844; 17IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 21 Oct. 1844; 77B, Graham to Heytesbury, 18 Sept. 1844; Graham to Aberdeen, 20 Sept. 1844; Graham to Peel, 28 Sept. 1844; 77A, Graham to Wellington, 2 Oct. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f195, Graham to Peel, 28 Sept. 1844. Wellington Papers, Port. 123, f115, 151, Booth to Wellington, 23 Sept., 3 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, f139, Graham to Wellington, 2 Oct. 1844. DEM, 23 Sept., 18, 21, 25 Oct., 4, 11, 13, 18 Nov. 1844.



110. Duffy, Young Ireland, 540-1. DEM, 25 Sept. 1844.
111. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3091, O'Connell to Maunsell, 24 Sept. 1844. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1292, Davis to O'Brien, 25 Sept. 1844. Duffy, Young Ireland, 541-2. DEM, 25 Sept. 1844.
112. DEM, 25, 27, 30 Sept. 1844.
113. Graham Papers, 16IR, De Grey to Graham, 27 Sept. 1844.
114. Ibid., 17IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 21 Oct. 1844.
115. Graham Papers, 18IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 16(2), 21 Nov. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 19 Nov. 1844; 19IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 17 Dec. 1844; Heytesbury to Graham, 19, 20 Dec. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 20, 24 Dec. 1844; 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 11, 14 Jan. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 15 Jan. 1845; 79A, Graham to Peel, 5 Dec. 1844; 79B, Graham to Stanley, 22 Dec. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 23 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f354, Graham to Peel, 5 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f207, 216, 240, Heytesbury to Peel, 19, 20, 26 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f211, Eliot to Heytesbury, 19 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 556, f306, Aberdeen to Petre, 28 Dec. 1844. O. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 131-3. O. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 423.
116. Graham Papers, 18IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 16 Nov. 1844.
117. Ibid, Carden to Donoughmore, 10 Nov. 1844; 19IR, Graham to Eliot, 3 Dec. 1844; Heytesbury to Graham, 4 Dec. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 27 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f362, Graham to Peel, 6 Dec. 1844.
118. Graham Papers, 19IR, Eliot to Graham, 21, 27 Dec. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 28, 30 Dec. 1844; Heytesbury to Graham, 28 Dec. 1844; 79B, Graham to Heytesbury, 23, 24 Dec. 1844; Graham to Eliot, 24 Dec. 1844; Peel to Graham, 26 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f440, Graham to Peel, 24 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f452, Peel to Graham, 26 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f497, Eliot to Peel, 31 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f503, Peel to Eliot, 6 Jan. 1845.
119. DEM, 9 Oct. 1844.
120. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 552, f306, Sugden to Peel, 15 Oct. 1844.
121. Ibid, MS 40, 479, f99, Peel to Heytesbury, 17 Oct. 1844; *ibid*, f101, 103, Heytesbury to Peel, 20, 21 Oct. 1844. DEM, 14 July 1845. O. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 122-3.
122. DEM, 4 Nov. 1844.
123. Graham Papers, 18IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 10 Nov. 1844.
124. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f153, Heytesbury to Peel, 17 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 555, f252, Redesdale to Peel, 10 Dec. 1844.
125. Graham Papers, 19IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 19 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f207, Heytesbury to Peel, 19 Dec. 1844.
126. DEM, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 18, 21, 25, 30 Oct., 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 20, 25 Nov., 2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 18, 20, 23, 27 Dec. 1844, 1, 3, 8, 10, 13, 17, 20, 22, 27, 29, 31 Jan., 3, 5, Feb. 1845.



127. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/B/16, Hamilton to Tennent, 6 Jan. 1845.
128. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f124-9, Pigot to Russell, 25 Jan. 1845.
129. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 558, f295, Daly to Peel, 28 Jan. 1845.
130. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 4 Feb. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 6 Feb. 1845. Hansard, 65, 388, 20 July 1842, Jocelyn.
131. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 12, 13 Feb. 1845.
132. Hansard, 77, 3-4, 4 Feb. 1845, Queen's Speech. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 18 Jan. 1845; 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 11 March 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 558, f456, J. B. Sheil to Peel, 31 Jan. 1845. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f25-8, Bessborough to Russell, 10 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f104-5, Leinster to Russell, 8 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, f124-9, Pigot to Russell, 25 Jan. 1845.
133. Hansard, 77, 83-4, 96, 110-2, 4 Feb. 1845, Peel, Shaw.
134. DEM, 7, 10, 12, 14, 19, 24, 26 Feb. 1845.
135. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f287, Heytesbury to Peel, 9 Feb. 1845.
136. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 7, 13, 19 Feb. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 9, 13 Feb. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 11, 17 Feb. 1845; 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 10, 20, 23 March, 29 May 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 23 March 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 22, 25, 30 March, 23, 28 May 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 25 March, 27 May 1845; 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 6 June 1845; 87, Graham to Heytesbury, 13, 18, 22 March 1845; Peel to Graham, 26 March 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f49, Peel to Graham, 26 March 1845; *ibid*, f59, Graham to Peel, 27 March 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 559, f23, Devon to Peel, 2 Feb. 1845. Derby Papers, 124/3, Knight of Kerry to Stanley, 17 Jan. 1845. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 180.
137. Hansard, 77, 596-8, 634-7, 17 Feb. 1845, Conolly, Division; 77, 774-8, 785-6, 820-1, 821-4, 19 Feb. 1845, Bernard, Conolly, Castlereagh, Divisions; 77, 952-6, 1022-5, 21 Feb. 1845, C. Hamilton, Division; 77, 1151-3, 24 Feb. 1845, Division; 77, 1346-50, 26 Feb. 1845, Division; 78, 208-10, 28 Feb. 1845, Division; 78, 506-7, 7 March 1845, Division; 78, 615-7, 10 March 1845, Division; 78, 736-7, 743-4, 12 March 1845, Divisions; 78, 881-4, 13 March 1845, Division; 78, 928-9, 14 March 1845, Division; 78, 1093-4, 18 March 1845, Division; 78, 1360-1, 1 April 1845, Division; 79, 209-10, 4 April 1845, Division; 79, 328-30, 8 April 1845, Division. Some aspects of the Government's economic policy, particularly the Customs' Acts, did occasion minor rebellions among the Irish Tory members. Hansard, 78, 620-2, 10 March 1845, Division; 78, 1033-41, 17 March 1845, Division; 78, 1180-1, 19 March 1845, Division, Grogan. See also, Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/930, Ennisclillen to Downshire, 15 March 1845.
138. DEM, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 28 Feb., 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 26 March, 2 April 1845.
139. Hansard, 79, 18-38, 3 April 1845; 79, 1024-42, 18 April 1845, Peel.
140. Hansard, 22, 973-4, 974, 18 April 1834, Mandeville, Lefroy; 28, 896, 19 June 1835, Jackson; 35, 1021-3, 8 Aug. 1836, Perceval, Shaw, Division; 38, 1629-30, 26 June 1837, Division; 44, 813-6, 30 July 1838, Perceval, Verner, Ellis, Verner; 49, 1270-2, 5 Aug. 1839, Perceval, Cole, Castlereagh, Division; 54, 1165-6, 15 June 1840, Batson, Division; 56, 1251-3, 1261-70, 1272-3, 2 March 1841,



- Litton, Jackson, Bateson; 59, 671-2, 20 Sept. 1841, Division; 59, 692, 21 Sept. 1841, Acton; 62, 459, 14 April 1842, Wicklow; 65, 380-94, 20 July 1842, Bateson, Verner, Division; 68, 729-30, 7 April 1843, Division; 71, 724-5, 15 Aug. 1843, Wicklow; 76, 1143-4, 19 July 1844, Division. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 511, f142, 270, Mo Ghee to Peel, 28 June, 4 July 1842. Beresford Papers, AFL, Vol. XI, f165, Mo Ghee to Beresford, 30 June, 5, 11 July 1842; *ibid*, f165a, Beresford to Mo Ghee, 9 July 1842. *The Times*, 19 April 1834, Division. DEM, 19 Jan., 11, 23 May, 3, 13, 27 June, 1, 6, 22, 29 July, 12, 26, 29 Aug., 5, 7, 12 Sept., 31 Oct. 1842.
141. Hansard, 79, 58-63, 3 April 1845, Gregory; 79, 512-20, 11 April 1845, Grogan; 79, 622-4, 642-5, 658-66, 14 April 1845, Lefroy, Gregory, Shaw; 79, 692-8, 700-5, 15 April 1845, Beresford, Verner; 79, 762-8, 804-11, 16 April 1845, George Hamilton, Bernard; 79, 959-61, 18 April 1845, Taylor; 79, 1257, 1287-8, 24 April 1845, Bateson, George Hamilton; 80, 108-9, 112, 126-8, 2 May 1845, Verner, Brooke, Shaw; 80, 622-3, 630-7, 20 May 1845, Ffolliott, Shaw; 80, 657-62, 21 May 1845, Verner. See also, Hansard, 79, 914-21, 17 April 1845, Graham, for the speech commented on by Shaw.
142. Hansard, 79, 109-11, 3 April 1845, Division; 79, 612-7, 14 April 1845, Castlereagh; 79, 814-8, 833-40, 16 April 1845, Jocelyn, Smythe; 79, 941-9, 1042-5, 18 April 1845, C. Hamilton, Division; 79, 1429-31, 28 April 1845, Division; 80, 745-8, 750-3, 21 May 1845, Divisions. See also *The Times*, 21 April 1845, Castlereagh to Blackwood, 15 April 1845.
143. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f60-1, Tufnell to Russell, 22 May 1845. *The Times*, 21 April, 23 May 1845. DEM, 21, 23 April 1845. On the concern caused within the Government by their dependence on Opposition votes see Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 6, 9, 25 April 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 10 April 1845; 88, Graham to Heytesbury, 4, 12, 18 April 1845. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham*, II, 10.
144. Hansard, 79, 1048-9, 1051-2, 21 April 1845, Roden, Mountcashell; 80, 1175-98, 1217-9, 1225-30, 2 June 1845, Roden, Manchester, Cashel; 81, 6-28, 99-105, 116-9, 4 June 1845, Clancarty, Charleville, Division; 81, 271-9, 279-82, 10 June 1845, Clancarty, Wicklow; 81, 581-4, 584-7, 16 June 1845, Rosse, Clancarty.
145. DEM, 21, 26, 31 March, 2, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 28, 30 April, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 21, 23, 26 May, 4, 6, 9, 11, 13, 25, 27 June, 7, 9, 11 July 1845.
146. DEM, 31 March 1845. Graham was disgusted with the 'contumely, opposition and malignity' of the petitioners. Graham Papers, 88, Graham to Heytesbury, 4 April 1845.
147. John Blackburn, *The Three Conferences held by the opponents of the Maynooth College Endowment Bill in London and Dublin during the months of May and June 1845* (London, Dublin, 1845), 24-42. DEM, 4, 6 June 1845.
148. Hansard, 79, 495-9, 11 April 1845, Ferrand; 80, 622-3, 20 May 1845, Ffolliott.
149. See above, chapters 4 and 5.
150. Erne Papers, D1939/21/5n/66, 77, Donoughmore to Erne, 17, 23 May 1845; 67, 70, 79, Wicklow to Erne, (19, 20, n.d. May) 1845; 68, Clancarty to Erne, 19 May 1845; 74, Erne to Wicklow, 23 May 1845; 78, Roden to Erne, May 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f354,



- Heytesbury to Peel, 14 May 1845. DEM, 28 May 1845.
151. Paok-Beresford MSS, D664A/501, 504, Beresford to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 12, 24 April 1845.
  152. Erne Papers, D1939/21/5n/47, Fox to Erne, 2 March 1845.
  153. Hansard, 79, 602, 14 April 1845, Fremantle; 79, 943, 18 April 1845, C. Hamilton; 79, 1419, 28 April 1845, Peel; 80, 109-11, 2 May 1845, Redington, Peel; 80, 710-1, 21 May 1845, Sheil; 80, 1334, 3 June 1845, Normanby; 81, 69-70, 4 June 1845, Monteagle.
  154. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 23 March, 18 April, 12 May 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 564, f490, Peel to Murray, 21 April 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 565, f3, Clare to Peel, 20 April 1845; *ibid*, f5, Peel to Clare, 21 April 1845; *ibid*, f31, Massey to Peel, 20 April 1845; *ibid*, f53, Montgomery to Peel, 21 April 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 573, f343, Major to Anon., 7 Sept. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f333, 364, Heytesbury to Peel, 24 April, 24 May 1845.
  155. Hansard, 79, 63, 3 April 1845, Gregory; 79, 518, 11 April 1845, Grogan; 79, 659, 14 April 1845, Shaw; 79, 701, 15 April 1845, Verner; 79, 809, 16 April 1845, Bernard; 79, 959-60, 18 April 1845, Taylor; 80, 108-9, 112, 2 May 1845, Verner, Brooke; 80, 623, 20 May 1845, Ffolliott; 80, 658-60, 21 May 1845, Verner. DEM, 9, 16 May 1845. DEM, 5, 9, 16 May 1845.
  156. *Op. cit.*
  157. *The Times*, 21 April 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 565, f53, Montgomery to Peel, 21 April 1845.
  158. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 18 April 1845; Heytesbury to Peel, 14 April 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 16 April, 22 May 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f321, Peel to Heytesbury, 18 April 1845. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 425. See also, *The Times*, 21 April 1845. DEM, 25, 30 April, 19 May 1845.
  159. Derby Papers, 131/7, Tennent to Stanley, 24 April 1845.
  160. Hansard, 79, 1257-60, 1282-9, 1294-5, 1311-4, 24 April 1845, T. Bateson, George Hamilton, Bernard, Division; 80, 1004-6, 28 May 1845, Division; 80, 1423-6, 3 June 1845, Division; 81, 381-4, 10 June 1845, Division. On the colleges, see above, chapter 5.
  161. Hansard, 82, 423-4, 11 July 1845, C. Hamilton, Division; 82, 491, 14 July 1845, George Hamilton. DEM, 7, 9, 11 July 1845.
  162. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1343, Reynolds to O'Brien, 6 June 1845. Hansard, 81, 176-7, 178-9, 5 June 1845, Divisions; 81, 247-8, 9 June 1845, Conolly; 81, 439, 442, 12 June 1845, Division, Bernard. DEM, 9 June 1845.
  163. Graham Papers, 21IR, Graham to Fremantle, 27 May 1845; 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1, 3, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 25, 27(2), 30(2) June, 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 26 July 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 6, 11, 18, 28, 29 June, 1, 6, 13, 18, 19, 30 July 1845; Farnham to Heytesbury, 13 July 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 15, 21 July 1845; 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1, 3, 27 Aug. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 19 Aug. 1845; 91, Peel to Graham, 8 July 1845. Wellington Papers, Port. 130, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 20 May 1845; *ibid*, Port. 131, f112, Graham to Wellington, 28 July 1845.



- Erne Papers, D1939/21/51, Heytesbury to Erne, 3 July 1845. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 181. DEM, 11, 18, 23, 25, 27, 30 June, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 30 July 1845. Hansard, 81, 1348-9, 30 June 1845, Hayes.
164. Hansard, 79, 1243, 24 April 1845, Verner; 81, 104, 4 June 1845, Charleville; 81, 475, 13 June 1845, Westmeath.
165. DEM, 16, 19, 30 May, 2 June 1845. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 3, 31 May 1845.
166. Graham Papers, 21IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 29 April 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 23, 25, 26 May 1845; 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 23 June, 16, 26, 28, 30 July 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 21 June 1845; 89, Graham to Heytesbury, 5 May 1845; 90, Wellington to Graham, 17, 20 June 1845; Graham to Wellington, 20 June 1845. Wellington Papers, Port. 130, f138, 153, Wellington to Graham, 17, 20 June 1845; *ibid*, f143, 154, Graham to Wellington, 18, 20 June 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f364, 370, Heytesbury to Peel, 24, 28 May 1845.
167. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/80, Londonderry to Crawford, 17 Dec. 1844. The Times, 18 Nov., 9 Dec. 1844, Londonderry. DEM, 9 Dec. 1844, Londonderry. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f382, Londonderry to Peel, 11 June 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 569, f51, 53, Devon to Peel, 14, 17 June 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 461, f142, Salisbury to Wellington, 20 June 1845. Hansard, 81, 229-30, 9 June 1845, Wicklow, Rosse; 81, 1116-21, 1135, 1150-2, 24 June 1845, Londonderry, Wicklow, Roden, Protest; 81, 1195-6, 1201, 1204, 26 June 1845, Londonderry, Wicklow, Roden. DEM, 11, 16, 20, 25, 27, 30 June, 4 July 1845. Ely chaired a meeting of peers on the 17th of June to consider the bill. 36 peers connected with Ireland signed the resultant critical remonstrance, which Londonderry later read in the Lords. DEM, 20 June 1845. Hansard, 81, 1118-9, 24 June 1845, Londonderry. Graham Papers, 90, Graham to Stanley, 22 June 1845. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, II, 14-5.
168. Graham Papers, 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 18 July 1845.
169. *Ibid*, Graham to Heytesbury, 6 July 1845.
170. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f562, Fremantle to Peel, 3 Dec. 1845.
171. DEM, 13 Aug. 1845.
172. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f395, 403, 405, 413, Peel to Heytesbury, 18, 23, 24, 30 July 1845; *ibid*, f399, 416, 420, Heytesbury to Peel, 20 July, 2, 3 Aug. 1845. Graham Papers, 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 18, 22 July 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 24 July 1845. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 183-6.
173. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, Heytesbury to Peel, 2 Aug. 1845. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 2 Aug. 1845.
174. DEM, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29 Aug. 1845.
175. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 21, 26 May 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 23 May 1845.
176. Graham Papers, 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 21 June 1845; Farnham to Heytesbury, 26 June 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 26 June 1845. DEM, 18, 23, 25, 27, 30 June, 2, 4, 9, 11 July 1845. John Blackburn, Three Conferences, 32 (S. Maxwell). Hansard, 81, 463, 13 June 1845, Farnham. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol. XI, f176, Mo Ghee to Beresford, 20 June 1845; *ibid*, f177, Beresford to Mo Ghee, (June 1845).



177. DEM, 30 June, 7, 25 July 1845.
178. Graham Papers, 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 11, 14, 16, 26 July 1845; Farnham to Heytesbury, 13 July 1845; Gosford to Lucas, 13 July 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 15 July 1845. DEM, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 28 July 1845.
179. DEM, 30 July, 1, 4, 6, 8 Aug. 1845.
180. Graham Papers, 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 15 July 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 18, 28 July 1845; 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1 Aug. 1845; 92, Lucas to Watson, 1 Aug. 1845.
181. DEM, 4, 6, 11, 15, 20, 22 Aug., 3, 5 Sept. 1845. Hansard, 82, 1521, 8 Aug. 1845, Verner.
182. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1, 11, 12 Aug. 1845.
183. Ibid, Heytesbury to Graham, 14 Aug. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 16 Aug. 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 18 Aug. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f426, Heytesbury to Peel, 13 Aug. 1845.
184. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 572, f301, Young to Peel, 19 Aug. 1845.
185. Ibid, MS 40, 451, f211, Peel to Graham, 21 Aug. 1845. Graham Papers, 92, Peel to Graham, 21 Aug. 1845. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 186.
186. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 27 Aug. 1845.
187. DEM, 13 Aug. 1845.
188. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 572, f325, Lifford to Peel, 20 Aug. 1845.
189. Graham Papers, 23IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 15, 16 Aug. 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 18 Aug. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 18, 25 Aug. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 25 Aug. 1845.
190. Ibid, Cleland to Heytesbury, 12 Aug. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Aug., 2, 10 Sept. 1845. DEM, 11, 13, 15 Aug. 1845.
191. Clanwilliam Papers, D3044/F/13/284, Diary, 20 Aug. 1845.
192. DEM, 15, 20, 22, 25, 27 Aug. 1845.
193. Graham Papers, 23IR, Fremantle to Graham, 21 Aug. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 21, 23, 25 Aug. 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 23 Aug. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 23, 26 Aug. 1845; 64B, Graham to Heytesbury, 27 Aug. 1845; 92, Graham to Peel, 23 Aug. 1845; Peel to Graham, 23, 25 Aug. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f217, 221, 227, 237, Graham to Peel, 22, 23, 25, 27 Aug. 1845; *ibid*, f225, Peel to Graham, 25 Aug. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 476, f438, Fremantle to Peel, 21 Aug. 1845. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, II, 18.
194. DEM, 5, 8 Sept. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f263, Graham to Peel, 8 Sept. 1845. Graham Papers, 23 IR, Graham to Fremantle, 9 Sept. 1845; 93, Graham to Peel, 8 Sept. 1845. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 397. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 187.
195. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 30 Aug., 3, 9, 12, 13 Sept. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 3, 8, 9 Sept. 1845; Graham to



- Heytesbury, 5, 16 Sept. 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 6, 10, 12 Sept. 1845; Enniskillen to Heytesbury, 10 Sept. 1845; Heytesbury to Enniskillen, 13 Sept. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f282, Graham to Peel, 16 Sept. 1845. DEM, 29 Aug., 3, 5, 8, 12, 17, 19, 22, 24 Sept. 1845.
196. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 Sept. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 5, 9, 11 Sept. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 7, 10 Sept. 1845; Graham to Fremantle, 9, 10, 14 Sept. 1845; 24IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 2 Oct. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 3 Oct. 1845; 93, Graham to Peel, 7 Sept. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f257, Graham to Peel, 7 Sept. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f467, Heytesbury to Peel, 7 Sept. 1845. DEM, 8, 10 Sept. 1845.
197. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 22, 26 Sept. 1845; 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 9 Oct. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 575, f90, Tennent to Peel, 1 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f492, Heytesbury to Peel, 9 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, f339, Graham to Peel, 2 Oct. 1845. DEM, 24 Sept. 1845.
198. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 26 Sept. 1845; 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 9 Oct. 1845. DEM, 6, 8 Oct. 1845.
199. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 12 Oct. 1845. DEM, 13 Oct. 1845.
200. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f273-4, Palmerston to Russell, 12 Oct. 1845. Also Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 395(3), Palmerston to Monteagle, 31 Oct. 1845.
201. Downshire Papers, D671/C/356/123, Roden to Downshire, 31 Oct. 1845. DEM, 20, 22 Oct. 1845.
202. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 578, f144, Roden to Jocelyn, 30 Oct. 1845. DEM, 20, 22, 27, 29 Oct., 3 Nov. 1845.
203. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Oct. 1845; 94, Peel to Graham, 23 Oct. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f428, Graham to Peel, 24 Oct. 1845.
204. Downshire Papers, D671/C/356/123, Roden to Downshire, 31 Oct. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 578, f143, Young to Peel, 6 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f144, Roden to Jocelyn, 30 Oct. 1845.
205. DEM, 14, 28 Nov. 1845.
206. Downshire Papers, D671/C/356/129, Reilly to Downshire, 8 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, /142, Watson to Downshire, 24 Nov. 1845.
207. DEM, 21 Nov. 1845.
208. DEM, 7, 9 Jan. 1846. Graham Papers, 26IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 8 Jan. 1846.
209. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 30 Oct., 7, 12, 13, 15, 19 Nov. 1845; Peel to Graham, n.d.; Graham to Heytesbury, 3, 10, 17 Nov. 1845; Heytesbury to Enniskillen, 6, 19 Nov. 1845; 95A, Graham to Peel, 14 Nov. 1845; Peel to Graham, 16 Nov. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 452, f5, 15, 25, Graham to Peel, 9, 14, 15 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f27, Peel to Graham, 16 Nov. 1845. DEM, 31 Oct. 1845.
210. Graham Papers, 24IR, Enniskillen to Heytesbury, 10 Nov. 1845.



211. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f571, Fremantle to Peel, 21 Dec. 1845.
212. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 24 Nov. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 18 Nov. 1845; 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 22, 30 Dec. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 29 Dec. 1845; 26IR, Fremantle to Graham, 2, 3, 8 Jan. 1846; Graham to Fremantle, 5, 10 Jan. 1846; Heytesbury to Graham, 10 Jan. 1846; 68C, Graham to Peel, 25, 28 Dec. 1845; 96B, Graham to Peel, 28 Dec. 1845; 98, Graham to Heytesbury, 6 Jan. 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 452, f37, 75, Graham to Peel, 28 Nov., 26 Dec. 1845.
213. DEM, 12 Dec. 1845. Graham Papers, 25IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 8 Dec. 1845; 95A, Graham to Fremantle, 8 Dec. (wrongly dated Nov.) 1845.
214. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 576, f22, Young to Peel, 17 Oct. 1845.
215. DEM, 7 Nov. 1845.
216. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f550, Fremantle to Peel, 14 Nov. 1845. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 15 Nov. 1845.
217. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f560, Peel to Fremantle, 1 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f562, Fremantle to Peel, 3 Dec. 1845.
218. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 26 Nov. 1845; 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 6, 11 Dec. 1845; Hamilton to Heytesbury, 4 Dec. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 8 Dec. 1845; 95A, Graham to Fremantle, 8 Dec. (wrongly dated Nov.) 1845.
219. Downshire Papers, D671/O/356/123, Roden to Downshire, 31 Oct. 1845. DEM, 20 Oct. 1845, 7, 9 Jan. 1846.
220. Graham Papers, 24IR, Fremantle to Graham, 14, 30 Nov. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 24, 28, 29 Nov. 1845; Westmeath to Heytesbury, 26 Nov. 1845; 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 22, 24, 28 Dec. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 5, 9, 22 Dec. 1845; Fremantle to Graham, 18, 29 Dec. 1845; 26IR, Fremantle to Graham, 8 Jan. 1846; Heytesbury to Graham, 8, 27, 30 Jan. 1846; Dunraven to Heytesbury, 26 Jan. 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 452, f43, Graham to Peel, 1 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 476, f562, Fremantle to Peel, 3 Dec. 1845. DEM, 10, 21, 26 Nov., 3, 5, 10, 12, 24, 26, 29 Dec., 1845, 12, 14, 16, 21, 23, 25, 28 Jan., 2, 4, Feb. 1846.
221. DEM, 28 Nov., 1, 3, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26, 31 Dec. 1845.
222. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f542, Heytesbury to Peel, 25 Dec. 1845. Graham Papers, 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Dec. 1845. See also Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 435, f1438, Powell to O'Brien, 15 Dec. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 581, f73, Brady to Peel, 13 Dec. 1845.
223. DEM, 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 28 Jan. 1846.
224. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 582, f267, Portarlinton to Peel, 13 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, f435, Dunsandle to Peel, 20 Jan. 1846.
225. *Ibid*, f426, Young to Peel, 19 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, MS 40, 461, f397, 405, Wellington to Peel, 16, 20 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, f399, Peel to Wellington, 17 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, f407, Farnham to Wellington, 20 Jan. 1846. Wellington Papers, Port. 136, f11, 44, Wellington to Farnham, 12, 19 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, f17, 56, Farnham to Wellington, 14, 20 Jan. 1846; *ibid*, f29, 60, Wellington to Peel, 16, 20 Jan. 1846. Graham Papers, 98, Peel to Graham, 20 Jan. 1846; 26IR,



- Graham to Heytesbury, 20, 25 Jan. 1846; Heytesbury to Graham, 23 Jan. 1846. DEM, 21, 23, 26, 30 Jan. 1846.
226. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 574, f335, Jones to Young, 26 Sept. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 576, f22, Young to Peel, 17 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, f223, Dunraven to Peel, 22 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 577, f8, Glengall to Peel, 26 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 578, f7, Glengall to Peel, 4 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f10, Jocelyn to Peel, 4 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f37, Saunders to Heytesbury, 4 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f95, Clare to Fennefather, 5 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f144, Roden to Jocelyn, 30 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, f326, Saunders to Peel, 12 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 580, f257, Croker to Peel, 5 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, f308, Mountcashell to Peel, 8 Dec. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 584, f411, Gregory to Peel, 11 Feb. 1846; *ibid*, MS 40, 585, f27, Clare to Peel, 14 Feb. 1846; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, f382, Graham to Peel, 14 Oct. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 452, f5, Graham to Peel, 9 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f527, Heytesbury to Graham, 11 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 476, f494, 536, 554, Fremantle to Peel, 29 Oct., 9, 16 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f530, Peel to Fremantle, 7 Nov. 1845; *ibid*, f546, Bernard to Fremantle, 6 Nov. 1845. Graham Papers, 24IR, Clare to Heytesbury, 30 Oct. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 12, 31 Oct., 7, 11 Nov. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 2, 25 Nov. 1845. Wellington Papers, Port. 133, f54, Glengall to Wellington, 16 Nov. 1845.
227. DEM, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 27, 29, 31 Oct., 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 21, 24, 26 Nov., 1, 5, 19, 24 Dec. 1845, 2, 7, 9 Jan. 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f556, Fremantle to Peel, 20 Nov. 1845. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 16 Oct. 1845.
228. Hansard, 83, 731, 11 Feb. 1846, Shaw; 83, 1075-7, 1115-6, 17 Feb. 1846, Shaw; 84, 21-2, 24 Feb. 1846, Conolly; 84, 740, 6 March 1846, Brooke; 84, 994-6, 999-1000, 13 March 1846, Shaw; 84, 1204-5, 18 March 1846, Shaw; 85, 49-55, 24 March 1846, Shaw; 85, 127, 26 March 1846, Bentinck; 85, 729, 17 April 1846, Verner; 86, 233-4, 255-8, 8 May 1846, Verner, Lefroy; 87, 257-8, 11 June 1846, Wicklow; 87, 410-1, 12 June 1846, Shaw. DEM, 30 Jan., 6, 9, 11, 18, 20 Feb., 4, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 27, 30 March, 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 27 April, 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27 May, 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 17, 26 June 1846.
229. Hansard, 83, 336, 28 Jan. 1846, Conolly; 83, 432-4, 2 Feb. 1846, Conolly, Division; 83, 536, 539, 9 Feb. 1846, Roden, Mountcashell.
230. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 591, f133, O'Brien to Peel, 4 May 1846.
231. Hansard, 85, 999, 24 April 1846, A. S. O'Brien; 86, 252-5, 8 May 1846, A. S. O'Brien.
232. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 593, f28, A. S. O'Brien to Peel, 1 June 1846; *ibid*, MS 40, 594, f85, Leinster to Peel, 22 June 1846.
233. Dublin Evening Packet, 29, 31 Jan. 1846. DEM, 30 Jan., 24, 6, 11, 13, 16, 18 Feb. 1846.
234. Hansard, 83, 667-9, 10 Feb. 1846, Lefroy; 83, 1113-23, 17 Feb. 1846, Shaw; 83, 1400-4, 23 Feb. 1846, Bateson; 84, 21-6, 24 Feb. 1846, Conolly; 84, 349-54, 27 Feb. 1846, Division; 84, 738-41, 6 March 1846, Brooke; 85, 49-59, 24 March 1846, Shaw; 85, 179, 265-70, 27 March 1846, Graham, Division; 86, 229-34, 255-9, 8 May 1846, Verner, Lefroy; 86, 721-6, 15 May 1846, Division.
235. Graham Papers, 99, Graham to Heytesbury, 18 Feb. 1846; 100, Graham to Peel, 1 March 1846. The Greville Memoirs, V, 309, 29 March 1846. DEM, 20 Feb., 1 April 1846. On Shaw's unsuccessful application in



November 1842 for an increased salary and a retiring allowance as Recorder of Dublin, see Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 519, f312, Shaw to Peel, 28 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, f327, Peel to Shaw, 6 Dec. 1842.

236. Hansard, 83, 123-4, 22 Jan. 1846, Northland; 83, 680-96, 10 Feb. 1846, Gregory; 83, 903-9, 13 Feb. 1846, Northland; 84, 1027, 1032-4, 1041-3, 13 March 1846, Grogan, Division; 84, 1110-2, 16 March 1846, Division; 84, 1158-9, 1162-3, 17 March 1846, Divisions; 84, 1340-2, 20 March 1846, Division.
237. DEM, 13, 16, 23 Feb., 2, 4, 30 March 1846.
238. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 585, f377, Young to Peel, 25 Feb. 1846; *ibid*, MS 40, 586, f147, Gregory to Peel, 6 March 1846. Lady Gregory, ed., Sir William Gregory, An Autobiography, 123.
239. <sup>Papers,</sup> Peel, MS 40, 584, f365, 371, Corry to Peel, 9(2) Feb. 1846. On Young's views see John Young, A Letter from John Young, Esq., M.P. for the County of Cavan, to Robert Burrows, Esq., (London, 1846).
240. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 588, f188, Londonderry to Peel, 27 March 1846. Hansard, 84, 479, 3 March 1846, Wicklow; 86, 732-3, 18 May 1846, Londonderry; 86, 1124-8, 25 May 1846, Londonderry; 86, 1405-8, 28 May 1846, Division; 87, 21-2, 4 June 1846, Wicklow; 87, 254-60, 11 June 1846, Wicklow; 87, 456-62, 478-80, 15 June 1846, Clancarty, Division; 87, 544-50, 16 June 1846, Wicklow; 87, 782, 22 June 1846, Division; 87, 939-43, 952-4, 961-4, 25 June 1846, Wicklow, Gage, Protests.
241. Hansard, 83, 748, 12 Feb. 1846, Farnham, Clarc; 83, 1373-89, 23 Feb. 1846, Farnham, Wicklow, Clancarty, Westmeath; 84, 694-715, 6 March 1846, Roden, Clancarty, Wicklow, Courtown; 84, 776-7, 9 March 1846, Wicklow; 84, 841, 10 March 1846, Wicklow; 85, 1406-9, 1 May 1846, Division; 87, 1027-32, 25 June 1846, Division.
242. Graham Papers, 28IR, Crofton to Heytesbury, 17 March 1846.
243. Hansard, 84, 1045, 16 March 1846, Shaw; 84, 1125-6, 17 March 1846, Shaw; 85, 299-305, 30 March 1846, Shaw; 85, 649-50, 6 April 1846, Division; 85, 1094-7, 1157-8, 27 April 1846, Verner, Conolly; 85, 1396-7, 1 May 1846, Beresford.
244. Hansard, 86, 977-8, 22 May 1846, Wicklow.
245. DEM, 10 June 1846.
246. DEM, 17, 19 June 1846. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 593, f298, Bonham to Peel, 15 June 1846.
247. Hansard, 87, 457, 15 June 1846, Clancarty.
248. Hansard, 87, 397-418, 12 June 1846, Bernard, Shaw; 87, 487-8, 15 June 1846, Verner; 87, 966-1032, 25 June 1846, A. S. O'Brien, Vesey, O. Hamilton, Beresford, Jones, Division.
249. DEM, 20 Feb., 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 23, 27, 30 March, 1, 6, 8, 10 April, 1, 8, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, 25 May, 1, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 24, 26, 29 June, 1 July 1846.
250. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 594, f462, J. E. Sheil to Peel, 29 June 1846.
251. *Ibid*, f38, Peel memo., 21 June 1846.



## Closing Remarks

No sweeping conclusions will be drawn here, as it is considered preferable that the reader should be left to extract what he will from the facts which have been drawn to his attention. Two points are especially worthy of note, however. In the first place, it is clear that neither the Irish Tories nor the liberal-unionists were organized as cohesive political units according to the standards of the 20th century. The Irish Tories were often seriously divided, and liberal-unionism was, as stated above, merely 'a left-over category'. Secondly, many liberal-unionists and Tories evidently held more 'extreme' views than their British leaders. Indeed, one is struck by the extent to which Irish politics had already taken on the polarized character of the modern era. Though the extent of division within each of the major groupings is emphasized in this study, the general picture is one of politicians and populace rallying to their respective sides of the sectarian divide. Even the liberal-unionists, among whom there were many pro-Catholic Protestants, took part in a political game which was essentially sectarian. Given the polarization of Irish politics, the Irish Tory tradition has survived rather better than that of middle-of-the-road liberal-unionism. It is necessary to remember, however, those highly able and individualistic men, the liberal-unionists, who lent so much colour to the politics of their own age and whose conciliatory approach might have done more to secure the Union than the heirs of Irish Toryism managed in the event to achieve.

## Appendix 1

The Remonstrance, August 1843

To The

People of Great Britain

We, the undersigned, Representatives of Irish Constituencies, impressed with earnest solicitude respecting the present state and future destiny of our country, deeply sensible of its wrongs, and resolved to leave no effort untried to obtain their redress, feel it our duty, before we separate, to place upon record our solemn Remonstrance against the fatal policy which has alienated from your government and institutions the minds of a large portion of our fellow-countrymen.

Deeprooted and increasing discontent pervades the nation whose interests are entrusted to our charge. Feelings of estrangement are rapidly supplanting those affections which kindness and justice would have placed at your command. Despairing of redress from the Legislature, the people of Ireland now rely upon their own strength and resolution for the attainment of those rights which they have sought from Parliament in vain.

The voice of the civilized world lays to your charge the guilt of having produced this exasperation of national feeling. For centuries our legislation and government have been subject to your control; on you, therefore, lies the responsibility of having failed to secure the welfare and contentment of the Irish people.

Our social condition is replete with elements of disorder. The connection between Landlord and Tenant, deranged as it has been by a long course of vicious legislation, wants that mutual confidence which is essential to the development of productive industry. The labouring population, unable to obtain employment, live habitually on the verge of extreme destitution. Notwithstanding our connection with a nation which boasts to be the wealthiest, the most enlightened, and the most



powerful in the world, our commerce, our manufactures, our fisheries, our mines, our agriculture, attest, by their languishing and neglected condition, the baneful effects of your misgovernment.

A Church Establishment is maintained for the exclusive benefit of one-tenth of the nation.

Our Representation in the Legislature is unjustly disproportionate to the population and resources of Ireland.

Our Parliamentary Franchises are wholly inadequate to secure a true reflection of the opinions of the mass of the nation.

Our Municipal Rights are abridged in comparison with yours. Our Corporate Franchises are limited by needless and harassing restrictions.

The pecuniary exhaustion, occasioned by absenteeism, is aggravated by the mode in which the proceeds of taxation are applied.

An Anti-Catholic and Anti-Irish spirit of exclusion governs the distribution of official appointments.

Our local wants are not duly considered in the Imperial Parliament. Yet adequate powers of self-government for local purposes are not afforded in the constitution of our fiscal and administrative institutions.

We have applied in vain to the Legislature for redress. Our complaints are unheeded - our remonstrances are unavailing. We now appeal to that higher tribunal of public opinion, which creates and deposes Parliaments and Ministers, and we ask your intervention to enforce our claims.

We demand, in behalf of our Country, the adoption of measures calculated to improve the condition of the industrious classes, and to develop the resources of Ireland.

We demand the recognition of perfect equality, in regard to ecclesiastical and educational arrangements, between the several religious communities into which the population of Ireland is divided.

We demand a more ample representation in the Legislature.

We demand franchises adequate to give full expression to public opinion.

We demand the assimilation of municipal rights in both kingdoms.

We demand that Ireland shall participate more largely in the benefits of the Public Expenditure.

We demand, in regard to administrative Government, that the profession of the Roman Catholic Faith shall no longer be made a ground of virtual, as it has ceased to be one of legal, exclusion from official station; that in the general administration of the affairs of the empire, Irishmen shall be called to take part, in a proportion commensurate with the extent to which Ireland contributes to its greatness; and that the management of our local affairs shall be confided as much as possible to those who are identified and acquainted with the interests of our country.

We demand that the principle of self-government subject to popular control shall be applied, wherever practicable, in the organization of our local institutions.

We recognize in you no superior title to political rights. We demand perfect equality, as the only secure and legitimate foundation upon which the Union can permanently rest. So long as these claims are denied, so long will continue the struggle of the Irish nation against injustice and misrule.

Should this remonstrance be successful, we cannot indeed promise the immediate restoration of those feelings of attachment which a few years since had begun to expel from the national breast sentiments engendered by centuries of oppression. We can only express our conviction, that those who confide in the influence of Justice will not have misplaced their trust. It may still be in the power of a Government which <sup>has</sup> the confidence of the Irish People to win back their forfeited affections; but we warn you, that every day's delay increases the difficulty of the task, and gives additional strength to those who maintain that there is no hope of good government for Ireland, except in the restoration of her National Parliament.

Should this warning be neglected, upon you, not upon us, be the responsibility of future events.



Thomas Wyse . . . . .	Waterford, City.
D. R. Ross . . . . .	Belfast.
Thomas Esmonde . . . . .	Wexford Town.
William Villiers Stuart . . . . .	Waterford, County.
R. S. Carew . . . . .	Waterford, County.
D. Jephson Norreys . . . . .	Mallow.
M. E. Corbally . . . . .	Meath, County.
John O'Brien . . . . .	Limerick, City.
M. J. O'Connell . . . . .	Kerry, County.
Robert Archbold . . . . .	Kildare, County.
Robert Gore . . . . .	New Ross.
Hugh M. Tuite . . . . .	Westmeath, County.
James Power . . . . .	Wexford, County.
William S. O'Brien . . . . .	Limerick, County.
John Collett . . . . .	Athlone.
V. F. Hatton . . . . .	Wexford, County.
O'Connor Don . . . . .	Roscommon, County.
Thomas N. Redington . . . . .	Dundalk.
Wm. H. Moliamara . . . . .	Clare, County.
Henry Grattan . . . . .	Meath, County.
Henry Winston Barron . . . . .	Waterford, City.
David Roche . . . . .	Limerick, City.
Andrew Armstrong . . . . .	King's County.
Benjamin Chapman . . . . .	Westmeath, County.
Valentine Maher . . . . .	Tipperary, County.
Francis Stack Murphy . . . . .	Cork, City.
George Bryan . . . . .	Kilkenny, County.
Samuel White . . . . .	Leitrim, County.
Henry Watson . . . . .	Kinsale.

## Bibliography

Some of the major manuscript sources for this study are used extensively here for the first time. The papers of the liberal-unionists Thomas Wyse, Sharman Crawford, Lord Clements and James Grattan and the Tories Roden and Farnham are especially noteworthy in this respect, as is the wealth of material in the surprisingly neglected Hatherton Papers. Of the secondary works, the best general studies of the period are those of Mac Intyre, McDowell and Nowlan, though one should also pay attention to the profusion of unpublished research in recent years.

I am pleased to acknowledge the kind permission of the Broadlands Archives Trust to consult and quote from the Broadlands MSS.

Manuscripts.

## National Library of Ireland, Dublin:

Beresford-Leslie MSS (typescript)  
 Bourke Papers (MS and microfilm)  
 Clements Papers  
 Farnham Papers  
 Graham Papers (microfilm)  
 James Grattan's Notebooks and Personal Journals of  
 Proceedings in Parliament  
 Grey Papers (microfilm)  
 Hatherton Papers (microfilm)  
 Knight of Kerry Papers  
 Monteagle Papers  
 Newport Papers  
 Sheil Papers  
 Smith O'Brien Papers  
 Wyse Papers

## Trinity College Dublin:

Beresford Papers

## Public Record Office, Belfast:

Anglesey Papers  
 Bruce Papers  
 Clanwilliam Papers  
 Clogher Diocesan Papers



Transcript of George Robert Dawson's Diary of  
Derry Election, July-August 1837

Downshire Papers  
Dunbar Correspondence  
Dunraven Papers  
Emerson Tennent Papers  
Erne Papers  
Ferguson Papers  
Howard Bury Papers  
Kirk Papers  
Nugent Papers  
Pack-Beresford MSS  
Perceval-Maxwell Papers  
Robert James Tennent Papers  
Roden Papers  
Rossmore Papers  
Sharman Crawford MSS

British Library, London:

Aberdeen Papers  
Broughton Correspondence and Diary  
Holland House Papers  
Peel Papers  
Russell Papers  
Wellesley Papers

Public Record Office, London:

Ellenborough Papers  
Home Office Papers  
Russell Papers

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, London:

Broadlands MSS  
Wellington Papers

University College, London:

Ogden MSS

Queen's College, Oxford:

Derby Papers (in temporary custody of Lord Blake)

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh:

Elliot Papers

Armagh Public (Church) Library:

Beresford Papers

Representative Church Body Library, Dublin:

Beresford MSS

Contemporary Newspapers, Magazines, Periodicals.

The Annual Register  
The Banner of Ulster  
The Belfast News Letter  
The Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine  
The Cork Standard  
The Dublin Evening Mail  
The Dublin Evening Packet  
The Dublin Evening Post  
The Dublin University Magazine  
The Edinburgh Review  
The Freeman's Journal  
The Globe  
The Limerick Standard  
The Morning Chronicle  
The Morning Post  
The Nation  
The Northern Whig  
The Orthodox Presbyterian  
The Pilot  
The Quarterly Review  
The Times  
The Vindicator  
The Warder

Parliamentary Papers.

Fourteenth Report from the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland, P.P., 1812-13, VI, 221.

First Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry, P.P., 1825, XII, 1.

Report from the Select Committee to whom the Reports on the subject of Education in Ireland were referred, P.P., 1828, IV, 223.

Report from the Select Committee on the state of the Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1830, VII, 451.

First and Second Reports from the Select Committee of the Commons on Tithes in Ireland, P.P., 1831-2, XXI, 1, 245.

First and Second Reports from the Select Committee of the Lords on Tithes in Ireland, P.P., 1831-2, XXII, 1, 181.

Report from the Select Committee on the State of Ireland, P.P., 1831-2, XVI, 1.

Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of the Municipal Corporations in England and Wales and Ireland, P.P., 1833, XIII, 1.

Return of Money advanced to ecclesiastical persons, etc., P.P., 1833, XXVII, 493.

Papers Relating to the State of Ireland, P.P., 1834, XLVII, 417.

Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, Ireland, P.P., 1835, XXXIII, 1.



Report of the Select Committee on Bribery at Elections, P.P., 1835, VIII, 1.

Reports from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the nature, character, extent and tendency of Orange Lodges, Associations or Societies in Ireland, P.P., 1835, XV, 1, 501; XVI, 1; XVII, 1.

Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations in Ireland, P.P., 1835, XXVII, 1; 1835, XXVIII, 1; 1836, XXIV, 1.

Third Report from the Commissioners for inquiring into the Conditions of the Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1836, XXX, 1.

Reports from the Select Committee appointed to examine the state, funds, and management of the Diocesan, Royal, and other Schools of Public Foundation in Ireland, P.P., 1836, XIII, 1.

Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the Progress and Operation of the New Plan of Education in Ireland, P.P., 1837, VIII, 1.

Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to inquire into the Progress and Operation of the New Plan of Education in Ireland, P.P., 1837, IX, 1.

Three Reports from the Select Committee appointed to inquire how far the intentions of the Reform Bill are defeated by creating and registering fictitious and improper votes in Ireland, P.P., 1837, XI, 1; 1837-8, XIII, 1.

Three Reports of G. Nicholls, Esq., to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Home Department, on Poor Laws, Ireland, P.P., 1837, LI, 201; 1837-8, XXXVIII, 1.

Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into Foundation Schools and Education in Ireland, P.P., 1837-8, VII, 345.

Report by the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland since the year 1835 in respect of Crime and Outrage, P.P., 1839, XI, 1; XII, 1.

Abstract of Returns Relating to Registration of Electors, Ireland, P.P., 1841, XX, 615.

Minutes of Proceedings of the Select Committee on the Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, P.P., 1842, XIV, 393.

Report from Select Committee on Belfast City Election, P.P., 1842, V, 263.

Letter Relative to the Establishment and Support of Provincial Colleges in Ireland, P.P., 1843, LI, 339.

Report of the Royal Commission on the Law and Practice in respect to the Occupation of Land in Ireland, P.P., 1845, XIX-XXII, 1.

Towns in Ireland from which Petitions have been presented to Her Majesty for Charters of Incorporation, P.P., 1845, XLV, 317.

Report by the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the operation of the 1 & 2 Vict. c. 56, and the other laws relating to the relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1846, XI, 1.

Report from the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practical working of the System of National Education in Ireland, P.P., 1854, XV, 1.

Return of Owners of Land, Ireland, P.P., 1876, LXX, 1.

Parliamentary Proceedings.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series.  
House of Commons, Divisions, 1832-1894, 62 vols..  
Journals of the House of Commons.  
Journals of the House of Lords.

Contemporary Pamphlets.

Anon., The Belfast Election : Mr Emerson Tennent's Claims and Conduct (Belfast, 1832).

National Education : Authentic Report of the very interesting and important speeches delivered at the meeting of the friends of Scriptural Education in the Commercial Buildings, Belfast, upon Tuesday, the 17th January, 1832 (Belfast, 1832).

An Authentic Report of the Proceedings at the Meeting of the Protestants of Ireland, held on Thursday, the 14th of August, 1834, in the King's Room, at the Mansion House, in the city of Dublin (Dublin, 1834).

Report of Proceedings at the Dinner given to the Earl of Winchilsea at Morrisson's Hotel, in the City of Dublin, on Friday, the 15th August, 1834 (Dublin, 1834).

Speech Delivered by the Rev. Charles Boyton, Late Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, at a meeting of the Protestant Conservative Society of Ireland, held at their rooms, Grafton Street, Dublin, on the 16th of September, 1834 (Dublin, 1834).

Speech Delivered by the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, at a meeting of the Protestant Conservative Society of Ireland, held at their rooms, Grafton Street, Dublin, on the 9th of September, 1834 (Dublin, 1834).

Anon., Prospects and Retrospects : an Appeal to British Protestants from their Irish Brethern (London, 1835).

Scrutator, The Question of the Irish Church : A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P., by the Author of "The Church in Danger", a Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Melbourne (London, 1835).

Address to the Clergy of Ireland, from the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Derry and Raphoe on the Subject of National Education (Dublin, 1836).

Report of the Speeches and Proceedings at the Belfast Society's Fourth Anniversary Dinner, Held on Tuesday, December 20, 1836, in the Conservative Hall, Belfast (Belfast, 1837).



Anon., *Strictures on the Proposed Poor Law for Ireland, as recommended in the Report of George Nicholls, esq.* (London, 1837).

Anon., *An Epitome of the Case of Irish Corporations, intended for the perusal of Protestants generally, and especially submitted to the dispassionate judgement of the Members of the Imperial Legislature* (Dublin, 1839).

Anon., *The Irish Municipal Corporations Bill : a few words in time on the subject of Reformed Corporations, and of their powers of taxation, addressed to all who are liable to the payment of poor-rates in Ireland. By a Rate-Payer* (London, 1839).

*Report of the Conservative Registration Committee for the City of Dublin, with an account of the results obtained within the four last years* (Dublin, 1839).

Anon., *A Plea for the Protestants of Ireland; A Letter addressed to the right hon. Lord Morpeth, Chief Secretary for Ireland, with proposals for modifying the National System of Education, by A Witness before the Committee of Inquiry into "The New Plan of Education in Ireland"* (Dublin, 1840).

*Report on the Registration and Election Laws of the United Kingdom; as prepared by a sub-committee of the Ulster Constitutional Association, and afterwards amended agreeably to the instructions of the General Committee, at their meeting on the 19th and 20th November, 1840* (Belfast, 1840).

Anon., *The Irish Franchise and Registration Question* (London, 1841).

Anon., *The Repealer Repulsed! A Correct Narrative of the Rise and Progress of the Repeal Invasion of Ulster : Dr Cooke's Challenge and Mr O'Connell's Declination, Tactics, and Flight, with ... an authentic report of the Great Conservative Demonstrations in Belfast on the 21st and 23rd of January 1841* (Belfast, 1841).

Anon., *Letter to an English Member of Parliament, upon the Subject of the Present State of Ireland, by an Irish Country Gentleman* (Dublin, 1843).

*Two Addresses to the Protestants of Ireland, Adopted at Public Meetings at the Rotundo, by the Dublin Protestant Operative Association and Reformation Society* (Dublin, 1843).

Anon., *A Few Remarks on the Pamphlets of Messrs. Trench, Woodward, Hiffernan, Knox, and Dr Martin, on Government Measures which have affected Protestant interests from 1824 to the Present Time, and on the Position and Duty of the Church, By a Catholic* (Dublin, 1845).

*Soiree of the Dublin Protestant Association and Reformation Society, at Whitefriars' Hall, January 14, 1846* (Dublin, 1846).

Lord Alvanley, *The State of Ireland Considered, and Measures Proposed for Restoring Tranquillity to that Country* (London, 1841).

John Blackburn, *The Three Conferences held by the opponents of the Maynooth College Endowment Bill in London and Dublin during the months of May and June 1845* (London, Dublin, 1845).

Francis Brady, *Report of the Committee of the Loyal National Repeal Association on the County Franchises of Ireland, and upon Lord Eliot's Registration of Electors Bill* (Dublin, 1844).



R. Dillion Browne, M.P., Debate on the First Reading of the Protection of Life (Ireland) Bill (London, 1846).

R. J. Bryce, Sketch of a Plan for a system of National Education for Ireland, including hints for the improvement of education in Scotland (London, 1828).

R. J. Bryce, The Irish Colleges Bill, examined in its bearings on the educational, religious, and financial interests of the country, in three letters to Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P. (Dublin, 1845).

Isaac Butt, Irish Corporation Bill : A Speech delivered at the Bar of the House of Lords on Friday, the 15th of May, 1840, in Defence of the City of Dublin; on the order for going into Committee on the Irish Corporation Bill (London, 1840).

Isaac Butt, The Poor-Law Bill for Ireland Examined, its provisions and the report of Mr Nicholls contrasted with the facts proved by the Poor Inquiry Commission, in a letter to Lord Viscount Morpeth, M.P. (London, 1837).

Isaac Butt, Speech of Isaac Butt, esq., delivered at the great Protestant meeting in Dublin on Thursday, February 13th, 1840 (London, 1840).

Rev. James Carlile, Defence of the National System of Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1838).

(Rev. James Carlile), Thoughts on the Mixed Character of Government Institutions in Ireland, with particular reference to the National System of Education; extracted from the Belfast News Letter of June 18 and 21, 1833. By a Protestant (London, 1833).

Edward Clements, First Report on the Two Registration Bills of Lord Morpeth and Lord Stanley, with a short history of the franchise since the year 1413 (Dublin, 1841).

Edward Clements, Report on the Two Bills Brought into Parliament by Lord Morpeth and Lord Stanley, read at a meeting of the Loyal National Repeal Association, at Dublin, on Monday, the 22nd of February, 1841 (Dublin, 1841).

Lord Clements, The Present Poverty of Ireland Convertible into the Means of her Improvement, under a well-administered Poor Law, with a preliminary view of the state of agriculture in Ireland (London, 1838).

Lord Cloncurry, The Design of a Law, for promoting the pacification of Ireland and the improvement of the Irish Territory and Population (Dublin, 1834).

Henry Cooke, National Education : a Sermon Preached in the Presbyterian Church, May Street, Belfast, upon Sunday the 15th of January 1832 (Belfast, 1832).

William Sharman Crawford, The expediency and necessity of a local legislative body in Ireland, supported by a reference to facts and principles (Newry, 1833).

William Sharman Crawford, Observations on the Irish Tithe Bill passed by the House of Commons in the last session of the Imperial Parliament, submitted to the consideration of the Electors of Dundalk, in letters addressed to William Brett (Dundalk, 1835).



William Sharman Crawford, A review of the circumstances connected with the past and present state of the protestant and catholic interests in Ireland (Dublin, 1833).

Thomas Davis, Report of the Parliamentary Committee of the Loyal National Repeal Association on the Tenants' Compensation Bill (Dublin, 1845).

James Doyle, Unpublished Essay on Education and the State of Ireland, by an Irish Catholic : with explanatory remarks by W. J. Fitzpatrick (Dublin, 1880).

G. H. Evans, Remarks on the Policy of Introducing the System of Poor Rates in Ireland : Addressed to the Society for the Improvement of that Country (London, 1829).

John L. Fitzpatrick, Second Report of the Parliamentary Petition Committee of the Loyal National Repeal Association, on Lord Eliot's Registration Bill (Dublin, 1844).

Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government entitled to the support of the Irish Liberal Members at the Present Crisis ? Considered in relation to the past and with reference to the future (London, 1839).

J. E. Gordon, M.P., Irish Education : Six Letters on the Subject of Irish Education addressed to the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley, M.P., Chief Secretary for Ireland (London, 1832).

Charles Haliday, Necessity of Combining a Law of Settlement with Local Assessment in the Proposed Bill for the Relief of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1838).

J. M. Hiffernan, Review of the Controversy on National Education in Ireland, revived by the Rev. H. Woodward's "Thoughts on the Points at Issue between the Established Church and the National Board of Education" (Dublin, 1844).

Edward Newenham Hoare, Dean of Achonry, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P., on the present state of the question of National Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1842).

(Edward Newenham Hoare, Dean of Achonry), Letters on National Education : containing suggestions with a view to obtaining the cooperation of the clergy of the Established Church with the Incorporated National Board ; by a Dignitary of the Irish Church (Dublin, 1846).

W. E. Hudson, A Treatise on the Elective Franchise and the Registration of Electors in Ireland, under the Reform Act (Dublin, 1832).

J. P. Kennedy, Instruct ; Employ ; Don't hang them ; or, Ireland Tranquillized without soldiers, and enriched without English capital (London, 1835).

(William Keogh), The Charitable Bequests Act: A Letter to the Most Reverend Doctor Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. By a Lay Roman Catholic (Dublin, 1844).

(William Keogh), Ireland Under Lord De Grey (Dublin, 1844).

The Knight of Kerry, A Letter to Sir Robert Peel on the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland (London, 1845).



Lord Langford, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Viscount Melbourne on the Peerage (London, 1837).

A. H. Lynch, An address to the Electors of Galway, on the Poor-Law Bill for Ireland (London, 1838).

Eneas Mac Donnell, The "Crisis" Unmasked : Respectfully Inscribed to the British People (London, 1843).

T. Mac Nevin, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. The Earl of Roden, K.P., on the nature and causes of Crime in Ireland (London, 1838).

P. Mahony, Tithe Bill, Ireland: Letters from Mr Mahony to the Right Hon. E. J. Littleton, M.P. and Chief Secretary for Ireland, on the Irish Tithe or Land-Tax Bill of 1834 (London, 1834).

J. C. Martin, A Defence of the Irish Clergy and a View of their Past and Present Duty with respect to the System of National Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1844).

Anthony Meyler, Irish Tranquillity under Mr O'Connell, My Lord Mulgrave, and the Romish Priesthood (Dublin, 1838).

George Miller, The Present Crisis of the Church of Ireland Considered (Dublin, 1845).

Lord Monteagle, Substance of a Speech delivered in the House of Lords, March 12, 1844 (London, 1845).

Daniel Murray, Letters Addressed to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, on the subject of National Education (Dublin, 1833).

W. H. Neligan, A Letter to a Clergyman in the Diocese of Cloyne, on National Education in Ireland (Cork, 1840).

(Henry Newland), An Address to the Conservative Members of Parliament, on the Present State of Affairs in Ireland (Dublin, 1845).

Henry Newland, Brief Observations on the Past and Present Condition of the Education of the Poor in Ireland (Dublin, 1845).

Henry Newland, Observations on the Past and Present Condition of the Education of the Poor in Ireland, with Remarks on the Lord Primate and Bishops' Address (Dublin, 1845).

William Smith O'Brien, Education in Ireland (London, 1839).

William Smith O'Brien, Plan for the Relief of the Poor in Ireland; with Observations on the English and Scotch Poor Laws ; Addressed to the Landed Proprietors of Ireland (London, 1830).

William Smith O'Brien, Speech of William Smith O'Brien, Esq., M.P., on the Causes of Discontent in Ireland, delivered in the House of Commons, on the 4th July, 1843 (Dublin, 1843).

William Smith O'Brien, Thoughts upon Ecclesiastical Reform, with Suggestions for the Conciliatory Adjustment of the Tithe Question (Limerick, 1833).

Daniel O'Connell, Five Reports of the Committee of the Precursor Association, to whom it was referred, to enquire and report upon the relative state and nature of the Parliamentary Franchises in the United Kingdom, and to suggest the best modes for their identification and improvement (Dublin, 1839).



Daniel O'Connell, Letters to the Reformers of England, on the Reform Bill for Ireland (London, 1832).

Daniel O'Connell, Report of the Committee appointed at a Public Meeting held in Dublin, Thursday, March 19, 1840, to consider the effect of Lord Stanley's Irish Registration Bill (Dublin, 1840).

Daniel O'Connell, Seven Letters on the Reform Bill and the Law of Elections in Ireland (Dublin, 1835).

T. O'Malley, An Idea of a Poor Law for Ireland (London, 1837).

T. O'Malley, A Word or Two on the Irish Poor Relief Bill and Mr Nicholls' Report (London, 1837).

Mortimer O'Sullivan, Reasons for declining to be connected with the System of National Education : a speech delivered at the meeting of the Church Education Society, April 1841 (Dublin, 1841).

Henry James Perry and Jerome William Knapp, Cases of Controverted Elections in the Eleventh Parliament of the United Kingdom; being the first Parliament since the passing of Acts for the Amendment of the Representation of the People (London, 1833).

J. G. V. Porter, Ireland ... A Federal (the only fair) Union between Great Britain and Ireland inevitable, and most desirable for both islands ... (London, Dublin, 1844).

T. M. Ray, Report on the Irish Coercion Bill, the Causes of Discontent in Ireland, Condition of the People, comparative criminality with England, remedial measures, etc, etc (Dublin, 1846).

The Earl of Roden, Observations on Lord Alvanley's Pamphlet on the State of Ireland, and proposed measures for restoring tranquillity to that country (London, 1842).

Lord Rossmore, An Appeal in the Cause of the Ex-Parliamentary Peers of Ireland and Scotland (London, 1830).

Lord Rossmore, Letter on Catholic Emancipation (London, 1828).

Lord Rossmore, Things I Can Tell (London, 1912).

G. P. Scrope, How is Ireland to be Governed ? A Question addressed to the New Administration of Lord Melbourne in 1834, with a postscript in which the same question is addressed to the Administration of Sir Robert Peel in 1846 (London, 1846).

Frederick Shaw, Municipal Corporations (Ireland): Speech of the Right Hon. Frederick Shaw (Recorder of the City of Dublin), in the House of Commons, Thursday, February 7, 1837, on the introduction of the bill (London, 1837).

Frederick Shaw, Speech of the Rt. Hon. Frederick Shaw, at the Election of the University of Dublin, Thursday, 1st July 1841 (Dublin, 1841).

W. Stanley, Remarks on the Government Measure for establishing a Poor-law in Ireland: chiefly with reference to the existing amount of pauperism (London, 1837).

Edward Stopford, Bishop of Meath, Correspondence with Sir James Graham (no place, 1845).



Edward A. Stopford, A Report to the Lord Bishop of Meath on the State of Elementary Schools in the Diocese and the Opinion of the Clergy respecting the question of National Education (Dublin, 1845).

James Henthorn Todd, University of Dublin; Remarks on Some Statements attributed to Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., in his speech in Parliament on Academical Education in Ireland, July 19th, 1844 (Dublin, 1844).

Jacob Venedey, Ireland and the Irish During the Repeal Year, 1843; tr. and with notes by William Bernard Mac Cabe (Dublin, 1844).

Henry Woodward, Thoughts on the Points at Issue between the Established Church and the National Board of Education in Ireland (London, 1844).

Francis Wyse, Federalism : its inapplicability to the wants and necessities of the country; its assumed impracticability considered, with remarks and observations on the rise and progress of the present repeal movement in Ireland, in reply to J. G. V. Porter, Esq. (Dublin, 1844).

Thomas Wyse, Speech of Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., on seconding the motion of W. S. O'Brien, Esq., M.P., for Redress of Grievances (Ireland), in the House of Commons, on Tuesday July 4th, 1843 (Dublin, 1843).

Thomas Wyse, Speech on the extension and improvement of academical, collegiate, and university education in Ireland; at the meeting held for that purpose, at Cork, November 13, 1844. With Notes (Cork, 1845).

John Young, A Letter from John Young, Esq., M.P. for the County of Cavan, to Robert Burrows, Esq. (London, 1846).

#### Other Works.

Anon., The Wellesley Papers : The Life and Correspondence of Richard Colley Wellesley Marquess Wellesley, 1760-1842 (London, 1914), 2 vols..

A. R. Acheson, The Evangelicals in the Church of Ireland, 1784-1859 (Ph D, Belfast, 1967).

D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland : Ecclesiastical Reform and Revolution, 1800-1835 (New Haven, London, 1971).

D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment (London, Toronto, 1970).

A. Alison, Lives of Lord Castlereagh and Sir Charles Stewart, the Second and Third Marquesses of Londonderry (Edinburgh, London, 1861), 3 vols..

Rev. Robert Allen, Henry Montgomery, 1788-1865, in H. A. Cronne, T. W. Moody and D. B. Quinn, eds., Essays in British and Irish History in Honour of James Eadie Todd (London, 1949), 255-77.

The Marquess of Anglesey, One-Leg : The Life and Letters of Henry William Paget, First Marquess of Anglesey, K.G., 1768, 1854 (London, 1961).

H. B. Archdale, Memoirs of the Archdales (Enniskillen, 1925).

A. Aspinall, Lord Brougham and the Whig Party (Manchester, 1927).



- A. Aspinall, *The Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot* (London, 1941).
- A. Aspinall, *Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries* (London, 1952).
- N. Atkinson, *Irish Education : a history of educational institutions* (Dublin, 1969).
- J. J. Auchmuty, *Irish Education : A Historical Survey* (Dublin, London, 1937).
- J. J. Auchmuty, *Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862 : The Life and Career of an Educator and Diplomat* (London, 1939).
- Edward Baines, *The Life of Edward Baines, Late M.P. for the Borough of Leeds* (London, 1851).
- F. E. Ball, *The Judges in Ireland, 1221-1921* (London, 1926), 2 vols..
- M. A. Barrington, *The Reform (Ireland) Act, 1832. A study of its Parliamentary course and its immediate consequences* (M.A., University College Dublin, 1969).
- Richard P. J. Batterberry, 'Sir Thomas Wyse and Mixed Education', *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 5th Series, Vol. LIII (June 1939), 561; LIV (July 1939), 21.
- Richard P. J. Batterberry, 'The synod of Ulster and the National Board', *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 5th series, Vol. LVI (1940), 548; LVIII (1941), 16; LIX (1942), 61.
- Richard P. J. Batterberry, *Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862 : An Advocate of a "Mixed Education" Policy over Ireland* (Dublin, Belfast, Cork, 1939).
- M. R. Beames, *Peasant Disturbances, Popular Conspiracies and their Control : Ireland, 1798-1852* (D. Phil., Manchester, 1975).
- J. C. Beckett, *The Anglo-Irish Tradition* (London, 1976).
- J. C. Beckett, *The Making of Modern Ireland, 1603-1923* (London, 1966).
- The Earl of Belmore, *The History of Two Ulster Manors and of their owners* (London, 1903).
- The Earl of Belmore, *Parliamentary Memoirs of Fermanagh and Tyrone, from 1613 to 1885* (Dublin, 1887).
- G. F. A. Best, 'The Whigs and the Church Establishment in the Age of Grey and Holland', *History*, Vol. 45 (1960), 103-18.
- R. D. Collison Black, *Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870* (Cambridge, 1960).
- Edward Blackburne, *Life of the Rt. Hon. Francis Blackburne, Late Lord Chancellor of Ireland* (London, 1874).
- Sir Henry Blackhall and J. H. Whyte, 'Correspondence on O'Connell and the repeal party', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. XII, No. 46 (September, 1960), 139-43.
- Desmond Bowen, *The Protestant Crusade in Ireland, 1800-70 : A Study of Protestant-Catholic Relations Between the Act of Union and Disestablishment* (Dublin, 1978).



- Desmond Bowen, *Souperism : Myth or Reality ?* (Cork, 1970).
- W. J. Bradley, *Sir Thomas Wyse, Irish Pioneer in Education Reform* (Ph D, Trinity College Dublin, 1945).
- R. C. Brewer, *An investigation into the effects of the 1832 Reform Act on the general elections of 1832, 1835 and 1837 in Ireland* (H.Sc., London, 1965).
- G. Brooker, *Rural Disorder and Police Reform in Ireland, 1812-36* (London, 1970).
- John Brooke and Julia Gandy, eds., *The Prime Ministers' Papers : Wellington, Political Correspondence, I, 1833-November 1834* (London, 1975).
- O. J. Brose, 'The Irish Precedent for English Church Reform : the Church Temporalities Act of 1833', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Volume Seven (1956), 204-25.
- Lord Brougham, *The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham*, written by himself (Edinburgh, London, 1871), 3 vols..
- E. P. Brynn, *Crown and Castle : British Rule in Ireland, 1800-1830* (Dublin, 1978).
- E. P. Brynn, *A Political History of the Church of Ireland, 1801-1845* (M. Litt., Trinity College Dublin, 1968).
- The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, *Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of William IV and Victoria, from original family documents* (London, 1861), 2 vols..
- P. Buckland, *Ulster Unionism and the Origin of Northern Ireland, 1886-1922* (Dublin, London, New York, 1973).
- Ian Dudge and Cornelius O'Leary, *Belfast : Approach to Crisis. A study of Belfast politics, 1613-1970* (London, 1973).
- H. L. Bulwer, *The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston : with Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence* (London, 1870, 1874), 3 vols..
- J. H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (London, 1960).
- G. A. Cahill, 'Irish Catholicism and English Toryism', *Review of Politics*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Jan. 1957), 62-76.
- R. H. Cameron, *Lord Melbourne's Second Administration and the Opposition, 1837-41* (Ph D, London, 1970).
- John Campbell, *A Short History of the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian Church of Ireland* (Belfast, 1914).
- Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (London, 1970), 2 vols..
- A. P. B. Chichester, *History of the Family of Chichester, from A.D. 1086 to 1870* (London, 1871).
- G. Kitson Clark, *Peel and the Conservative Party : a study in party politics, 1832-1841* (London, 1964).
- J. C. Clarke, *From Business to Politics : The Ellice Family, 1760-1860* (D. Phil., Oxford, 1972).



- Randall Clarke, 'The Relations between O'Connell and the Young Irelanders', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. III, No. 9 (March 1942), 18-30.
- Helen R. Clayton, *Societies Formed to Educate the Poor in Ireland in the late 18th and early 19th centuries* (D. Phil., Trinity College Dublin, 1980).
- Valentine Lord Cloncurry, *Personal Recollections of the Life and Times, with Extracts from the Correspondence of Valentine Lord Cloncurry* (Dublin, 1849).
- D. Close, 'The formation of a two-party alignment in the House of Commons between 1832 and 1841', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 84, (April, 1969), 257-77.
- M. D. Condon, 'The Irish Church and the Reform Ministries', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. III, No. 2 (May, 1964), 120-42.
- K. H. Connell, *The Population of Ireland 1750-1845* (Oxford, 1950).
- Nuala Costello, *John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam* (Dublin, London, 1939).
- George Crolly, *The Life of the Most Rev. Doctor Crolly, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland* (Dublin, 1851).
- W. H. Curran, *Sketches of the Irish Bar: with Essays Literary and Political* (London, 1855), 2 vols..
- Ian D'Alton, A contrast in crises : southern Irish Protestantism, 1820-43 and 1885-1910, in A. C. Hepburn, ed., *Minorities in History* (London, 1978), 70-83.
- John D'Alton, *Memoir of the Family of French* (Dublin, 1847).
- W. J. O'Neill Daunt, *Eighty-Five Years of Irish History, 1800-1885* (London, 1888).
- W. J. O'Neill Daunt, *A Life Spent for Ireland, being selections from the journals of the late W. J. O'Neill Daunt, edited by his daughter* (London, 1896).
- G. C. B. Davies, *Henry Phillpots, Bishop of Exeter, 1778-1869* (London, 1954).
- Gustave De Beaumont, *Ireland : Social, Political, and Religious*, edited by W. C. Taylor (London, 1839), 2 vols..
- A. De Vlieger, *Historical and Genealogical Record of the Coote Family* (Lausanne, 1900).
- Benjamin Disraeli, *Lord George Bentinck : A Political Biography* (London, 1852).
- Ralph Disraeli, ed., *Lord Beaconsfield's Correspondence with his Sister, 1832-1852* (London, 1886).
- J. S. Donnelly, Jr., *The Land and the People of Nineteenth-Century Cork : The Rural Economy and the Land Question* (London, 1975).
- P. F. Doran, *Irish Parliamentary Representation, 1832-67* (M.A., Cork, 1954).
- Lady Dorchester, *Recollections of a Long Life by Lord Broughton (John Cam Hobhouse), with additional extracts from his private diaries* (London, 1910-1), 6 vols..

P. J. Dowling, *A History of Irish Education : a study in conflicting loyalties* (Cork, 1971).

F. A. Dreyer, *The Russell Administration, 1846-1852* (D. Phil., St. Andrews, 1962).

C. G. Duffy, *Four Years of Irish history, 1845-9 : a sequel to 'Young Ireland'* (London, 1883).

C. G. Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres* (London, 1898), 2 vols..

C. G. Duffy, *Short Life of Thomas Davis, 1840-1846* (London, Dublin, 1895).

C. G. Duffy, *Young Ireland : A Fragment of Irish History, 1840-1850* (London, Paris, New York, 1880).

(Durham Dunlop), *A Brief Historical Sketch of Parliamentary Elections in Belfast from the first General Election under the Reform Act till 1865* (Belfast, 1865).

R. D. Edwards and T. D. Williams, eds., *The Great Famine : Studies in Irish history, 1845-52* (Dublin, 1956).

D. H. Elliott, *William Blacker (1777-1855) : A Consideration of his impact on some social and military organisations in Ireland as revealed principally in his memoirs* (M.A., Belfast, 1975).

J. C. Erok, *An Account of the Ecclesiastical Establishment Subsisting in Ireland* (Dublin, 1830).

A. B. Erickson, *The Public Career of Sir James Graham* (London, 1952).

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

B. Farrell, ed., *The Irish Parliamentary Tradition* (Dublin, 1973).

D. R. Fisher, *The opposition to Sir Robert Peel in the Conservative Party, 1844-6* (Ph D, Cambridge, 1969).

W. J. Fitzpatrick, *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, The Liberator, edited with notices of his life and times* (London, 1888), 2 vols..

W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times , and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin* (Dublin, 1890), 2 vols..

W. J. Fitzpatrick, *The Life, Times and Cotemporaries of Lord Cloncurry* (Dublin, 1855).

W. J. Fitzpatrick, *Memoirs of Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, with a Glance at his Cotemporaries and Times* (London, 1864), 2 vols..

T. W. Freeman, *Pre-Famine Ireland : A Study in Historical Geography* (Manchester, 1957).

N. Gash, *Politics in the Age of Peel : a study in the technique of parliamentary representation, 1830-50* (London, 1953).

P. Gibbon, *The Origins of Ulster Unionism : the formation of popular Protestant politics and ideology in nineteenth-century Ireland* (Manchester, 1975).

P. J. Gibbon, *The Origins of Ulster Unionism* (Ph D, Manchester, 1972).



James Godkin, *Education in Ireland; its History, Institutions, Systems, Statistics, and Progress, from the earliest times to the present* (London, 1862).

James Godkin, *Ireland and her Churches* (London, 1867).

G. P. Gooch, *The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-1878* (London, 1925), 2 vols..

A. H. Graham, 'The Lichfield House Compact, 1835', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. XII, No. 47 (March, 1961), 209-25.

Tony Grey, *The Orange Order* (London, Sydney, Toronto, 1972).

Lady Gregory, ed., *Sir William Gregory, An Autobiography* (London, 1894).

W. Greig, *General Report on the Gosford Estates in County Armagh, 1821* (Belfast, 1976).

Charles Greville, *Past and Present Policy of England towards Ireland* (London, 1845).

Henry Earl Grey, ed., *The Reform Act, 1832 : The Correspondence of the late Earl Grey and His Majesty King William IV and with Sir Herbert Taylor, from November 1830 to June 1832* (London, 1867), 2 vols..

H. Grote, *The Personal Life of George Grote* (London, 1873).

D. Gwynn, 'O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill', *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Vol. LXIX (1947), 561, 668, 767, 957, 1051; Vol. LXX (1948), 17.

D. Gwynn, *O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill* (Cork, 1948).

Denis Gwynn, 'William Smith O'Brien', *Studies*, Vol. XXXV, No. 140 (Dec. 1946), 448-58.

Denis Gwynn, 'Smith O'Brien and Young Ireland', *Studies*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 141 (March 1947), 29-39.

Denis Gwynn, 'Smith O'Brien and the "Secession"', *Studies*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 142 (June 1947), 129-40.

D. Gwynn, *Young Ireland and 1848* (Cork, Oxford, 1949).

W. D. Hamilton, *The Development of Education in the County of Londonderry from 1800 to 1922* (M.A., Belfast, 1963).

J. P. Hennessey, *The Failure of the Queen's Colleges and of Mixed Education in Ireland* (London, 1859).

J. M. Henry, *An Assessment of the Social, Religious and Political Aspects of Congregationalism in Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (D. Phil., Belfast, 1965).

R. Finlay Holmes, *Henry Cooke, 1788-1868* (M. Litt., University College Dublin, 1970).

K. T. Hoppen, 'Landlords, Society and Electoral Politics in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Ireland', *Past and Present*, No. 75 (May 1977), 62-93.

K. T. Hoppen, 'Politics, the law, and the nature of the Irish electorate, 1832-1850', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 92, No. 365 (Oct. 1977), 746-76.

- D. T. Horgan, *The Irish Catholic Whigs in Parliament, 1847-74* (D. Phil., Minnesota, 1975).
- H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Londonderry's : a family portrait* (London, 1979).
- The Earl of Ilchester, Elizabeth, Lady Holland to Her Son, 1821-1845* (London, 1946).
- B. Inglis, *The Freedom of the Press in Ireland, 1784-1841* (London, 1954).
- William Jaques, *The Chief Factors Determining the Developments in Primary Education, Ireland, 1831-1947* (Ph D, Belfast, 1952).
- T. S. James, *The history of the litigation and legislation respecting Presbyterian chapels and charities in England and Ireland between 1816 and 1849* (London, 1867).
- John Jamieson, *The History of The Royal Belfast Academical Institution, 1810-1960* (Belfast, 1959).
- John Jamieson, *The Influence of the Rev. Henry Cooke on the Political Life of Ulster* (M.A., Belfast, 1950).
- L. J. Jennings, *The Croker Papers : The Correspondence and Diaries of the late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker* (London, 1884), 3 vols..
- M. D. Jephson, *An Anglo-Irish Miscellany : Some Records of the Jephsons of Mallow* (Dublin, 1964).
- Douglas W. J. Johnson, *Sir James Graham as Politician and Home Secretary, 1818-1846* (B. Litt., Oxford, 1947).
- V. B. P. Jones, *Lord John Russell and the Leadership of the House of Commons, 1835-41* (M.A., Wales, 1969).
- W. B. Jones, *Lord Derby and Victorian Conservatism* (Oxford, 1956).
- B. A. Kennedy, *Sharman Crawford's Federal Scheme for Ireland*, in H. A. Cronne, T. W. Moody and D. B. Quinn, eds., *Essays in British and Irish History in Honour of James Eadie Todd* (London, 1949), 235-54.
- B. A. Kennedy, *William Sharman Crawford, 1780-1861 : a Political Biography* (D. Litt., Belfast, 1953).
- W. D. Killen, *The Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, from the earliest period to the present times* (London, 1875), 2 vols..
- W. D. Killen, *Memoir of John Edgar* (Belfast, 1867).
- A. D. Kriegel, *The Holland House Diaries, 1831-1840* (London, 1977).
- A. D. Kriegel, 'The Irish Policy of Lord Grey's Government', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 86, No. 338 (January 1971), 22-45.
- A. D. Kriegel, 'The Politics of the Whigs in Opposition, 1834-1835', *The Journal of British Studies*, Vol. VII, No. 2 (May 1968), 65-91.
- A. D. Kriegel, *The Whig Government and Ireland, 1830-1835* (Ph D, Duke, 1965).
- H. A. Lambert, 'Lambert of Wexford', *The Past : the organ of the Ulster Historical Society*, II (1921), 129-38.



D. Large, 'The House of Lords and Ireland in the age of Peel, 1832-50', Irish Historical Studies, Vol. IX, No. 36 (Sept. 1955), 367-99.

Emmet Larkin, The Quarrel among the Roman Catholic Hierarchy over the National System of Education in Ireland, 1838-41, in Ray B. Browne, William John Roscelli and Richard Loftus, The Celtic Cross : Studies in Irish Culture and Literature (Purdue, 1964), 121-52.

W. T. Latimer, A History of the Irish Presbyterians (Belfast, 1902).

W. T. Latimer, A History of the Life and Times of the Rev. Henry Cooke, D.D., LL. D. (Belfast, 1888).

I. S. Leadam, Coercive Measures in Ireland, 1830-1880 (London, 1881).

W. E. H. Lecky, Leaders of public opinion in Ireland (London, 1903), 2 vols..

G. Shaw Lefevre, Peel and O'Connell : A Review of the Irish Policy of Parliament from the Act of Union to the death of Sir Robert Peel (London, 1887).

Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy (Dublin, 1871).

Sir Denis Le Marchant, Memoir of John Charles Viscount Althorp, Third Earl Spencer (London, 1876).

E. J. Littleton, First Lord Hatherton, Memoir and Correspondence Relating to Political Occurrences in June and July 1834 (London, 1872).

G. Locker-Lampson, A Consideration of the State of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1907).

S. R. Lowry-Corry, Earl of Belmore, Parliamentary Memoirs of Fermanagh, county and borough, from 1613 to 1885 (Dublin, 1885).

Michael A. Lynch, The Kildare Place Society, 1811-1831 (M.A., Cork, 1958).

G. Lyne, 'Daniel O'Connell, Intimidation and the Kerry Elections of 1835', Journal of the Kerry Archaeological and Historical Society, No. 4 (1971), 74-97.

G. Lyne, The General Association of Ireland, 1836-7 (M.A., University College Dublin, 1968).

F. S. L. Lyons and R. A. J. Hawkins, eds., Ireland under the Union : Varieties of Tension. Essays in Honour of T. W. Moody (Oxford, 1980).

L. J. M<sup>c</sup> Caffrey, Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year (Lexington, 1966).

H. M<sup>c</sup> Call, The House of Downshire : A Sketch of its History from 1600 to 1868 (Belfast, 1881).

Donal M<sup>c</sup> Cartney, ed., The World of Daniel O'Connell (Dublin, Cork, 1980).

W. T. M<sup>c</sup> Cullagh, Memoirs of the Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil (London, 1855), 2 vols..

O. MacDonagh, Ireland : the Union and its aftermath (London, 1977).

O. MacDonagh, 'The politicization of the Irish Catholic Bishops, 1800-1850', The Historical Journal, Vol. XVIII, No. 1 (1975), 37-53.

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

R. B. McDowell, 'The Irish Executive in the Nineteenth Century', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. IX, No. 35 (March, 1955), 264-80.

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

R. B. McDowell, ed., *Social Life in Ireland, 1800-45* (Dublin, 1957).

B. M. McGrath, *Introduction of the Poor Law in Ireland, 1831-38* (M.A., University College Dublin, 1965).

A. Mac Intyre, *The Liberator : Daniel O'Connell and the Irish party, 1830-1847* (London, 1965).

J. F. McLennan, *Memoir of Thomas Drummond, Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1835 to 1840* (Edinburgh, 1867).

T. Mac Nevin, *The Speeches of the Right Honourable R. L. Sheil; with a memoir by T. Mac Nevin* (Dublin, 1867).

Liam McNiffe, *The Politicisation of Leitrim, Sligo and Mayo in the general election of 1852* (M.A., Maynooth, 1979).

D. O. Madden, *The Castle and the Country* (Dublin, 1850).

D. O. Madden, *Ireland and its rulers since 1829* (London, 1843), 3 vols..

W. A. Maguire, *The Downshire Estates in Ireland, 1801-1845 : The management of Irish landed estates in the early nineteenth century* (Oxford, 1972).

W. A. Maguire, *Letters of a great Irish landlord : a selection from the estate correspondence of the third Marquess of Downshire, 1809-45* (Belfast, 1974).

T. Martin, *A Life of Lord Lyndhurst from Letters and Papers in Possession of his Family* (London, 1884).

Sir Herbert Maxwell, *The Creevey Papers : A Selection from the Correspondence and Diaries of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P.* (London, 1904), 2 vols..

D. W. Miller, *Queen's Rebels : Ulster Loyalism in Historical Perspective* (Dublin, New York, 1978).

R. Moley, *Daniel O'Connell : Nationalism Without Violence* (New York, 1974).

W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield* (London, 1910-20), 6 vols..

T. W. Moody, 'The Irish University Question of the Nineteenth Century', *History*, Vol. XLIII (1958), 90-109.

T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, *Queen's, Belfast, 1845-1949 : The History of a University* (London, 1959), 2 vols..

T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, eds., *Ulster since 1800 : a political and economic survey* (London, 1954).



- T. W. Moody and J. O. Beckett, eds., *Ulster since 1800, second series, a social survey* (London, 1957).
- H. Kingsmill Moore, *An Unwritten Chapter in the History of Education, Being the History of the Society for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, generally known as the Kildare Place Society, 1811-1831* (London, 1904).
- G. Morton, *Home Rule and the Irish Question* (London, 1980).
- Mac Vey Napier, *Selection from the Correspondence of the late Mac Vey Napier, Esq.* (London, 1879).
- C. W. New, *Lord Durham : A Biography of John George Lambton, First Earl of Durham* (Oxford, 1929).
- George Nicholls, *A History of the Irish Poor Law* (London, 1856).
- L. Nolan, *The Third Earl of Leitrim* (Letterkenny, 1978).
- E. R. Norman, *Anti-Catholicism in Victorian England* (London, 1968).
- E. R. Norman, *A History of Modern Ireland* (London, 1971).
- E. R. Norman, 'The Maynooth Question of 1845', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. XV, No. 60 (Sept. 1967), 407-37.
- K. B. Nowlan, 'Agrarian Unrest in Ireland, 1800-1845', *University Review*, Vol. II, No. 6 (1959), 7-16.
- K. B. Nowlan, 'The Catholic Clergy and Irish Politics in the Eighteen Thirties and Forties', *Historical Studies, Papers read before the Irish Conference of Historians, IX, Cork, 29-31 May 1971* (Belfast, 1974), 119-35.
- K. B. Nowlan, *The Politics of Repeal : a Study in the Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-50* (London, Toronto, 1965).
- Donough O'Brien, *History of the O'Briens, from Brian Boruimhe* (London, 1949).
- G. O'Brien, *The Economic History of Ireland from the Union to the Famine* (London, 1921).
- R. B. O'Brien, *Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881* (London, 1883-5), 2 vols..
- R. B. O'Brien, *Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary in Ireland, 1835-40 : Life and Letters* (London, 1889).
- R. B. O'Brien, *Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691-1870* (London, 1888).
- Lecn O'Broin, *Charles Gavan Duffy : Patriot and Statesman* (Dublin, 1967).
- John O'Connell, *Recollections and Experiences During a Parliamentary Career from 1833 to 1848* (London, 1849), 2 vols..
- J. O'Connell, ed., *The Life and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell, M.P.* (London, 1846).
- Maurice R. O'Connell, *The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell* (Dublin, 1972-80), 8 vols..
- P. O'Donoghue, *The Tithe War, 1830-1833* (M.A., University College Dublin, 1961).



P. O'Donoghue, 'Causes of the Opposition to Tithes, 1830-38', *Studia Hibernica*, No. 5 (1965), 7-28.

P. O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1830-31', *Studia Hibernica*, No. 6 (1966), 69-98.

P. O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1832-3', *Studia Hibernica*, No. 12 (1972), 77-108.

Patrick O'Farrell, *Ireland's English Question : Anglo-Irish Relations, 1534-1970* (London, 1971).

T. P. O'Neill, *The State, Poverty and Distress in Ireland, 1815-45* (Ph D, University College Dublin, 1971).

T. O'Riifeartaigh, 'Mixed education and the Synod of Ulster, 1831-40', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. IX, No. 35 (March 1955), 281-99.

Lord Oranmore and Browne, 'Pedigree of the Brownes of Castle Mac Garrett', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, Vol. V (1907-8), 48-59, 165-77, 227-38.

Bernard O'Reilly, *John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, His Life, Times, and Correspondence* (New York, Cincinnati, 1890), 2 vols..

G. O'Tuathaigh, *Ireland Before the Famine, 1798-1848* (Dublin, 1972).

C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, second Baronet of Netherby, 1792-1861* (London, 1907), 2 vols..

C. S. Parker, *Sir Robert Peel, from his private papers* (London, 1891-99), 3 vols..

T. G. F. Paterson, 'Proposals for a University at Armagh', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, Third Series, Vol. 8 (1945), 5-13.

M. W. Patterson, *Sir Francis Burdett and his times, 1770-1844* (London, 1931), 2 vols..

R. R. Pearce, *Memoirs and Correspondence of the most noble Richard Marquess Wellesley* (London, 1846), 3 vols..

*Sir Robert Peel, Memoirs by the Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel* (London, 1856), 2 vols..

W. A. Phillips, ed., *The History of the Church of Ireland, from the earliest times to the present day* (London, 1933), 3 vols..

David Plunket, *The Life, Letters and Speeches of Lord Plunket* (London, 1867), 2 vols..

J. E. Pomfret, *The Struggle for Land in Ireland, 1800-1923* (Princeton, 1930).

Bernard Pool, *The Croker Papers, 1808-1857* (London, 1967).

J. L. Porter, *The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL. D.* (London, 1871).

John M. Prest, *Lord John Russell* (London, 1972).

J. S. Reid, *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (Belfast, 1867), 3 vols..



S. J. Reid, *Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham, 1792-1840* (London, 1906), 2 vols..

T. W. Reid, *The Life, Letters, and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, First Lord Houghton* (London, 1891), 2 vols..

E. Rowley-Morris, *The Family of Blayney* (London, 1890).

John Earl Russell, *Recollections and Suggestions, 1813-73* (London, 1875).

Rollo Russell, *Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1805-40* (London, 1913), 2 vols..

L. C. Sanders, *Lord Melbourne's Papers* (London, 1889).

M. W. Savage, ed., *Sketches, Legal and Political, by the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil* (London, 1855), 2 vols..

H. Senior, *Orangeism in Ireland and Britain, 1795-1836* (London, Toronto, 1966).

E. P. Shirley, *The History of the County of Monaghan* (London, 1879).

E. P. Shirley, *Some Account of the Territory or Dominion of Farney* (London, 1845).

E. P. Shirley, *Stemmata Shirleiana : or the Annals of the Shirley Family* (London, 1873).

D. Southgate, *The Passing of the Whigs, 1832-1886* (London, 1962).

A. T. Q. Stewart, *The Transformation of Presbyterian Radicalism in the North of Ireland, 1792-1825* (M.A., Belfast, 1956).

Baron E. Von Stockmar, *Memoirs of Baron Stockmar* (London, 1872), 2 vols..

L. Strachey and R. Fulford, *The Greville Memoirs, 1814-1860* (London, 1938), 7 vols..

J. Morgan Sweeney, *The House of Lords in British Politics, 1830-1841* (D. Phil., Oxford, 1974).

J. A. Thomas, 'The System of Registration and the Development of Party Organisation, 1832-1870', *History*, Vol. XXXV (February and June, 1950), 81-98.

M. Tierney, ed., *Daniel O'Connell : Nine Centenary Essays* (Dublin, 1948).

W. M. Torrens, *Memoirs of the Right Honourable William Second Viscount Melbourne* (London, 1878), 2 vols..

A. S. Turberville, *The House of Lords in the Age of Reform, 1784-1837* (London, 1958).

H. Twiss, *The Public and Private Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon, with selections from his correspondence* (London, 1844), 3 vols..

Ruth W. Verner, *Reminiscences of William Verner (1782-1871), 7th Hussars* (London, Aldershot, 1965).

Col. Sir William Verner, *A Short History of the Battle of the Diamond* (Armagh, 1863).

Spencer Walpole, *The Life of Lord John Russell* (London, 1891), 2 vols..

John J. Webb, *Municipal Government in Ireland, Mediaeval and Modern* (London, 1918).

The Duke of Wellington, ed., *Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington, K.G.* (London, 1867), 8 vols..

E. J. Whately, *Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., Late Archbishop of Dublin* (London, 1866), 2 vols..

T. De Vere White, *The Road of Excess* (Dublin, 1945).

J. H. Whyte, 'Daniel O'Connell and the repeal party', *Irish Historical Studies*, Vol. XI, No. 44 (September 1959), 297-316.

J. H. Whyte, 'Landlord influence at elections in Ireland, 1760-1885', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 80, No. 317 (October 1965), 740-60.

J. H. Whyte, *The Tenant League and Irish Politics in the 1850's* (Dundalk, 1963).

J. H. Whyte, 'The Influence of the Catholic Clergy on elections in Nineteenth-Century Ireland', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 75, No. 295 (April, 1960), 239-59.

T. D. Williams, ed., *Secret Societies in Ireland* (Dublin, 1973).

C. Woodham-Smith, *The Great Hunger : Ireland, 1845-9* (London, 1962).

S. F. Woolley, 'The Personnel of the Parliament of 1833', *English Historical Review*, Vol. 53, No. 210 (April, 1938), 240-62.

Thomas Wyse, *Education Reform ; or, the Necessity of a National System of Education* (London, 1836), vol. 1, 2nd vol. not published.

Thomas Wyse, *Historical Sketch of the Late Catholic Association of Ireland* (London, 1829), 2 vols..

Winifrede M. Wyse, *Notes on Education Reform in Ireland during the first half of the 19th century : compiled from speeches, letters, &c, contained in the Unpublished Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Wyse, K.C.B.* (Waterford, 1901).

Philip Ziegler, *Melbourne : a biography of William Lamb, 2nd Viscount Melbourne* (London, 1976).

#### Works of Reference.

J. Bateman, *The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1879).

H. Boylan, *A Dictionary of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1978).

*The British Almanac and Companion.*

L. K. Brown and I. R. Christie, *Bibliography of British History, 1789-1851* (Oxford, 1977).



J. Burke, A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland (London, 1836-8), 4 vols..

U. H. Hussey De Burgh, The Landowners of Ireland : An Alphabetical List of the Owners of Estates of 500 acres or £500 valuation and upwards, in Ireland, with the acreage and valuation in each county (Dublin, 1878).

C. R. Dod, Electoral Facts, 1832-52 (London, 1852).

The Dublin Almanac and General Register of Ireland.

V. Gibbs et al, G.E.C., The Complete Peerage (London, 1910-40), 13 vols..

F. B. Hamilton, The Picture of Parliament, containing a biographical dictionary of the Irish Members (London, 1831).

R. J. Hayes, ed., Manuscript Sources for the History of Irish Civilization (Boston, 1965), 11 vols..

Return of Members of Parliament, Part II, 1357-1874 (London, 1878).

M. Stenton, Who's Who of British Members of Parliament, Vol. I, 1832-1885 : A Biographical Dictionary of the House of Commons, based on annual volumes of "Dod's Parliamentary Companion" and other sources (Hassocks, 1976).

M. Stenton and J. Vincent, eds., McCalmont's parliamentary poll book : British election results, 1832-1918 (Brighton, 1971).

L. Stephen and S. Lee, Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1908-9), 22 vols..

P. Townend, Burke's Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage (London, 1970), 2 vols..

B. M. Walker, Parliamentary Election Results in Ireland, 1801-1922 (Dublin, 1978).

A. J. Webb, A Compendium of Irish Biography (Dublin, 1878).