

8-1-1968

The Maynooth grant and the Conservative Party

R S. McGregor

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

McGregor, R S., "The Maynooth grant and the Conservative Party" (1968). *Student Work*. 387.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/387>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



THE MAYNOOTH GRANT AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of History

and the

Faculty of The Graduate College

University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

R. S. McGregor

August 1968

UMI Number: EP73025

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73025

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of
the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Stanley Trickett, Boston
Chairman Department

Graduate Committee

Ralph M. Wardle English
Name Department

William R. Peterson History

PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the impact of the Maynooth Bill upon the Conservative party and the career of Sir Robert Peel. Because of the limitations of time and space and in the interest of a concise narrative, a great deal of Peel's Irish program has either not been mentioned or only dealt with in passing: the Devon Commission, the Irish Colleges Bill, and the Charitable Bequests Act are the most notable of these omissions or glosses.

Some criticism of my assessment of the condition of the Conservative party between 1840 and 1845 may arise on the part of my readers. However, the most hostile comments will, I think, be reserved for my judgment of Sir Robert Peel. It ought to be pointed out that Peel was not the only English statesman or politician to be bedeviled or ruined by the Irish problem; after 1845 it had only one effective solution, and that solution remained, until after the end of the first World War, a political impossibility for any responsible official of the British Government. But Peel had a chance to deal with Ireland in a truly meaningful way, although he failed to attempt it until it was too late. He had the opportunity to deal with Maynooth before 1845; he made no effort to "educate" his party about the political

and religious realities of the Irish situation, when he knew full well both the necessity for conciliation in Ireland and the typical Conservative attitude towards that country. Peel's failure to prepare the party for the imperatives of the Irish situation is incredible, and there can be no excuse for his lack of such action.

This thesis could not have been attempted, let alone completed, without the guidance, encouragement, and friendship of Dr. A. Stanley Trickett, Chairman of the Department of History at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. His help was invaluable, and I am deeply grateful to him. I would also like to thank Professor William R. Petrowski of the Department of History at the University of Nebraska at Omaha for his advice and counsel over the past years, and Professor Goldwin Smith of the Department of History at Wayne State University, for stimulating my interest in English history.

Without the patient and skillful help of Miss Ella Jane Dougherty of the Eppley Library at the University of Nebraska at Omaha this thesis would not have been possible, for only through her efforts was much of the material used available. I would also like to thank Mrs. Darlene Menard, who typed this thesis under the most difficult of circumstances.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
Chapter	
I. PEEL AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY 1835-1845:	
AN OVERVIEW	1
Sir Robert Peel	1
Peel's First Government	5
His view of Conservatism	7
Peel's Problems with The Tories	9
His Philosophy of Opposition	11
Tory Discontent with Peel	17
The New Poor Law of 1834: The Divisive Issue Between Peel and the Tories	20
Peel's Unpopularity with the Tories	23
The Conservative Party Deeply Divided	25
II. PEEL AND IRELAND 1841-1845	28
The Irish Problem	28
Peel's Religious Position	28
The Basis of Peel's Irish Policy	31
Earl De Grey Appointed Lord-Lieutenant	34
Lord Eliot Appointed Chief Secretary	35
The Conflict Within the Irish Government	36
Peel Decides to "Conciliate" Ireland	45
History and Problems of Maynooth College	46
Peel Decides to Increase the Maynooth Grant	50
The Political Danger of Increasing the Maynooth Grant	51
The Necessity of Increasing the Grant	59
Public Opinion Becomes Alarmed about what Peel may do with the Maynooth Grant	61
Gladstone Resigns from the Government	62
The Government in Extreme Danger Because of its stand on Maynooth	65

Chapter		
III.	THE MAYNOOTH BILL AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY	67
	The Maynooth Bill	68
	The Government in Danger over the Bill	70
	The Maynooth Bill in the House of Commons	70
	Public Reaction to the Maynooth Bill	76
	Pamphlet Propaganda Against the Bill	88
	Pressure Brought to Bear on those who favored the Bill	92
	Role of the Maynooth Bill in the General Election of 1847	98
	The Maynooth Bill and the Destruction of the Conservative Party	99
	CONCLUSION	103
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	107

CHAPTER I

PEEL AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

1835-1845: AN OVERVIEW

Sir Robert Peel was born, in 1788, into a family that had helped to create industrial Lancashire.¹ He became the most notable proponent of "this new dynasty," and he was, in fact, "the representative of a transacting and trading multitude" throughout his career.² Brought up in a relatively strict Tory home, Peel was, almost from birth, educated to be a statesman.³

¹Norman St. John-Stevas, ed., Bagehot's Historical Essays, Anchor Books (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 189. Hereafter cited as Bagehot.

²Ibid., p. 191; Edwin Hodder, The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury (3 vols.; London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886), I, 408. Hereafter cited as Shaftesbury.

This was, at least from Peel's point of view, somewhat unfortunate, as most of the party he was to lead after 1834 loathed the manufacturing interest and everything connected with it. Cf. Fraser's Magazine, "The Conservatives in Power," Vol. XXV, No. CLXVII (March, 1842), p. 376; "The Age We Live In," Vol. XXIV, No. CXXXIX (July, 1841), p. 1. Hereafter cited as Fraser's; Shaftesbury, I, 199, 408, 480; II, 33; Spencer Walpole, A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815 (6 vols.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1886), IV, 140. Hereafter cited as Walpole, History; Cecil Driver, Tory Radical: The Life of Richard Castler (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 194. Hereafter cited as Driver.

³A. A. W. Ramsay, Sir Robert Peel (London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1928), pp. 10-11. Hereafter cited as

In 1801 Peel was sent to Harrow where he enjoyed, after a slightly difficult beginning, a successful yet gentlemanly career.⁴ In the fall of 1805 Robert went up to Oxford, where he entered one of the most eminent and aristocratic of the Colleges, Christ Church; he worked hard and enjoyed a brilliant career, being the first man under the new regulations of 1807 to enjoy a double first in mathematics and classics.⁵

Peel entered the House of Commons in mid-April, 1809, as member for the rotten borough of Cashel City, Ireland.⁶ He made his maiden speech near the end of January, 1810, and it received more than the usual compliments necessary on such an occasion.⁷ Three months later the Prime Minister, Perceval, appointed him Under-Secretary at the Colonial Office.⁸

Ramsay; Norman Gash, Mr. Secretary Peel (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961), pp. 37-40. Hereafter cited as Gash, Secretary Peel.

⁴Ramsay, pp. 11-12; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 44-46.

⁵Ramsay, p. 12; Gash, Secretary Peel, p. 51.

⁶Gash, Secretary Peel, p. 60.

⁷Ramsay, p. 18; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 68-70.

The speech is printed in The Speeches of the Late Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel, Bart. (4 vols.; London: George Routledge and Co., 1853), I, 5-7. Hereafter cited as Peel, Speeches.

⁸Ramsay, p. 18; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 74-76.

Lord Liverpool was then Colonial Secretary; this is when the two men began their fruitful official relationship.

In 1812, in the governmental shake up which followed the assassination of Perceval, Peel became, after some hesitation on his part, the Chief Secretary for Ireland in Lord Liverpool's Government.⁹ He was to spend the next six years in the post, long grueling years, but, at least from the English point of view, highly successful ones. As Chief Secretary he incurred a great deal of odium and a feud with O'Connell, but also gained a reputation, even among Irish Roman Catholics, for honesty and fairness.¹⁰

He resigned his office in 1818, chiefly because "he was tired of it." For the next four years Peel was to enjoy a private life, and spent the last two years of his retirement with his young wife, Julia Floyd, whom he married in 1820.¹¹

In January, 1822, Peel reentered Lord Liverpool's Government, this time as Home Secretary. He was to hold this post for nearly eight consecutive years, and he here consolidated his reputation as a skilled administrative reformer. As Home Secretary Peel rationalized the structure and procedure of the Home Office, reformed the Criminal Code, and in 1829, in perhaps his greatest

⁹Ramsay, p. 20; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 89-90.

¹⁰Ramsay, pp. 21-48; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 96-236.

¹¹Ramsay, pp. 48, 61-62.

achievement at the Home Office, created the Metropolitan Police Force.¹²

With the death of Lord Liverpool in early 1827, Peel's public relationship with Canning became increasingly strained because of their opposite views on the question of Roman Catholic Emancipation. When Canning became Prime Minister in April he resigned; when Canning died in August, 1827, the Luckless Goderich ministry was formed, only to collapse of its own inertia four months later. In January, 1828, the Wellington-Peel Government was formed, with Peel as Home Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons. In July of that year Vesey-Fitzgerald was dramatically defeated in the Clare Election, and the Government now insisted that Roman Catholic Emancipation was inevitable and therefore necessary.¹³

¹²G. M. Trevelyan, British History in the Nineteenth Century and After, 1782-1919, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1966), p. 199; Asa Briggs, The Making of Modern England, 1783-1867, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1965), pp. 192-194, 216-218. Hereafter cited as Briggs; Ramsay, pp. 66-90; Gash, Secretary Peel, pp. 283-307.

¹³Ramsay, pp. 91-121; Briggs, pp. 195, 199, 200-201, 218-219, 226-227, 331; E. L. Woodward, The Age of Reform 1815-1870 (2nd ed.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962), pp. 74-77. Hereafter cited as Woodward.

Peel's position probably never recovered from this reversal of opinion, and he was haunted until the end of his life by this "aposty." Cf. Lord Mahon and Edward Cardwell, eds., Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel (2 vols.; London: John Murray, 1857), I, passim. Hereafter cited as Peel, Memoirs.

The Government managed to successfully weather the storm evoked by their sudden espousal of Emancipation, but it ran into even more serious trouble in 1830. In May of that year Peel succeeded his father as second baronet; in June George IV died; in July the Second French Revolution occurred; in November the Government fell over the issue of Parliamentary Reform,¹⁴ which Peel only ultimately accepted because it was the law of the land.¹⁵

Between November, 1830, and November, 1834, Peel was one of the leaders of the Opposition to the Whig Government, but he did not become the leader of his party until William IV chose him to be Prime Minister in late 1834.¹⁶ His first Government had a minority in the House

¹⁴Briggs, pp. 228-229, 233-244, 251-260.

¹⁵Peel opposed the Bill on the grounds that it was not and could not be a "final settlement" of the constitution. By 1834 he had reluctantly accepted the Bill, but only as the final settlement of the question of representation, and as a portion of the constitution. Cf. Peel, Speeches, II, 291-292; Peel to Wellington, May 24, 1831, Peel to Goulburn, June 5, 1831, Peel to Lord Harrowby, February 5, 1832, C. S. Parker, ed., Sir Robert Peel From his Private Papers (3 vols.; London: John Murray, 1891-1899), II, 186-187, 202. Hereafter cited as Parker, Peel; Peel, Memoirs, II, 58-67; Great Britain, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3d ser., Vol. 40 (1838), 1251-1252. Hereafter cited as Hansard; Peel's speech at the Merchant Taylor's Hall dinner, May 11, 1835, quoted in W. T. Haly, ed., The Opinions of Sir Robert Peel, Expressed in Parliament and in Public (London: Whittaker & Co., 1843), pp. 393-394. Hereafter cited as Haly.

¹⁶Norman Gash, Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics 1832-1852 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965),

of Commons, and it could only struggle on until it was defeated for the last time in April of 1835, being replaced by Lord Melbourne's Government.¹⁷

As Leader of the Conservative Party, Sir Robert was faced with one great problem: to get the Tory portion of his party, which tended to see post-Reform-Bill-England in the darkest terms,¹⁸ to accept the Reform Bill. The Conservative, or Peelite members of the party now did, and the Ultra-Tory or Tory members did not.¹⁹ They formed the old Country Party, and were opposed to any and all reform;²⁰ they looked to Ultra-Protestantism and to the past, to a

pp. 133-134, 140-141. Hereafter cited as Gash, R&R; cf. Greville's remarks, quoted in Briggs, p. 268.

Wellington was "astonished" at the amount of support that Peel received from the Tory peers in 1834. Wellington to Peel, Nov. 30, 1834. Peel, Memoirs, II, 28-30.

¹⁷Ramsay, pp. 179-191.

¹⁸Fraser's, "The Age We Live In," Vol. XXIV, No. CXXXIX (July, 1841), p. 1; Robert Southey, Sir Thomas More: or, Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society (London: John Murray, 1831), passim; Thomas Carlyle, Sartor Resartus (London: Oxford University Press, 1960), Bk. III, Ch. VII; Past and Present (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1935), Bk. IV, Ch. IV; Lockhart to Croker, September 9, 1842, Louis J. Jennings, ed., The Croker Papers (2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), II, 202. Hereafter cited as Croker; R. B. McDowell, British Conservatism 1832-1914 (London: Faber and Faber, 1959), pp. 32-33, 37. Hereafter cited as McDowell, Conservatism.

¹⁹Duke of Newcastle to Peel, March 29, 1835, Parker, Peel, II, 296.

²⁰Ibid.; Gash, R&R, n. 1, p. 133.

romanticized hierarchical social order founded upon an agrarian way of life.²¹

For Peel, Conservatism meant a readiness "to support monarchy, property, and public faith, whenever attached."²² The "chief object" of his Conservative Party was "to resist Radicalism," and "to prevent those further encroachments of democratic influence which will be attempted."²³ The party was based upon four great "Conservative Principles:" the maintenance of the prerogatives of the Crown; the preservation of the existing constitutional relationships between the Crown, Lords, and Commons; the defense of the Church of England; the preservation of the equality of all before the law.²⁴

The goals of a Conservative Government were, according to Sir Robert, to eliminate "every abuse" in

²¹Hereward Senior, Orangeism in Ireland and Great Britain 1795-1836 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 150, 159, 164, 216; Driver, pp. 31-32, 290, 428.

²²Peel to Croker, May 28, 1831, Parker, Peel, II, 186.

²³Peel to Goulburn, January 3, 1833, Parker, Peel, II, 212.

²⁴Peel's speech at the Merchant Taylor's Hall dinner, May 11, 1835, quoted in Haly, pp. 14-15; The Times (London), May 14, 1835; Peel to Goulburn, January 3, 1836, Parker, Peel, II, 318; Peel's speech at the Glasgow Banquet, January 13, 1837, quoted in Haly, p. 325; George Peel, ed., The Private Letters of Sir Robert Peel (London: John Murray, 1920), p. 140. Hereafter cited as Peel, Letters; Gash, R&R, pp. 148, 131.

It must be pointed out that on this level of party principle, Protection had no place. It was not an issue of cardinal importance.

government, to the "application of every principle of just and wise economy,"²⁵ and to encourage industry and production.²⁶ Peel's position was summed up in late 1834 in his Tamworth Manifesto, which officially accepted the Reform Bill on behalf of the party, and stated his approval of all moderate and necessary reform.²⁷ It created a "prodigious sensation"²⁸ and its impression of moderation and sanity was made more profound and effective because it was known that the Prime Minister was courting Sir James Graham and Lord Stanley, two of the most prominent of the dissident Whigs.²⁹ The Tamworth Manifesto satisfied "all the moderate people,"³⁰ and its impact was increased because it was written by a Conservative Prime Minister.³¹

While Peel seems to have been personally opposed to the Ultra-Tory, agricultural wing of his party,³² he was also

²⁵Peel's speech at the Merchant Taylor's Hall dinner, May 11, 1835, quoted in Haly, p. 14.

²⁶Quoted in Cash, R&R, p. 144.

²⁷Peel, Memoirs, II, 58-67; cf. n. 15, supra.

²⁸Henry Reeve, ed., The Greville Memoirs. A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV and King William IV (3 vols.; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1875), December 20, 1834, III, 178. Hereafter cited as Greville, First Part.

²⁹Annual Register (1835), pp. 5-6.

³⁰Greville, First Part, December 20, 1834, III, 178; cf. Quarterly Review, CV (February, 1835), 261-287.

³¹Cash, R&R, p. 141.

³²Peel to Croker, January 12, 1836, October 29, 1838, Croker, II, 101, 131; Peel to Croker, February 2,

motivated by political necessity, as "the Tories alone could not maintain him."³³ He was forced to try and increase his party's poll in the towns, and these urban Conservatives were necessary to him if he were ever to achieve a stable majority in the House of Commons.³⁴ This was a perilous course for Peel to pursue, because until after 1850, the political system was dominated by landed aristocrats;³⁵ his risk was even greater as his own party was heavily agricultural.³⁶

The Tory portion of the Conservative Party was not happy with Peel's attempts to extend the party, and to make

1835, Peel to Hardinge, May 27 [1841], Peel to Arbuthnot, October 30, 1842, Peel to Bulwer, May 12, 1845, Parker, Peel, II, 284, III, 273, II, 533, III, 177. Cf. Gash, R&R, p. 140.

³³Greville, First Part, January 8, 1835, III, 189; Croker and Peel's remarks, quoted in Parker, Peel, II, 261.

³⁴Donald Southgate, The Passing of the Whigs 1832-1886 (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 123. Hereafter cited as Southgate; Gash, R&R, p. 136.

³⁵G. S. R. Kitson Clark, The Making of Victorian England (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 214. Hereafter cited as Kitson Clark, Victorian England.

³⁶In 1832 the percentage of landholding Tories in the House of Commons was 58%; in 1835 57%; in 1837 58%; in 1841 59%. The party was never again to be so completely agricultural, and by 1865 only 45% of the party could be classified as primarily agricultural (These calculations are based on the tables given in J. A. Thomas, The House of Commons 1832-1901. A Study of its Economic and Functional Character (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1939), pp. 4-5, 15.)

These figures are reasonably well corroborated in Kitson Clark, Victorian England, pp. 300, 305, and by the Annual Register (1837), p. 170.

it more in touch with contemporary life;³⁷ the situation was not improved by Sir Robert's contemptuous attitude towards them. He thought, often too publicly, that they were rash, over-confident bores who were completely lacking in political principle and would do anything to gain office. He felt that they were, or at least could be, dangerous fools, and he refused to compromise on "any one opinion I entertain in order to consolidate Ultra-Tory support."³⁸

Perhaps the most damning Ultra-Tory sin in Peel's eyes, however, was their political unpopularity.³⁹ As early as 1828, Bishop Lloyd of Oxford had noted that "no government wd. be in such danger [of collapse] as an ultra-Tory,"⁴⁰ and Peel was warned, in 1841, to avoid including them in his Government at all costs.⁴¹ To strengthen his position within the party "against the great body of his

³⁷R. L. Hill, Toryism and the People, 1832-1846 (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1929), pp. 40, 46, 68, 187.

³⁸Peel to Goulburn, ND [1830], Peel to Goulburn, May 28, 1831, Peel to Goulburn, June 5, 1831, Peel to Har- dinge, September 24, 1846, Parker, Peel, II, 170, 186-187, 188, III, 473-474; Peel, Letters, p. 273; Greville, First Part, February 25, 1837, III, 390; Peel to Graham, January II, 1845, quoted in David Large, "The House of Lords and Ireland in the Age of Peel, 1831-50," Irish Historical Studies, IX, No. 36 (September, 1955), p. 386.

³⁹Peel, Memoirs, II, 50; J. W. Freshfield to Peel, December 9, 1834, Parker, Peel, II, 262-263.

⁴⁰Quoted in Olive Brose, Church and Parliament (Stanford University Press, 1959), p. 45.

⁴¹J. W. Freshfield to Peel, August 28, 1841, Parker, Peel, II, 482-483.

Tory supporters" and to increase the power and ability of the parliamentary party, Sir Robert took in Sir James Graham and Lord Stanley.⁴²

But the most singular part of Peel's political philosophy was his theory of how a political party in Opposition ought to function.⁴³ Proper Conservative policy in Opposition ought, he wrote, to seek "to conciliate the sober-minded and well-disposed portion of the community," thereby laying "the foundation of future strength."⁴⁴ He thought this self-effacing type of policy provided "the best chance" to create a Conservative Government, but for his methods to be effective, it was of cardinal importance that the Opposition show "no anxiety for power" and especially to avoid all "petty manoeuvring [sic.]" and "little cunning schemes for putting a Government in a minority."⁴⁵ Peel said, in his first speech to the reformed House of Commons, that it was his "duty to support the Crown" and that his support was determined by "independent and disinterested" principles;

⁴²Greville, First Part, March 31, 1837, III, 394. Graham and, at this time, Stanley were hated by the Tories. Cf. Ibid., July 3, 1835, III, 274; Shaftesbury, I, 479; II, 38-40.

⁴³Peel to Arbuthnot, November 4 [1832], Parker, Peel, II, 409-410.

⁴⁴Peel to Goulburn, January 3, 1833, Ibid., p. 212.

⁴⁵Peel to Arbuthnot, May 27, 1834, Ibid., p. 247.

he had "no desire to replace" the Government.⁴⁶ In fact, a Conservative Opposition was, he wrote, "almost a contradiction in terms" because "faction" and "extreme opinions for the purpose of faction" were not at all "reconcilable with Conservative Opposition."⁴⁷

The Duke of Wellington, the leader of the party in the House of Lords, agreed with Peel. He told Greville that the Government should always be supported when it "ought to be supported."⁴⁸ Another of Sir Robert's closest lieutenants, Lord Aberdeen, who became his Foreign Secretary in 1841, wrote that the Conservative Opposition was "in a false position" in that they were "an opposition without the desire of obtaining office," and that "Many of us are perfectly satisfied to remain as we are."⁴⁹

⁴⁶Quoted in Norman Gash, "Peel and the Party System," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series, Vol. 1, 52-53. Hereafter cited as Gash, Peel.

⁴⁷Peel's Memorandum, July 4, 1837, Parker, Peel, II, 338; Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 47 (1839), 1122.

This also helps to explain why Peel supported the Whig Government on sixteen "of the most important questions" that came before the House in 1833-1834 (Peel, Letters, p. 147).

Cf. Lord Melville's remarks, quoted in Gash, R&R, p. 130.

⁴⁸Henry Reeve, ed., The Greville Memoirs (Second Part) (3 vols.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885), May 26, 1840, January 23, 1838, I, 287, 49. Hereafter cited as Greville, Victoria.

⁴⁹Aberdeen to Pass. Lieven, February 7, 1838, quoted in G. S. R. Kitson Clark, Peel and the Conservative Party (London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1929), p. 367. Hereafter cited as Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party.

Peel's reasons for his "half conscious coalition"⁵⁰ with the Whig Government were that it maintained "the Conservative Cause"--i.e., the status quo,⁵¹ because Whig Policy tended to be very much like official Conservative policy,⁵² because the Conservative leadership thought they could control the Government in this way,⁵³ and because the leadership of the Conservatives did not want to form a Government.⁵⁴

Sir Robert also opposed the formation of a Conservative Government because, according to Sir James Graham, he feared the hostile attitude of the Queen towards the party, the "lukewarmness" of some "disappointed followers," the irresponsibility and lack of discipline on the part of a large portion of the party, and because of other numerous "conflicting difficulties."⁵⁵ Wellington too was opposed

⁵⁰Southgate, p. 65.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 66.

⁵²Cf. Russell to Taylor, January 9, 1836, Russell to Melbourne, September 9, 1839, Rollo Russell, ed., Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell (2 vols.; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1913), II, 170-173, 264-265. Hereafter cited as Russell, Early Correspondence; Greville, First Part, March 10, 1836, III, 347; Gash, R&R, p. 148.

⁵³Aberdeen to Pess. Lieven, May 8, 1833, quoted in Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 273.

⁵⁴Greville, Victoria, August 13, 1840, I, 291; Parker, Peel, II, 401.

⁵⁵Graham to Peel, December 26, 1839, Parker, Peel, II, 428-429.

to the party taking office because, in his view, they "could not improve matters much" by doing so,⁵⁶ and because the back-benchers as a group were not capable of giving the leadership adequate support.⁵⁷ Stanley agreed with Peel and Wellington's position,⁵⁸ and he would have concurred in Lord Aberdeen's opinion that, even if the Conservatives obtained office, the leadership was "doubtful of retaining it."⁵⁹ Graham alone opposed this view. While he had informed Greville that, when Lord Melbourne's Government nearly resigned in the Spring of 1839, he was "pleased" that they had not.⁶⁰ He felt that "The scheme of governing in Opposition" could not "be durable,"⁶¹ and that the only true goal of Conservative political Opposition was to turn out the Government and "replace it by a better" one.⁶²

⁵⁶Arbuthnot to Peel, November 19, 1840, Ibid., p. 451.

⁵⁷Wellington to Peel, March 28, 1839, Ibid., pp. 385-386.

Cf. Wellington to Peel, December 18, 1839, January 3, 1840, Ibid., II, 416-420, 430-432; Wellington to Croker, November 12, 1839, Croker, II, 151-152.

⁵⁸Graham to Peel, December 26, 1839, Parker, Peel, II, 427.

⁵⁹quoted in Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 367.

⁶⁰Greville, Victoria, March 28, 1839, I, 178.

⁶¹Graham to Peel, December 26, 1839; Graham to Peel, December 18, 1839, Parker, Peel, II, 428, 420-423.

⁶²Graham to Peel, December 18, 1839, Ibid., p. 421.

The Conservative leadership also had one more reason for not wanting office at this time: they were deeply divided among themselves over the Irish Municipal Bill and the Canada Bill.⁶³ This division of opinion, chiefly between Sir Robert and Graham on the one hand and Wellington on the other, was so serious that Graham thought that if the differences became public they would almost certainly "destroy the Conservative party."⁶⁴

With his rather curious attitude towards Parliamentary opposition, it is somewhat surprising to find that Peel, and Graham and Aberdeen as well, claimed to believe in the efficacy of party Government.⁶⁵ Peel more often acted upon the principle of looking "at every measure solely in reference to its merits, uninfluenced by the ties of party,"⁶⁶ and held to the position that to "con- descend to humiliating submissions for mere party purposes" was contemptible. If a parliamentary leader was

⁶³ Peel's Memorandum, July 6, 1840; Graham to Arbuthnot, July 27, 1840, *Ibid.*, pp. 433-438, 444-446.

⁶⁴ Graham to Peel, June 9, 1840, *Ibid.*, p. 439.

⁶⁵ Peel's Memorandum, July, 1846, *Ibid.*, III, 364; Peel, *Speeches*, I, 392; II, 44, 754; Peel to Lady Peel, August 22, 1834, Peel, *Letters*, p. 245; Cash, *R&R*, p. 126.

Graham did claim to value his personal political independence more highly than his party affiliation. C. S. Parker, *Life and Letters of Sir James Graham* (3 vols.; London: John Murray, 1907), II, 429. Hereafter cited as Parker, *Graham*.

⁶⁶ Peel, *Speeches*, II, 44.

obstructed in any way in exercising his will, he would "retire from office" rather than compromise his principles.⁶⁷ He refused, he wrote, to hold political office unless it was held on his own terms,⁶⁸ and to allow "consideration of mere political support" to influence his opinions. He absolutely would not "be the instrument of carrying other men's opinions into effect."⁶⁹ He would never, he told the House, show "subservience to a party," or prefer the interests of party to those of the nation.⁷⁰ To do so would be a crime, "a most unworthy proceeding, and a most improper exercise of power."⁷¹ He could not hold, or be held responsible for, "other people's acts--particularly when he disapproved of their acts."⁷² Peel was, obviously, "essentially an authoritarian,"⁷³ and he equated opposition to his policies with the weakening

⁶⁷Peel to Croker, September 20, 1841, Croker, II, 200.

⁶⁸Peel, Speeches, III, 703, IV, 138; Peel to House, August 28, 1841, Parker, Peel, II, 480; Greville, Victoria, February 4, 1840, I, 264.

⁶⁹Annual Register (1841), p. 211.

⁷⁰Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 85 (1846), pp. 247-248.

⁷¹Ibid., Vol. 47 (1839), p. 1122.

⁷²Peel to Lady Peel, August 3, 1835, Peel, Letters, p. 153. Cf. Bagehot, p. 185.

⁷³Gash, R&R, p. 150; Peel to Lord Harrowby, February 5, 1832, Parker, Peel, II, 201; Peel, Speeches, II, 720-721, 817, III, 365.

of both the "efficiency" and the "authority" of his Government.⁷⁴

Sir Robert's singular conduct did not pass unnoticed.⁷⁵ When, after the election of 1837, the Conservative party returned more than 300 of its members to the House, forming the most powerful opposition in history,⁷⁶ the leadership's methods of opposition began to arouse a great deal of comment among the backbenchers and in Tory ranks outside the House of Commons.⁷⁷ They did not understand

⁷⁴Peel to Lord Sandon, June 17, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 152; Peel to Frederick Peel, June, 1844, Peel, Letters, p. 258.

Peel's Irish experience seems to have confirmed him in his autocratic behavior. Cf. Peel to Lord Liverpool, October 20, 1813, Peel to Gregory, March 15, 1816, Peel to Lord Whitworth, February 29, 1816, Peel to Arbuthnot, November 4, 1837, Parker, Peel, I, 112-113, 215, 211, II, 410; Ramsay, p. 25; Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, pp. 7, 10-11.

⁷⁵Fraser's, "Philosophy of Party Politics," Vol. XVI, No. XCI (July, 1837), p. 128; "Lessons of Illiberalism," Vol. XVII, No. CI (May, 1838), pp. 527-530; "The Last Session of Parliament," Vol. XXVIII, No. CLXV (September, 1843), p. 369; "The State and Prospects of the Government," Vol. XXIX, No. CLXX (February, 1834), p. 241; "The State of Parties," Vol. XXX, No. CLXXV (July, 1844), p. 126.

⁷⁶Gash, R&R, p. 145.

⁷⁷Greville, First Part, July 25, 1837, III, 390; Victoria, August 23, 1838, May 13, 1838, May 2, 1839, July 14, 1838, June 3, 1838, I, 127-128, 93, 194-196, 111, 100; Shaftesbury, I, 329, 480; King of Hanover to Croker, November, 1838, Croker, II, 122-123; Fraser's, "Our Present Position," Vol. XIII, No. LXXVIII (July, 1836), p. 756; "The Weakness and the Strength of the Conservative Party," Vol. XV, No. LXXXIX (May, 1837), passim; "Conservative Policy, For 1838-9," Vol. XVIII, No. CV (September, 1838), pp. 371-372; "The Close of the Session of 1840," Vol. XXII, No. CXXIX (September, 1840), p. 373.

Peel's moderation in Opposition.⁷⁸ They wanted to destroy the Whig Government, and were, on the whole, not very particular about how they did it.⁷⁹ John Wilson Croker, one of the most prominent Tories outside of Parliament, wrote to an old political friend that the Conservative leadership would have to be forced to accept office,⁸⁰ and many other Tories were equally disappointed by Peel's policy.⁸¹ Lord Ashley, one of the most intelligent of the Tories in the House of Commons, recorded in his Diary that Sir Robert cared more for the good opinion of Lord John Russell or Macaulay than he did for that of his party.⁸² The Marquise of Londonderry, a leader of the Ultra-Tories, complained that Peel was ignoring the party and its legitimate claims,⁸³ and Lord Stanhope declared that the party was

⁷⁸Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 367; Greville, First Part, June 14, 1835, III, 263; Victoria, March 4, 1838, I, 72.

⁷⁹Greville, Victoria, March 4, 1838, I, 72; Elic Halévy, A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. IV: Victorian Years 1841-1895 (6 vols.; New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1961), p. 38. Hereafter cited as Halévy, IV.

⁸⁰Croker to The King of Hanover, ND, Croker, II, 121-122.

⁸¹Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1965), p. 136.

⁸²Shaftesbury, I, 343.
Peel's campaigning on his support of the Government (cf. The Times (London), July 25, 1837) did little to quiet speculation about his motives.

⁸³Londonderry to the Duke of Buckingham, September 1, 1837. Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs of the Courts

in the hands of the Whigs.⁸⁴ Lord Ashley felt that the party's leadership was totally lacking in principle, and would do anything to keep itself in power,⁸⁵ and Disraeli, in the most literate indictment of Peel's methods, wrote that "A sound Conservative government" was only "Tory men and Whig measures," and claimed that Peel had hoodwinked his party.⁸⁶

Peel's autocratic attitude also aroused considerable criticism on the part of the Tories, and increased their alienation from the leadership.⁸⁷ Lord Ashburton, a prominent Tory, complained to Croker that he "thought our friend too severe in his notions of party obedience," and that Sir Robert was behaving like a drill-sergeant. He concluded by saying that "a little more freedom" would aid both the party and Peel.⁸⁸ Sir Robert's tendency to ignore the party, and

and Cabinets of William IV and Victoria (2 vols.; London: Hurst and Blackett, 1861), II, 288. Hereafter cited as Buckingham, Memoirs.

⁸⁴Walpole, History, IV, 140.

⁸⁵Shaftesbury, I, 334; Peel to Lord Sandon, June 14, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 152; Benjamin Disraeli, Lord George Bentinck (London: Colburn and Co., 1852), p. 308. Hereafter cited as Disraeli, Bentinck.

⁸⁶Benjamin Disraeli, Coningsby (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1933), Bk. II, Ch. II; Sybil (London: Colburn and Co., 1860), Bk. VI, Ch. 1.

⁸⁷Lord Ashburton to Croker, April 7, 1844, Croker, II, 236.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 237.

his failure to consult with them over most matters of importance, also roused their ire.⁸⁹ Ashley wrote that Peel was "omitting to call his friends frequently together, to state his desires and rouse their zeal." He added that some consultation with the party on the part of Peel would have done wonders for morale; instead, they felt they were led by a drill-sergeant.⁹⁰ Lord Lyndhurst, who was Peel's Lord Chancellor in both his Governments, told Greville that "the great misfortune of our party is that [Peel] won't communicate with anybody."⁹¹ Even in small matters, he often did not inform the rest of the Government of his intentions.⁹²

Perhaps the most important specific issue that separated the Conservative leadership from their party before 1845 was the controversy over New Poor Law of 1834.⁹³

⁸⁹Greville, First Part, February 20, 1836, III, 341; Victoria, August 26, 1843, II, 197; Fraser's, "Can the Queen's Government be carried on?" Vol. XXVIII, No. CLXIII (July, 1843), p. 123; "The Late Session of Parliament," Vol. XXVIII, No. CLXV (September, 1843), p. 377.

⁹⁰Shaftesbury, I, 479.

⁹¹Greville, Victoria, February 28, 1836, I, 70.

⁹²Ibid., August 26, 1843, II, 197.

⁹³For information on the New Poor Law of 1834, cf. G. M. Young and W. D. Hancock, eds., English Historical Documents 1835-1874 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), pp. 603-736; S. E. Finer, The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1952), pp. 70, 77, 86, 93-94, 127. Hereafter cited as Finer; Annual Register (1841), p. 35; Earl Russell, Recollections and Suggestions 1813-1873 (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1875),

Peel and the party's leadership supported the Amendment, while the bulk of the party did not; Sir Robert had, in fact, invited the Government to reform the Poor Law, and his support for the measure was of critical importance in getting the Bill enacted into Law.⁹⁴

Peel campaigned on his support for the New Poor Law,⁹⁵ and he was a consistent defender of it in the House. He told the Commons that he was, on the whole, quite satisfied with the Act,⁹⁶ and said that he gave it his "cordial support."⁹⁷ He added that, as of yet, he had no reason to change his views.⁹⁸ Sir Robert was very much aware of the Act's unpopularity,⁹⁹ but he supported the new Law because he felt that it was in the public interest to do so.¹⁰⁰ The

p. 96. Hereafter cited as Russell, Recollections; L. G. Johnson, The Social Evolution of Industrial Britain (Liverpool; Liverpool University Press, 1959), p. 67.

On the Old Poor Law, cf. the excellent summary of it in Finer, pp. 39-42; Alexis de Tocqueville, Journeys to England and Ireland, Anchor Books (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 40, 86-87.

⁹⁴Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 21 (1834), pp. 691-692; Peel to Croker, December 13, 1838, Croker, II, 133; Halévy, IV, 8.

⁹⁵The Times (London), July 25, 1837.

⁹⁶Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 40 (1838), pp. 1410-1412.

⁹⁷Peel, Speeches, III, 365-366.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹Cf. Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 57 (1841), p. 619; Vol. 64 (1842), pp. 255, 594-595.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., Vol. 64 (1842), p. 251.

Old Poor Law was, he said, almost worthless, and it was destroying the self-respect of the poor. He wanted, he went on, to restore the poor to "what they were in former times--a peasantry respectable in station, independent in feelings, and comfortable in circumstances."¹⁰¹ He also took particular pains to defend the highly controversial Poor Law Commissioners from attack, and claimed that they really protected the poor, serving as they did as a sort of "tribunal to which the poor man could have recourse in case of hardship."¹⁰² As Prime Minister, Peel refused to allow the Law to be altered, and, in 1842, he secured its renewal for an additional five year term.¹⁰³

The New Poor Law was "odious, repulsive, and detestable" both to the Tories and to the "masses" of England. It was the most hated of the great Reform Ministry's works, and it was the object of a mass of ill-feeling and reprobation.¹⁰⁴ While opposition to the Law

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 596-597; Peel's speech at Tamworth, July, 1837, quoted in Haly, p. 334.

¹⁰² Hangard, 3d ser., Vol. 57 (1841), p. 645; Vol. 64 (1842), p. 255; Annual Register (1841), pp. 23-29, 201-254.

¹⁰³ Annual Register (1841), pp. 202-203; Walpole, History, IV, 191; Greville, Victoria, September 22, 1841, September 29, 1841, II, 49.

¹⁰⁴ Walpole, History, IV, 35, 90; Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, pp. 149, 321; Russell to Melbourne, August 13, 1839, Russell, Early Correspondence, II, 255-256; Quarterly Review, CVI (April, 1835), pp. 473-539; Greville, First Part, May 13, 1837, III, 398; Victoria,

was often "irrational" and fanatical,¹⁰⁵ many Tories had always opposed the Amendment, and their opposition to it was, just as often, based upon both constitutional and humanitarian grounds.¹⁰⁶ The Law was obviously cruel, and it raised a host of problems because no precedents existed for such an extra-Parliamentary Department of State. Tory opposition to it was far more than a stick with which to beat the Whigs.¹⁰⁷

The Tories in the Conservative Party put up with Peel and his methods only because there was no alternative

August 25, 1837; March 30, 1841, I, 18-19, 389; Lockhart to Croker, September 9, 1842, Croker, II, 202; Finer, p. 202.

Popular reaction to the new Law was often violent. Cf. Finer, pp. 127-129, 134, 140-141, 178.

¹⁰⁵ John Stuart Mill, Autobiography of John Stuart Mill (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1964), p. 144; Finer, p. 140.

¹⁰⁶ Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 321; G. M. Young, Victorian Essays, ed. W. D. Hancock (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 30-31. Hereafter cited as Young, Essays.

¹⁰⁷ Young, Essays, p. 31; Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, pp. 149-150, 321; Marion Miliband, ed., The Observer of the Nineteenth Century, 1791-1901 (London: Longmans, 1966), pp. 117-119; Driver, pp. 284, 301, 282.

This was especially true in the case of John Walter II, proprietor of The Times (London), and most notable opponent of the New Poor Law. Cf. Annual Register (1841), p. 35; The History of The Times (4 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939), II, 4-6; Greville, Victoria, January 24, 1840, May 2, 1841, I, 258, 391; John Walter to Croker, July 20, 1837, September 20, 1837, Croker, II, 115, 118; Finer, pp. 43, 99, 129; Driver, p. 370.

to him.¹⁰⁸ As Lord Londonderry wrote, the party had no real choice in the matter of the leadership and its policy, because to disavow Sir Robert would be to split the party, and "if that party is split into any sections, the Whigs are in power forever."¹⁰⁹

Peel was well aware of his party's attitude towards him,¹¹⁰ and he does not seem to have been in doubt that he was, as Lord Ashley put it, "the most unpopular head of a party that ever existed."¹¹¹ He was faced with ever-growing difficulty in holding the party together,¹¹² and in mid-1837 there was, he wrote, "imminent danger of disunion in" the party.¹¹³ By 1840 there was a great deal of evidence that the party was becoming desperate,¹¹⁴ and in 1842 Tory

¹⁰⁸Croker to the King of Hanover, December 28, 1844, Croker, II, 232; Greville, Victoria, January 16, 1843, II, 135.

¹⁰⁹Londonderry to the Duke of Buckingham, September 1, 1837, Buckingham, Memoirs, II, 288.

¹¹⁰Thomas Doubleday, The Political Career of Sir Robert Peel, Bart. (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1856), p. 128.

¹¹¹Shaftesbury, II, 100.
Cf. Ibid., 342; Buckingham, Memoirs, II, 424-425.

¹¹²Graham to Peel, December 11, 1836, Parker, Peel, II, 329.

¹¹³Peel's Memorandum, July 4, 1837, Ibid., p. 337.

¹¹⁴Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 449.

discontent reached a new and unprecedented height.¹¹⁵ That year Sir Robert was the object of a savage but articulate public attack on the part of Sir Richard Vyvyan, an Ultra-Tory Cornish M.P. Vyvyan denounced Peel as a dictator, and claimed that he was ignoring the party, and trying "to convert a body of high-minded noblemen and gentlemen into a regiment of partisans."¹¹⁶ In 1843 the Government's popularity reached a new low,¹¹⁷ and Peel, who drove himself at a furious pace,¹¹⁸ was beginning to show the strain of overwork.¹¹⁹

Peel could try to dismiss his party's internal troubles as basically irrelevant,¹²⁰ but he was compelled to inform his "shadow cabinet" that the opposite was

¹¹⁵Peel to Arbuthnot, October 30, 1842, Parker, Peel, II, 532-533.

¹¹⁶quoted in R. L. Hill, Toryism and the People, 1832-1846 (London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1929), p. 65; McDowell, Conservatism, p. 35.

¹¹⁷Greville, Victoria, January 16, 1843, June 6, 1843, II, 135, 161-162.

¹¹⁸Peel, Letters, pp. 220-221, 223-224, 237, 240, 244, 251.

¹¹⁹Russell to Lord Minto, August 5, 1843, Spencer Walpole, The Life of Lord John Russell (2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889), I, 390. Hereafter cited as Walpole, Russell; Cobden to F. Cobden, ND, 1843, John Morley, The Life of Richard Cobden (2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908), I, 284. Hereafter cited as Morley, Cobden.

¹²⁰Peel to Croker, ND, 1843, Croker, II, 220-221.

true.¹²¹ Graham too was "sadly afraid" that the party was deeply divided, and thought that it must be reconciled, as the alternative was political collapse; he told Peel in late 1839 that this seemed imminent.¹²² By mid-March, 1845, the Conservative internal division had deepened. Graham wrote to Croker that "the existence of the Government" was "endangered" by the Tories, who were "ready to give" the Government "the deathblow."¹²³ Lord Sandon told Peel that his actions vis à vis the party surpassed all understanding, and he bluntly warned him: "Try their attachment by any real test, and you will see . . . how they will answer to it."¹²⁴

By March, 1845, Peel was looked upon by most of the Tories in the Conservative Party as a traitor to the

¹²¹ Peel's Memorandum, July 4, 1837, Parker, Peel, II, 337-338.

The Tory press sometimes took great pains to deny this rift. Cf. Blackwood's Magazine, "The Elections," Vol. 42 (September, 1837), p. 304; Fraser's, "The State and Prospects of the Government," Vol. XXIX, No. CLXX (February, 1844), p. 239; "The Late Session of Parliament," Vol. XXVIII, No. CLXV (September, 1843), p. 369; "The Crisis: and What is to Follow," Vol. XXI, No. CXXI (January, 1840), pp. 116-117.

¹²² Quoted in Gash, Peel, p. 59; Graham to Peel, December 18, 1839, Parker, Peel, II, 421. Cf. Peel, Letters, p. 148.

¹²³ Graham to Croker, March 22, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 172.

¹²⁴ Lord Sandon to Peel, June 15, 1845, Ibid., pp. 151-152.

"Conservative Cause," and he was forced to rely to an increasingly dangerous extent upon the goodwill and support of the Whigs.¹²⁵ A large, unbridgeable gap separated the Peelite Government from their Tory supporters; the brains and the votes of the party were at odds. Sir Robert still had, as Disraeli pointed out, the votes of his party,¹²⁶ but he could not, without certain disaster for both his Government and his party, strain their patience further.

¹²⁵Walpole, Russell, I, 399-400; History, IV, 140-141; Young, Essays, pp. 14, 164.

¹²⁶Disraeli, Bentinck, p. 8.

CHAPTER II

PEEL AND IRELAND 1841-1845

Immediately after his smashing victory in the General Election of 1841,¹ Sir Robert Peel was confronted with the tangled problem of Ireland. The "Irish problem" was exceedingly complex; because it was both political and religious, it almost defied solution.

The Tories, in and out of Parliament, had long been concerned over the condition of the established churches of England and Ireland, and what Peel would do for and with them when he returned to power.² In addition, they were also worried about the Prime Minister's personal religious position, for while Peel was a wholehearted supporter of the established churches of the United Kingdom,³ he was also an Erastin⁴ and felt by many to be quite unsound in Anglican

¹The Conservative party won an overall majority of 76 seats. Annual Register (1841), p. 147.

²Croker to Peel, February 2, 1835, Parker, Peel, II, 284.

³Peel's speech at the Glasgow Banquet, January 13, 1837, quoted in Haly, pp. 81-82.

⁴Peel, Speeches, III, 316; Peel to De Grey, September 15, 1841, Parker, Peel, III, 414.

doctrine.⁵ Moreover, Sir Robert believed in the necessity of at least some reform of the Church,⁶ though he realized (as did most of the Tories) that any reform, no matter how positive and constructive, was fraught with danger for the Church.⁷ The Prime Minister would, on occasion, defend Bishops' incomes, cathedral establishments, Church extension, and pluralities;⁸ he too deplored the Oxford Movement.⁹ But Peel opposed the Orange Societies¹⁰ and, far

⁵Dr. Lloyd to Peel, December 23, 1825; Peel to Dr. Lloyd, December, 1825, Parker, Peel, I, 385-386.

⁶Peel to the Bishop of Exeter, December 22, 1834, Peel to Hobhouse, January 23, 1835, Peel to Goulburn, January 29, 1835, Peel to Croker, February 2, 1835, Peel to Heytesbury, November 6, 1844, Ibid., II, 255-256, 282-285; III, 415. Cf. Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 53 (1840), pp. 602-604.

⁷Peel to Graham, December 22 [1842], Parker, Peel, II, 550-551.

⁸Peel, Speeches, III, 318, 325-326; Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 45 (1839), pp. 869-875; Peel to Graham, December 22, [1842], Peel to Hobhouse, January 21, 1843, Parker, Peel, II, 550-551, 563-565.

⁹Peel to Gladstone, June 23, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 418.

¹⁰Peel to Littlehales, April 9, 1816, Peel to Wellington, July 23, 1829, Peel to Graham, August 22, 1845, Ibid., I, 223; II, 118; III, 186; Peel, Speeches, I, 221, 334, 491; Peel's speech in the Debate on a Petition, March 3, 1825, quoted in Haly, p. 257.

Peel's opposition to the Orange movement represented an important reversal in his policy. Cf. Peel, Speeches, I, 39-42, 47-48; Hansard, 1st ser., Vol. 28 (1814), p. 745.

more importantly, was known to favor "a complete" settlement of Roman Catholic claims within the Kingdom.¹¹

It was Peel's willingness, however, to discuss both religious and political accommodation with "Rome" that created such profound additional distrust of the Prime Minister within Tory circles. For them, the Church was in mortal danger, especially in Ireland,¹² from what they regarded as the insidious and insatiable demands of Roman Catholicism.¹³ The Tory attitude towards the Church of Ireland and its members was well summed up by the Duke of Wellington when he wrote that "The Protestants in Ireland" were "the proprietors of the soil, the gentry, and the well-educated class" of the country. These people,

¹¹ Peel's Memorandum, August 11, 1828, Parker, Peel, II, 59. Cf. Haly, pp. 59-81.

¹² Quarterly Review, No. CV (February, 1836), pp. 174-214; No. CXII (July, 1836), p. 400; No. CXII (September, 1836), pp. 243-251; Gilbert A. Cahill, "Irish Catholicism and English Toryism," Review of Politics, XIX (January, 1957), 62-76.

On the condition and problems of the Church in the first half of the nineteenth century, cf. Gash, R&R, pp. 60-91; F. W. Cornish, The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (London: Macmillan and Co., 1910). Hereafter cited as Cornish, Church; J. R. H. Moorman, A History of the Church in England (New York: Moorehouse-Gorham Co., 1954); W. L. Mathieson, English Church Reform 1815-1840 (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1923).

¹³ Quarterly Review, No. CXIII (September, 1836), pp. 243-251; McDowell, Conservatism, pp. 22-23; Young, Essays, pp. 146-153.

because they were in such a minority, required "the special protection of the Government and the laws."¹⁴ Peel's political problems were made even more difficult because of the tendency of many of the Tories to over generalize and equate their particular brand of Anglicanism with "proper" Conservative views and politics.¹⁵

The basis of Sir Robert Peel's Irish policy was the maintenance of the Union, which, he believed, was mutually beneficial to both nations.¹⁶ To repeal the Act of 1801

¹⁴Wellington to Lady Greville, September 27, 1828, Alice, Countess of Stratford, ed., Personal Reminiscences of the Duke of Wellington by Francis, The First Earl of Ellesmere (London: John Murray, 1903), p. 135.

The Duke's views on the Church are also worth noting: it was "the true Christian Church" and "the best religious establishment that could be formed." Moreover, it was "political as well as religious" and "essential to the conservation, the prosperity, the peace and good order of the country." Wellington's Memorandum, September 29, 1843, Ibid., p. 175.

¹⁵Fraser's, "What is to be done for Ireland," Vol. XXVII, No. CLIX (February, 1843), p. 238; "Preface to our Second Decade," Vol. XXI, No. CXXI (January, 1840), p. 11; "Treason Within the Church," Vol. XVIII, No. CIV (August, 1838), p. 191; "The Irish Church," Vol. XI, No. LXIV (April, 1835), pp. 491-496; "The 'No Popery' Cry," Vol. XIII, No. LXXVI (April, 1836), pp. 511, 519; "Orangemen versus Romanism," Vol. XIII, No. LXXV (March, 1836), p. 381; "The Politics of the Month," Vol. XI, No. LXII (February, 1835), p. 246; "Justice to Ireland," Vol. XIII, No. LXXVIII (June, 1836), pp. 719-722; "More Justice to Ireland," Vol. XIV, No. LXXIX (July, 1836), p. 51; "Ireland and the Conciliatory System," Vol. XIV, No. LXXXI (September, 1836), pp. 260-271; Shaftesbury, I, 288-289; Greville, First Part, February 14, 1835, April 9, 1835, III, 205, 244; Victoria, August 1, 1843, II, 188-189.

¹⁶Peel, Speeches, II, 608-609; Peel's speech in the Debate on a Petition, February 8, 1830, quoted in Haly, p. 399.

was, he felt, both "mad" and "absurd;" it would only "injure the integrity of the Empire."¹⁷ England would never, he said, allow repeal to take place, except "in the last extremity."¹⁸ Furthermore, elimination of the Union would only turn anarchy loose in Ireland and, at the same time, reduce England to the status of a "fourth-rate power."¹⁹ But Peel at the same time rejected the use of force in the maintenance of the Union, and emphatically repudiated its use in governing Ireland.²⁰

The new Prime Minister refused, as well, to author a policy that rejected the late Whig Government's Irish legislation.²¹ Ireland was quiet in 1841,²² and the Conservative Government would do nothing to disturb that calm.²³ There would be no restoration of the Orange Societies, or any other repressive acts on the part of

¹⁷Peel, Speeches, II, 119.

¹⁸Peel's speech in the Debate on a Petition, February 8, 1830, quoted in Haly, p. 399.

¹⁹Peel, Speeches, II, 816, 609, 400.

²⁰Peel to Graham, October 19, 1843, Peel to Hardinge, May 27 ~~1845~~, Parker, Peel, III, 65, 272.

²¹Kevin B. Nowlan, The Politics of Repeal: A Study of the Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-1850 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 26. Hereafter cited as Nowlan, Repeal.

²²Ibid., p. 25.

²³Greville, Victoria, January 24, 1842, II, 77.

the new Government.²⁴ Nor would it attempt to provoke or alienate the Irish; rather its policy would be one of quiet conciliation.²⁵ Peel and his Home Secretary, Sir James Graham, thought that a policy of this kind might eliminate the repeal agitation and, if at the same time, Irishmen who favored the "British connection" were given preferential treatment, Ireland might be reduced to a permanent state of quiet.²⁶

To enforce their Irish policy while maintaining a compromise political balance like the one that obtained in London,²⁷ the Government appointed Lord De Grey to the post of Lord-Lieutenant and Lord Eliot to the office of Chief Secretary.²⁸

²⁴Ibid. Some of the members of the Government were, however, privately in favor of a rather far reaching plan of conciliation for Ireland. Ibid., February 14, 1841, I, 375.

²⁵Peel to Graham, December 19, 1841, Peel to Graham, January 2, 1842, Parker, Peel, III, 37.

²⁶Nowlan, Repeal, p. 27; Peel to Graham, July 16, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 364.

²⁷Walpole, History, IV, 116.

²⁸The operation of the Irish Government was complex and often difficult. It has been compared with "the imperial double headed eagle, or even occasionally Cerberus." The Lord-Lieutenant was the chief executive of the Irish Government, appointed by letters patent to represent the Crown, and was the official head of Irish society. The Chief Secretary, "subject to the Lord-Lieutenant's supervision," was "responsible for managing many domestic matters which in England were the business of a secretary of state." He was responsible to the House of Commons for the Irish Government. The Government was supposed to be shared between the two officials; while the Lord-Lieutenant was the "nominal

Thomas Phillip De Grey, second Earl De Grey,²⁹ was a Tory who was far more conservative than his voting record indicated.³⁰ He was appointed Lord-Lieutenant in late August, 1841, over the objections of his wife, who feared the influence of her brother, the Ultra-Protestant Earl of Enniskillen, upon him.³¹ The elder brother of the Earl of Ripon (the former Prime Minister, Lord Goderich), De Grey had served as First Lord of the Admiralty in Peel's first Government.³² A firm upholder of the

superior," the power of the Chief Secretary "tended" to increase throughout the century; the "exact balance of power between the two offices" often fluctuated, depending upon who held them. R. B. McDowell, "The Irish Executive in the Nineteenth Century," Irish Historical Studies, IX, No. 35 (March, 1955), p. 264; R. B. McDowell, The Irish Administration 1801-1914 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), pp. 52, 56.

²⁹1781-1859; educ. St. John's, Cambridge (M. A.). Succ. as 3d baron Grantham of Grantham, 1786; aid-de-camp to Wm. IV, 1831, and to Victoria, 1837. Succ. as 2nd Earl De Grey and baron Lucas of Crudwell, Wilts., 1833. K. G., 1844; 1st. Pres. of the Institution of British Architects, 1834-1859; F. R. S., 1841. G. C. Boase, "Thomas Phillip de Grey, Earl De Grey," Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (22 vols.; London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922), VIII, 651. Hereafter cited as D.N.B.

³⁰Kitson Clark, The Conservative Party, p. 291; Nowlan, Repeal, p. 26.

³¹Parker, Graham, I, 349; Greville, Victoria, September 1, 1841, III, 54.

³²Lord Ripon to Graham, December 19, 1834, Parker, Graham, I, 219.

"Ascendency,"³³ he was also, rather singularly, a close personal friend of the Home Secretary, Sir James Graham.³⁴

Edward Grenville, Lord Eliot,³⁵ was a "well-meaning and liberal" minded man who may have been politically "timid."³⁶ Eager to initiate a policy of conciliation in Ireland--far too eager for the Government³⁷--Eliot was looked upon as too pro-Catholic by part of the Tory press.³⁸ His chief weaknesses may have been his lack of

³³Greville, Victoria, September 10, 1843, II, 198; Lawrence J. McCaffrey, Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966), pp. 59, 149, 162-167, 216. Hereafter cited as McCaffrey, O'Connell; Nowlan, Repeal, p. 27.

³⁴Graham to Lord Ripon, December 23, 1834, Parker, Graham, I, 219-220.

De Grey came into control of the borough of Ripon in 1845 and Graham held that seat from 1847 to 1852; De Grey seems to have engineered his election there. Norman Gash, Politics in the Age of Peel (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1955), p. 223. Hereafter cited as Gash, Politics; Southgate, p. 473; Mandell Creighton, "Sir James Robert George Graham," D.N.B., VIII, 331.

³⁵1798-1877; succ. 3d Earl of St. Germans, January, 1845. Educ. Westminster school, Christ Church, Oxford. M. P. Liskeard, 1824-1832; lord of the treasury, 1827-1830. Diplomat 1823 & 1824; negotiated "Eliot Convention" in Spain, 1834. M. P. East Cornwall, 1837-1845; Postmaster General, 1845-1846. Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 1852-1855; afterwards official in the Royal Household and "confidential adviser" to the Queen. G. B. Smith, "Edward Granville Eliot, third Earl of St. Germans," D.N.B., VI, 603-604.

³⁶Greville, Victoria, September 10, 1843, II, 199.

³⁷Graham to Stanley, November 21, 1842, Parker, Graham, I, 358.

³⁸McCaffrey, O'Connell, pp. 94-95. He was, in fact, a leading advocate for the endowment of the Irish

ability as an administrator and his alleged "craving for power;"³⁹ his main strength his perceptive ability, for he alone in the Government recognized the full importance of the land question in Ireland.⁴⁰

Peel began his Irish Administration by instructing De Grey, in mid-September, 1841, to pursue a policy of moderation and caution at almost all costs.⁴¹ Whatever harmony there was in Dublin Castle was, however, soon destroyed. By early December Lord Eliot was quite disenchanted, because the Lord-Lieutenant was keeping him "too much in the background." Peel advised Graham that, since Eliot was responsible to the House of Commons for the conduct of the Irish Government, "his opinion" was "entitled in such matters to great deference and authority."⁴² De Grey did not accept this advice and inferred in his own defense that Eliot was being kept in the dark

Roman Catholic Church. Ibid., pp. 162-163, 222-223.

Peel and Graham seem to have privately shared most of his beliefs, but feared that he would yield his convictions in the face of strong Protestant pressure.

Ibid., n. 56, p. 164.

³⁹Nowlan, Repeal, p. 26; Stanley to Peel, October 21, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 67.

⁴⁰Nowlan, Repeal, pp. 33-34.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 27.

⁴²Peel to Graham, December 6, 1841, Parker, Peel, III, 36-37.

because he was about to become a Catholic tool.⁴³ The internal feud continued unabated, and it broke out in the House of Commons in July, 1842, when the Irish Solicitor-General clashed with Lord Eliot on the issue of Irish education.⁴⁴

The Lord-Lieutenant was, at the same time, attempting to place an opponent of Government policy in an Irish office; in response to this undeniably provocative action, Eliot attacked the Protestant Education Society.⁴⁵ De Grey's appointment policy was now noted by the Government, for he was openly violating his instructions by appointing only Ultra-Protestants to office.⁴⁶

The Chief Secretary, meanwhile, proposed that the Government, in line with its stated policy, authorize a commission of inquiry into the condition of Maynooth College prior to an increase in the Regium Donum. Peel managed to dissuade Eliot from this course at the end of September, 1842, by arguing that such a plan would only, in all probability, yield a heated religious controversy.⁴⁷ Acutely

⁴³Nowlan, Repeal, p. 32.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Lord Eliot to Peel, July 15, 1842, Lord Eliot to Graham, July 16, 1842, Graham to Peel, July 17, 1842, Parker, Peel, III, 38-39.

⁴⁶Parker, Graham, I, 353-354.

⁴⁷Nowlan, Repeal, p. 31.

aware of Protestant sensitivity towards Irish Roman Catholicism, the Prime Minister and, to a greater extent, Graham, opposed Eliot's move because they were afraid that Eliot "would compromise himself and the Government in his discussions with the Catholic representatives."⁴⁸

The Irish Government's internal troubles unfortunately continued, and in October, 1842, the Prime Minister wrote to the Home Secretary in a tone of complete exasperation that it was not possible to go on with the task of governing Ireland from Ireland if such conditions persisted. He went on to lament that it was very difficult to get De Grey and Eliot to give individual opinions, let alone collective ones; he would, he concluded, not tolerate such acrimonious dissent any longer.⁴⁹

In response to this letter from Peel, Graham issued a stern rebuke to De Grey two days later. The Lord-Lieutenant was bluntly told that "It was impossible that the Irish Government could be safely or well conducted in this manner." He advised De Grey that "it would be well" if he and Eliot did confer upon official business, reminding him that Eliot had that right since he was responsible to the House of Commons for the policy of the Irish Government. Graham went on to say that if agreement was still impossible

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Peel to Graham, October 20, 1842, Parker, Peel, III, 39.

after such consultation, the matter should be appealed to the Prime Minister, with or without the aid of the Home Secretary. He concluded with an admonition to his old friend to work with the Chief Secretary because "Your temper, discretion, and judgement could not fail to exercise a commanding influence over" him.⁵⁰

The Lord-Lieutenant did not heed the Home Secretary's advice, and in mid-December Graham was forced to write to the Prime Minister that he was "afraid of a rupture between De Grey and Eliot." He feared that their "mutual estrangement" was increasing and that an "open breach" was near. He did, however, hold out some hope for the successful conclusion of the trouble, trusting as he did in "the prudence of De Grey, who is aware of the danger, and will endeavour to avert it."⁵¹

Peel, who did not share the Home Secretary's high opinion of the Lord-Lieutenant, advised De Grey in rather strong terms to avoid a public break with Lord Eliot, and he offered the Chief Secretary roughly the same advice.⁵² The Prime Minister was also deeply concerned about De Grey's policy of appointing opponents of Government policy to Irish

⁵⁰Graham to De Grey, October 22, 1842, Ibid., II, 354-355.

⁵¹Graham to Peel, December 15, 1842, Ibid., III, 40.

⁵²Peel to Graham, December 23, 1842, Peel to Eliot, December 23, 1842, Ibid., pp. 41-43.

posts, and he warned Graham that they must not allow this to continue.⁵³

Graham somehow managed to negotiate a compromise in Dublin and on Christmas Eve he cheerfully informed the Prime Minister that "The danger" had "passed away." He hoped that there would be no further trouble, at least for the session. Optimistically he added that "Lord St. Germans Lord Eliot's father cannot be immortal, and there are some great advantages in an hereditary peerage."⁵⁴ Graham concluded that he would like to send Eliot to Canada but that this was impossible because of the influence Gibbon Wakefield had over him and because of his weakness in the face of "popular influences." He advised Peel to dismiss the Chief Secretary from the Government at once, claiming that "his absence from the House of Commons would be a positive gain."⁵⁵

This acerbic letter provoked a stringent reply from Peel. He told the Home Secretary that he was "sure" that De Grey could "manage" Eliot, but he pointed out that the Lord-Lieutenant "must show him full confidence, and ought to admit him into all his councils, and talk over with him

⁵³Peel to Graham, December 23, 1842, Ibid., p. 40.

⁵⁴Graham to Peel, December 24, 1842, Ibid., p. 43.
The Home Secretary often reasoned on this level.
Cf. Shaftesbury, II, 85.

⁵⁵Graham to Peel, December 24, 1842, Parker, Peel, III, 43-47.

every important appointment."⁵⁶ But Peel's patience had run out. The quarrel inside the Irish Government was still about the same thing--De Grey would not consult Eliot about major policy decisions.⁵⁷ The Prime Minister proposed to solve the problem by abolishing the Lord-Lieutenancy,⁵⁸ and this drastic proposal at least temporarily eliminated the difficulties within Dublin Castle.

Within five months the calm that had prevailed in Ireland ceased to exist, and this revival of the Repeal movement caught the Irish Government completely unawares.⁵⁹ The Chief Secretary, possibly to counter a move by De Grey, counseled the Government in London to avoid repressive measures in Ireland, and he renewed his demands for a more conciliatory policy there.⁶⁰ Graham too, by this time, was coming to favor a more conciliatory policy for Ireland, but he was "afraid that De Grey would never give effect to" one.⁶¹ De Grey countered Eliot's pressure with some of his own, and he informed the Prime Minister that his Chief Secretary and his Lord Chancellor were "useless" to the

⁵⁶Peel to Graham, December 27, 1842, Ibid., p. 47.

⁵⁷Nowlan, Repeal, pp. 32-33.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 33.

⁵⁹De Grey to Peel, May 6, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 47.

⁶⁰Peel to De Grey, May 9, 1843, Ibid., p. 48.

⁶¹Graham to Peel, July 17, 1843, Ibid., I, 365.

Irish Government. He complained that, "With all their good qualities," neither possessed "insight, respect, or the confidence of any party in the country."⁶² Two days later he told Peel that he alone was "the hope" of "thousands" in Ireland, and that he deeply regretted having to return temporarily home because of illness; the country had, he wrote, no confidence or respect for any "other member of the Government." Because of his absence from Dublin, great unrest would, he concluded, prevail in the country.⁶³ Some days later he informed the Prime Minister that, while he was in no way personally biased against Roman Catholics, no attempt to aid them would work because "Conciliation was a chimera."⁶⁴

Peel then wrote again to Graham about the difficulties of the Irish Government, and he wryly remarked that he thought that De Grey misunderstood "the relative position of Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary." He also commented about the fact that the Lord-Lieutenant was still excluding Eliot from his confidence, and that the Chief Secretary had

⁶²De Grey to Peel, August 7, 1843, Ibid., III, 55. Cf. De Grey to Peel, June 8, 1843, Ibid., p. 53.

⁶³De Grey to Peel, August 9, 1843, Ibid., p. 55. He was also "very anxious" to personally consult with Peel and Graham when he returned to England. Peel to Lady Peel, August 9, 1843, Peel, Letters, p. 270.

⁶⁴De Grey to Peel, August 18, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 56. Cf. De Grey to Peel, January 22, 1844, Ibid., pp. 103-104.

been reduced to a position of a "mere cypher."⁶⁵ The Home Secretary promptly wrote to De Grey and admonished him in particular for his failure to appoint Roman Catholics to the constabulary.⁶⁶ The Lord-Lieutenant replied in a rather injured tone, claiming that he was acting upon the advice of a Colonel Macgregor, who "did not feel it safe to increase the number of Catholics."⁶⁷

The Government began to experience serious difficulties in Ireland and it looked as if a revolution might break out.⁶⁸ In response to this grave situation and, no doubt, to calm the Government's side of the House, Graham now made one of the most unfortunate statements of his career when he told the Commons that "Conciliation has been carried to its utmost limits in Ireland."⁶⁹ He soon regretted saying it,⁷⁰ not only because it was at variance

⁶⁵ Peel to Graham, August 31, 1843, Ibid., pp. 60-61.

⁶⁶ Graham to De Grey, September 3, 1843, Ibid., I, 365-367.

⁶⁷ De Grey to Graham, September 5, 1843, Ibid., I, 367.

⁶⁸ Wellington to Graham, June 10, 1843, Graham to Peel, June 17, 1843, Graham to Peel, June 18, 1843, Graham's notes of May 21, 1843 and June 1, 1843, Parker, Graham, I, 360-361; Russell to Lord Lansdowne, November 18, 1843, G. P. Gooch, ed., The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell (2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925), I, 69. Hereafter cited as Russell, Later Correspondence; Walpole, History, IV, 226.

⁶⁹ Parker, Graham, I, 362; Walpole, History, IV, 244.

⁷⁰ Parker, Graham, I, 363.

with his feelings and his beliefs,⁷¹ but because he was privately urging the Prime Minister to do anything short of establishing the Roman Catholic Church to conciliate Ireland.⁷²

The situation in London was not calmed when, in mid-September, Wellington privately accused the Irish Government (and indirectly, Graham) of gross incompetence since it could not enforce law and order across St. George's Channel.⁷³ But, by the middle of the month, the agitation seemed to be subsiding and criticism of the Government in London was also on the wane.⁷⁴

Conditions were relatively quiet into the new year and in May, 1844, Lord De Grey finally resigned on grounds of ill health.⁷⁵ The new Lord-Lieutenant, Lord Heytesbury,⁷⁶

⁷¹Graham to De Grey, November 27, 1841, quoted in Nowlan, Repeal, p. 33; Graham to Peel, September 6, 1843, October 3, 1845, October 20, 1845; Parker, Peel, III, 63, 190, 65-66.

⁷²Graham to Peel, June 16, 1843, Parker, Graham, I, 363-364.

⁷³Wellington to Graham, September 3, 1843, Parker, Peel, I, 367-369.

⁷⁴Creville, Victoria, September 10, 1843, II, 197, 199.

⁷⁵Eliot to Peel, May 16, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 112.

The Chief Secretary stayed on, in a post he thought ought to be abolished, though Peel had offered him the Secretaryship at War, with a seat in the Cabinet. Eliot to Peel, May 7, 1844, Eliot to Peel, May 16, 1844, Ibid., pp. 111-112.

⁷⁶1779-1860. Educ. Eton. Diplomat: Ambassador to Portugal, 1824-1828, to Russia, 1828-1832. Succ. 2nd baronet

Peel's second choice for the position,⁷⁷ was a man of impeccable character and exceptional ability.⁷⁸ Perhaps more importantly, he was in complete agreement with Government policy in Ireland.⁷⁹

The Government was now ready to take a new course in Ireland, and this departure from previous policy was indicated in Heytesbury's first instructions. The Prime Minister ordered the Lord-Lieutenant to act fairly in his conduct of Irish affairs. He must, Peel wrote, defend the Church of Ireland but he did not necessarily have to encourage it. Instead, he was to try and steer a middle course in his selection of officials, and religion was not to be a barrier to anyone's advancement. If the Lord-Lieutenant could manage this successfully, the Prime Minister "was confident that the Government could win the friendship and even the support" of the Catholic gentry.⁸⁰ Peel had

1817; P. C. 1817. Cr. Baron Heytesbury of Heytesbury, Wilts., 1828. Nominated Governor-General of India, 1835. Governor of the Isle of Wight to 1857. W. A. J. Archbold, "William A'Court, Baron Heytesbury," D.N.B., IX, 779.

⁷⁷Peel originally asked the Duke of Buccleuch to take the position, but he was advised to refuse. Peel to De Grey, June 1, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 113.

⁷⁸Peel to the Queen, June 21, 1844, Ibid., p. 114; Walpole, History, IV, 247.

⁷⁹Heytesbury to Peel, July 20, 1845, Heytesbury to Peel, July 25, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 183-185.

⁸⁰Peel to Heytesbury, August 1, 1844, Ibid.; p. 114; McCaffrey, O'Connell, p. 216.

finally decided, in spite of increasingly hostile and suspicious Tory feeling,⁸¹ to increase the grant to Maynooth College.⁸²

The Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth, usually known simply as Maynooth, was one of the most perennially unpopular institutions in the United Kingdom.⁸³ It

⁸¹ Peel was warned that any conciliation towards Ireland would be fatal to his Government. Cf. Fraser's, "The State and Prospects of the Government," Vol. XXIX, No. CLXX (February, 1844), pp. 243-244; "The General Policy of the Government," Vol. XXX, No. CLXXVIII (October, 1844), p. 501.

He had just been denounced as a political fraud and told that his party was on the verge of collapse. Fraser's, "The State of Parties," Vol. XXX, No. CLXXV (July, 1844), pp. 122, 119.

⁸² Peel did not now, nor had he ever, contemplated the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. He had long ago opposed such a course, and his views on the beneficial effects, if any, of Roman Catholic Endowment were somewhat equivocal. But his position on the positive effects of education and its extension were very clear, and he was an ardent advocate for the improvement of the Irish educational system. Cf. Peel to Leslie Foster, March 25, 1813, Peel to the Attorney-General, April 1, 1813, Parker, Peel, I, 89-91; Peel to Gregory, March 21, 1825, Peel to Leslie Foster, February 16, 1826, Peel to Leslie Foster, July 16, 1826, Ibid., pp. 369-370, 393-394, 413-414; Peel to Croker, November 12, 1837, Croker, II, 120; Hansard, 1st ser., Vol. 31 (1815), pp. 877-879; Peel, Speeches, I, 307-308, 396, 411-412; Hansard, 2nd ser., Vol. 6 (1822), pp. 1553-1554.

⁸³ Between 1833 and the end of 1836 111 petitions against the continuance of the Maynooth Grant were received by the House of Commons; in 1839 the petitions against the Grant and College filled slightly less than two columns of the Reports on Public Petitions; in 1840 they filled nearly four columns; in 1841, out of the large number of petitions received on the subject of Maynooth, only thirteen were in favor of the institution. In 1845, the year of the increase in the Regium Donum, 16,453 petitions against the Grant or College were received, and less than ninety were in favor of it. The petitions against Maynooth continued to flow

was founded largely because the French Revolution, "that moral earthquake,"⁸⁴ had destroyed "the greatest part of the Irish Colleges on the Continent" and made the others subversive or at least suspect of "Liberal" tendencies.⁸⁵

In 1794 the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland had petitioned the Lord-Lieutenant, Westmorland, for a subsidy to establish a seminary at Maynooth and his successors, Lords Fitzwilliam and Camden, agreed and proposed an annual grant for it.⁸⁶

into the House well into the 1850's. Great Britain, Parliament, Sessional Papers, ed., Edgar L. Erickson (230 vols.; New York: Readex Microprint Corporation, n.d.) (Hereafter cited as Sessional Papers). "Reports on Public Petitions /Maynooth/ 1833-1852," Index Cards No. 381 and 382; Sessional Papers, Sess. 1847-1848 (236.), LI, "A Return of the Number of Public Petitions Presented and Printed in each of the Fifteen Years from 1833 to 1847 inclusive; showing the Total Number in each successive Period of Five Years, and the Average Number; also of the Number of Signatures to Petitions for each of the said Fifteen Years, and the Total Number," p. 33.

Moves were also made to repeal the Grant in 1840 and 1841. Sessional Papers, "Divisions of the House of Commons," Index Card No. 363; Annual Register (1841), pp. 79-82.

⁸⁴The Establishment of the Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth, Near Dublin, London: 1796, p. 4. Hereafter cited as Maynooth.

⁸⁵Ibid.

The Irish Catholic community had, in 1793, 478 scholars and 27 masters studying abroad; most of them (348 scholars and 17 masters) attended seminaries in France, and a large number of these were located in Paris. The Case of Maynooth College Considered: With A History of the First Establishment of that Seminary, Dublin, 1836, p. 4. Hereafter cited as Maynooth Considered.

⁸⁶Cornish, Church, I, 150; Maynooth, 4-5; Walpole, History, IV, 248.

The internal political situation in Ireland, and

The Royal College of St. Patrick was created by an act of the Irish Parliament in 1795.⁸⁷ This act set up a board of trustees that was empowered to receive "subscriptions and donations" and to "purchase and acquire" land not exceeding a value of £ 1000 per annum. They were also charged with appointing the professors and scholars of the College, and were given a "superintending and visitatorial power over" Maynooth. An outright grant of £ 8000 was given for "establishing" the seminary.⁸⁸

Progress "was at first slow" because of the almost total lack of accommodations and classrooms, but in 1795

especially the conflicts between the Radicals and the Roman Church, greatly complicated the negotiations over Maynooth. Cf. Maynooth Considered, pp. 7-20.

⁸⁷ Sessional Papers, Sess. 1826-27 (509.), XIII, "Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry. Roman Catholic College of Maynooth," p. 5. Hereafter cited as Eighth Report.

This Act, 35 Geo. III, c. 91, is printed in "Appendix No. 1" of Eighth Report, pp. 17-18.

Two other Acts applied to Maynooth:

(1) 40 Geo. III, c. 85, determined who would be Visitors to Maynooth, and established these visitations on a triennial basis. It required the president and members of the College to take an oath of "faithful and true allegiance" to the Crown, and stated that only Roman Catholic Visitors would be competent to consider matters of religion. Ibid., pp. 5-6, 18-20.

(2) 45 Geo. III, c. 145, empowered the Trustees to "compromise law suits" and to acquire lands not exceeding £ 1,000 per annum in value "in addition to such lands and buildings as they already possessed." Ibid., pp. 6, 20-21.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 5.

Maynooth was not popular in England even in its first year of existence. Cornish, Church, I, 152.

fifty students were admitted.⁸⁹ Maynooth did enjoy some early patrons, and the Duke of Leinster became a warm supporter of the College, giving it a house and fifty-four acres of land; a Mr. Stoyte donated another "immediately contiguous" twenty acres, and Lord Dunboyne, who had been a Roman Catholic bishop but who had been converted to the Church of Ireland, willed all of his property to the College. Several other substantial gifts were also received in Maynooth's early years.⁹⁰

Maynooth, however, could not survive on donations alone, and it was "principally supported by Parliamentary grants."⁹¹ Yet, even with the Regium Donum a large number of students were forced to pay all or at least a portion of

⁸⁹Eighth Report, p. 6.

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 7; the annual grant could vary, during the first years of the College's life, about £ 1,000 per annum.

While the Grant was necessary to Maynooth's existence, it also indirectly harmed the school: it was not large enough to allow the College to function adequately, but just large enough to almost eliminate voluntary donations. Walpole, History, IV, 248.

Donations and gifts for the period 1798-1814 only totaled £ 4,436.14.3. Sessional Papers, Sess. 1808 (132.) IX, "Papers Presented to the House of Commons Relating to the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth," p. 31.

Cf. Emmet Larkin, "Economic Growth, Capital Investment, and the Roman Catholic Church in Nineteenth Century Ireland," American Historical Review, Vol. LXXII, No. 3 (April, 1967), pp. 860, 876-883.

their expenses,⁹² and by 1841 the College was in deep financial trouble. In that year the annual vacation had to be extended for six days and "no student . . . permitted to remain in the College" because of the "inadequacy of the College income."⁹³ Maynooth was beginning to literally fall down, and Thackeray, who was there in the early 1840's, was horrified by what he saw. He found an inconceivable amount of ruin, disgusting "filth" and "squalor," and asked that "the next Maynooth grant include a few shillings'-worth of whitewash and a few hundredweights of soap."⁹⁴

Sir Robert Peel was now convinced that an increase in the Maynooth Grant was a national imperative. The fact that the issue was a political "bomb," and that, in trying to effect the increase, he might destroy both his Government and his party did not even temporarily deter the Prime Minister from acting.⁹⁵

⁹²Eighth Report, p. 7.

The Grant became stabilized at £ 8,928, and was "charged with the maintenance of 250 students." Each student on the Establishment received £ 23 per annum; there were usually about 100 Pensioners (who supported themselves), 20 Bursars, and 11 graduate students in attendance as well. Ibid., p. 8; Sessional Papers, Sess. 1845 (244.), XXVIII, "Returns Relating to the College of Maynooth," p. 2. Hereafter cited as Returns, 1845.

⁹³Returns, 1845, p. 9.

⁹⁴William Makepeace Thackeray, The Irish Sketch Book of 1842 and Character Sketches (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1899), pp. 353-354.

⁹⁵Stanley to Peel, November 30, 1841, Peel to the Queen, April 9, 1845, Peel to Croker, April 22, 1845, Peel

The Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy had originally requested that the Government increase the Grant in mid-November, 1841, but Peel instructed Graham to have De Grey tell them the Government would not alter the Grant.⁹⁶ In 1842 the Maynooth problem seems to have been discussed in Cabinet,⁹⁷ but Peel was still fearful, he told Eliot, of the religious feelings that would be aroused if the Grant were increased. For the present, he preferred to wait in the hope that such violent intolerance might "peaceably die away."⁹⁸ The Catholic bishops, who had reapplied, were again turned down, and the Prime Minister managed to get the Chief Secretary to agree to this course.⁹⁹

to Hardinge, May 4, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 35, 173-174, 176, 271. Cf. McCaffrey, O'Connell, pp. 229-231; Nowlan, Repeal, Gash, Peel, p. 65.

Peel had defended the Grant in 1840 (Peel, Speeches, III, 736-737) but the policy he was now espousing was, unfortunately for the Prime Minister, Whig in parentage. Cf. McCaffrey, O'Connell, pp. 159-160; R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846 (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1952), p. 249.

⁹⁶ Nowlan, Repeal, pp. 31, 33.

⁹⁷ De Grey to Graham, October 25, 1842, Parker, Graham, I, 355.

⁹⁸ Peel to Eliot, November 13, 1842, quoted in Nowlan, Repeal, p. 31.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

Graham agreed with Peel and joined him in deploring the religious bigotry that was keeping the Government from acting. Graham to Stanley, November 27, 1842, Parker, Graham, I, 358.

Maynooth was discussed by the Government again in 1843, and the chief obstacle to their doing anything about it was the Church of Ireland. The Government could not, Graham wrote, "abandon the Protestant Church in Ireland, though [he was] most anxious to remove every remnant of abuse which" disfigured it and impaired its "usefulness." Thus a Roman Catholic Establishment was impossible in Ireland. "But," he went on, "no opportunity should be omitted" in trying to win the allegiance of as many of the Irish as possible to the Union; everything politically feasible should be done to conciliate the Irish people.¹⁰⁰ Peel, Graham, and Stanley, the Colonial Secretary, had now come round to Eliot's position, and they concluded that more measures would be needed to integrate the Irish Catholics into the Irish State.¹⁰¹ The Home Secretary now perceived that one of the keys to the discontent that was boiling over in Ireland was a religious one, and he admitted that "the severance of the religion of the people from all

¹⁰⁰ Graham to Peel, June 18, 1843, Parker, Graham, I, 363-364.

¹⁰¹ Nowlan, Repeal, p. 59; Stanley to Peel, October 21, 1843, Peel to Graham, December 22, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 66-68.

De Grey was still opposed to the employment of Roman Catholics by the Irish Government. Nowlan, Repeal, p. 59.

connection with the State" was a grave error on the part of the Government.¹⁰²

In early 1844 the Prime Minister prepared a secret memorandum for the Cabinet. He assumed that the Established Church of Ireland would be maintained no matter what the Government would do in that country, but Peel proposed that Maynooth could, and should, be improved. The existing Grant was, he pointed out, "insufficient for its purpose" and only injured the Government. Conditions at the College were, both for professors and students, deplorable and only succeeded in turning out an embittered priesthood. The question of whether or not it was admissible in principle to endow Maynooth did not apply--even if it did, that principle had been violated since 1795. He suggested that the Cabinet appoint a Select Committee to investigate "the state of Maynooth College, avowedly for the purpose of improving the character of the education" at the seminary.¹⁰³

Sir Robert also proposed the drawing up of a Charitable Bequests Act, which would allow any Irishman to endow, from real or personal property, a priest or a religious establishment. He realized, he wrote, that this

¹⁰²Graham to Peel, September 6, 1843, Parker, Peel, III, 63.

He was now apparently convinced that conciliation was the only answer to the Irish Government. Cf. Graham to Peel, September 16, 1843, Ibid.

¹⁰³Peel's Memorandum, February 11, 1844, Ibid., pp. 101-102.

would violate the Statute of Mortmain, and would probably set a precedent for Dissenters in England as well, but the Prime Minister thought that it was justified in light of the state of Ireland.¹⁰⁴

The purpose of these two proposals were, Peel said, to improve Anglo-Irish relations, the condition of Ireland, and "to detach, if we can" as many people as possible from the Repeal movement and unite them in support of the Union.¹⁰⁵

Less than a week later, the Prime Minister presented a second memorandum to the Cabinet. He began by openly despairing over the "evil" condition of Ireland, and bluntly

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 102.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., p. 103; cf. McCaffrey, O'Connell, pp. 214-215.

The Prime Minister may have wanted to bring his Maynooth Bill forward in 1843 but was stopped by opposition from within the Government. Cf. Prince Albert to Peel, February 16, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 108-109.

Gladstone, the President of the Board of Trade, was the chief opponent to Peel's conciliatory policy in the Government. Cf. Gladstone to Peel, July 12, 1844, Graham to Stanley, February 19, 1843, Stanley to Peel, February 18, 1843, Ibid., III, 160-161, I, 359, 107; Gladstone to Mrs. Gladstone, November 25, 1844, quoted in Philip Magnus, Gladstone: A Biography (London: John Murray, 1960), p. 68. Hereafter cited as Magnus, Gladstone; Northcote to Shirley, December, 1842, Andrew Lang, Life, Letters, and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, First Earl of Iddesleigh (2 vols.; London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1890), I, 64-65.

The Cabinet thought Gladstone a fool for his opposition, though he did offer to resign his position and go to Italy, to take some quiet part in the unofficial conversations going on between his Government and the Vatican. Cf. Ransay, p. 280; Gladstone to Peel, July 12, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 160-161; Magnus, Gladstone, p. 68.

stated that only "the detaching (if it be possible) from the ranks of Repeal, agitation, and disaffection a considerable portion of the respectable and influential classes of the Roman Catholic population" offered any hope to Ireland as a part of Great Britain. This attempt had to be made, and now, because not to would unite "the whole Roman Catholic population" against the Union.¹⁰⁶ The aim of the Government's policy, he argued, should be to conciliate, "as far as we can," the Irish Roman Catholics and those Protestants who were amenable to such conciliation, and to get the two groups to support the "two great principles" of the Union and the Irish Church.¹⁰⁷

The Government was conducting this discussion, naturally, under the traditional conditions of secrecy, but somehow rumors of their deliberations seem to have leaked out. Greville noted, in mid-February, that he was afraid of a new "No Popery" cry, but was sure that the Government

¹⁰⁶ Peel's Memorandum, February 17 [1844], Parker, Peel, III, 105-106.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 106.

Response to these memoranda was somewhat favorable but both were dropped because of Gladstone's intransigent attitude and because of Graham's decision, under some Catholic pressure, to deal with Maynooth separately. Stanley to Peel, February 17, 1844, Ibid., pp. 107-108; Nowlan, Repeal, p. 80.

Peel's firm tone in the memoranda may be explained by the fact that he had the complete backing of the Queen and the Prince Consort for his Irish policy. Cf. Prince Albert to Peel, February 16, 1844, the Queen to Peel, February 25, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 108-109.

would try and prevent it. He added that the Dissenters and the Scots would probably oppose any pro-Catholic legislation like establishment or endowment, and that a Scots Member had told him "that hardly any Scotch Member could safely vote for a Catholic endowment."¹⁰⁸ About a month later he had a conversation with Peel and he gathered from it that the Prime Minister thought that something eventually had to be done about the Irish Church but that he would have nothing to do with it.¹⁰⁹

In July, 1844, Peel formally informed Gladstone of his intentions towards Ireland, and of his plan to try and establish diplomatic contact with the Vatican. Gladstone told the Prime Minister that "as a member of the Cabinet he could not support any measures leading to the endowment of the Catholic Church," and offered to resign in order to avoid embarrassing the Government.¹¹⁰ Peel would not accept his proffered resignation, as he still hoped to convert his

¹⁰⁸Greville, Victoria, February 17, 1844, II, 229-230.

Greville, who was at the heart of the London "rumour mill" was reassured by Graham (who seems to have gone out of his way to do so) on the 15th. Ibid., p. 229.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., March 9, 1844, II, 233-234.

Lord John Russell, however, told Greville that same day that Peel was prepared to establish Roman Catholicism in Ireland, if the Church of Ireland was preserved along side it. Ibid., p. 234.

¹¹⁰McCaffrey, O'Connell, n. 105, p. 225.

young protose to the Government's Irish policy,¹¹¹ but he would not alter his policy to satisfy Gladstone. He did not, he wrote Lord Heytesbury, "despair of weaning from the cause of Repeal the great body of intelligent and wealthy Roman Catholics," with a policy of conciliation, "impartiality," and "justice."¹¹²

The Lord-Lieutenant, in his reply, thought that the most "determined opposition" to the Government's program from within Ireland would come from the "higher ecclesiastical" circles of the Church of Ireland.¹¹³ He went on to hope that the Government would "find" a "growing party" of men of both religions who would "look with equal indifference upon the Orange and the Green," men who were "ready to support any Government carried on with honesty and impartiality."¹¹⁴ A month later, Lord Heytesbury thought that he could offer the Prime Minister at least some of this hope. He had received a letter from Lord Arran, a prominent Irish Roman Catholic, that claimed that there

¹¹¹Parker, Peel, III, 160.

¹¹²Peel to Heytesbury, August 1, 1844, Ibid., p. 114.

The Government's problem now centered, Peel wrote, on finding a way of "peaceably governing seven millions of people, and maintaining intact the Protestant Church Establishment for the religious instruction and consolation of one million." Ibid.

¹¹³Heytesbury to Peel, August 5, 1844, Ibid., p. 115.

¹¹⁴Ibid.

existed in his country "a vast body" of Catholics very much opposed to the Repeal agitation, and deeply "desirous of an equitable adjustment of what they consider their claims." Arran said that these men were at the moment afraid to come forward because they were unsure of the Government's attitude, and that they wanted only three things from London: diplomatic relations with Rome, the recognition, if possible, of the titles of the Roman Catholic Irish hierarchy, and a small endowment for their clergy on the French model.¹¹⁵

By October, conditions in Ireland had worsened and there were alarming signs of "growing discontent" among the people.¹¹⁶ The Government, however, was bolstered by the support of Prince Albert,¹¹⁷ and the Home Secretary instructed

¹¹⁵ Heytesbury to Peel, September 3, 1844. Enclosure from Lord Arran, *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.

Peel regarded this letter as very "commendable." Peel to Heytesbury, September 5, 1844, *Ibid.*, p. 120.

¹¹⁶ Graham to Croker, October 14, 1844, *Croker*, II, 229.

¹¹⁷ Prince Albert to Peel, October 5, 1844; Prince Albert to Peel, December 26, 1844, Parker, *Peel*, III, 128, 133.

This complete support of the Government by the Queen and her Consort is rather surprising considering that, in 1839, in the "Bedchamber Crisis," relations between the Queen and Peel were so strained; such support is also startling because the Tories had been, and were, so openly hostile to the Queen. Cf. *Fraser's*, "A Passage in the Second Year of the Reign of Queen Victoria," Vol. XX, No. CXVII (October, 1839), pp. 509-511; "What is Our Real Position," Vol. XX, No. CXVII (September, 1839), p. 367; "Close of the Session of 1840," Vol. XXII, No. CXXIX (September, 1840), p. 379; Ashley to Peel, May 21, 1839, Parker, *Peel*, II, 405; *The Observer*, November 3, 1839, quoted in Marion Miliband, ed., *The Observer of the*

Lord Heytesbury to say, if the Irish Roman Catholic bishops asked again about an increase in the Maynooth Grant, that it was "the wish of the Government to include this matter" in a program of conciliation and adjustment. The Lord-Lieutenant was, however, also ordered to inform the bishops that this would only be possible "if a fair arrangement could be made by which the scruples and false impressions of the Protestants could in some degree be removed." Heytesbury was to conclude this conversation by telling the bishops that the Government had no wish to exert any degree of control or "power of influence" over Maynooth, and to inquire as to the needs of the College.¹¹⁸

The Home Secretary was convinced that this was "the last" opportunity to save Ireland from Repeal and disunion. Any settlement the Government could arrange would have to be "so just and so reasonable that the best portion of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and laity" would find it "impossible . . . to refuse."¹¹⁹ The settlement

Nineteenth Century, 1791-1901 (London: Longmans, 1966), p. 123; Croker to Peel, August 15, 1837, Graham to Croker, May 22, 1839, Croker to Lord Hertford, May 29, 1839, Croker, II, 117, 151; Cobden to F. Cobden, August 24, 1841, Morley, Cobden, I, 191. This change of the Royal mind can only be attributable to Peel.

¹¹⁸Graham to Heytesbury, November 30, 1844, Parker, Graham, I, 421.

¹¹⁹Graham to Heytesbury, December 9, 1844, Ibid., p. 422.

of the Maynooth problem was "the most difficult but the most important part" of the Government's proposed plan of conciliation. It was, Graham wrote, "the key," which would, if there was still time, give the Government some degree of influence over the Catholic Clergy of Ireland. He ended his letter on a note of urgency, and implored Peel to force the Cabinet to come to a decision about the College as soon as possible.¹²⁰ Eliot too was in favor of the proposed course of action, for he thought that it would bring the Irish Roman Catholic Church into "connection" with the Government, dissolving the existing political parties and forcing them to live in the future for political, not religious, goals. Conciliation would also, he thought, cut away O'Connell's clerical support.¹²¹

In January, 1845, Lord Eliot's father died; upon his succession to his earldom, the Government was forced to choose a new Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Peel's choice, Sir Thomas Freemantle,¹²² was a significant one. His mother,

¹²⁰Graham to Peel, December 10, 1844, Ibid.

¹²¹Eliot to Heytesbury, December 19, 1844, Parker, Peel, III, 132.

The Cabinet were also considering the establishment of diplomatic relations with Rome at that time, hoping to use the authority of the pope to break up Repeal and to end disorder. Graham to Peel, December 23, 1844, Parker, Graham, I, 423-424.

¹²²1798-1890. Baronet 1821; M. P., 1830. Secretary of Treasury, 1834, 1841-1844. Secretary at War, 1844. Cr. Baron Cottesloe, 1874. Nowlan, Repeal, n. 93, p. 78.

his sisters, and his brother-in-law were Roman Catholics. His liberal views on Ireland were also well known.¹²³

Informed English public opinion was now alarmed and rumors abounded about what the Government was going to do about Maynooth even before Freemantle's appointment as Chief Secretary. In early January the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Goulburn, informed Peel that, at Cambridge, the dons regarded an increase in the Regium Donum "as putting arms in the hands of the enemy." The Master of Trinity, a man who had "always been of very liberal opinions," told Goulburn that the Government's proposed Maynooth Bill would be useless and would not "ally Roman catholic [sic.] hostility."¹²⁴ Palmerston had heard, he wrote Lord John Russell, that "some of the zealous Protestants" would rather see the Church of Ireland disestablished and the Voluntary principle erected in Ireland rather "than endow and as it were establish a Roman Catholic Church there."¹²⁵

In the same month the Government, worried about the adverse public commentary on its Irish policy, suppressed

¹²³Graham to Heytesbury, January 28, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 4-5.

Graham's farewell letter to St. Germans was rather hypocritical, but Peel and Heytesbury were genuinely sorry to see him go. Ibid., p. 4; Peel to St. Germans, January 24, 1845, Heytesbury to Peel, January 27, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 178.

¹²⁴Goulburn to Peel, January 6, 1845, quoted in Nowlan, Repeal, p. 220.

¹²⁵Palmerston to Russell, January 9, 1845, Russell, Later Correspondence, I, 79.

Greville's book on Ireland.¹²⁶ The book, which advocated a conciliatory policy in Ireland, especially in matters of religion, was to have been published in early 1845, but the Government took exception to the timing of publication and its potentially provocative nature.¹²⁷ At the end of January Greville was told by a member of the Cabinet that the "impending resignation" of Gladstone was the reason why the book was suppressed.¹²⁸ He finally received permission to publish his book in mid-March, but it had to come out anonymously.¹²⁹

What Peel had feared for nearly two years now happened: Gladstone resigned, specifically because of the Government's policy on Maynooth.¹³⁰ He sent his original resignation to the Prime Minister in early

¹²⁶Greville was Chief Clerk of the Privy Council, and the Government seemed to have been afraid of the impact of a book from this "semi-official" source.

¹²⁷Greville, Victoria, January 12, 15, 16, 18, and 28, 1845, III, 258-267.

¹²⁸Ibid., January 30, 1845, III, 269.

¹²⁹Ibid., March 15, 1845, III, 274.

The book, ominously, was well received by the Whigs, and with hostility by the Tories. Ibid., March 30, 1845, III, 275-276.

¹³⁰Gladstone resigned because of the views he expressed in his book The State in its Relations with the Church (London: John Murray, 1838). For a convenient analysis of his opinions, see Magnus, Gladstone, pp. 36, 41-43, 68.

He no longer believed in the views he expressed in the book, but felt himself publicly committed to those views in 1845. Greville, Victoria, January 30, 1845, II, 267.

January,¹³¹ but Peel strove throughout the month to try and change his mind.¹³² His resignation, or impending resignation, threw the Government into a turmoil, and nearly held up their plans to increase the Maynooth Grant.¹³³ Graham and Peel would not, however, abandon or postpone their legislative timetable,¹³⁴ and Gladstone's second letter of resignation was regretfully accepted.¹³⁵ His loss was a "heavy" one,¹³⁶ and was "severely felt" by the Government.¹³⁷ The resignation became known to the public by

¹³¹Gladstone to Peel, January 2, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 163-164.

Neither Peel nor Graham were exactly sure what Gladstone meant in this letter, but they assumed he meant to resign. Cf. Peel to Graham, January 3, 1845, Ibid., III, 164; Graham to Peel, January 4, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 2.

¹³²Peel to Gladstone, January 20, 1845, Peel to Graham, January 21, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 165-166.

¹³³Graham to Peel, January 21, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 3.

¹³⁴Graham to Peel, January 4, 1845, Parker, Peel, p. 164.

¹³⁵Gladstone to Peel, January 21, 1845, Ibid., p. 169.

¹³⁶Ramsay, p. 280.

¹³⁷Peel to Hardinge, March 1, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 269.

The Government had to be "reformed:" Lord Dalhousie succeeded Gladstone at the Board of Trade, but without a seat in the Cabinet; Edward Cardwell became Vice President of the Board; Sidney Herbert and Lord Lincoln entered the Cabinet (causing Ashley to sneer, "It will be a cabinet of Peel's dolls." Shaftesbury, II, 84). On the whole, the "liberality" of the Government was greatly increased. Peel to Wellington, January 28, 1845, Ibid., p. 168.

February 2,¹³⁸ and its political implications were serious. It imperiled the "Maynooth measure" and gave "the general impression" that Gladstone had resigned as a matter of conscience, not because he felt that he could not honorably repudiate his book.¹³⁹ It seemed as if the Government was about "to compromise the Protestant establishment" in Ireland.¹⁴⁰

Gladstone's explanation to the House of Commons did not help the situation. His speech lasted an hour, and when it was over no one was any "wiser at the end than he had been at the beginning."¹⁴¹ Greville thought the speech "ludicrous" and sarcastically noted that his resignation "was quite uncalled for;"¹⁴² Disraeli thought that his career was, very definitely, over.¹⁴³ More importantly,

¹³⁸Greville, Victoria, January 30, 1845, II, 267; Shaftesbury, II, 84.

¹³⁹Graham to Heytesbury, N.D., Parker, Graham, II, 3-4; Heytesbury to Peel, January 27, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 178.

¹⁴⁰McCaffrey, O'Connell, p. 225.

¹⁴¹Richard Cobden, quoted in Magnus, Gladstone, p. 69.

¹⁴²Greville, Victoria, February 6, 1845, III, 271.

¹⁴³Robert Blake, Disraeli (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1966), p. 188. Hereafter cited as Blake, Disraeli; W. F. Monypenny and G. W. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (4 vols.; London: John Murray, 1912), II, 324. Hereafter cited as Monypenny and Buckle, Disraeli.

at least from the point of view of Gladstone's political future, the Queen found his speech "very unintelligible," and was enraged by his attitude.¹⁴⁴

The Prime Minister no longer seemed to be worried about the political situation; he told Lady Peel that "Everything [in London] concerning the Cabinet and Government is most satisfactory, and all promises well."¹⁴⁵ While the Government was going to have to be very careful in the future,¹⁴⁶ it would not drop or postpone the Maynooth Bill.¹⁴⁷ But, for all of Peel's optimism, the political outlook for the Government was very grim by the end of March. Croker, that political bellwether, wrote to Graham that he heard "from all quarters that the country gentlemen [were] greatly out of temper," and he advised the Home Secretary that their "state of mind" was "precarious and alarming." He concluded with a warning, in the strongest terms, to not antagonize the country party any further;

¹⁴⁴Elizabeth Longford, Queen Victoria (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 182. Hereafter cited as Longford, Victoria.

The Queen was, from this time forward, exceedingly hostile towards Gladstone, and "Her contempt for Mr. Gladstone soon eclipsed all other emotions." Ibid.

¹⁴⁵Lady Peel to Frederick Peel, February 3, 1845, Peel, Letters, p. 266.

¹⁴⁶Greville, Victoria, February 6, 1845, II, 271.

¹⁴⁷Graham to Heytesbury, February 13, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 7.

that, he said, would bring disaster upon the Government.¹⁴⁸

Graham replied the next day:

I am aware of the fact that our country gentlemen are out of humour, and that the existence of the Government is endangered by their present temper and recent proceedings. . . . we are scouted as traitors, and are denounced as if we were time-serving traders in politics, seeking to retain place by the sacrifice of the interests of our friends. The country gentlemen cannot be more ready to give us the death-blow than we are prepared to receive it. . . . If we have lost the confidence and good will of the country party, our official days are numbered . . .¹⁴⁹

That same day, March 22, the Home Secretary informed Heytesbury that Peel would introduce the Maynooth Bill into the House on April 3. He thought it only fair to warn the Lord-Lieutenant that "A storm [was] evidently gathering" over the Bill, and that the Government might fall on the issue. But the Bill would not be abandoned, no matter how adverse its reception.¹⁵⁰

With Ireland on the verge of anarchy,¹⁵¹ Sir Robert Peel introduced the Maynooth Bill into the House of Commons on April 3.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁸Croker to Graham, March 21, 1845, Croker, II, 238-239.

¹⁴⁹Graham to Croker, March 22, 1845, Ibid., pp. 239-240.

¹⁵⁰Graham to Heytesbury, March 22, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 8.

¹⁵¹Peel to Graham, March 26, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 180.

¹⁵²Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 18.

CHAPTER III

THE MAYNOOTH BILL AND THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

The Maynooth Bill authorized the incorporation of the College's trustees so that the school could hold land worth up to £3,000; £6,000 per year would be added to the Grant for the salaries of the professors and officers of the college; the amount of student aid would be increased so as to allow the school to accept and decently maintain up to 500 students. The Bill would raise the annual Grant from £9,000 to £26,360 per year, with the increase being borne by the Consolidated Fund. An outright grant of £30,000 was also proposed for repairs and improvements, with the work to be done by the Board of Works. Finally, the Government would appoint five visitors to serve along with the three elected by the College. They would have no more power than the smaller group already possessed, and would not be allowed to interfere in religious affairs, but visitations would now take place annually. In addition, the Grant would now be permanent, and no longer subject to annual review.¹

Peel told the House of Commons that the Maynooth Bill was conceived "in a friendly and generous spirit," and

¹Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 34-37.

that its purpose was "to improve the system of education, and to elevate the Character of" St. Patrick's College.² But the aim of the Bill was more subtle than that. It was designed as well to destroy the repeal movement by dividing Irish opinion about the true benefits of the Union, and by cutting away O'Connell's clerical support.³

The Government was courting political disaster by introducing the Bill, and it was acutely aware of it.⁴ The Government realized that it could easily destroy the already tenuous unity of the party by introducing the Bill but, as Graham put it, since the measure was "necessary, wise, and just," they could not "vary our course while we are responsible for the conduct of affairs."⁵ Even if defeat came over the Bill, it would be an honorable and glorious one, as Aberdeen (the Foreign Secretary) wrote, "for defeat in

²Ibid., pp. 19-20, 33.

³Peel's Memorandum, February 11, 1844; Eliot to Heytesbury, December 19, 1844; Heytesbury to Peel, January 31, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 103, 132, 179; Graham to Peel, December 10, 1844, Parker, Graham, I, 422; the Liverpool Mercury, April 11, 1845 (for O'Connell's remarks).

⁴Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 18-19, 37. Cf. Greville, Victoria, II, 259, n. 1; James E. Thorold Rogers, ed., Speeches on Questions of Public Policy by John Bright (2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1869), I, 55.

⁵Nowlan, Repeal, p. 82; Graham to Heytesbury, March 22, 1845, February 13, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 7-8.

maintaining a great principle of justice and liberality" was not quite the same as defeat over "a miserable squabble about sugar or cotton. We are determined to persevere."⁶

The Maynooth Bill was "a Government question" and, as a vital issue, the "fate of the Government" was involved with it.⁷ Peel informed the Queen of the potential gravity of the political situation on April 9, and advised her that it was her duty not to allow the Government to be defeated on a technicality, which was a very real possibility. However, if the Government was defeated on April 18, it could always move the Bill again on the following Monday. Sir Robert tried to encourage the Queen, and wrote that he did "not at all despair, even after the first defeat, of succeeding with this motion," but admitted that the party's support for both the Government and the Bill was crumbling.⁸

The Prime Minister thought that the "best product of ultimate success" for the Government would be to "go on with the Bill temperately and firmly in the ordinary course."⁹ He would never, he wrote, give in to the pressures that the

⁶Aberdeen to Fcss. Lieven, April 12, 1845, quoted in McCaffrey, O'Connell, p. 230.

⁷Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 390; Peel to the Queen, April 9, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 173.

⁸Peel to the Queen, April 9, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 173-174.

⁹Peel to Stanley, April 9, 1845, Ibid., p. 174.

Dissenters were apparently preparing to mobilize against the Bill,¹⁰ and he thought that many of the Bill's opponents were "merely" yielding either to the pressure of their Dissenting constituents or were motivated by the unsettled economic condition of the country or by disappointed political ambitions.¹¹ Peel noted with pride that the Government's supporters included "almost all the youth, talent, and real influence . . . in the House of Commons."¹²

The Maynooth Bill was received with great hostility by most of the Conservatives in the House of Commons. They saw it as "a deliberate attempt to relight the fires of Smithfield,"¹³ and they felt betrayed by their leadership. As Ashley noted in his diary:

What a spectacle! Why were the Whigs displaced. . . .
Peel was brought in to correct their mischiefs. . . .

¹⁰Peel to Hardinge, May 4, 1845, Ibid., p. 271;
Peel to Croker, April 22, 1845, Croker, II, 240.

¹¹Peel to Croker, April 22, 1845, Croker, II, 240.

¹²Ibid.

Peel would have four factors operating in his favor in the ensuing crisis: his determination to see the Bill through, the support of the moderate wing of his party, the favorable attitude of nearly all the Whigs, and the support of the Queen and Prince Albert. For the views of the Queen, cf. the Queen to Peel, April 9, 1845, April 15, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 173, 176; the Queen to the King of the Belgians, April 15, 1845, A. C. Benson and Viscount Esher, eds., The Letters of Queen Victoria 1837-1861 (3 vols.; New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907), II, 42-43; Longford, Victoria, p. 181.

¹³Charles Whibley, Lord John Manners and his Friends (2 vols.; London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925), I, 180. Hereafter cited as Whibley, Manners.

Peel was their opponent, and led everyone to believe that he was also their opposite, and therefore to support him.¹⁴ His conduct . . . is considered to be treacherous.

W. F. Cowper, Conservative M. P. for Hertford, asked where the party was "to look for a representative of Toryism, if they were not to find it in the present head of the Government,"¹⁵ and C. E. Law, a Tory member for Cambridge University, announced that he could no longer support his party's leaders.¹⁶ Disraeli, a young M. P. for Shrewsbury, said that Peel was turning his back, along with the rest of the Government, on the principles of the party; he was simply a traitor to all those who had voted for him and to the party as well.¹⁷ Lord Bernard, who represented Bandon Bridge, and C. Goring, M. P. for Shoreham, also withdrew their support from the Government at this time.¹⁸

The ministry now seemed, even to the Whigs, to have embraced Whiggism,¹⁹ and because of this about face it was accused of destroying the Constitution;²⁰ W. B. Ferrand, a

¹⁴Shaftesbury, II, 100; cf. Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 744.

¹⁵Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 638.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 561; The Times (London), April 12, 1845.

¹⁸Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 804-811, 773-774; cf. ibid., pp. 968-980; Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 717-718.

¹⁹Ibid., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 648-650.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 559, 712, 968-980.

High Tory member for Knaresborough, proposed the impeachment of Sir Robert Peel for treason.²¹ The Prime Minister was also the object of several personal attacks in the House. Macaulay, a Whig M. P. for Edinburgh City, savagely denounced Peel for his hypocrisy,²² and Disraeli bitterly mocked the Prime Minister.²³

The primary objection of the opponents of the Maynooth Bill was that it would create an Established Roman Catholic Church in Ireland.²⁴ Law, who sat for Cambridge University, saw the Bill as a direct attack upon "and in derogation ~~to~~ the Established and United Church of England

²¹Ibid., pp. 495-501. Ferrand tried to impeach Peel again on April 15. Ibid., pp. 685-692.

²²He did, however, support the Bill; his attack on Peel is one of the best pieces of invective in the English language, and the conclusion is worth repeating: "Did you think, when you went on, session after session, thwarting and reviling those whom you knew to be in the right, and flattering all the worst passions of those whom you knew to be in the wrong, that the reckoning would never come? It has come. There you sit, doing penance for the disingenuousness of years." Thomas Babington Macaulay, The Complete Writings of Lord Macaulay (20 vols.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., Ltd., 1900), XVIII, 41; cf. Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 657-658 (for a slightly different version of the speech); Macaulay to Napier, January 19, 1846, Macvey Napier, ed., Selection From the Correspondence of the Late Macvey Napier, Esq. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879), p. 591.

²³Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 588; The Times (London), April 12, 1845. Cf. Lady Dorchester, ed., Recollections of a Long Life by John Can Hobhouse, Lord Broughton (6 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), VI, 140-141; Blake, Disraeli, p. 188.

²⁴Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 884-888.

and Ireland." No matter what the Government's intentions, the Bill would end in erecting a Roman Catholic Establishment in Ireland.²⁵ Plumptre, a Conservative member for West Kent, thought that the Bill was as "liberal" as it was unpopular, and he could never agree to subsidize "a religion [he] believed to be wrong." He also warned the House that, if the Bill should pass, God would vent his wrath upon the nation.²⁶ Sir Robert Inglis, M. P. for Oxford University and the leader of the opposition to the Maynooth Bill in the House of Commons,²⁷ objected "to the endowment of the Church of Rome," and said that it was not intolerant not to want to subsidize "a system of instruction" distrusted by "the great majority of" Englishmen. He called upon the Roman Catholics of Ireland to "educate their own priests, as the Dissenters did theirs."²⁸ Disraeli asked where endowment stopped, and if every church, every sect, and every religious opinion in the country were to be endowed. The Bill would, he claimed, set up nothing short of Pantheism

²⁵Ibid., pp. 70-71.

²⁶Ibid., p. 90.

²⁷1786-1855; S. A., F. R. S., R. A. Educ. Winchester and Christ Church, Oxford (M.A. 1809, D.C.L. 1826), Lincoln's Inn. Pvt. Sec. to Sidmouth, 1806; Succ. as 2nd Bart. 1820. M.P. Dundalk 1824-1826, Ripon 1828-1829, Oxford University 1829-1854. P.C. 1855. G. F. R. Barker, "Sir Robert Harry Inglis," D.N.B., X, 443-444.

²⁸Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 42-43, 46.

in the United Kingdom.²⁹ Fox Maule, a member for Perth, opposed the Bill because it would create a Roman Catholic Establishment in Ireland completely outside of Parliamentary control.³⁰

Strafford O'Brien, Conservative M. P. for Northamptonshire, opposed the Bill because it would create a Roman Catholic Establishment in Ireland, "and he did not conscientiously consider that the [Conservative] party . . . had any right to enter into that question."³¹ Shaw, a Conservative who represented Dublin University, saw the Bill as "the heaviest blow that had yet been struck by foe or friend against the Established Church in Ireland,"³² and G. A. Hamilton, the other Conservative member for Dublin University, objected because the Bill would create two Establishments in Ireland.³³ Lord Ashley, M. P. for Dorsetshire, opposed the Bill for the same reasons as Hamilton, and felt that the Bill would lead the country to "ruin" if allowed to become law.³⁴ John Bright, who sat for Durham City, was against the Bill because it would create another Established

²⁹Ibid., p. 559.

³⁰Ibid., pp. 603-609.

³¹Ibid., pp. 631-632.

³²Ibid., p. 659.

³³Ibid., pp. 762-763, 773.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 774-781; Shaftesbury, II, 101.

Church in the Kingdom, when one was one too many.³⁵ Blackstone, the Tory M. P. for Wallingford, refused, he said, to "plunder" one church for another's benefit.³⁶

The other main objections of the Conservatives in the House to the Maynooth Bill were that it involved the State with Roman Catholicism, that Maynooth itself was a corrupt failure, and that the priests educated there were wretched and subversive. The Roman Catholic religion was dismissed by the dissident Conservatives as an "erroneous and superstitious religion," and as one which only taught disgusting and obnoxious "error."³⁷ The College was denounced as so rotten and corrupt that, even if only "the best and most humane" attended it, which was not the case, they would emerge tainted to mingle with the other vile failures produced by the school.³⁸ Maynooth's priests were singled out for much abuse by the opponents of the Bill, and they were denounced for their political involvement with Repeal and for their lack of loyal and peaceful

³⁵ Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 818-823.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 888-889. Cf. ibid., pp. 909, 929-931, 939-941, 949-955, 959-961, 1411-1412; Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 112, 619-620, 622-623.

For the Maynooth debates in chronological form, cf. Annual Register (1845), pp. 101-140, which gives an admirable digest of them. The debates in the Lords followed those in the Commons, and are not included.

³⁷ Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 622-623; Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 774, 804-811, 1257-1260.

³⁸ Ibid., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 514, 713, 774, 929.

devotion "to the institutions of their country." "Haughty" and "intolerant," they were nothing more than subversives, and only Maynooth was responsible for their political activities--those priests educated abroad, it was claimed, were never seditious.³⁹

The public reaction to the Maynooth Bill was highly emotional and infuriated.⁴⁰ The Dublin Protestant Operative Society immediately met in protest against the Bill, and Peel was denounced as a man against God; a Rev. T. D. Gregory hinted that, if the Bill did become law, all true Protestants would revolt and settle matters in their own

³⁹Ibid., pp. 58-61, 506-510, 514, 694.

The opponents of the Bill may here have had a rather substantial case. Cf. John F. Broderick, "The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Union with England, 1829-47," Analecta Gregoriana, LV (1951), passim; Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1965), pp. 111-117.

⁴⁰Greville, Second Part, April 26, 1845, April 22, 1845; II, 277, 279; Shaftesbury, II, 101; Illustrated London News, April 5, 1845.

On April 3d, the day the Maynooth Bill was introduced into the House of Commons, 298 petitions were presented against it; on April 8th, 148 were laid on the Table; the next day 254 were handed in; on April 10th, 552 were introduced; on April 11th, 2,262 petitions against the Bill were laid before the House. Walpole, History, IV, 250-251.

According to The Times (London) of May 21, 1845, p. 8, 758 petitions against the Maynooth Bill, with more than one million signatures, were received by Parliament by the near end of May. On June 6th the Committee on Public Petitions of the House of Commons announced that it had received 10,075 anti-Maynooth petitions containing more than 1,200,000 signatures; by the end of the year, the House had received 16,453 anti-Maynooth petitions. The Liverpool Mercury, June 21, 1845; supra., Ch. II, n. 83.

way. The meeting ended in riot when it was invaded by a mob in favor of the Grant.⁴¹ At Edinburgh, where the Kirk's current troubles were being attributed to Jesuits "in disguise," the town council accepted, by a vote of 16 to 19, a petition against Maynooth.⁴²

On April 9, the Manchester Guardian endorsed the Government's Maynooth policy,⁴³ but it was forced to note that the people of the midlands, led by their Dissenting clergy, were deeply aroused against the Maynooth Bill.⁴⁴ Later in the week, Peel was the object of bitter attacks in Belfast, and in Dublin W. B. Ferrand denounced him as "the greatest traitor since Judas Iscariot."⁴⁵

London was in a turmoil, and most of the City was reported to be opposed to the Bill.⁴⁶ Large meetings, made up mainly of Dissenters, were being held against it,⁴⁷ and they enjoyed the hearty support of The Times. On the

⁴¹Liverpool Mercury, April 4, 1845.

⁴²Ibid.; Henry Cockburn, Journal of Henry Cockburn (2 vols.; Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1874), II, 112-117.

⁴³Manchester Guardian, April 9, 1845.

⁴⁴Ibid.; Cf. Liverpool Mercury, April 11, 1845; The Times (London), April 9, 1845.

⁴⁵The Times (London), April 7, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, April 11, 1845.

⁴⁶Illustrated London News, April 19, 1845, April 26, 1845; The Times (London), April 3, 1845.

⁴⁷The Times (London), April 3, 1845, April 8, 1845.

day that Peel introduced the Maynooth Bill into the House, The Times ran a leading article against it, calling it tyrannical at heart.⁴⁸ The next day it claimed that the Prime Minister was as dishonorable a political leader as had ever lived, and rebuked the Government for financing "popery" when few if any poor Englishmen could obtain a subsidized education.⁴⁹ On April 5 it ran an anti-Maynooth story on the front page, and two days later it attacked Peel as a man whose friendship was worthless.⁵⁰

Less than a week after the introduction of the Maynooth Bill the Government was rumored to be in serious difficulties, and Mr. Fitzroy, a lord of the Admiralty, and Captain Meynell, a Household officer, were thought to have been given "the sack" for failing to vote for the Bill on its first reading.⁵¹ Meanwhile the anti-Maynooth meetings were becoming louder and more disorganized, and they were occurring with increasing frequency all over the country.⁵²

On April 9 the newly formed Central Anti-Maynooth Committee sent a deputation to call upon the Prime Minister

⁴⁸Ibid., April 3, 1845.

⁴⁹Ibid., April 4, 1845.

⁵⁰Ibid., April 5, 1845, April 7, 1845.

⁵¹Ibid., April 9, 1845. Cf. Greville, Victoria, April 5, 1845, II, 277.

⁵²The Times (London), April 9, 1845, April 10, 1845, April 11, 1845.

at Downing Street, to request "more time before Second Reading" of the Maynooth Bill.⁵³ Peel, rather naturally, refused to give the opposition any more time to marshal support against the Bill, and he claimed that the petitions against the Bill were really manufactured by the Committee in London.⁵⁴ Nothing loath, the deputation called upon Lord John Russell the next day, to see if they could convince him of their case since, as leader of the Opposition in the House, he could by right demand up to six weeks delay for a second reading of the Bill. Russell, however, temporized, and the Anti-Maynooth deputation again went away empty handed.⁵⁵

In Ireland O'Connell, speaking before the Repeal Association, said that the Maynooth Bill was scrupulously fair and that he wholeheartedly approved of it. But, he went on to say that the real intent of the Bill was to undermine the Repeal movement, and that it would not succeed in this--after all, the Repeal agitation had yielded the Bill. He concluded by reasserting his support of the

⁵³Rev. A. S. Thewall, ed. and comp., Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845 (London: Blackwell and Pardon, 1845), pp. xxxi-xxxii. Hereafter cited as Thewall, Proceedings. Cf. Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 391.

⁵⁴Thewall, Proceedings, p. xxxii; The Times (London), April 11, 1845; Illustrated London News, April 12, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 12, 1845.

⁵⁵Thewall, Proceedings, pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

measure, but only "as a modification of an existing evil," and by demanding an immediate end to the Ascendency.⁵⁶

On April 11 Peel was savagely abused by The Times and by Feargus O'Connor's the Northern Star. O'Connor denounced Sir Robert as inconsistent though courageous, and mocked his "politic" performance.⁵⁷ At the same time the popular outcry against the Bill continued to grow, and in London the Lord Mayor was at the head of it.⁵⁸ Belfast, Northampton, Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Leigh, Stockport, Salford, Ashton-under-Lyne, and Warrington were all reported to be violently opposed to Maynooth Bill.⁵⁹ The situation looked so unfavorable in the mid-lands that the Manchester Guardian felt constrained to run a leading article explaining its position on the issue, calling the uproar "somewhat unreasonable," and pointing out "our inability to comprehend" why the opponents of the Bill were not disturbed by the amount of the existing Grant. The paper found the Maynooth Bill "highly desirable," if

⁵⁶ Liverpool Mercury, April 11, 1845. Cf. O'Connell to Patriarch Mahoney, April 19, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 9; The Nation, April 12, 1845, quoted in McCaffrey, O'Connell, p. 231.

⁵⁷ The Times (London), April 11, 1845; Northern Star, April 11, 1845.

⁵⁸ The Times (London), April 11, 1845, April 14, 1845; Illustrated London News, April 12, 1845.

⁵⁹ The Times (London), April 8, 1845, April 11, 1845, April 12, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 12, 1845, April 16, 1845.

only because it would give a better education to the Irish priesthood, and it endorsed a Roman Catholic Establishment for Ireland.⁶⁰

Again on April 11, while Peel was receiving the thanks of the English Roman Catholic prelates for his Maynooth policy, rumors began to circulate in the provinces about the fate of the Maynooth Bill,⁶¹ and "in some very well-informed quarters," it was thought that the Bill might be lost on either its second or third readings because of the Tories failing to support the Government.⁶²

While a few large meetings were held in favor of the Bill,⁶³ the Government was more frequently attacked at them, and usually vitriolically.⁶⁴ Those newspapers that defended the Bill or the Government were also heaped with abuse, as the editors of the Manchester Guardian found out. A correspondent, who signed himself "G. B. S.," violently attacked the paper, asserting that their position on the Maynooth Bill was "jesuitical," and that they had no

⁶⁰Manchester Guardian, April 16, 1845.

⁶¹The Times (London), April 14, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

⁶²Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴The Times (London), April 12, 1845, April 14, 1845, April 15, 1845; Northern Star, April 19, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1845.

concept of either "Christian charity" or "common justice" in supporting the Bill.⁶⁵

Popular feeling against the Bill continued to mount, and there could be no doubt that the country was heavily against the Bill. There were large anti-Maynooth meetings in Edinburgh, London, Leeds, Manchester, Coventry, Bermondsey, Liverpool, and Nottingham;⁶⁶ at Rochdale a large meeting, composed mainly of Dissenters and chaired by the local magistrate, was addressed by two other magistrates and "several Dissenting ministers." They resolved to send a petition against any grant to Maynooth to Westminster.⁶⁷ Petitions against the Bill were also being got up at Merthyr Tydvil, Altrincham, Bury, and Middleton.⁶⁸ Only at Crewe had the opponents of the Maynooth Bill run into any real trouble, for there the "charitable and tolerant spirit in the 'new town'" kept the number of signatures on a petition against Maynooth at an insignificant level.⁶⁹

After the Maynooth Bill passed its second reading, the Manchester Guardian expressed its pleasant surprise at

⁶⁵Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1845. Another of his letters was printed on April 21, 1845.

⁶⁶The Times (London), April 14, 1845, April 15, 1845, April 16, 1845, April 17, 1845, April 18, 1845; Illustrated London News, April 19, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 16, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

⁶⁷Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

⁶⁸Ibid.; Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1845.

⁶⁹Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

the comfortable majority it received (147),⁷⁰ but Peel and the Government were still being violently attacked by The Times and the Scottish press, and popular feeling against the Bill had not dimmed in London.⁷¹ There the meetings against the Grant went on, and with increasing savagery: Exeter Hall, the "home" of the Protestant Association, was convulsed by the Bill's continued success, and their rage was shared by the Wesleyan Methodists. Exeter Hall and the Crown and Anchor Tavern, another popular meeting place, were continually crowded throughout the remainder of the month.⁷² Punch now joined the fray, and gleefully attacked the Prime Minister:

How wonderful is Peel!
 He changes with the time;
 Turning and twisting like the eel,
 Ascending through the slime.

 'Tis true he is a rat,
 But what of that?
 Tory he used to be,
 But now a Liberal he!⁷³

But perhaps the peak of popular feeling was reached in

⁷⁰Manchester Guardian, April 23, 1845.

⁷¹The Times (London), April 21, 1845, April 22, 1845, May 1, 1845.

⁷²Ibid., April 23, 1845, April 29, 1845, May 1, 1845, May 2, 1845, May 3, 1845; Illustrated London News, May 3, 1845; Manchester Guardian, May 3, 1845.

⁷³Punch, VIII, 191.

London on May 5, when The Times indulged itself in a leading article full of anti-Roman Catholic sentiment.⁷⁴

The Government was still thought to be in grave difficulties, and rumors of a coalition between Peelites and Whigs were rife;⁷⁵ and the provinces were as agitated as was London. The night the Maynooth Bill passed its second reading there was a large meeting of the Protestant Operative Society in Liverpool, and the Bill's success "made them almost rampant." Roman Catholicism was denounced as "fundamental error" and the meeting resolved to petition the Queen, begging her not to sign the Bill if it passed its third reading.⁷⁶ At Bolton the opponents of the Maynooth Bill held two meetings in protest to the measure's success, and one was held in the town's Methodist chapel; at Stockport the Wesleyans were also up in arms over the Bill's success, and they drafted an "almost" unanimous petition against it.⁷⁷ Bury and Leigh were also disturbed by the Bill's progress, and in both towns violently anti-Roman Catholic meetings were held that drafted petitions against the Grant.⁷⁸

⁷⁴The Times (London), May 5, 1845.

⁷⁵Manchester Guardian, April 23, 1845; Greville, Victoria, April 22, 1845, II, 281.

⁷⁶Manchester Guardian, April 23, 1845.

⁷⁷Ibid., April 26, 1845.

⁷⁸Ibid., April 30, 1845.

In May popular feeling against the Maynooth Bill showed no sign of abating,⁷⁹ and the Government was dogged with rumors of impending resignations. Now Lord Lonsdale, the Postmaster General, Lord Liverpool, the Lord Steward of the Household, and the Marquiss of Exeter, Prince Albert's chief Household officer, were thought to be on the brink of resignation in order to be able to vote against the Bill on third reading.⁸⁰

Over five weeks of violent public agitation on an unprecedented national scale was altering the course of those opposed to the Maynooth Bill. The anti-Maynooth movement, as a leading article in the Manchester Guardian pointed out, had originally been directed at the extension of the Grant to Maynooth; by May the increasingly frustrated opponents of the Bill were slowly "joining in one general and fanatical outcry" against all Roman Catholics (A Rev. Mr. Faithfull of Hatfield, for example, asserted that those who supported the Bill only worshiped "the beast," supported "apostacy," and "crucified afresh our Lord and Saviour."). The situation had indeed become "as rancorous

⁷⁹The Times (London), April 23, 1845, April 30, 1845, May 5, 1845, May 14, 1845.

The police had to be called in when an anti-Maynooth meeting ended in riot in Manchester. Ibid., May 14, 1845.

⁸⁰Liverpool Mercury, May 2, 1845; Manchester Guardian, May 3, 1845.

and bigoted as the 'no popery' howl set up by Lord George Gordon."⁸¹

Peel, who was fast becoming a hero at Repeal Association meetings and amongst the Roman Catholic hierarchy,⁸² was the object of increasingly frenzied attacks in England,⁸³ and his Government's position in Scotland was scarcely any better. Macaulay, who represented the City of Edinburgh, was "browbeaten and threatened" by a large number of his constituents because of his support of the Maynooth Bill,⁸⁴ and the Marquiss of Bredalbane, prior to presenting 82 petitions with over ten thousand signatures against the Grant to the Lords, accused the Government of acting in an unconstitutional manner in trying to force the Bill through Parliament.⁸⁵ But the extent of Scotland's opposition to the extension of the Maynooth Grant only became truly manifest at the end of

⁸¹Manchester Guardian, May 14, 1845; Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 1139. Cf. Fraser's, "The Maynooth Question," Vol. XXXI, No. CLXXX (May, 1845), pp. 620-630.

⁸²The Times (London), April 14, 1845, April 23, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, May 2, 1845; Manchester Guardian, May 14, 1845.

⁸³The Times (London), May 1, 1845; Northern Star, May 3, 1845, May 10, 1845, May 17, 1845; Greville, Victoria, April 22, 1845; II, 280.

⁸⁴Liverpool Mercury, May 16, 1845. Cf. G. O. Trevelyan, The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay (2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), II, 122.

⁸⁵Liverpool Mercury, May 9, 1845.

May, when the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland approved, by a vote of 185 to 41, a resolution in favor of opposing the Bill, which it termed "aid in propagation of pestilent error."⁸⁶

Still the meetings went on, and they grew louder and more confused as May wore on.⁸⁷ Stockport's mayor was reported to be in London to "memorialize" the Queen and beg her not to sign the Bill if it should get through Parliament;⁸⁸ the Manchester Guardian was denounced in London by a Rev. Dr. Massie as unprincipled and cowardly because it supported the Bill;⁸⁹ a delegation from the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee appeared in Manchester and, at a loud and violent meeting, resolved to revenge themselves upon Peel at the next General Election if the Bill should clear Parliament;⁹⁰ on May 21, the day that the Maynooth passed its third reading in the House of Commons, the people of Warrington sent another petition against the Grant to London.⁹¹

⁸⁶Ibid., May 30, 1845.

⁸⁷Manchester Guardian, May 3, 1845, May 7, 1845.

⁸⁸Ibid., May 3, 1845.

⁸⁹Ibid., May 7, 1845.

⁹⁰Ibid., May 14, 1845.

⁹¹Ibid., May 21, 1845.

The intense popular feeling against the Maynooth Bill was mirrored in the pamphlet literature produced because of the Bill's introduction into the House of Commons.⁹² In Maynooth, The Crown, And The Country, it was claimed that the Government, by introducing the Bill, had ceased to tolerate Roman Catholicism and was now encouraging it, betraying both God and the people of the United Kingdom.⁹³ The Government was rebuked for attempting to seduce the people of England by its fortifying of a "national evil" with "fresh diseases" rather than trying to remedy the situation by the abolition of the Grant, and for acting "directly contrary to" the "duty of the State to itself."⁹⁴ The pamphlet went on to claim that the establishment of Maynooth in 1795 was a terrible mistake, for it was really rotten to the core: it was disloyal and seditious, and a center of anti-English feeling.⁹⁵ Moreover,

⁹²For the divisions that existed amongst the Protestants who opposed the Maynooth Bill, cf.: Thewall, Proceedings; R. G. Cowherd, The Politics of English Dissent (New York: New York University Press, 1956); G. I. T. Machin, "The Maynooth Grant, the Dissenters, and Dis-establishment, 1845-1847," English Historical Review, Vol. LXXXII, No. 322 (January, 1967); G. A. Cahill, "The Protestant Association and the Anti-Maynooth Agitation of 1845," The Catholic Historical Review, Vol. XLIII, No. 3 (October, 1957). Hereafter cited as Cahill, Maynooth.

⁹³Maynooth, The Crown, And The Country (London, 1845), p. 2.

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 4, 6.

⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 8, 90-91, 10-11, 15, 18.

the Bill would only alienate the Irish Roman Catholic clergy and harm the College itself.⁹⁶ The anonymous author also attacked Roman Catholicism, and denounced all members of that faith as traitors.⁹⁷

The Maynooth Grant. Facts and Observations, also opposed the Maynooth Bill.⁹⁸ It claimed that the Bill envisioned "the greatest stretch of liberality" ever "dreamed of," for it was inconsistent if not insane for a Protestant England to pay for the education of "a Romish priesthood."⁹⁹ The Irish people could, it argued, afford to keep Maynooth going themselves and, besides, "neither the Irish people, nor the Romish priesthood, [would] be satisfied with the enlarged Grant."¹⁰⁰ Another pamphlet sought to prove that the Bill should be opposed because Roman Catholicism was, at heart, against the Bible and all religious truth.¹⁰¹ The seminary was rotten as well, for it only taught "dangerous error;"¹⁰² to vote for or to in

⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 70-71, 73.

⁹⁷Ibid., pp. 6-7, 31, 54, 18, 25, 27, 14, 132.

⁹⁸The Maynooth Grant. Facts and Observations (London, 1845).

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 13-14.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., pp. 14-15.

¹⁰¹The Anti-Maynooth Petition. A Tract for the Times (London, 1845), pp. 2, 3-4.

¹⁰²Ibid., pp. 4-6.

any way approve of the Maynooth Bill would only aid the insidious and intolerant adherents of Rome, who were anathema to all true Christians.¹⁰³

The Bill was also to be opposed as the original Grant was "bad in principle," for it involved England in "nothing short of a national participation in the guilt of idolatry."¹⁰⁴ The great error of 1795 had involved the nation in the financing of heresy, and unless the Grant and the Bill were abandoned at once, England was in danger of being "abandoned by God, or visited with His judgement."¹⁰⁵ The day of reckoning was fast approaching, for "Popery was now marching forward with giant strides," and it was a "Protestant duty" to oppose it in any way.¹⁰⁶ Every true Protestant was exhorted to join in defeating the vile Bill.¹⁰⁷

The textbooks used at Maynooth came under especially sharp attack, and Delahogue's Treatises on Dogmatic Theology and Bailly's Moral Theology were pilloried. These books

¹⁰³Ibid., pp. 7-8.

¹⁰⁴The Popish College of Maynooth (London, The Protestant Association, 1845), p. 11.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶Ibid. Cf. Thomas Gisborne, Maynooth. An Investigation, upon Scriptural Principles, of the Maynooth Question (London, 1845), passim.

¹⁰⁷Maynooth, The Crown, And The Country (London, 1845), p. 1.

were "shown" to be "unsound and dangerous," and to be "infecting" the entire Roman Catholic part of Ireland: who, it was asked, could trust a tradesman, servant, or priest when they were guided by such books?¹⁰⁸ The entire moral and theological system they upheld was thrown out, and Roman Catholicism was "shown" to be an immediate and insidious danger to all Protestants,¹⁰⁹ because it existed in direct opposition to God and the coming of His Kingdom, an "Adversary of God and Man."¹¹⁰

All true Protestants were asked to oppose the Bill, which was described as the weapon of the Anti-Christ: "If Protestantism and its leaders sleep now, it is the sleep of death."¹¹¹ The Bill was only a piece of tawdry political expediency, but it violated scriptural "truth" and worked as an aid to the lies of Rome.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ "When we recollect . . . that there are about 3000 unmarried priests [in Ireland], we are prompted by a higher motive than mere curiosity to inquire what sort of communications they are taught to hold with the wives and daughters of persons in every rank of life . . ." Roman Catholic Morality, as inculcated in the Theological Class-Books used in Maynooth College (Dublin, 1845), p. 5.

¹⁰⁹ Maynooth. The Basis of The Investigation Upon Scriptural Principles of the Maynooth Question (London, 1845), p. 15.

¹¹⁰ A Letter to the Archbishop and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, on the Proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth (London, 1845), pp. 5, 9.

¹¹¹ Ibid., pp. 5, 7.

¹¹² Ibid., pp. 8, 13.

The Maynooth Bill provided "The great popular agitation of the year," and, while "the table of the House groaned under the mass of petitions,"¹¹³ the politicians in Westminster were the target of an unbelievable amount of pressure from their constituents; the Carlton Club was reported to be furious with Peel, and "in a state of insurrection" because of the introduction of the Maynooth Bill;¹¹⁴ the Conservative whip in the Lords, Redesdale, rapidly resigned in protest to the measure.¹¹⁵

The Government was in serious political trouble, and those members who supported the Maynooth Bill were placing their political careers in jeopardy.¹¹⁶ Richard Cobden wrote that "We are all being plagued to death with the fanatics about the Maynooth Grant," and noted with some surprise that "The dissenters and the Church people have joined together to put the screws upon the members" of the House of Commons. Three days later he told his wife that the pressure had not let up, and that "all the

¹¹³Morley, Cobden, I, 350; Harriet Martineau, A History of the Thirty Years' Peace (4 vols.; London: George Bell and Sons, 1877-1878), IV, 247.

¹¹⁴Greville, Victoria, April 5, 1845, April 6, 1845, II, 277; Stuart J. Reid, Lord John Russell (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1895), p. 128.

¹¹⁵Gash, R&R, p. 47.

¹¹⁵Gash, R&R, p. 47.

1845, : ¹¹⁶Greville, Victoria, April 6, II, 277, 281; The Times (London),

1845, April 22,
April 17, 1845.

April 22
17, 1845

bigots in the country" seemed to be writing him about the evils of the Grant.¹¹⁷ Lord John Russell also received a number of threatening letters, telling him that unless he changed his views on the Bill, his constituency, the City of London, would abandon him at the next General Election.¹¹⁸

Lesser known politicians were also subject to this sort of pressure. Colonel Wood, M. P. for Middlesex, was rebuked by his constituents for supporting the Bill, which they referred to "as contradictory to the word of God."¹¹⁹ Lord Jocelyn, who represented Lynn, Lord Worsley, M. P. for Lincolnshire, and Sir John Easthope, who sat for Leicester, all supported the Bill and all were doing so against the vocally expressed wishes of their constituents; they were the object of heavy pressure from home and they were all in grave political danger because of their views on Maynooth.¹²⁰ In West Kent, where an election was forthcoming, the Conservative candidate, Lord Holmesdale, who had been unopposed, was now faced with the opposition of a Thomas Frewen, and only because Holmesdale was known to favor the Maynooth

¹¹⁷Cobden to Mrs. Cobden, April 11 [1845], April 13 [1845], Morley, Cobden, I, 352-353.

¹¹⁸Russell, Recollections, p. 173; Stuart J. Reid, Lord John Russell (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1895), p. 129.

¹¹⁹The Times (London), April 14, 1845.

¹²⁰Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 735-737, 811-812, 814-815.

Bill.¹²¹ In mid-April Pringle, a Scots lord of the Treasury, resigned because he did not feel he could vote for the Bill on second reading.¹²² The member for Louth was in trouble in his constituency, and Sir Frederick Trench, who represented Scarborough, told the House that he had been openly warned by "many" of his constituents to either alter his favorable views on Maynooth or to look elsewhere at the next election.¹²³

Lord John Manners lost his seat at Newark because "nothing but a fierce opposition to Sir Robert Peel would satisfy the Tories" there;¹²⁴ in Cambridge Estcourt was reported to be in trouble with his people because he had been absent when the Maynooth Bill received its first reading.¹²⁵ The Earl of Sefton was forced to defend his pro-Maynooth views in print,¹²⁶ and at Greenock, in an election which "turned entirely upon the Maynooth question," candidate Baines, who had been unopposed until six days

¹²¹The Times (London), April 14, 1845, April 15, 1845, April 16, 1845, April 17, 1845, April 26, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1845.

¹²²Peel to Heytesbury, April 18, 1845, Parker, Peel, III, 425-426; Illustrated London News, April 26, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 23, 1845.

¹²³Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 958, 961.

¹²⁴Whibley, Manners, I, 224-225.

¹²⁵The Times (London), April 15, 1845.

¹²⁶Liverpool Mercury, April 18, 1845.

before the election, was nearly defeated by a man who only ran because Baines supported the Bill.¹²⁷ M. P.'s who supported the Bill were also in trouble with their constituents in Devonport, Dover, Newport (Isle of Wight), and Birmingham;¹²⁸ Milner Gibson, a member for Manchester, was threatened and abused for his stand favoring Maynooth, and the Manchester Guardian was compelled to defend him in print.¹²⁹ Captain Gladstone, M. P. for Ipswich, and Stansfield, who sat for Huddersfield, also seemed to be in trouble with their constituents because of their favorable views on the Maynooth question.¹³⁰

Pressure could be applied by the Government as well. Captain Henry Meynell, M. P. for Liskeard, was in danger of losing his Household post because of his views on the Maynooth Bill, and he was subjected to an intense amount of pressure from John Young, the Conservative whip. His patience finally run out, Meynell caused the following letter to be widely printed:

¹²⁷The Times (London), April 18, 1845, April 19, 1845, April 21, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1845.

¹²⁸Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 873-874, 890, 901-902, 909-910.

¹²⁹Manchester Guardian, April 23, 1845.

¹³⁰Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 1272; ibid., Vol. 80 (1845), p. 125.

Dear Young--Peel and all of you may be d---d before I come up to vote for Maynooth. Because Fitzroy and Kelley are rogues, that is no reason why I should be.¹³¹

Lord Castlereagh was reported to be encountering difficulties with his constituency at Down because of his support of the Bill, and his people were made even angrier when he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of Downshire.¹³² The Maynooth Bill was a prominent feature of the Leominster election,¹³³ and the Marquiss of Blandford was given "the sack" by his father, the Duke of Marlborough, because he supported the Bill against the Duke's wishes on second reading.¹³⁴ The electors of Denbigh were divided over the Bill, and at Peebleshire the incumbent member was returned without opposition, but he was attacked because of his pro-Maynooth position.¹³⁵ Henry Mitcalfe, M. P. for Tynemouth, was under heavy pressure from his constituency to adopt an anti-Maynooth position, and when he refused he felt it necessary to publicly state his reasons

¹³¹Ibid., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 389-390; The Times (London), April 23, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, May 2, 1845. Cf. The Times (London), April 9, 1845.

¹³²Lord Roden was thought to have been promised the position, but he opposed the Maynooth Bill. The Times (London), April 24, 1845, April 18, 1845, May 29, 1845.

¹³³Ibid., April 28, 1845.

¹³⁴Ibid., April 28, 1845, May 2, 1845; Manchester Guardian, April 26, 1845; Liverpool Mercury, May 2, 1845.

¹³⁵The Times (London), May 2, 1845, May 8, 1845.

for failing to comply with their wishes.¹³⁶ Lord Francis Egerton resigned his seat for South Lancashire on May 6 at least in part because his constituents could not accept his favorable position on Maynooth,¹³⁷ and Macaulay was reported to be in serious political trouble in Edinburgh because of his pro-Maynooth position.¹³⁸ Lord Ingestre, M. P. for South Staffordshire, Godson of Kidderminster, and Lord Harry Vane, who represented Durham County, were all in trouble in their constituencies for their favorable views on the Bill, and one, Vane, had been attacked for his stand on the question.¹³⁹

The spirit of revenge was in the air, and both Manchester and Ulster resolved to avenge themselves upon those who supported the Maynooth Bill.¹⁴⁰ Ulster was especially indignant, and a leading Tory newspaper, the Newry Telegraph, threatened ten Ulster M. P.'s with political ruin for their support of the Maynooth Bill.¹⁴¹ The

¹³⁶Liverpool Mercury, May 9, 1845.

¹³⁷Manchester Guardian, May 10, 1845; The Times (London), May 12, 1845.

¹³⁸Liverpool Mercury, May 16, 1845.

¹³⁹Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 584, 624-625, 662.

¹⁴⁰Manchester Guardian, May 14, 1845; The Times (London), May 29, 1845.

¹⁴¹The Newry Telegraph, quoted in The Times (London), May 29, 1845.

Edinburgh County election was the scene of much unpleasantness because of the Bill,¹⁴² and Protestant feeling ran high throughout the summer, embittering the elections that took place.¹⁴³ At Dartmouth the Conservative candidate, who had seemed assured of an easy victory, went down to defeat because of his support of the Bill;¹⁴⁴ at Exeter the Protestant Committee of Electors were requiring a statement of religious belief from the Conservative candidates that it was considering;¹⁴⁵ at Belfast Lord Chicester was campaigning as a Protestant, as the term "Conservative" was "only" used there "as a term of reproach."¹⁴⁶

The uproar over the Maynooth Bill was very slow to subside, and the issue was still alive during the General Election of 1847.¹⁴⁷ While the Peelites did "surprisingly"

¹⁴²The Times (London), June 6, 1845.

¹⁴³At Abingdon: The Times (London), July 5, 1845, July 7, 1845, July 8, 1845; at Cambridge cf. ibid., July 1, 1845, July 10, 1845, July 11, 1845, July 14, 1845, July 18, 1845; at Southwark cf. ibid., August 18, 1845, August 19, 1845, August 21, 1845, August 23, 1845; at West Suffolk cf. ibid., July 7, 1845, July 8, 1845.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., July 4, 1845, July 5, 1845.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., July 5, 1845, July 7, 1845, July 8, 1845, July 9, 1845.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., June 12, 1845.

¹⁴⁷Charles Wood to Lord John Russell, August 1, 1847, quoted in Gash, R&R, p. 104. Cf. Thomas Erskine May, The Constitutional History of England Since the Accession of George the Third 1760-1860 (2 vols.; New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1887), II, 457-458; Parker, Peel, III, 487-489.

well in the election, winning 117 seats to the Whigs' 336 and the Protectionists' 201,¹⁴⁸ the memory of the Bill still worked against those who had supported it. Henry Goulburn, Peel's Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1841 to 1846, had some trouble because of Maynooth at Cambridge,¹⁴⁹ and Lord Lincoln was nearly defeated at Falkirk because he had supported the Bill.¹⁵⁰ Macaulay lost Edinburgh because of it,¹⁵¹ and Peel was informed that "'Maynooth' has certainly destroyed several of our friends. 'Free Trade' hardly any."¹⁵²

But the most important effect of the Maynooth Bill was that it destroyed both the party and the career of Sir Robert Peel. By the end of May 1845 the Prime Minister was probably the most hated man in England, and he knew it.¹⁵³ He had been compared to "the young man void of understanding,

¹⁴⁸J. B. Conacher, "Peel and the Peelites, 1846-50," English Historical Review, Vol. 73, No. 288 (July, 1958), p. 438.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 437.

¹⁵⁰Gash, Politics, p. 176.

¹⁵¹G. O. Trevelyan, The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay (2 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960), II, 166-167.

¹⁵²Bonham to Peel, August 2, 1847, quoted in Gash, Peel, p. 65.

¹⁵³Peel to Lady Peel, September 15, 1845; Peel, Letters, p. 269; Peel, Memoirs, II, 107, 293.

who fell a victim to a woman with the attire of an harlot,"¹⁵⁴ and was commonly referred to in Conservative circles as a traitor and as a man who had dishonored his name, his party, and his country.¹⁵⁵ Peel was repeatedly denounced as a traitor, and for delivering his party into the hands of its enemies.¹⁵⁶

Sir Robert's introduction of the Maynooth Bill had created "fresh sources of dislike and disunion between the great body of the Conservatives and the Government," and by April 12 it was clear that Peel was kept in office "entirely by the Opposition."¹⁵⁷ When the Bill passed its first reading on April 3 by a vote of 216 to 114, the victory was only possible because of Whig support.¹⁵⁸ It

¹⁵⁴Quoted in Walpole, History, IV, 249.

¹⁵⁵Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 80 (1845), p. 744; The Times (London), April 11, 1845. Cf. Fraser's, "Contemporary Orators: Sir Robert Peel," Vol. XXXI, No. CLXXXIV (April, 1845), pp. 387-391; "The Treasury Benches," Vol. XXXI, No. CLXXXIV (April, 1845), p. 493; "Tory Policy," Vol. XXXII, No. CLXXVIII (August, 1845), p. 240.

¹⁵⁶Greville, Victoria, April 6, 1845, II, 277-278; The Times (London), April 11, 1845, April 12, 1845, April 15, 1845, April 17, 1845, May 23, 1845, July 14, 1845.

He was never forgiven for the Maynooth Bill. Cf. Walpole, History, IV, 250; Bagehot, p. 191.

¹⁵⁷Greville, Victoria, April 6, 1845, II, 277-278; Lady Dorchester, ed., Recollections of a Long Life by John Can Hobhouse, Lord Broughton (6 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), VI, 141; Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 109-111; The Times (London), April 7, 1845; Shaftesbury, II, 103.

¹⁵⁸The Times (London), April 5, 1845, April 7, 1845; Greville, Victoria, April 5, 1845, II, 277.

passed its second reading with a majority of 147 votes; 158 Conservatives and 165 Whigs and Radicals voted for the Bill, and 145 Conservatives and 31 Whigs and Radicals voted against it. But, as The Times pointed out, thirty of the Conservatives who voted for the Bill were placemen, and 64 members of the Conservative party failed to vote on second reading.¹⁵⁹ On its third reading the Maynooth Bill passed by a vote of 317 to 184, with 169 Whigs and Radicals and 148 Conservatives voting for it; of the 184 negative votes, 151 were cast by Conservatives. Moreover, 74 Conservatives were not present at the division.¹⁶⁰

Peel was now in a decisive minority within his own party, and The Times proclaimed an end to Conservatism. Sir Robert remained in power only because there was no alternative to him;¹⁶¹ the party was, for all practical purposes, dead.¹⁶² As Sir James Graham, the Home Secretary, wrote

¹⁵⁹ Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 1042-1045; The Times (London), April 21, 1845; Spencer Walpole, The Life of Lord John Russell (2 vols.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889), I, n. 416; Shaftesbury, II, 110.

¹⁶⁰ Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 745-748; The Times (London), May 23, 1845.

It must be also pointed out that, of the 47 men who spoke against the Bill in the House of Commons, 39 were members of the Conservative party.

¹⁶¹ The Times (London), April 19, 1845; Greville, Victoria, June 16, 1845, August 21, 1845, II, 284, 290.

¹⁶² Greville, Victoria, April 22, 1845, April 25, 1845, II, 280, 282; The Times (London), August 16, 1845; Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), pp. 971-972; Vol. 80 (1845), pp. 717-718.

on April 12th, "The Bill will pass, but our party is destroyed." He went on to lament that

A large body of our supporters is mortally offended, and in their anger they are ready to do anything . . . to revenge themselves upon us.¹⁶³

The party really came to an end on June 17, 1845, when the dissident "Protestant Conservatives" withdrew from the Carlton and formed the National Club, whose aim was to propagate "the Protestant principles of the Constitution."¹⁶⁴

¹⁶³Graham to Heytesbury, April 22, 1845, Parker, Graham, II, 10.

Colonel Sibthorpe, a Tory M. P. for Lincoln, summed-up the dissident Conservative's views on the Government and the Prime Minister when he told the House on April 17: "I will never support Peel. I'll never support any man who acts contrary to the duty that he owes to his Sovereign, to the people, and last of all, and greatest of all, to his God. I never will support any man who does this. . . ." Hansard, 3d ser., Vol. 79 (1845), p. 888.

¹⁶⁴The Times (London), June 26, 1845. Cf. Cahill, Maynooth, pp. 300-301; The Times (London), August 16, 1845.

CONCLUSION

The Maynooth policy of Sir Robert Peel and his Government destroyed the Conservative party. While the Government remained in office for several months after the Maynooth Bill received the Royal Assent, it did so only because no Tory alternative to the leadership of Peel existed. Disraeli was still regarded as a "fop" and as a suspect and rather disreputable figure; he did not yet own Hughenden. Lord George Bentinck had supported the Bill and was far from being well known in either the party or the country. But, when the next major crisis occurred, over the repeal of the Corn Laws, the Tory malcontents in the party were furnished with a respectable, popular leader in Lord Stanley. Whatever public unity the "party" had then promptly dissolved, and the Government collapsed. The Tories had their revenge.

Peel had as much to do with the destruction of the Conservative party as did Disraeli or Lord George Bentinck. The party was based upon the broad principles of defense of the Constitution, the Church, and the House of Lords; the Maynooth Bill, at least from the Tory point of view, was subversive if not totally destructive of two of the three main, cohesive props of the party.

From a purely political point of view, Sir Robert Peel's sudden espousal of the cause of Maynooth College was no more than a dangerous adventure. He and the rest of the Government knew well beforehand the risks involved in any legislative tampering with the Grant to Maynooth. He staked his party's future on a gamble in which the odds were less than favorable. When Sir Robert lost the throw, the Whigs came into power and would remain in control of the Government, with one interruption, until 1886. His "victory," as Lord John Russell pointed out, was pyrrhic at best.¹

One is tempted to wonder what would have happened if Peel could have overcome his arrogance and obstinacy and found himself able to discuss the Bill with the leaders of the Tory wing of the party prior to its introduction into the House of Commons. If Sir Robert had clearly explained the Bill's real purpose to Inglis, Ashley, and Ferrand, he might have been able to secure its passage through the House of Commons without such frenzied and widespread opposition; the party and the remaining influence of the Prime Minister did not have to collapse over the issue.

Perhaps the most important effect of the Maynooth Bill was not in its impact upon Peel and the Conservative

¹Russell to Lansdowne, December 27, 1845; Russell to Sir Charles Wood, August 15, 1847; Russell, Later Correspondence, I, 99, 181.

party but in its effect upon Gladstone as a politician. As Professor Kitson Clark has pointed out, no other Victorian politician until Gladstone "turned to the problems of Ireland with the same resolution which Peel showed until his pupil Gladstone took up the matter in 1868."² His apprenticeship under Peel may explain both his passionate desire to "pacify Ireland" and his lordly and contemptuous attitude towards those politicians who opposed him in securing his goals. He too would wreck his party over Ireland. Queen Victoria also may have remembered the Maynooth crisis, and her harsh view of Gladstone may have been conditioned as much by his contrary and singular actions in 1844 and 1845 as by his well known tendency to address her "like a public meeting."

It is, however, extremely difficult to ultimately evaluate the situation that Sir Robert Peel precipitated in the spring of 1845. One can either admire the man and his courage in doing what he believed to be right for Ireland and England, or stand appalled at his obstinacy, arrogance, and the willful, needless destruction of his party. One thing, however is clear: Peel was not the man to introduce and guide the Maynooth Bill through the House of Commons; he should have resigned and let Lord John Russell do it, or fought a General Election over the issue. He did neither. Sir Robert had, more than fifteen years before the Maynooth

²Kitson Clark, Victorian England, p. 44.

crisis, been responsible for the repeal of the Test and Corporation acts, and he then increased the Regium Donum to Maynooth College. "Feats of this kind do not bear repetition," and the only "surprising" thing about Peel's Conservative party is "that it lasted so long" as it did.³

³Morley, Cobden, I, 373; Gash, Peel, p. 65.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Documents

Great Britain. Parliament. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1st. ser., Vol. 28 (1814).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1st. ser., Vol. 31 (1815).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 2nd ser., Vol. 6 (1822).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 21 (1834).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 40 (1838).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 45 (1839).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 47 (1839).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 53 (1840).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 57 (1841).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 64 (1842).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 79 (1845).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 80 (1845).

_____. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd ser., Vol. 85 (1846).

Great Britain. Parliament. Sessional Papers. Edited by Edgar L. Erickson. 230 vols.; New York: Readex Microprint Corporation, n.d. "A Detailed Account of the Expenditure of the Sum of £ 30,000, granted in the Year 1845, for putting Maynooth College into repair: Copy of any Estimates and Plans furnished by the Architect employed on that Occasion: And Detailed Account of the Sum of £5,718.17s9d, the Total Amount of the Grants voted from the Year 1846 to the Year 1850, inclusive of both Years, for the Repairs and Maintenance of Maynooth College." Sess. 1851 (213.), L, 661.

. "A Return of the Number of Students in the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth, during the Years 1840, 1841, and 1842; Also the Number of Professors at present employed therein, with their respective Salaries and Emoluments." Sess. 1843 (271.), LI, 55.

. "A Return of the Number of Public Petitions Presented and Printed in each of the Fifteen Years from 1833 to 1847 inclusive; showing the Total Number in each successive Period of Five Years, and the Average Number; also the Number of Signatures to Petitions for each of the said Fifteen Years, and the Total Number." Sess. 1847-1848 (236.), LI, 33.

. "A Return of the Sums of Money voted to the College of Maynooth during the last Five Years; the Number of Professors employed therein, and their respective Salaries." Sess. 1835 (488.), XXXVIII, 569.

. "A Return of the Totals of all Sums of Money issued from the Treasury on account of the Civil List, excepting that of Her Present Majesty . . . the Total Amount voted by Parliament for Maynooth College from the earliest Grant to the present period." Sess. 1840 (633.), XXXIX, 71.

. "Divisions of the House of Commons." Index Card No. 363.

. "Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry. Roman Catholic College of Maynooth." Sess. 1826-27 (509.), XIII, 537.

. "Letter from the President of Maynooth College." Sess. 1812-13 (179.), VI, 637.

Great Britain. Parliament. Sessional Papers. Edited by Edgar L. Erickson. 230 vols.; New York: Readex Microprint Corporation, n.d. "Papers Presented to the House of Commons Relating to the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth." Sess. 1808 (132.), IX, 371.

_____. "Report of the Visitors of the Royal College of Maynooth." Sess. 1831 (267.), XV, 71.

No report was made, as no visitation took place.

_____. "Reports on Public Petitions Maynooth 1833-1852." Index Cards Nos. 331 and 332.

The petitions themselves are not printed in Erickson's edition of the Sessional Papers. These index cards contain the only record of them in the set.

_____. "Returns Relating to the College of Maynooth." Sess. 1845 (244.), XXVIII, 333.

Pamphlets

A Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, on the Proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth. London, 1845.

Common Sense v. Bigotry: or, Reasons for Supporting the Parliamentary Grant to Maynooth. London, 1845.

One of the two pamphlets in the British Museum's holdings on Maynooth College in favor of the Grant.

Gisborne, Thomas. Maynooth. An Investigation, upon Scriptural Principles, of the Maynooth Question. London, 1845.

Maynooth. The Basis Of The Investigation upon scriptural principles of the Maynooth Question. London, 1845.

Maynooth, The Crown, And The Country. London, 1845.

Roman Catholic Morality, as inculcated in the Theological Class-Books used in Maynooth College. Dublin, 1845.

The Anti-Maynooth Petition. A Tract for The Times. London, 1845.

The Case of Maynooth College Considered: With A History of the First Establishment of that Seminary. Dublin, 1836.

The Establishment of the Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth, Near Dublin. London, 1796.

The Maynooth Endowment Vindicated. London, 1845.
The other pamphlet that the British Museum has that is in favor of the Grant.

The Maynooth Grant. Facts and Observations. London, 1845.

The Popish College of Maynooth. London: The Protestant Association, 1845.

Sources

Benson, A. C., and Esher, Viscount, eds. The Letters of Queen Victoria 1837-1861. 3 vols. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.

Of some help for this thesis, the Queen's letters are far more valuable in assessing her own singular personality.

Buckingham and Chandos, Duke of. Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of William IV and Victoria. 2 vols. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1861.

These memoirs are gossipy but, to some extent, informative, especially in dealing with the Ultra-Tory faction within the Conservative party.

Carlyle, Thomas. Past and Present. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1935.

Very helpful in determining the Weltanschauung of the High Tories.

_____. Sartor Resartus. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Cockburn, Henry. Journal of Henry Cockburn. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1874.

Lord Cockburn was one of the most prominent of early Victorian Whigs, and his Journal provides an intimate view of that party.

Disraeli, Benjamin. Coningsby. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1933.

A savage, but gleeful novelistic indictment of Peel and his politics.

Disraeli, Benjamin. Lord George Bentinck. London: Colburn and Co., 1852.

Disraeli's lavish tribute to a man who probably did not deserve it. Chapters I and XVII are of especial value, for there the author makes his most serious criticism of Peel's political philosophy.

----- Sybil. London: Coburn and Co., 1860.

Another novelistic assessment of what Peel meant to the party as a whole; Disraeli did not like Peel, either as a man or as a politician.

Dorchester, Lady, ed. Recollections of a Long Life by John Cam Hobhouse Lord Broughton. 6 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.

A very valuable political memoir by one of the leading Whigs of the period. Vol. 6 was of especial help.

Gladstone, William E. The State in its Relations with the Church. London: John Murray, 1838.

A highly interesting book. Its espousal of the High Church, Anglo-Catholic position was the product of Gladstone's emotions, not his mind, and the book embarrassed him for the rest of his life.

Gooch, G. P., ed. The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925.

An admirably edited and annotated work, very valuable for the politics of the early Victorian period.

Haly, W. T., ed. The Opinions of Sir Robert Peel, Expressed in Parliament and in Public. London: Whittaker & Co., 1843.

An invaluable guide to the speeches of Peel. Haly, who must have been a Parliamentary correspondent for one of the London newspapers, here organizes under topic headings the relevant speeches of Peel. It is also a source for many speeches made that are not included in Hansard or in the collected speeches.

Jennings, Louis J., ed. The Croker Papers. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

A major source for the politics of the age of reform. Croker, who refused to sit in the reformed Parliament, was one of the party's most

important journalists up until the time of his death, and his opinions, however wrongheaded, carried great weight with Conservatives throughout the United Kingdom.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. The Complete Writings of Lord Macaulay. 20 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., Ltd., 1900.

The last four volumes of this work are of real importance to the political history of the period, as they contain all of Macaulay's speeches in the House of Commons. He was a far more important politician than most historians recognize.

Mahon, Lord, and Cardwell, Edward, eds. Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1857.

Peel's memoirs deal primarily with Roman Catholic emancipation, his Government of 1834-1835, and with the repeal of the Corn Laws. But they are, in terms of this thesis, still very important, both for the man they reveal, and for scattered references to the Maynooth Bill.

Milaband, Marion, ed. The Observer of the Nineteenth Century, 1791-1901. London: Longmans, 1966.

A light book, which presents the views of The Observer on a varied number of significant topics.

Mill, John Stuart. Autobiography of John Stuart Mill. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, 1964.

Not of crucial importance for this thesis, Mill's opinions are, however, of some value. His position on the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 is illustrative of the Radical position on the new Law, and his intolerance of the opposition to the Law is fairly typical of the views of those who supported it.

Macvey Napier, ed. Selection From the Correspondence of the Late Macvey Napier, Esq. London: Macmillan and Co., 1879.

The elder Napier was the editor of the Edinburgh Review, and he was always well-informed about political developments in London. Macaulay was one of his principal correspondents.

Parker, C. S. Sir Robert Peel From his Private Papers.
3 vols. London: John Murray, 1891-1899.

This book provides the bulk of the information upon which this thesis is based. According to Professor Gash, Parker was not the best editor Peel's correspondence could have had. But, this aside, it is a good collection of correspondence and memoranda, and it is the only collection of Peel's papers outside the British Museum.

Peel, George, ed. The Private Letters of Sir Robert Peel.
London: John Murray, 1920.

This is a good collection of Peel's correspondence with his wife and family. It was of real use in researching this paper, but it contains no letters from February 3, 1845 to June 13, 1845, and there is no way of knowing what Peel privately felt about the opposition to the Maynooth Bill.

Reeve, Henry, ed. The Greville Memoirs. A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV and King William IV. 3 vols.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1875.

This, and its companion volumes, form one of the major resources used in the writing of this thesis. Greville was clerk of the Privy Council, and he was an intimate of the leading politicians of both parties for the period covered in both parts of the Memoirs. It is, collectively, of major interest for the political history of the period.

. The Greville Memoirs (Second Part). 3 vols.
London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1885.

Russell, Earl. Recollections and Suggestions 1813-1873.
Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1875.

Lord John Russell's political memoirs, this volume is important more for events within the Whig party than for anything else, but it was useful in the writing of this thesis.

Russell, Rollo, ed. Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell. 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1913.

This work, edited by Lord John's recluse son, is not as well done as the volumes edited by G. P. Gooch; it is, however, an important source for the political developments of early Victorian England.

Sanders, Lloyd C., ed. Lord Melbourne's Papers. London:
Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889.

A valuable source of background information, especially on Ireland.

Southey, Robert. Sir Thomas More: or, Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society. London: John Murray, 1831.

An old work scarcely remembered if at all, and then only because Macaulay reviewed it. It illustrates how the High Tories felt about the new industrial England.

St. John-Stevas, Norman, ed. Bagehot's Historical Essays. Anchor Books. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1965.

This collection of one of the most eminent of the Victorian's essays is very valuable. Bagehot was the editor of The Economist, a journal which represented the most respectable of middle class views in the nineteenth century.

Stratford, Alice, Countess of, ed. Personal Reminiscences of the Duke of Wellington, by Francis, The First Earl of Eilesmere. London: John Murray, 1903.

These memoirs deal chiefly with the military side of the Duke's life, but there is some interesting information in them of a personal nature, and some light is thrown on his religious views.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. The Irish Sketch Book of 1842 and Character Sketches. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1899.

Thackeray went to Ireland in 1842 and he published his reminiscences of the trip. He was, on the whole, shocked by the poverty and misery that Ireland presented; he was horrified by the disgusting physical condition of Maynooth College.

The Speeches of the Late Right Honourable Sir Robert Peel, Bart. 4 vols. London: George Routledge and Co., 1853.

This is the complete edition of Peel's speeches in the House of Commons. It is a valuable source for any work on Peel.

Thewall, Rev. A. S., ed. and comp. Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference of 1845. London: Blackwell and Pardon, 1845.

A major source for any work on the Maynooth problem. However, Thewall is primarily concerned with the divisions within the anti-Maynooth camp and with detailed theological arguments proving that Roman Catholicism is morally and religiously wrong. It has also been heavily used by Cahill and Machin (q.v., below).

Thorold Rogers, James E., ed. Public Addresses by John Bright, M. P. London: Macmillan and Co., 1879.
Taken with the volumes below, these form an almost complete collection of Bright's speeches outside of the House of Commons. They are invaluable for any study of early Victorian Politics.

Speeches on Questions of Public Policy by John Bright. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1869.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Journeys to England and Ireland. Anchor Books. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.

A masterful and perceptive account of the two nations by one of the most observant men who ever lived. This book is an absolute necessity, at least for background information, for any study of England or Ireland in the early 1840's.

Young, G. M., and Hancock, W. D., eds. English Historical Documents 1833-1874. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.

An essential tool for any beginning research in early Victorian England.

Books

Aspinall, A. Politics and the Press 1780-1850. London: Home & Van Thal Ltd., 1949.

A valuable study of the relationship between politics and newspapers; however, no mention is made in the book of the Maynooth crisis.

Black, R. D. Collison. Economic Thought and the Irish Question 1817-1870. Cambridge: The University Press, 1960.

A highly valuable background work. One of its strongest points is that it demonstrates how complicated and involved the Irish question was.

Blake, Robert. Disraeli. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1966.

The most recent life of Beconsfield, and the best one. It combines a high degree of scholarship with as much literary merit.

Briggs, Asa. The Making of Victorian England, 1783-1867. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1965.

The best general history of the period; it provides a great deal of background information.

- Brightfield, Myron J. John Wilson Croker. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1940.
The only modern biography of Croker. In terms of this study, its chief value is in determining what articles were written by Croker for the Quarterly Review.
- Brose, Olive J. Church and Parliament. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959.
Miss Brose provides an excellent study of the Church of England in the Age of Reform, and how the Church was reshaped to meet the needs of nineteenth century England.
- Cornish, F. W. The English Church in the Nineteenth Century. 2 parts. London: Macmillan and Co., 1910.
A standard history of the Church of England; the author seems to subtly resent the reforms made in the Church during the century.
- Cowherd, R. G. The Politics of English Dissent. New York: New York University Press, 1956.
The book is not well done. It is sloppy in its scholarship and it often grossly oversimplifies the politics of the period.
- Davis, H. W. Carless. The Age of Grey and Peel. New York: Russell & Russell Inc., 1964.
A reissue of a book which first appeared in 1929. It is highly valuable, both for the politics and the literature of early Victorian England.
- Doubleday, Thomas. The Political Life of Sir Robert Peel, Bart. 2 vols. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1856.
An old biography of Peel, it is still of some value as Doubleday was a more than passable scholar.
- Driver, Cecil. Tory Radical: The Life of Richard Castler. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
A magnificent biography of one of the most interesting of the Ultra-Tories. Professor Driver's book is sympathetic but objective, and is marvelously well-written.
- Erskine May, Thomas. The Constitutional History of England Since the Accession of George the Third 1760-1860. 2 vols. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1887.
The author, who is more famous for his handbook of Parliamentary procedure, has written here an interesting political history of England for the period. It is objective and of real value to the scholar.

Finer, S. E. The Life and Times of Sir Edwin Chadwick.
London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1952.

This fine biography of Bentham's favorite pupil should be used with Professor Driver's book on Castler. Together, these two works allow one to clearly see the conflicts of the age, and the two extreme positions that produced much of the political and social conflict of the early Victorian period.

Gash, Norman. Mr. Secretary Peel. Cambridge, Mass.:
Harvard University Press, 1961.

Professor Gash is the leading expert on the career of Sir Robert Peel, and this, the first volume of his biography of Peel, is a fine book. When his life of Peel is completed, it will be definitive.

. Politics in the Age of Peel. London: Longmans
Green and Co., 1953.

This is probably the best political history of early Victorian England available.

. Reaction and Reconstruction in English Politics
1832-1852. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

Professor Gash gave the Ford Lectures at Oxford for 1964 and they appear here in slightly different form. It is a must for any political study of the period.

Graves, Charles L. Mr. Punch's History of Modern England.
4 vols. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, n.d.

In terms of scholarly use, this work is useful primarily for locating articles and cartoons in Punch itself.

Halevy, Elie. A History of the English People in the Nine-
teenth Century, Vol. III: The Triumph of Reform
1830-1841. 6 vols. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc.,
1961.

Essential background reading; much of Professor Halevy's work has, however, been superseded by more recent and more readable efforts.

. A History of the English People in the Nine-
teenth Century, Vol. IV: Victorian Years 1841-1895.
New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1961.

Hill, R. L. Toryism and the People. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1929.

An old monograph on the attempt of the Tory party to gain some "popular" support and following. Its value today is mainly in its chapters on the party's organization.

Hodder, Edwin. The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury. 3 vols. London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1886.

The definitive life of one of the most interesting of all the Victorians. Hodder draws heavily upon Ashley's diary, and it is an essential work for any political or religious study of the period.

Johnson, L. G. The Social Evolution of Industrial Britain. Liverpool; Liverpool University Press, 1959.

A perceptive analysis and interpretation of the coming of industrialism to the United Kingdom.

Mitson Clark, George S. R. Peel and the Conservative Party. London: G. Bell & Sons Ltd., 1929.

A most informative study of Peel and his relationship with the party. It underestimates the lack of unity in the party however, especially in the period 1835-1841.

The Making of Victorian England. London: Methuen & Co Ltd., 1962.

This is a very perceptive and suggestive book, and the Appendix, by Professor Aydelotte, is extremely interesting.

Lang, Andrew. Life, Letters, and Diaries of Sir Stafford Northcote, First Earl of Iddesleigh. 2 vols. London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1890.

An "official" life, this is the sort of book that led Carlyle to denounce biography, and to claim that whatever it was, it was not literature. When one considers that Northcote was one of the most important of second-line Conservative politicians during the period 1846-1878, this is a grievous loss.

Langford, Elizabeth. Queen Victoria. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

The definitive life of the Queen, written with a great deal of style and verve. It is a must for any study of the period.

Macintyre, Angus. The Liberator. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1965.

An excellent study of O'Connell and his movement 1830-1847; the bibliography and the index are very helpful.

Magnus, Phillip. Gladstone: A Biography. London: John Murray, 1960.

The best biography of Gladstone, it is of obvious importance for any serious political examination of Victorian England.

Mansergh, Nicholas. The Irish Question 1840-1921. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

This is a new and revised edition of a book published in 1940; it is an excellent survey of the period and, besides serving as an introduction to Victorian Ireland, helps keep things in their true perspective.

Martineau, Harriet. A History of the Thirty Years' Peace. London: George Bell and Sons, 1877-1878. 4 vols.

This is English history according to the leading lady Radical of the period. It is crammed with mis-information and is valuable primarily as an intellectual document.

Mathieson, W. L. English Church Reform 1815-1840. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1923.

A study of the Church when it faced its period of "ultimate danger" at the hands of the Benthamites and the Whigs. A valuable monograph.

McCaffrey, Lawrence J. Daniel O'Connell and the Repeal Year. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966.

This is an excellent study of O'Connell and the Repeal movement. It was invaluable for this thesis.

McDowell, R. B. British Conservatism 1832-1914. London: Faber and Faber, 1959.

Professor McDowell is, along with Professor Gash, one of the finest scholars writing on Victorian England. This book, which is definitive, provides an intellectual and political history of Conservatism which is not only profound but readable. A must for any political analysis of the period.

McDowell, R. B. Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1952.

The definitive work in its field.

. The Irish Administration 1801-1914. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964.

The definitive work in its field.

Monypenny, W. F., and Buckle, G. E. The Life of Benjamin Disraeli Earl of Beaconsfield. 4 vols. London: John Murray, 1912.

Now superseded for the most part by Blake's Disraeli, this is still a monumental landmark in historiography; full of information, it is essential to any political study of the period 1835-1880.

Moorman, J. R. H. A History of the Church in England. New York: Moorehouse-Gorham Co., 1954.

A good history of the Church of England, especially for the nineteenth century.

Morley, John. The Life of Richard Cobden. 2 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1908.

The best life of Cobden, it is essential for an understanding of the early Victorian period.

. The Life of W. E. Gladstone. 3 vols. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903.

The old life of Gladstone.

Nowlan, Kevin B. The Politics of Repeal: A Study of the Relations Between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-50. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.

This is a key book to any study of the Irish problem for the period. It was essential for this thesis because Nowlan is one of the few scholars who appreciates the significance of the Maynooth Bill.

Parker, C. S. Life and Letters of Sir James Graham. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1907.

One of the most important books used in this thesis. However able an editor and author, Parker here provides a sizeable portion of the Graham Papers, and they are invaluable.

Ramsay, A. A. W. Sir Robert Peel. London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1928.

A good, solid biography of Peel.

Read, Donald. Press and People 1790-1850. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd., 1961.

An excellent study of the topic, but this work, like Mr. Aspinall's, makes no reference to the Maynooth problem at all; this would be more understandable if the anti-Maynooth agitation had not been the most notable popular issue of 1845. It is, however, very good on the Irish problem in general.

Reid, Stuart J. Lord John Russell. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1895.

An old but useful life of Russell.

Senior, Hereward. Orangeism in Ireland and Britain 1795-1836. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

This provides valuable background for the Irish problem as it existed in the 1840's. It reveals that anti-Roman Catholicism tended to be a viable part of British life.

Southgate, Donald. The Passing of the Whigs 1832-1886. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1962.

An excellent study of the Whigs; it is especially valuable for the relationship between Melbourne and Peel, and for its excellent bibliography and index.

The History of The Times. 4 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.

Especially valuable for determining the internal politics and positions of "the Thunderer." It also is essential in revealing the split between the Peelites and the rest of the party.

Thomas, J. A. The House of Commons 1832-1901. A Study of its Economic and Functional Character. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1939.

Very valuable in determining who were and, for the most part, who were not, Peelites.

Trevelyan, G. M. British History in the Nineteenth Century and After, 1782-1919. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Incorporated, 1966.

A valuable survey of the period.

Trevelyan, G. M. The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

The classic biography of the great Whig historian and politician.

Walpole, Spencer. A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815. 6 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1886.

This is by far the best of the great flood of contemporary histories about nineteenth century England. Walpole was both a gifted scholar and an able writer, and he produced a superb and often penetrating narrative history.

The Life of Lord John Russell. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1889.

Insofar as it goes, the best biography of Russell. He is in need of a new life.

Whibley, Charles. Lord John Manners and his Friends. 2 vols. London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1925.

The biography of perhaps the most interesting Duke of Rutland.

Woodward, E. L. The Age of Reform 1815-1870. 2nd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

An encyclopedia of information for the period.

Young, G. M. Victorian Essays. Edited by W. D. Handcock. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

The most illuminating single book ever written on Victorian England. Mr. Young not only knew his material, but could write and explain it with a truly singular amount of verve, understanding, compassion, and wit.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Annual Register, 1834-1846.

Blackwood's Magazine, 1835-1845.

Edinburgh Review, 1835-1845.

Fraser's Magazine, 1834-1846.

One of the three great Tory reviews of the first half of the nineteenth century. It however, unlike Blackwood's and the Quarterly Review, has for the most part been ignored by scholars doing work in early victorian history, which is why this thesis draws so heavily upon it at the expense of the others.

Illustrated London News, 1845.

Liverpool Mercury, 1845.

Liverpool's leading weekly newspaper, it was a warm supporter of the anti-Corn Law League and other Liberal causes. It was also firmly committed to the passage of the Maynooth Bill.

Manchester Guardian, 1845.

In 1845 it was a bi-weekly newspaper, and its politics were largely like those of the Liverpool Mercury. It also supported the Government on Maynooth, and suffered nearly as much abuse for its stand.

Northern Star, 1845.

Feargus O'Connor's newspaper, it echoed for the most part the daily and usually varying whims of its master. It is a singular paper, and rather amusing to read.

Punch, 1845.

Quarterly Review, 1834-1845.

The Times (London), 1834-1846.

Probably Peel's most bitter and persistent critic among the press, the paper seems to have turned against the Conservative leadership (except for Aberdeen) because of its position on the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834.

Articles

Archbold, W. A. J. "William A'Court, Baron Heytesbury," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. IX.

Barker, G. F. R. "Sir Robert Harry Inglis," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. X.

Boase, G. C. "Thomas Phillip de Grey, Earl de Grey," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. VIII.

Broderick, John F. "The Holy See and the Irish Movement for the Repeal of the Union with England, 1929-47," Analecta Gregoriana, LV, 1951.

A very useful examination, at least in part, of the extent to which Irish priests trained at Maynooth were involved in politics, especially the Repeal movement.

Cahill, Gilbert A. "Irish Catholicism and English Toryism," Review of Politics, XIX (January, 1957).

An excellent study of the intense anti-Roman Catholicism that pervaded most of the Conservative party; it demonstrates that this intense hostility on the part of conservative Englishmen was increasing as the Evangelical spirit increased in England.

_____. "The Protestant Association and the Anti-Maynooth Agitation," The Catholic Historical Review, Vol. 43, No. 3 (October, 1957).

An excellent examination of the differences that pervaded the anti-Maynooth camp in 1845. Invaluable.

Cline, C. L. "Disraeli and Peel's 1841 Cabinet," Journal of Modern History, Vol. 9, No. 4 (December, 1939).

This brief article sheds some new light on Disraeli's relationship with the Government, but most of the facts were known before this was published.

Conacher, J. B. "Peel and the Peelites, 1846-50," English Historical Review, Vol. 73, No. 288 (July, 1958).

Conacher demonstrates that Peel did not learn anything from the Maynooth crisis or from Corn Law repeal. He was as arrogant and cold at the end of his life as he was in 1845.

Creighton, Mandell. "Sir James Robert George Graham," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. VIII.

Gash, N. "Peel and the Party System," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series, Vol. I.

An examination of Peel and the party system. It is a revealing article, but I would question Professor Gash's conclusion that Peel was a willing and adaptable party leader.

Large, David. "The House of Lords and Ireland in the age of Peel, 1832-50," Irish Historical Studies, Vol. 9, No. 36 (September, 1955).

Mr. Large shows that the basic reason underlying the Lords' solid stand against any reform in Ireland was because, as a group, they owned most of it. Any change in the status quo would only hurt them in their collective pocket-book.

Larkin, Emmet. "Economic Growth, Capital Investment, and the Roman Catholic Church in Nineteenth Century Ireland," American Historical Review, Vol. 72, No. 3 (April, 1967).

This article is basic to an understanding of the problems of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland for the century. The Church was poor because its members were, for the most part, even poorer.

Machin, G. I. T. "The Maynooth Grant, the Dissenters, and Disestablishment, 1845-1847," English Historical Review, Vol. 82, No. 322 (January, 1967).

Machin's article takes Professor Cowherd to task, and examines the differences between the Dissenters raised by the Maynooth Bill. An excellent article, it is based on Thewall's work.

McDowell, R. B. "The Irish Executive in the Nineteenth Century," Irish Historical Studies, Vol. 9, No. 35 (March, 1955).

This article, in a slightly different and greatly expanded form, is the basis for Professor McDowell's The Irish Administration 1801-1914 (q.v., supra.)

Peel, George. "Sir Robert Peel," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. XV.

Smith, G. B. "Edward Granville Eliot, third Earl of St. Germans," in the Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford University Press, 1921-1922. Vol. VI.