



University
of Glasgow

Sloan, Robert Carson (1982) *Irish issues and Unionist M.P.'s 1832-1846*.
PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1501/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or
study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first
obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any
format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the
author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

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

Presented by Robert Carson Sloan, M.A.,

for the degree of Ph D

at the Department of Modern History,

University of Glasgow.

June 1982.

Volume I

Foreword

It would be difficult to thank all of those who have assisted me in this undertaking. Special mention is due, however, to Professor William Brook of the University of Glasgow, Mr Gerald Slater of the Public Record Office, Northern Ireland, Miss Margaret McBride, who typed the thesis, and, above all, my supervisor, Mr Geoffrey Finlayson of the University of Glasgow.

Contents

Volume I

Chapter	1.	Introduction	1
	2.	The Church, 1831-4	46
	3.	The Church, 1834-46	130
	4.	Education : primary schools	203
	5.	Education : colleges	285
	6.	The Municipal Corporations	342

Volume II

Chapter	7.	The Poor Law	1
	8.	The Liberal-Unionists, 1841-3	61
	9.	The Liberal-Unionists, 1843-6	101
	10.	The Irish Tories, 1841-3	156
	11.	The Irish Tories, 1843-6	218
		Closing Remarks	297
		Appendix	303
		Bibliography	307

Abbreviations

The Belfast News Letter	BNL
The Dublin Evening Mail	DEM
The Dublin Evening Post	DEP
The Dublin University Magazine	DOM
The Freeman's Journal	FJ
The Northern Whig	NW
Parliamentary Papers	P.P.

Abstract

This study is principally concerned with the Irish unionist members in the first four Parliaments after the 1832 Reform Act. By 'unionist' is meant those who opposed the attempts, led by O'Connell, to repeal the Act of Union of 1800 and recover the degree of independence enjoyed by Ireland in the final two decades of the eighteenth century. It does not imply a strict adherence to the articles of the Act of Union. Indeed, as shown below, a number of so-called unionist members wished, without becoming Repealers in the accepted sense, to replace the existing union with a federal constitution. As well as being opponents of Repeal, the liberal-unionist and conservative-unionist members were the rivals of Daniel O'Connell. This study might be regarded as an attempt to make redress for the tendency in earlier work to concentrate upon the career of O'Connell. Without wishing to minimise the latter's importance, it is hoped that this account will draw attention to the activities of those who withstood his powerful influence and made significant contributions in their own right to the political developments of the period.

The unionist members fell into two fairly distinct groups, the liberals and the conservatives. They were separated primarily by their views on the advancement of the interests of the majority Catholic population. The liberal-unionists and conservatives did not constitute two entirely separate political parties. Movement from one group to the other was not infrequent, and, during the 1830s especially, it was not always easy to determine the affiliation of some of the members. The same applies to the distinction between liberal-unionist and Repealer. However, such 'waverers' were relatively few and it was possible for contemporaries and for the present writer to allocate members to each group with a reasonable degree of confidence.

While the Irish unionist members of the House of Commons are the main subject of this study, their views and actions could not be

discussed in isolation. The result has been that, in spite of the narrowness of scope implied in the title of the thesis, much material on the general politics of the period is brought to light. Certainly Irish unionism in general is explored even where the unionist members were not directly involved.

The period chosen for an examination of the views and activities of the unionists was one in which Irish issues were particularly prominent. During the years after the Reform Act of 1832 successive British governments sought to apply various remedies to the ills of an Ireland which was more poverty-ridden, disturbed and discontented than any other part of the United Kingdom. Several of the issues involved - the Established Church, education, reform of the municipal corporations and the poor law - are discussed below. The Church question is given especially lengthy treatment in chapters 2 and 3, for it was the issue which more than any other agitated Irish politics in the 1830s. The utilitarian spirit of the age was offended by the fact that the Anglican Church was maintained largely out of dues levied on people the great majority of whom belonged to other Churches. The Irish liberals played an important part in presenting this grievance. Some of the liberal-unionists were among the most radical opponents of the Church, though others were anxious to reach a settlement even if it meant compromise and wished to pacify Ireland on terms which would not damage the Church. Irish Tories fought a desperate battle to protect the Established Church from assaults which seemed to threaten not only 'true religion' but also the Union and property in general. But here again there were divisions, notably between those Irish Tories who wished to maintain the Church's 'historic rights' in their entirety and those who felt the need to settle the question and defuse the discontent by conceding a degree of reform. In this respect, Irish issues ~~illustrated~~ epitomised the general dilemma which faced Toryism in the 1830s.

The extension of education in Ireland was a further matter which

gave rise to heated debate and is considered in chapters 4 and 5. In 1831 the National System of Education was established as a system of non-denominational primary education. Though some were critical, Irish liberal members generally supported the new scheme, and for many years the ultra-Catholic opposition made little impact outside the archdiocese of its leader, John MacHale. The principal opposition in the 1830s and 1840s came from the Irish Tories, who considered the new system insufficiently religious or at any rate insufficiently Protestant. The resultant differences with Sir Robert Peel are examined in some detail below. The Irish Tories had similar reservations about the non-denominational system of higher education proposed by Peel in 1845. But in this instance it was Catholic interests which proved the more hostile, and the liberal-unionist members had to reconcile the opposition of their constituents with their own guarded approval of the measure.

The reform of the municipal corporations in Ireland, considered in chapter 6, was another of the major issues of the 1830s. Following municipal reform in England, it became the test of the principle of equal justice for Ireland. The Irish liberals were united in condemnation of the corrupt and Protestant-dominated corporations, though the struggle to reform them proved so ineffectual, owing to the opposition of the Lords, that many came to accept the need for a solution which fell far short of their ideal. The majority of Irish Tories were unwilling to compromise sufficiently to settle the issue. The result was that they were deserted by their British leaders, and when some of their own more moderate members followed suit there emerged a bitter and protracted dispute within Irish Tory ranks.

If the above-mentioned issues occasionally divided the unionist members, it was the Irish poor law, considered in chapter 7, which caused more confusion among them than any other question. Certainly both the liberals and conservatives found themselves divided on many occasions. In view of the confused alignments which emerged, computer

analysis of the divisions proved especially useful in dealing with this subject. It is argued below that the majority of unionist members generally adopted a conservative policy on the question, displaying rather more anxiety about the costs which they and the rest of Irish landlordism would have to bear than an understanding of the plight of the destitute.

In addition to the study of specific policy areas, there is a detailed examination, comprising four chapters, 8 - II, of the parts played by the unionists in the troubles which afflicted Peel's Government of 1841-6. The remarkable upsurge of the Repeal movement in the 1840s heightened interest in Irish politics, and one result of this has been a legacy of abundant manuscript material concerning the period, much of it not previously examined. The first of the chapters is principally concerned with the activities of the liberal-unionist members during 1843, when the Repeal movement reached its peak. The sudden popularity of Repeal posed a great threat to the liberal-unionists. They responded with a vigorous effort to claim the position of chief spokesmen in Parliament of the 'Irish people', and, in the process, to establish a more cohesive liberal-unionist party. This liberal-unionist initiative was vividly described in a remarkable series of letters written by Thomas Wyse, a leading figure in the liberals' campaign.

This campaign achieved only limited success. In chapter 9 it is shown that the liberal-unionists faced even greater problems in 1844-5, when Peel's conciliatory policies seemed to deprive them of their raison d'être. On several important occasions they could do little more than approve the efforts of the Conservative Government. They were unable to unite even on the Coercion Bill of 1846, and O'Connell's return to Parliament that session meant that their efforts were overshadowed, as they had so often been in the previous decade.

Finally, there is a detailed examination of one of the most

striking aspects of Irish politics in the 1840s. When Peel's Government came to power in 1841 many Irish Tories expected that it would redress what they considered to be the pro-Catholic imbalance of the years of Whig rule. Some clearly expected the restoration, to a greater or lesser degree, of Protestant Ascendancy. Peel, of course, disappointed such people. His failure to suppress the Repeal agitation in 1843 greatly alarmed many Irish Tories. His attempts in 1844-5 to conciliate the Catholics confirmed their worst fears. The result was disillusionment among many Irish Tories and venomous denunciation of the Government by a considerable number of them. Peel's Irish supporters were not to be outdone by their British colleagues in the vigour of their assault on the 'arch-traitor'. The study concludes with the fall of Peel in June 1846, a suitable point given not only the change of government but also the dominant role thereafter of the Famine in Irish affairs.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The number of unionist members itself suggests the necessity of this study. The unionist members, liberal and conservative, constituted a majority of the representation of Ireland throughout the period. Indeed the Repeal contingent was the largest of the three groups only in 1833-4, and in 1841 had been reduced to a rump¹. This conclusion holds in spite of the necessary qualification that among the liberal-unionists after 1835 were a few 'sleeping Repealers' like Bodkin, Bridgeman and Brady, men who desisted from attacking the Union only until O'Connell revived the agitation for Repeal in the 1840's.

The religious make-up of the three groupings is interesting. With one exception (the Presbyterian member for Coleraine from February 1843, John Boyd) all of the 88 Irish Tory members were Protestants of the Established Church. Of the 94 liberal-unionists, 65 were Protestants of the Establishment, 24 were Catholics and 5 were Presbyterians. In sharp contrast, the 66 repealers consisted of 21 Establishment Protestants and 45 Catholics². As for the socio-economic make-up of the membership, the vast majority were clearly landlords before all else. Even the repealers were 'a party of landlords'³. Lawyers and members of the armed forces also figured prominently and there was a smattering of representatives of the commercial classes⁴.

The years after Catholic Emancipation in 1829 brought a sustained assault on the vestiges of Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland and Irish Toryism was essentially characterized by its opposition to that assault. It was not a united opposition by any means. There were those, the urban Protestant 'operatives' especially, who would have repealed the Act of Emancipation and restored the Ascendancy in all its 18th century vigour⁵. The Tory member for Dublin, William Gregory, found in the 1840's that while 'English Conservative opinion' was 'desirous of

raising up the Irish Catholics to an equality with the Protestants and to do away with all disabilities and inequalities', the Irish 'was desirous of keeping down the Roman Catholics and retaining every anomaly, every insulting distinction and of preserving their own social superiority'⁶. On the other hand, some shared Peel's readiness to effect the reform of proven abuses and were part of the Canningite liberal-Tory tradition. The Irish Tory members included representatives of both extremes, but most belonged to the middle ground. They were possibly, as a group, more moderate or liberal than the majority of their supporters in Ireland, though the veracity of this statement is by no means self-evident according to the evidence provided below.

Virtually all Irish Tories and Protestants in general, were unionist by 1833. Many had opposed the Act of Union at the beginning of the century. However, most Protestants quickly became reconciled to the Union when it became clear that continued opposition was futile and a bar to advancement in many careers. And, contrary to expectations, the Union did not lead immediately to Catholic Emancipation; indeed it became clear that Protestant interests were more secure in a Protestant United Kingdom than they could be in a self-governing Catholic Ireland. The vigour of the Catholic campaign for Emancipation underlined this point. In addition, the Protestant North-East of Ireland apparently benefited economically from the Union.⁷ There were indications, however, of Irish Tory dissatisfaction with the Union in the early 1830's. In particular 'the middle & lower classes of Protestants in Dublin' - the Orangemen, corporators and guildsmen - threatened several times in 1830-34 to turn to Repeal in reaction to Whig policy and economic stagnation and were 'kept from joining the papists .. merely by party spirit'.

According to one report in March 1834, the 'generality of the Aristocracy' in Ulster also favoured Repeal because of Whig reforms and held back only 'for dread of O'Connell's ascendancy in the event of Repeal'. Charles Boyton, a leading Dublin Tory, saw the advantage in

threatening the Whigs with a Protestant Repeal movement and himself preferred Repeal to a betrayal of Protestant interests within the Union.⁸ Until 1834, O'Connell tried to encourage the Irish Tories to oppose the Whigs by turning to Repeal. He asked Shaw in 1832 to stand for Dublin as a Repealer and in 1833-4 opened communications with Boyton and Sheehan (editor of the Dublin Evening Mail) in an effort to win over the Tories.⁹ However, Roden and Lefroy were resolutely opposed to Repeal and the latter felt that 'all the Protestants of respectability' would discountenance Boyton's 'dangerous' experiment. Roden and some of his 'noble friends' joined the Orange Order in January 1832 in order to counter the 'shaking' of its members on the subject of Repeal.¹⁰

Though several of the Irish Tory members acknowledged the existence of Protestant disaffection during the debate in April 1834 on O'Connell's Repeal motion, all of the 27 Irish Tory members present - and only one, O'Neill of Antrim, was absent - voted against the motion. A number of them spoke out against Repeal, contending that it would lead to 'separation' from England and would be harmful to Ireland's economic interests. It would lead to 'a Catholic ascendancy' in Ireland, with subversion of the Established Church and 'the re-assumption of forfeited estates'.¹¹ O'Connell's courting of the Conservatives in July 1834 was a half-hearted affair. He had come to the conclusion that it was 'not possible to conciliate the Orangeists'. His public letters of the autumn of 1834 were stridently critical of the Irish Tory would-be Ascendancy Party and meant the abandonment of 'the idea of conciliating the Orange faction ... I am now - and forever - convinced that Orangeism must be put down'.¹² In September 1834, Roden claimed that 'the Orange body are the most forward defenders of the Constitution of the country and the unity of the Empire'.¹³

Tory Repealism was hardly a significant force in Irish politics even in the 1830's and the Irish Tory reaction to the Repeal agitation of

the 1840's, discussed below, betray little evidence of a disposition to support Repeal. If Irish Toryism was essentially unionist during the period under study it was also essentially Protestant. Though many clearly voted for Tory candidates under the influence of their landlords, few Catholics were Tory by conviction. In Dublin, where landlord influence was negligible, only two of the Tory candidate's 3825 supporters in the by-election of 1842 were Catholics.¹⁴ The Irish Tories drew most of their firm support from the members of the Protestant Churches. There were 852,064 Protestants of the Established Church in Ireland in 1834-5, the great majority of whom were without doubt Tory in politics.¹⁵ In addition, most of the 642,356 Presbyterians were also Tories; the terrors of revolutionary France and the rebellion of 1798, the pressure of Catholic militancy, the influence of the Tory Clergymen Robert Black and Henry Cooke, the spread of the Orange Order, the breaking of the common bond of grievance with the Catholics in 1828-9 and the threat posed by Repeal to northern prosperity had undermined the attachment of most Presbyterians to the radical principles of their forbears.¹⁶

Though there were more than four times as many Catholics as Protestants in the country, the Irish Tories possessed several advantages in the political arena. Four-fifths of Ireland was owned by Protestant landlords,¹⁷ and the majority of these were clearly Tory. For example, the Tory candidates for the representative peerage could rely upon the votes of more than two-thirds of the 130-40 Irish Peers.¹⁸ In 1833, only seven of the Irish Peers were Catholic. Below the ranks of the nobility, the Irish Squirearchy was equally Tory in politics; though the proportion of Catholics was probably higher, there was not an equivalent among the Irish Protestant Squires of the sizeable band of Protestant Whig Aristocrats.¹⁹ Landlords were able to give qualifying leases to the politically reliable, and of course, to exert pressure on their tenants to vote for particular candidates. The Tory domination of the magistracy may also have told electorally, as it represented a further source of

influence.²⁰

The relative facility with which the Irish Tories could raise funds gave them an advantage in both legitimate political activity (e.g., the hiring of professional agents for the registration courts) and in illegal bribery in the boroughs. Because of the important role of assistant barristers and judges in the registration process, the ascendancy of the Irish Tories in the legal profession was not without political effect. Similarly, the Irish Tory domination of the municipal corporations, discussed below, was important politically, since in many boroughs the corporations were able and willing to inflate the Tory electorate by their choice of freemen. In Dublin, for instance, it was the existence of more than 2,000 freemen, created by the exclusively Protestant corporation, which ensured that the Conservatives could challenge strongly in a constituency where the majority of those holding a property qualification were Catholic and Liberal.²¹

Even if the vast majority of tenants were Catholic/Liberal, the Protestants/Tories were probably represented disproportionately well among the larger farmers who were qualified for the franchise. And the fact that the Protestants/Tories tended to be concentrated in certain parts of Ireland ensured that they would be represented in Parliament. Given the views of Presbyterians and Establishment Protestants, the Tories were in a numerical majority in the north-east. Significant concentrations of Protestants/Tories were also to be found in Wicklow, Wexford, Sligo, Bandon, and most of the larger cities of the south. The pattern of representation reflected this distribution. 50 of the 67 members who sat for Ulster seats in 1833-46 were Tories. Outwith Ulster, the Irish Tories generally had to scramble for seats, though they invariably won Bandon, Portarlington, County Sligo and the University and had considerable success against O'Connell in Dublin.

The Irish Tories did not constitute an organized party in the modern sense, with a formal leadership structure and local bodies

united within one association. The Protestant Conservative Society was the only Irish Tory body which might be likened to a party organization. It was formed in Dublin in February 1832 'to give direction & energy to the Protestants & unite them under those they are looking up to for guidance.'²² Its weekly meetings involved 'impassioned harangues' on the issues of the day, and various activities were pursued in the Protestant interest.²³ In June 1832, a large number of leading Irish Tories joined the society with a view, realized to some extent, to making it a significant organizing force in the Tory election campaign of 1832.²⁴ The society dissolved itself in April 1833 in apprehension of suppression under the Coercion Act. It was revived in August 1834 to organize the Tory protest against Whig rule, but was dissolved again in December 1834 after the accession of a Conservative Administration.²⁵ No such society was established again during the period under study.

The Irish Tory members also failed to unite in any formal structure. It would appear that they seldom even met to consider their tactics in Parliament and the group had neither a formal nor an informal leadership, no member attaining, for example, the stature which O'Connell had among the repealers. However, as will be obvious from the ensuing chapters, the Irish Tory members were a much less disparate group than the liberal-unionists. Though they would hardly be described as leaders, some members - Lefroy, Hamilton, Jackson, Tennent and Shaw, the latter especially - were particularly prominent and influential. Their preeminence was acknowledged by the British Tory leaders, who often consulted them on Irish policy and, to some extent, recognized their claims with regard to patronage.

Before leaving the Irish Tories for the moment, it is necessary to give a general outline of the period from an Irish Tory point of view. As suggested above, the 1830's were difficult years for the Irish Tories, as the vestiges of ascendancy came under attack. The passing of Catholic Emancipation in 1829 clearly gave an impetus to

reform in Ireland, as liberal politicians sought to give practical effect to that concession of principle. Parliamentary reform, the new education system, the Processions Act against Orange marches, the assault on the temporalities of the Protestant Church, the promise of corporate and poor-law reform and the turning of the stream of patronage towards liberals and Catholics combined to show Irish Tories that they could not expect protection from the Government of Lord Grey. The coercion bill of 1833, with its stringent proposals for the suppression of agrarian outrage and (O'Connell's) political agitation, was welcomed by the Irish Tory members. But even this initiative turned sour for the Irish Tories; a succession of amendments in deference to liberal opinion left them convinced that the measure had been 'frittered away' and, particularly regarding the suppression of political agitation, 'rendered almost of not altogether nugatory'²⁶.

In Ireland, the political fortunes of the Irish Tories were in decline. They had commanded a majority of the representation before 1830, but the number of Irish Tory members was reduced steadily at each of the three general elections between 1830 and 1833. In the general election of 1832-3, only 29 Irish Tory members were returned, when one of their principal 'managers' had expected at least 63 and possibly 70²⁷. The secession of Stanley and his friends in May 1834 and the resignation of Grey himself in July represented the departure of some of the more conservative elements of the Administration and seemed to promise still more radical policies. The circumstances surrounding these events were particularly alarming from an Irish Tory point of view, Stanley and his friends departing because of the likelihood that the Government would advocate the appropriation of Irish Church revenues and Grey because the Irish Chief Secretary had consorted with O'Connell and effectively sabotaged his plan to renew those provisions of the coercion act which were directed against O'Connellite agitation in Ireland.

2 On the latter occasion the Irish Tories in both Houses complained

angrily that the instigators of crime were to be made immune and accused the Government of the 'meanest subserviency' to O'Connell, with whom 'an understanding' had, it was alleged, been reached.²⁸ One Irish Tory peer wrote in July 1834 that the 'Protestant people' of Ireland were 'subjected to the detestable triumvirate of O'Connell, Littleton & Duncannon'.²⁹ The extraordinary Protestant agitation of the second half of 1834 was a reaction to the apparently increasingly liberal tendency of Whig policy in Ireland. This agitation, of which the great meeting at Hillsborough at the end of October was the highlight, is described in some detail below, in connection with one of its principal themes, the Irish Tory response to the assault on the Church.

The Irish Tories rejoiced at 'the happy & delightful change' in Government in November 1834. Roden evidently hoped for a Government which would rule Ireland through the Protestant party, forswearing 'expediency' and evincing 'moderation and firmness', though Londonderry and Farnham found it difficult to 'place confidence in Peel or Wellington'.³⁰ The Irish Tories could hardly have complained of the initial steps of the new Government, as a considerable number, including Roden, Londonderry, Castlereagh, Shaw, Lefroy, Perceval, Jackson and Corry, were offered employment or favour. Londonderry declined office as Ambassador to Russia when the appointment caused a furore in the Commons. The offer to such a notorious ultra as Roden was perhaps even more surprising, but was due recognition of his immense stature among Irish Tories; perhaps fortunately for Peel, Roden refused office on the grounds that he wished to avoid giving the impression that his political activities had any 'private or selfish' object and to give the Government an independent support.³¹ O'Connell later described the 'virulent display and practical exertion of the worst and most sanguinary passions of the Orange faction' under the new Administration.³² Another indication of the improved fortunes of the Irish Tories was their gain of eleven seats in Ireland in the General

Election of January 1835, though it was more than a year before the election committee gave them their most important triumph, in the city of Dublin.

The electoral gains of the Tories in England were even more impressive, but in the event proved insufficient. Roden regarded the return of the Whigs in April 1835 with 'great alarm' and was prepared to meet the 'awful crisis' with a Protestant agitation against the Government.³³ Lefroy feared that 'a democratic republic or a military despotism' would follow, and Morgan O'Connell noted the horror with which Irish Tories, including Shaw and Perceval, reacted to the change of Government.³⁴ To a considerable extent their fears were justified, for the liberal tendency of the Irish policy of the Melbourne Government was hardly calculated to please Irish Conservatives. The tendency towards a more conciliatory Irish policy was evident from the time that Stanley quit the Chief Secretaryship in March 1833, but it was in the years 1835-41 that the conciliatory system of Government reached full development. The new policy was reflected in the legislative programme of the Whigs and in their administration of Irish affairs. In particular, Catholics and Liberals were treated more favourably with regard to patronage than had been the case for well over a century. Thomas Drummond, the Under-Secretary, has been given much credit for this development but it probably owed much more to the dependence of the Government on radical and liberal-Irish support in the Commons and to the liberal views of Drummond's superiors, Mulgrave (Lord Lieutenant), Morpeth (Chief Secretary) and Russell (Home Secretary).³⁵

One of the early victims of the new system was the Orange Society. This was not an overtly political body, at least in the narrow sense, and as it has already been examined by a number of historians it is not proposed to dwell on the subject. The role of the Irish Tory members in the debates of 1835-6 must, however, be noticed. At that time, many leading Irish Tories, especially in the northern counties, held office in the Society. These included the Irish Tory

members Henry Maxwell (Grand Secretary), Perceval (Treasurer), Verner, Plunkett, Archdall, O'Neill, Brooke, S. Maxwell, Young, Hayes, Cooper, Stewart, Jones, Anthony Lefroy, Claud Hamilton, Viscount Bernard and the Coles, and such Irish Tory Peers as Rodon, Farnham, Loftus, Bandon, Rathdowne, Ely, Castlemaine, Langford, Mandeville, Powerscourt, Thomond and Enniskillen.³⁶

From March 1835, the Society was attacked by radical members in the Commons; they argued that its secret oaths and passwords rendered it illegal. Several Irish Tory members, including some who were not Orangemen, turned out to defend the Society as a legal body dedicated only to 'self-defence' and protection of the Union. Rodon and the 'brave Orangemen' were privately unhappy with the classification by Sir Henry Hardinge (the Tory Chief Secretary) of this Society with that of the Catholic Ribbonmen, but even Rodon saw that the Government could not be expected to defend the Orangemen.³⁷ The Irish Tory members did not oppose - indeed Henry Maxwell seconded - Finn's motion for a Select Committee to inquire into Orangeism; the Grand Orange Lodge had petitioned for such inquiry, confident it would show that the Society was legal and 'that the disordered state of Ireland renders a defensive Society not a matter of choice but of necessity'.³⁸

Orange prospects were clouded when the inquiry showed that Orange Lodges had been organized in the Army. Maxwell and Perceval denied all previous knowledge of this, and, in defending Orangeism in the House in August 1835, they and other Irish Tory members indicated their disapproval of the Army Lodges.³⁹ Later in the year, it emerged that a leading British Orangeman, William Fairman, had contrived in 1832 to bring about a coup d'état in order to turn out the Whig Government and replace the King with the Duke of Cumberland.⁴⁰ The Irish Tory members actually tried to uphold Fairman's right to withhold his private correspondence from evidence, though they were probably ignorant of its contents.⁴¹ They continued in 1836 to defend the Society, but also expressed their

willingness to have it dissolved if the King so wished. Indeed, according to Greville, 'Perceval proposed to John Russell to draw up some resolutions condemning these associations, which he said they would agree to if not violent and offensive, and that it was very desirable the sentiments of the House of Commons should be expressed unanimously, or by a very large majority, because in that case the Orangemen would see the necessity of yielding obedience to them and would do so'. Greville wrote of the 'really meritorious conduct' of the Orange members in declaring their willingness to dissolve. The King, acting on the recommendation of the Commons, issued an announcement in February 1836 in which he expressed his desire that the Orange Society should cease to exist. The Duke of Cumberland (Imperial Grand Master) and 'the leading members of the Orange Society now in London' immediately agreed 'to recommend the dissolution of that Society'.⁴²

The Orange members and peers duly signed a public letter to the Orangemen in which dissolution was recommended in deference to the wishes of the King.⁴³ Londonderry, though not himself an Orangeman, complained that Wellington had 'entirely deserted' their cause in the final debate in the Lords.⁴⁴ The English Ultra Duke of Newcastle implored Roden to reverse the decision to dissolve the Society.⁴⁵ There was dissatisfaction, too, in Ireland with the Parliamentary Orangemen for their readiness to dissolve. Many felt 'deserted by all their aristocratic great friends'. The Grand Committee of the Orange Lodge met on the 27th of February and resolved that they should not conform with 'the mere wish of the Sovereign'.⁴⁶ However, the Parliamentary Orangemen, including Maxwell and Roden, were present at the general meeting of the Grand Lodge on the 13-14th of April 1836 and they were able to persuade the Orangemen, by a majority of 92 to 62, to dissolve the Society.⁴⁷

Though individual Lodges continued to exist in some parts of Ireland, and Orangemen continued to infringe the law by marching on the July anniversaries, this was the end for a short time of Orangeism as an organized force endorsed by the leading political figures.

Several Irish Tories urged Roden to re-organize the Society soon after its dissolution, but he was advised by Jackson that 'nothing could be more injurious to the Protestant cause ... The conduct of the Orange body, so creditable to them, contrasts so strikingly with the misconduct of the Government'. And if there was a change of Government 'it would embarrass our friends extremely if the Orange Society were re-organized'.

Roden advised against the step.⁴⁸ The revival of the Society in 1845 is examined in Chapter 11.

It was Russell who moved the decisive resolution against Orangeism in February 1836 and the subsequent debates on the issue were naturally marked by Tory resentment of the Government's role in the affair. However, this was only one of many aspects of Government policy which led to a storm of Irish Tory protest. In Parliament, as shown below, the Irish Tories opposed the major legislative initiatives of the Government, and, with the Tories in a majority in the Lords and opinion in England hostile to O'Connell, achieved a measure of success in that respect. There was little they could do about the administrative practices of Mulgrave's Government in Ireland, but they conducted a vigorous campaign of protest against many aspects of the 'system of concession': the appointment of radical and exclusion or displacement of Protestant Magistrates, High Sheriffs, Constables and other public functionaries, allegedly at the behest of O'Connell; the Lord Lieutenant's exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy to release convicted prisoners; the failure of Crown Prosecutors to challenge Catholic Jurors; the extent of crime in Ireland; the impunity with which O'Connell's agitations were conducted, and so on. According to Londonderry 'a severe penal code was enforced' against Irish Protestants.⁴⁹

There is abundant evidence in private correspondence that these grievances were genuinely held; there was particularly great alarm at the extent of crime in Ireland and indignation at Whig claims of

tranquillity. The great Irish Tory meeting in Dublin in January 1837 was designed to draw the attention of English opinion to what even in private the organizers described as 'the O'Connell Government of Ireland'.⁵⁰ The Irish Tories were given an additional grievance in 1838 when, in response to a demand by the Magistrates of Tipperary for stringent measures against crime, Drummond remarked that 'property has its duties as well as its rights; to the neglect of those duties in times past is mainly to be ascribed that diseased state of society in which .. crimes take their rise'.⁵¹ This 'slur' upon Irish Landlords stirred Irish Tories to renewed complaint against the Government.⁵²

The British Tory leaders had mixed feelings about the efforts of their Irish allies. Ellenborough held back those who wished in April 1837 to move for a Select Committee of the Lords on the Lord Lieutenant's injudicious use of the prerogative of mercy, as he felt that 'so strong a measure' required more 'mature consideration'.⁵³ Later in the year, when Roden called the attention of the Lords to the state of crime in Ireland and threatened to move for a Committee, Ellenborough felt he had 'advanced no proof' of his claims. 'We shall carry our motion for a Committee of course; but I very much doubt our making much of it - nothing if we leave the management of it to Roden & the Irish'.⁵⁴

Soon afterwards, Stanley and Graham complained generally of 'the management of the Irish discussions', and their reflections on this point throw some light on the standing of the Irish Tory members. They felt that there was 'a good case against Mulgrave', given 'the abuse of patronage and the placing in situations to enforce the law, the prominent violators of the law and others of the most objectionable character'. But the case had to be 'properly got up and all the materials sifted with care and marshalled in proper order. These piecemeal attacks, made by the greatest blockheads in both Houses, feebly launched and coldly supported, have been a perfect Godsend to

the Ministers ...'

Stanley felt that no matter how good the case 'your Irish friends will in the first place deceive you as to the facts by concealing half, and afterwards spoil the effect of any discussion by introducing some unsubstantiable cases, and some gross absurdity of their own. To fight a battle where all depends on prudence & judgement and where your coadjutors are to be Perceval, Conolly and Verner is encountering too long odds ! ... our hotbrained Irish friends (would) flourish their shillelaghs over their heads, rush into the fight and not only get their own heads broken, but contribute to break those of their friends'.⁵⁵

It was Wellington who bore the responsibility of restraining the Irish Tories of the House of Lords. When Lorton and Jackson visited the Duke in December 1837 to urge the need for a Committee on the State of Ireland they 'found the very strong inclination of his mind to be against any motion of Inquiry into the State of Ireland. He put forward in the strongest possible manner the objections to the Lords originating such a measure ...'⁵⁶ The Irish did not proceed to move for a Committee at that time. When Roden and Westmeath approached him in January 1839 to urge again the propriety of 'an inquiry into the state of crime in Ireland', the Duke, though convinced of 'the terrible situation' of that country, doubted if such an inquiry would produce 'any benefit'. Even if the evidence stood up under 'severe cross examination', it would 'open the door to the production of evidence to extenuate if not to justify the commission of crime by the proof of the existence of want and even of destitution among the people', with the landlords made out as the culprits. And 'the only remedy' for the state of crime, 'the establishment in Ireland of a strong and efficient Government willing to protect Life and Property', would not be advanced.⁵⁷

Nevertheless, at 'a meeting of Irish Peers and Members at the Carlton Club on Saturday, the 9th of February' it was resolved 'unanimously' that they should move for a Committee of Inquiry in the

Lords to remedy 'the utter insecurity of Life and Property' in Ireland.⁵⁸ Peel, on being sent these resolutions, replied that he and Wellington did 'not hesitate to give our assent to the proposal' when it came so authoritatively endorsed, though he evidently had reservations about its result.⁵⁹ Wellington subsequently sought in vain to dissuade Westmeath from a motion on the prerogative of mercy issue, as he was fearful that it would involve the Lords in conflict with the Lower House and unwilling to demand the Lord Lieutenant's confidential correspondence.⁶⁰ But this was only a side issue. On the 21st of March Roden carried, with the assistance of Wellington and several other Irish Tory Peers, a motion for a Select Committee on 'the State of Ireland since 1835 in respect of Crime and Outrage, which have rendered Life and Property insecure in that part of the Empire'. On the following day Russell announced his intention to respond to this decision by asking 'for the opinion of the House (of Commons) with respect to the Government of Ireland in late years'.⁶¹

The Government's response was, according to Mahon, 'precisely the result' which Wellington had 'always apprehended to ensue from any aggressive motion in the Lords'.⁶² The Duke wrote to Peel that he had 'always objected to these motions in the House of Lords. The Irish noblemen came but little prepared with a case, and it is very difficult to bring to a favourable termination their discussions on the motion'. He would 'not have allowed' the motion had he not been led to understand by Shaw that it had been decided upon at a meeting at Peel's house. Their followers, he complained, 'think that they know what ought to be done better than you and I. They don't care a pin about our opinions. They will risk the public interests, or a quarrel between the Houses, or any outrage on the part of the Government, in order to get the better of the independent action of the House of Lords, in order to enjoy a momentary triumph; and some perhaps in the futile expectation that such triumph in the

House of Lords will dissolve the Government ... I cannot adequately express my disgust with such people'.

It was this 'disgust' which dominated Wellington's feelings, though he did acknowledge that Roden's speech was 'very moderate', and he was evidently as upset as the Irish Tories at the Whig claim of 'tranquillity' in Ireland when 'the insecurity of Life and Property' there was a matter of 'notoriety'. Peel, though not as obviously angry as the Duke, shared his doubts about the benefits to be derived from Roden's success; he had thought that the motion would not accuse the present Government so explicitly and that, as a result, it would have been carried unopposed.⁶³ His amendment to Russell's motion did not evaluate the merits of the conduct of the Tory Peers beyond stating that it was their 'undoubted right' so to act and that the Government's response was not justified.⁶⁴

The Government duly received a vote of confidence in their Irish policy from the Commons. Almost 20 Irish Tory Peers undertook in April 1839 to subscribe to a fund to defray the expenses of a professional agent to prepare the evidence to Roden's Committee.⁶⁵ But most of the Whig Peers nominated to serve in the Committee apparently refused to do so because it was 'of a criminatory character as concerned the whole administration.'⁶⁶ Other developments also undermined the effectiveness of the Committee. It was intended to provide a summary of the evidence, but the difficulty of summarizing more than 15,000 answers and disagreement between the Whig Hatherton and the Tory Peers on its contents induced the Committee to report only the evidence. Roden 'was anxious that the Committee should recommend the renewal of the inquiry next year'. But Ellenborough objected and the Committee divided 7 to 7, which meant the loss of the proposal. Ellenborough also objected 'to a modified proposal for the insertion of words to the effect that it would be for the consideration of the House whether the Committee should be renewed' in the following session, but this was carried.⁶⁷

The evidence was duly printed, on the 2nd of August, 'unaccompanied by any comment or opinion upon the part of the Committee'.⁶⁸ A debate on the whole evidence was, Ellenborough thought, 'impracticable at any time. We might as well have a debate upon the contents of the Encyclopedia'. However, Brougham proposed resolutions condemnatory, in effect, of the current practice regarding the setting aside of jurors and of Mulgrave's exercise of the prerogative of mercy. The Tory Peers decided to support these resolutions as incontrovertible truths according to the evidence to the Committee. Ellenborough assured Peel, who was worried about the possible reaction of the lower House, that they would accordingly be supported by public opinion, regardless of the view of the Commons, particularly since the motion was not being made by Roden and 'the Ultra Irish'. Roden did speak in favour of Brougham's resolutions, which were carried easily when the House divided on party lines.⁶⁹

The Government, much to Peel's relief, decided against proposing any resolution in the Commons in vindication of Mulgrave's Administration. Russell merely announced in the House, and communicated to the Lord Lieutenant, his determination that they should not make 'any alteration whatever' in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.⁷⁰ And Melbourne was not deterred by the disclosures of the Committee from making Mulgrave (Normanby) Home Secretary in August 1839, though Stanley and the (disaffected) Whig Lord Howick thought the appointment scandalous as it flew 'in the teeth of the Irish Report'.⁷¹

It is difficult to assess the overall result of Roden's Committee, the single most striking aspect of Irish Tory opposition in the 1830's. Liberals felt it had shown that the level of crime had diminished and had therefore failed in its object of embarrassing the Government. According to Holland, the Committee seemed to 'end in nothing; they could not agree in any report, and the evidence .. seemed to cut the ground under them by proving or at least sanctioning the surmise that Crime had not increased but actually diminished in frequency and in

intensity under Lord Normanby's Viceroyalty⁷².

Tories pointed to the catalogue of outrage which had been brought to light and, as in the Lords debate, to the apparent abuse of the prerogative of mercy. According to a congratulatory address to Roden from the Protestants of Co. Down, signed by more than a dozen Peers and Members and nearly 5,000 others, his Committee had 'demonstrated the existence of a deep-rooted and widely-spread conspiracy in Ireland, long known to Government though denied by Ministers, embracing vast numbers of the Roman Catholic population, exclusively confined to that sect, and which, whether of an agrarian or political nature, or both, is totally incompatible with social order and with the security of property and life'. There had been a 'complete exposure of the gross maladministration of justice, and the prostitution to Roman Catholic influence of the prerogative of the Crown, the patronage of Government, and the majority of the laws during the viceroyalty of the Marquis of Normanby'⁷³.

In the Spring of 1841, Wellington was again unable to restrain an Irish Tory Peer, Lord Charleville, who objected in Parliament to the failure of the Crown to challenge the jury in the trial of King's County Ribbonmen. Wellington had argued that a discussion in Parliament would serve no purpose; the Lords had not time to debate the question properly and had 'no power'⁷⁴ to make their views tell. On the other side, some Irish Tories deplored the 'weakness' and forbearance of their British leaders.⁷⁵ Specific differences between the leading British and Irish Tories on the major issues of the day are discussed in subsequent chapters.

The general election of July-August 1837 gave the Opposition a substantial majority in Britain; but in Ireland the Conservatives not only failed to match the gains of their English counterparts but lost six seats to the Liberal Party, finishing with a total of 34. In fact the elections made the Whig Government more than ever dependent on

O'Connell and the Irish Liberals. The Irish Tory members gave solid support to the assault on the Government's Irish policy in the new Parliament and were largely responsible for what was probably the most successful Opposition initiative of the period. It was pressure and assistance from Jackson, Tennent, Shaw and other Irish Tories which caused Stanley to bring on the issue of Ireland's defective registration laws in 1840-41, when the Government suffered a series of humiliating ⁷⁶ defeats.

In June 1841 all 35 Irish Tory members voted or paired for the motion of lack of confidence which, carried by one vote, led to the general election of 1841. On this occasion the Conservative majority in Britain was such as to outweigh the Irish liberal majority, and even in Ireland the Tories made gains, six in all, most notably the defeat of O'Connell in Dublin. All of the Irish Tory members voted against the Address in August 1841, when the Whigs were finally driven from office.⁷⁷ The problems of the Irish Tories did not end with the accession of Peel's Government, however; the uneasy relationship between the new Government and its Irish supporters is the subject of detailed examination in Chapters ten and eleven.

Many were prepared to deny the existence of any moderate party in Ireland, that is of any middle-ground between O'Connellism and Conservatism.⁷⁸ Though this was clearly a gross exaggeration it serves to underline the weakness of liberal-unionism. In fact liberal-unionism cannot be regarded as a party label; it is no more than a left-over category of which heterogeneity was one of the principal characteristics.

Registration associations apart, no national liberal-unionist organization was established during the period. The Ulster Constitutional Association of 1840-1 brought together the most prominent of the northern liberal-unionists. Significantly, it foundered largely as a result of internal disagreement on the

franchise question. ⁷⁹ The liberal-unionist M.P.'s were not united in any formal body and were even more bereft of leadership than the Irish Tories. A wide range of political views was represented; in 1833, Charles Wood wrote that between the 'O'Connellite' members and the 'Orangemen' there was 'a large intermediate body of various shades', in which he could identify only ten who were 'excellent' supporters of the Government. ⁸⁰ On one side of the spectrum, liberal-unionism included some very conservative Whigs, and it would be a mistake to imagine that there was a clear dividing line between Whiggery and Conservatism. Indeed one of the notable features of the period was the drift into Tory ranks of a substantial number of liberal-unionists in the years after 1832. Oxmantown, Lambert, John Browne, Donoughmore, Downshire, John Martin and Emerson Tennent all followed that course, and there were many others.

On the other side of the spectrum there were liberal-unionists who were at least as radical in their politics as O'Connell. The majority were middle-of-the-road liberals, men like Wyse, Jephson, Smith O'Brien, French, James Grattan, More O'Ferrall and Lord Clements. Electorally the liberal-unionists generally benefited from their position as middle-of-the-road politicians, for they could appeal directly to the £10 voters on the strength of their liberal views and, in addition, rely on the support of a considerable Whig landed interest. Some of the greatest Irish landlords of the period - Leinster, Clanricarde, Leitrim, Lansdowne, Kenmare, Charlemont, Lismore, Rossmore, Meath, Sligo, etc., and the English Devonshire and Fitzwilliam - were Whigs who lent their interest to liberal (generally liberal-unionist) candidates for Parliament.

The influence of the great Whig landowners was strongly challenged in the general election of 1832-3 by O'Connell's Repealers. Some of the liberal-unionists reacted bravely, refusing outright to pledge themselves to Repeal and even denouncing that 'wholly impracticable' scheme. Their principal organ, the Dublin Evening Post, vigorously

denounced 'the Big Beggarman' O'Connell. Many of the liberal-unionists, notably Evans, Lambert, Barry, O'Reilly, Wallace, Brabazon and Keane, ^{tried} to cloud the Repeal issue by saying that they would support it if Ireland was denied 'justice', while Wyse advocated a federal solution.⁸¹ The result was something of ^a disaster for the liberal-unionists, especially if compared with the Whig triumph in Britain. Only 36 liberal-unionists were returned, representing a loss of almost 30 seats. Liberal-unionist casualties included such prominent figures as Duncannon, Spring Rice, Parnell, Wyse, Killeen, Leader and Mahony. The number of Repeal Members soared to 39.

The elections over, the liberal-unionists quickly asserted their independence of O'Connell. The latter invited the Irish Members and Peers to attend a 'National Council' in January 1833 to consider Irish questions. Only three liberal-unionists - Chapman, Keane and Barry - attended, and Chapman refused to pledge himself to Repeal or any other measure.⁸² James Grattan was resolved to keep O'Connell and the Repealers 'at a distance, civil. Sheil, ^{&c} are tricky & they do & will tell lies'. Regarding the intention to reconvene the National Council in London, he felt that, 'the meeting in London will be also under O'Connell & better avoided'.⁸³

O'Connell called a meeting of the Irish Members in London in mid-February. 46 attended, but only 12 supported O'Connells' proposals for a 'factious opposition' to the Whig Government and in particular the majority refused to pledge themselves against the Coercion Bill. The liberal-unionists, James Talbot and O'Reilly castigated O'Connell for his abuse of the liberal-unionists who had voted for the Address. Wallace told him that he did not object to those parts of the Coercion Bill 'which went to put down political agitation & dangerous societies'. Indeed, Stanley felt that 'a number' of Irish liberals who were opposed to the stringent provisions against agrarian outrage were 'by no means averse to those parts of the Bill which go to put down political agitation'.⁸⁴

At another meeting, on the 26th^{of} February, the Irish Whigs Acheson, Oxmantown and O'Grady 'supported the Bill'⁸⁵.

The support given to the Coercion Bill in Parliament by a majority of liberal-unionist members was particularly striking given the determined opposition of the Repealers and provided an early and irrefutable indication of their determination not to be dominated by O'Connell. Some exchanged angry words with O'Connell during the debates, John Browne, for instance, declaring his refusal 'to bow down to the Juggernaut of Ireland'⁸⁶. Many liberal-unionists openly professed a desire to see (O'Connell's) political agitation checked by the Bill, and liberal-unionist opposition was particularly weak on the meetings clauses.⁸⁷ Those who did oppose the measure were more ready than the Repealers to consent to extra powers of some description to end outrage. One of the Bill's liberal-unionist opponents, Chapman, approved of the intention to suppress political agitation in general and O'Connell's Volunteers in particular.⁸⁸ In private, More O'Ferrall and some Repealers - including Sheil and Henry Grattan - hoped that the Bill would succeed in putting down O'Connell.⁸⁹

The 'treacherous' conduct of most of the liberal-unionists on Coercion greatly disappointed and angered O'Connell and he took steps 'to pour the vial of popular indignation' upon them.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, in July, O'Reilly made a strong public attack on O'Connell's integrity.⁹¹ In a series of letters to Littleton and Wyse, Lambert bitterly denounced the 'wretched conspirator' O'Connell. Carew, Wyse and O'Ferrall took a similar view. Lambert and O'Ferrall evidently wished the suppression of O'Connell's Repeal agitation and the Government's failure to do so greatly disappointed Lambert. When the Government gave up the meetings clauses of the Coercion Act in July 1834, the liberal-unionists held their peace in Parliament and, with few dissentients, approved of the rest of the Bill. Lambert privately expressed his fear that O'Connell would thus be enabled 'to organize

as much harm and disturbance as he thought expedient for his interest .. it was only his miserable dupes and victims that were to be made to feel the severity of the amended law'. He vigorously denounced the ministers for their 'truckling to a fellow who unites in himself every sort of scoundrel propensity ...'⁹²

The debate on Repeal in April 1834 saw a succession of liberal-unionist members rising to oppose O'Connell's motion on the grounds that the pre - 1800 system to which it was proposed to return had given Ireland neither independence, prosperity, nor freedom from corruption and lawlessness, that the Union had brought many benefits, economic and political, and that Repeal would involve 'separation' from Britain. Some of these speakers, Tennent and Lambert especially, denounced O'Connell and his 'system of abuse and blackguardism' and expressed their apprehension of an independent Ireland under his control. In the division 30 Irish liberal members voted against the motion, though some sat on the fence (Keane and James Grattan were absent; Barry, French and Wallace abstained).⁹³

Though only a minority (39) of the Irish members, and one English member, supported his motion, O'Connell insisted after the debate that there was not 'the least relaxation in my opinions on the subject of the Repeal'. But he intended to 'get what I can and use the Repeal in terrorem merely until it is wise and necessary to recommence the agitation', which would not be until after the threat of a renewed Coercion Act had passed. The subsequent ministerial changes, promising a 'half Radical, half Whig' Administration, improved the prospect of winning 'solid advantages for Ireland'.⁹⁴ Though in the event disappointed with the performance of Melbourne's first Administration in this respect, O'Connell was induced by the accession of the Tories in November 1834 to 'postpone' the Repeal question. He would forgo the Repeal pledge as a test of which candidates he would support in the general election, wishing to 'bury in oblivion all differences' between reformers and to

combine them 'in one simultaneous and continued exertion' behind those candidates, repealers or unionists, who would prevent the election of Tories. This was the principle on which he founded the Anti-Tory Association in November 1834. In the Association he duly advocated the return even of such solid Whigs as O'Grady, Fitzgibbon, Jephson, Talbot, Stawell, Villiers Stuart, French, the Westenras, Clements, O'Ferrall, Howard and so on, though the 'amnesty' was not extended to those whose conduct on Coercion and Repeal especially - O'Reilly, Oxmantown, Keane, John Browne - had given O'Connell and local radicals particular annoyance. All of these lost their seats.⁹⁵

O'Connell asked Warburton to have pressure exerted by the Government on the leading Whig landowners in Wicklow and Kerry to ensure the return of reformers; he was 'willing to join in returning four Whigs and does not ask for support to Repealers'.⁹⁶ The Evening Post welcomed O'Connell's view of the election and joined in fighting an Anti-Tory campaign. Some liberal-unionists - notably Evans, Crawford, Chapman, Cave, Smith O'Brien, Keane, Talbot, Burke, Murphy and Conway of the Post - joined the Anti-Tory Association. However, the vast majority of liberal-unionists stayed aloof. Indeed the most striking aspect of the General Election of 1834-5 was the limited extent to which the liberal-unionists reciprocated O'Connell's friendly gestures. Perrin was 'averse' to joining the Association from fear of being considered 'an O'Connellite'. He organized a meeting in Dublin of 'more moderate Reformers than O'Connell', who, he felt, 'were alarmed at O'Connell's violence & particularly at his taking into his own hands the conduct of all the elections throughout the country.' Many Whigs, he claimed, held back from open proceedings because they did not wish to co-operate with O'Connell.⁹⁷

James Grattan felt that his repealer brother was 'most injudicious in attending an Anti-Tory Association got up by O'Connell ... , who has done all the mischief & mainly contributed to bring back the Tories & is

now frightened at it'. He 'could not act with O'Connell' and not only refused to join the Anti-Tory Association but had qualms about attending an 'aggregate meeting' of reformers in Dublin because he felt it was merely O'Connell's Association in another form.⁹⁸ When Perrin tried to effect 'a reconciliation' between Lambert and O'Connell, 'the only difficulty' was on Lambert's part.⁹⁹ Lord Carew supported Lambert and a Tory against the Repeal candidates in Wexford.¹⁰⁰ Sir Henry Parnell allowed his tenants in the Queen's County to remain neutral because he was a relative of one of the Tory candidates, Thomas Vesey.¹⁰¹ Another Whig, Lord Darnley, supported the Tories against the Repeal candidates in Meath, while Lord Killeen and William Murphy refused to support the Repealers in that county.¹⁰² The Duke of Devonshire remained neutral in Youghal, where John O'Connell was challenged by a Tory.¹⁰³ The Whig Frederick Ponsonby challenged the sitting Repeal member for Kildare, without success. When O'Connell endorsed Wyse's candidature in Waterford, Wyse almost withdrew rather than give the impression that he came in as O'Connell's 'nominee or protégé'. He would 'resist' any attempt by O'Connell 'to force his protection or alliance' on him.¹⁰⁴

Most remarkable of all was the Earl of Kenmare's opposition to the Repeal candidates in Kerry. O'Connell was willing to support Kenmare's brother for one of the seats, but he did not stand.¹⁰⁵ When Littleton, at Duncannon's request, wrote to Kenmare early in December 1834 to ask him to support Mullins and M. J. O'Connell (O'Connell's nephew), Kenmare replied that he deprecated the alliance between the Irish Whigs and Repealers; he abhorred the political creed of the Repealers, 'whose aim is subversion not reformation', and he expected only 'treachery & duplicity' of O'Connell. The latter was 'subversive and destructive of the peace and welfare of the country'. He would remain neutral in the election.¹⁰⁶ However, when O'Connell went down to Kerry and made various threats against those who voted against the Tory candidate, Kenmare was so angry at O'Connell's 'insolent dictation

and intimidation' he asked his friends and tenantry to support the Tory.¹⁰⁷

The general election saw the number of liberal-unionist members fall slightly, to 33, but it was the Repeal Party, with only 32 members, which suffered most from the Tory advance. The return of the Whigs to power in April 1835 inaugurated an era in which liberal-unionism was very much in the ascendant. Indeed the government of Ireland between 1835 and 1841 could be regarded as an experiment in liberal-unionism. The response of the liberal-unionists to the Whig legislative programme is described below. Administratively the liberal-unionists not only approved of the conduct of the Government but themselves benefited from it to a considerable degree. A significant number of liberal-unionist members - O'Ferrall, Perrin, O'Loughlen, Woulfe, Ball, Pigot, Curry, Stock, Wyse - received high office; others received Peerages, Baronetcies and such favours, and it is likely that the liberal members were able to exert influence of their friends and constituents.¹⁰⁸

Relations between the liberal-unionists and O'Connell improved as they found a common object in support of the Government. O'Connell formed the General Association in July 1836 to support the Government's tithe and corporation bills; in fact Lyne has argued that the 'primary purpose' of the association was simply 'to maintain support for the Ministry in Ireland.' Sixteen of the liberal-unionist members and several Whig Peers joined the Association.¹⁰⁹ Spring Rice, writing to the King, hesitated to condemn the Association and contended that the recent conduct of the Irish radicals had been 'such as to contribute to the well-being of Ireland'.¹¹⁰ Liberal-unionist animosity towards O'Connell did continue, of course. The majority of liberal-unionist members and peers remained aloof from the General Association. George Evans allegedly felt that O'Connell's influence was 'one which blasts and withers whatever it approaches and that nothing good will ever come to maturity near its pestilence'.¹¹¹ James Grattan refused to join in forming a registry association 'with O'Connell's co-operation' at the end of 1835;

'it would be O'Connell's and our present weak condition is owing to O'Connell's abuse of the Whigs for two years. I am glad to be out of the country ...'¹¹²

As shown below, Grattan also resented aspects of O'Connell's behaviour regarding specific issues. Smith O'Brien refused in October 1835 to attend a dinner apparently because he objected to 'yielding homage' to O'Connell.¹¹³ O'Brien and O'Connell came into open conflict in January 1837; the latter denounced O'Brien to his constituents over his advocacy of a State provision for the Catholic Clergy and opposition to the ballot, and O'Brien replied with a repudiation of O'Connell's 'arrogant dictation' to the Limerick electors and a declaration that he was 'equally indifferent to his (O'Connell's) censure and to his praise'¹¹⁴. Jephson, the liberal-unionist member for Mallow, congratulated O'Brien on his 'temperate and manly rebuke' for O'Connell's 'impertinent interference'¹¹⁵ In July 1837 O'Brien, like Wyse before him, responded angrily when O'Connell's endorsement of his candidature in the general election seemed to him 'to compromise the independence which as a member of Parliament I will never cease to claim for myself'¹¹⁶.

In 1840, the liberal-unionists of the Ulster Constitutional Association came into conflict with O'Connell when it was felt that the latter wished to dictate to them, and liberal-unionists refused to attend the reform dinner held by O'Connell in Belfast in January 1841.¹¹⁷ O'Connell's principal antagonist in the Ulster Constitutional Association was Sharman Crawford, who had long been critical of O'Connell's politics. It is important to note that in criticizing O'Connell Crawford also demonstrated his disillusionment with the Whig Government. In a series of public letters in 1836-8 he accused the Ministers of being motivated by the desire to cling to office and O'Connell of sustaining them there 'without reference to the value of their measures'. He produced a long list of the failings of the Whigs with respect to the enactment of radical policies and concluded that

there was 'no difference between the Whigs and the Tories, except that the latter would take away the rights of the people by violence - the former by deception'. He called on O'Connell to abandon his 'unnatural and degrading' alliance with the Whigs and in union with the British radicals, to exploit their strength in the Commons to enforce 'the people's rights'.¹¹⁸

As he explained in a private letter to O'Connell, Crawford was ready to look to O'Connell as 'the great leader of the Irish nation' but objected to 'the dictation of any one individual' and, unlike O'Connell, desired with regard to legislation 'that the word "impracticable" should be blotted out of the vocabulary of freemen ... let us inquire what justice to our country demands, let us put forward our claims and on those claims let us take our firm, deliberate and constitutional stand'.¹¹⁹ Crawford's policy differences with O'Connell and the Government are noted in subsequent chapters, but it is necessary to draw attention here to one source of difference, the Government's introduction, and O'Connell's approval of the fairly innocuous Peace Preservation Act of 1835. Though loud in public protest Crawford privately opined (to his son) that the measure was 'not liable to any great objection' and indicated that his principal object in protesting in 1835 was to demand that it be accompanied by a poor law and to show that he was 'not one of the Tail'.¹²⁰

From another part of the political spectrum, the Whig member for Wicklow, Sir Ralph Howard, found fault with the Government's liberalism. Though he was 'weaning off his radicalism' as early as November 1836,¹²¹ he accepted a Baronetcy from the Whigs in 1838. But in a celebrated public letter in October 1839, he lamented, 'the dangerous' decision to make the ballot an open question in the Cabinet and the appointment to the Board of Trade of a man, Sheil, who was an opponent of the Union and the Church. He declared that he could not have 'confidence in a Government, the members of which entertain such principles ... the time

has arrived when a more moderate Government should be formed, unconnected with the extremes of either of the great parties which now divide the Empire'. He deliberately abstained on the crucial vote of confidence in June 1841, though he had 'no expectation of being able to support any Government formed by Sir Robert Peel; to such a Ministry my whole public life has been consistently opposed'. He supported the Whig Address in August 1841. Richard Fitzgibbon was the other Irish Whig who abstained on the confidence vote; he had long ceased to attend to his duties in Parliament.¹²²

In addition, it is necessary to mention those who not only became critical of the Government but defected into the Conservative ranks in disgust with their policy. As mentioned above, the 1830's saw a gradual drift of Irish Whigs in this direction. Though some may have been so inclined even before the end of 1834, a number of such Whigs - John Browne, Oxmantown, Tennent, Lambert, Copeland, John Martin - were probably influenced by the tendency of the Irish policy of the second Melbourne Administration. Indeed John Browne and Lambert wrote several times to another former Whig, Stanley, to complain about 'the O'Connell Ministry' and lament that Ireland was practically under 'the yoke of an infamous ruffian'. Lambert declared that he hated even more than Orange rule 'the grinding, vulgar, indefatigable despotism which now crushes and degrades Ireland'. He still described himself as 'a reformer' in 1837 but by the end of the decade was willing the Conservatives to drive out the Whigs and in 1841, seeking office from Peel's new Government was professedly 'a Conservative', though 'no Tory'.¹²³

However, the majority of liberal-unionists clearly rejoiced in the more liberal policy of the Government. The Whig member for Monaghan felt that, 'The Government are doing everything they possibly can for us, and we in return are willing to surrender as far as we can some portion at least of what we should insist on from any other ...'.¹²⁴ Even Crawford felt in April 1836 that, 'The Government are going on well with reference

to the administration of Government (sic) in Ireland. This is ascribable to two causes. The decided character of the Earl of Mulgrave .. and the power of the Irish Party in the House of Commons¹²⁶. He subsequently congratulated Mulgrave on his administration of Ireland, inducing the Lord Lieutenant to note that Crawford was 'though legislatively unreasonable, executively tractable'¹²⁷. Clements of Leitrim assured Russell in December 1836 that he 'would be very happy to do anything in my power to prove how much cordial interest I take in the success and policy of your Government, which is the best I have ever seen in this country'¹²⁸.

The protest signed by 43 Peers and 58 Liberal M.P.'s against the Irish Tory meeting of January 1837 was in effect a vote of confidence in the Government.¹²⁹ During the General Election of 1837 Irish Liberals of every description emphasized their support of the Ministry as 'the first that ever showed an honest disposition to benefit Ireland'. O'Connell urged reformers to 'rally round the Throne of the Queen' and 'her excellent Ministers'. Repeal was still on the shelf as the 'great experiment' in seeking justice within the Union was pursued and, of course, no Repeal pledge was required of any candidate; O'Connell again supported liberal-unionist candidates throughout the country and himself contested Dublin, successfully, in alliance with a liberal-unionist, Thomas Hutton. The Whig Evening Post supported (former?) repealers with equal candour and the Whiggish Richard Fitzgibbon welcomed the return of the 'great patriot' O'Connell in Dublin. Even Kennare and Carew supported the O'Connellite candidates in Kerry and Wexford.¹³⁰ Thirty-nine seats were won by men who were clearly liberal-unionists, six more than in 1835 and many of the 32 repealers might be added to that number, for the division between the two had virtually ceased to exist.

The principal series of Crawford's Anti-Government letters in the Autumn of 1837 were 'considered a failure as to any effect they

intended (sic) to produce¹³¹. O'Connell had the General Association dissolved in October 1837 as a 'proof of our satisfaction at the improved state of the Administration of Government in Ireland and of our confidence in the intentions of our gracious Sovereign and in those of Her Majesty's Ministers'¹³². At the beginning of the following year Mulgrave noted that the prevalent feeling among Irish liberals was 'to do nothing that could hurt the Government'¹³³. In the period 1839-41, when the Administration was constantly assailed by the Tories, Irish Liberals of every description rallied to its defence. In April 1839 '20 Peers, 18 sons of Peers, 70 Lieutenants and Deputy-Lieutenants of Counties, 42 Members of Parliament, 20 Baronets' and nearly 5,000 others met in Dublin to praise the 'just and impartial policy' pursued by the Whigs, though Lord Miltown also pressed for more radical measures.¹³⁴ In consenting to take the chair the Whig Duke of Leinster was giving up a long-standing resolution never again to appear at a political meeting with O'Connell.¹³⁵ Also in 1839 Fitzstephen French, the liberal-unionist member for Roscommon, produced a general panegyric of the Whig Governments since 1830 as 'the first to unfurl the standard of equal and impartial justice'.¹³⁶

Crawford, though still unhappy with many aspects of Government policy, came forward to endorse 'the executive policy of Lord Normanby'. He did so at a public meeting in Meath in April 1839, attended also by the Whigs Headfort, Fingall and Corbally and later in the year he led 'the Liberal inhabitants of the County of Down' in signing a declaration in which the 'many important advantages' of Normanby's system of government were described.¹³⁷ At the beginning of 1840, Leinster and Charlemont issued an address, later subscribed to by others, in which they defended the Government's recent (Irish) Catholic appointments against the 'outcry' over them in England.¹³⁸

In Parliament the Irish Liberals were equally prominent in defence of the Government. They helped in resisting the Irish Tory assault in

March 1839 on the 'State of Ireland' question.¹³⁹ James Grattan privately regarded Russell's decision to seek the endorsement of the Commons of the Government's Irish Policy as 'ridiculous, uncalled for, promoting division between the two Houses and disturbing Ireland...'¹⁴⁰ But he and 12 other Irish Liberals defended that 'fair and honest' policy in the debate, and, in the division, 67 of the 70 Irish Liberals voted or paired for the Government and the other three were absent, two of them abroad.¹⁴¹ O'Brien was one of the speakers on this occasion and his vote against the Jamaica Bill a few weeks later, though it helped to bring down the Ministry, should not be seen as implying a general dissatisfaction with the Government.¹⁴²

The Government's resignation in May 1839 greatly angered James Grattan, who thought it 'infamous treatment' of those like himself who had 'stood by them in all their troubles ... they are so touchy & hasty & have gone out about nothing ... they never should have given up while they had one majority .. thus are 294 men sacrificed ... They have ruined their party & disgusted & destroyed their friends ... I fear they want morality & principle ...' He immediately threw himself into efforts to rally the liberal members in defence of the Government and was clearly delighted when the Queen effectively secured the return of the Whigs, though he continued to regard Ministers as 'a miserable set' who 'will resign again ... The Queen is the only man among them'.¹⁴³

Over the next two years the Irish Liberal members continued to support 'the first Ministry that ever did justice to Ireland', with O'Connell prominent in that respect, ^{even} after his resumption of the Repeal agitation in July 1840. In 1841 of the Irish Liberals only Howard and Fitzgibbon, according to the Mail, 'intentionally' failed to support the Government in the division which led to the General Election. Again in August 1841, on the Address, the Irish Liberals, including Howard, joined in the final vain effort to save the Whig Government.¹⁴⁴

The General Election of 1841 saw O'Connell urging his supporters to

return repealers where possible, radicals if there wasn't a repeal candidate and, failing both, Whigs. In fact the alliance of 1837 was maintained in virtually all constituencies. Though O'Connell stood as a repealer he again lent his support to liberal-unionists like Pigot, Stock, Gore, Yates and William Browne. He even wished to fight Dublin with the son of the Duke of Leinster; and when Leinster refused, O'Connell, though regretting Hutton's failure to adopt Repeal, agreed to fight the seat again with the sitting member. On failing in Dublin, O'Connell displaced the liberal-unionists Barry (Cork) and Corbally (Meath), but Barry had apparently decided already to retire and actually nominated O'Connell; and the latter allowed Corbally to regain the Meath seat a few months later, after deciding to sit for Cork. These special cases apart, only Lynch of Galway was driven to retire by his rejection of Repeal. In Kerry, Kenmare and the other Whig Peers united with O'Connell against the Tory and effected the return of O'Connell's nephew and Kenmare's brother. O'Ferrall cooperated privately with O'Connell to stave off the threat of 'dissension all over the country' between liberal-unionists and repealers. The liberal-unionists again stood primarily as supporters of the Government which had tried 'to do justice to Ireland'¹⁴⁵.

The elections saw the return of at least 45 liberal-unionists and perhaps 20 repealers, though the number of active repealers was, in fact, no more than a dozen.¹⁴⁶ The liberal-unionists had slowly gained ground since 1835 as a result of O'Connell's forbearance, the popularity of the Government they supported, and the tendency of landed influence and individual talent to be especially important when the electorate were in a less excited condition than they had been in 1832 over Repeal and tithes. However, the year 1841 saw the end of the liberal-unionist honeymoon, of the experiment in liberal-unionism. The accession of a Conservative Government and the revival of the agitation for Repeal threatened liberal-unionist interests in several respects. Their response, which was by no means unimpressive, is examined in Chapters eight and nine.

Chapter 1

1. Figures for the position after each General Election are provided below. They are derived from primary sources but conform broadly with the earlier findings of Angus Mac Intyre and Brian Walker, both of whom used the same tripartite classification as is used in this study. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator: Daniel O'Connell and the Irish Party, 1830-1847 (London, 1965), Appendix B.
B. M. Walker, Parliamentary Election Results in Ireland, 1801-1922 (Dublin, 1978).
2. Political break-down according to affiliation when first entered Parliament.
3. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 73-7.
4. Precise figures are not provided on this question because of the difficulty of classification. For the socio-economic backgrounds of the repealers see Sir Henry Blackhall and J. H. Whyte, 'Correspondence on O'Connell and the Repeal Party', Irish Historical Studies, Vol. XII, No. 46 (Sept. 1960), 139-43.
A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 73-7, 302-7.
5. On the Protestant Operative Association see esp. Jacqueline Hill, The Protestant Response to Repeal: the case of the Dublin working class, in F. S. L. Lyons and R. A. J. Hawkins, eds., Ireland under the Union: Varieties of Tension. Essays in Honour of T. W. Moody (Oxford, 1980), 35-68. Two Addresses to the Protestants of Ireland, Adopted at Public Meetings at the Rotunde, by the Dublin Protestant Operative Association and Reformation Society (Dublin, 1843). Soirée of the Dublin Protestant Association and Reformation Society, at Whitefriars' Hall, Jan. 14, 1846 (Dublin, 1846).
6. Lady Gregory, ed., Sir William Gregory. An Autobiography (London, 1894), 122.
7. J. C. Beckett, The Anglo-Irish Tradition (London, 1976), 84-6.
R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846 (London, 1952), 14-5, 35. T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, eds., Ulster since 1800: a political and economic survey (London, 1954), 22-5 (McDowell).
8. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (1), Lefroy to Farnham, 7, 25 Dec. 1830; *ibid*, MS 18, 610 (2), Cottingham to Farnham, 13 Nov. 1830; *ibid*, (3), Cottingham to Farnham, 2 April 1831; *ibid*, MS 18, 609, Boyton to Farnham, 4, 14, 15, 30 Dec. 1830, 8, 28 Jan. 1831. Anglesey Papers, D619/29B/24, 53, Anglesey to Melbourne, 2 Jan., 4 Feb. 1831; *ibid*, D619/27C/26, 42, Anglesey to Holland, 4 July, 18 Aug. 1831; *ibid*, D619/28C/231, Anglesey to Grey, 2 March 1832. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f9, 171, 260, Anglesey to Grey, 25 Nov. 1830, 18 Aug. 1831, 2 March 1832. Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f102, Donoughmore to Knight of Kerry, 12 Jan. 1831. Dublin Evening Mail (DEM), 18 July, 1 Aug. 1832, 20 Sept. 1833, 21 Feb. 1834. The Times, 24, 31, Jan., 5 March, 6, 29, Oct. 1832. Parliamentary Papers (P.P.), 1835, XV, 124, Blacker's evidence to the Select Committee on Orange Lodges, 8 June 1835. Hatherton Papers, D260/A/01/2059, Stovin to Gosset, 24 March 1834. Home Office Papers, HO100/245, f118, Simpson to Harvey, 6 April 1834; *ibid*, f132, Thompson to Harvey, 5 April, 1834.
9. Maurice R. O'Connell, The Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell (Dublin, 1972-80), IV, 1915, 1916, 1921, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick,

29, 31 Aug., 22 Sept. 1832; 1929, O'Connell to Scott, 25 Oct. 1832; V, 1957, 1959, 1967, 1973, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2073, 2075, 2087, 2091, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 21 Feb., (Oct. 1833), (22 March), 2 May, 13, 17, 20 Sept. 1833, 30 May, 3 June, 16, 22 July 1834; 2014, O'Connell to Kiernan, 24 Sept. 1833; 2033, O'Connell to Dwyer, 7 Feb. 1834. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, The Liberator, edited with notices of his Life and Times (London, 1888), I, 327, Note by Fitzpatrick, n. d.; 453, Basis of an Arrangement to combine Persons of all Persuasions in Ireland in Defence of their Common Country and for the Repeal of the Union, July 1834.

10. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (1), Lefroy to Farnham, 7, 25 Dec. 1830. John Brooke and Julia Gandy, eds., The Prime Ministers' Papers: Wellington, Political Correspondence, I, 1833-Nov. 1834 (London, 1975), 671-3, Roden to Wellington, 11 Sept. 1834.
11. Hansard, 23, 158-60, 160-4, 28 April 1834, Bateson, Lefroy; 23, 224-33, 233-7, 263-7, 286-7, 29 April 1834, Christmas, Verner, Shaw, Division.
12. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2087, 2091, 2104, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 16, 22 July, 25 Aug. 1834. See esp. The Times, 30 Aug. 1834, O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 25 Aug. 1834.
13. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 671-3, Roden to Wellington, 11 Sept. 1834.
14. Lady Gregory, ed., Sir William Gregory, An Autobiography, 75. And on how 'almost all' Catholics voted for the liberal candidates in the Belfast Election of 1832, see Ian Budge and Cornelius O'Leary, Belfast: Approach to Crisis. A study of Belfast Politics, 1613-1970 (London, 1973), 43.
15. Figures for the number in each denomination from the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, Ireland, P.P., 1835, XXXIII, 11.
16. See A. T. Q. Stewart, The Transformation of Presbyterian Radicalism in the North of Ireland, 1792-1825 (M. A., Belfast, 1956). John Jamieson, The Influence of the Rev. Henry Cooke on the Political Life of Ulster (M. A., Belfast, 1950). J. L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL. D. (London, 1871). R. Finlay Holmes, Henry Cooke, 1788-1868. (M. Litt., University College Dublin, 1970). R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy, 52-3.
17. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f217, Memorandum on the Comparative Amount of Protestant and Roman Catholic property in Ireland, (Oct. 1834). According to another estimate the ratio was 13 to 1, 984, 693 acres to 74,194. Home Office Papers, HO 100/245, f209, Beresford to Wellington, 13 Dec. 1834.
18. See Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 149-52, Downes to Wellington, 30 March 1833. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 537, f330, Plunkett to Peel, 28 Dec. 1843. Erne Papers, D1939/21/5n/76, Note by Erne, 1845. Lord Langford, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Viscount Melbourne on the Peerage (London, 1837), appendix.
19. The evidence for this conclusion is impressionistic. But see also R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy, 113.

- A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 95. J. H. Whyte, 'Landlord influence at elections in Ireland, 1760-1885', English Historical Review, Vol. 80, No. 317 (Oct. 1965), 748.
20. In 1834 only 292 out of 2,668 Magistrates in Ireland were Catholics, with Protestants in a majority in every county. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/2058, List of Magistrates in Ireland, stating the number who are Roman Catholics, from Returns furnished by the Sub-Inspectors of Police, Jan. 1834.
 21. See esp. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2689, Ray to O'Connell, 20 Feb. 1840.
 22. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (2), Lefroy to Farnham, 11 Dec. 1831; *ibid*, MS 18, 610 (5), Cottingham to Farnham, 2 Dec. 1831; *ibid*, (6), Cottingham to Farnham, 24 Jan., 16 March 1832; *ibid*, MS 18, 609 (3), Boyton to Farnham, 2 Dec. 1831; *ibid*, (4), Boyton to Farnham, 29 Feb. 1832. Perceval-Maxwell Papers, D3244/G/1/76, Printed report of proceedings of the Protestant Conservative Society, 28 Feb. 1832.
 23. R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy, 116-7. DEM, 14, 21, 28 March 1832.
 24. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (2), Lefroy to Farnham, 4, 15 June 1832; *ibid*, MS 18, 610 (7), Cottingham to Farnham, 15, 17 June, 17 Oct., n.d. 1832. DEM, 3 Dec. 1832.
 25. See Chapter Two.
 26. Hansard, 15, 133-4, 5 Feb. 1833, Roden; 15, 435-48, 8 Feb. 1833, Shaw; 15, 743-5, 757-8, 15 Feb. 1833, Longford, Wicklow; 15, 837-41, 844-7, 900-2, 18 Feb. 1833, Wicklow, Roden, Conolly; 15, 999, 1003, 20 Feb. 1833, Maxwell, Perceval; 16, 133-4, 144-6, 4 March 1833, Castlereagh, Bateson; 16, 196-8, 202-15, 222-5, 5 March 1833, Roden, Lefroy, Coote; 16, 421-3, 453, 460-3, 480, 8 March 1833; Conolly, Cooper, Perceval, Lefroy; 16, 611-4, 616, 632, 13 March 1833, Shaw; 16, 683, 15 March 1833, Perceval; 16, 866-7, 870, 19 March 1833, Shaw, Perceval; 16, 1154-5, 27 March 1833, Shaw; 16, 1246-9, 1283, 1283-4, 29 March 1833, Young, Verner, Division; 16, 1307-9, 1310-3, 1330-2, 1 April 1833, Wicklow, Roden, Division. Brooks, Wellington Correspondence, I, 190-2, Fitzgerald to Wellington, 8 April 1833.
 27. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 610 (7), Cottingham to Farnham, 17 Oct. 1832. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 15, 31, 52. Number after petitions heard.
 28. Hansard, 25, 32-3, 38-9, 44, 54-5, 17 July 1834, Wicklow, Limerick, Londonderry; 25, 142-5, 178, 184-7, 192-3, 18 July 1834, Lefroy Christmas, Perceval, Division; 25, 311-5, 21 July 1834, Lefroy; 25, 354-5, 357, 22 July 1834, Peel; 25, 565-70, 26 July 1834, Shaw; 25, 669-700, 29 July 1834, Glengall, Wicklow, Protest.
 29. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 612 (21), Longford to Farnham, 26 July 1834. Also Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/510, Roden to Downshire, 11 July 1834, on 'this miserable, wretched Government' and 'the shameful proceedings of Littleton and O'Connell'.

30. Downshire Papers, D671/C/208/20, Downshire to Bishop of Dromore, n.d., *ibid*, D671/C/12/542, Roden to Downshire, 19 Nov. 1834. Wellington Papers, Portfolio 16, f16, Downshire to Wellington, 16 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, f139, Londonderry to Wellington, 23 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, Port. 18, f38, 119, Downshire to Wellington, 29 Nov., 1 Dec. 1834. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (14), S. R. Maxwell to Henry Maxwell, 28 Feb. 1835. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 404, f245, Dawson to Peel, 22 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, MS 40, 405, f251, Roden to Ellenborough, 8 Dec. 1834. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, from his private papers (London, 1891-99), II, 260, Dawson to Peel, 22 Nov. 1834. The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of William IV and Victoria, from original family documents (London, 1861), II, 141, Londonderry to Buckingham, 18 Nov. 1834.
31. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f673, Peel to Roden, 20 Dec. 1834; *ibid*, f677, Roden to Peel, 24 Dec. 1834; *ibid*, D/10/C84 (3), Roden to Londonderry, 27 Dec. 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/549, Roden to Downshire, 27 Dec. 1834. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 406, f251, Peel to Roden, 21 Dec. 1834; *ibid*, MS 40, 407, f210, Roden to Peel, 24 Dec. 1834; *ibid*, MS 40, 408, f171, Roden to Peel, 31 Dec. 1834.
32. Ellice Papers, MS 15040, f33, O'Connell to Ellice, 11 May 1835 (also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2245).
33. Roden Papers, D/10/C84 (4-6), Roden to Londonderry, (April 1835), 14, 24 April 1835.
34. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (3), Lefroy to Farnham, 21 March 1835. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, I, 14, Morgan O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 15 April 1835.
35. This is certainly the impression given by the extensive correspondence on Ireland in the Russell Papers. On Drummond see esp. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary in Ireland, 1835-40; Life and Letters (London, 1889), J. F. McLennon, Memoir of Thomas Drummond, Under-Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1835-1840 (Edinburgh, 1867). G. Shaw Lefevre, Peel and O'Connell: A Review of the Irish Policy of Parliament from the Act of Union to the death of Sir Robert Peel (London, 1887), 173-204.
36. Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the nature, character, extent and tendency of Orange Lodges, Associations or Societies in Ireland, P.P., 1835, XVII, Appendix 2.
37. Roden Papers, D/10/C84 (4), Roden to Londonderry, (April 1835).
38. Hansard, 26, 541-54, 4 March 1835, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Bateson, Conolly, Verner; 26, 623-46, 6 March 1835, Perceval, Shaw; 27, 142, 23 March 1835, H. Maxwell; 27, 305, 26 March 1835, Verner. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f55, Butt to Roden, 16 March 1835.
39. Hansard, 29, 735, 20 July 1835, H. Maxwell; 30, 85-6, 88-95, 4 Aug. 1835, H. Maxwell, Perceval; 30, 279-308, 11 Aug. 1835, Verner, Plunkett, Hayes, Shaw; 30, 394-5, 12 Aug. 1835, Perceval; 30, 508-9, 14 Aug. 1835, Perceval; 30, 1440-1, 7 Sept. 1835, Perceval.
40. H. Senior, Orangeism in Ireland and Britain, 1795-1836 (London/Toronto, 1966), 254-73.
41. Hansard, 30, 676-96, 19 Aug. 1835, Perceval, Shaw, Jackson, Division.

42. L. Strachey and R. Fulford, The Greville Memoirs, 1814-1860 (London, 1938), III, 285-7, 23, 25 Feb. 1836. Hansard, 31, 345, 12 Feb. 1836, H. Maxwell; 31, 835-861, 23 Feb. 1836, H. Maxwell, Verner, Perceval, Plunkett, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Cooper; 31, 870, 25 Feb. 1835, Russell; 31, 934, 946-7, 947, 26 Feb. 1836, Cumberland, H. Maxwell, Russell; 31, 1275-6, 1284-9, 7 March 1836, Londonderry, Roden. For brief notes on the meetings between Cumberland, Peel and the leading Irish Tories in Feb. 1836, see Farnham Papers, MS 19, 103, Diary of Henry Maxwell, 15-26 Feb. 1836.
43. DEM, 29 Feb. 1836.
44. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, 228, Londonderry to Buckingham, 9 March 1836.
45. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f207, Newcastle to Roden, 4 March 1836.
46. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 610 (8), Cottingham to Farnham, 3 March 1836. DEM, 29 Feb. 1836.
47. Farnham Papers, MS 19, 103, Diary of Henry Maxwell, 13, 14 April 1836. DEM, 15, 18 April 1836. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 537, f330, Plunkett to Peel, 28 Dec. 1843.
48. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f577, Jackson to Roden, 21 Feb. 1837. See also, *ibid*, Vol. 13, f227, 237, Dartwell to Roden, 16, 21 Sept. 1837; *ibid*, f313, M. G. Beresford to Roden, 1 Oct. 1839. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f359, Shaw to Peel, 3 Dec. 1838.
49. Hansard, 27, 118-25, 1291-3; 28, 1-14, 46-50, 340-7, 360, 590-1; 29, 633, 729, 1078, 1333; 30, 313-22, 510-1; 31, 102-4, 937-9, 1276-7, 1300; 33, 953-77; 34, 39-40; 36, 94, 233-60, 269-82, 291-3, 301-4, 311-6, 320-37, 696-7, 721-33, 773-91, 855; 38, 299-354, 1863-87; 39, 65, 212-24, 250-9, 259-62, 281-2, 341-2, 396-423, 496, 633-87; 42, 33-9, 353-7; 43, 799-802, 1226-43; 44, 105-6, 130-1, 559-67, 848-68; 45, 144-5, 152, 761-4, 842-4, 907-15, 946-9, 1261-2; 46, 10-130, 308-21, 948-1048; 47, 94-161, 173-217, 246-9, 375-86; 48, 721-2; 49, 1275-1385; 50, 24-88; 51, 737-68, 970-5; 52, 1153-4, 1165-7; 53, 88, 227-8, 1082-3, 1087-90, 1140-2; 54, 239-45; 55, 6-11, 110-1, 369-70, 590-3, 1197-1214; 57, 850-76, 963-9, 1143-6; 58, 1067-71.
50. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f231, 251, 297, 577, Jackson to Roden, 9, 24 Dec. 1836, 10 Jan., 21 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, f233, Downes to Roden, 9 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f285, 601, Farnham to Roden, 10 Jan., 16 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, f299, Tennent to Roden, 12 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f467, Westmeath to Roden, 18 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f597, Conolly to Roden, 9 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, f681, Joy to Roden, 25 Nov. 1837; *ibid*, f763, Charleville to Roden, 22 Nov. 1839; *ibid*, f904-34, Roden and Morpeth correspondence, 13 Nov.-19 Dec. 1839; *ibid*, Vol. 13, f233, Lefroy to Roden, 12 Sept. 1837; *ibid*, f359, Roden to Wellington, 14 Nov. 1839; *ibid*, D/LO/C84 (10), Roden to Londonderry, 6 March 1839; *ibid*, (16), Tennent to Londonderry, 3 Oct. 1837. Wellington Papers, Port. 43, f57, 109, Roden to Wellington, 25 Nov., 26 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, Port. 44, f80, 121, Roden to Wellington, 28 Jan., 15 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, Port. 49, f73, Roden to Wellington, 8 Feb. 1838; *ibid*, Port. 50, f104, Jackson to Peel, 17 April 1838; *ibid*, Port. 55, f69, Lorton to Wellington, 17 Dec. 1838; *ibid*, Port. 63, f91, Roden to Wellington, 14 Nov. 1839; *ibid*, Port. 73, f152, Charleville to Wellington, 23 Jan. 1841; *ibid*, Port. 74, f6, 110, Charleville to Wellington, 3 Feb., 12 March 1841.

- Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/633, Roden to Downshire, 2 Dec. 1836; *ibid.*, /733, Downshire to Ebrington, July 1839; *ibid.*, /745A, Hillsborough to Peel, (July 1838). Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, 22 Nov. 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 424, f254, 258, Clare to Peel, 18, 23 Dec. 1837; *ibid.*, MS 40, 425, f56, Jackson to Peel, 27 April 1838; *ibid.*, MS 40, 426, f67, Jackson to Fremantle, 13 Jan. 1839; *ibid.*, f73, Clare to Peel, 21 Jan. 1839; *ibid.*, MS 40, 318, f137, Graham to Peel, 27 Jan. 1839.
51. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, 273-87. J. F. McLennon, Memoir of Thomas Drummond, 312-25. Report by the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland since the year 1835 in respect of Crime and Outrage, P.P., 1839, XI, 945-50.
52. The Times, 1 Oct., 5 Nov. 1838, 14 Jan. 1839. Wellington Papers, Port. 56, f36, Knight to Kerry to Wellington, 24 Jan. 1839. Howard Bury Papers, T3069/D/22, Glengall to Charleville, Jan-March 1839.
53. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p46-8, 28 April 1837.
54. *Ibid.*, p159-60, 27 Nov. 1837. Also The Greville Memoirs, III, 402, 8 Dec. 1837. A. D. Kriegel, The Holland House Diaries, 1831-1840 (London, 1977), 373, Dec. 1837.
55. Graham Papers, 34, Graham to Stanley, 12 Dec. 1837; Stanley to Graham, 17 Dec. 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 424, f352, Stanley to Peel, 19 Feb. 1838.
56. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f715, Jackson to Roden, 14 Dec. 1837; *ibid.*, f729, Lorton to Roden, 16 Dec. 1837.
57. Wellington Papers, Port. 56, f10, 15, Wellington to Westmeath, 3, 9 Jan. 1839. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f265, Wellington to Peel, 28 March 1839.
58. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f215, Resolutions of the Irish Tory Peers and Members, 9 Feb. 1839.
59. Wellington Papers, Port. 56, f119, Peel memo to Shaw, 12 Feb. 1839; *ibid.*, Port. 58, f38, 47, Peel to Wellington, 25, 27 March 1839.
60. Wellington Papers, Port. 57, f63, 70, 75, Westmeath to Wellington, 5, 6, 7 March 1839; *ibid.*, f64, 71, Wellington to Westmeath, 6 (2) March 1839.
61. Hansard, 45, 948-74, 1012-5, 1016-20, 1022-7, 1029-30, 1047-8, 21 March 1839, Roden, Wellington, Charleville, Donoughmore, Westmeath, Division; 46, 1118-20, 22 March 1839, Russell.
62. Wellington Papers, Port. 58, f33, Mahon to Wellington, 22 March 1839. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 383.
63. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f259, 265, Wellington to Peel, 23, 28 March 1839. Wellington Papers, Port. 58, f34, 48, Wellington to Peel, 23, 28 March 1839; *ibid.*, f33, Peel to Wellington, 25 March 1839. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 384-6.
64. Hansard, 46, 1321-2, 12 April 1839, Peel.
65. Roden Papers, Vol. 13, f281, Declaration, 20 April 1839.

66. Hansard, 46, 1108, 1118, 22 March 1839, Normanby; 47, 218-22, 222-4, 18 April 1839, Lansdowne, Normanby; 47, 457, 22 April 1839, Radnor; 47, 866, 6 May 1839, Hatherton; 47, 1006, 14 May 1839, Normanby.
67. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f81, Ellenborough to Peel, 19 July 1839. J. F. McLennon, Memoir of Thomas Drummond, 420, Hansard, 49, 1355-6, 6 Aug. 1839, Roden.
68. P.P., 1839, XI, 111.
69. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f86, Ellenborough to Peel, 3 Aug. 1839; *ibid*, f89, Ellenborough to Peel, 5 Aug. 1839. Hansard, 49, 1275-1335, 6 Aug. 1839, Brougham, Roden, Brougham, Division.
70. Graham Papers, 37B, Peel to Graham, 11 Aug. 1839. Home Office Papers, HO 100/257, f84, Ebrington to Russell, 9 Aug. 1839; *ibid*, f86, Russell to Ebrington, n.d.; *ibid*, HO 122/17, p251, Russell to Ebrington, 14 Aug. 1839. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 192, 9 Aug. 1839. Hansard, 50, 2-3, 7 Aug. 1839, Russell.
71. Graham Papers, 37B, Stanley to Graham, 2 Oct. 1839. Ellice Papers, MS 15025, f57, Howick to Ellice, 30 Aug. 1839. A. Aspinall, The Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot (London, 1941), 207, Graham to Arbuthnot, 12 Sept. 1839.
72. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 406-7, July - Aug. 1839. Dublin Evening Post (DEP), 23, 25, 27, 30 July, 1, 3, 6, 8 Aug. 1839. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, 351-4. Hansard, 50, 206, 12 Aug. 1839, O'Connell.
73. Roden Papers, Vol. 13, f321, Address to the Earl of Roden, 21 Oct. 1839. DEM, 22, 24, 26 July, 21 Oct. 1839.
74. Wellington Papers, Port. 74, f111, Wellington to Charleville, 12 March 1841. Hansard, 57, 850-76, 5 April 1841, Charleville.
75. Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f88, Note by Knight of Kerry, 24 June 1836. Beresford Papers, AFL, Uncat., Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan to Beresford, 23 Feb. 1836. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, 37, 48, 103, 141, 228, 287, 292, 310, 322, Londonderry to Buckingham, 25 March, 5 May 1833, 13 June, 18 Nov. 1834, 9 March 1836, 1 Sept., 6 Nov. 1837, 28 Jan., 30 April 1838.
76. Wellington Papers, Port. 17, f128, Knight of Kerry to Wellington, 27 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, Port. 47, f40, Roden to Wellington, 12 Aug. 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 422, f40, Tennent to Peel, 22 Jan. 1836; *ibid*, MS 40, 424, f51, Tennent to Peel, 9 Aug. 1837; *ibid*, f63, Chatterton to Peel, 13 Aug. 1837; *ibid*, f113, Jackson to Peel, 31 Aug. 1836; *ibid*, MS 40, 425, f263, Tennent to Peel, 13 Oct. 1838; *ibid*, MS 40, 426, f67, Jackson to Fremantle, 13 Jan. 1839; *ibid*, MS 40, 467, f1, Stanley to Peel, 16 Jan. 1841. Derby Papers, 131/7, Tennent to Stanley, 30 Dec. 1837, 9 May 1839. Graham Papers, 38, Graham to Stanley, 8 Feb. 1840. Hansard, 53, 120, 26 March 1840, Stanley. Anon., The Repealer Repulsed (Belfast, 1841), 60-1. Anon., The Irish Franchise and Registration Question (London, 1841), 2-3.
77. Hansard, 58, 1241-6, 4 June 1841; 59, 450-5, 27 Aug. 1841, Divisions. DEM, 7 June 1841.

78. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2106, O'Connell to Duncannon, 2 Sept. 1834; 2109, O'Connell to Abercromby, 5 Sept. 1834; VII, 2976, O'Connell to Ray, 6 Aug. 1842. D. O. Madden, Ireland and its rulers since 1829 (London, 1843), I, 128-9, 142. Gustave De Beaumont, Ireland: Social, Political and Religious, edited by W. C. Taylor (London, 1839), II, 124-5, DEM, 20 July, 10 Aug. 1842, 19 Jan., 1 Feb. 1843(O'Connell), 14 July 1845(Ed.).
79. Northern Whig (NW), 17, 19, 22, 24, 29 Dec. 1840, 2 Jan., 2, 6, 11, Feb. 1841. On the Association generally, see esp. B. A. Kennedy, William Sharman Crawford, 1780-1861: a Political Biography (D. Litt., Belfast, 1953), 151-78.
80. Broughton Correspondence, Add MS 36, 467, f38, Wood to Hobhouse, 9 April 1833.
81. DEP, 6, 8, 15, 29 Nov., 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 22, 27 Dec. 1832, 8 Jan. 1833.
82. DEP, 19, 22 Jan. 1833.
83. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, Jan. 1833.
84. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/109, Stanley to Anglesey, 19 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, D619/28A/144, Grey to Anglesey, 24 Feb. 1833 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f361).
85. Personal Journals of Proceedings in Parliament kept by James Grattan, M.P., MS 14, 147, 26 Feb. 1833.
86. Hansard, 15, 520-2, 11 Feb. 1833, J. Browne; 16, 445-7, 8 March 1833, J. Browne; 16, 628-9, 13 March 1833, Lambert; 16, 1157-8, 27 March 1833, Lambert.
87. Hansard, 16, 155-8, 159-60, 4 March 1833, Lambert, Tennent; 16, 431-9, 445-7, 8 March 1833, Oxmantown, J. Browne; 16, 522, 11 March 1833, Talbot; 16, 601, 628-9, 629-30, 13 March 1833, Division, Lambert, D. Browne; 16, 679-80, 15 March 1833, Division; 16, 1157-8, 1166-7, 27 March 1833, Lambert, Division. The Times, 16 March 1833, Division.
88. Hansard, 16, 153-4, 4 March 1833, Chapman; 16, 452, 457-8, 8 March 1833, O'Ferrall, J. Grattan; 16, 615-6, 13 March 1833, O'Ferrall.
89. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 13 March 1833. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries (London, 1952), Le Marchant's Diary, 313-4, n.d., Lady Dorchester, Recollections of a Long Life by Lord Broughton (John Cam Hobhouse), with additional extracts from his private diaries (London, 1910-1), IV, 292, 1 March 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/144, Grey to Anglesey, 24 Feb. 1833 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f361).
90. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1956, 1961, 1963, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 17 Feb., 6, 11 March 1833. Freeman's Journal (FJ), 14 Feb. 1833, O'Connell to the Volunteers of Ireland, 10 Feb. 1833.
91. Hansard, 20, 9-10, 26 July 1833, O'Reilly.
92. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/6, f349, Carew to Littleton, June/July 1833; *ibid*, /7, f219, /8, f105, 377, 469, 633, 753, /9, f91, 131, 341, /10, f75, 83, 229, 293, 365, /12/1, f201, 305, Lambert to

- Littleton, 25 Aug., 12 Oct., 3, n.d., 22, 30 Nov., 15, 19, 31 Dec. 1833, 8 (2), 28 Jan., 2, 9 Feb., 1, 24 July 1834; *ibid*, /11, f481, Melbourne to Littleton, 30 April 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/1800, Lambert to Littleton, 7 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /2322, Carew to Littleton, 22 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p35, 131, Littleton to Melbourne, 20 March, 30 April 1834. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f212, Lambert to Littleton, 30 Nov. 1833. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse, to George Wyse, 4 June 1834; *ibid*, (7), Wyse to George Wyse, 9, 30 May, n.d. July 1834; *ibid*, MS 15025 (3), Lambert to Wyse, 14 Jan., 16 Oct. 1834. Valentine Lord Cloncurry, Personal Recollections of the Life and Times, with Extracts from the Correspondence of Valentine Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1849), 460-1, Lambert to Cloncurry, 3 June 1834.
93. Hansard, 22, 1164-1283, 23 April 1834, S. Rice; 22, 1288-1333, 24 April 1834, Tennent; 23, 9-10, 29-41, 25 April 1834, J. Browne, Lambert; 23, 142-6, 28 April 1834, Perrin; 23, 212-4, 271, 286-7, 29 April 1834, Jephson, O'Reilly, Division. The Pilot, 2 May 1834.
94. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2066, 2067, 2070, 2073, 2075, 2081, 2087, 2089, 2091, 2104, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 7, 8, 22, 30 May, 3, 17 June, 16, 17, 22, 25 July 1834; 2077, O'Connell to French, 10 June 1834; 2086, O'Connell to Barrett, (c 11 July 1834).
95. DEP, 22, 25, 29 Nov., 2, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 23 Dec. 1834.
96. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/14, f553, Warburton to Littleton, 12 Dec. 1834.
97. *Ibid*, f453, 473, 565, Craig to Littleton, 30 Nov., 1, 15 Dec. 1834.
98. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, 1 Dec., n.d. Dec. 1834, n.d. Jan. 1835.
99. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/14, f473, Craig to Littleton, 1 Dec. 1834.
100. Report of the Select Committee on Bribery at Elections, P.P., 1835, VIII, 262-4.
101. P.P., 1835, VIII, 288, 305.
102. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, n.d. Jan. 1835. P.P., 1835, VIII, 478.
103. P.P., 1835, VIII, 521.
104. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (3), Wyse to Abraham, n.d.; *ibid*, Abraham to Wyse, 23, 26 Dec. 1834. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862; The Life and Career of an Educator and Diplomat (London, 1939), 142.
105. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2147, O'Connell to Wife, 2 Dec. 1834.
106. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/14, f493, Duncannon to Littleton, 3 Dec. 1834; *ibid*, f535, Kenmare to Littleton, 9 Dec. 1834. DEM, 16 July 1841, Kenmare to M. J. O'Connell, n.d.. Hansard, 27, 1133-4, 15 May 1835, O'Connell, Shaw, M. J. O'Connell.

107. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 410, f126, Knight to Kerry to Peel, 15 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, f128, Peel to Knight of Kerry, 16 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 442, f23, Knight of Kerry to Peel, 27 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 314, f7, Hardinge to Peel, 12 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 327, f207, Haddington to Peel, 12 Jan. 1835. Wellington Papers, Fort. 25, f57, Knight of Kerry to Wellington, 12 Jan. 1835. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2198, O'Connell to John O'Connell, 15 Jan. 1835. P.P., 1835, VIII, 279, 684-5. Hansard, 31, 1369-70, 7 March 1836, Hardinge. G. Lyne, 'Daniel O'Connell, Intimidation and the Kerry Elections of 1835', Journal of the Kerry Archaeological and Historical Society, No. 4 (1971), 74-97.
108. Though at least one, Smith O'Brien, was far from satisfied in the latter respect. See Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f325, O'Brien to E. J. Stanley, 4 Sept. 1835; *ibid*, f380, 408, 410, O'Brien to Morpeth, 16 May, n.d. Aug., 21 Aug. 1836; *ibid*, f411, Roche to O'Brien, 22 Aug. 1836; *ibid*, f417, O'Brien to Melbourne, 20 Oct. 1836; *ibid*, f468, Morpeth to O'Brien, 10 Sept. 1837. Morpeth allegedly said in Nov. 1835 that 'all he knows of O'Connell is that of all our Irish supporters he is the only one who asks for nothing for himself or his friends'. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 30, Nov. 1835.
109. G. Lyne, The General Association of Ireland, 1836-7 (M. A., University College Dublin, 1968), esp. 3-5, 42-3, 55-7, 85, 133-4, 171-4 (Appendix B).
110. Monteagle Papers, MS 545, Spring Rice to King, 13 Jan. 1837.
111. H. Grote, The Personal Life of George Grote (London, 1873), 105, Mrs George Evans to Mrs Grote, 12 Aug. 1835.
112. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, Dec. 1835.
113. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f328, O'Brien to Edward O'Connell, 15 Oct. 1835.
114. DEP, 12 Jan. 1837, O'Connell to the Electors of the County of Limerick, 8 Jan. 1837. DEP, 17 Jan. 1837, O'Brien to Same, n.d.. Also M. D. Jephson, An Anglo-Irish Miscellany: Some Records of the Jephsons of Mallow (Dublin, 1964), 229.
115. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f443, Jephson to O'Brien, 17 Jan. 1837. See also *ibid*, f445, O'Malley to O'Brien, 23 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f446, Fitzgerald to O'Brien, 24 Jan. 1837.
116. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f459, O'Brien to Edward O'Connell, 21 July 1837; *ibid*, f461, Edward O'Connell to O'Brien, 1 Aug. 1837.
117. NW, 21, 23 July, 15 Aug., 3 Oct. 1840, 21, 23, 26 Jan. 1841.
118. DEP, 28 July 1836, Crawford to O'Connell, 25 July 1836; DEP, 31 Dec. 1836, Crawford to French, 28 Dec. 1836; DEP, 10 Jan. 1837, Crawford at Dinner in Belfast, 5 Jan. 1837; DEP, 11 May 1837, Crawford to the People of Ireland, 6 May 1837; DEP, 4 July 1837, Crawford to the Dundalk Registry Reform Association, 29 June 1837; DEP, 26 Aug., 2, 9, 16, 19, 21 Sept., 14, 25, Nov., 1837, 4 Aug. 1838, Crawford to O'Connell, 22, 29 Aug., 7, 12, 16, 19 Sept., 9, 23 Nov. 1837, 2 Aug. 1838; DEP, 21 Aug. 1838, Crawford in Precursor Association, 18 Aug. 1838. NW, 18 Jan. 1838, Crawford at Meeting at Staly bridge, n.d..

119. W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times and Cotemporaries of Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1855), 442-3, Crawford to Cloncurry, 14 Oct. 1836.
120. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/37, Crawford to John Crawford, (1 Aug. 1835). Hansard, 29, 1334-5, 1335-6, 31 July 1835, O'Connell, Crawford; 30, 476-8, 13 Aug. 1835, Crawford, O'Connell, Division; 38, 1078-81, 25 May 1837, Crawford, Division. NW, 20 Sept. 1836, Crawford to the Liberal Constituency of Dundalk, 13 Sept. 1836; NW, 1 April 1837, Crawford to the Secretary of the Dundalk Reform Registry Association, 25 March 1837; NW, 15 Sept. 1840, Crawford to Crean, 12 Sept. 1840; NW, 23 Oct. 1841, Crawford, Observations addressed to the Repealers of Ireland, 16 Oct. 1841. DEP, 26 Aug., 9 Sept., 25 Nov., Crawford to O'Connell, 22 Aug., 7 Sept., 23 Nov. 1837.
121. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/c/6, Wingfield to Tennent, 26 Nov. 1836.
122. DEM, 28 Oct. 1839, Howard to the Electors of the County of Wicklow, 24 Oct. 1839.
123. DEM, 7, 26 July, 13 Aug. 1841, Howard to the Electors of the County of Wicklow, n.d., 21 July, 10 Aug. 1841. Hansard, 58, 1241-6, 4 June 1841; 59, 450-5, 27 Aug. 1841, Divisions.
124. Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 20 Feb., 10 March 1837, 5 Aug., 8 Nov. 1839, 26 May, 22, 26 June, 18 July 1840, 15 Jan., 18 July, 9, 20 Sept. 1841, 22 June 1842; *ibid*, 130/11, John Browne to Stanley, 18 Feb. 1837, 18 Dec. 1839.
125. Clogher Diocesan Papers, D.I.O. (RC) 1/6/34, H. R. Westenra to McDermott, 26 June 1835.
126. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/47, Crawford to John Crawford, 5 April 1836.
127. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f14-24, Mulgrave to Russell, 5 Nov. 1836.
128. *Ibid*, f251-2, Clements to Russell, 25 Dec. 1836.
129. DEP, 4 Feb. 1837.
130. DEP, 24, 27 June, 1-29 July, 1-17, 31 Aug. 1837.
131. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f60-5, Mulgrave to Russell, 8 Sept. 1837.
132. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 116-7, O'Connell to French, 19 Oct. 1837. DEP, 31 Oct. 1837.
133. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f9-14, Mulgrave to Russell, 2 Jan. 1838.
134. NW, 13 April 1839.
135. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, 334, Drummond to Mother, 14 April 1839. J. F. McLennon, Memoir of Thomas Drummond, 418.
136. Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government entitled to the support of the Irish Liberal Members at the Present Crisis? Considered in relation to the past and with reference to the future (London, 1839).

137. NW, 20 April, 23 Nov. 1839, 4, 9, 14 Jan. 1840.
138. NW, 14 Jan., 14 May 1840. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 230-1, O'Connell to Leinster, 28 March 1840.
139. Hansard, 46, 117-30, 7 March 1839, O'Connell; 46, 315-9, 11 March 1839, French; 46, 1020-2, 1028-9, 1030-1, 1047-8, 21 March 1839, Rossmore, Lismore, Fingall, Division.
140. Personal Journals.. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 26 March 1838.
141. Hansard, 47, 119-22, 129-35, 140-2, 144-7, 150-7, 16 April 1839, O'Brien, Bellew, O'Conor Don, Somerville, J. Grattan; 47, 166-72, 195-209, 17 April 1839, Barron Pigot; 47, 234-46, 249-50, 251-5, 256-7, 18 April 1839, M. J. O'Connell, D. Roche, W. Roche, Redington; 47, 381-400, 426-43, 447-56, 19 April 1839, Sheil, O'Connell, Division.
142. For the attempt in Limerick to unseat O'Brien because his vote made him 'the only Irishman professing liberal sentiments who contributed to remove from place and power the only Administration which has ever shewn a sincere disposition to do justice to Ireland', see Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f616, 635, Griffin to O'Brien, 18 May, 1 June 1839; *ibid*, f618, 619, Powell to O'Brien, 22, 23 May 1839; *ibid*, f620, Laffan to O'Brien, 27 May 1839; *ibid*, f622, 633, Potter to O'Brien, 28 May, 2 June 1839. O'Connell was extremely angry over O'Brien's vote and colluded in the moves to unseat him. See M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2611, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 7 May 1839; 2623, O'Connell to Costello, 16 May 1839.
143. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15 May 1839.
144. Hansard, 50, 55-60, 8 Aug. 1839, Lurgan; 50, 206, 12 Aug. 1839, O'Connell; 51, 107-10, 16 Jan. 1840, Somerville; 51, 996-1016, 1073-9, 31 Jan. 1840, O'Connell, Division; 58, 904-5, 908-15, 28 May 1841, Hutton, H. Grattan; 58, 986-8, 2 June 1841, J. Grattan; 58, 1056-65, 1103-8, 3 June 1841, O'Connell, Somerville; 58, 1121-30, 1241-6, 4 June 1841, Sheil Division; 59, 253-9, 25 Aug. 1841, H. Grattan; 59, 290-3, 26 Aug. 1841, O'Brien; 59, 366-8, 390-400, 450-5, 27 Aug. 1841, M. J. O'Connell, O'Connell, Division. DEM, 7 June 1841.
145. DEM, 24, 26 May, 2, 11, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 28 June, 2, 5, 7, 12, 14, 16, 21 July, 4 Aug., 8, 15 Sept. 1841. DEP, 12, 15, 17, 22, 24, 26, 29 June, 1 July 1841. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 2846, 2848, 2852, 2903, 2905, 2907, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 8, 10, 12 May, 11, 17, 21 July 1841; 2849, 2857, Fitzpatrick to O'Connell, 10, 15 May 1841; 2684, 2874, 2877, O'Connell to John O'Connell, 21, 26-8, 29 May 1841; 2879, C. Fitzsimon to O'Connell, 31 May 1841; 2887a, 2890b, O'Ferrall to O'Connell, 11, 17 June 1841; 2890a, O'Connell to O'Ferrall, 15 June 1841; 2892, O'Connell to Anon., 18 June 1841; 2893, O'Connell to C. Fitzsimon, 19 June 1841.
146. The primary sources indicate that Duffy's estimate of less than 12 repealers was justified in terms of the number than agitating for repeal. C. G. Duffy, Young Ireland; A Fragment of Irish History, 1840-1850 (London/Paris/New York, 1880), 42. See also A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 69, 262. R. B. McDowell, Public Opinion and Government Policy, 135.

Chapter 2

The Church, 1831-4

Dwarfing all other Irish issues in importance in the 1830's was the question of the Established Church of Ireland. According to a report in 1835, Ireland had 6,427,712 Catholics, 642,356 Presbyterians and 852,064 Protestants of the Established Church, and 'a considerable number' of the latter were in fact Wesleyan Methodists¹. By 1830 the Establishment, with some assistance and pressure from Parliament, had done much to purge itself of the evils of pluralism, absentee clerics, churchless parishes and political appointments². But, with 22 Bishops and about 2000 inferior Clergymen, the Church still assumed the structure established when it was confidently expected that Catholicism would be displaced in Ireland and the mass of the people would adhere to the Establishment. And what made the issue of the Church so contentious was the fact that the people in general, Catholics and Presbyterians as well as the Protestants of the Establishment, were taxed to support the Church of only 1/10th of the population.

The forms taken by this taxation have been described in detail by a number of writers; so too have the history of resistance to the principal impost, tithe, and the amendments made in response to that resistance³. It is not proposed, therefore, to introduce the Chapter with a discussion of this sort of background, though much of it will necessarily be covered in the following narrative. Suffice to say that from 1830 Catholic resistance to tithe reached new heights in many parts of Ireland, virtually forcing the representatives and government of Ireland into a searching examination of the Church question. And their readiness to do so was reinforced by the utilitarian rationalism of the Reform era, which was so clearly offended by the anomalous position of the Irish Church.

In January 1831, the Liberal-Unionist member Thomas Wyse concluded that such were the feelings against the Church there would have to be 'great and searching alterations' in 'this absurd and oppressive anomaly,' while the Whig Sir Henry Parnell urged Grey to meet the problem of

resistance to tithe by paying the Clergy out of the Treasury.⁴ In Parliament the reaction of the Irish Liberals to the 'Tithe War' in Ireland was an increasingly strident demand for reform of the tithe system and the Church during 1831 and the early weeks of 1832. They deprecated the 'enormous opulence' of the Church and the coexistence within it of holders of wealthy 'ecclesiastical sinecures' and poor, hard-working curates. A number of members, including even the relatively conservative Whigs Dominick and John Browne, demanded the reduction of the temporalities of the Church 'to a size .. in proportion to the Protestant population'. Many members effectively or explicitly condoned the resistance to tithe when they complained of the 'injustice' of forcing Catholics and Presbyterians to support the Church of the Protestant minority and deprecated the 'vexatious and oppressive' means of collection used by the Clergy. They claimed that resentment and resistance were so widespread as to mean the end of the existing tithe system and demanded an 'alteration' or 'abolition' of the system in recognition of this fact.

Even in 1831-2, the Liberal-Unionists Wyse, Chapman and James Grattan and the repealers O'Connell, Ruthven, Henry Grattan and Sheil envisaged appropriation of a portion of Church revenues to non-ecclesiastical purposes, particularly relief of the poor and infirm, with Sheil warning in February 1832 that 'no measure that merely went to secure in a better manner the present incomes of the Clergy would ever content' the Irish people⁵. The Whig Sir John Newport warned Rice in January 1832 that, so great was the resistance to tithe, failure to change the system would lead to 'all the horrors of revolutionary war'. Tithe should be replaced with a State Land Tax in which the Church would only have a share. To induce or compel landlords, as opposed to occupiers, to support the Clergy and increase rents accordingly would be 'adding the ruin of the landed proprietor to that of the Established Church, & increase in a proportionate degree the incentive to the occupying tenantry to resist the payment of the charge thus consolidated ...'⁶

Concern for the plight of landlords was to be a constant theme in Irish
 ● Liberal thinking on the tithe question.

James Grattan noted in January 1832 that,

'All are making up their minds not to pay Tythe ... I say make one operation of the whole Church property, fix £2000 a year to each Bishop, set the land at its value. Pay the Clergy, the Bishops, the repairs of (the) Church, the Priest & the poor, thus relieving the people of vestry cess & Priests' cess & regulating Tythe & Church property. Then you will satisfy',⁷

Daniel Callaghan, the repealer, felt by February 1832 that fundamental change could be achieved.⁸ However, Stanley, the Chief Secretary, aware of the 'imminent hazard' in which the Church was placed by Catholic hostility and the desire of many Protestant landlords to effect 'the confiscation of her property', declared in October 1831 his intention to make the revenue of the Church more secure by transferring liability for tithes to the landlords and subsequently commuting tithes into landed property.⁹ In December, Stanley and the Duke of Richmond stressed in Cabinet the 'inviolable' nature of Church property. In the same month, the Government, acting on Stanley's suggestion, proposed the appointment of Select Committees of both Houses to investigate the tithe system. Several Irish Liberals protested in Parliament at the exclusion of Catholics from membership of the Committees and the omission of the temporalities of the Church from their remit.¹⁰ But a number of Irish Liberals, all unionists, were placed on the Commons Committee.¹¹

Early in February 1832 the Cabinet considered Stanley's proposal to ask the Select Committees to recommend a measure to recover the arrears of tithe, in order to 'vindicate the authority of the law', and subsequent legislation to give effect to Stanley's remedy for the tithe problem. Durham threatened to oppose the arrears measure. Anglesey, the Lord Lieutenant, asked, 'Why rigidly enforce a law which, from its unjust and mischievous tendency, you are about to abrogate? Let the new arrangement precede the law of coercion, or, at all events, let them be simultaneous'. Anglesey had, in fact, already submitted a plan, drawn up by Blake,

Cloncurry and others in Dublin, for a 'new arrangement' to the Cabinet, involving abolition of tithe and support of the Clergy out of episcopal property, but Stanley had convinced Grey of the impracticality of the plan. Though many in the Cabinet, Holland and Durham in particular, shared Anglesey's doubts about Stanley's proposals, the Chief Secretary's view that the promise of a remedial measure would be sufficient prevailed.¹²

On the 13th of February, Stanley read his proposed report to the Commons Committee. According to James Grattan, a member of the Committee and a Liberal-Unionist, it stated:

'the condition of the country, the organized opposition to Tythe, necessity for stopping it, asserting the law, aiding the Clergy, advancing £35,000 to them, Government to collect arrears in a certain mode and holding out a prospect that the name & character of Tythe be abolished, always securing the rights of the Clergymen ... A discussion arose. Duncannon said relief should accompany coercion. Leader talked idly & mischievously as usual. Newport supported Stanley. I objected to Report that it would aggravate hostility, set the people at issue with Government, held out nothing, would add to Repealers ... the Lord Lieutenant must get an absolute power & the people would go to gaol.. No one supported me. Carew nothing. Ebrington supported Stanley ...'

Grattan also noted in his journal his determination to move an amendment to appropriate clerical income for the relief and employment of the poor on the demise of the incumbent Clergy.¹³

According to Holland, Ebrington, Carew and Newport were all 'satisfied', and Cloncurry 'warmly' approved of the Lords' Report.¹⁴ Peel told Ellenborough that Duncannon 'would not agree to the Report unless there was a distinct pledge that "the name and character of tithes" should be done away', but Ellenborough heard soon after that 'Duncannon had given in and James Grattan alone held out.'¹⁵ Wyse lamented that 'even our own men, Grattan excepted, were mute. Nous verrons. This is owing to Plunkett. Leader is very shy of the question'. He foresaw many 'battles' in the House.¹⁶

In Parliament on the 14th, Stanley produced his famous declaration, later incorporated in the reports of the Select Committees, that the Government intended 'the extinction of the present system of tithes'. Grattan was delighted and Wyse wrote that the words 'are ambiguous, but we will make use of them and now make them go the entire way, however,

reluctantly .. The Irish members marshalled very strong and supported very well both with speeches and cheers'. He was confident they would bring the Government 'to its senses. We may expect to see the whole followed up by a reduction of the Church'¹⁷. In the Select Committee, however, Grattan's amendment to the effect 'that the measure of redress should accompany the measure of severity' was 'not entertained at all ... The Report is premature', he went on, 'it recommends relief to the Clergy without knowing how far their distress goes .. "Extinguish" is qualified by securing a provision, &c'. He told Stanley 'that he should not consider the Report as unanimously agreed to'. Musgrave was similarly critical, but Stanley's Report was adopted in substance.¹⁸

When the Report was presented to the House, Henry Grattan said that 'so far as he knew of the report it was unjust, unsatisfactory and premature. In his opinion church property should be appropriated to its original purposes, the chief of which was the relief of the poor'¹⁹. James Grattan was angry that this was the only protest made and O'Connell did not even attend for the occasion: 'The Catholic party who talked so big were all mute. It is bluster & nothing else'²⁰. Nobody protested in the Lords when the report of their Committee was presented on the 16th. Grey claimed that all were happy; he was greatly annoyed by Henry Grattan's protest, which had 'set the whole House against' the Irish. He had 'reason to believe that this new discontent was the work of Dr. Doyle', who was 'no more to be trusted than O'Connell'²¹.

On the 19th of February, Lord Durham, a member of the Cabinet, attempted to placate Wyse with a rather distorted interpretation of the Government's policy, assuring Wyse that the arrears measure would not be used, that instead 'John Bull' would bear the burden, that 'the would be 'totally abolished' and replaced with 'a low rate of land tax' on occupiers, and that a post-Reform Parliament would be asked to reduce the Church 'to the wants of the people' and apply the surplus revenues to secular purposes. He had no doubt whatever that a reformed Parliament would 'deal sweepingly

with the whole concern'. Wyse 'told him we could never be satisfied unless we had good grounds for being convinced that these were the intentions of Government', and he complained of the choice of witnesses to the Tithe Committees and the production of the report 'before half the evidence was gone through'. But he found that the radical Joseph Hume, like Durham, urged patience and noted that O'Connell had 'kept clear of the House too whilst the Report was in agitation and particularly requested me "to keep back all my petitions from Tipperary"²²'. Wyse's comments to his brother in the following weeks show that he was quite mollified, confident as he was that after the Reformed Parliament met the Government would dismantle the Establishment and redistribute its revenue. Thus 'another Catholic question is acceded without a blow ... If this be done, Dr. Doyle says all will be right, but nothing less will content'. Wyse described the Commons Tithe Committee as 'a Coroner's inquest'²³ on the Church.

The Government's proposal to enforce the collection of arrears brought the Irish liberals into vigorous action. At a series of meetings early in March they resolved to oppose the Report and arranged their 'parts' for the assault in the House.²⁴ Wyse noted, 'Sheil talks furiously ... Stanley has deceived us so dreadfully ... None of us will hold back and I suppose the field will be left to us alone'²⁵. Indeed the Government plan won the approval of a large meeting of the English members on the 8th of March.²⁶ In the subsequent debates half-a-dozen repealers and more than twice that number of liberal-unionists took part in the first significant radical revolt against the Whig Government's handling of the Irish Church question. Several of the British Whig leaders were annoyed by this 'insurrection' of the 'stout little phalanx' of Irish members, though while Littleton and Grey felt that the Irish members were sincerely angry and determined 'to strip the Church and screw up their own rents in proportion', Stanley and Holland thought that the majority 'did not mean mischief' by their revolt and that 'they were obliged, as

they owed, to speak with the fear of the Hustings before their eyes'. Holland noted that Cloncurry and 'our most paddified friends such as Duncannon, Ebrington, etc' were still satisfied.²⁷

James Grattan also noted after the first protest that the Irish members 'behaved ill' and 'did not get much credit for their conduct', but 'were right in principle'.²⁸ In debate the Irish liberals objected strongly that, with the Committees still taking evidence, the conclusions of the Report were arrived at prematurely. Most agreed that the clergy required assistance, though some members objected even to this proposal. But the principal thrust of their argument was a protest against the proposal of 'coercion' without first offering relief from the 'vexatious and oppressive' burden of tithes. Such coercion, they claimed, was unjust and would not succeed in securing the arrears or in reconciling the people to either the Church or its new tithe-proctor, the Government.

As for the form of relief demanded, Brownlow, Howard, Ruthven, Sheil and the Grattans wanted 'radical change in the whole Church system' involving redistribution of revenues between the opulent sinecurists and the poorly-paid 'working clergy'. A significant number - Lambert, Jephson, Brownlow, James Grattan, Musgrave, Dominick Browne, Chapman (liberal-unionists), Sheil, O'Connor and Ruthven (repealers) - rejected any alteration of tithe in name only or simple transfer of the burden to the Irish landlords. They advocated appropriation of a part of Church income, leaving the clergy an amount compatible with 'the simplicity of a Christian Church' and with the number of Episcopalians in Ireland. Jephson claimed that the riches of the Church 'had eaten into its heart, and all but destroyed its powers of vitality'. Most of these appropriators wished to give some of the Church revenues to support the poor, though Jephson and Dominick Browne put a priority on sharing these revenues with the Catholic and Presbyterian clergy. 22 Irish liberals voted for Ruthven's motion for reduction of the Church Establishment and sharing of its revenues with the poor.

In the first division on the Government's proposals, 28 of the 32 rebels were Irish, the majority of them unionists. However, this was the height of their success, at least in terms of numbers. In debate, Carew argued that the clergy must be relieved in the manner proposed, as the sum should not be taken out of the pockets of the English taxpayers. Callaghan joined the opposition late in the day after supporting the Government in the belief that they would not press their 'coercion' (arrears) bill in advance of the promised remedial measure. Jephson deserted his colleagues on the crucial arrears issue because he 'thought it was absolutely necessary for the safety of all that the Government should be enabled to enforce the law'. Dominick and John Browne and Ralph Howard of Wicklow took the same line and More O'Ferrall later admitted voting for the advance to the clergy to alleviate their distress. The Irish office-holders, Rice, Duncannon and Crampton naturally supported the Government. All of these members, apart from Callaghan, were liberal-²⁹ unionists.

Stanley, who was clearly much less 'furious' about their protest than Wyse believed, noted that even in the first division, which saw the largest revolt, '13 or 14' Irish liberals voted with the Government. He subsequently wrote, that, though still obstructive, the disclosure of the detailed provisions of the arrears bill 'has much mitigated the hostility of some of the Irish Members'.³⁰ In April, James Grattan lamented that while in advance of the debate he had 'urged consideration & caution in proceeding', though fully sharing in the feelings of those who advocated a more aggressive posture, the 'most violent' beforehand - Parnell, Brownlow and Jephson - had since then either deserted the cause or failed to attend.³¹ O'Connell was absent throughout the protracted struggle but felt no compunction about denigrating those in Parliament who 'deserted' the opposition to the Government's proposals.³² On the other hand, Wyse subsequently wrote, referring to these debates, of 'I who have been at the head of the whole .. and O'Connell who did nothing

and ³³ ~~worse~~. Wyse felt at this time that tithe had been 'virtually extinguished'. Parliament can do little more than ratify the decision of the country... They would not precede and they must follow'. Church reform would also come: 'Churches must have Pastors and Pastors must have ³⁴ Churches'.

Less optimistically, the Whig Lord Rossmore wrote that so vigorous was the opposition to tithe he feared 'that the Church will swamp us all ³⁵ yet'. Also at this time, Carew of Wexford, one of those who had supported the Government, privately urged Grey and Stanley to replace tithe with a new Land Tax and avoid 'patching up the old system by compulsory ³⁶ composition'. He suggested that the new tax should be levied equitably, with the South no longer taxed more heavily than the North, and that 20% should be deducted from clerical incomes as an equivalent for their greater security. But to make the new tax palatable and prevent resistance they must go on to reform and reduce the Church Establishment, that is, make 'the present overgrown Church Establishment not more than commensurate with the wants of the Protestant population'.

The number of Bishops, he felt, should be reduced from 22 to 10 at most, that is, two Archbishops and one or two Bishops for each of the four provinces; sinecures should be reduced and the 'working clergy' better paid.

'This Reform, with a better management of the Church Property, would leave a large surplus which might be appropriated to support the sick & impotent & to pay the Catholic Clergy. This last should be done under any circumstance. There is but one other plan, to reduce the present assessment very largely, so as to induce landlords to run the risque & (at least temporary) unpopularity (of undertaking the tithe and passing the charge onto their tenants). The former would be preferred, which proves that the landlords do not want to extinguish the assessment but to render the appropriation more equitable'. ³⁷

A few months later, though still anxious that the Government should 'recognize prospectively reform & reduction in the Church Establishment & a better appropriation of the surplus', he urged Stanley to ensure that the Government forces were not defeated in their effort to collect the arrears; 'defeat now would involve every thing else with Tithe. You

must make the laws obeyed, but you must alter them'.³⁸

The Lord Lieutenant, Anglesey, also pressed for a sweeping reform of the Church.³⁹ And he despaired of the prospects of being able to enforce collection under the new Law: 'Thousands will go to Jail, but no one will pay Tithe'.⁴⁰ But Grey and Melbourne (Home Secretary) felt they could not 'suffer all rights of property to be trodden under foot and the authority of the Law set at defiance'. And ^{Grey} was aware of the need to propose measures which would be passed in Parliament.⁴¹

In May 1832, Stanley unveiled his 'remedial measure' to the Select Committee on Tithes. He proposed to surmount the difficulty of collection by charging the tithe on the land-holders immediately above the yearly tenants, and at the expiry of the leases of such landholders on their lessors, and so on up the chain to the head landlord. The emburdened party could add the charge to the rent of his tenant. Any landholder voluntarily taking on the tithe charge would receive an abatement of 15%. Comutation of the tithe into landed property was the ultimate object. James Grattan and Carew felt there was 'much good' in the plan. But the repealer Walker 'denounced it as infamous, oppressive and offensively favourable to the Church Establishment'.⁴²

Carew was, in fact, less satisfied than he affected to be; he wrote to Stanley, regarding the Report, that he was 'sorry to say there is much of which I cannot approve, & when I say so I fear others will be much more unmanageable ... The whole tenor is too favourable to the Clergy, who will receive from the State their whole income minus only 15 per cent...'⁴³ And in spite of his first favourable impressions, James Grattan, with sporadic assistance from Leader, opposed the report in the Select Committee. He urged a 'revision & reduction' of the level of the composited tithe, 'with little success'. He moved that the Government should collect the tithe and felt that the abatement of 15% was not enough to compensate landlords for the task. In general, he thought the plan would 'only suit for the present' and 'would not satisfy any party'.⁴⁴

Wyse was clearly angry that there was 'not a word about appropriation, but what the Conservatives longed for', the compulsory composition. 'The opposition will be strong .. we shall give vigorous battle'. He was further annoyed upon learning that Lord Lansdowne had advised Spring Rice on how to evade liability for the tithes on his estate, 'a cunning trick for a Minister! But this will not be tolerated .. The people are in full organization and know how to use with effect their strength...'⁴⁵

Wyse was confident that Stanley would not be able to carry his proposals that session against the 'determined' opposition of the Irish liberals and he felt still that an extensive Church reform was 'certain'⁴⁶ in the next session. From the end of June, the Irish liberals opposed Stanley's second bill as fiercely as they had the arrears measure. Showing a considerable tenderness for the interests of Irish landlords, they claimed it was 'an injustice' to transfer liability to the landlords, who would fairly resent the burden itself and being effectively 'degraded into tithe proctors'. And as the bill did not extinguish tithes 'in substance', the tenants would continue to resist. In fact, the 'amalgamating tithes with the rent' would, they said, merely encourage the non-payment of rents and generally disrupt relations between landlord and tenant.

The Irish agreed that the Protestant clergy should be supported out of a general property tax, a tax less heavy and unequally distributed than the proposed charge. The Establishment should be reduced according to the number and needs of the laity and the surplus applied to church-building and secular purposes like Education and Poor Relief. The Whig office-holder, Lord Duncannon approved this plan and persuaded Wyse to press it on the Government. The Irish members also 'denounced' the Bill at private meetings with English Whigs, to no avail. James Grattan felt the Government, though 'infatuated', would be forced to give away; but Ministers were convinced of the 'unreasonableness' of the Irish and pressed on with the measure.⁴⁷⁴⁸

Wyse became increasingly frustrated. He considered the principal debate 'a very triumphant one as to reasoning for us .. though our numbers few'. But O'Connell 'was literally pulled into it and did not vote for the resolutions though he drew the greater part up himself.' Explain that'⁴⁹. (These resolutions outlined the above settlement). And O'Connell, according to Wyse, was so much frightened by the cholera outbreak in London he fled leaving 'Tithes in the lurch and us to fight it out'. Others also left. 'The post is surrendered and it (tithe) will come on the landlords, at least as far as an Act of Parliament can do it'. The English Members and Ministers refused to listen; Stanley had 'no sort of comprehensive view on the subject ... The fact is, Government do not know what they are doing or what to do. I hold it from authority unquestionable. If earlier in the session, and our members stood to their posts, we could have foiled them...The Bill will pass here, but the people have yet to ratify it'⁵⁰.

Only two independent Irish Liberals, the Whigs Belfast and Dominick Browne, supported the Government in debate, and even Browne called for the reduction of the 'monstrous nuisance', the Church, according to the number of its adherents and protested against the injustice of requiring Catholics to support a church from which they received no benefit. In the principal division, Dominick Browne, Ferguson, George Ponsonby and the Irish Whig office-holders supported the Government; 28 Irish Liberals voted against, the majority of them liberal-unionists. In a subsequent division, 17 Irish liberals voted for an amendment involving appropriation of surplus Church revenues.⁵¹

The measure duly passed. Anglesey was far from satisfied that the Bill would suffice. He warned that the Government must cease to rely on 'the bayonet' with regard to tithe. They had accomplished only 'the most offensive part of the Tithe arrangements, without any of the healing measures which ought to have accompanied it ..' They should, he urged, effect 'the total abolition of tithes' by means of his measure to

improve the administration of episcopal lands, reduce the number of bishops, dignitaries and inferior clergymen to 'a reasonable number', and appropriate surplus revenue to meet 'the exigencies of the State.' He pressed Holland to 'force the timid of the Cabinet' to overrule 'Stanley's support of the Church Establishment as it is', for 'to attempt to keep peace in Ireland whilst Stanley's Church prejudices are acted upon is utterly hopeless'. Replying to one of these epistles, Grey agreed on the need to reform the Church, but balked at the likely 'clamour' against appropriation.⁵²

The Irish Whigs Parnell and Duncannon were similarly frustrated with a policy which had 'turned the (Irish) nation into something little short of Civil War to procure the Protestant Establishment which their (the Government's) measures are duly destroying'. According to Duncannon in October,

'The opposition to tithe is almost general .. Tithes never can be collected again and the only thing is to prevent the amount falling into the hands of the landlords, who have encouraged the present state of things for their own individual profit. The Tax must be collected by the State, the present incumbents provided for during their lives and then after a general and thorough Reform of the Irish Church from Top to Bottom, a new appropriation must be made of the Tax raised'. 53

The tensions within the Government came to a head after Stanley revealed his Church reform plan to the Cabinet on the 19th of October 1832. The plan involved abolition of vestry cess (a tax levied on persons of all creeds principally for the building and repair of Protestant Church property), taxation on a graduated scale of clerical incomes over £200, and abolition of six bishoprics and of sinecure dignities; the revenues thus saved were to be devoted to the repair and building of churches, the erection of glebe houses for the clergy, augmentation of smaller livings and other purposes 'connected with the support of the Established Church'. Various other reforms - the more effectual prevention of pluralities and dissolution of Unions, enforcement of residence, a better provision for curates - were also proposed. The appropriation principle was admitted only in the provision that tenants should be allowed to buy perpetual leases

on episcopal land with any surplus thus created left at the disposal of Parliament and 'applicable to any purpose, unconnected with the Church'. This 'appropriation clause' involved a 'surplus' created by Act of Parliament and did not involve any diminution of the Church's revenues. ⁵⁴

Lord Durham objected 'that the plan did not apply any remedy to the evil, which was an amount of Church revenue disproportioned to the numbers of the Protestants, that it only stuffed the saddle more equally, but did not take off the weight. In short, that it was only a different distribution of the same sum, that such a plan could never be final'. Russell and Althorp agreed, and advocated the abolition of sinecure parishes and the appropriation of surplus Church revenue to secular purposes. But Grey replied that the plan was all they could hope to carry and that ministerial resignations on the question would bring down the Government. With Durham isolated, the Cabinet authorized Stanley to prepare his Bill, though they did not commit themselves against the principle of appropriation. Holland and Grey urged on Anglesey, with some success, the impracticability of more radical reform. ⁵⁵

In the ensuing months Russell and Durham expressed their lack of faith in the plan and continuing commitment to appropriation. Ellice, Ebrington and Duncannon thought appropriation inevitable, but Grey continued to believe that opinion in England would reject such a measure. In December and January Anglesey warned that the measure 'as it stands and if not greatly enlarged, will not do'. The liberal-unionist members More O'Ferrall and Newport urged on the Government 'the necessity of an immediate & very extensive Church Reform'. In addition, the Duke of Leinster and Sir Henry Parnell complained about the Government's policy on tithes, Parnell blaming their measures for the rapid advance of the Repeal agitation and the 'jeopardy' into which the connection between Britain and Ireland had been thrown. ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸

The Irish Tories gave the Church their vigorous support in resisting the assaults detailed above. This fact requires some explanation. After

all, tithe was to some extent a deduction from the rent rolls of Irish landlords; and many of the Tory gentry had themselves, as lessees, to pay tithes. The opponents of the Church constantly claimed that tithe was disliked or resisted by Presbyterians and Protestants as well as Catholics. One of the most notable events in the history of resistance to tithe was the resolution of the Protestant Irish Parliament in 1735 which removed tithe from pasture; this 'exempted most of the great landlords from the obligation to support the church' and 'virtually halved the income of the clergy'. Even in the 1820's landlords, unhappy with the deduction from rents and the unrest caused by tithe among the peasantry, were often found to be hostile to the Church.

On the other hand about £120,000 a year, a fifth of all tithe revenue, was held by lay tithe owners. Much of the ecclesiastical patronage was distributed by the landowners. A number of developments eroded antagonism and contributed to the alliance of the 1830's, when time and again the Irish Tories in Parliament put clerical interests before the immediate benefit of the landed proprietary. The much-resented domination of the Irish Church by English clerics was diminished substantially from 1800 and the Irish Church became more closely identified in terms of personnel with the gentry and aristocracy of Ireland. Many of the leading Irish Tories of the 1830's had close relatives in the Church. The Church and the Union were to some extent bound together by the declaration in the Act of Union that the Irish and English Churches were one body, and the Union strengthened the claims of Protestantism to be the Established Church as Protestants were in a majority in the newly united state.

The growth of Catholic radicalism was a unifying factor, particularly as it then became more difficult to see depression of the Church as not involving elevation of Catholicism. The debates on Reform early in the 1830's saw much stress laid by Conservatives on the inviolable nature of all the ancient institutions, invigorating the Burkean idea that such

institutions as Church and aristocracy were both integral parts of the social organism. The evangelical revival in the early years of the 19th century undoubtedly did much to consolidate and sanctify the bond. Roden, Bandon, Lefroy, Farnham, Henry Maxwell, Mountcashell, Perceval, Bateson, De Vesoi, Caledon, Lorton and many other Irish Tories were greatly influenced by this revival and fired by it to an intense devotion to the Church. For all these reasons the spoliators of 1735 were ready by the 1830's to defend Church privilege and property as if they were indivisible from the privilege and property of their social class.

During 1831 and 1832 the Irish Tories in Parliament vigorously defended the Church as the Tithe War brought its clergy to 'the verge of ruin' and liberal members demanded conciliation of the grievances of tithe-payers. They warned that the 'conspiracy' against Irish Church property would be followed by a similar movement in England and the subversion of the Union and of all property. Tithe was depicted as a species of property and the clergy's right to it defended as a property right. It was asserted that the (predominantly Protestant) landlords, not the Catholic peasantry, actually paid the tithe and that abolition would benefit only the landlords. The Protestant clergy were lauded as the most 'laborious, pious and zealous' churchmen in 'any country in the world' ; it was pointed out that they did not demand the full amount of tithe; and the 'great distress' to which many had been brought by the non-payment of tithe was presented as a pressing grievance.

The Government were urged to use 'a strong hand' in putting down resistance to tithe, which their 'weak and vacillating conduct' in that respect had encouraged. When in June 1831, the Protestant Yeomanry of Co. Wexford killed 12 people in an affray over tithe, the Irish Tories were stout in defence of the Yeomanry and the responsible magistrates. Westmeath, Wicklow, Shaw and Carbery advocated legislation to compel composition, as the clergy demanded.⁶⁴ By the end of 1831, Primate Beresford was greatly alarmed at the position of the Church, with much

of its income withheld, radical opponents maintaining a constant stream of denunciation, and the Government far from sympathetic. He feared disestablishment of the Church and perhaps even the elevation of the Catholic Church as the new Establishment. He wanted the tithe burden thrown upon the landlords and the composition made compulsory, and 'a firmer hand' taken with tithe defaulters. Instead, he complained, the Government had failed to act strongly against the defaulters and contemplated reforms which would involve 'large sacrifices on the part of the clergy'. Such a conciliatory policy was 'very questionable, when it is manifest that nothing less than entire confiscation will satisfy the enemies of the Church'.⁶⁵

The Irish Tories continued their defence of the Church into the following year. They warmly welcomed the Government's determination to relieve the distressed clergy and enforce the collection of arrears, though Wicklow was angry that the arrears measure would not extend to the arrears of 1830 and he, Lefroy and seven other Irish Tories protested that a Government amendment on costs would be 'unjust' to the clergy and unnecessarily lenient to tithe defaulters.

According to the radical Walker, the clergy sent a deputation to Stanley 'to say they disapproved' of the arrears bill,

'that if it passed none of them would apply under it, that all their tithes would be swallowed up by the costs and they themselves marked out for murder, that they would rather run (the) chance of the voluntary contributions of their Catholic parishioners. Stanley got in a rage, told them they might all be damned, why could not they tell him this before? The bill is given up to please the clergy, which was refused to be done for us and eight millions of people'.⁶⁶

A deputation of Irish clergymen certainly did approach Stanley to complain that they would 'sustain a heavy loss' if the arrears of 1830 were not included under the bill and Primate Beresford subsequently expressed his concurrence in the complaint.⁶⁷

In the Tithe Committee Peel, who felt that tithe was held on 'as sacred a title' as any other species of property, had approved, indeed urged, the arrears collection measure but objected to the pledge to

effect the 'extinction' of tithe. In Parliament, Shaw, Anthony Lefroy, Perceval, Dawson and Wicklow expressed alarm at the 'injudicious' use of such a term; it would excite Protestant fears and Catholic hopes that would not be realized; but almost all of these members, and Lefroy and Conolly, recognized that clerical incomes should be re-ordered to render it 'more secure and less obnoxious'. Dawson and Wicklow advocated commutation of tithe into land, as the most secure basis of revenue. Conolly had no objection, as a landlord, to being made to bear the tithe, so long as the landlord had 'the same powers for collecting the tithes that he had for collecting his rent', but Dawson, A. Lefroy and Wicklow all feared that the landlords would prove as reluctant to pay the tithe as the tenants and more formidable in their resistance.

The Earl of Caledon, the only Irish Tory layman on the Lords Committee, defended the Report in debate. One Irish Tory, Lord Lorton, signed a Protest to the effect that no sufficient security was given that an adequate substitute would be provided upon the promised extinction of tithe. Shaw, Lefroy and Conolly were adamant that there should be no appropriation of Church revenue to secular purposes. They denied Parliament's right to interfere to that end. In a division on the 27th of March no Irish Tory voted for Ruthven's appropriation amendment.⁶⁹

In April 1832, Stanley, convinced there was 'no very great difference' in their views on tithes and that this was 'far too serious for a party question', revealed to Peel his intended tithe measure. Peel acknowledged that 'the principle' of the proposal was 'a just one', though he was concerned that the landlords might withhold the payment due to the clergy.⁷⁰ In the Select Committee, Peel was joined by Goulburn and the Irish Tory Lefroy in making a 'fight for the Church' when the measure was discussed.⁷¹ In Parliament, Lefroy, Shaw, Wicklow and Brydges welcomed the proposals as likely 'to allay disturbance in Ireland and to give satisfaction both to the clergy and laity'. Shaw hoped the proposed transfer of the liability for tithe would finally make it clear to the

peasantry that it was really the landlord who had always paid the tithe.

In July, Lefroy again attacked the idea of appropriation as a denial of 'the rights of property' and the benefits of religion, though he was not averse to a 'modification of the property of the Irish Church among the members of the Church itself'. Westmeath felt that Stanley's tithe bill would not prove an adequate remedy and regretted that the Government had not proceeded immediately with their intention to have tithes commuted into land. But only Dawson of the Irish Tories condemned the bill outright; he described it as an 'unfair' attempt to make landlords into 'tithe-proctors', without bringing relief to the tenantry or prospect of a more secure revenue to the clergy. He was probably, as Crampton suggested in the House, already courting the constituency of Londonderry, for which he was soon to stand on a distinctly (and cynically) liberal platform. Peel, according to Greville and Wyse, 'was furious with Dawson and got up in order to throw him over' by offering his 'cordial support' for the measure. In the principal division on the bill Dawson abstained but over a dozen Irish Tories supported the Government and none opposed.

Throughout the debates of 1831 and 1832, the Irish Tories (including Dawson) produced a vigorous defence of the Church, based mainly on the sanctity of property and the merits of the Protestant clergy. They advocated and supported reform of the tithe system in order to secure the rights of the Church, and even Lefroy accepted the need for Church reform. Russell said to Greville of the Irish Protestants that,

'the Lefroys, etc.. began to admit the necessity of a change, but by no means would consent to the alienation of Church property from Protestant uses; that they were willing where there was a large parish consisting entirely of Catholics that the tithes should be taken from the rector of such parish and given to one who had a large Protestant flock - an arrangement which would disgust the Catholics as much or more than any other, and be considered a perfect mockery'. 74

Primate Beresford, too, was unwilling to countenance any 'scheme of spoliation which may hold out a precarious hope of tranquillity'. In negotiations with Stanley from the Autumn of 1832 he described appropriation as detrimental to the efficiency of the Church and 'a

precedent of evil omen to the security of all vested property'. He feared that even a commutation of tithe into land would merely facilitate 'spoliation' by breaking the link between individual clergymen and their property. However, faced with a 'choice of evils', he was induced to acquiesce in a reduction of the number of bishoprics, legislation on non-residence, pluralism and unjustifiable unions, the augmentation of smaller livings, the tax on clerical incomes and abolition of vestry cess. He protested only at the sale of perpetual leases in see lands and alienation of the surplus, and at the belated proposal to suspend the non-cure parishes. Several of the Government's proposals were objected to by Churchmen in whom Beresford confided, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Mant of Down considering abolition of even such an anomaly as vestry cess 'an avowal that the Protestant Episcopal Church is no longer, to a certain extent at least, to be regarded as the Established National Church of Ireland'. Both were prepared, however, to accept a
75
diminution in the number of Bishops.

Several of the liberal-unionist candidates in the General Election of 1832 pledged themselves to support the reform or 'utter extinction' of
76
tithe and reform of the Church. One liberal-unionist complained that the Waterford repealers had an anti-tithe meeting at Dungarvan adjourned indefinitely because they were 'literally apprehensive that the moderate party might gain perchance an accession of strength by the announcement of their readiness to co-operate with the people in removing a substantial
77
grievance.' Dominick Browne recognised that his acceptance of the tithe composition bill had made him unpopular, and the Evening Post, after the Election, blamed Stanley's arrears bill for the loss of thirty seats by
78
the supporters of the Government. At the beginning of 1833, the liberal-unionist William Smith O'Brien produced a pamphlet in which he described the anomalous position of the Church, sustained as it was on a prodigious scale by non-Protestants for the religious instruction of a small minority of the people. The Government's policy had been 'an alternate series of

delusive professions and inconsistent severity', the arrears measure having been enforced with great severity and little success and at a cost of the popularity of the Government and their supporters, while the 'remedial measure', far from fulfilling the 'extinction' promise, involved no real change.

O'Brien proposed the abolition of vestry cess, but he felt that to abolish tithe completely would merely benefit the landlord, who would raise rents accordingly; instead the appropriation of Church income must be changed. He would reduce the number of Protestant clergy generally, and the number of bishops in particular, from 22 to 4, and pay the Protestant clergy on a modest scale according to their duties and needs. Such reforms would leave a surplus Church income of about £1/2 million, which should be devoted to purposes beneficial to Protestants and non-Protestants alike - relief of the poor, support of schools, colleges, hospitals, public works, etc.. In place of tithe, the High Constables should levy taxes in each county for the support of the clergy of all three major denominations.

O'Brien subsequently pressed his ideas on Stanley in a private letter, and warned the Chief Secretary that 'if a compromise is not made in the present session between the Protestant clergy and the Irish nation it will next year be too late', for 'the gentry' would be driven into the ranks of Repeal 'and a separation or a civil war will probably be the alternative'. A couple of days later another liberal-unionist, Henry Villiers Stuart, praised O'Brien's pamphlet for its demonstration of 'the abuses' of the Established Church and agreed on 'the pressing necessity that exists for an immediate and radical reform'. Also at this time the Irish Whig office-holder, Spring Rice, addressing an English Churchman, hoped that the Government's proposed Temporalities Bill would 'appear safe as well as efficient' and that members of the Church of England would not oppose it out of apprehension of similar treatment for their Church:

'I am as little inclined to overthrow Establishments in the one case as in the other - but that any man should say that the cases of the two branches of the Church are identical augurs a want of power of dealing with forms & quantity which ..I cannot for the life of me understand. To defend York and Canterbury the battle ought to be fought in a better position than in Connemara'. 82

The early weeks of the session of 1833 saw a continuation of Irish liberal demands for substantial reform of the Church and its finances during the debates on the question of coercion in Ireland, several repealers arguing that as tithes were a principal cause of disorder in Ireland measures to remedy that grievance were the only effective and just means to restore tranquillity. James Grattan privately approved of O'Connell's attack on the tithe system and described Stanley and Peel as 'our enemies' after the latter's defence of the Church. Even the Whig coercionist Emerson Tennent spoke of 'the vicious system of tithes' and wanted 'the thorough reform of the abuses of the Church'. 83

On the 12th of February Althorp described the Temporalities bill, substantially Stanley's plan except that four more bishoprics, making ten, were to be abolished and deceased clergymen might not be replaced where no service had been performed for three years. The latter provision had been earnestly pressed upon Stanley in January by Duncannon. 84 James Grattan noted that, following Althorp, 'O'Connell expressed much satisfaction at the bill. So did other Catholics privately. Lambert, O'Ferrall, &c. They all seemed more or less well pleased'. Grattan himself felt that the 'groundwork is good & it is a handsome beginning. Fewer bishops would have done'. As for the Ministers, the bill would 'set them up & lower the Tories, who evidently calculated on a plan which would not satisfy'. 85 Hobhouse, Anglesey and Grey also noted the 'acclamation' with which the bill was met. Sheil privately told Hobhouse that the plan was 'admirable' and the Whig Sir John Newport wrote of his satisfaction. 86 O'Connell was joined in welcoming the bill in Parliament by the repealers Barron and Ruthven and the liberal-unionists O'Reilly and Keane, the latter expressing 'his unmixed delight and unfeigned gratitude'. 87

O'Connell privately wrote that the bill was 'good for a beginning' only, establishing 'valuable principles' with respect to Parliament's right to reduce and manage Church property, but 'very short (sic) of what it ought to be in point of extinction of burden'. Sheil and Feargus O'Connor were said to be unhappy with O'Connell's welcome for a plan which would not suffice, said O'Connor, 'while there is to be a rixence paid in any way for tythe'.⁸⁸ Subsequently O'Connell again praised the measure; but he and other repealers made it clear that the tithe grievance remained, and demanded a more extensive reduction and appropriation of Church property, inducing Stanley to remark that he was 'trying hard to get out of his approbation' of the bill. From Ireland the liberal-unionist Thomas Wynn, temporarily out of Parliament, wrote,

'Lord Althorp's Church Reform as far as it goes is .. good & offers a fair opening for future improvements. I should have liked however that, as in the case of State Reform, the Ministers had been bold enough to make those improvements now. There are still too many Bishoprics & the Bishoprics are too rich ... The Establishment should be made to fit the Church. Hesitating on such matters is not prudence. It is the wisdom only of the procrastinator. It leaves a Church Question behind & perpetuates a race of agitators ... (And the tithe question must immediately be) settled, and when I say settled I mean not to the satisfaction merely of the Ministers but of the People. "Extinction" must be made a reality. The propositions of the Irish members last session offered a fair basis & would have satisfied the great majority of all parties'.⁸⁹

In March 1833, a succession of repeal members kept up a constant attack on the tithe system, and on the Whig measures for its enforcement, and demanded abolition of tithe and appropriation to other purposes of Church revenues. The liberal-unionist coercionists Lambert, Duncannon and Carey stressed that the coercion bill 'should be unconnected with the levying of tithe'. James Grattan urged that the tithe system should be 'extinguished' and on the 13th of March he joined the repealers in arguing that the coercion bill was designed to enforce collection of tithe. The failure of the Ministers to give 'a plain negative' to this charge induced Lambert to conclude that this was indeed 'the real object' of the coercion bill. James Grattan privately noted that

'Stanley did not answer me about Tythe & in fact it is a Tythe Bill'.

On the 18th of March, Lambert moved an amendment to the coercion bill to prevent its use in collecting tithes. He and James Talbot (also a liberal-unionist) said they had supported the coercion bill only under the impression that it would not be so used. Althorp agreed to that part of the amendment which forbade proclamation of a district merely because of resistance to tithe, a safeguard which O'Connell, Sheil and James Grattan felt would be 'perfectly useless'. The amendment was passed in the form approved by Althorp. O'Connell, convinced of its inutility, subsequently led six other repealers and two liberal-unionists in voting (unsuccessfully) for omission of the amendment. But most of the Irish liberals supported it as a necessary safeguard. Lambert said the amendment allowed him to support the coercion bill and stated that he 'wished the Establishment to be properly supported, but not by the unjust, the iniquitous ⁹⁰ tithe system'.

James Grattan in his journal described Lambert's amendment as 'idle' and 'futile', and O'Connell explained its 'foolish' and delusive nature to Fitzpatrick. ⁹¹ The final Irish liberal comment on the Church question during the long coercion debates came from the Whiggish Dominic Browne of Mayo. Though driven by 'indispensable necessity' to support the coercion bill he felt that peace in Ireland could be secured only by remedying 'two great and prominent grievances ... One was the existence of a Church Establishment for a small minority, and the other was the non-existence of an establishment for the great majority of the population of Ireland'. ⁹²

In spite, however, of the efforts of Lambert, Browne and other liberal-unionists, it was the repealers who took the principal part in presenting the Church/tithe grievance during the early part of the session. No Irish liberal spoke on the second reading of the Temporalities bill, though, equally, none voted with the Tory opposition. According to James Grattan, 'O'Connell & sons never appeared at all'. On the motion

to go into Committee, Fitzstephen French, the liberal-unionist member for Roscommon, supported the 'substance and principle' of the bill, in particular the redistribution of clerical incomes and abolition of vestry cess; he protested only that the intention to convert the tenants of episcopal lands into permanent leaseholders would in practice injure the tenants, a complaint which the Whig Lord Oxmantown also voiced on a later occasion. O'Connell said he no longer approved of the bill because it allow^{ed} vestiges of the vestry cess to remain and did not extinguish tithe. He was grateful only for the bill's (tentative) adoption of the appropriation principle, which 'might lead to ulterior and highly important consequences'. He did not, however, join the six repealers who supported a motion greatly to widen the scope of the appropriation. No liberal-unionist voted for this motion, James Grattan⁹³ deliberately abstaining.

In May - June Lambert led a number of Irish liberals in protesting bitterly, privately and in Parliament, that the coercion act had been used to collect tithe and that the Government had reneged on Althorp's pledge, made in Parliament in March, that they would no longer levy the arrears of tithe. Lambert and other liberal-unionists were particularly upset because they had voted for the coercion bill on receipt of Government pledges on these questions. The Government, he informed Wyse, were 'playing the old game of insulting their friends and oringing to their enemies'. The failure to 'extinguish' tithe as promised increased discontent. On the 12th of June, Lambert pressed the collection question to a division, winning support from nine other liberal-unionists⁹⁴ and 27 repealers. Though well beaten, O'Connell considered the episode⁹⁵ the 'first step' towards carrying Repeal. James Grattan voted for the⁹⁶ motion and noted that, 'The case was not denied'. Lambert and other Irish liberal members continued privately to complain to Littleton and the latter was induced to try to restrict the use of police in tithe collection.⁹⁷

The arrears measure of 1832 raised only £12,316 at a cost of
 98
 £26,000. Anglesey called it 'perhaps the most pernicious, unhappy
 measure that ever was adopted .. a total failure', and a boon to the
 99
 agitators. This failure and the desire to avoid further collision, and
 Althorp's pledge that the arrears would no longer be levied, induced the
 Government to propose a loan to the clergy, repayable out of a temporary
 Land Tax, in return for which the arrears of 1831 and 1832 and the tithe
 of 1833 would be given up. In Parliament, O'Ferrall and the repealers
 Barron, Macnamara, O'Connor and O'Connell welcomed the plan, the latter
 considering it 'a virtual extinction of tithes in Ireland'. But a number
 of liberal members, including 14 repealers and 3 liberal-unionists
 (Chapman, Talbot and Wallace), dissented on the grounds that it would
 merely continue tithe in another form. Littleton reported to Anglesey that,

'the Irish Landlords showed themselves up .. in colours that could
 not be mistaken. Althorp, in his statement, led them, unintentionally,
 to imagine the Tenant or Occupier, was to pay the Land Tax. The
 satisfaction of the Irish Members was universal. I thought it right to
 let them know the truth, and told them the immediate landlord was to pay
 it. The uproar was immediately as universal as their previous satisfaction..'

Several speakers, Talbot included, objected to the scheme because
 it would tax Irish landlords or turn them into tithe proctors. Chapman
 and Talbot said that Catholics would still 'have a just right to complain'
 at being taxed for the support of another Church; Talbot felt that any
 land tax should be 'appropriated to national purposes' and that the lands
 of the Church would be 'more than sufficient' for its support. Dominic
 Browne objected to appropriation for temporal objects, but proposed 'that
 at least one-half of the ecclesiastical property in the country should be
 devoted to Roman Catholic purposes', and he was 'sorry to see that no
 Catholic Member came forward to claim the rights which his Church
 100
 distinctly possessed'.

A few days later, the Cabinet discussed 'the great probability as
 well as obvious and fearful consequences of a defeat of the Irish Church
 bill on 2nd reading in the Lords', one of the consequences being, as a

result of their pledge to 'stand or fall' by the bill, that they would probably have to go out. Russell, Duncannon and others advocated 'striking out the most obnoxious parts of the bill' to meet the Lords' likely objections, and Graham, Stanley and Grey subsequently decided, 'without consulting their colleagues', that the 'appropriation clause' should be abandoned. When Stanley announced the amendment on the 21st of June, O'Connell made 'an angry but powerful speech' condemning the Ministers for having 'sacrificed their principles in order to keep their places ... a shameless proceeding'. He reported to Fitzpatrick that the Government had 'trucked to the Tories' and he rejoiced in the 'cruel crushing' he had given to Stanley and the Ministers. 'There was no rally against me at all and even those who voted for the Ministry admit that no man ever deserved better to be abused'.

James Grattan also noted that O'Connell was 'furious' and he himself felt that, 'It was an abandonment of principle & disgraceful to the Government. Stanley & Lushington made a bad defence'. Carey wrote to Chief Secretary Littleton to lament the decision and to urge that it should be made clear that appropriation might still be proposed by the Government at a future date. The repealers O'Connor, Baldwin and Henry Grattan also attacked the 'vacillating Ministry' in Parliament. Dominick Browne spoke of the 'disastrous' effect on opinion in Ireland. He said he would rather see the Government go out 'than that it should go forth in Ireland that the Reformed Parliament had declared that Church property was inalienable'. In the division 15 liberal-unionists and 29 repealers voted, in vain, for retention of the clause; 1 repealer and 6 of the more Whiggish liberal-unionists voted with the Government.

Both Ministers and the leaders of the Opposition regarded the episode as a severe blow to the reputation of the Government among its own supporters, even with those who remained loyal in the division. Littleton regarded it as a 'monstrous desertion of principle' by the Government. Durham wrote of the Government's 'political self degradation and imbecility'.

Anglesey explained to an unhappy Cloncurry that it was unreasonable to expect the Government to propose what they could not carry, but the affair provoked him to complain again of the failure to settle the issue the previous year.¹⁰⁹

The repeal members continued subsequently to deprecate this amendment, which they said robbed the measure of its usefulness, and to assail the abuses of the Church. The liberal-unionist More O'Ferrall complained about the surrender of 'the only valuable principle' in the bill and Dominick Browne urged the Government to bring in an appropriation measure in the next session. On the 8th of July, Sheil's proposal to have the appropriation principle asserted in the preamble of the bill was defeated in spite of support from 19 other repealers and 12 liberal-unionists. On the third reading O'Connell deprecated the loss of 'the main principle of the bill', appropriation, and described the reduction of the number of bishops as 'a gratuitous insult to the Church' which 'did not benefit the Roman Catholic population' by giving any 'relief from the burthens that oppressed them'. He and five other repealers voted against; at least one repealer (Fitzgerald of Louth) voted for the third reading.¹¹⁰ No liberal-unionist joined O'Connell. According to James Grattan he was one of 20 Irish members - presumably all or mostly liberals - who voted for the bill.¹¹¹

Though he considered the bill a 'miserable instalment', O'Connell was one of 32 Irish liberals, 13 of them unionists, who rebelled against the Government to vote for a Call of the House, a move designed to intimidate the Lords into passing the bill.¹¹² One prominent Irish Whig, Duncannon, 'rather hoped the Tories would throw out the bill' in the Lords, to open the way for reform of the upper chamber, though he was no less convinced of the need to remove the 'abominations' of the Church.¹¹³ In the Lords, the Irish Whigs warily supported the bill as a useful reform of abuses.¹¹⁴ Just as the bill was being steered through the dangerous waters of the Lords the liberal-unionist, Fitzstephen French

made his contribution to the reputation of Irish politicians for jobbing and duplicity when he complained to Littleton that the intended abolition of the Waterford bishopric was 'a great absurdity' which damaged his clergyman brother's chances of preferment. 115

Finally, towards the end of an eventful session the tithe issue again provoked both discontent and division among Irish liberals. Fifteen liberal-unionists and the moderate repealer Charles Walker signed a memorial to Lord Althorp, presented by Clements of Leitrim, on 'the increased disadvantages laid upon the Tithe payers and perpetuated by Stanley's Composition Act of 1832, which by increasing the discontent that already exists against tithes will tend to endanger, very materially, the peace of the country'. They complained that the Act tended to increase the amount of tithe demanded because it was based on tithe previously 'agreed for' but not necessarily paid. The Act's failure to make any deduction where landlords did not voluntarily undertake the tithe was an 'injustice'; landlords received no return for 'the risk and trouble which they experience'. And the bonus of 15% for voluntary assumption of the burden had proved a 'quite inadequate' inducement; 'there exists no probability that the landlords will avail themselves of it'. Carew wrote to Littleton on the 13th of July that 'the keystone to everything in Ireland is the Tithe question .. the only one I dread. 117
Settle that & O'Connell will in vain discharge the brutum fulmen of repeal.

In Parliament, a number of Irish members, including the liberal-unionists Lambert and O'Ferrall, attacked the tithe system. Lambert 'highly approved' of the 'passive resistance' to tithe in Ireland. When the Government brought on its proposal to subvent £1 million to the tithe-owners, for the arrears of 1831 and 1832 and the tithe of 1833, O'Connell 'heartily concurred', but was opposed in this by many repealers and a few liberal-unionists on the grounds that it effectively continued the tithe system. O'Connell and liberal-unionists like O'Ferrall, Perrin and Browne supported the bill under the impression that the Exchequer

would in the event foot the bill, which view Littleton privately thought
 118
 was possibly correct. A few months later, Littleton wrote to Lambert,

'I think you and your friends have not sufficiently published the fact that it was mainly to you that the country is indebted for the Church Million Act and for the comparative tranquillity it now enjoys. Had it not been for your insisting on Althorp's redeeming an incautious pledge, we might have been at work "vindicating the law" now'.¹¹⁹

The session ended with only this temporary settlement of the tithe question and the appropriation issue left in a position which most Irish liberal members thought unsatisfactory. In 1832, the liberal-unionists had played a major role in urging redress of the tithe grievance, but in the following session it was the repeal contingent, much reinforced by the General Election, which dominated that side of the argument. And, as in 1832, liberal-unionists showed a greater readiness to compromise, notably on appropriation. But many liberal-unionists, with Lambert, Dominick Browne, Chapman and James Grattan especially prominent, continued to take a radical view of the question and wholeheartedly joined with O'Connell to press the case for a reform of ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland.

Though several had recognized during the General Election of 1832-3
 120
 that there should be tithe and Church reform, the Irish Tories continued in 1833 stoutly to defend the interests of the Irish Church. Upon the introduction of the Temporalities Bill in February, Grey and Anglesey felt that the Conservatives were 'generally satisfied' and would 'cordially acquiesce in a measure which events have taught them to feel
 121
 has become essential to the security of the Church Establishment'.

James Grattan noted that in his speech Peel was 'cautious & weak &
 122
 cautioning & doubting'. But in debate the Irish Tory members assailed the 'spoliation of Church property' in a measure which was 'an unavailing sacrifice' made to 'appease' those who had infringed the law. For Conolly the question 'involved the existence of the Protestant religion, the welfare of the Church tenantry and even in some degree the integrity
 123
 of the monarchy and the permanence of connexion between the two countries'.

The Irish Tories, including Perceval and Roden, intended also to meet on the 13th of March to discuss the measure, but Peel refused to attend. ¹²⁴ In the meantime, the Irish clergy expressed their disapproval of the measure to Primate Beresford, and Bishop Elrington of Ferns, the Duke of Cumberland, Viscount Beresford and Wellington deprecated Beresford's alleged complicity in the work. The Bishop of Killala felt that Parliament had been 'moved to things which exceed the legitimate exercise of their power' by suppressing bishoprics and re-ordering and appropriating Church property. These were 'acts of despotic power'. Mant thought the clerical tax 'an act of monstrous iniquity'.

In reply to his outraged correspondents Beresford contended that the vestry cess caused great resentment and would become impossible to collect, and that the abolition of 'a few of the less important sees' was the least objectionable way to make up the loss. He claimed, however, that the abolitions went 'much beyond what I anticipated or what I can sanction', and stressed that the sale of leases and appropriation of any surplus value and the suspension of non-cure parishes had been inserted against his will. He refused to join the Archbishop of Tuam and 12 bishops in signing a petition against the bill, but he did sign a petition from his own diocese against many of its leading provisions. In all, three out of four Archbishops and 14 out of 18 bishops criticized the bill in some degree in petitions to Parliament. ¹²⁵

During April, May and June, the Irish Tory members led a strong assault on the bill in the Commons, and 19 Irish Tories voted against the second reading. According to James Grattan, Peel, who voted with his Irish supporters, was 'half friendly, chiefly objecting to appropriation of surplus' and 'only rank Tories & Orangemen' opposed the second reading. The Irish Tory speakers claimed that they were not averse to reform of the Church and approved in particular of the abolition of vestry cess, the reduction of excessively high and augmentation of low clerical incomes and the provisions against sinecures, non-residence and

pluralism. But they felt that the bill contained many objectionable features: the 'appropriation clause' was a violation of Church property going beyond the right of Parliament both in its interference with the administration of episcopal lands and above all in the appropriation to other purposes of the surplus thus derived. The reduction of the number of bishops would lessen the efficiency of the Church and, given the possibility, canvassed by the Irish Tories, of raising the same sum by reducing episcopal incomes, was a 'gratuitous insult' to the Protestants.

The inclusion of paid laymen in the Commission to administer various aspects of Church affairs was depicted as an erosion of episcopal influence and an augmentation of State patronage. The tax on clerical incomes was unjust in principle and oppressively heavy and would merely allow landlords to increase rents; instead tax the landlords directly, they urged, or at least share the burden between the clergy and the lay tithe-owners. The Irish Tories also objected to the suspension of appointments to parishes in which services had not been performed for three years; Parliament should take steps to extend Church activity in such places rather than place them 'out of the pale of the established religion'. Far-reaching implications were attributed to the measure. It tended to the 'annihilation' of the Establishment and the 'extinction' of Protestantism in Ireland and would also undermine the Union, the English part of the Church and property rights in general.

A number of amendments were conceded by the Government in response to Tory objections: the proportion of bishops on the Commission was increased, the new tax was not to be levied upon incumbent clergy and benefices rather than parishes were made subject to the provision regarding non-performance of services. The principal amendment, the abandonment of appropriation, was regarded by Shaw as 'a considerable improvement' and approved by 19 Irish Tories in the division; Coote and Bernard voted for retention of the clause. But these amendments still left much that was unacceptable; the stream of denunciation

continued unabated and Lefroy led a contingent of twelve Irish Tories in
 126
 opposing the third reading.

With Peel also voting against the third reading, there was every possibility that the Lords would throw out the bill. From February, Wellington was under pressure from the Bishop of Exeter and Roden to oppose the 'wicked' measure, but, though originally tempted, the Duke was unwilling to take any step which might result in a more radical Government and an attempt to destroy the Lords. Roden was left to plough a lone furrow when in March he protested in the Lords against the abolition of ten bishoprics and invoked the spectre of the transfer of their revenues 'to those who were anxious to support treason and
 127
 rebellion in every part of Ireland'.

On the first of July, the Duke of Cumberland called a meeting of Tory Peers to discuss the bill, when a number of them, though not the Irish Tory Carbery, avowed their determination to vote against the
 128
 second reading. On the 7th, Wellington, Primate Beresford and a few of the leading Tory Peers met to weigh Beresford's view that 'the throwing out of the Bill will be the ruin of the Irish Church', given that something must take the place of the unworkable vestry cess, against the opinion of '17 Irish Bishops' that 'its passing will be yet more injurious'. Ellenborough noted that, 'Of our friends, Wicklow is for the second reading and probably many others. Eldon and his people are violent against the second reading. A division we shall have and a split, do
 129
 what we will'.

At meetings on the 10th, 11th and 14th, Wellington, urging Beresford's opinion and anxious to avoid a collision between the two Houses and a futile attempt at a Tory Government, argued in favour of allowing the second reading, but he failed to convince 'the Ultras', including Londonderry and Roden, and the latter was chosen at a meeting at Cumberland's to move the rejection of the bill. The Irish Tory Viscount Strangford tried in vain to persuade the Ultras to act with Wellington.

Peel was as reluctant as Wellington to attempt a Tory Administration, given the political balance in the Commons and the country, and feared that rejection of the bill might end in the introduction of a more radical measure.¹³⁰

Even Thomas Lefroy felt that 'the wisest and best course' would be approval of the second reading, 'for the sake of the Church, as well as the State ...

The fact is, if we were to throw it out, the Government would resign; and as it is impossible for us to form a Government, these men must come back again and the King would be under the necessity of making peers to swamp the House of Lords and the last state of things would be worse than the first. Besides this, the Government have kept the clergy of our Church in their power by putting an end to tithe and vestry cess, and yet are determined not to give them a shilling if this Bill does not pass ... The Government have us and the Church in their power'. 131

When the debate on the second reading began on the 17th of July, the Irish Tory Lords Roden, Limerick, Londonderry, Westmeath, Carbery and Longford and several British Ultras bitterly denounced the measure in terms similar to those used by the Commons opposition. Only Wicklow of the Irish Tory Peers spoke out in favour of the bill, insisting on his continuing adherence to Tory principles but convinced that the measure, with some amendments, would both improve the state of the Church and help to restore tranquillity in Ireland. Wellington and Carbery said they would not oppose the second reading, the Duke objecting to much in the bill but hopeful that the worst parts could be amended in Committee. In the division, which was won comfortably by the Government, Wellington and eight others (including the Irish Tory Lord Dufferin) 'went away without voting', Wicklow, Caledon and twelve or thirteen British Tories voted for, and about twenty Irish Tories joined the British Ultras in opposing the reading.¹³²

In subsequent stages, Wicklow, Carbery, Limerick, Westmeath and Rosse were among the assailants of aspects of the bill and proponents of amendments. An amendment greatly diluting the suspension clause was carried by the Tories over the Government's objections, much to the

annoyance of James Grattan and Greville; the latter feared it would cause a constitutional storm, and, according to Littleton and Le Marchant, several Ministers did wish to resign. But the Cabinet gave way and, as Ellenborough hoped, the division probably helped to re-unite the Tories. Longford spoke out against the third reading and with nearly 20 other Irish Tory Peers rejected Wellington's advice and voted against, to no avail.¹³³ Wellington himself, for all his forbearance, thought that even as amended the measure would 'give a severe blow to the Protestant interest in Ireland' and to the security of property.¹³⁴ And Lefroy, who worked closely with Wellington in the preparation of amendments and regarded the Duke as Ireland's 'most devoted friend', felt that though it had been 'improved in a great many respects' the bill still had 'many mischievous provisions'.¹³⁵

While the Temporalities bill was their main preoccupation, the Irish Tories were also attentive to the less spectacular developments regarding tithe. Speaking in February-March 1833, Shaw described the 'state of destitution and misery' to which the clergy had been reduced by the 'widespread conspiracy' to resist tithe. Lefroy warned that repealers attacked the tithe system in order to destroy the Church Establishment, which was 'the great key-stone of the arch which connected the two countries'. When Lambert proposed his amendment to prevent use of the coercion bill in collecting tithe, Shaw and Lefroy asked if the clergy were to be treated as 'outlaws', singled out to be denied the protection of the law 'merely because they were the most defenceless and oppressed class of persons in the United Kingdom'. Seven Irish Tories supported Shaw's motion to expunge the proviso; one (Dobbs of Carrickfergus) voted with Lambert. Spurred on by Buckingham, Wellington moved the omission of the proviso in the Lords, but, though Roden lent his support, the motion was easily defeated. Lefroy, Shaw and Anthony Lefroy took a similar line in June when Irish liberals questioned the methods used in tithe collection, stressing the clergy's forbearance and sacrifices

regarding enforcement of their legal rights.¹³⁶

Also in June the Irish Tory Lord Farnham wrote to Littleton to urge an amendment in Stanley's Act of 1832. Like the Irish liberals he argued that landlords would refuse to 'become little better than a Tithe proctor' for a bonus of 15%. Instead, however, of proposing a further deduction from clerical incomes, he outlined a plan by which the middlemen would have to collect the tithe from the tenantry, though the landlords would still receive most of the bonus. Farnham's concern for the interests of the landlords was evident again in his demand that lay tithe owners should be eligible for the Government loan to cover the arrears of 1831-2 and the tithe of 1833.¹³⁷

The decision to grant this loan was generally welcomed by Irish Protestants.¹³⁸ Some British Tories in Parliament, led by George Sinclair of Caithness, feared that the loan was 'synonymous with a gift' and objected to the proposal under the eventual bill to place landlords 'in the invidious situation of a tithe proctor'. The Irish Tories, on the other hand, welcomed the proposed loan in view of the 'starvation and misery' being suffered by the 'oppressed' clergy. Lefroy, speaking as a landlord, 'would willingly bear his share' of any tax to recover the subvention.¹³⁹ However, when the details of the Government's loan plan were unveiled in August, Wicklow and Shaw, though aware of the necessity of the subvention, felt that the bill 'would bear most unjustly on the landed proprietors', regretted the concession of a victory to the defaulters at a time when the law was finally reasserting itself and tithes were being collected, feared that the loan was a bribe to the clergy to give up their legal claims, and objected to the proposal to advance to the clergy only 'half of what was due'. Coote voted against the bill. Shaw 'would not give his assent to it' though his 'friends were struggling to restrain' him.¹⁴⁰ Primate Beresford raised similar objections to the bill in private correspondence with Lord Grey and it is possible that Shaw's strenuous efforts were inspired by communication

141
with the Primate.

The Government continued during the later months of 1833 to minimize police and military assistance in the collection of tithe, in part to encourage titheowners to apply for the Million Act loans (and thereby avoid collisions), but in December, when the deadline for such applications had passed and it was thought desirable to prepare the country for Government enforcement of a tithe-equivalent under new legislation, Littleton persuaded the Cabinet that the State should take a more active role, interfering in cases of apprehended as well as actual breaches of the peace. 142 Though this decision, and resistance to the claims of 'the recusant clergy' (those rejecting the loan), threatened to involve 'the whole army' in a renewed tithe war, the ready application 143 of overwhelming force prevented violent collision.

In the meantime several members of the Administration turned their minds to effecting a permanent settlement of the tithe question. Russell, Duncannon, Littleton and Wellesley, all of whom were in Ireland during the Autumn of 1833, agreed that there should be a general land tax out of which both the Protestant and Catholic clergy might be paid and provision made for various secular purposes. Duncannon was particularly insistent that the settlement must also involve the abolition of sinecure parishes and unions and that the resultant surplus should be 'appropriated 144 by the state for charitable purposes'. A number of liberal-unionists were asked to comment on the issue. The veterans Parnell and Newport (and Cloncurry in a pamphlet) agreed to the necessity of a land tax for payment of both sets of clergy and Newport warned that, 'Tithe in form and substance must be extinguished and all attempts to palliate or 145 couple it with Rents can only aggravate the evil'.

James Talbot, the liberal-unionist member for Athlone, rejected the notion that Stanley's Act of 1832 would solve the problem, as 'it is quite absurd to suppose that landlords will voluntarily tax themselves with the collection of this oppressive impost', particularly the 'large

class of small and needy landowners ... nothing short of the total extinction of Tythes' would settle the question. Villiers Stuart,¹⁴⁶ Lambert, Carew and Donoughmore emphasized the strength of the popular resolve 'to resist the payment of Tithes in whatever shape or mode it may be attempted to levy them'. But Stuart felt that State payment of the Protestant clergy out of 'a species of landed property tax' would solve the collection problem. Lambert argued that 'a very considerable portion of this public property can yet be secured' if the Government offered 'a reduction of at least 25 per cent to the landholders who will make themselves liable to the payment' and allowed landholders to redeem (that is, buy out of the liability to) the tithe on generous terms. Lambert also proposed payment of the Catholic clergy but insisted that, 'The provision for the Catholic clergy should be kept carefully separated from any arrangement of the Tithes'.¹⁴⁷

Colonel Rochfort, a moderate Tory, stated in November that resistance to tithe was so strong he would put his rents at risk if he acted upon the Act of 1832. He favoured a land tax and support of the Catholic clergy.¹⁴⁸ In spite, however, of the popularity of the latter solution, it was not proposed in the plan submitted by the Irish Government in November 1833. The Catholic clergy had 'evinced a determination not to share a Land Tax with the Protestant Church', afraid they would become a 'crutch' of the latter; and it was feared that the new tax would be 'stoutly resisted' by those whose land had been partially or wholly exempt from the old impost. Plunket, the Irish Chancellor, felt that the Catholic clergy and politicians would reject the 'bribe' of State payment and that 'the great body of the landed proprietors, whose object is to despoil the clergy', would prove still more intractable if it were proposed that they should be taxed to support two Churches. Melbourne feared that the question of how the funds would be distributed between the Churches would cause controversy and that the principle itself would 'have the effect of materially affecting if not of hastening the downfall of the

Church Establishment in this Country' (England). Furthermore the plan might bring the latent division in the Cabinet 'at once to a rupture'.¹⁴⁹

The plan submitted by the Lord Lieutenant shelved the issues of a provision for the Catholic clergy and Church reform, though Wellesley formally stated his commitment to both. It involved the redemption of the tithe and commutation of clerical income into land. Littleton informed Melbourne that he had 'in general conversation ascertained that the leading principles of it are consistent with the views of Carew, Lambert, (and) More O'Ferrall ... Ferrin also thinks it quite feasible'. The Chief Secretary believed that 'Irish members generally will approve'. Stanley was hopeful that the proposals would resolve 'the great difficulty', that is, 'how to overcome the combination between landlord and tenant to rob the Church, the third party, for the purpose of dividing the plunder between them ...' The general principles of the plan, and the postponement of Church reform and payment of the Catholic clergy, were duly approved by the Cabinet on the 21st of November.¹⁵⁰

While Plunket was concerned that the tithe settlement would deprive the clergy, Carew and Newport argued that the proposed deduction from clerical incomes was too small.¹⁵¹ It was the issue of Church reform, however, which caused greatest dissension in the Cabinet. In December, Lord Ebrington, an influential Whig member, suggested a Commission of Inquiry into the Irish Church. Littleton and Wellesley, encouraged by Duncannon and Russell,¹⁵² endorsed this proposal. Althorp saw that some in the Cabinet would object to such a Commission as a step towards appropriation. At the end of January the Cabinet duly divided upon the propriety of a Commission, with Stanley stubbornly and successfully resisting the majority opinion in favour of inquiry.¹⁵³

Littleton disclosed the tithe plan on the 20th of February, essentially that submitted by the Irish Government in November. He explained that previous legislation had failed to overcome the difficulty

of collection, with even Stanley's Composition Act leaving many small landholders still the party liable for tithe. He proposed, in order that 'lawful property' in tithe should receive due protection and that 'the clergy and peasantry will be relieved from pecuniary collision at once', that the Government should first levy a land tax on those liable for tithe, at the same level as the existing burden, and landlords could then redeem by payment of a capital sum (or surrender of property) and raise rents to recover that amount and a bonus of 20%. The Government would invest their income (from the land tax and the sums paid in redemption) in land, and transfer it to the clergyman or lay tithe-owner, effecting a commutation of tithe property into land.¹⁵⁴

Shoill, writing to his wife, reckoned the plan 'as bad as any we have yet had'.¹⁵⁵ He, O'Connell and a considerable number of fellow-repealers angrily attacked the measure as involving a mere 'change of name' of tithe and leaving untouched the principle of taxation of Catholics to support another's Church; the burden of the 'sinecure Church' was not to be diminished or distributed more equitably; the Church was to become possessed of still greater landholdings; landowners were to be made into 'tithe-proctors', thrown into collision with their tenants and their rents endangered. Most of the repealers, including O'Connell, rejecting the accusation that they wished to abolish tithe in order to allow landlords to raise their rents, envisaged continuation of some form of tax, but one equitably applied and with appropriation of much of the revenue to non-Church purposes; and they attacked the plan for its omission of such appropriation.

The liberal-unionists Henry Lambert, Lord Clements, Dominick Browne, William O'Reilly and More O'Ferrall expressed similar views in resisting the measure, with O'Ferrall leading the opposition to the second reading. Resolutions reflecting these objections, including the need for appropriation, were approved in divisions by 25 repealers and six liberal-unionists. The Whig John Browne attacked O'Connell's proposal to deduct

two-thirds from tithe as 'a national robbery; for those two-thirds belonged to the poor of Ireland. He approved of the principle of the proposed Tithe Bill as he thought .. a Land-tax would put an end' to the 'horrible scenes' associated with tithe collection. The Whig member for Wexford, Carew, also gave a general approval to the measure, but even he 'disapproved of many of its details' and moved the adjournment of the second reading to allow consultation between the Government and the Irish members. His unsuccessful amendment was supported by 37 repealers and 21 liberal-unionists, that is, by the great majority of the Irish liberal
156
representatives.

Referring to this division, Littleton wrote that,

'Every Irishmen in the House returned by a Roman Catholic Constituency, with the exception of Lord Oxnantown and some one other, voted last night for postponing the second reading of the Tithe Bill for a week. Carew moved the Amendment! He was obliged to do something, as he thought, and therefore did what he thought most innocent. But each member was afraid of leaving it said that "he had voted against even a week's delay" - so they mustered a good Division. The Irishmen will agree to no measure in the House of Commons that they cannot defeat in Ireland - unless it be one that shall at once surrender to them or their Tenants the Property of the Church'. 157

Thomas Martin, the liberal-unionist member for Galway, subsequently explained that he 'was compelled to oppose the Government, owing to previous declarations to my constituents. The warmest supporters that I had in the late election were most adverse to the Tithe Bill'.
158

The repealers continued the assault on the 6th of May, in the adjourned debate on the second reading, and in the division 32 repealers
159
and 12 liberal-unionists voted for outright rejection of the bill. A few days later Wyse wrote that the Irish members were 'exceedingly vexed' regarding the bill; he still wished to 'extinguish' tithe 'in toto' and 'impose a new tax for religious and moral instruction, that is, the support of the clergy of all denominations and education, (and) reduce the Protestant church to its just ~~own~~ dimensions ...'
160

On the 6th of May, Russell initiated developments of major importance when he spoke 'unnecessarily warmly and prematurely' in favour of

appropriation, driving Stanley and others of the more conservative Whigs farther towards secession from the Government. When Henry Ward, the radical member for St. Albans, brought on a motion for appropriation, Stanley, Graham and two other opponents of appropriation, aware that their view was not shared by a majority in the Cabinet and on the liberal backbenches, resigned from the Cabinet. On Littleton's advice, Ward's motion was met with the announcement of a commission of inquiry into the state of the Irish Church. Ward persisted and was supported in debate by the liberal-unionists Lambert and Brown and by O'Connell, and Clanricarde took a similar line in the Lords. But William O'Reilly, a Catholic liberal-unionist, declared that he was opposed to the motion and to any such appropriation and that the Catholics of Ireland were opposed only to the mode in which tithe was levied, not to its principle. The motion was defeated with surprising ease, but won the support of 11 liberal-unionist members and 28 repealers.

Carew wrote to Stanley to express his regret at the latter's resignation, 'though I differ with you as to the appropriation prospectively of some of the surplus, after providing fully and efficiently for the support of the Protestant Established Religion'. He reviewed Stanley's achievements favourably, including his 'excellent' Temporalities Bill of the previous year and concluded that the tithe question was the only one which he had failed to resolve. Another liberal-unionist, Thomas Wyse, was convinced that the Commission proposal, though it might turn out well or ill', was 'a half measure, an expedient to get out of a scrape, and to jog on till next session ... The majority of the liberals were in favour of Ward's motion' but were induced to settle for 'the humbug of a Commission' by Althorp's threat of resignation. Lambert, too, complained that the Commission represented prevarication on the part of the Government.

Lord Lansdowne took a hard line in Cabinet in opposition to Ward's motion, told the King that he almost left with Stanley, and in the Lords

on the 6th of June. virtually committed himself against appropriation.¹⁶⁵
 There were 'rumours' that his protégé, Spring Rice, 'had been gained over
 by Lord Lansdowne and would give but faint support to the reform of the
 Irish Church'.¹⁶⁶ But the new Colonial Secretary stated in Parliament and
 in correspondence with friends that he differed with Stanley and would
 be prepared to appropriate surplus revenue revealed by the Commission
 for the education of children of all denominations.¹⁶⁷

In the meantime the liberal-unionist members contrived to secure
 changes in the Tithe Bill. On the 8th of May, a group of Irish members,
 whose views Clements of Leitrim subsequently put in writing, met
 Littleton and urged four grievances in relation to the bill: the need
 to allow an easier revision of excessively high tithe compositions;
 the high rate of purchase for redemption; the desirability of giving
 the 20% bonus not to landlords but to the occupiers (!); and the
 proposed investment of redemption money in land for the clergy. To the
 latter proposal the Irish members entertained 'the strongest objections',
 as it would obstruct future appropriation and 'any Church reform whatever',
 and give the clergy 'a variety of secular interests' and 'an enormous
 political power which they would always use in strict concert and which
 in some dioceses the Bishops could command absolutely'. Finally, it
 threw a great deal of land into mortmain and if this or any other
 circumstance necessitated a repeal of the act the resale of the land
 'would be effected at a great loss to the public'.¹⁶⁸

At a meeting at Althorpe on the 24th of May, 'attended by ten or
 twelve of the best of our (the Government's) friends among the Irish
 members', it was agreed that they should postpone or give up redemption
 and commutation into land. According to Littleton, 'Every friend we had
 amongst the Irish members was against investment in land', and 'Redemption
 is useless without it'.¹⁶⁹ About ten days later Ministers met 'a party of
 the Irish members who are friendly to the Government' and agreed that
 the Government should impose a land tax for three years (later changed

back to 5), after which the landlords would bear a rent-charge for the support of the Church. The fear of the Irish members that investment in land would increase the Church's 'political influence' had in fact facilitated agreement, for, thought Littleton, 'We should never have won their assent to a rent charge .. if their fears had not been thus awakened'. 170

The Government then agreed, after 'daily discussions' with the Irish members, to act on the suggestion of the liberal-unionists that the occupier should get the bonus of 20%, with landlords levying only the 80%. 171 On the 14th of June, however, Clements informed Littleton that landlords would refuse to levy the tithe until it was made 'less unpopular', for it was 'not safe' at present to do so such was 'the inveterate hostility' to tithes. In addition, there was 'the still confident expectation which the landed interest retain of getting rid of the tax altogether. I condemn that expectation as much as you do, nor to I believe it to be general among proprietors', but it was sufficiently so to frustrate a settlement. The tendency of Stanley's Act of 1832 to raise nominal clerical incomes by 'at least' 30% increased resentment. Whatever scheme was proposed, Clements felt the landlords would manage to throw the burden on the tenants, and the latter's resistance would continue until it was undermined by 'a moderate independent provision for the Roman Catholic clergy'. 172

Another liberal-unionist, More O'Ferrall, urged the need to give the landlords 'a bonus' for their trouble out of the Consolidated Fund. Littleton and O'Hanlon, an adviser in the Irish Government, began to fear that the Irish members would not 'stand to their engagements' and accept the rent-charge. 173 In Parliament, O'Connell and other repealers declared that they were far from satisfied with amendments which would not immediately reduce the tithe burden or appropriate surplus revenue. But the liberal-unionist Fitzstephen French 'stood forward as the advocate of this Bill', which would end collision between the Protestant clergy and the people; a moderate sacrifice by landlords was in order for the

sake of tranquillity, though he contended that the landlords should be allowed an abatement upon their taking on the tithe burden and regretted that they were now to be denied the opportunity of redemption. 27 repealers and 7 liberal-unionists voted for O'Connell's appropriation motion of the 23rd of June.¹⁷⁴

Lambert privately demanded a more efficient mechanism for securing 'redress from excessive charges in the compulsory composition'.¹⁷⁵ On the 29th of June, the Cabinet agreed on a further amendment of the bill, the advance of 20% of the tithe from the Consolidated Fund as a 'bonus' to landowners who took on the rent-charge voluntarily within five years, with the Treasury repaid out of the Perpetuity Purchase Fund held by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the Temporalities Act of 1833. 'It is probable', thought Littleton,

'it will swallow up the whole fund! This is Appropriation with a vengeance, for it is appropriation not for Church, or Charitable, or Educational purposes, but by the landlords. Will the Bishops and the House of Lords assent to this? And yet it is considered and perhaps correctly, that a compulsory rent charge, irredeemable, cannot be carried without it ... Ellice moved this plan in the Cabinet on a suggestion from O'Hanlon'.¹⁷⁶

The bill now involved a transfer to the land of up to 40% of the amount of tithe, though only the original deduction of 20% would come from ^{tithe} incomes. The Cabinet also agreed to institute a new valuation to solve the problem of 'excessive' tithe compositions. Lambert wrote to Littleton to congratulate him on these amendments, and supported the amended bill in debate. Clements and More O'Ferrall also welcomed the changes. O'Connell and 18 other repealers (in the division) supported Hume's demand for a more explicit declaration of the appropriation principle; but this time only one liberal-unionist (Barry) voted for the amendment.

O'Connell and O'Reilly objected that the bill promised continuation of the tithe war for another five years, involving resistance to the proposed land tax. O'Connell proposed instead that the landlords should be compelled immediately to take on the burden, at the uniform 40% rate

of abatement. O'Reilly (in essence), Ferrin, Clements and O'Grady, all liberal-unionists, agreed. ¹⁷⁷ In fact it was the solution canvassed behind the scenes by Clements, Acheson, O'Grady and other Irish Whig members, and O'Connell's act of piracy was the subject of scornful comment in various quarters. ¹⁷⁸ Though Althorp and Littleton protested that the proposal would be unfair to landlords, their opposition was half-hearted and many in the Government approved of the amendment because it gave a better prospect of immediate tranquillity while securing the income of the clergy. ¹⁷⁹ The Government were defeated by their own supporters, with the Irish liberals - 14 repealers and 14 liberal-unionists - voting unanimously for the change. It was a rare instance of apparent disregard for the interests of the landlords, but they evidently agreed with Rice's judgement that in spite of the 'hardship' imposed on them the Irish landlords would obtain 'a full though a collateral indemnity' by the end of disturbance. ¹⁸⁰ O'Connell, Ruthven and the Whig O'Grady subsequently supported the bill, O'Connell privately calling it 'my glorious Tithe Bill' and it passed through the House without further liberal opposition. ¹⁸¹

Notwithstanding O'Connell's boast, it is clear that the liberal-unionist members played a major role in the transformation of the tithe bill of 1834. If the Irish liberals warmed to the bill as it was amended, the Irish Tories became its most bitter opponents. Their initial reaction was anything but hostile. Shaw welcomed the proposal to commute tithe into land, evidently convinced it would secure the revenue; Christmas agreed that the occupying tenant must be relieved of the tithe burden and approved of Littleton's omission of appropriation. ¹⁸² Wellealey wrote in March that 'the Clergy & the Protestants of weight are inclined to approve it (the bill). Lord Roden (I hear) has expressed a favourable opinion of it'. Other reports also represented the clergy as favourable, though some felt 'that the drawback on their income is perfectly ruinous'. ¹⁸³

Primate Beresford and his principal adviser on tithe, Archdeacon Stopford, argued in correspondence with the Irish Government early in

April that the clergy would 'suffer heavy losses by the Bill'. But ¹⁸⁴
 Littleton found Beresford's views 'an agreeable surprise ... He clearly
 concedes the principle & does not object to the leading provisions of
 the Bill.' ¹⁸⁵ Prior to the second reading he managed to 'come to terms
 with the Primate, the Archbishop of Cashel, Shaw & Lefroy, about the
 tithe then due to clergymen and the sum they would receive from the
 Government under the bill.' ¹⁸⁶

In the second reading debate, Lefroy and Perceval pledged their
 support to the measure in spite of its reduction of clerical incomes,
 though Shaw was unhappy with the extent of the latter and Perceval
 regarded it as the maximum permissible. Anthony Lefroy and Conolly also
 supported the bill, the latter reckoning that it 'would be the final
 adjustment of the question of tithes', and Shaw approved the principle
 of shifting the tithe burden from tenant to landlord, with whom it in
 fact already rested. Only one Irish Tory, Sir Edmund Hayes of Donegal,
 voted against the second reading. In the Lords, Wicklow expressed his
 approval of the bill.

From May to August, Shaw, Conolly and the Lefroys bitterly opposed
 the proposition of appropriation as a threat to all property, the Union
 and the prospects of the Protestant religion in Ireland. They also
 attacked the Government's 'equivocal and contemptible' course in
 appointing a Commission of Inquiry into the Irish Church, contending
 that appropriation should have been rejected outright and that the
 proposed comparison of Protestant population and Church revenues
 involved 'a principle destructive to the Church Establishment in Ireland'.
 Emerson Tennent, at that stage moving rapidly into the Conservative ranks,
 spoke out against appropriation, though he favoured a transfer of income
 from 'the pampered prelates and overpaid dignitaries' to 'the struggling
 clergy and the indigent curates'. Hayes supported Ward in the division
 on appropriation, presumably in protest against the Commission; no Irish

Tory voted for the later appropriation motions, on the 23rd of June and
 187
 4th of July.

After Stanley's departure, Lefroy wrote to a friend in great alarm regarding 'the despoiling' of the Church; 'if a check be not put to the course now entered upon, it will be stript of its last shilling by
 188
 Radicals and Infidels, who have joined together in the plunder'. Roden felt that the Lords would have to take a part 'in stopping the progress of destruction' and the Ultra Tory Duke of Buckingham wanted the Lords to condemn the proposed Commission of Inquiry. But, Wellington, though afraid that some in the Government wished 'to plunder' the Irish Church and that the Commission was intended as 'the first step' in 'the destruction of the Church of England in Ireland', felt that the Lords could not yet play a role. Wellington and Peel were also active in discouraging pro-Church and anti-Commission addresses to the King from various bodies, not least because the King had formally authorized the
 189
 Commission. On the 6th of June, Wicklow led the Tory Lords in Parliament, including the Irish Tories Limerick and Westmeath, in attacking the proposed Commission as a preparatory step for 'revolutionary spoliation', and Wicklow and Londonderry urged the same point again on subsequent
 190
 occasions.

Peel also exercised a restraining hand on the Irish Tory members, advising those who met him on the 22nd of June 'to consider the consequences very maturely' before they tried to defeat a bill which absolved the clergy from tithe collection. 'Their impression was in
 191
 concurrence with mine'. At another meeting on the 3rd of July the Conservative leaders agreed that the bill had been 'mutilated and bastardized'. They deprecated in particular 'the bribe to be given to the Irish landlords' from the Consolidated Fund (repayable out of the Church's Perpetuities Fund). And the loss of redemption and commutation 'facilitates and encourages future spoliation'. Peel urged that they 'should fight strenuously for the bill in its original shape', though he

192
 was prepared 'to recede in some degree' on the question of commutation. In debate the Irish Tory members protested at the amendments - the loss of commutation and redemption, the allowance of easier revision of the composition and the proposal to fund the 40% abatement out of Church revenues. By the end of June, Lefroy and Shaw were clearly contemplating opposing the bill, and Christmas said on the 4th of July that he would vote against it.

The O'Connell-Clements amendment at the end of July confirmed the Irish Tories in their opposition to the bill. Hayes, Shaw, Jones, Young and the Lefroys spoke out and, with Corry, voted against the change. They pleaded that it would be unfair to both landlords and clergy. Though it was right that landlords should ultimately bear the burden, it was not just that they should be asked to do so until resistance had been overcome, and to emburden landlords thus would damage relations between them and the clergy and provide a poor guarantee of the latter's income. And that income, even if received, might, according to Shaw and Lefroy, be reduced by 40% on the expiry of the one-year guarantee of 20% from the Consolidated Fund. Shaw angrily accused the Government of connivance in the amendment. He, Lefroy and Young declared their opposition to the bill and gave lengthy expositions of the differences between the satisfactory measure first introduced and the bill as it then stood.

193

Littleton subsequently complained that the Irish clergy were 'wilfully deceived by Shaw & Lefroy' into believing 'that 2/5ths was to be taken from the clergyman's income instead of 1/5th which none of them objected to ... Shaw & Lefroy perfectly well knew what they were doing & the effect they were creating'. However, according to his letter to Farnham on the 2nd of August, Lefroy genuinely held fears on this point, deprecated the proposals on revision (downwards) of the composition and doubted if, offered no bonus for the task, the landlords would collect the tithe for the clergy. The Commons were 'so base that they seem to

194

relish a base way of doing things. The conspiracy of the Government with O'Connell was self-evident & yet the House shewed no symptom of disgust or disapprobation'.¹⁹⁵

In July Peel, Stanley and Graham were strongly of the opinion that the Lords should pass the second reading and amend the bill in Committee, that is, 'should restore the Bill very much' to its original shape.¹⁹⁶ Wellington was disposed to reject the bill outright.¹⁹⁷ Towards the end of July a worried Shaw informed Roden that the Duke, because he was 'much in want of Peers', meant to consent to the second reading; he urged Roden to come over to London.¹⁹⁸ But in meetings at Apsley House early in August Wellington and the Peers agreed, under pressure from British Ultras and according to the wish of the Irish Bishops, to oppose the second reading. Downshire wrote to Wellington to say that the O'Connell-Clements amendment of the 30th of July induced him to send his proxy for use against the second reading; he further signified his conversion to Tory politics with the remark, 'I have a thousand excuses to make to you for so long a history which I hope you will forgive'.

Replying to Stanley on the 8th Graham agreed that it would be 'most prudent' to amend rather than reject the bill. But it was 'not practicable', for the Duke despaired of getting the peers to attend and fight in Committee, and, at any rate, Graham felt that 'the sham defeat of the Government' justified outright opposition. On the 11th, Roden, over from Ireland specially for the debate, and a succession of British Tory Peers duly spoke out against the second reading, their objections to the amendments similar to those voiced in the Commons and their attitude, like that of the Commons Tories, hardened by apprehension as to the Government's intentions regarding appropriation. The Bishop of London read out a letter from Primate Beresford in which he condemned the bill. In the division the Irish peers split along party lines. The bill was thrown out by the substantial majority of sixty-seven.¹⁹⁹

Littleton and his colleagues in Government thought it 'the weakest or wickedest vote ever given in the House of Lords', one for which Roden,

Shaw, Lefroy and the Irish Bishops were primarily responsible. It was felt that the lower clergy favoured the bill and that they stood to suffer most by its defeat, though Ministers decided that, far from using all their power to assist the clergy in the expected tithe war, they would in fact attempt to reduce the extent of their interference. ²⁰⁰

O'Connell had earlier 'made up my mind not to trouble myself about the decision of the scoundrels' and left London. ²⁰¹ Another repealer, Lynch, was 'not sorry the Lords threw out the Bill: for now the Tithes are irrevocably & entirely gone'. In Parliament Henry Grattan, on whom Ministers had urged restraint, the liberal-unionists O'Reilly and Stowell and others protested that the prospect of peace in Ireland was lost with the bill, but Shaw and Perceval 'rejoiced' in the course taken by the Lords and attempted to vindicate their hostility to the bill, ²⁰³ appropriation and the Commission of Inquiry. Wellington regarded the division as a triumph for the House of Lords and thought the bill so utterly 'abominable' it was beyond amendment in Committee, and he felt that the Tory Lords would have rebelled if he had asked them to support the second reading. ²⁰⁴

The Irish Tory defence of the Church took on a particularly striking aspect during the Autumn of 1834. A public meeting was arranged for the 14th of August in Dublin, with six Tory Peers asking Protestants to co-operate 'for the protection of our Religion and the preservation of our liberties and property'. ²⁰⁵ Roden urged Downshire to attend. ²⁰⁶ The member for Monaghan, Edward Lucas, feared that attendance might commit him to the excesses of some but would write to 'state unequivocally my determination to support the church establishment in connection with the state, and to oppose the appropriation of church revenue to secular purposes'. ²⁰⁷

The meeting was attended by nine peers (including the British Ultra Lord Winchilsea and 'that rascal the Marquis of Downshire' ²⁰⁸), seven sitting Tory members, and several thousand others. Roden, hotfoot back from London, attacked the proposed Commission of Inquiry as designed

'to show that in those places where the Protestants are weak their enemies may with more confidence attack them ... it is done to put down the Protestant religion, for the purpose of establishing Popery'. The other speakers, including Winchilsea, Eoyton, Bateson, West and George Hamilton, took a similarly alarmist view of the Commission, and of its tendency to promote appropriation, which was represented as an assault on all property, the Union and on their religion. The Lords were congratulated on having 'nobly done their duty' by rejecting the Tithe bill and much indignant comment was passed on the attempt to confiscate 2/5ths of tithe income.

Roden wrote to Wellington on the 16th claiming that their 'most powerful and effective' meeting ~~held~~ had shown that the landlords and clergy of Ireland concurred in the Lords' defeat of the Tithe bill. Protestant activity did not end there by any means. Roden organized a subscription for the Irish clergy, to be applied in enforcing by legal process their right to tithe. More than £3,000 were subscribed by a number of leading Irish Tories within a few weeks. Shaw, who warmly welcomed the project, Lefroy and the future Tory M.P.'s Jackson, George Hamilton, and J. H. Hamilton agreed to assist in administering the fund. But Lords Downes and Bandon were evidently reluctant to aid a non-resident and negligent clergy. Later in August, Roden wrote to Remy Sheehan, editor of the Evening Mail, doubting if the subscription would succeed, as it would involve 'forcing Protestants to pay tithes'. Sheehan agreed that,

'the fiendish spirit of Democracy is infusing itself amongst the Orangemen and an objection to tithes, complaints against the Clergy, disinclination to the Establishment, doubts as to the necessity of a union between the Church & State'.

But he felt that the problem would recede 'after the question was made one of resistance to popery' and wrote of 'the necessity of appealing to the prejudices & passions of those with whom we have to deal'.

Roden complained to Winchilsea of the lack of co-operation from other Tories in the project. And Shaw wrote to Roden,

'I am sure as you say that there are now many Protestants turned against tithes - but that is the natural consequence of the suspension of any right - & if tenants were for three years not to pay their rents we should find Protestants as well as Papists unwilling to return to the payment again - & the law must be enforced or there will be no security for any property in this country ... the meeting has hit O'Connell hard & all it wants is to be followed up'.

Even unsuccessful proceedings would do good, he argued, by putting defaulters to 'trouble & expense'. Boyton felt it would be 'a matter of immense importance to realize the Church property without the interference of Parliament, & .. this is certain if we get time'. The appeal circular sent out in September reminded Protestants that the 'extraordinary combination' against tithe threatened not only the Church and 'Religion' but 'must introduce a precedent that will speedily lead to the invasion of every other description of property'.

211

George Hamilton, later the Tory member for Dublin, became Secretary to this fund. He also proposed the revival of the Protestant Conservative Society in order to publicize the distressed state of the clergy. Shaw welcomed this step and, in fact, advocated an organization which would associate the Protestants in every part of Ireland under 'some more general & less exclusive standard than that of Orangism .. now or never must the battle of Protestantism be fought .. the Church is the outpost that the Protestants of Ireland should manfully defend, if it was but for the sake of their own properties'. The Society was duly revived, and its weekly meetings continued until their 'perfect confidence' in the Conservative Government formed later that year induced them to adjourn indefinitely.

212

Also in August 1834, Wellington proposed to Roden that the Protestant gentry of Ireland should issue a declarationⁿ which they would pledge themselves to pay tithe and to assist the clergy in recovering it. This would remove the 'unjust' suspicion in England that the Irish landlords coveted the tithe themselves and alert English Protestants to the plight of the Irish Church. To others the Duke declared his dislike of 'all the nonsense and bombast that passes at these Conservative meetings'

213

and saw his task as being to direct the Irish Protestants towards more
214
useful goals, such as the proposed declaration.

Roden and Hamilton accepted Wellington's advice regarding the
215
declaration. But when Roden revealed the plan to Boyton the doubts about
Protestant devotion to the Church again emerged. Boyton

'would not say so publicly, but my conviction is that the Irish Proprietors, by which I mean in particular the resident High Protestant or Orange Proprietors, have been long & are at present casting an eye upon the tithes, & I doubt the sincerity of their support of the Church. I doubt greatly whether they could be got to sign a paper of the form his Grace suggests, "binding themselves to each other to pay their dues to the clergy". If a more abstract expression was used it might answer, such as support of the Church, or the Protestant Religion, &c ... (and) we could add greatly to our numbers by taking our stand on the basis of the security of property generally & this would include the Church'. 216

Roden informed Wellington that,

'we are unhappily so divided amongst ourselves and there is such a blindness to the awful situation in which we stand .. I am sorry to say, even in the North, there is a great cry amongst the Protestant farmers, etc. against tithes, so that at all our public meetings we are obliged to speak on the general ground of Protestantism as opposed to error to keep them fully with us'.

But he felt that a 'carefully worded' declaration would be as successful as any other step. Wellington replied that if the Irish Protestants were unwilling to act 'there will be no exertion here to support their cause'. The two met in London in mid-September and agreed upon a formula, though Wellington was not entirely happy with the result. 217

Roden also envisaged the holding of 'large meetings in Ulster', at
218
Derry and Belfast. George Hamilton shared Wellington's view of the importance of English opinion; he wanted meetings in England as well as in the North, to establish 'a complete confederation amongst us, English & Irish, which no Government would dare to encounter'. But in September
219
Roden wrote to Winchilsea and Hamilton of the 'apathy & indifference' of Irish Protestants and doubted if any meeting was practicable on account of 'the feeling of the Protestant farmers on the subject of Tythes'. He appeared 'to have given up all idea of public meetings in the North'.

Hamilton feared that 'our own party are ready to join in the sacrilegious spoliation of the Church of God' and lamented 'the indifference
220
& dissensions & want of principle amongst those whom we consider our friends'.

Bateson of Londonderry had met with some of the Tories of Belfast to consider holding a provincial meeting in that town, but had found 'so much apathy & jealousy & foolish fears' among the gentry he felt that a County Down meeting, perhaps at Downshire's family seat, Hillsborough, would be more successful. Downshire, already approached by Roden, approved of the plan to hold a county meeting, though he would not attend, objected to holding it at Hillsborough and was anxious that 'moderation in conduct and language' should prevail; the Church should be defended against the 'violent' and 'unjustifiable' assaults made upon it, but not by outraging the feelings of Catholics. Pressed subsequently by Roden to allow the meeting to take place at Hillsborough, Downshire agreed with some reluctance, convinced that the crisis was such that 'much energy, discretion and prudence is required on the part of those who do not wish to see the Roman Catholic religion established in Ireland'. Like many involved in these proceedings he felt that 'the great object is to open the eyes of all men here (England) to the ultimate danger to this country & to its Established Church of allowing the Roman Catholic Body to triumph over that portion of it in Ireland', though the importance of the English audience necessitated 'a display of moderation and regard for the law'.

Towards the end of September Wellington again urged on Roden the necessity of removing the suspicion in England that Irish landlords supported the Church 'for selfish motives .. coveting the Tithes themselves'. But the declaration circulated for signature at this time adopted only part of Wellington's proposal. It pledged signatories to stand by each other, by 'the rights of property', the Union, the authority of the law and 'the supremacy of the Church of England in Ireland'. It did not involve any promise to pay tithe or help the clergy recover their tithe. Londonderry, annexing his and Castlereagh's signatures, thought the declaration 'short, good, pithy & politick'. Many Presbyterians objected to the expression 'supremacy of the Church'

and this was duly changed to 'integrity'. The declaration was eventually signed by 50 Irish Peers and 1500 gentry. ²²⁸

Matthew Forde, a leading Down Conservative, feared that the Down meeting might be faced with a successful counter-demonstration and that 'the Presbyterians will be lukewarm if not against us'. Another local Tory, Andrew Nugent of Portaferry, was 'convinced the contrary of good will be the result' and remained aloof. ²²⁹ Others shared Forde's fears about Presbyterian opinion. Lord Dufferin expected failure 'because the Presbyterians would not be with us, but against Church & Tithe'. Bateson and James Reilly urged Roden to secure the co-operation of the Presbyterians, in particular to persuade Henry Cooke, the Presbyterian leader, to appear as a speaker. ²³⁰ Dufferin, Donegall, Forde and others also feared that the Down meeting would be 'too highly Orange'. ²³¹

The Belfast (Conservative) Society were divided regarding a provincial meeting in Belfast, with Emerson Tennent's friends hostile. The prospects for county meetings in Armagh and Fermanagh did not look good. ²³² However, the southern Protestants held a successful meeting at Eandon on the 7th of October, with more than 5,000 people allegedly in attendance. ²³³ The requisition for the Down meeting, published on the 15th of October, contained the names of Downshire, Londonderry, Hertford, Roden, Donegall, Clanwilliam, Dufferin, Bateson, Forde, Castlereagh and Arthur Hill (the County Members) and J. W. Maxwell (the member for Downpatrick). ²³⁴ Roden reported to Wellington that the prospects for the meeting were good and that the declaration and the tithe fund were 'getting on very prosperously', though he was a little concerned about the Presbyterians attitude to tithes. ²³⁵ On the 25th of October, Cooke replied in the affirmative to Roden's invitation to speak at Hillsborough. Though theologically averse to 'prelacy' he concurred in 'the abstract principle of religious establishments' and had no wish 'to rob the Bishops in order to expedite their conversion .. on the contrary, I stand up in defence of all the property of the Established Church'. ²³⁶

237

Roden was delighted with Cooke's decision.

238

Though Cooke subsequently expressed a wish to retract his commitment, when the Protestants of Down met at Hillsborough on the 30th of October, he appeared on the platform with the great episcopalian landowners of the county. The Evening Mail claimed an attendance of 75,000 people. Many of the requisitionists spoke, moving resolutions expressing alarm at their prospects under a hostile, O'Connell-influenced Government. Roden proposed a resolution which embodied the declaration then being circulated, including the pledge 'to uphold the integrity of the Protestant Church'. Cooke seconded this resolution in the most striking terms, calling himself 'a friend to the Protestant establishment' and declaring his readiness to join the episcopalian clergy 'in protecting their rights and privileges'. He claimed that Presbyterians in general shared such feelings towards their Protestant 'brethren' and, in a famous passage, proclaimed the bans of marriage between the two Churches. ²³⁹

The leading Down Tories exulted in 'the great success' of the meeting, with Downshire confident that it would answer Wellington's 'object of exciting attention in England to the danger of the Established Church in both countries'. ²⁴⁰ The undoubted success of the Hillsborough meeting must, however, be set against the grave doubts expressed over the previous few months as to the extent to which episcopalians and Presbyterians were prepared to support the Church and in particular the claims of the clergy to their tithe.

The Irish Clergy formed a Clerical Society in October 1834 which, it was intended would provide information to the friends of the Church in Parliament, obtain legal assistance in the enforcement of tithe collection and appeal to the English public to support the Irish Church's struggle with those who resisted her claim to tithe. The necessity for some such action was increased in the Primate's view by the Government's rejection of the plea from 14 Irish Bishops that, because of the continuing resistance to tithe and the depression in agriculture, repayment of the

first instalment on the Million Act loan, due on the first of November, 'must involve' the clergy in extreme difficulty and embarrassment'. The Lord Lieutenant and Home Secretary both made it clear that the clergy owed their plight to the Lords' defeat of the Tithe Bill. The editor of the Tory Evening Mail, though prepared to respond indignantly in print to this refusal to assist the clergy, privately regarded it as an act of folly from the Ministry's own point of view, as the decision would 'drive the Government into the absolute necessity of recovering the arrears of tithes by force of arms'.

Another subject which achieved some prominence in Irish Tory circles in the autumn of 1834 was the desirability of the landlords' undertaking to pay the tithe composition under Stanley's Act of 1832. As one clergyman put it, landlords were induced by the 'present unfavourable prospects of the clergy' to 'become responsible to the clergy for the payment & thereby prevent any collision between the clergy and the people'. In return the landlords 'became entitled to a Premium of 15 per cent on the amount collected, to remunerate them for the trouble of collection and any failures in payment which may ensue'. Downshire, Roden and Stanley, who duly undertook the burden, had high hopes that if others did likewise it would 'defeat the inroads which the agitators are making upon all property, lay and ecclesiastical' and 'procure for the clergy their undoubted right ... an assuredly the present attack on the Church is a mere prelude to an attempt at the destruction of every species of property whatsoever'.

Downshire also wrote to Roden that, though Charleville and 'another peer' had already stepped forward, he recognized that the 'Southern proprietors will be slower in adopting the measure from the organized state of the Roman Catholic population' - presumably a reference to the likelihood that southern landlords would have trouble receiving compensation in increased rents. At a meeting of Irish Land Agents in Dublin early in October it emerged that the agents in the North and West were keen to

utilize the Act and had in the North already done so extensively, but that in the midlands and south they were deterred by the probable difficulty of levying the sum off the tenantry, the unsettled state of the tithe law, and the agricultural depression. Downshire himself undertook the payment of the tithe composition on his Southern estates, as well as those in the North. Longford was another Tory landlord in the South who felt the bill would prove useful to both clergy and landlords.

One northern Orangeman saw the measure as a suitable vehicle for overcoming the reluctance of 'presbyterians and other dissenters' to pay tithe. Roden and Fitzgerald exulted in the hope and belief that the landlords were utilising the Act 'very extensively', and Fitzgerald described the resultant satisfaction of the clergy. Wellington welcomed the movement as a step towards an end to all conflict over tithe, a blow to the hopes of O'Connell and Duncannon for division between landlords and clergy, and a recognition by proprietors 'that if they cannot maintain the Church of England in Ireland, they cannot expect to keep their properties', and it would make it easier to rouse English opinion in defence of the Irish Church.

However, though the Primate was pleased that so many landlords had come forward he feared they 'will be found few in number when compared with those who stand aloof', in the South especially, 'and take no part whatever in a danger which if not averted will speedily come home to themselves in the form of resistance to rent and repeal of the legislative union'. Littleton believed that many landlords assumed the tithe in the expectation that the deduction would be increased by new legislation, that they were merely pursuing 'cheap credit for liberality'. And there was later an allegation that even those landlords who undertook to pay the clergy under Stanley's Act 'generally declined the payment, in earnest expectation of the anticipated settlement of the question'.

O'Connell felt in August 1834 that,

'if the people generally, and in particular the Presbyterians of the

North, resist the payment of tithes this year generally, they will be abolished or much reduced in the next session. The Bill rejected by the Lords will certainly pass unless there be an acquiescence in the payment .. If we could but get an universal expression of detestation of tithes, it would secure our victory in the next session'. 254

At the end of August, Sharman Crawford, soon to be the liberal-unionist member for Dundalk, complained to O'Connell that the Tithe Bill of 1834 bestowed a bounty on the Irish landlord instead of channelling it into 'public purposes'. O'Connell wrote privately to Crawford that it was perhaps impossible to prevent landlords from being the beneficiaries of the extinction of tithe, though he hoped that 'that mischief' might be 255 'alleviated and diminished as much as possible'. O'Connell proposed in a series of public letters, professedly with a view to diminishing the benefit to landlords, the imposition of a tax on rents in lieu of tithes; and he generally continued the assault on the tithe system with instructions as to how payment might be evaded. 256

Crawford also figured in the lead-up to the great Tory meeting in County Down, where he was a major landowner. One of the organizers of the meeting warned Roden on the 22nd of October that Crawford meant to attend and move the 'total abolition of tithes', and that he was actively seeking support for such a motion. Crawford in fact wrote to Andrew Nugent 257 affecting to assume that as a moderate Conservative Nugent 'would not wish to close the door against any amicable or equitable adjustment of the tithe question. I think you would not desire to support the sinecures and undoubted abuses in the Church Establishment'. He wanted Nugent to propose a resolution at the meeting 'expressing a wish that the tithe question may be taken into consideration next session of Parliament, with a view to its equitable adjustment, etc, etc,' and claimed that he would move such an amendment himself if necessary. Nugent refused. Crawford and a number of other Down gentry issued a protest against the meeting but did not attend 258 to disrupt it. 259

In October 1834 a Tithe and Church Reform Bill was prepared by the Irish Government. It allowed for a 20 per cent deduction from clerical

incomes. And, in accordance with the wishes of Duncannon and Littleton, it suspended the livings of all parishes where there were less than a certain number of Protestants and appropriated the resultant surplus 'for such purposes of Education and Charity as Parliament shall from time to time direct'. Clements was shown this plan and gave it his approval; Dominick Browne and Henry Villiers Stuart again testified as to the unworkability of the existing tithe system. It was, however, the King's opinion on the question which proved rather more decisive, for it played a major part in the fall of the Whig Government in November 1834. The King was strongly opposed to the intention to make 'farther encroachments upon the establishment of the Protestant Church'. He was particularly unwilling to allow Russell to replace Althorp as leader of the Commons because of Russell's views on the Irish Church. In addition, Melbourne apparently told the King that Lansdowne and Spring Rice would retire from office if an attempt should be made to force the proposed measure on the King or through Parliament.

According to his own testimony these factors weighed heavily in the King's decision to dismiss the Whig Government. Holland later noted that Melbourne's assessment of the views of Lansdowne and Rice were mistaken, and according to Greville the Whigs argued in the wake of their fall that 'there was no disunion in the Cabinet and that Lord Lansdowne and Rice had seen the Irish Tithe Bill ... and that they both agreed to its provisions'. This view was later shown to be correct. However, the Whigs were out, and the Conservatives were given an opportunity to resolve the question which had so troubled and divided their opponents over four years of passionate and acrimonious debate.

Chapter 2

1. P.P., 1835, XXXIII, 11.
2. E. P. Brynn, A Political History of the Church of Ireland, 1801-1845 (M. Litt., Trinity College Dublin, 1968), 37-271, 284. D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland: Ecclesiastical Reform and Revolution, 1800-1885 (New Haven/London, 1971), 111-32.
3. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 167-83. Brynn, A Political History of the Church of Ireland, 18-255. J. C. Erok, An Account of the Ecclesiastical Establishment Subsisting in Ireland (Dublin, 1830). R. B. O'Brien, Fifty years of Concessions to Ireland, 1831-1881 (London, 1883-5), I, 367-93. P. O'Donoghue, The Tithe War, 1830-1833 (M.A., University College Dublin, 1961). D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland, 87-111, 148-52. P. O'Donoghue, 'Causes of the Opposition to Tithes, 1830-38', Studia Hibernica, No. 5 (1965), 7-28. P. O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1830-31', Studia Hibernica, No. 6 (1966), 69-98. P. O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1832-3', Studia Hibernica, No. 12 (1972), 77-108.
4. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 371 (2), Wyse to Rice, 12 Jan. 1831. Grey Papers, File of Papers on the State of the Country, f22, Parnell to Grey, 27 June 1831; *ibid*, f39, Parnell's Observations on Ireland. Paok-Beresford MSS, D664/A/223A, Parnell to Vesey, 27 April 1831. Berby Papers, 122/1, Parnell to Stanley, 27 May 1831.
5. Hansard, 2, 743-4; 3, 1-3; 3, 427-8; 3, 477; 4, 1094-5, 1095-7, 1101-2; 6, 871; 6, 949-50; 6, 1306-7; 7, 22-3; 7, 858-9; 8, 135-6, 137, 139, 140-1; 9, 89-90; 9, 131; 9, 239-40, 280-4, 284-5, 289, 290-3; 9, 710, 711-2, 712-3, 718-9; 9, 783-4, 787, 787-8, 789-91; 10, 7-8; 10, 66-9, 70-1, 73-5, 75, 76; 10, 102-3, 103-4; 10, 309-11, 311, 311-4, 315, 316-7, 319-20, 322, 323; 10, 410-2, 412-3.
6. Monteagle Papers MS 13, 372 (3), Newport to Rice, 3, 7 Jan. 1832.
7. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, Jan. 1832.
8. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f154, Callaghan to O'Brien, Feb. 1832.
9. Grey Papers, File of Papers on the Irish Church, f12, Stanley to the Bishop of London, Oct. 1831.
10. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 90, 2 Dec. 1831. Hansard, 9, 280-4, 15 Dec. 1831, Leader; 9, 710, 23 Jan. 1832, O'Connell; 9, 783-91, 24 Jan. 1832, O'Connell, Ruthven, Wyse, Sheil; 10, 103-4, 9 Feb. 1832, Chapman, Blackney; 10, 316-7, 14 Feb. 1832, Blackney. The exclusion of Catholics from the Committees was insisted upon by Stanley and Palmerston and carried over the objections of more liberal Ministers. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 91, 95, 10, 14 Dec. 1831. A. D. Kriegel, 'The Irish Policy of Lord Grey's Government', English Historical Review, Vol. 86, No. 338 (Jan. 1971), 29.
11. House of Commons Journals, 87, 1831-2, 26.
12. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/77, 78, 80, 82, 86, Stanley to Anglesey, 20, 25 Dec. 1831, 10, n.d. Jan., 7 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, D619/31J/47, D619/31K/5, 6, 7, Anglesey to Stanley, 18 Jan., 6, 18, 21 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, D619/27C/80, 83, 89, Anglesey to Holland, 11 Jan., 10, 12 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28A/97, 98, 99, Grey to Anglesey, 5, 6, 17 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28 C/200, 209, 213, 216, 220, 221, 224, 225,

- 226, 227, Anglesey to Grey, 25 Nov., 26 Dec. 1831, 10, 18, 30 Jan., 8, 9, 10, 12, 19 Feb. 1832. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, ff217, 219, 232, 237, 241, 246, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 256; *ibid*, File of Papers on Irish Church Revenues and Tithes, f32, Stanley's objections to Anglesey's Tithe plan, Jan. 1832; *ibid*, f35, Anglesey's Paper on Tythe & Church & Bishops' Lands, for the consideration of the Cabinet, 18 Jan. 1832. Derby Papers, 127/2, Blake to Stanley, 22 Jan. 1832; *ibid*, 119/3, Anglesey to Stanley, 18 Jan., 6, 18, 21 Feb. 1832. Graham Papers, Old Files, A, Anglesey to Graham, 12 (2) Feb. 1832. Broadlands MSS, GC/AN/9, Anglesey to Palmerston, 1 Feb. 1832. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 125-9, 5, 8, 12 Feb. 1832. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Lord Ellenborough's Diary, 196, 15 Feb. 1832. Cloncurry, Personal Recollections, 351-2, 365-6, 440-2, The Marquess of Anglesey, One-Leg: The Life and Letters of Henry William Paget, First Marquess of Anglesey, K. G., 1768-1854 (London, 1961), 263-4.
13. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 13 Feb. 1832.
14. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 130, 14 Feb. 1832. Anglesey Papers, D619/27A/147, Holland to Anglesey, 14 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28A/99, Grey to Anglesey, 17 Feb. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f255).
15. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Lord Ellenborough's Diary, 195, 14 Feb. 1832.
16. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 Feb. 1832.
17. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 14 Feb. 1832. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 15 Feb. 1832. Hansard, 10, 322, 14 Feb. 1832, Stanley.
18. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 16, 17 Feb. 1832.
19. Hansard, 10, 525-6, 17 Feb. 1832, H. Grattan.
20. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 17 Feb. 1832.
21. Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/99, 100, Grey to Anglesey, 17, 21 Feb. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f255, 257). Doyle, Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, was then in London giving evidence to the Tithe Committees. For another account of the 'factious' disposition of the Irish members on this occasion see Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/37, Stanley to Anglesey, 18 Feb. 1832.
22. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 20 Feb. 1832.
23. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 27, 28 Feb., 2 March 1832.
24. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 5, 7, 8 March 1832. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 3 March 1832.
25. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 3 March 1832; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 7, 8 March 1832.
26. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Littleton's Diary, 205, 8 March 1832.

27. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/88, Stanley to Anglesey, 10 March 1832; *ibid*, D619/27A/153, Holland to Anglesey, 11 March 1832; *ibid*, D619/28A/104, 106, Grey to Anglesey, 21, 29 March 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f270, 273). A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Littleton's Diary, 206, 8 March 1832; Le Marchant's Diary, 210-1, (8/9 March 1832).
28. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 8 March 1832.
29. Hansard, 10, 1332-74, 8 March 1832, Brownlow, M. O'Connell, Sheil, Wallace, H. Grattan, Leader, Parnell, J. Grattan, Division; 11, 134-203, 13 March 1832, Wallace, Leader, Jephson, Brownlow, O'Connor, Carew, O'Ferrall, Musgrave, D. Browne, Crampton, Sheil, Killeen; 11, 243-5, 15 March 1832, Leader, H. Grattan; 11, 971-1012, 27 March 1832, M. O'Connell, Rice, Wyse, Leader, Ruthven, H. Grattan, J. Grattan, Division, Wyse, Division; 11, 1043-64, 28 March 1832, Lambert, Chapman, Mullins; 11, 1116-55, 30 March 1832, Wyse, Walker, Duncannon, Jephson, Lambert, Division, Sheil, H. Grattan; 11, 1235-43, 2 April 1832, Wallace, Leader, O'Ferrall, Sheil; 11, 1364-1402, 6 April 1832, Leader, Sheil, J. Grattan, Wyse, Ruthven, Callaghan, J. Grattan, Sheil, Crampton, O'Ferrall, Jephson, Wyse, Leader, Division; 12, 86-94, 9 April 1832, J. Browne, Killeen, M. O'Connell, Leader; 12, 572-93, 16 April 1832, Ruthven, M. O'Connell, Sheil, H. Grattan, Lambert, Howard, Division (third reading, no list), Sheil; 12, 633, 18 April 1832, D. Browne; 18, 636, 12 June 1833, O'Ferrall.
30. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 22 March 1832. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/88, 91, Stanley to Anglesey, 10, 19 March 1832. Only the names of the voters in the minority in each division were listed.
31. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 6 April 1832.
32. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, IV, 1881, O'Connell to Wife, 31 March 1832.
33. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 11 June 1832.
34. *Ibid*, MS 15025 (2), Wyse to Belfast Reform Society, 10 April 1832.
35. Rossmore to Gossett, 16 March 1832 (State Paper Office, Ireland, Registered Paper 1200), quoted in P. O'Donoghue, 'Opposition to Tithe Payment in 1832-3', Studia Hibernica, No. 12 (1972), 80, with the comment that Rossmore's remark was 'somewhat typical of his class'.
36. That is, a measure to rationalize and stabilize the amount of tithe.
37. Grey Papers, File of Papers on Irish Church Revenues and Tithes, f14, Carew to Grey, March/April 1832. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, March/April 1832; *ibid*, Carew to Stanley, 30 April 1832.
38. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, 2, 4, 10 Aug., 5 Sept. 1832.
39. Anglesey Papers, D619/28C/227, 233, Anglesey to Grey, 19 Feb., 9 March 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f256, 263); *ibid*, D619/31K/6, 7, 13, Anglesey to Stanley, 18, 21 Feb., 21 March 1832 (also in Derby Papers, 119/3). W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin (Dublin, 1890), II,

273, Anglesey to Doyle, 14 March 1832. Cloncurry, Personal Recollections, 366.

40. Anglesey Papers, B619/27C/100, 102, Anglesey to Holland, 22 May, 6 June 1832; *ibid*, Uncat., Anglesey to Grey, 16 March 1832; *ibid*, D619/29B/112, 127, Anglesey to Melbourne, 11, 24 June 1832; *ibid*, D619/31K/22, 23, 24, Anglesey to Stanley, 31 May, 4, 23 June 1832 (also in Derby Papers, 119/2); *ibid*, D619/28C/241, 249, 250, Anglesey to Grey, 23 March, 30 May, 13 June 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f267, 271, 289, 291).
41. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f290, 295, 299, Grey to Anglesey, 11, 30 June, 5 July 1832 (also in Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/115, 116). L. C. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers (London, 1889), 185, Melbourne to Anglesey, 30 June 1832.
42. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 18 May 1832. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (1), Lambert to Wyse, 19 May 1832; *ibid*, Walker to Wyse, 19 May 1832.
43. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, 21 May 1832.
44. Personal Journals ..by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 30, 31 May 1832, 1 June 1832.
45. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 26, 31 May 1832.
46. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 18, 25, 30 June 1832.
47. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 30 June 1832.
48. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 6, 9 July 1832. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 197, July 1832.
49. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 July 1832.
50. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 18, 19, 22, 25 July 1832.
51. Hansard, 13, 1159, 1161, 29 June 1832, O'Connell, Killeen; 14, 112-36, 5 July 1832, J. Grattan, Carew, Sheil, Ruthven, D. Browne, Hort; 14, 229-52, 10 July 1832, Leader, Belfast, J. Browne, Sheil, M. O'Connell, Lambert, Wyse, H. Grattan, O'Ferrall, Jephson, Blackney; 14, 356-424, 13 July 1832, Callaghan, Killeen, O'Connell, H. Grattan, Mullins, Crampton, Walker, Chapman, M. O'Connell, Maonamara, Division; 14, 685-719, 24 July 1832, Ruthven, Sheil, Wallace, O'Ferrall, Division; 14, 996-1016, 1 Aug. 1832, Ruthven, Wallace, Leader, Wyse, Walker, Wallace, Division, Maonamara; 14, 1078-85, 2 Aug. 1832, Sheil, Walker, Callaghan, Leader, O'Ferrall, Leader, Ruthven; 14, 1096, 3 Aug. 1832, Leader, Ruthven; 14, 1156-7, 6 Aug. 1832, Ruthven; 14, 1399, 15 Aug. 1832, Ruthven. The Times, 14 July 1832, Division.
52. Anglesey Papers, D619/28C/261, 267, 275, Anglesey to Grey, 1 Aug., 9, 21 Oct. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28C/123, Grey to Anglesey, 12 Sept. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f309, 311, 313, 314); *ibid*, D619/31K/22, 23, 24, 28, Anglesey to Stanley, 31 May, 4, 23 June, 15 July 1832 (also in Derby Papers, 119/2, 119/3); *ibid*, D619/29B/112, 129, 147, 155, 159, 164, 173, Anglesey to Melbourne, 11 June, 3, 14, 28, 30 July, 9 Sept., 21 Oct.

- 1832; *ibid*, D619/27C/118, Anglesey to Holland, 21 Oct. 1832. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 1, f1, Anglesey to Grey, 1 Aug. 1832; *ibid*, f12, Anglesey Paper for Cabinet, 9 Oct. 1832. Graham Papers, Old Files, A, Anglesey to Graham, 16 Aug., 6 Oct. 1832. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, second Baronet of Netherby, 1792-1861 (London, 1907), I, 174.
53. Ellice Papers, MS 15047, f142, Duncannon to Ellice, 28 Sept. 1832. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Doyle, II, 419, Parnell to Doyle, 20 Sept. 1832. Graham Papers, 15, Duncannon to Graham, 1, 17 Oct. 1832.
54. Grey Papers, File of Papers on the Irish Church, f15, Stanley's Plan of Church Reform.
55. Ellice Papers, MS 15032, f70, Durham to Ellice, 28 Oct. 1832. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 255-6, Diary, 2 Nov. 1832. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/10, f35-6, Russell to Grey, 20 Oct. 1832. Russell Papers (BL), Add MS 38, 080, f58, Grey to Russell, 25 Oct. 1832. Holland House Papers, Add MS 51, 548, f82, 84, Russell to Grey, 20, 25 Oct. 1832. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 204-6, n.d.. Spencer Walpole, The Life of Lord John Russell (London, 1891), I, 196-9. Sir Denis Le Marchant, Memoir of John Charles Viscount Althorp, Third Earl Spencer (London, 1876), 446. Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1805-40 (London, 1913), II, 35. Spencer Papers, Althorp to Grey, 20 Oct. 1832, Grey to Althorp, 21 Oct. 1832, cited in Kriegel, 'The Irish Policy of Lord Grey's Government', English Historical Review, 86, 36-7, and A. D. Kriegel, The Whig Government and Ireland, 1830-1835 (PhD, Duke, 1965), 141-4. Anglesey Papers, D619/27C/123, Anglesey to Holland, 27 Oct. 1832 (also in Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 1, f20); *ibid*, D619/27A/171, 172, 173, 174, Holland to Anglesey, 22, 24, 25, 29 Oct. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28A/124, 125, Grey to Anglesey, 24/25 Oct., 3 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, D619/28C/276, Anglesey to Grey, 27 Oct. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f315, 316, 318).
56. Ellice Papers, MS 15016, f94, Ellice to Grey, 5 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, f109, Grey to Ellice, 9 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, MS 15015, Ebrington to Ellice, 7 Jan. 1833; *ibid*, MS 15032, f85, Durham to Ellice, 1 Jan. 1833. Graham Papers, 16, Stanley to Grey, 29 Nov. 1832. Home Office Papers, HO 100/244, f391, Anglesey to Melbourne, 7 Jan. 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/28C/286, Anglesey to Grey, 30 Nov. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f327); *ibid*, D619/27C/135, 144, 149, Anglesey to Holland, 7, 16, 21 Jan. 1833; *ibid*, D619/28D/4, Anglesey memo to Cabinet, 6 Jan. 1833; *ibid*, D619/31k/34, 35, Anglesey to Stanley, 6, 10 Jan. 1833 (also in Derby Papers, 119/3). Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 1, f26, Anglesey to Holland, 7 Jan. 1833. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 372 (1), Anglesey to Rice, 23 Dec. 1832. Derby Papers, 116/7, Duncannon to Stanley, 8 Jan. 1833. Kriegel, 'The Irish Policy of Lord Grey's Government', English Historical Review, 86, 33-4, 39-40. Kriegel, The Whig Government and Ireland, 151-4. John M. Prost, Lord John Russell (London, 1972), 57-9. C. W. New, Lord Durham: A Biography of John George Lambton, First Earl of Durham (Oxford, 1929), 225-6.
57. Anglesey Papers, D619/28c/286, Anglesey to Grey, 30 Nov. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f327). Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 375 (7), Newport to Rice, 22 Dec. 1832.
58. Ellice Papers, MS 15047, f8, Parnell to Ellice, 28 Nov. 1832. Graham Papers, 16, Stanley to Graham, 8 Nov. 1832.

59. Brynn, A Political History of the Church of Ireland, 18-9, 26, 138-40, 151-3, 218-55. D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland, 95-6. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol. II, f281, Beresford to Dawson, 10 June 1822; *ibid*, Uncat., Archbishop of Dublin to Beresford, 27 March 1824, for the fears of Churchmen in the 1820's that landlords were 'ready to dispose of the property of the Church for their own advantage'.
60. D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland, 91. Grey Papers, File of Papers on Irish Church Revenues and Tithes, f35, Anglesey's Paper on Tythe & Church & Bishops' Lands, for the consideration of the Cabinet, 18 Jan. 1832. William Smith O'Brien, Thoughts upon Ecclesiastical Reform, with Suggestions for the Conciliatory Adjustment of the Tithe Question (Limerick, 1833), 5. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 182.
61. Brynn, A Political History of the Church of Ireland, 285.
62. See especially, A. R. Acheson, The Evangelists in the Church of Ireland, 1784-1859 (PhD, Belfast, 1967). Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy (Dublin, 1871), 28-50, 199-214, 340-68.
63. Many of the points are based on information in D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland, and Brynn, A Political History of the Church of Ireland.
64. Hansard, 2, 735-41, 742-3; 3, 4-5; 3, 419-21; 3, 473-6, 478; 4, 160; 4, 269-70, 271-2; 4, 585; 4, 1092-3, 1094, 1095, 1098, 1099, 1100-1, 1101; 4, 1173-82; 5, 1193; 6, 645-7, 655; 6, 923; 6, 1242, 1243, 1243-4, 1244-5; 6, 1373-4; 7, 21-2, 22, 24, 24-5, 25-6, 26; 7, 85-9; 7, 1209; 8, 134-5, 135, 136, 137-8, 138, 140, 140-1; 9, 51-3, 92-3; 9, 234-9, 277-80, 285-8, 293-5.
65. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 60, Beresford to Howley, 9 Dec. 1831.
66. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (1), Walker to Wyse, 19 May 1832. Of course the bill was not given up.
67. Derby Papers, 128/11, Beresford to Stanley, 13 March 1832.
68. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 16 Feb. 1832. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Lord Ellenborough's Diary, 193, 195-6, 10, 15 Feb. 1832.
69. Hansard, 9, 788-9, 24 Jan. 1832, Perceval; 9, 833-4, 26 Jan. 1832, Westmeath; 10, 3-4, 20, 7 Feb. 1832, Wicklow, Shaw; 10, 69-73, 8 Feb. 1832, Lefroy, Shaw; 10, 316-23, 14 Feb. 1832, Shaw, Croker, Lefroy; 10, 413-6, 16 Feb. 1832, Shaw; 10, 448-53, 17 Feb. 1832, Wicklow; 10, 675-7, 23 Feb. 1832, Limerick; 10, 759-60, 27 Feb. 1832, Wicklow; 10, 1062-3, 2 March 1832, Lefroy; 10, 1282-6, 1302, 1305, 1374, 8 March 1832, Wicklow, Caledon, Protest, Division; 11, 170-1, 13 March 1832, Conolly; 11, 995-1012, 27 March 1832, Lefroy, Division, Gordon, Division; 11, 1047-53, 28 March 1832, Dawson; 11, 1128-52, 30 March 1832, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Hayes, Jones, Division; 11, 1243-4, 2 April 1832, Dawson, Perceval; 12, 96, 9 April 1832, Lefroy, Division; 12, 465-6, 13 April 1832, Trench, Shaw, Perceval; 12, 499-537, 16 April 1832, Wicklow, Roden; 12, 1364-5, 23 May 1832, Wicklow; 13, 279-84, 1 June 1834, Wicklow, Roden, Londonderry.
70. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 403, f25, Stanley to Peel, 22 April 1832; *ibid*, MS 40, 611, f158, Memo from Stanley, annotated by Peel.

71. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 30, 31 May 1832.
72. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 July 1832. The Greville Memoirs, II, 309, 15 July 1832.
73. Hansard, 13, 1080-1, 28 June 1832, Wicklow; 13, 1159-60, 29 June 1832, Shaw; 14, 233, 10 July 1832, Brydges; 14, 378-82, 408-24, 13 July 1832, Lefroy, Dawson, Crampton, Division; 14, 690-1, 24 July 1832, Brydges; 14, 1009-10, 1 Aug. 1832, Shaw; 14, 1081, 2 Aug. 1832, Shaw; 14, 1278, 9 Aug. 1832, Westmeath. The Times, 14 July 1832, Division.
74. The Greville Memoirs, II, 310-1, 15 July 1832.
75. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 17, 19, 22, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, Beresford to Stanley, 22 Sept., 4 Oct., 1 Nov. 1832, 21 Jan., 2, 14, 19, 23 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 28, 30, 34, 35, Stanley to Beresford, 30 Sept., 5, 30 Oct., 1 Nov. 1832, 16, 28 Jan., 9, 19, 26 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, 64, 65, Beresford to Howley, 7, 10 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, Mant to Beresford, 15 Nov. 1832; *ibid*, 67, 68, Howley to Beresford, 17 Nov., 22 Dec. 1832. Beresford-Lealie MSS (NLI), MS 4838, p30, Stanley to Beresford, 30 Sept. 1832; *ibid*, p35, Beresford to Stanley, 4 Oct. 1832. Derby Papers, 128/11, Beresford to Stanley, 22 Sept., 4 Oct., 1 Nov. 1832, 21 Jan., 2, 14, 19, 23 Feb. 1833; Stanley to Beresford, 30 Sept., 5 Oct. 1832.
76. DEP, 8 (Jephson, Mahony), 17 (D. Browne), 29 (Evans) Nov., 1 (Evans, Ponsonby, Leader), 6 (T. Martin, Acheson), 8 (Wallace), 13 (O'Ferrall), 18 (Perrin, Brabazon, Evans) Dec. 1832, 8 (Lamb), 26 (J. Martin) Jan. 1833.
77. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f200, Villiers Stuart to O'Brien, 23 Dec. 1832.
78. Derby Papers, 126/5, Browne to Stanley, 3 Dec. 1832. DEP, 3 Jan. 1833.
79. William Smith O'Brien, Thoughts upon Ecclesiastical Reform, with Suggestions for the Conciliatory Adjustment of the Tithe Question (Limerick, 1833).
80. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f217, O'Brien to Stanley, 29 Jan. 1833.
81. *Ibid*, f219, Villiers Stuart to O'Brien, 1 Feb. 1833. See also, *ibid*, f241, Jacob Harvey to O'Brien, 29 March 1833.
82. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 375. (14), Rice to Musgrave, 30 Jan. 1833.
83. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 5, 7 Feb. 1833. Hansard, 15, 172-4, 212-5, 5 Feb. 1833, O'Connell, H. Grattan; 15, 270, 6 Feb. 1833, Sheil; 15, 395-6, 454-5, 8 Feb. 1833, Ruthven, Tennent.
84. Hansard, 15, 561-77, 12 Feb. 1833, Althorp. P.P., 1833, I, 339. Derby Papers, 116/7, Duncannon to Stanley, 8 Jan. 1833.
85. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 12 Feb. 1833.
86. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 284, Recollections, 12 Feb. 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/1, Littleton to Anglesey, 12 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, D619/28D/30, 32, Anglesey to Grey, 15, 17 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, D619/28A/143, Grey to Anglesey, 17 Feb. 1833 (also in Grey

- Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f357, 358, 359). Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 375 (7), Newport to Rice, 20 Feb. 1833.
87. Hansard, 15, 577-8, 591-2, 594-5, 615, 615, 12 Feb. 1833, O'Connell, Barron, Ruthven, Keane, O'Reilly.
88. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1955a, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 15 Feb. 1833. The Greville Memoirs, II, 355, 14 Feb. 1833. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 77, Exeter to Wellington, 13 Feb. 1833.
89. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (3), Wyse to Abercromby, 24 Feb. 1833. Beresford MSS, RCB, Vol. VI, 34, Stanley to Beresford, 19 Feb. 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/109, Stanley to Anglesey, 19 Feb. 1833. Hansard, 15, 875-930, 18 Feb. 1833, O'Connell, Ronayne, Finn; 15, 973-4, 19 Feb. 1833, O'Connell; 15, 996-8, 20 Feb. 1833, Sheil, O'Connell; 15, 1025-6, 21 Feb. 1833, Butler; 15, 1099-1100, 22 Feb. 1833, O'Connell; 15, 1150, 26 Feb. 1833, O'Connell; 15, 1192-1210, 27 Feb. 1833, O'Dwyer, Barron, Sheil, Roe, O'Connell; 15, 1308-48, 28 Feb. 1833, Sheil, F. O'Connor.
90. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 13 March 1833. Hansard, 15, 1351, 28 Feb. 1833, Carew; 16, 151-76, 4 March 1833, Barron, Lambert, Fitzgerald, Duncannon; 16, 216-61, 5 March 1833, Ruthven, Daunt, O'Connell; 16, 299-300, 6 March 1833, Vigors, Blackney; 16, 442-58, 8 March 1833, Ronayne, W. Roche, J. Grattan; 16, 521, 527, 11 March 1833, Lynch, M. O'Connell; 16, 575-618, 13 March 1833, Fitzgerald, H. Grattan, Baldwin, J. Grattan, Sheil, O'Connell, Lambert; 16, 668-9, 15 March 1833, O'Connell; 16, 727-69, 18 March 1833, Butler, Lambert, O'Connell, Lambert, Talbot, H. Grattan, O'Connell, Finn, Sheil, O'Connell, H. Grattan, Lambert, Althorp, O'Connell, J. Grattan, Sheil, O'Connell; 16, 1149-54, 27 March 1833, O'Connell, Chapman, H. Grattan, Barron, Lambert. The Times, 28 March 1833, Division.
91. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 18 March, 1 April 1833. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 3 April 1833.
92. Hansard, 16, 1263-4, 6 March 1833, D. Browne.
93. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 6, 20 May 1833. Hansard, 17, 1010-1, 6 May 1833, Division (one-sided); 17, 1131-9, 1140-2, 13 May 1833, French, O'Connell; 17, 1384, 1386, 20 May 1833, Finn, Division (one-sided); 18, 1065, 21 June 1833, Oxmantown.
94. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p3, Littleton to Lambert, 30 May 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/6, f103, Lambert to Littleton, 30 May 1833; *ibid*, f115, Althorp to Littleton, n.d.; *ibid*, f131, 167, Anglesey to Littleton, 4, 10 June 1833. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (3), Lambert to Wyse, 21 May 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/29A/93, Melbourne to Anglesey, 9 May 1833; *ibid*, D619/31E/9, Littleton to Anglesey, 3 June 1833; *ibid*, D619/31L/10, 13, Anglesey to Littleton, 4, 10 June 1833. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Le Marchant's Diary, 334, n.d.. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 213, 2 June 1833. The Times, 7 June 1833, Lambert (not in Hansard). Hansard, 16, 743, 18 March 1833, Althorp; 18, 388-90, 6 June 1833, H. Grattan, Ronayne, O'Connell, Barron; 18, 447-52, 7 June 1833, O'Connell, H. Grattan, Finn; 18, 597-659, 12 June 1833, Butler, O'Connor, Finn, Lambert, H. Grattan, Barron, Lambert, O'Ferrall, Barron, H. Grattan, F. O'Connor, Chapman, N. Fitzsimon, O'Connell,

- Fitzgerald, Ronayne, O'Connor Don, Division (one-sided); 18, 812-7, 14 June 1833, Barron, H. Grattan, O'Connell, F. O'Connor, Ronayne.
95. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1984, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 13 June 1833.
96. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 12 June 1833.
97. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p19, 35, Littleton to Gosset, 27 June, 5 July 1833; *ibid*, p22, Littleton to Lambert, 29 June 1833; *ibid*, p24, 28, Littleton to Anglesey, 29 June, 2 July 1833; *ibid*, p49, Littleton to Crampton, 12 July 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/1306, 1308, 1309, Lambert to Littleton, 28, 30 June, 3 July 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/20, Littleton to Anglesey, 29 June 1833.
98. Return of Money advanced to ecclesiastical persons, etc., P.P., 1833, XXVII, 491. See also Anglesey Papers, D619/29E/210, Anglesey to Melbourne, 12 May 1833.
99. Anglesey Papers, D619/27C/135, Anglesey to Holland, 7 Jan. 1833. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 372 (1), Anglesey to Rice, 23 Dec. 1832. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/6, f131, Anglesey to Littleton, 4 June 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/1321, Anglesey to Anon., 9 June 1833; *ibid*, D619/28C/284, 288, Anglesey to Grey, 28 Nov., 18 Dec. 1832 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f326, 330). See also Broughton Correspondence, Add MS 36, 467, f45, Graham to Hobhouse, 10 April 1833.
100. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/6, f115, Althorp to Littleton, n.d.; *ibid*, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p7, Littleton to Anglesey, 10 June 1833. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 213-4, 2 June 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/12, 13, 17, Littleton to Anglesey, 5, 10, 15 June 1833. Hansard, 18, 659-60, 12 June 1833, Althorp; 18, 819-51, 14 June 1833, Ruthven, O'Connell, F. O'Connor, O'Ferrall, Finn, Baldwin, Bellew, Chapman, James Talbot, D. Browne, Ruthven, Ronayne, Walker, O'Ferrall, Barron, Maonamara, Division.
101. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 219-23, 12, 16, 18, 22, 23 June 1833. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p91-2, 22 June 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/19, Littleton to Anglesey, 23 June 1833; *ibid*, D619/28A/157, Grey to Anglesey, 24 June 1833 (also in Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f394). A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Le Marchant's Diary, 338-9, 21, 22 June 1833; Ellenborough's Diary, 340, 22 June 1833. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 221-3, Peel to Goulburn, 19, 24 June 1833. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 317, Diary, 19 June 1833.
102. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 223, 22 June 1833.
103. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1988, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 22 June 1833. According to Littleton, 'Dan's eloquence and anger ran mountains high. Long as I have been in Parliament I never witnessed such a storm'. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/19, Littleton to Anglesey, 23 June 1833.
104. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 21 June 1833.
105. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/6, f349, Carew to Littleton, n.d..
106. Hansard, 18, 1073-1102, 21 June 1833, Stanley, O'Connell, F. O'Connor, H. Grattan, D. Browne, Baldwin, Division.

107. Anglesey Papers, D619/27A/200, Holland to Anglesey, 25 June 1833; ibid, D619/31E/19, Littleton to Anglesey, 23 June 1833. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 223, 23 June 1833. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p91-2, 22 June 1833. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Le Marchant's Diary, 338-9, 21, 22, 23 June 1833; Ellenborough's Diary, 340, 22 June 1833. The Greville Memoirs, II, 383, 26 June 1833. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 222, Peel to Goulburn, 24 June 1833.
108. Ellice Papers, MS 15032, Durham to Ellice, 23 June 1833. Lambton MSS, Durham to Grey, 30 July 1833, in C. W. New, Lord Durham: A Biography, 232, and S. J. Reid, Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham, 1792-1840 (London, 1906), I, 329.
109. Anglesey Papers, D619/27C/174, Anglesey to Holland, 23 June 1833; ibid, /190, Anglesey to Holland, 27 July 1833. The Marquess of Anglesey, One-Leg: Life and Letters of Anglesey, 121.
110. Hansard, 18, 1141-57, 24 June 1833, O'Connell, Ronayne, Finn, Lynch, O'Connell, Sheil, Division (one-sided), Sheil; 19, 42-5, 2 July 1833, O'Ferrall; 19, 119-20, 4 July 1833, Sheil; 19, 211-4, 5 July 1833, Sheil, Finn, Division (one-sided); 19, 257-301, 8 July 1833, Sheil, O'Connell, Division (one-sided), O'Connell, Fitzgerald, Division (one-sided); 20, 557, 12 Aug. 1833, D. Browne,
111. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 8 July 1833.
112. Hansard, 19, 654, 662-3, 15 July 1833, O'Connell, Division (one-sided).
113. The Greville Memoirs, II, 394, 15 July 1833.
114. Hansard, 19, 768-79, 17 July 1833, Conyngham, Clanricarde, Gosford; 19, 1016-8, 19 July 1833, Division; 20, 113-4, 126, 30 July 1833, Headfort, Division.
115. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Littleton's Diary, 354-5, 27 July 1833.
116. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1825, Memorial to Althorp, 1833; ibid, 1863, Clements to Littleton, 14 June 1834.
117. Ibid, 231a, Carew to Littleton, 13 July 1833.
118. Hansard, 19, 37-59, 2 July 1833, Barron, F. O'Connor, O'Ferrall, O'Connell, Sheil, Lambert, Barron; 20, 287, 2 Aug. 1833, O'Connell; 20, 350-1, 356-7, 5 Aug. 1833, O'Connell, Division; 20, 393-4, 6 Aug. 1833, Division; 20, 548-61, 12 Aug. 1833. O'Ferrall, Ruthven, D. Browne, Perrin, Division; 20, 737-40, 17 Aug. 1833, Wallace; 20, 782-3, 19 Aug. 1833, Division; 20, 813-5, 820-1, 21 Aug. 1833, O'Connell, Division. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p106, Littleton to Anglesey, 7 Aug. 1833 (also in Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/34).
119. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p333, Littleton to Lambert, 3 Jan. 1834.
120. DEP, 8 (Bruen), 13 (Daly, Shaw), 15 (Dawson) Dec. 1832.
121. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f358, Grey to Anglesey, 17 Feb. 1833; ibid, f359, Anglesey to Grey, 17 Feb. 1833 (also in Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/143, D619/28D/32).

122. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 12 Feb. 1833.
123. Hansard, 15, 614-5, 12 Feb. 1833, Shaw; 15, 999-1000, 1003-4, 20 Feb. 1833, Maxwell, Perceval; 16, 478-89, 11 March 1833, Shaw, Lefroy, Conolly, Perceval, Division; 15, 655-7, 14 March 1833, Shaw.
124. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p56-7, 12 March 1833 (also in A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, 315-6).
125. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 70, Goulburn to Beresford, 13 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, 71, 86, Beresford to Goulburn, 16 Feb., 20 March 1833; *ibid*, 72, 85, Elrington to Beresford, 13, 19 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, 83, Beresford to Elrington, 16 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, 87, 90, Beresford to Howley, 17 Feb., 16 March 1833; *ibid*, 88, 89, 92, Howley to Beresford, 14, 20 Feb., 23 March 1833; *ibid*, 91, Beresford to Laurence, 21 March 1833; *ibid*, 137, 139, 141, 143, Beresford to Cumberland, 22 Feb., 5, 16, 28 March 1833; *ibid*, 138, 142, Cumberland to Beresford, 27 Feb., 10 March 1833. Beresford Papers, AFL, Uncat., Mant to Beresford, 18 Feb. 1833; *ibid*, Killala to Beresford, 10 March 1833; *ibid*, Beresford to Blomfield, 30 March 1833. Grey Papers, File of Papers on the Irish Church, f18, Petition of the Archbishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Armagh against parts of the Church Temporalities Bill, March 1833. Hansard, 17, 1121, 13 May 1833, Lefroy. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 75, Exeter to Wellington, 13 Feb. 1833; 83, Viscount Beresford to Wellington, 22 Feb. 1833; 84, Beresford to Viscount Beresford, 18 Feb. 1833; 93, Wellington to Gleig, 26 Feb. 1833; 101, 104, Cumberland to Beresford, 18, 27 Feb. 1833; 102, Beresford to Cumberland, 21 Feb. 1833.
126. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 6 May 1833. Hansard, 16, 1355-67, 1 April 1833, Lefroy; 17, 40-3, 2 April 1833, Shaw; 17, 970-1011, 6 May 1833, Shaw, Peel, Conolly, Division (one-sided); 17, 1113-31, 1157, 1159-60, 13 May 1833, Lefroy, Bateson, Castlereagh; 17, 1393-1402, 20 May 1833, Bateson, Shaw, Perceval, A. Lefroy; 18, 919-953, 17 June 1833, Shaw, Lefroy, Shaw, Conolly, Bateson, Perceval; 18, 987-91, 18 June 1833, Shaw; 18, 1013-4, 19 June 1833, Shaw, Bateson; 18, 1098-1102, 21 June 1833, Division; 18, 1153-62, 24 June 1833, Shaw, Conolly, Perceval; 19, 51-8, 2 July 1833, Lefroy, Shaw, Conolly; 19, 210-7, 5 July 1833, Shaw, Lefroy, Perceval; 19, 288-91, 301, 8 July 1833, Lefroy, Division (one-sided). The votes of Coote and Bernard for the appropriation clause are not easily explained. Coote, possibly, had not yet completed his movement into the Conservative ranks. Bernard had voted with his Tory colleagues against the second reading in April and was regarded unequivocally by Charles Wood as a member of the 'orange opposition'. Broughton Correspondence, Add MS 36, 467, f38, Wood to Hobhouse, 9 April 1833. Also Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 11, Bandon to Wellington, 4 Jan. 1833.
127. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 64, 73, 75, 182, Exeter to Wellington, 8, 12, 13 Feb., 6 April 1833; 67, 194, Wellington to Exeter, 10 Feb., 10 April 1833; 93, Wellington to Gleig, 26 Feb. 1833; 117, Roden to Wellington, 12 March 1833; 119, Wellington to Rosslyn, 13 March 1833; 120, Wellington to Roden, 13 March 1833; 141, Wellington to Camden, 26 March 1833. Hansard, 16, 995-7, 25 March 1833, Roden.
128. *Ibid*, 243, Carbery to Wellington, 1 July 1833.

129. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p98-9, 7 July 1833 (also in A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, 343). Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 246-8, Eldon to Wellington, 9 July 1833.
130. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p100-6, 10, 13, 16 July 1833. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Ellenborough's Diary, 346-8, 10, 13, 16 July 1833; Le Marchant's Diary, 361-3, 21 July 1833. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 248, 256, 259, Lady Salisbury's Diary, 10, 13, 14 July 1833; 251, 253, Wellington to Bishop of Exeter, 11, 13 July 1833; 256, Note by Wellington, n.d.; 258, Strangford to Wellington, 14 July 1833; 263, Peel to Wellington, 20 July 1833; 265, Wellington to Peel, 23 July 1833. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 309, f264, Wellington to Peel, 23 July 1833. H. Twiss, The Public and Private Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon (London, 1844), III, 206-7, Eldon to Bankes, 12, 16 July 1833. G. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 218, 222. The Greville Memoirs, II, 394, 15 July 1833. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 231, 17-9 July 1833.
131. Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy, 195-6, Lefroy to Wife, 18 July 1833, n.d..
132. Hansard, 19, 755-81, 17 July 1833, Roden, Wicklow, Limerick, Winchilsea, Londonderry, Westmeath; 19, 807-76, 18 July 1833, Carbery, Exeter, Mansfield; 19, 948-1018, 19 July 1833, Wellington, Longford, Newcastle, Cumberland, Division. Carbery apparently did not attend for the division.
133. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/4, p112, 25 July 1833. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Littleton's Diary, 352, 354, 25, 26 July 1833; Ellenborough's Diary, 353, 25 July 1833; Le Marchant's Diary, 364-6, n.d.. Ratherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p88, Littleton to Althorp, 26 July 1833; *ibid*, p91, Littleton to Anglesey, 26 July 1833. Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/44, Littleton to Anglesey, 26 July 1833; *ibid*, /45, Littleton to Althorp, 26 July 1833; *ibid*, D619/29A/120, Melbourne to Anglesey, 26 July 1833. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 25 July 1833. The Greville Memoirs, II, 400-1, 404, 25, 27 July 1833. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 260, Carbery to Wellington, 16 July 1833; 266, Cashel to Wellington, 23 July 1833. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 234-5, 25, 26 July 1833. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 324, Diary, 27 July 1833. Hansard, 19, 1085-8, 23 July 1833, Rosae; 19, 1222-3, 1229-30, 1232-3, 25 July 1833, Limerick, Wicklow, Division; 20, 1-4, 26 July 1833, Grey; 20, 54-5, 29 July 1833, Westmeath; 20, 116-26, 30 July 1833, Longford, Wellington, Division.
134. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 269, Wellington to Elgin, 27 July 1833; 270, Wellington to Cashel, 27 July 1833; 284, Wellington to Monson, 24 Aug. 1833.
135. Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy, 196, Lefroy to Wife, n.d.. On the fury of 'a great body of the Tories' against Wellington, see also H. Maxwell, The Creevy Papers (London, 1904), II, 258, Creevy to Ord, 31 July 1833. A. Aspinall, The Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot, 172-5, Rosslyn to Mrs Arbuthnot, 24, 27 July 1833, 5 Aug. 1833, to Arbuthnot, 6 Aug. 1833.
136. Hansard, 15, 444-6, 8 Feb. 1833, Shaw; 16, 133, 4 March 1833, Castlereagh; 16, 212-5, 5 March 1833, Lefroy; 16, 747, 760-1, 762-3,

- 18 March 1833, Shaw, Lefroy; 16, 1149, 27 March 1833, Shaw; 16, 1317-32, 1 April 1833, Wellington, Roden, Division; 18, 390, 6 June 1833, Lefroy; 18, 448, 450-2, 7 June 1833, Lefroy, Shaw; 18, 604-6, 655-6, 658-9, 659, 12 June 1833, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Division. The Times, 28 March 1833, Division on Lambert's proviso, 27 March 1833. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 153-4, Buckingham to Wellington, 31 March 1833.
137. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/2C68, Farnham to Littleton, 18 June 1833.
138. Beresford Papers, AFL, J. E. Jackson, Dean of Armagh, to Beresford, 22 June 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/6, f247, Cashel to Littleton, 17 June 1833.
139. Hansard, 18, 661, 12 June 1833, Shaw; 18, 811-51, 14 June 1833, Sinclair, Shaw, Perceval, Lefroy, Conolly, Verner, Christman, Division; 18, 1057-9, 1059, 21 June 1833, Roden Westcath; 18, 1143-7, 24 June 1833, Shaw; 19, 51-8, 2 July 1833, Lefroy, Shaw, Conolly.
140. Hansard, 18, 1031-7, 1060-2, 21 June 1833, Wicklow; 20, 345-8, 356-7, 5 Aug. 1833, Shaw, Division; 20, 393-4, 6 Aug. 1833, Division; 20, 545-8, 560-1, 12 Aug. 1833, Shaw, Division; 20, 741-8, 17 Aug. 1833, Shaw; 20, 816-20, 21 Aug. 1833, Shaw; 20, 886-7, 26 Aug. 1833, Wicklow.
141. Grey Papers, File of Papers on Irish Church Revenues and Tithes, f20, 21, Beresford to Grey, 14, 21 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, f22, Grey to Beresford, n.d.. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 75, 95, Beresford to Grey, 14, 21 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, 93, 94, Grey to Beresford, 15, 18, Aug. 1833; *ibid*, 101, Howley to Beresford, 26 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, 102, Plunkett to Beresford, 26 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, 134, A Brief View of the Tithe Arrears bill, of its probable effects, its advantages and disadvantages .. sent to Lord Grey, Aug. 14, 1833.
142. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f61, Melbourne to Littleton, 29 Aug. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p151, Littleton to Wellesley, 6 Sept. 1833; *ibid*, p154, 165, 308, Littleton to Melbourne, 6, 21 Sept., 20 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, p155, Littleton to Gosset, 7 Sept. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/7, f239, Melbourne to Littleton, 29 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, f315, Wellesley to Littleton, 7 Sept. 1833; *ibid*, f359, Russell to Littleton, 16 Sept. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/9, f235, Melbourne to Littleton, 23 Dec. 1833. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, Melbourne to Littleton, 29 Aug. 1833.
143. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/10, f17, 251, 277, 321, 357, Wellesley to Littleton, 2, 30 Jan., 1, 4, 12 Feb. 1834. Home Office Papers, HO 100/245, f138, Wellesley to Melbourne, 18 April 1834.
144. Ogden MSS, MS 84, Russell's Journal of Visit to Ireland, 7, 16, Sept. 1833; *ibid*, Enclosed Note by Russell, Sept. 1833. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f130, 162, Duncannon to Littleton, 17 Oct., 6 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f139, Duncannon to Wellesley, 22 Oct. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p188, 229, Littleton to Duncannon, 10 Oct., 4 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, p191, Littleton to Melbourne, 14 Oct. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/7, f379, Duncannon to Anon., 17 Sept. 1833; *ibid*, f383, Littleton paper, n.d.; *ibid*, /8, f141, 277, 417, Duncannon to Littleton, 17, 29 Oct., 6 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f157, Wellesley to Littleton, 17 Oct. 1833; *ibid*, /1421a, Littleton paper, Oct. 1833; *ibid*, /1421c, Duncannon memo, 22 Oct. 1833. Graham Papers, 22, Duncannon to Graham, 30 Oct. 1833. Walpole, Lord John Russell,

- I, 205-6, Memorandum by Russell, 18 Oct. 1833 (also in Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 42-4).
145. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f169, Newport to Wellesley, 11 Nov. 1833. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 375 (7), Newport to Rice, 6 Dec. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1792d, Parnell to Littleton, 9 Aug. 1833. Lord Cloncurry, The Design of a Law, for promoting the pacification of Ireland and the improvement of the Irish Territory and Population (Dublin, 1834), 1-3, 22-5.
146. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/2687, Talbot to Littleton, 2 Nov. 1833.
147. Ibid, /1800, Lambert to Littleton, 7 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /1792, Carew to Littleton, 1 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /1792, Donoughmore to Littleton, 3 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /1796, 2659, Stuart to Littleton, 14, 25 Oct. 1833; *ibid*, /9, f13, Lambert's plan for payment of the Catholic clergy, (Nov. 1833).
148. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1792a, 1792c, Rochfort to Littleton, 28 Aug., 1 Nov. 1833.
149. Newport Papers, MS 796, Littleton to Newport, 31 Dec. 1833. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f166, Melbourne to Wellesley, 10 Nov. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p249, Littleton to Melbourne, 16 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/8, f185, Plunket to Littleton, Oct. 1833; *ibid*, f293, Campbell to Wellesley, 30 Oct. 1833; *ibid*, f453, Melbourne to Littleton, 10 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /1914, Memo on the impracticability of a land tax, 1833.
150. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f188, Stanley to Wellesley, 20 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f190, 209, Grey to Wellesley, 22, 30 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f193, 196, Melbourne to Wellesley, 22 (2) Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f201, 203, Melbourne to Littleton, 22, 23 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f227, Holland to Wellesley, 1 Dec. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p249, Littleton to Melbourne, 16 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/8, f525, Wellesley to Melbourne, 16 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f589, 617, 645, Melbourne to Littleton, 20, 22, 23 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f621, Melbourne to Wellesley, 22 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f719, Grey to Wellesley, 30 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /9, f211, Tithe plan, 16 Nov. 1833.
151. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/10, f113, Newport to Littleton, 10 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, f117, Plunket to Littleton, 11 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, f209, Plunket to Wellesley, 23 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/1850, Carew to Littleton, n.d..
152. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f209, Grey to Wellesley, 30 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f246, Duncannon to Wellesley, 13 Dec. 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p249, 265, Littleton to Melbourne, 16, 26 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, p307, Duncannon to Wellesley, 13 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/8, f609, Russell to Littleton, 22 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, f719, Grey to Wellesley, 30 Nov. 1833; *ibid*, /9, f37, Melbourne to Littleton, 3 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, f75, Duncannon to Littleton, 13 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, f163, Ebrington to Littleton, 21 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, f171, Littleton to Melbourne, Dec. 1833; *ibid*, /10, f71, Duncannon to Littleton, 8 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, f97, Russell to Littleton, 9 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, /2770, Littleton to Wellesley, 24 Jan. 1834.
153. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 306, f308, Althorp to Littleton, 5 Jan. 1834. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p359, Littleton to Duncannon, 10 Jan. 1834. *ibid*, p394, 397, 402, 406, 409, 461, Littleton to Wellesley, 31 Jan., 3, 5, 6, 7 Feb., 3 March 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/9, f255, Althorp to Littleton, 26 Dec. 1833; *ibid*, /10,

- f55, Althorp to Littleton, 5 Jan. 1834; *ibid*, f289, 317, 325, 509, Wellesley to Littleton, 2, 4, 5, 20 Feb. 1834; *ibid*, f433, Russell memo, 15 Feb. 1834. Holland House Papers, Add MS 51, 677, f125, Russell to Holland, 15 Feb. 1834.
154. Hansard, 21, 572-91, 20 Feb. 1834, Littleton.
155. Sheil Papers, MS 11, 138 (1), Sheil to Wife, 21 Feb. 1834.
156. Hansard, 21, 591-628, 20 Feb. 1834, O'Connell, F. O'Connor, Bellew, Lambert, Sheil, H. Grattan, Barron, Lalor, Fitzgerald, Walker, Division (one-sided); 21, 763, 25 Feb. 1834, J. Browne; 21, 1046-8, 1050, 4 March 1834, O'Connell, Sheil; 23, 27, 64-5, 25 April 1834, H. Grattan, Sheil; 23, 150-1, 172-3, 180-3, 28 April 1834, Finn, Ronayne; 23, 216-7, 262-3, 269, 286, 29 April 1834, M. O'Connell, Walker, W. Roche, O'Connell; 23, 402-4, 1 May 1834, Barron; 23, 426-72, 2 May 1834, O'Ferrall, Carew, Finn, Clements, F. O'Connor, H. Grattan, D. Browne, Lambert, Sheil, Blackney, Walker, O'Reilly, Division (one-sided). See also Pierce Mahony, Tithe Bill, Ireland: Letters from Mr. Mahony to the Right Hon. E. J. Littleton, M.P. and Chief Secretary of State for Ireland, on the Irish Tithe or Land-Tax Bill of 1834 (London, 1834).
157. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p134, Littleton to Wellesley, 3 May 1834 (also in Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f8); *ibid*, p137, Littleton to Blackburn, 3 May 1834.
158. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/2571a, Martin to Littleton, 25 Sept. 1834.
159. Hansard, 23, 623-678, 6 May 1834, Ronayne, Lalor, O'Conor Don, W. Roche, Ruthven, Fitzgerald, O'Connell, Barron, D. Roche, Sheil, Division (one-sided).
160. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (7), Wyse to George Wyse, 9 May 1834, n.d. May 1834. He would pay priests 'as schoolmasters are paid - a house, a garden or glebe, a small income to keep it in repair from the State'.
161. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p150, 152, 171, 181, 183, 195, 202, 212, 214; *ibid*, D260/M/01/11, ff505, 529, 557, 579, 603, 651, 659; *ibid*, /12/1, ff17, 25. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, ff26, 30, 43, 64, 70; *ibid*, MS 37, 311, f145. Graham Papers, 25, Memo by Graham, 27 May 1834; 26, Graham to Lyttleton, 3 June 1834; Graham to Bentinck, 12 June 1834. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 333, f172. Ellice Papers, MS 15047, f149. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 251-3. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, 378-81. The Greville Memoirs, III, 33-50. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2066, 2068, 2073. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 243-7. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 187. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 340-7. John Earl Russell, Recollections and Suggestions, 1813-1873 (London, 1875), 117-24. Sir H. L. Bulwer, The Life of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston (London, 1870), I, 194-9, Palmerston to Temple, 27 June 1834. Lord Brougham, The Life and Times of Henry Lord Brougham, written by himself (Edinburgh/London, 1871), III, 364-75. Prest, Russell, 64-6. Hansard, 23, 666, 6 May 1834, Russell; 24, 11-87, 2 June 1834, Althorp, Ward, Rice, Lambert, O'Connell, O'Reilly, Palmerston, D. Browne, Ellice, Division (one-sided); 24, 281-2, 6 June 1834, Clanricarde.
162. Derby Papers, 128/15, Carew to Stanley, 3 June 1834.
163. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (7), Wyse to George Wyse, 2 June 1834. *Ibid*, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 June 1834.

- X 164. Durham Papers, Lambert to Durham, 10 June 1834, cited in Kriegel, The Whig Government and Ireland, 272. Also Cloncurry, Personal Recollections, 460-1, Lambert to Cloncurry, 3 June 1834.
- X 165. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p212, 214, Littleton to Wellesley, 30 31 May 1834. Graham Papers, 25, Graham memorandum, 27 May 1834. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 June 1834. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 252, n.d.. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Le Marchant's Diary, 379-81, n.d.. The Greville Memoirs, III, 42, 1 June 1834. Baron E. Von Stockmar, Memoirs of Baron Stockmar (London, 1872), I, 332, Memoir of King William IV, 14 Jan. 1835. Hansard, 24, 292-3, 6 June 1834, Lansdowne.
- X 166. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Le Marchant's Diary, 381, n.d..
167. Monteagle Papers, MS 550, Rice to Northampton, 26 June 1834; *ibid*, Rice to Bourke, 26 June 1834. Hansard, 24, 41-4, 2 June 1834, Rice; 24, 775-80, 23 June 1834, Rice.
168. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1517a, Clements to Littleton, 8 May 1834.
169. *Ibid*, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p195, Littleton to Wellesley, 26 May 1834.
170. *Ibid*, p224, Littleton to Wellesley, 5 June 1834.
171. *Ibid*, p247, Littleton to Wellesley, 11 June 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/2836, Littleton to Wellesley, 12 June 1834.
172. *Ibid*, D260/M/01/1863, Clements to Littleton, 14 June 1834.
173. *Ibid*, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p260, Littleton to Althorp, 18 June 1834; *ibid*, p264, Littleton to Wellesley, 18 June 1834.
174. Hansard, 24, 734-71, 23 June 1834, O'Connell, O'Connor, Sheil, French, The Times, 25 June 1834, Division.
175. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1572, Lambert to Littleton, 27 June 1834.
176. *Ibid*, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p302, Littleton to Wellesley, 29 June 1834.
177. *Ibid*, D260/M/01/12, f201, Lambert to Littleton, 1 July 1834. Hansard, 24, 982-98, 30 June 1834, O'Connell, Clements, O'Ferrall; 24, 1143-1212, 4 July 1834, O'Connell, O'Reilly, O'Connell, Lambert, Division (one-sided); 25, 713-9, 747-9, 29 July 1834, O'Connell, O'Reilly, Clements; 25, 25, 755-72, 30 July 1834, O'Connell, Clements, O'Grady, O'Connell, Ferrin, O'Grady, O'Reilly, O'Connell.
178. Monteagle Papers, MS 550, Rice to Taylor, 31 July 1834; *ibid*, MS 13, 382 (13), Taylor to Rice, 2 Aug. 1834. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (3), Lambert to Wyse, 16 Oct. 1834. Lambert called O'Connell a 'brazen ruffian' for his conduct in this affair.
- X 179. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (3), Lambert to Wyse, 16 Oct. 1834. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p377, Littleton to Blackburne, 31 July 1834; *ibid*, p381, Littleton to Wellesley, 2 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p384, Littleton to Gosset, 5 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/13, f13, Wellesley to Littleton, 6 Aug. 1834. Monteagle Papers, MS 550, Rice to Taylor, 31 July 1834; *ibid*, MS 13, 382 (13), Taylor to Rice, 2 Aug. 1834. The Greville Memoirs, III, 67, 7 Aug. 1834. Kriegel, Holland House

- Diaries, 262-3, n.d.. Hansard, 25, 748-8, 29 July 1834, Althorp, Littleton; 25, 758, 763-4, 30 July 1834, Littleton, Althorp. According to Hobhouse, Lansdowne was the only Cabinet member who opposed the change, allegedly out of concern for his 'pecuniary interests' as an Irish landlord. Recollections of Lord Broughton, IV, 360, Diary, 31 July 1834.
180. Monteagle Papers, MS 550, Rice to Taylor, 31 July 1834. Hansard, 25, 771-2, 30 July 1834, Division.
- X 181. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2096, 2097, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 5, 6 Aug. 1834. Hansard, 25, 924-5, 4 Aug. 1834, O'Connell; 25, 991-3, 5 Aug. 1834, O'Connell; 25, 1114, 1114-5, 8 Aug. 1834, Ruthven, O'Grady.
182. Hansard, 21, 598-9, 623-4, 20 Feb. 1834, Shaw, Christmas.
183. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/11, f79, Wellesley to Littleton, 13 March 1834; *ibid*, f291, Conway to Littleton, 1 April 1834. Home Office Papers, HO 100/245, ff116, 118, 120, 122, 126, 128, 130, 134, 140, 146, Reports of Inspectors General, April 1834.
184. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/11, f365, Wellesley to Littleton, 5 April 1834; *ibid*, f369, Beresford to Wellesley, 4 April 1834; *ibid*, f373, Beresford to Littleton, 4 April 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/1425, Observations of Primate Beresford on the Tithe Bill of 1834, in the handwriting of Archdeacon Stopford, n.d.. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 98, Beresford to Littleton, 4 April 1834.
185. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p84, Littleton to Wellesley, 10 April 1834.
186. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f1, Littleton to Wellesley, 2 May 1834 (also in Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p132).
187. Hansard, 23, 437-72, 2 May 1834, Conolly, Lefroy, Perceval, Division (one-sided); 23, 654-78, 6 May 1834, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Conolly, Lefroy, Division (one-sided); 23, 1100-2, 16 May 1834, Wicklow; 24, 24-8, 83-5, 86-7, 2 June 1834, Conolly, Lefroy, Division (one-sided); 24, 421-5, 13 June 1834, Tennent; 24, 1211-2, 4 July 1834, Division (one-sided). The Times, 25 June 1834, Division.
188. Thomas Lefroy, Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy, 206-10, Lefroy to Jeffrey, 4 June, 7 July 1834. See also Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (13), Fox to Maxwell, 12 June 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/208/16, Lascelles to Downshire, (June 1834).
- X 189. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 547, Roden to Wellington, 31 May 1834; 552, Wellington to Roden, 3 June 1834; 558, Wellington to Rowley, 14 June 1834; 561, Wellington to Londonderry, 17 June 1834; 577, Exeter to Wellington, 25 June 1834; 578, Wellington to Exeter, 25 June 1834; 589, Peel to Wellington, 4 July 1834; 589, Wellington to Peel, 5 July 1834, (also in Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 309, f268); 596, Wellington to Taylor, 5 July 1834.
190. Hansard, 24, 244-50, 279-80, 280-1, 308-9, 6 June 1834, Wicklow, Limerick, Westmeath; 25, 201-4, 21 July 1834, Londonderry; 25, 1137, 1140-1, 11 Aug. 1834, Londonderry, Wicklow.
191. Graham Papers, 26, Peel to Graham, 23 June 1834.

192. Ibid, 27, Graham to Stanley, 3 July 1834. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 206-7.
193. Hansard, 24, 765-75, 23 June 1834, Lefroy, Shaw; 24, 998-1000, 30 June 1834, Shaw; 24, 1173-8, 1179-82, 1203, 4 July 1834, Lefroy, Shaw, Christmas; 25, 743-8, 29 July 1834, Shaw; 25, 758-74, 30 July 1834, Hayes, Shaw, A. Lefroy, Lefroy, Jones, Division, Shaw, Lefroy; 25, 797-811, 31 July 1834, Shaw, Lefroy, Christmas; 25, 895-6, 1 Aug. 1834, Lefroy, Shaw; 25, 925, 927, 4 Aug. 1834, Shaw, Lefroy; 25, 971-88, 5 Aug. 1834, Lefroy, Young, Shaw; 25, 1112-3, 1115, 8 Aug. 1834, Shaw, Lefroy.
194. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p403, Littleton to Melbourne, 13 Aug. 1834.
195. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 611 (3), Lefroy to Farnham, 2 Aug. 1834.
196. Graham Papers, 14, Graham to Stanley, 29 July 1834; 27, Graham to Stanley, 3 July 1834; Stanley to Graham, 22 July 1834.
197. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 596, Wellington to Beresford, 5 July 1834.
198. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f187, Shaw to Roden, 29 July 1834.
199. The Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs of the Courts and Cabinets of William IV and Victoria ..(London, 1861), Vol. II, 115, 119, Londonderry to Buckingham, 2, 8 Aug. 1834; 118, Cumberland to Buckingham, 7 Aug. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 629, Downshire to Wellington, 4 Aug. 1834. The Greville Memoirs, III, 67, 12 Aug. 1834. Graham Papers, 27, Graham to Stanley, 8 Aug. 1834. Hansard, 25, 1198-1207, 11 Aug. 1834, London, Roden, Division.
200. Graham Papers, 30, Palmerston to Graham, 11 Aug. 1834. The Greville Memoirs, III, 67-8, 12 Aug. 1834. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 3, p401, 425, Littleton to Wellesley, 12, 21 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p403, Littleton to Melbourne, 13 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p407, 433, 445, Littleton to Gosset, 14, 30 Aug., 2 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, p409, Littleton to Conway, 14 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p412, Littleton to Bishop of Limerick, 14 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p429, Littleton to Abercromby, 28 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, p437, Littleton to Duncannon, 2 Sept. 1834; Vol. 4, p11, Littleton to Melbourne, 19 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/13, f113, Gosset to Littleton, 27 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, 137, 709, Wellesley to Littleton, 28 Aug., 17 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f149, Craig to Littleton, 29 Aug. 1834. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f143, Duncannon to Wellington, 27 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, MS 37, 311, f167, 169, Brougham to Wellesley, 8, 21 Aug. 1834. E. J. Whately, Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., Late Archbishop of Dublin (London, 1866), I, 243, whately to Senior, 5 Dec. 1834. Also The Wellesley Papers, The Life and Correspondence of Richard Colley Wellesley Marquess Wellesley, 1760-1842 (London, 1914), II, 245-6, Brougham to Wellesley, 8, 21 Aug. 1834. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 263, n.d..
201. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2099, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 8 Aug. 1834.
202. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/13, f157, Craig to Littleton, 30 Aug. 1834.
203. The Greville Memoirs, III, 70, 14 Aug. 1834. Hansard, 25, 1240-54, 13 Aug. 1834, Perceval, O'Reilly, Ward, Potter, Codrington, Shaw, Walker, Stawell, Perceval, H. Grattan.

204. Aberdeen Papers, Add MS 43, 060, f113, 121, Wellington to Aberdeen, 23 Aug., 4 Sept. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 639, 663.
205. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/516, Duplicated summons to the Protestant Meeting on the 14th, signed by Lords Roden, Longford, Bandon, Lorton, Farnham and Enniskillen. Anon., An Authentic Report of the Proceedings at the Meeting of the Protestants of Ireland, held on Thursday, the 14th of August, 1834, in the King's Room, at the Mansion House, in the City of Dublin (Dublin, 1834), 1.
206. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/512, 517, Roden to Downshire, 5, 14 Aug. 1834.
207. Ibid, /518, Lucas to Downshire, Aug. 1834.
208. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2102, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 15 Aug. 1834.
209. An Authentic Report of the Proceedings .. on Thursday, the 14th of Aug. 1834. See also, Anon., Report of Proceedings at the Dinner given to the Earl of Winchilsea at Morrisson's Hotel, in the City of Dublin, on Friday, the 15th Aug. 1834 (Dublin, 1834). DEM, 15 Aug. 1834.
210. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 645, Roden to Wellington, 26 Aug. 1834. For a less complimentary view of this meeting of 'fools', see The Greville Memoirs, III, 73, 19 Aug. 1834.
211. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f65, 145, Bandon to Roden, 20, 27 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f73, Roden to Wellington, 25 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f77, Lorton to Roden, 20 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f105, 289, Longford to Roden, 23 Aug., 4 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f111, 189, Sheehan to Roden, 21, 30 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f115, Downes to Roden, 20 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f117, 237, 293, Shaw to Roden, 23 Aug., 1, 4 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f259, Circular, Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f267, Boyton to Roden, 2 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f283, Winchilsea to Roden, 3 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f701, Prospectus, n.d... Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/521, Roden to Downshire, 1 Sept. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 643, Roden to Wellington, 25 Aug. 1834.
212. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f51, 57, Hamilton to Roden, 16, 21 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, f87, 293, Shaw to Roden, 20 Aug., 4 Sept. 1834. Wellington Papers, Port. 20, f34, Mc Crea to Wellington, 10 Dec. 1834.
213. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f55, 223, Wellington to Roden, 19 Aug., 1 Sept. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 636, 651, 657.
214. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 650, Wellington to Fitzgerald, 29 Aug. 1834; 663, Wellington to Aberdeen, 4 Sept. 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/522, Wellington to Downshire, 4 Sept. 1834. Aberdeen Papers, Add MS 43, 060, f121, Wellington to Aberdeen, 4 Sept. 1834.
215. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f341, Hamilton to Roden, 14 Sept. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 643, Roden to Wellington, 25 Aug. 1834.
216. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f233, Boyton to Roden, 26 Aug. 1834.
217. *Ibid*, f345, Wellington to Roden, 15 Sept. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 671, Roden to Wellington, 11 Sept. 1834; 677.

- Wellington to Downshire, 20 Sept. 1834; 677, Wellington to Aberdeen, 21 Sept. 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/529, Wellington to Downshire, 20 Sept. 1834.
218. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 645, Roden to Wellington, 16 Aug. 1834. Report of Proceedings at the Dinner given to the Earl of Winchilsea, 7.
219. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f51, 57, Hamilton to Roden, 16, 21 Aug. 1834.
220. Ibid, f283, 347, Winchilsea to Roden, 3, 16 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, f297, Hamilton to Roden, 5 Sept. 1834.
221. Ibid, f301, Bateson to Roden, 5 Sept. 1834. Also *ibid*, f307, James Stuart to Roden, 6 Sept. 1834.
222. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/523, Downshire to Roden, 9 Sept. 1834 (also in Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f367); *ibid*, D671/C/2/573/1, Downshire to Reilly, 10 Sept. 1834.
223. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/525, Roden to Downshire, 17 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, /526, Downshire to Roden, 18 Sept. 1834 (also in Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f361).
224. Downshire Papers, D671/C/2/579/1, Downshire to Reilly, 23 Sept. 1834.
225. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f413, Wellington to Roden, 29 Sept. 1834.
226. Ibid, f431, Declaration. Nugent Papers, D552/A/6/6/22, Declaration.
227. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f429, Londonderry to Roden, 27 Sept. 1834.
228. Ibid, f545, Forde to Roden, 15 Oct. 1834. Wellington Papers, Port. 17, f66, Roden to Wellington, 26 Nov. 1834.
229. Nugent Papers, D552/A/6/6/21, 25, Forde to Nugent, 1, 13 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /23, Nugent to Forde, 4 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /26, Crawford to Nugent, 23 Oct. 1834. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f453, Forde to Roden, 5 Oct. 1834.
230. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f457, Gordon to Roden, 6 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f519, Reilly to Roden, 12 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f529, Bateson to Roden, 13 Oct. 1834.
231. Ibid, f529, Bateson to Roden, 13 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f545, 585, Forde to Roden, 15, 19 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f629, Clanwilliam to Roden, 24 Oct. 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/534, Clanwilliam to Downshire, Oct. 1834.
232. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f445, Bateson to Roden, 3 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f537, Anon. to Roden, 13 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f539, Ely to Roden, 14 Oct. 1834.
233. DEM, 10 Oct. 1834.
234. DEM, 15 Oct. 1834.
235. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 696, 698, Roden to Wellington, 16, 24 Oct. 1834.
236. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f635, Cooke to Roden, 25 Oct. 1834.

237. J. L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, 269-71, Roden to Cooke, 26 Oct. 1834.
238. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f647, Cooke to Roden, 27 Oct. 1834.
239. DEM, 31 Oct. 1834.
240. Roden Papers, D/Lo/C84 (1), Roden to Londonderry, 7 Nov. 1834. Clanwilliam Papers, D3044/F/13/165, Diary, 30 Oct. 1834. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f269, Downshire to Wellesley, 2 Nov. 1834. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/536, Forde to Downshire, 3 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, /537, Kilmorey to Downshire, 3 Nov. 1834. Wellington Papers, Port. 16, f16, Downshire to Wellington, 16 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, f139, Londonderry to Wellington, 23 Nov. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 706, Roden to Wellington, 31 Oct. 1834; 712, Clanwilliam to Wellington, (2 Nov. 1834).
241. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 99, Beresford to Wellington, 11 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, 114, Beresford to Northumberland, 13 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, 115, Beresford to Howley, 9 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, 124, Wellington to Beresford, 3 Nov. 1834. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 4, p48, 181, Littleton to Duncannon, 27 Sept., 30 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, p129, Littleton to Brougham, 17 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, D260/M/01/13, f609, Duncannon to Littleton, 10 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /14, f25, Wellesley to Beresford, 4 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, /1952, Stopford to Whately, 16 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /1953, Address of the Irish Bishops to the Clerical Society, n.d.; *ibid*, /1954, Whately to Littleton, Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /1955, Duncannon to Wellesley, 3 Nov. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 687, 695, 705, Gloucester to Wellington, 12, 16, 30 Oct. 1834; 690, 737, Wellington to Gloucester, 14 Oct., 14 Nov. 1834; 697, Wellington to Roden, 18 Oct. 1834; 715, Wellington to Beresford, 3 Nov. 1834; 731, Beresford to Wellington, 11 Nov. 1834; 733, Memorial to the Lord Lieutenant from the Irish Bishops, 30 Oct. 1834; 734, Wellesley to Beresford, 4 Nov. 1834; 737, Duncannon to Wellesley, 3 Nov. 1834. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f567, Wellington to Roden, 18 Oct. 1834. Home Office Papers, HO 100/245, f255, Duncannon to Wellesley, 3 Nov. 1834.
242. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f597, Sheehan to Roden, 20 Oct. 1834.
243. Stanley on his estate in Tipperary.
244. Downshire Papers, D671/C/208/18, Address to the Marquis of Downshire, Nov. 1834; *ibid*, /20, Reply, n.d.; *ibid*, D671/C/165/1, Close to Downshire, 22 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, /2, Close to Reilly, 30 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, /4, Downshire to Close, 9 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, D671/C/12/520, Roden to Close, 22 Aug. 1834; *ibid*, /527, Downshire to Wellington, 18 Sept. 1834. Perceval-Maxwell Papers, D3244/G/1/96, Roden to Maxwell, 11 Oct. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 676, Downshire to Wellington, 18 Sept. 1834. Graham Papers, 27, Stanley to Graham, 30 Sept., 19 Oct. 1834.
245. *Ibid*, D671/C/12/526, Downshire to Roden, 18 Sept. 1834 (also in Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f361).
246. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1948, Report of Meeting of the Irish Land Agents in Dublin on the 2nd of Oct. 1834.
247. W. A. Maguire, Letters of a great Irish landlord: a selection from the estate correspondence of the third Marquess of Downshire, 1809-45 (Belfast, 1974), 94, Thomas Perry to John Murray, 3 Nov. 1834.

248. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f289, Longford to Roden, 4 Sept. 1834.
249. Ibid, f349, Anon. to Roden, 16 Sept. 1834.
250. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 696, Roden to Wellington, 16 Oct. 1834; 701, Fitzgerald to Wellington, 26 Oct. 1834.
251. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f567, 589, Wellington to Roden, 18, 20 Oct. 1834. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 124, Wellington to Beresford, 3 Nov. 1834. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 690, Wellington to Gloucester, 14 Oct. 1834; 691, Wellington to Cumberland, 15 Oct. 1834; 693, Wellington to Aberdeen, 16 Oct. 1834; 697, Wellington to Roden, 18, 20 Oct. 1834; 715, Wellington to Beresford, 3 Nov. 1834; 716, Wellington to Fitzgerald, 3 Nov. 1834.
252. Brooke, Wellington Correspondence, I, 731, Beresford to Wellington, 11 Nov. 1834. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 99, Beresford to Wellington, 11 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, 115, Beresford to Howley, 9 Nov. 1834.
253. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 415, f170, Memorial of the Diocesan Committee on behalf of the Clergy of the Diocese of Leighlin to Peel, 24 Feb. 1835. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 4, p234, Littleton to Duncannon, 11 Nov. 1834.
254. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2105, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 27 Aug. 1834. The Times, 30 Aug. 1834, O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 25 Aug. 1834.
255. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/22, O'Connell to Crawford, 17 Sept. 1834 (also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2116).
256. DEP, 2, 7 Oct. 1834, O'Connell to Crawford, 27 Sept., 1 Oct. 1834. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, I, 536-8. See also DEP, 27 Sept. 1834, O'Connell to the People of Ireland, 20 Sept. 1834.
257. Roden Papers, Vol. 14, f619, Reilly to Roden, 22 Oct. 1834.
258. Nugent Papers, D552/A/6/6/26, Crawford to Nugent, 23 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /29, Nugent to Crawford, 25 Oct. 1834.
259. *Ibid*, /28, Crawford to Nugent, 25 Oct. 1834.
260. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f181, 194, Duncannon to Littleton, 2, 5 Oct. 1834. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 4, p58, Littleton to Gosset, 30 Sept. 1834; *ibid*, p93, 181, 234, Littleton to Duncannon, 11, 30 Oct., 11 Nov. 1834; *ibid*, p163, Littleton to Melbourne, 27 Oct. 1834. See also Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 46-7, Russell to Melbourne, 22 Sept. 1834.
261. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/13, f812, Stuart to Littleton, 29 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, f821, Browne to Littleton, 30 Oct. 1834; *ibid*, /14, f189, Clements to Littleton, 14 Nov. 1834.
262. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, FRO 30/12/28/5, p1-2. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/14, f255. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 309, f274. Wellington Papers, Port. 16, f95. Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f82. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 270-7. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 254. The Greville Memoirs, III, 92-116. Memoirs of Baron Stockmar, I, 326-40. Bernard Pool, The Croker Papers, 1808-1857 (London, 1967), 166. L. J. Jennings,

- ~~■ ■ ■ ■ ■~~ The Croker Papers: The Correspondence and Diaries of the late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker (London, 1884), II, 242. W. M. Torrens, Memoirs of the Right Honourable William Second Viscount Melbourne (London, 1878), II, 34-8. A. Aspinall, Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot, 183. Bulwer, Life of Palmerston, I, 207-11. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 224, 228, 273. Sir Robert Peel, Memoirs (London, 1856), II, 18. Recollections of Lord Broughton, V, 26. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, 143, 146.
263. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 273, n.d.. The Greville Memoirs, III, 107, 112, 26, 28 Nov. 1834. In fact the King only thought that Melbourne named Lansdowne and Rice. Memoirs of Baron Stockmar, I, 332, Memoir of King William IV, 14 Jan. 1835.

Chapter 3

The Church, 1834-46

With the accession of the Conservative Government, Downshire's fears for the Church were removed. But Duncannon and Greville foresaw that the Conservative Government in turn would fall on the Irish Church question, and one of O'Connell's correspondents recognized this as the Duke's 'weak point', as he would be caught between popular pressure for change and support for the status quo among 'a section of his own party'. When Ellenborough advised Wellington on the 19th of November that they should 'consider what modifications should be made in the first Irish Tithe bill of last session', the Duke 'replied that he understood the landlords were making any measure unnecessary by taking the Tithes upon themselves'. Wellington wrote to Beresford that if the landlords were acting as he thought 'the best thing to do would be to give the Irish Church the Protection which ought to be given to all Proprietors, and to leave the question of Property as it stands under the existing law'. And after Roden had urged that it 'would be most important to stop the expense of the numbering Commission', Wellington cut off their financial support.

On the other hand, Emerson Tennent, a recent accession to Tory ranks, was anxious that the new Government should 'embrace such a Church reform as will enforce residence, sever pluralities and ensure a more equitable distribution of Church revenues amongst its ministers'. And, 'above all', he wished for a tithe measure to render Stanley's Act 'compulsory, keeping the parsons out of collision with the people & rendering the landlords the ostensible & no longer the covert payers of the Church..'. Stanley agreed 'that whoever may be the men, the measures must be those of real & practical reform.' In the General Election campaign of 1834-5 the Irish Tories Shaw, Daly, George Hamilton, West and J. H. Hamilton recognized that there would have to be reform of what the latter called 'a monstrous system of Tithes'. A return of the extent to which landlords used Stanley's Act showed that payment had been undertaken by an impressive number of

landlords, including many Irish Tory Peers, almost a dozen Irish Tory M.P.'s and several Irish Whig Peers and M.P.'s .. But it is clear from the amount of composition levied by the landlords, £95,000, that only⁹ about one-sixth of the tithe income was being secured in this way. Other returns show that the Southern landlords were particularly slow to assume¹⁰ the burden.

The Conservative Government resolved to ensure 'the immediate transfer of the payment from the tenant to the landlord'. Between December and February the problem was debated within the Government. The moderate Irish Tory Lord Fitzgerald discussed it with members of the Irish Government in January 1835, but Shaw's was the principal Irish Tory voice in this respect, taking part in the deliberations of the Irish Government and of the Cabinet, and acting in Committee with Hardinge and¹¹ Ellenborough.

Roden, too, was consulted by Hardinge, and he informed Peel that 'nothing .. could be more satisfactory than the very measure proposed by the late Government and which they abandoned at the suggestion of Mr. O'Connell, or at all events some measure founded on the principle of¹² Redemption'. When the Irish Government produced its proposals Primate Beresford gave his 'sanction to the proposed reduction of the property¹³ of the Church'. He also advised the clergy 'to abstain as much as possible from embarrassing with petitions a Government in whose equitable intentions they may reasonably confide'; his close associate Archdeacon Stopford urged the clergy to proceed for tithe in such a way that the Government would not be embarrassed by involvement of the military, and was aware, too, that the Church had no choice but to acquiesce in the Government's¹⁴ intention to legislate.

Lord Fitzgerald also indicated his approval of the Government's bill.¹⁵ Unveiled on the 20th of March, it was closely modelled on the original Whig measure of 1834, except that, as in the amended measure, landlords were to be made responsible immediately for the rent-charges. Redemption and commutation were again proposed and the rent-charge was to be 75% of

the composition (compared with 80% in the bill of February 1834 and 60% in the amended bill). And the Clergy were to be released from repayment of the Million Act loans. Shaw supported the measure in Parliament, regarding 25% as a reasonable deduction and deprecating the 'monstrous' proposal by which, under the amended bill of 1834, the Clergy would have been certain of only 60% of their income. And he made clear his opposition to any appropriation of Church property. Conolly also declared his approval of the measure and opposition to appropriation; and he welcomed the remission of the Million Act loans as an act of justice to the Clergy. Some of the Irish Clergy were less enthusiastic; one regarded the deduction of 25% as 'a desperate blow to their incomes', and another informed Peel that the proposal to place all tithepayers - defaulters and law-abiding - on 'precisely the same footing' had 'excited such general dissatisfaction & complaint even among your warmest friends & supporters'.

However, it was liberal opposition to the bill which proved much the more important. Many of the Irish liberal candidates in the General Election had declared in favour of the 'total extinction of tithes' and the appropriation of surplus Church revenues. Sheil claimed in Parliament that at least 53 Irish members had called for appropriation. In January 1835, pressed by Russell, Lansdowne and Spring Rice confirmed that they would appropriate for 'the education of all classes of the people'. Spring Rice also made this clear in Parliament and denied that the issue had divided the Whig Government. Russell insisted to Melbourne that he would not join any Government which did not intend to appropriate, and duly won Melbourne's commitment to 'Duncannon's bill' of November 1834. O'Connell demanded an appropriation measure. And Russell was under pressure from the radical Henry Ward to bring on a motion on the question. By the 12th of February it was decided that Russell should proceed, and on the next day, in Parliament, he thanked Ward for giving way to him and stated his intention of moving, as a preliminary step, that the House should go into Committee on the Irish Church.

When the Government's bill was introduced, O'Connell, Henry Grattan and Spring Rice declared that no bill would satisfy which did not include appropriation. An incidental motion on the question was supported by 58 Irish liberals, of whom almost half were unionists. Crawford, newly elected for Dundalk, informed his son that 'all the Irish Liberal Members' wanted to reject the bill. The liberal members met again on the 23rd of March and prepared for Russell's motion 'in full persuasion that Peel will resign after the division'.

Between the 30th of March and the 7th of April Russell carried three motions which, in sum, committed Parliament to the view that no tithe measure could be 'satisfactory and final' which did not apply surplus Church revenues 'to the general education of all classes of Christians'. The motions were supported by 64, 59 and 59 Irish liberals, repealers each time in a slight majority, while 33-7 Irish Tories and the Irish Whigs Ferguson and Martin voted against. The Government fell after the third division. The lengthy debates were dominated by the British members, but Clements, Wyse, Perrin, Spring Rice and a number of repealers spoke in favour of the proposed appropriation. Wyse, Perrin and Spring Rice emphasized Parliament's right to apply Church property to the education of all denominations, the absurdity of spending large sums on the Church in parishes where there were few or no Protestants, and the impossibility of settling the tithe question and ensuring tranquillity in Ireland without appropriation. Crawford simply declared that no Presbyterian or Catholic should be made to contribute to the Church.

On the other side, 10 Irish Tories joined in contending against appropriation. They argued that it was wrong to act when the Commission of Inquiry had not yet reported. Exaggerated claims regarding Church revenue and the smallness of the Protestant population had been made, they said, and the existence of any surplus was in fact questionable. The 'highly satisfactory' tithe measure proposed by the Government would resolve the tithe question, by removing the possibility of collision between the clergy and the Catholic tenantry, without asserting a principle

which subverted the Protestant Establishment, property and the Union. Several Irish Tories expressed a readiness to reform abuses in the Church and a number were prepared to sanction the diversion of any surplus to the education of Protestants; but they rejected the suggestion that Catholics should be educated out of Church revenues and certainly not under the auspices of the objectionable National System of Education. Shaw urged Peel to dissolve Parliament if defeated and appeal to the Protestant people of Britain 'that our common religion was in danger'.²⁹

Peel's resignation resulted in the return of a Melbourne Administration more committed than ever to the sort of reform that the King had tried to stave off by his conduct in November 1834. Indeed, in the negotiations upon the formation of the new Government, Melbourne made it clear to the King that his Administration would be committed to acting 'without delay' on the appropriation principle sanctioned by the House of Commons, and the King was forced to waive the 'scruples' which he had again ventured to express.³⁰ The carrying of the appropriation resolution also highlighted what Greville called the 'bigoted and senseless obstinacy'³¹ of the Lords in rejecting a much less radical proposal the previous year. The Whigs were clearly committed to the principle of appropriation by the circumstances of their coming to power. The next few years were to witness a vain struggle to embody that principle in legislation on the Irish tithe question.

The Cabinet discussed the Irish tithe question in May 1835 and decided immediately to include an appropriation provision in their measure. Duncannon again proposed to support the Church out of a new land tax, arguing that because the Commons would now reject any subvention of English money to the Clergy the rent-charge could not again be set at 60% as in the last Whig bill. This, it was feared, would cause the Irish liberal members to oppose the bill; indeed Howick believed that it was 'the secret wish of not a few of the Irish members that no bill should pass' in order that 'the whole property of the Church' would 'fall into the hands of the landowners. With this feeling it seems not unlikely that,

availing themselves of the pretence which will be afforded by the withdrawal of a part of the bonus last year promised to them, they will vote against the bill & us on the 3rd reading'. However, the land tax proposal was lost when Spring Rice objected 'vehemently' that it would be unjust to depart from the proportions hitherto borne by the different estates. In addition, the Cabinet decided to continue the practice of using Government forces to suppress breaches of the peace but not to levy ³² tithe.

In December 1834, Smith O'Brien, soon to be the liberal-unionist member for Limerick, had urged as his solution to the Church grievance that the Catholic Church should, in effect, be established alongside the Protestant, with both in receipt of 'a state provision' and the bishops of both seated in the House of Lords. Failing that, neither Church should be supported by any statutory provision. O'Connell declared ³³ that the Catholic Clergy had no wish for any connection with the State. During the Church debates of March/April 1835 the Irish Tory Dawson Damer and the liberal-unionists Clements and Spring Rice advocated payment of the Catholic Clergy, but O'Connell again objected. O'Brien revived the question in May when he gave notice of a motion to effect a state provision for the Catholic Church. However, he was informed by a succession of correspondents that virtually all Catholics, the laity in particular, who had no wish to end the dependence of the Clergy on them, were 'hostile to the pensioning of the Catholic Clergy'. And it was suggested that Conservatives would be equally hostile to a step which approximated to concurrent endowment of the two Churches. Faced with the threat of denunciation by influential Catholic constituents, O'Brien withdrew his ³⁴ notice.

The heads of the Government's Tithe Bill were submitted to the King on the 16th of June, and William, recognizing that his Ministers were pledged on the appropriation question, reluctantly acquiesced in the ³⁵ measure. The bill, introduced in the Commons on the 26th of June,

cancelled much of the arrears of tithe and remitted the Million Act loans to the Clergy. It fixed the rent-charge at 70%, empowering landlords to recover the same proportion in increased rent; the Clergy's income was to be topped up out of Church funds to give them 73.5% of their existing entitlement. Most controversially of all, the bill proposed to suspend new appointments to the 860 benefices in which there were fewer than 50 Protestants of the Established Church; Protestants in such benefices were to be attended either by the Clergymen of an adjoining benefice, who would be modestly remunerated, or by a curate whose salary would not exceed £75-100 a year. The Lord Lieutenant was empowered to reduce livings of more than £300 a year. The surplus created by these reforms was to be applied ^{to the support} ^{of mixed} education under the auspices of the National System of Education.

Conservatives were said to be 'perfectly mad' at this 'very outrageous measure'.³⁷ In the Commons the Conservatives, including Shaw, Verner, Bateson, Jackson, Plunkett, Young and the Lefroys, vigorously opposed the bill. They lamented the damage that it might do to the efficiency of the Church in the benefices where there were less than 50 Protestants and pointed out other anomalies in the proposed reforms; in particular, a just reform of the Church, which they professed to favour, would not leave any surplus for appropriation, because, it was claimed, local surpluses would be swallowed up in removing deficiencies elsewhere. And the Conservative speakers restated the apprehensions voiced during the appropriation debates of the previous Spring. The proposals regarding tithe being relatively satisfactory, 34 Irish Tories supported Peel's unsuccessful attempt to separate the tithe and reform/appropriation sections into separate bills.³⁸ According to Charles Fox, the future Tory member for Longford, the fate of Peel's motion was a matter of 'life & death'.³⁹

The unanimity of the Irish Tories in opposition to the bill stood in marked contrast to the support accorded by the great majority of Irish liberals. The liberal-unionists James Grattan, French, Smith O'Brien,

Dominick Browne and the repealers (including O'Connell) warmly supported the 'ample and excellent Tithe Bill' in debate. They approved in particular of the controversial suspension and appropriation clauses. 64 Irish liberals helped to vote down Peel's motion to divide the bill, and a dozen Irish Whig Peers voted against the omission of the suspension clause in the Lords. O'Connell objected briefly to the continuation of tithe but 'was willing to waive his objections for the sake of the good to be effected by the measure'. Other Irish liberals voiced objections on relatively minor points, but this did not detract from their general
40
approbation of the measure. Henry Westera, the Whig Member for Monaghan, wrote that if the appropriation proposals passed he would die his
41
'political death with more delight'.

However, the Irish Whigs Ferguson, John Martin and Copeland (the latter an appropriator just a few months before) supported Peel's proposal to divide the bill. From the radical point of view there were also dissentients. On the day of its introduction, Henry Westera wrote to a local priest that he was,

'much inclined to think that we might have been enabled to have got a better bill next Session, if we left it over till then. I know also that the Tories are anxious to get it over and out of their way, for they think (and I agree with them) that one great obstacle would be removed against their return to power if this question were disposed of. I was anxious to stave off such return as long as possible. We had a meeting of Irish Members on the subject - a few of us you know - and canvassed it well. But we found the difficulty of providing for the clergy in the interim so great we were obliged to abandon it. We (none of us liked the Bill) think it very unsatisfactory, but under existing circumstances, the best we can get. You are aware, I dare say, that all human institutions are capable of subsequent improvement and on the knowledge of this simple fact many of the Irish members rely!!!'. 42

One Clergyman felt that 'the O'Connell party' did not want the bill
43
to pass, in order to 'starve the parsons into terms in one year more'. Sharman Crawford thought the bill did not go far enough. At first, though he found it deficient 'in many respects' and thought it could 'certainly be improved', he recognized that the Ministers had 'honestly redeemed their pledge with reference to the appropriation clause' and felt that
44
the bill 'must not be met with hostility by Irish Members'. By mid-July

he was lamenting O'Connell's acquiescence.⁴⁵ On the 29th of July he declared in Parliament that the bill, far from being 'a final settlement of the question', must be regarded by the opponents of tithes as no more than 'an approximation and a step to their total extinction, and as such entitled to their support'. He claimed that, 'No measure which did not go to the complete extinction of tithes, as an Ecclesiastical exaction, would, or ought to, satisfy the people of Ireland'.⁴⁶

Two days later he wrote, 'I dislike this bill beyond measure and unless it should be much altered I will never give a vote for it ... I think the Tithe bill a mass of absurdity. There is no possibility of mending it - and my utter astonishment is how O'Connell can support it'.⁴⁷ In the House on the 12th of August he rejected the bill outright. He urged that the Church should no longer be supported out of any compulsory assessment. Existing interests should be compensated out of an annual tax on 'profit-rents'; once such compensation was made the proceeds of the tax should be applied to education, poor relief and 'such other general purposes as Parliament shall direct'.⁴⁸ Crawford, then, took the voluntary view of the question of endowment of religion. O'Connell, even when supporting the bill, took a similar view;⁴⁹ but his readiness to disendow the Church in 'instalments' was not enough for the less patient Crawford, and their difference in this respect was destined to become a major issue of controversy.

The Government agreed to only one important amendment; the surplus was to be paid into the Consolidated Fund and the National System of Education given a fixed revenue out of that fund. Archbishop Whately had contended that application of the surplus directly to the National System did not sufficiently guarantee the income of the National Board, tended 'to give an invidious appearance in the eyes of some persons to the proceedings' of the Board, and offered an inducement to Catholics to murder Protestants.⁵⁰ But this amendment was hardly calculated to mollify the Lords. Holland had never expected that the Lords would accept

appropriation, and Crawford foresaw that 'battle will be made in the Lords and the Bill rejected at all risks'⁵¹. On the other side the Irish Tory Charles Fox realized early in July that they 'must rely on the Lords'⁵².

The Tory Lords met at Wellington's and agreed unanimously 'to go into Committee on the Irish Bill, protesting against its principle, but acquiescing in the consideration of it in Committee for the sake of the famishing clergy and with a view to reject the appropriation clause'⁵³.

When the Bill came on in the Upper House Westmeath objected to the size of the proposed deduction from clerical incomes and said he 'could not excuse the late Government for introducing a clause of this kind into their Irish Tithe Bill'. Fitzgerald, Roden and their British allies concentrated their attack on the clauses for suspension of benefices and appropriation of the surplus. They removed the suspension clause, with 22 Irish Tory Peers among the majority for the amendment.⁵⁴

The principal source of any surplus being thus deleted, the Government abandoned the bill. Fitzgerald wrote confidently that 'we stand very well before the country, which never can be persuaded that the responsibility or the guilt of starving the Irish Clergy rests on the rejectors of the appropriation clauses and not on the authors of it'⁵⁵. Greville, in a lengthy and uncharacteristically heated passage, described the Government's conduct as 'unspeakably wicked'. Earlier in the session they had been induced by 'mere party objects' to commit themselves to making the 'essentially distinct' question of appropriation an integral part of any Tithe bill. They combined the two 'with a full knowledge that by so doing they should ensure the rejection of the Bill itself and that Ireland would continue in the same state of anarchy and confusion'. They should, he thought, have undone their earlier mistake by accepting the Tithe bill minus appropriation as approved by the Lords.⁵⁶

In September 1835, Spring Rice reviewed the events of the previous session in an interesting letter to Macaulay. He regretted that the Irish Church had been the issue on which they had opposed Peel's Government,

but only because he felt the issue of English Municipal reform would have seen the Whigs on more advantageous political ground. Far from disapproving of the appropriation for education he claimed that it had been his own project. Indeed he had 'at one time' persuaded Stanley 'to acquiesce in the proposal'. To his 'great delight and astonishment' the Catholics had 'grasped at it, & said that it left them no ground of complaint. By the Tories it has been repeatedly stated that we combined the Tithe & appropriation question purely with a view of dishing them out. It was no such thing, the very same plan was printed for the Government before last November & indeed we were so strongly pledged on the subject by the issue of our Commission that the measure could not, any more than it ought to, have been postponed'.⁵⁷

Also in September, Crawford commenced a series of public letters outlining his position on the tithe question. He objected that the Church would have remained disproportionately large under the tithe bill, that the bill effectively offered 'a bonus to the landlords to tempt them to enter into a compromise with the clergy to rob the people', and that the entire principle, sanctioned by the bill, of taxing all for the purposes of one-tenth of the people was 'a principle of unjust monopoly and ascendancy'. The principle of establishment was a denial of liberty. He repeated that 'nothing short of the total extinction of Tithes as an ecclesiastical payment would or ought to satisfy the people of Ireland', with existing interests compensated by means of the tax on rents which O'Connell had proposed in 1834. By 'accepting even an instalment (appropriation) on those terms, your vantage ground is lost, you cease to be assertors of political and religious liberty and become mercenary traders in the matter of pounds, shillings and pence'. His views were offered as a direct challenge to O'Connell when he addressed a public letter to him in December in which he urged the Liberator to pursue the abolition of tithes, which he had in past times declared to be the object.⁵⁸ Crawford wrote to his son that he had shown in this letter 'the variance of Lord Morpeth's Bill with those principles he (O'Connell) advocates

and call ^(ed) upon him .. to temporize no longer ... it will clearly manifest that I am not a joint of the Tail of the Great Man'. And he opined that, 'A strong feeling is rising in Ulster among the Presbyterian body in favour of the voluntary principle with regard to Church affairs'.

Primate Beresford wrote to Wellington on the 3rd of September to thank him for the efforts made by the Conservative Peers regarding the tithe question. Wellington sent, with his reply, a draft for £100, to be transmitted as an anonymous gift to the 'Lay Association for defending the property of the Established Church in Ireland'. This organization was based upon the fund organized by Roden in 1834. Its purpose, which Beresford sanctioned, was to assist the clergy in proceeding 'in the Superior Courts for the recovery of their dues'. More than £7,000 had been subscribed to the Association by October 1835. The Primate was also engaged in agitating the clergy to petition against the Tithe bill of the previous session.

Asked by Graham what he thought of the Lay Association, Stanley replied, 'I think its objects are so good that I regret to see the hands into which it appears exclusively to have fallen, and which have hitherto prevented me (perhaps they ought not) from subscribing to it'. Graham sent in his subscription early in December, convinced that 'this is the mode whereby passive resistance by force of law may be overcome and full effect given to your own wise and salutary measure .. How admirable was our foresight in passing the measure which throws the burthen of tithe on the landlords! My belief is that this Act alone, with Protestant co-operation from England, will save the Church in Ireland'. However, the moderate Irish Tory Lord Clare informed Stanley that he had 'very reluctantly' declined to act under that measure because his tenants had made it clear to him that they would not pay even 70% of the tithe to either him or the clergy. 'The people most certainly imagine the impost is to be abolished altogether .. I do not think as far as the Church is concerned it is of the slightest importance that the bills of 1834 & 1835

have been lost. Neither measure would have finally settled the question', for the people would no more pay the landlords than the clergy. He advocated conversion of tithe into a land tax payable to the Crown and payment of the clergy out of the fund; he did not share the objections to making a stipendiary Church.

Duncannon also reported from Ireland that the people 'all consider Tithes as gone forever'. And the Government continued to try to avoid lending military assistance to tithe collectors. In October the Archbishop of Dublin informed Melbourne that while some of the clergy were 'left quite destitute' and some were 'pretty well paid', the majority were 'in an intermediate state'. Whately argued that it was in the Church's interest to pool all her revenues in one fund, to be administered with regard to spiritual need and regardless of the existing parishes; thus, any appropriation would be 'like losing a few ounces of blood' instead of 'having a limb mortified and the mortification likely to spread', which was how Protestants saw the suppression of benefices and parishes.

Towards the end of November 1835, the Cabinet considered the Tithe bill to be introduced in the next session. Lansdowne proposed that a bill be prepared shorn of any direct reference to appropriation and Melbourne apparently agreed. But Russell and Howick felt they could not abandon the principle on which they had thrown out Peel, and Ellice, Abercromby and Mulgrave were resolutely opposed to any 'flinching on the Irish Church'. Holland and Morpeth pressed the land tax option again but the Cabinet decided to persist with essentially the same plan as that of 1835. As Morpeth noted, anything more ambitious, in the way of Church reform, was ruled out by 'the reported success and confidence of the Clergy in the collection of Tithe'. The more successful the Clergy were in enforcing tithe collection, and the November levy was evidently more successful than formerly, the more intransigent would be their supporters in Parliament. The difficulties of the clergy were the most effective inducement to them to compromise.

Stanley, too, was informed, by Spring Rice among others, that 'the clergy are going on very successfully in Ireland and say they can pull through if Government will leave them alone'. The police report for December 1835 also suggested the clergy were achieving greater success. And the balance was further swung in favour of the clergy by a decision of the Court of Exchequer in January 1836 that the titheowner could, by application for 'a Writ of Rebellion', force the police and military to assist in the collection of tithe. This decision was strongly but vainly contested by the Irish law officers. O'Loughlen, Plunket and Mulgrave (the Lord Lieutenant) were alarmed that the police were to be removed from the control of the Government and placed under that of 'any pettyfogging representative of one of the parties in a civil suit', under 'an obsolete form some years since abolished as cumbrous and useless in the Courts of Chancery'.

Sheil, O'Connell, O'Loughlen and Rice protested in similar terms in Parliament. Sheil, attributing the new movement to the Lay Association, assailed the latter as 'nothing but a branch of Orangeism, partaking of all the mischief and malevolence of its prototype'. Jackson, Lefroy and Shaw defended the Lay Association and its use of the writ of rebellion procedure; it was, they said, a legitimate means to secure a property right in the face of a 'foul conspiracy'. At least one Churchman doubted if the hopes entertained 'in many quarters' of success through the efforts of the Lay Association would prove justified in the long term. The Church was 'like a dying patient who having some sensations of recovery, declines any further medicine, while his greedy heir (the radicals) stands by, equally averse to the interference of the physician'. The clergy should instead petition for legislation, preferably a measure which, as Whately proposed, went to redistribute clerical income according to local needs.

Whatever the future prospects, it is evident that the Lay Association had launched a major campaign to recover tithe. Lyne has argued convincingly that, contrary to the views of many historians, the police

and military were compelled on numerous occasions to assist in tithe collection in execution of writs of rebellion; in fact, 'throughout 1836-7, a hot and from the tithe owners' viewpoint, not ineffective tithe war was being carried on over a wide area of the country', though success was much greater among the larger landholders.⁷³

In March 1836 Stanley expressed the view that 'many' liberals would be glad to throw overboard the appropriation principle.⁷⁴ In April Mulgrave reported to Russell that while the popular party in Ireland 'would be happy certainly at anything which tended to relieve them from the constant vexations of Tithes' the abandonment of appropriation would not drive them into outright opposition.⁷⁵ Ralph Howard, the Whig member for Wicklow, 'told Hume he would not support the Government if they adhered to the appropriation clause'.⁷⁶ O'Connell allegedly said he wished Ministers 'would make a compromise with the Conservatives ...to get a good Municipal Bill I would give up the Appropriation Clause .. I would have a present good for a future benefit; with the one I shall have an advantage - the other I shall never see'.⁷⁷

However, Russell informed the King, who had evidently urged the giving up of appropriation, that the Cabinet still felt bound to include such a provision.⁷⁸ On the 25th of April Morpeth outlined the Government's intended measure. He claimed that though tithe^{collection} had been more successful than in previous years, clerical incomes were still so inadequate and insecure, and the recent success had been obtained by such objectionable means, it was the Government's duty again to propose a reform of the tithe system. Their proposals were substantially the same as those of 1835. And, as the Government could not abandon the principle on which they had entered office, they would persist with appropriation. Rather than suppress any benefices, however, it was proposed that existing boundaries should be redrawn and the clergymen given incomes in relation to the number of their flock; their incomes were to be set at such a level as to give a surplus for appropriation to education.⁷⁹ According to Mulgrave this

new scheme was based on Whately's proposals; in his view the changes did not involve a question of principle but was 'entirely one of expediency as calculated in its effect upon votes'.

The debates on the bill saw Conservatives and liberals divided along the same lines as in 1835. Stanley went so far as to propose an alternative measure which included redemption and excluded appropriation. A succession of Irish Tories restated the familiar arguments against appropriation. Jackson and Tennent claimed that the proposal to change the boundaries of benefices was no improvement on the previous year's bill, that it was in fact a 'covert, roundabout' way of suppressing benefices. 37 Irish Tories opposed the second reading and 35 voted for omission of the appropriation clause, with Knox of Dungannon the sole Irish Tory dissentient on both occasions.

In Committee, Shaw and Tennent objected to the proposal, subsequently abandoned, to cancel all arrears of tithe without compensation to the clergy. Shaw also proposed to increase the rent-charge from 70% to 75% of the tithe composition, as the former level would be too favourable to the landlords and harsh on the clergy. And Jackson, Shaw, Bateson and Perceval contended that the proposals for revision of tithe composition agreements involved 'injustice and harshness towards the Irish Clergy'.

With the exception, then, of Knox, whose political allegiance was always doubtful, the Irish Tory M.P.'s were as resolute as ever in opposition to the Government's proposals, particularly with regard to appropriation. And the Conservative speakers were confident that the commitment of liberals to appropriation was waning. This was hardly evident in the speeches of the several repeal members who contributed to the debates. And the liberal-unionist Smith O'Brien would have increased the surplus by farther reducing the incomes of the clergy and devoted the surplus not only to education but also to the support of the Catholic Clergy. Spring Rice restated his commitment to appropriation

and in a private letter opined that it represented 'the cheapest insurance ever fixed' for the security of the Church. 58 Irish liberals supported the second reading of the bill and 59 opposed the motion to expunge the appropriation clause; Ferguson, Martin and Copeland again
82
dissented.

Lord Carew, the former Whig member for Wexford, informed Russell
83
that 'nothing could be fairer than your proposal in case of any surplus'. James Grattan noticed some falling off in enthusiasm among liberal members. Many were resigned to the loss of the bill in the Lords, and after it was sent up, 'Many English, some Irish, (were) talking of passing the Tythe Bill if sent from the Lords without appropriation. This would be fatal to us'. Grattan's personal commitment was evidently still intact. And he was disgusted with the Tories: 'The Established Church is their motto, & it is working hard in every parish. They are making it religious & the Irish Church have thrown themselves on the English. The Tories are implacable. They have no feeling for Ireland & would go to war about the surplus, or no surplus as they say'. At the same time Grattan clearly had more sympathy with the Whigs, who 'wish to uphold the Established Church', than with the radicals, Dissenters and Catholics, who wanted
84
'to pull it down or damage it'.

Tavistock, Bannerman and Greville all noted the readiness of Irish and English liberals to give up appropriation, and Greville noted the 'grievous disappointment' and 'great triumph' with which Government and Opposition respectively had reacted to the Commons majority of 'only' 26 on appropriation. Greville still considered the Government's refusal to give way 'a wicked and a foolish proceeding' which obstructed a measure which would bring peace to Ireland, and he attributed a similar opinion
85
to many English members.

Howick acknowledged that 'the feeling of the country clearly is not
86
with us' on the issue. The Tory Arbuthnot had 'reason to believe that the Ministers would give much to get rid of the question. They know that it is

an unpopular one for them in England & their last division annoyed them
 87
 greatly'. However, Melbourne showed no sign of wavering when he
 introduced the bill in the Lords on the 22nd of July. The Lords proceeded
 to amend the bill, raising the rent-charge to 75%, increasing the scale
 of clerical incomes and expunging appropriation. The Irish Tories duly
 88
 sided with the Opposition, the Irish Whigs with the Government.

James Grattan noted that the bill was 'no great loss. Evidently it
 89
 will not satisfy occupiers'. Armed with the opinion of the Speaker that
 the Lords had infringed the privileges of the Commons regarding financial
 questions, and, according to Greville and Graham, bound still more to
 appropriation by O'Connell's generous assistance when the English radicals
 threatened to rebel on the English Church measure, Russell 'held very
 strong language' in rejecting the amendments when the bill was returned
 to the Commons at the beginning of August. He moved, in effect, that the
 bill should be abandoned for the session, and had a majority of 29 in the
 division. Shaw was one of the Conservatives who urged that the amendments
 be considered, urging again the unacceptability of appropriation and its
 obstruction of the tithe and Church reforms which he agreed were desirable.
 Sheil and O'Loughlen, on the other side, supported appropriation and rejected
 the amended bill. In the division, 37 Irish Tories and three liberal-
 unionists (Ferguson, Martin and Copeland again) opposed the Government,
 90
 and 61 Irish liberals sided with the majority against the bill.

According to Graham, Fitzstephen French, the liberal-unionist member
 for Roscommon, had intimated that,

'if we would restore the deduction of 30 per cent he with nine others
 would change their votes; but he is too slippery to hold and speaks vaguely;
 moreover, after the division in the Lords on this point and the agreement
 with the Primate it would not be safe to change our ground'. 91

Stanley foresaw that French would not assist the Tories:

'His interests as a landlord strongly lead him to desire a settlement
 of the question before he becomes liable to the whole 100 per cent, but
 he will venture to face the clamour that would be raised by O'Connell &
 Co. against him'. 92

French, apparently, was due to become liable for the tithe under

Stanley's Act of 1832. Stanley regarded the 'gradual liability' of the
 93
 landlords under this measure as 'the only practicable settlement'. In
 the meantime Crawford had continued to develop his ultra radical position.
 On the 5th of April he wrote to his son:

'The People are universally taking up my view of total extinction and numerous petitions from various parts of Ireland are sent to me to present. The Government are to bring on the question on the 20th ...If it falls short of what it ought to be (which I am almost sure will be the case), I am determined to bring forward a more extended proposition and to divide the house upon it. This will puzzle the Trimmers, but no matter, they deserve it. At the same time it will do the Government no harm because my proposition will be so completely Ultra that it will not bring on any kind of party collision which will be injurious to them. Of course the Tories and the Government and the Tory Whigs will all divide against me. Although I shall be beaten, still it will give the cause of religious liberty a lift to have the question debated and a respectable division on it, for I must have all the Irish and English Radicals with me whether they like it or not'. 94

At the end of the month, after the introduction of the Government's measure, Crawford's wife informed their son that,

'Father is as busy as possible. He is going to commence leading and get some of O'Connell's tail. O'Connell is satisfied to take the tithe bill offered by Government. This does not satisfy the Master and he is determined to oppose it and move the total abolition of the Tithe - and many of the Irish members are so pledged they cannot avoid voting with your father. O'Connell of course hates him but dares not attack him as your father's famous letter to him and the letter he wrote to your father keep him in complete subjection. Your father glories no little that he has O'Connell under cow and that he is the only one who has ever been able to do so ...' 95

On the 4th of May Crawford said in Parliament that the tithe bill was 'for the protection of the clergy'. On the 14th he declared in a public letter that his aim was 'the total extinction of this odious impost, in name and substance' and called the bill 'one of revenue to
 96
 the church but of infliction to the people'. On the 26th he wrote to his son of his intention to object to O'Connell's acceptance of the bill and opined that,

'there is a powerful body entertaining my views in Ireland and I think Dan is committed in such a manner he can hardly make an escape from my arguments. A little time will show. Certainly I think it was my threat of dividing the House on the Corporations Bill which brought about the change in Dan's views and maybe he may turn round in the same manner on the Tithe Bill'. 97

Even the Whiggish Villiers Stuart of Waterford stated in Parliament

that though he 'felt bound to give his general support' to the bill he 'could not extend his unqualified approbation to that part of it which imposed upon the Catholic landlords the necessity of contributing to the maintenance of a Church from which they derived no benefit'. On the 1st of July Crawford moved 'the total extinction of tithes', condemning in the language of the voluntary 'the tyranny of establishments'. He felt it was a delusion to state that the bill removed the tithe burden from the tenants to the landlords; and the combination of tithes and rents jeopardized payment of the latter. He reminded O'Connell and the other Irish liberal members that they had on many occasions professed similar views. Crawford would support the Protestant Clergy out of Church property, with the incomes of the bishops greatly reduced. Several repealers spoke up in support of the motion. But O'Connell deprecated the sacrifice of 'expediency' to the search for 'eternal justice'. In the division, six liberal-unionists and eleven repealers supported the motion; seven liberal-unionists, three Irish Tories and four repealers (including O'Connell) joined the Government in voting it down. Crawford subsequently addressed public letters to his constituents and O'Connell, again deprecating the latter's inconsistency in supporting tithe bills which brought no benefit to the tenantry of Ireland and insisting upon the total extinction of tithes.

The General Association was formed by O'Connell in July 1836 in order to press for 'full corporate reform and a satisfactory adjustment of the tithe' question. It was also intended to assist tithe defaulters in the courts. The latter object was pursued with some vigour but, given the greater resources of the Lay Association, with only limited success. The General Association also provided Crawford with another forum on which to advocate the total extinction of tithe. With the aid of Father Thaddeus O'Malley he urged his views in the Association during the winter of 1836-7. But O'Connell accused him of lack of realism and ^{of} damaging Ireland's interests by opposing the Government. O'Connell carried the

Association with him in the conclusive debate on the 21st of January 1837, when Crawford was the sole dissentient to O'Connell's motion that if 'the entire abolition of tithes' proved 'impracticable' the Irish members should in the coming session 'fall back upon the next best measure, the abolition of part, provided the same be accompanied by the appropriation clause'.¹⁰¹

Also at this time the Government considered the measure to be proposed in the next session. Mulgrave and Morpeth favoured resolution of the appropriation dilemma by proposing the endowment of all three major denominations out of a general land tax.¹⁰² Melbourne, Duncannon, Russell, Spring Rice, Cottenham and Tavistock (Russell's brother) all accepted the need to abandon appropriation because of the certainty of its rejection in the Lords and the waning enthusiasm of both Irish and English liberal members. Russell apparently informed the King that appropriation was to be given up.¹⁰³ Mulgrave, replying to Russell, wrote that although resentment against tithe was undiminished no one in Ireland cared 'the least about it (appropriation) except as a badge of attachment to the party at present in power', nor expected any 'solid advantage' from its enactment.¹⁰⁴

One of those urging the need to give way was the Duke of Leinster,¹⁰⁵ the doyen of Irish Whigs. Thomas Wyse was aware of the relative unpopularity of appropriation in England: 'John Bull fears Popery far more than Democracy'.¹⁰⁶ Most important of all, O'Connell indicated to Henry Warburton at the end of the year his earnest wish that the Government, 'who are for the first time in history conquering the "Anti-Saxon" spirit of Ireland', should be 'decently freed' from the 'dilemma' of the appropriation clause; he regretted that such a ministry should 'risk its existence' for a surplus which would exist only at some future date.¹⁰⁷

On the 8th of February 1837, Russell announced in Parliament the postponement of the Irish Church bill until later in the session, and hinted very strongly that the Government were prepared to give up

appropriation. This was the impression received by Shaw, Grattan and Greville. O'Connell thought it 'extremely doubtful' that Ministers would agree to give up appropriation, but his comment that if such a settlement were proposed 'the Irish members will probably feel it their duty to protest against any compromise .. and accept the deduction (of 30% from tithe) merely as an instalment', suggests that he would have acquiesced under protest. Melbourne wrote to Russell that what he had said 'is understood to indicate pretty distinctly the giving up of the appropriation', and he intimated a wish that this could be effected without any 'foolish difference' in the Cabinet caused by 'the wrong-headedness' of some of the Ministers.

According to Holland, Russell 'postponed, according to agreement in Cabinet, with some little ambiguity as to his final determination, the question of Irish tithe and Appropriation'. The Government's origins 'made it difficult for us to recede with honour from the appropriation', but the original proponents of the plan

'were not only averse to our sacrificing ourselves for it, but in truth somewhat averse to the measure itself, or at least satisfied of its insufficiency and insignificance, and earnest in their hearts that we should deal with it in the manner most likely to retain our power. We determined if not to abandon at least not to gratify our enemies and disappoint our friends by hazarding our existence for it early in the Session. In this all the Cabinet more or less reluctantly acquiesced'.

Various plans were considered, including 'a land tax in lieu of tithe' proposed by the liberal-unionist members Clements and O'Ferrall. No decision was made, however, and Mulgrave suggested in April that, 'If the Government thought it desirable with reference to their instability to postpone the question altogether .. I am sure for such an object the popular party here (Ireland) would acquiesce'. He added that when Crawford had called 'to explain to me why he would not vote for the bill of last year' if reintroduced, he had also said that to 'maintain the Government in power' he would be prepared not only to forgo legislation but would, if necessary, publicly recommend the payment of tithes.

Jackson, the Tory member for Bandon, was active in December 1836 in

organizing the response of the Lay Association to the increased efforts of the General Association to protect the tithe-defaulters, depicted by Jackson as 'the new tactics of O'Connell & his anti-tithe or rather anti-¹¹²protestant Conspiracy'. Later in the month he urged on Roden the wisdom of introducing a tithe bill in the Lords in order to foil the expected Government ploy of resigning on the relatively popular municipal corporations measure before the Opposition could exploit the 'weak point' of the Ministry, the Irish Church. But Wellington, whom Roden informed of Jackson's view, was unwilling to put the Lords in the firing line and was aware of the difficulty of the Lords' introducing a bill with money ¹¹³ clauses. Wellington and Peel subsequently agreed to resist pressure from ¹¹⁴ other Tories to propose legislation on the question.

One of the principal objects of the great Irish Tory meeting in Dublin in January 1837 was to address the King regarding 'the attempts which are making to undermine and destroy the Protestant religion in this ¹¹⁵ kingdom'. Like that at Hillsborough a few years earlier it was undertaken with a full awareness of the need to impress the English audience. Courtown wished to 'rouse a Protestant feeling in England .. without which the Protestant Church in this country will certainly go as an ¹¹⁶ Established Church'. Jackson, Farnham and other Irish Conservatives objected to the proposal to resolve at the meeting that the extinction of ten bishoprics under the Temporalities Act of 1833 was 'a breach of the Articles of the Union'. A 'considerable difference of opinion' was said to exist among Conservatives on this proposition and it was feared that the resolution would 'disgust or offend' Stanley and Graham, who were involved in framing the Act. George Hamilton, the Tory member for Dublin, disagreed, deprecating a 'milk and water' meeting 'governed by ¹¹⁷ motives of expediency'.

In the event no reference was made to the Temporalities Act at the meeting. But resolutions were passed in support of the Church and in opposition to 'the contemplated extinction or misappropriation of

church property to secular purposes'. A succession of speakers - including the Tory members West, Vesey, Litton, Tennent and Archdall - warned that the Government intended to give the Catholic Church 'an ascendancy built upon the ruins of the Protestant Church' and that appropriation was the first 'instalment' in that direction. There was 'a systematic and ferocious determination to ruin the Protestant Church'. 118

Ellenborough noted in April 1837 that 'by lapse of time the Irish clergy are getting under Stanley's bill into a better state, (and therefore) they begin to dislike the giving up' of the sort of deduction envisaged by Whigs and Tories alike. 119 On the 1st of May Morpeth unveiled the Government's latest tithe bill. It involved yet another mode of appropriation, viz. a tax of 10% on all clerical incomes and devotion of the proceeds to the education of children of every denomination. The rent-charge was again set at 70% of the tithe composition and the proposals for revision of the composition were again included. As a concession to the Church, the (higher) scale of clerical incomes substituted by the Lords in 1836 was adopted in the Government measure. 120 According to James Grattan, 'The Tories seemed taken by surprize, & nothing was said after Morpeth sat down'. 121

Crawford subsequently intimated his intention to propose again the total extinction of tithes, but his attempt on the 5th of May to have the bill postponed was supported by only six Irish liberals and opposed by 14 Irish liberals and 12 Irish Tories. On the 6th of May and again at the beginning of June he issued addresses to 'the people of Ireland' in which he warned them against the delusion that the 30% deduction from tithe would benefit anyone but the landlords. He wrote of the 'injustice and insult' of a measure which 'under the fiction of a bill of relief' was in fact 'a measure calculated to rivet upon you this odious burthen.' And he claimed that appropriation had effectively been surrendered in order to retain office, as had the attempt to suppress sinecure benefices. 122 He informed his son that,

'if the Catholics give way on this point they and I part forever. Of course the Dundalk people will stick by O'Connell .. and I will not again stand for that place or any Catholic constituency or any constituency at all while this miserable, perfidious, disquieting policy is to be proceeded with ...' 123

John Mac Hale, the Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, also agitated against the bill and indicated to O'Connell that he shared Crawford's views. O'Connell in reply argued the merits of the bill - the revision of the composition, the 30% deduction ('affording a precedent for going further') and the appropriation plan. He feared that Mac Hale's influence would induce enough liberal members to oppose the bill to cause its defeat and the fall of 'the only bearable Government Ireland ever experienced since the fatal day when the followers of the murderers of Becket polluted our shores'. The likelihood of the Government's defeat and fall on Crawford's motion against the second reading he considered very great, and he wrote in despair of 'Sharman Crawford's motion in aid of the Tories'.¹²⁴

On the 9th of June Crawford objected to the second reading on the grounds that the bill did not abolish all compulsory assessment for support of the Church. Dillon Browne again seconded the motion. Shaw found several aspects of the bill objectionable: the 70% rent-charge was insufficient, the composition should not be revised, the clergy should not be required to repay the Million Act loans, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should not be given the power to reduce the value of benefices. These were precisely the objections listed by Beresford a week earlier in a letter to Wellington except that the Primate also included the new scheme of appropriation. In the division, however, only one Irish Tory (Conolly) and 8 Irish liberals voted for rejection of the bill, while 8 Irish Tories (including Shaw) and 35 Irish liberals (including O'Connell) supported the second reading.¹²⁵

The Tory leaders had, in fact, decided to expedite the progress of the Tithe bill because its fate would dictate their response to the Irish Corporations measure. Crawford, clearly disappointed with the division, wrote to his son that it was

'too good a bill for the Church for the Tories to vote against it, on the second reading. They hope to make it perfectly to their mind before it comes back from the Lords and then that a compromise would be made and that O'Connell would recommend the taking of it ... But if the public mind in Ireland be too strong on this point the scheme may of course be thrown overboard and this is the reason why I have taken such a determined stand'.

Far from worrying about O'Connell's turning him out, he was 'fully determined to leave Parliament .. If I can upset O'Connell's machinations
127
I am doing the greatest good that man can do'.

It was probably the intention of the Government to give up appropriation at a subsequent stage of the bill's passage through Parliament. Melbourne had told the Conservative Lord Wharncliffe in mid-May that 'as to the Appropriation Clause I can't (say) so publicly yet, but we should give that up without much difficulty' and he described
128
the resolution of 1835 as 'a very foolish thing'. The King's death brought the dissolution of Parliament, however, and the Tithe Bill was duly lost. The liberal candidates who advocated tithe reform in the subsequent election campaign usually spoke in generalities, though some - O'Connell, Fitzpatrick and O'Callaghan - specifically advocated the
129
Government measure. The General Election facilitated compromise in that, in the first place, it removed Crawford from Parliament; he wrote to his constituents at the end of June to explain that he was disillusioned with them and the other Irish members, as they had abandoned previously held positions on tithe in order to sustain a Whig Government which
130
sought 'the perpetuation of the tithe system' and of the Establishment. His continuing complaints on the tithe question, in a series of public letters to O'Connell later in 1837, were more than ever a forlorn 'cry
131
from the wilderness'.

Secondly, and more importantly, the Government's majority was so much reduced that there appeared to be little prospect of being able to carry appropriation in the Commons. Ebrington, Abercromby and Russell felt it must be abandoned, and Russell was under the impression that the new House was not bound by the resolution of 1835. Melbourne 'was for

giving it up last session' and wished to do so now if their supporters agreed. 'It is one of those measures which looks specious at a distance, but which when you approach it vanishes into nothing'.¹³²

According to Mulgrave, Irish liberals would accept the tithe bill which was 'considered safest and least embarrassing for the Government', and More O'Ferrall felt that a revision of composition agreements would reconcile 'most parties' to a measure shorn of appropriation.¹³³ The Irish Whig Lord Carew informed Rice that

'the operation of Stanley's Act is fast throwing the payment upon the landlords, as the leases expire. Before many years the landlords will be liable for the whole without any deduction. It would be most desirable, if you can, to settle the question & I think the thinking Catholics are of the same opinion, for they see that eventually the Church will be gainers by postponement'.

He and Melbourne saw that, especially in Ulster and parts of Munster and Connaught, where tithes were 'tolerably paid', the operation of Stanley's Act made the clergy 'indifferent' to legislation.¹³⁴ In fact, there was a movement among the Irish clergy to petition for a bill to enforce a rent-charge with a deduction of only 15%. Beresford and Wellington sought to hold them back, the former unwilling to have the Church embarrass her friends in Parliament by demanding 'terms which it may not be practicable to secure' and the Duke fearful lest the Irish landlords be turned against the Church by the clergy's insistence on such a small deduction.¹³⁵

In December 1837 Russell and Mulgrave were anxious to remove the 'anomaly' of 'a large Establishment for a fraction of the people and none for the ^{large} number' by endowing the Catholic clergy, but Mulgrave was assured on investigation that such payment would not be welcomed by the priesthood.¹³⁶ A couple of months later, the Chief Secretary consulted Lord Clements, the liberal-unionist member for Leitrim, on the Government's latest tithe plan. In a lengthy reply Clements urged the need for a settlement which would end the 'horrors of religious animosity' and opined that, the elections having 'shown clearly that the English

sympathize in the sincere alarm of the Protestants', they must evince a desire 'to give a new principle of stability to the Irish Church'. He proposed therefore that they should 'raise the required sum off the Protestant landlords exclusively and relieve the Catholic landlords from the payment of Ecclesiastical Tithe'. He 'would gladly support any measure' that he 'thought likely to pass', but felt there was no 'new ingredient' in the Government plan which would 'promote its passing. My new ingredient would be to increase the stability of the Church by deriving the payment exclusively from Protestant sources'.

Tithe was 'an unjust tax', Clements continued, which 'ought to have been abolished unconditionally', but if it must be levied it should go to support the Church alone, the object which he as a Protestant landlord would find most acceptable. Indeed he proposed that, far from ^{there} being a deduction from the tithe, the Protestant landlords should pay 100% of the existing tithe. As Protestants owned 70% of the land this would give the Church the same income as proposed under the plan to deduct 30% when applying the rent-charge to all land; 'religious peace & the abolition of that pernicious impost will be well worth a much larger sum to us landlords'. And he proposed to reduce any dissatisfaction among the latter by instituting such reform of the Church as would proportion stipends to the numbers in congregations. The Catholic landlords might be taxed for the support of their own clergy. If the authority of the Catholic Bishops was recognized at the same time as payment of the priesthood and absolution of Catholics from support of the Protestant clergy, the result would be 'to bind them all with the greatest sincerity to the existence of our Church'.

In mid-March Russell approached Shaw directly and communicated with Primate Beresford through the Archbishop of Canterbury. He expressed his anxiety to avoid proposing 'any plan which should revive angry feeling and end again in disappointment'. Shaw disliked the plans disclosed, but, with Peel's concurrence, returned the papers to Russell without comment.

He urged Beresford similarly to avoid passing judgement on the proposals,¹³⁸ as his comments might be misused by the Government. Beresford, replying through the Archbishop of Canterbury, duly refused to comment except to reject a proposal, described by Shaw as 'monstrous', to allow the landlord voluntarily to take on the rent-charge at 75% of the composition; Beresford felt this proposal would see landlords undertaking collection where resistance was minimal and leaving the clergy 'to contend with the desperate ones'.¹³⁹

Beresford's 'decided negative' to the 'permissive' plan was evidently conclusive for it was omitted when the Government's proposals were outlined in Parliament by Russell towards the end of the month. The (compulsory) rent-charge was to be set at 70% of the composition and devoted to education, the constabulary and other secular purposes. The clergy would be paid the same amount out of the Consolidated Fund. This plan was essentially the same as one suggested in November by O'Connell,¹⁴⁰ and approved by Mac Hale. The appropriation issue was somewhat confused by these quite drastic proposals, 'perhaps intentionally', thought Goulburn, but he acknowledged the 'retreat' from appropriation and Morpeth and Spring Rice subsequently declared unequivocally that they did not involve that principle.¹⁴¹

Melbourne had objected 'that this scheme will be more disliked by the clergy than any former one. It pays them by the State, & appropriates their funds to the uses of the State'. He would rather have reintroduced the previous year's bill and agreed to the loss of appropriation if the Lords again cut it out.¹⁴² Beresford consulted the clergy and found them convinced, as Melbourne expected, that the proposals were 'utterly destructive to their interests & the stability of the Church'. The Primate entirely concurred and deprecated in particular the proposal to deduct 30% from clerical incomes when the conversion into rent-charges had already progressed so far under the more favourable terms of Stanley's Act. And he objected to making the clergy 'pensioners of the state'; the

rent-charge should, he felt, be devoted to the Church, as in all previous bills, and his principal adviser, Archdeacon Stopford, succeeded in persuading Shaw to give up 'all his ideas about purchasing land' and 'make a firm stand for preserving the rent-charges to the clergy'. In the Lords, Wicklow attacked the measure as one 'by which the revenues of the Church should be transferred from the Church' and the clergy 'made pensioners on the consolidated fund'. On the other side, O'Connell gave the plan a qualified approval, but Mac Hale lamented the absence of appropriation, of suppression of sinecure benefices and of 'any advantage to the occupying tenantry.'¹⁴⁴ Crawford, replying to O'Connell, continued to demand an end to all compulsory assessment for support of the Church and accordingly rejected the plan outright.¹⁴⁵

On the 14th of May Russell moved the adoption of the Tithe resolutions and was answered with the motion of Sir Thomas Acland, an English Tory, to rescind the appropriation resolutions of 1835. Acland felt that as the Government plan was so 'mystifying' and ambiguous regarding appropriation, his motion was justified; and it was desirable, he said, to 'ascertain whether the present Parliament felt upon this subject as did the last'. The Irish Tories Conolly, Lefroy, Litton, Young and Shaw supported Acland's motion, claiming that the Church would not be safe until the appropriation resolution were rescinded. Lefroy, Litton and Shaw also stated that the placing of the clergy 'on the civil list' gave insufficient security to their incomes and made them 'pensioners of the State'. Litton and Shaw also opposed the proposed 30% deduction from clerical incomes; as a result of the operation of Stanley's Act and of litigation the difficulty of collection had so diminished, they contended, that no such sacrifice was called for in order to secure the income of the clergy. The liberal-unionists Somerville, French, Redington and Spring Rice, and the repealers O'Connell and Bellew, joined in opposing Acland; they indicated their continuing support for appropriation, but were prepared to accept the Government measure in spite of its 'postponement' of that question.¹⁴⁶

In the division the Irish split along party lines, 70 Irish liberals (including Ferguson) opposing Aoland's motion and 34 Irish Tories lending it their support. The only unpaired Irish absentee was Thomas Martin of Galway, who was then in prison. Many regarded the majority of 19 as 'a triumph' for the liberal side of the House, and considered, too, that the debate had gone against the Tories. According to Grattan, 'many said the Tories felt they had made a wrong move', and Greville was sure that it was 'forced on Peel against his judgement' by those Conservatives who felt that the continuing operation of Stanley's Act would be more favourable to the clergy than any other measure likely to be carried. Stopford wrote immediately before the division that,

'We expect to be beat, but by a majority under ten & the resolutions were carried I believe by 35. Some people are sanguine enough to hope to have a majority, but the cooler calculators are not. The Duke and Sir Robert Peel were rather against this bold measure. But the Conservatives are tired of the Fabian policy and cannot be held together unless their leaders take a strong & decided & spirited part'.

One of Beresford's clerical correspondents was disappointed by the size of the Government's majority; and he disagreed with Litton's claim that tithe collection was problem - free in Ulster. With regard to the Government's tithe resolutions he expected that they would 'not be persisted in or if persisted in will never pass into law'.

Perhaps with a view to the likely attitude of the Lords, and encouraged by Mulgrave's opinion that the Irish were so 'heartily tired of the question' they would not be 'very punctilious' as to the terms of its settlement, Russell announced on the 18th of May that the Government would persist only with that part of their plan which converted tithe into rent-charge with a deduction. Mulgrave subsequently advised that the 'only thing' Russell had 'to guard against as far as the impression here (Ireland) is concerned .. is anything like a declaration that it is a final settlement'. On the 29th of May Peel declared his willingness to co-operate in resolving the tithe question according to the proposed conversion principle and his readiness to support a measure of corporate

reform. James Grattan thought that the measure would 'go far to settle the country' and noted that 'Shaw was pleased'. Clements and Smith O'Brien said they looked forward to a settlement of the tithe question and the latter declared his readiness to give up appropriation.

O'Connell, however, asserted that no settlement could be satisfactory which continued to tax the people for the support of the Church of a minority; 'the people of Ireland' could not be 'deluded' by a proposal merely to convert the tithe into a rent-charge which the landlords 'would afterwards place upon the tenants'. James Grattan felt that 'the Catholics', including O'Connell, Bellew and the Whig Lord Fingall, were not happy with the proposed settlement. 'The fact is (I fear) they will not be so without abolition. We cannot agree to that'. Grattan himself, keen for a settlement, recognized that the measure would merely 'give a new title to tythe' but felt that,

'if the Catholic clergy refuse to take a salary they cannot complain of the other sect who do. It is impossible to allow of this continued agitation. I will set my face against it & withdraw from opposition to a fair settlement & oppose Ward & his appropriation & O'Connell & his opposition .. if the Tythe Bill does not contain all we wish, it contains 152 much of what we asked, or all except the major principle of appropriation'.

Grattan subsequently noted that the effect of refusing to go on with a simple conversion measure would be that,

'we will take the bill from the Lords, & the Duke of Wellington will get the credit & our people swallow it & submit & thus their position is ridiculous. Another bad effect of not making the compromise in time & being driven into it is that O'Connell if he does not get the Mastership of the Rolls will continue to agitate & make the people dissatisfied with the bill'.

He felt that O'Connell opposed compromise on the Corporations measure in the hope that its defeat would also cause the loss of the tithe bill:

'O'Connell would rather get rid of the (Corporations) Bill as the Tithe arrangement will not suit him ... The Catholics have an object to break down the Church. I do not think they are hostile to Protestants, but very to the Establishment. They want to have the voluntary system'. 153

Outside Parliament Crawford encouraged agitation against a bill which continued the compulsory assessment and, far from transferring the

burden to the landlords, merely made them the 'tithe-proctors' for the
 154 clergy. On the 2nd of July, Ward moved to insert appropriation in the
 bill. Morpeth replied that it was time to propose a bill which might
 pass. O'Connell also opposed the motion. He pointed to the numerous
 meetings taking place in Ireland at which the 'entire abolition' of
 tithe was demanded and argued that 'appropriation of a paltry imaginary
 surplus' would only deflect 'the Irish people' from this, their proper
 goal. The bill would drive landlords into the ranks of those who
 agitated against the Establishment, he said, but in order to mitigate
 the fury which 'raged throughout Ireland' he would not vote against the
 bill. In the division the majority against Ward included 19 Irish Tories,
 12 repealers (including O'Connell) and 11 liberal-unionists. Six
 repealers and nine liberal-unionists supported Ward. James Grattan
 155
 'would have voted with (the) Government' had he been present.

Stopford informed his son on the 20th of May that he had been
 somewhat alarmed to find the Church's 'friends' in Parliament 'not
 very adverse to the pension plan & very favourable to the redemption
 plan' included in the Government's original proposals; the decision
 merely to convert to the rent-charge was 'just what we wanted', giving
 'the best income which the clergy can have under all circumstances'.
 He contemplated a deduction, however, of only 25%. And Beresford had
 also indicated to Goulburn that 25% was the maximum he would accept,
 and that very reluctantly; he urged Goulburn 'and our friends in
 156 Parliament' to move the 25% deduction. Following the Ward motion on
 the 2nd of July, Shaw moved to substitute 25% for 30% as the amount of
 deduction. The motion was carried against the Government, with 22 Irish
 157 Tories in the majority and 46 Irish liberals supporting the Ministers.

Shaw was later approached by Irish clergymen who felt that even
 the deduction of 25% was too much. He had warned Peel 'that the clergy
 generally would be against it' and had acquiesced 'with reluctance' when
 the Tory leaders insisted that the 20% he preferred would not pass.

Though he felt that 'when the Bill has passed they (the Clergy) will become generally reconciled to it' he was afraid that Gladstone's declared preference for 20% would 'increase dissatisfaction among the clergy & make them more difficult to manage'. And he was anxious to have the impression removed that he alone was responsible for the decision to compromise on 25%.¹⁵⁸ One of Beresford's confidants, Dean Jackson, was similarly disappointed that some of the clergy protested at the 25% deduction; 'the bill', he wrote, 'considered in its main feature of a deduction of 25% is as advantageous as any other we can now flatter ourselves with the hope of obtaining'; rejecting the view that Stanley's Act would suffice, he was extremely anxious that the bill should pass. Litton of Coleraine subsequently said his feelings had been 'outraged' by the 25% deduction, 'but his friends and party had consented for the sake of settlement'.¹⁵⁹

During discussions in Committee Lord Howick made what James Grattan considered an 'imprudent' speech in which the Minister predicted that the existence of the Irish Establishment would be questioned at some future date. When O'Connell spoke a few days later of the 'great evil' of taxing all the people to support the Church of a minority, Grattan's distaste was obvious; O'Connell and the Catholics wanted

'to upset the Church .. The present object is to pull down the Church & abolish Tithe altogether. This would enrich the landlord & priest. They at present get the Tithe of which the Clergyman is dispossessed .. it was a question to take their property, & so far objectionable...' 160

On the 26th of July the Mac Hale - sponsored member for Mayo, Dillon Browne, opposed the third reading on the grounds that 'the Irish people' desired 'a total abolition of tithes'. The liberal-unionist Thomas Redington had already said that the bill would not reduce his 'hostility to tithes in Ireland', but he quietly voted for the third reading. Somerville regretted that the 25% deduction would be put 'into the pockets of the landlords'. He felt the bill would fail 'even as a palliative' and pledged himself to support the efforts of his countrymen to get rid

of the 'monstrous burden' of the Church. Still another liberal-unionist, Bryan of Kilkenny, 'did not think this measure would satisfy the people of Ireland' but voted for the third reading. O'Connell argued that the landlords would become the new enemies of the Church burden and looked forward to the day when Catholics would not be asked to support the Protestant Church; but he too voted against Browne. Peel and Stanley gave the bill a qualified support. In the division 6 Irish Tories and 25 Irish liberals voted for the third reading. The only Irish dissentients were the repealers Browne and Vigors. Shaw subsequently recognized that the Government had made 'great' and 'satisfactory' concessions on the
 161
 question.

James Grattan, who absented himself from the third reading debate, noted that,

'Somerville appears to have been imprudent & talked of not opposing agitation. Ebrington violent, Harvey also. Grote, Peel tranquil, & Russell. O'Connell also, but obviously looking to voluntary principles. All this will keep up agitation ... Howick has caused this'.

When the following day the Lords again mutilated the Corporations bill Grattan wrote, 'Ministers are impotent. Much abused by the radicals for giving up appropriation & giving the Million & all only to pass Tory
 162
 bills ..' Russell informed Normanby (Mulgrave) that the bill passed the lower House 'after an opposition small in numbers but somewhat bitter in spirit. The Lords, after Peel's speech, will I imagine accept the Bill - & I hope it will prove a considerable relief to your Government in Ireland'. Normanby was 'quite relieved' at the news. 'The fear of a fatal collision with the people on this subject was a constant weight
 163
 upon my mind'.

Wellington, meanwhile, was under pressure from a number of dissatisfied Irish Conservatives and Clergymen to reject the bill. Most notably, Lord Clancarty wrote that, given the operation of Stanley's Act and the fact 'the law has been daily becoming more efficient', more legislation was unnecessary; and the proposal to deduct more than 15%

from the converted charge would, he claimed, be 'as much uncalled for by any necessity as it would be both cruel and unjust by the clergy and detrimental to the future stability of the Church Establishment'.¹⁶⁴

Clancarty accordingly opposed the bill in the House of Lords, but his motion for its rejection was negatived without a division. Wicklow spoke in terms almost as hostile as Clancarty's but disclaimed an intention to oppose the bill. Wellington did not speak, but he reported to Glengall his belief 'that the Church and Tithe owners in general have agreed that it is desirable to pass this Bill'.¹⁶⁵

Primate Beresford and Lord Donoughmore discussed only details of the measure in correspondence with Wellington. Fitzgerald supported the measure as an acceptable settlement of a difficult question. He moved the amendment of the composition revision clauses along the lines suggested by Beresford to Wellington, and this was carried against the wishes of the Government. The only peer to oppose the bill from a radical standpoint was Brougham.¹⁶⁶ According to James Grattan even the Irish Catholic Earl of Fingall found the measure sufficient. Grattan considered the revisions amendment 'a fresh difficulty' and O'Connell declared in the House that he hoped that the bill would be rejected in the Commons as a result of the amendments made in the upper House.¹⁶⁷ Russell asked Shaw to bring down as many Conservatives as possible because he feared the bill might be opposed by some of 'their more violent men'. In the event, however, the amended bill was agreed to without protest.¹⁶⁸

Thus ended the long search for a legislative settlement of the Irish tithe question. However, many Irish liberals remained dissatisfied. In August and again in October Crawford bitterly attacked O'Connell for his acceptance of a bill which fell so far short of the voluntaryism which both professed.¹⁶⁹ Meetings were held throughout the southern part of Ireland to protest against the Act and petition for the total extinction of tithes or 'their appropriation to national purposes'. The most notable was held in Meath on the 24th of October, with the liberal-unionists

Headfort, Cloncurry, Crawford, Somerville (M.P.), Chapman (M.P.) and Chester (M.P.) and the repealers Henry Grattan and Morgan O'Connell signing the requisition and Headfort, Crawford and Somerville the leading
 170 speakers. Mac Hale expressed his dissatisfaction to O'Connell and his opinion that the Irish people would not 'acquiesce in so unjust a law'.
 171 Emerson Tennent thought that O'Connell's influence had been 'thoroughly shaken'. The Tithe Bill has been his Moscow'. O'Connell himself
 172 continued to state that his ultimate object was 'the total extinction of the odious tithe system' by ending compulsory assessment for support of the Church and devotion of the tithe 'to purposes of public and universal utility'. This was one of the declared objects of the Precursor Association founded by O'Connell in August 1838. In justification of his vote he claimed that he had never regarded the bill as satisfactory, 'far less final'; but it effected with a deduction of 25% what Stanley's Act had already accomplished over half of Ireland and would gradually
 173 have accomplished in the rest without any deduction.

On the other side, Primate Beresford, in his charge to the clergy of Derry and Raphoe, gave his opinion 'that, under all the circumstances,
 174 more favourable conditions could not have been procured'. In April 1839 Tennent called the Act a 'measure of justice'. Early in 1840 Litton said that he was 'satisfied' with the Act and Shaw 'saw the good effects of the Irish Tithe Bill in the increased security of the Irish Church and
 175 the improved condition of society in Ireland'. Graham was happy with the settlement and Stanley claimed to have received 'letters from all quarters from the Irish Clergy in the South, thanking for (sic) the satisfactory
 176 arrangement we have effected for them'.

Their contentment was probably justified. The clergy might have held out until the operation of Stanley's Act became universal, but that would have involved continued hardship for many and would probably have left the liberal/Catholic sense of grievance a serious threat to the Church. By the Act the clergy escaped the task of tithe collection, at

a cost of 25% of their nominal incomes. The landlords were enabled to charge the whole amount upon their tenants and retain a bonus of 25% for their trouble. The landlords had, of course, much greater power than the clergy to enforce the payment. But Daunt subsequently reckoned that it 'frequently' proved 'impossible to obtain more than 75% from the tenant; so that in every such case the landlord got nothing for his trouble and liability'. And there were 'numerous instances .. where the landlord found it difficult enough to obtain his original rent'. The landlords lost out, too, in that, with the clergy removed from conflict with the tenantry, 'rent (increased by the hidden payments to the clergy) became the sole focus of agrarian discontent and opposition'.¹⁷⁷

This realignment effect and the obvious futility of demanding further change had a stifling effect upon agitation. That of the Autumn of 1838 was short-lived, and the Church grievance remained for many years thereafter a matter of secondary importance in Irish politics. Several Tories, the Irish in particular, protested vigorously in 1839 at the appointment as Lord Lieutenant of a man, Lord Ebrington, who had pronounced himself favourable to a further reduction of the Establishment.¹⁷⁸ And the issue did receive the attention of Irish liberals from time to time, of course. In his eulogy of the Whig Government in 1839, Fitzstephen French, the liberal-unionist member for Roscommon, wrote of 'the injustice of forcibly levying the funds for the support of the Established Church from a dissenting community' and allowed only that the system had been 'relaxed' by the recent measure.¹⁷⁹ James Grattan, who clearly hoped that the present settlement would succeed, felt in May 1839 that Sheil, Redington and others of 'the Catholic party' were disappointed that the Whigs survived the ministerial crisis of that year because 'they want to destroy the Irish church & I suspect would rather see the party in opposition attacking the Irish Church than supporting as they now of necessity do ..'.¹⁸⁰ In July one influential priest wrote to O'Brien that O'Connell had 'betrayed' their cause and lamented that

'since the O'Connell bill as they call it passed into law' the people of Limerick were 'all obliged .. to meet the landlords' rent charge'.¹⁸¹
 A few weeks later O'Connell contemplated a campaign to secure application of the tithe rent-charge in aid of the poor law, but he¹⁸² does not appear to have pursued the idea.

In April 1840, O'Connell formed the organization which in July became the Repeal Association; 'the extinction or public appropriation of the tithe rent-charge' was one of the objects of this body and O'Connell, writing to Mac Hale, described the continuing assessment for support of the Church as 'the first, the greatest of our grievances .. a master grievance to be redressed by the Repeal of the Union'.¹⁸³ The grievance became, however, part of an agitation which was to remain moribund for several years. In May 1840 Cloncurry argued that 'the appropriation clause should be again and again brought forward'. In August 1840 and again in October 1841 Crawford revived the issue of O'Connell's apostasy on the tithe question, laying the blame for the 'degrading compromise' squarely on O'Connell's shoulders.¹⁸⁵

According to Greville in February 1841, Catholic Ireland still felt 'insulted and impoverished by the vast Protestant ecclesiastical establishment'. He thought that there would be a 'battle' on this issue, 'and that the end of it will be (however long in coming) the downfall of the Church of England in Ireland, as fall it ought'.¹⁸⁶ The prospects of further reform were set back still further by the accession in September 1841 of a Conservative Government which, though anxious to placate 'loyal Catholics', was determined that 'the Protestant Church must be maintained inviolate in full possession of the means which it now draws directly from Protestant Property'; the Catholics would have to 'rest satisfied with the present settlement of the Protestant Church in Ireland on its reduced scale'.¹⁸⁷ The Conservative Government was to stick closely to this line throughout its term. Towards the end of 1841, Lord Roden indicated that he was no more favourably disposed towards

further concession when he contended that tithe was then, 'as always, paid by the predominantly Protestant landlords and that 'under the existing state of the law the Tithe is already scarcely noticed by the majority of Tenants. In a short time, if left to themselves, the name of it will be almost forgotten ..'

In July 1842 there took place virtually the first debate specifically devoted to the Irish Church since the passing of the tithe bill in 1838. The liberal-unionist Sergeant Murphy moved for a Committee to study the possibility of abolishing the 'onerous and unjust' impost of ministers' money, the urban equivalent of tithe. This tax, though light in theory, bore quite heavily on some of the poorest classes. And Murphy objected to the general principle of taxing Catholics for Protestant purposes. He envisaged compensation of the affected clergy out of Church funds. Other Irish liberals supported the motion. The Irish Tories Jackson, Shaw and Litton protested that the tax was 'exceedingly low' and that no acceptable substitute was proposed, but Shaw and Litton and Chief Secretary Eliot did favour some alteration of the system. In the division, won by the Government, the motion was supported by 18 Irish liberals and opposed by 16 Irish Tories. In the Maynooth debate later in the month, Clements of Leitrim spoke angrily of the 'notorious riches' and 'neglect' of the Protestant Clergy.

In Ireland O'Connell and the repealers continued to include 'the total abrogation of the rent-charge' as one of the principal objects of the Repeal agitation. When this agitation burgeoned in 1843 the grievances it encompassed, including the Church, gained a new importance. In the Summer of 1843 the crisis in Ireland riveted the attention of the British Parliament upon the state of that country. The debates on the Arms bill, O'Brien's general motion of July 1843 and subsequently Ward's Irish Church motion saw a major revival of the Church issue, with Irish liberals, almost all of them unionists (the repealers remained in Ireland), and a number of British members describing it as an important

grievance. For some, indeed, particularly the British members, it was still 'the master grievance' of Ireland.

Many contended that the question could never be settled while 'the Church of so small a minority of the people' remained the establishment and that of the majority was 'excluded from similar advantages'. Smith O'Brien, recognizing with regret that Parliament was not prepared to dissolve the Establishment and introduce voluntaryism, advocated instead removal of the 'invidious distinction' between the Churches by assisting the Catholic Church in the construction of churches and purchase of residences for the clergy. In more general terms he asserted that the Catholic Church should 'at least be placed upon a footing of perfect equality with the other religious communities in regard to ecclesiastical arrangements'. Wyse, Jephson-Norreys, Buller, Macaulay and Russell held very similar language. This desire for elevation of the Catholic Church in some way was manifested in fact by a great many of the liberal speakers, marking a considerable shift of emphasis from that of the debates of the 1830's. Monteagle, Clanricarde, Villiers Stuart and several English members advocated payment of the Catholic clergy, but a succession of Irish members pointed out that they would not accept such payment. Diminution of 'the overgrown Church Establishment' and appropriation of the surplus (in the traditional sense) still had many advocates, and Crawford clung to the voluntary solution.

The Conservative member for Westminster, H. J. Rous, acknowledged that the Irish Catholics were justified in complaining at being made to support the Church of a minority; Monckton Milnes of Pontefract advocated a State provision for the Catholic clergy and suggested that, since taxation of Catholic landlords for the Protestant Church was a legitimate grievance, 'a portion' of the rent-charge falling on them 'might be expended for some other religious or secular purpose'. Wicklow (in Parliament) and Lord Clare, Croker, Lambert and the Knight of Kerry (in correspondence with Ministers) advocated 'a liberal and

handsome provision for the Roman Catholic Church'. But the great majority of Tory speakers, including the Ministers and the Irish Tories Shaw, Tennent, Bateson, Smith, Bernard, Dungannon, Jocelyn and George Hamilton, resolutely opposed any further interference with the Church. The threat to property, the English Church and the Union in any subversion of the Irish Establishment was again underlined. In addition, it was asserted that 'since the church had taken upon itself the payment of church-rates (vestry cess) and the law had transferred the tithe from the occupier to the landowner, nine-tenths, at least, of whom were of the Established Church, it was unreasonable to say that any practical grievance was felt by the occupier'. According to Shaw and Hamilton, 'The Irish Church had ceased to be a profitable item in Irish agitation .. the Roman Catholics of Ireland generally did not feel the Established Church to be the grievance which Hon. Members represented it to be'.¹⁹²

In fact, the Duke of Bedford thought that in Ireland 'the Church question is of less importance than the Landlord and Tenant question', and Sheil told Wyse that the Church was 'not a prominent subject in his part of the world' and that he did not 'think Priests or flocks care much about it'. Wyse commented,

'Surely this can only be from its having been overshadowed by Repeal. Here the opinion is very different - they consider it the monster grievance, and are awake to the necessity of at last setting about a thorough re-constitution. Even Shaw said to me in the library last night (31 July), "better to settle the whole concern at once than thus keep us always in excitement by bit-by-bit alterations & diminutions". He is right, and I believe many Conservatives think so who speak differently. It is really not worth the while of the country to be always in fret and ferment for such an institution. Believe me, before this time next year despite of the big words from ministerial mouths, you will see a radical change. Nothing is now offered in the way of argument but the danger of example to dissenters in England in reference to the English church. The case however is not analagous. Were the Church of England the Baptist congregation it would be similar'. 193

Wyse adverted several times during the summer of 1843 to the growing tendency of Conservatives to talk of 'throwing the Church overboard ... They think (when we meet in society they are rational enough) that the Church is not worth the expense and trouble'. Landed proprietors were tired of the role of protectors, 'besides hating the

rent-charge', and 'would be right glad for any plea to get rid of the whole concern .. The Church I think is doomed - & by the very men from whom you would least expect it'. British Tories outwith the House indulged in 'daily denunciation of the Church', seeing no reason 'why every one on this side of the Channel should be kept in hot water' for the Irish Church. ¹⁹⁴ According to Graham in July, 'There is no warm feeling on the Conservative side of the House of Commons in favour of the maintenance of the Protestant Church of Ireland in its integrity'. He remained determined that the Government could not 'abandon the Protestant Church in Ireland' or 'give to the Roman Catholics an Establishment'. ¹⁹⁵

In July 1843 Ward gave notice of a motion in which it was asserted that the assignment of all ecclesiastical property to 'the clergy of a small section of the population' was 'amongst the most prominent' of Irish grievances, that such a system was 'not conformable to reason', and that the House should pledge itself to 'remove all just ground of complaint' on this score. Wyse considered the motion 'large and embracing. Anyone not a sheer Churchman may vote for it, yet if passed it leads to the fullest reform ... Ward told me he had adopted verbatim the very declarations in Parliament of Lord John, & thus secured .. his & his followers' consent and in most instances support'. And Wyse was hopeful that the debate might elicit 'a gleam of the light now common even in Conservative society'. ¹⁹⁶

Ward introduced his motion with a plea that Parliament should 'break up the present Establishment', disbanding the hierarchy, recognizing the titles of the Catholic bishops, returning to the Catholics the churches they possessed before the Reformation, and distributing ecclesiastical property between the Churches according to their respective numbers. ¹⁹⁷

On the second night of the debate the House was counted out, there being less than 40 members present. Wyse wrote that the motion 'went off like the "Story of the Bear and Fiddle, Begins but breaks off in the middle"'. He was

'astounded at the catastrophe .. The Tories are rejoicing, they have

escaped from the inconvenient disclosures and side attacks of "Young England" and our Whig friends from the necessity of throwing over Ward, who had not been satisfied with his motion, the wording of which was most judicious, but insisted on giving interpretation too. The interpretation was much too strong for their digestion, and you would have undoubtedly had a speech or two from Lord John & Palmerston which would have gone far to settle them & Whiggery, if not already settled, in Ireland. Catholics too were placed in a dilemma from which it would require some very bold and decided representatives to escape .. On the whole, then, all seem agreed it went off - by accident? - just as 4/5ths of the House desired. Ward, however, has done good. All are attacking or defending, so that all are thinking, which is what we want. Next session we shall be ripe for this ..' 198

A few days later he felt that,

'On the whole perhaps we have lost nothing. Ward's interpretation and commentary embarrassed many, especially the Catholics & Whigs. We should have had faint-hearted & mealy-mouthed declarations - not so, I vouch for it, when next we meet.' 199

In their Remonstrance to the People of Great Britain in August 1843 the liberal-unionist members complained that, 'A Church Establishment is maintained for the exclusive benefit of one-tenth of the nation.' And, in vague but bold terms, they went on to 'demand the recognition of perfect equality in regard to ecclesiastical and educational arrangements between the several religious communities into which the population of Ireland is divided.' The assault on the Church in 1843, lacking as it did such specific goals as appropriation and tithe reform, dealt very largely in this sort of generality. It saw the status of the Protestant Church as Establishment questioned to an unprecedented degree; the trend towards disestablishment was, in fact, much more clearly visible in 1843 than it had been during the more purposeful, goal-oriented debates of the previous decade.

The second half of 1843 also saw the leaders of the Whig party in Britain once more earnestly discussing the Church question in their private correspondence. Macaulay wished to pay the priesthood out of Protestant Church funds, while Russell and Palmerston were prepared to suppress sinecure parishes in the Church and 'not at all clear' that the resultant surplus should be devoted to 'purposes exclusively Protestant'. Though Russell and Palmerston were 'not anxious to revive the appropriation clause', which 'would raise again all the prejudices

against which we struggled so long', and (with Lansdowne) convinced that it was 'not advisable to endow the Roman Catholic Church with any of the spoils of the Protestant', Russell felt vaguely that 'the principle of equality in all matters, ecclesiastical as well as civil, should be our guide', and there was general agreement on the desirability of paying the priesthood as 'the only way of doing justice to the nation at large'. Russell and Melbourne did fear that the priests would refuse the payment, especially after the Catholic Bishops repudiated any such provision at their annual Synod in November 1843. But Palmerston remained confident that it would be accepted if offered.

The Edinburgh Review of January 1844 contained an article by Nassau Senior in the writing of which Lansdowne was clearly involved and advice was taken from Russell, Monteagle, Fortescue, Macaulay and Archbishop Whately. The contrast between the endowment of the Protestant and Presbyterian Churches and the neglect of the Church of 4/5ths of the people was described as 'an insult and injury', an 'absurdity' and a 'crime'. Given this, and the need to end the dependence on their flocks which had caused the priesthood to encourage agitation, Senior proposed to give them a State provision and funds for erecting churches and glebe houses. The sum required should be taken from the imperial revenue, not Protestant Church funds. But Senior also proposed the abolition of the Church's parish system as it bore little relation to Protestant numbers. Re-division of the country according to Protestant population would remove the sinecure parishes, and the 'surplus revenue' thus released should be appropriated in the manner proposed by Melbourne's Government. Senior would also allow landlords to redeem the tithe rent-charge, partly in order to end the taxation of Catholic landlords for Protestant purposes. And he would exclude the Irish bishops from the House of Lords, their presence there constituting a 'relic of Protestant Ascendancy' and a denial of the desired 'complete equality' of the Protestant and Catholic Churches. Monteagle had objected that this proposal would only provoke 'the indignant defiance of the whole Church party' and 'the loud

applause of the Radicals & Revolutionists', but Napier replied that none of the other Whig leaders had protested and that all had 'given
202
great praise to the paper'.

Several times between September 1843 and January 1844 Chief Secretary Eliot advocated payment of the Catholic clergy out of an Irish land tax in order to wean them from agitation. He felt that Irish landlords would agree to such taxation and that among Irish Protestants 'a feeling is beginning to prevail that a provision for the Roman Catholic Clergy would render the contrast between their condition and that of the Clergy of the Established Church less striking & less invidious in the eyes of the peasantry than it now is'. Graham also came round to this view. However, the Cabinet decided in January that the opposition from Catholics, Dissenters and some Churchmen would
203
prove too formidable. And when a proposal to this effect was made at a meeting of Irish Whigs at Lord Charlemont's Dublin House on the 18th of January the Catholics present, including Wyse and Redington, objected that it would 'be regarded rather as a bribe than a boon' and therefore tend to irritate. The proposition was omitted. Also at this meeting the repealer Sir Valentine Blake and Lords Clanricarde and Miltown spoke of 'the monster church grievances' of Ireland. The petition from the meeting included the complaint that, 'In England the established church
204
is the church of the many; in Ireland it is the church of the few'.

O'Connell in his famous letter to Charles Buller on the 9th of January 1844 completely rejected the idea of paying the Catholic clergy, arguing that it would destroy their calming influence on the peasantry. Instead voluntaryism - 'the paying neither clergy, the having no state church ..., perfect religious equality .. the equality of non-payment' - was 'the first great measure for quieting Ireland'. The Church was still, he claimed, 'the monster grievance', and adoption of his solution would be a necessary part of any attempt to 'mitigate the present ardent
205
desire for Repeal'.

The Irish debates of the early weeks of the session of 1844 saw

another searching examination of the Church question. The liberal-unionists Wyse, Clements, Ross, Rawdon, O'Ferrall, Bellew and Sheil, and the repealers O'Connell and E. B. Roche and John O'Brien joined in decrying the anomaly of the minority Establishment and the various practical shortcomings and abuses of the Church. Ross and Bellew demanded 'equality' of the Protestant and Catholic Churches. So, too, did Russell, hopeful that the Catholic Church might eventually become 'part of a general Church Establishment'. He subsequently told Greville 'that he was not opposed to the establishment of the Catholic religion, provided the Protestant was preserved', though he was nonetheless anxious for a further reduction of the overgrown Protestant Establishment. Howick argued that disestablishment/voluntaryism, establishment of the Catholic Church, or a joint Establishment were all preferable to the existing system. O'Connell, Hawes, Buller, Ward, Roebuck and Crawford
206
all opted for voluntaryism.

O'Connell rejoiced in Howick's attack on the Church and felt that 'the grasp of the English which that Church has so long firmly held is
207
much relaxed'. Graham feared that the 'destruction of the Protestant Church in Ireland is the object' of 'a new treaty' between the Whigs
208
and O'Connell. The Irish Tories Shaw, Conolly, Young, Stafford O'Brien and Gregory combined with the Government spokesmen firmly to reject the idea of any interference with the status of the Established Church and to expose the practical difficulties involved in some of the more ambitious projects of their opponents. And they denied again that, after the reforms of the 1830's, the Church was a legitimate source of
209
grievance. In private memoranda to the Cabinet Peel made clear his resolve that 'no concession can be made' with regard to 'any proposals for a transfer of any portion of the Revenues of the Church or for weakening its connection with the State as the Established Religion in Ireland'. Graham doubted if any of the institutions he treasured, the monarchy and property included, could survive disestablishment in Ireland. The Cabinet agreed that they 'would maintain in all its

integrity, in the full possession of all its present rights and
 210
 privileges, the Established Church^o of Ireland.

In documents which show that Peel and his Ministers were contemplating a new, more liberal phase of their Government of Ireland, this language is particularly striking and significant, though some Irish Tories were less than satisfied with Peel's declaration that his opposition to 'the undermining and destruction of the Protestant Church' was based not on 'the comparatively narrow ground of (the Union) compact' but on 'the conviction of his own mind'²¹¹. Peel, in fact, contemplated abolition of ministers' money and legislation on 'any remaining sinecures in the Church of Ireland'²¹². During the ensuing weeks the issue of ministers' money, described by Graham as 'the most angry question still left undetermined', was considered by the Government. George Hamilton, the Tory member for the University of Dublin, submitted a paper on the subject. His plan, which Primate Beresford favoured, was merely to transfer the burden from occupier to owner. Graham felt this was not 'likely to be regarded as a satisfactory settlement or as any material alleviation of the grievances of which the Roman Catholics complain ... it is no measure of peace and not likely therefore to add strength to the foundations of the Protestant Church'.

Graham and the Attorney-General for Ireland envisaged 'the extinction of Ministers' Money and the transfer of this charge to the Ecclesiastical Revenues'. But Stanley felt that such a transfer would not be 'equitable' and that the Church's funds could not bear the burden. And he and Wellington were not prepared to abolish the impost without compensation. When Murphy raised the subject again in Parliament in July 1844, Eliot and Stanley had to admit that the Government had been unable to devise any substitute by which the incomes of the urban clergy would be maintained.²¹³ In addition Graham and Peel undertook the difficult and frustrating task of inducing the Church leaders to end various 'gross abuses' - maladministration and 'lavish expenditure' under the

Temporalities Act, and episcopal absenteeism - which threatened to provoke and encourage their enemies; Graham was once driven to declare that the Church was 'doomed .. it will fall from the folly of its natural guardians'.
214

On the 11th of June 1844, Ward initiated another major debate on the Irish Church with his motion for a Committee of the House upon 'the present state of the Temporalities of the Church of Ireland'. Russell, the repealers Maurice O'Connell and Dillon Browne and the liberal-unionists Ross, Redington, Rawdon and Sheil duly pitched in with assaults on the overgrown minority Establishment; they were answered by Shaw and a number of British Tories with a steady refusal to countenance any further reform or reduction. In the division, which the Government carried against Ward by 95 votes, 31 Irish liberals, the great majority of them liberal-unionists, supported the motion. Ferguson, the liberal-unionist member for Londonderry, and 26 Irish Tories voted against.
215

The issue was given scant attention during the rest of 1844 and early part of 1845 as the repeal agitation which had brought this and other Irish questions to the fore went into relative decline. In July 1844 John O'Brien, the federalist-repealer, twice spoke out strongly against 'the Church of an opulent minority claiming a national and exclusive establishment'. Lord Campbell 'did not say that they must disestablish the existing Church but he said that they must form an equal Establishment for the Catholic Church'. Wicklow (Tory) and Monteagle (Whig) advocated payment of the priesthood, but the Bishop of Exeter felt it was 'inconsistent with the support of an Established Church to support a religion which was opposed to that Church', and Wyse contended that 'the Catholic Clergy of Ireland would not receive salaries and .. did not wish to have their Church enjowed'.
216

In November 1844 Monteagle (Spring Rice) wrote to a Fermaragh clergyman,

'I cannot defend things as they are. I cannot defend large

benefices in the south & west without Protestants & populous places in the north & in our cities where the religious instruction of members of the Established Church are (sic) inadequately provided for. I cannot reconcile laws & an establishment based on the supposition that we are a people of 8,000,000 of Episcopalian Protestants with the fact that we have amongst us 7,200,000 Roman Catholics & Dissenters.'

But he was opposed to the 'voluntary system', as religion could no more be left 'to be scrambled for' than defence, civil administration or justice. He concluded:

'I therefore ... hold to the Protestant Church, if maintained adequately to its merits & no more & if a like provision be made for other professions .. Let us not break down the walls of our own Cathedrals because some foolish people say they will not permit us to build up the walls of theirs. Considering the maintenance of religion to be an obligation imposed on the state I would maintain all & maintain them justly.' 217

During the next few months a provision for the Catholic Clergy was urged in public by Croker and Greville, and there was clearly a widespread belief that the Government intended to propose such payment. But Russell's enthusiasm was checked, though he remained in favour in principle, when Bessborough expressed his fear that O'Connell would use 'what he would call an insult to their Church' as 'a new subject of agitation', and the Duke of Leinster felt that 'other liberal measure would have more effect'. Palmerston reckoned that,

'... zealous Protestants .., if driven to choose between evils, .. would rather abolish the Protestant Church in Ireland and place all sects there upon the voluntary principle, than endow and as it were establish a Roman Catholic Church. If so we shall have Inglis and Howick and Daniel all voting with Ward for the simple abolition of the Protestant Establishment.' 218

The Government's proposal in April 1845 to increase and make permanent the grant to Maynooth College brought the Church issue once again into the limelight. For many Irish Tories the bill, particularly the permanency provision, involved a measure of endowment of Catholicism and held out a prospect of movement towards payment of the priests and establishment of their religion. Fears for the Church played a major part in the decision of the majority of Irish Tories to oppose the Maynooth bill. The Government spokesmen, and Irish Tory supporters of the bill such as Claud Hamilton, Rosse and Jocelyn, contended that the bill did not offer any threat to the Establishment and denied that they

intended to proceed to pay the priesthood.

The latter assertion was true in that payment of the priests was by no means the principal end in view, but Graham did entertain a hope that the proposed scholarships would form 'the foundation of a system of stipends to be received from the State', would, that is, be 'easily extended in duration hereafter when the College Education shall have terminated ... The habit of being fed by the State increases the

appetite for being fed'. In Parliament Wicklow again urged payment of the priesthood out of an Irish land tax. Croker wrote to Peel in favour of such a provision, convinced as he was that 'endowments strengthen endowments ... the endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland would be the best security for the Anglo-Irish Church here & there'. Peel gave Croker some assistance in preparing another article on the subject for

the Quarterly Review.

Crawford and a number of British members opposed the bill in

accordance with their voluntary views. Most liberal members warmly supported the bill, however, and many used the debates as an opportunity to attack the Irish Church. In particular, Ward moved that the Maynooth grant should be taken out of the inflated revenues of the Church. 'Can any man who voted for the appropriation clause refuse to vote for this?', he asked Russell, but there was clearly little enthusiasm in the liberal camp for a step which jeopardized the Maynooth bill. The amendment was defeated by the massive majority of 174. Six Irish liberals voted against Ward, with Barron explaining that he felt the bill should not be impeded. The only other Irish liberal speaker, the repealer E. B. Roche, regretted Ward's course for the same reason. 18 Irish liberals, mostly unionists, supported Ward. 35 Irish Tories voted against, and there were speeches against the motion from 3 Irish Tories, Bateson, Hamilton and Bernard, in a debate reminiscent of the appropriation controversy of the 1830's.

In the House and in correspondence with Russell the British liberal Edward Ellice expressed a wish to go further than Ward by substituting

for Peel's 'bit-by-bit policy' a 'wide measure for the endowment of the Catholic Establishment .. & for restoring as far as may be the equality between Catholic & Protestant '. This he would do by means of an Irish land tax and an equal sharing out of the revenues of the Established Church, constituting the Catholic Church as 'a sister establishment'. Other liberals - Murphy of Cork, Hawes, Howick and Russell - took a similar view in debate; taken in conjunction with Palmerston's advocacy of payment of the priests, it may be said that a provision of some sort for the Catholic clergy was then the
223
proclaimed policy of the Whig leadership.

The repealer E. B. Roche said during the debate on Ward's motion that the Church was not 'as important a question now as it was some
224
years since'. This was undoubtedly the case, in spite of Ward's persistent efforts and the hopes and fears raised by the Maynooth measure. At the end of May, for the fourth year in succession, Murphy raised the question of ministers' money, gaining support from Barron and Roche. But their proposal to 'provide a substitute from the funds
225
of the Established Church' was rejected by the Chief Secretary. The English liberal Evelyn Denison led an assault on the mismanagement and profligacy of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, forcing the ministers to confess the 'past errors' of these Church leaders and to resolve in private that 'a more rigid economy must be introduced into their entire
226
system'. Finally, in a 'Business of the Session' debate in August 1845, Russell said that they would 'sooner or later' have to adopt a policy of 'equality' between the Irish Protestant and Catholic Churches, either by endowing the Catholics or abolishing the existing Establishment. Sheil agreed, pointing out that the Catholic Church could be endowed in other ways than the payment of priests, but Graham was resolutely opposed to disestablishment and felt that 'the greatest possible resistance
227
would be offered' to endowment of the Catholic Church.

Towards the end of August 1845, Monteagle wrote, regarding the Church,

'I think our Irish system cannot last, & I think I see symptoms of the time which I have always anticipated when some of the advocates of the appropriation clause will be found more friendly to the Irish church & more disposed to defend it in a reduced & reformed condition than Sir Robert Peel & his conservative Cabinet ..' 228

In October Roden's Address to the Protestants of the British Empire expressed a fear that,

'... there may yet be a more direct violation of the Constitution, (as, for instance, by the endowment of the Clergy and Church of Rome), and that, from the policy of the Government, the maintenance of the Established Church in Ireland, although a fundamental article of the Union, may be seriously endangered'. 229

Roden privately concluded from his perception of 'the feeling of England towards Ireland & the Church' that,

'the days of the Irish Church are numbered. When she is removed Popery as a mere consequence must step into her shoes as a permanent Establishment & the consequence will be that the great mass of the aristocracy will go over to the Church of Rome...' 230

In November and December, George Hamilton, the Tory member for Dublin University, complained to the Lord Lieutenant of the Government's 'indifference to the interests of the Established Church', in particular of 'the very cautious & guarded language' of Graham and Peel in Parliament. Protestants feared, he claimed, that the Government would eventually
231
'surrender' the Establishment under pressure from the Repealers.

Primate Beresford subsequently wrote of 'the misapprehension which exists, especially in England, as to the property & condition of the
232
Church Establishment of Ireland'.

On the other side, the Duke of Leinster advocated payment of the priests out of an Irish land tax, as opposed to 'by taxing Britain or
233
out of the funds of the Established Church'. Morpeth, however, was 'rather tending' to voluntarism, 'to have no endowed religion at all .. The ground of expediency tells very much against endowing a clergy
234
which would lustily repudiate it'. In December, when Russell was asked to form a Government Grey (Howick) wrote to him that there were 'two fundamental principles to which I think we ought to declare our adherence', indeed would have to if he were to join the Ministry. One was free trade, the other, on which he laid 'equal stress', was 'that of

establishing complete religious equality in Ireland, .. as I believe policy & justice equally require'. He felt that the priesthood's objection to payment might be overcome, 'but if not then the only other means of correcting the present anomalous state of thing should I think be taken by applying the Church property as existing interests terminated to purposes of general instruction'.

Peel retained office, however, as a result of Grey's opposition to Palmerston's returning to the Foreign Office. Lord Carew of Wexford found some consolation in the view that 'Peel can carry the payment of the Catholic Clergy, which you could not even look at'. In March 1846, More O'Ferrall, looking forward to the advent of a Whig Government, informed Russell that,

'On the settlement of Church questions all others must depend. If this difficulty cannot be overcome no other need be attempted, force alone can then govern Ireland .. I do not think the confiscation of the Revenues of the Established Church without an equivalent would give religious peace, quite the reverse. In place of the Church of England, we should soon have a crowd of ignorant intolerant sects who would wage a perpetual war on the Catholic Church, and having no settled principle in religion would neither be good Christians nor good subjects'.

Thus he dismissed voluntaryism. He would, however, reduce the number of bishops from 12 to 6, and sell the episcopal lands, the produce of the sale 'to be employed in the building and repairs of churches of Protestants, Catholics and Presbyterians'. The latter should be the only endowment of the Catholic Church until Catholic suspicions were removed. But he proposed to substitute for the tithe rent-charge 'a general land tax to vary in amount in proportion to the religious wants of the country', and in proposing this tax he 'would state that it was liable to the charge for maintaining the three Churches whenever any of them saw fit to claim it' and 'that the ministers of religion were not to be the stipendiaries of the State, or dependent on the annual votes of Parliament'. In this way 'perfect equality' between the Churches would be established. David Pigot, another Catholic liberal-unionist, shared O'Ferrall's 'strong objections to the endowment of the Catholic Church' if proposed with the 'sinister views' generally held in that

connection. Russell apparently replied that he considered O'Ferrall's ²³⁷ 'views on the Established Church extreme though not unreasonable'.

In addition, there was in 1846 yet another assault on the Church in Parliament. Much of this discussion arose as the liberal members suggested a conciliatory approach in Ireland in place of the Government's proposal of coercion. Grey strongly urged his desire for 'perfect equality' of the Churches, with the surplus revenues of the Protestant Church transferred to the Catholic and supplemented by the State and Catholic Bishops admitted into the House of Lords. Fortescue, Fitzwilliam and the liberal-unionists Armstrong and R. S. Carew held similar language, but Clanricarde seemed reluctant to go beyond reform ²³⁸ of the Church's abuses and reduction according to the needs of the laity. The Ministers and a few Irish Tories defended the Church, issuing the habitual declarations that the measures proposed would lead to the 'extinction' of the 'Protestant Church' in both Ireland and England and ²³⁹ the subversion of property and the Union.

These discussions were much more limited in extent, however, than they had been in the previous three sessions. And a number of the Tory speakers contended that the Church was no longer felt as a pressing grievance in Ireland, a fact conceded by Morpeth and Ward. It was, in the latter's words, 'of secondary importance to the social questions involved in the present condition of Ireland', where famine threatened. After the fall of Peel in June 1846, Grey was told by Charles Wood that if he wished to join the new Government he must allow things to go 'smoothly' and that 'above all the Irish Church must wait till social questions were disposed of'. Grey replied 'that he did not wish to press ²⁴⁰ that or anything else precipitately ..' In September O'Connell told the new Lord Lieutenant that he did not want the Irish Church question raised, that he hoped the Government would 'keep that subject quiet, as it ²⁴¹ would do infinite mischief' in Ireland. In spite of all their professions in opposition in the 1840's the Whigs did not proceed with any remedy

of 'the monster grievance'. It was another 20 years before the 'perfect equality' which they had declared to be their object was realized, in the form not of the endowment of Catholicism, which most Protestant Whigs preferred, but of disestablishment. Nevertheless, the debate of the 1840's put this question upon the political agenda. In the absence of O'Connell and the repealers, the liberal-unionists played a prominent role in this process, though their contribution was outweighed by the efforts of a Whig leadership freed of the responsibilities of Government and a British radicalism outraged at the anomalous position of the Protestant Establishment.

Chapter 3

1. Downshire Papers, D671/C/208/20, Downshire to Bishop of Dromore, n.d.. Wellington Papers, Port. 18, f38, Downshire to Wellington, 29 Nov. 1834.
2. The Greville Memoirs, 107-9, 121, 152, 26, 27 Nov., 11 Dec. 1834, 14 Feb. 1835. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2141, Phillips to O'Connell, 25 Nov. 1834.
3. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/5, p1-2, 19 Nov. 1834.
4. Wellington Papers, Port. 19, f37, Wellington to Beresford, 4 Dec. 1834.
5. Ibid, Port. 17, f66, Roden to Wellington, 26 Nov. 1834. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 282, 15 March 1835.
6. Derby Papers, 131/7, Tennent to Stanley, 23 Nov. 1834.
7. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/C/3, Stanley to Tennent, 28 Nov. 1834.
8. DEP, 6, 8, 13 Jan. 1835.
9. Home Office Papers, HO 100/245, f209, Beresford to Wellington, 13 Dec. 1834.
10. Returns of Tithe Composition, P.P., 1835, XLVII, 2-7, cited by A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 187.
11. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/5, p102, 107, 149, 181-2, 183-4, 184-5, 187, 188, 189, 27 Dec. 1834, 24 Jan., 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 Feb. 1835. Home Office Papers, HO 100/246, f4, Goulburn to Haddington, 10 Jan. 1835. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 409, f170, Peel to Shaw, 8 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 412, f140, Shaw to Peel, 28 Jan. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 314, f26, 41, 47, Hardinge to Peel, 30 Jan., 6, 7 Feb. 1835; *ibid*, f53, Peel to Haddington, 13 Feb. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 323, f214, Fitzgerald to Peel, 13 Jan. 1835.
12. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 412, f216, Roden to Peel, 30 Jan. 1835.
13. *Ibid*, MS 40, 314, f47, Hardinge to Peel, 7 Feb. 1835.
14. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/1980, Beresford to Dwyer, 18 Feb. 1835. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 77, Notes by Archdeacon Stopford on the collection of tithe, Dec. 1834; *ibid*, 121, Stopford to Beresford, 30 Jan. 1835.
15. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 323, f220, Fitzgerald to Peel, 13 Feb. 1835.
16. Hansard, 27, 13-22, 24-8, 46-8, 20 March 1835, Hardinge, Shaw, Conolly.
17. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 418, f206, Graves to Peel, 27 March 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 419, f195, Rose to Peel, 8 April 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 611, f185, Rose to Peel, 4 April 1835.
18. DEP, 4 (Crawford), 20 (Dobbin, Burke, aggregate liberal meeting), 23 (O'Brien, O'Connell), 27 (James Talbot) Dec. 1834, 1 (Evans), 3 (Hort, L. White, J. Grattan), 6 (C. Nitzsimon, S. White, Howard, Acheson, Jacob), 8 (N. Fitzsimon, T. Martin), 10 (James Power, Perrin, Cassidy), 13 (Lynch, O'Connell), 15 (J. Browne), 17 (Copeland), 20 (Wyse), 22 (Crawford, James Grattan), 24 (M. J.

- O'Connell), 27 (Sheil, Cave) Jan. 1835.
19. Hansard, 26, 276-80, 25 Feb. 1835, Sheil.
 20. Monteagle Papers, MS 11, 140 (2), Russell to Spring Rice, 23 Jan. 1835, including excerpt from Lansdowne's reply; *ibid*, MS 546, Spring Rice to Inglis, 17 Jan. 1835. Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 74, 79. Hansard, 26, 449-51, 27 Feb. 1835, Spring Rice.
 21. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/143, Melbourne to Russell, 12 Feb. 1835; *ibid*, /3, Russell to Melbourne, 13 Feb. 1835. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 254. Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 90, 94.
 22. Hansard, 26, 406-8, 26 Feb. 1835, O'Connell. See also M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2216, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 27 Feb. 1835.
 23. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f33-4, Ward to Russell, 16 Feb. 1835. The Greville Memoirs, III, 168, 26 Feb. 1835. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 235-6.
 24. Edward Baines, The Life of Edward Baines, Late M.P. for the Borough of Leeds (London, 1851), 211-2. Hansard, 26, 956-8, 13 March 1835, Russell.
 25. Hansard, 27, 39-46, 63-9, 69-72, 81-3, 83-4, 20 March 1835, O'Connell, Rice, Grattan, Rice, Division (one-sided).
 26. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/28, Crawford to John Crawford, 21 March 1835.
 27. The Greville Memoirs, III, 180, 24 March 1835.
 28. For the same point see Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 418, f199, Bishop of Cashel to Peel, 27 March 1835; *ibid*, f230, Cashel to Peel, 28 March 1835; *ibid*, f298, Mason to Peel, 30 March 1835.
 29. Hansard, 27, 361-84, 30 March 1835, Russell; 27, 466-520, 31 March 1835, Sheil, Lefroy, Damer, F. O'Connor; 27, 597-618, 1 April 1835, Spring Rice; 27, 713-77, 2 April 1835, Clements, O'Connell, Division; 27, 796-820, 3 April 1835, Conolly, Crawford, Verner, Bateson, Castlereagh, Wyse, Shaw; 27, 846-64, 6 April 1835, Lucas, F. Bruen, W. Roche, Ronayne, Division (one-sided); 27, 890-974, 7 April 1835, H. Grattan, Perrin, Jackson, Spring Rice, Division.
 30. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 273, 276. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 287-90, 15, 16, 17 April 1835. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 316, f187, King to Lyndhurst, 16 April 1835.
 31. The Greville Memoirs, III, 184-5, 31 March 1835.
 32. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f108-9, Duncannon memo, 16 May 1835; *ibid*, f117-24, Howick memo, 18 May 1835; *ibid*, f124, Duncannon note, May 1835; *ibid*, f125-30, Russell memo, 16 May 1835; *ibid*, f151B-E, Draft letter from Russell to Irish tithe-owners, (May) 1835; *ibid*, f152-3, Russell to Mulgrave, 27 May 1835; *ibid*, f158-61, Thompson memo, May 1835. Rollo Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 115. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 278. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 295, 298, 299, 302, 6, 13, 14-19, 26 May 1835.

33. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 427, f269, James O'Brien to O'Brien, 20 Dec. 1834. DEP, 23 Dec. 1834, O'Brien to the Secretary of the Anti-Tory Association, 15 Dec. 1834.
34. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f301, Edward O'Brien to O'Brien, 27 April 1835; *ibid*, f302, Geary to O'Brien, 15 May 1835; *ibid*, f303, Griffith to O'Brien, 19 May 1835; *ibid*, f304, Potter to O'Brien, 23 May 1835; *ibid*, f305, 310, Costello to O'Brien, 24 May, 4 July 1835; *ibid*, f306, O'Shaughnessy to O'Brien, 24 May 1835; *ibid*, f307, Massie to O'Brien, 28 May 1835; *ibid*, f312, Hogan to O'Brien, 1 Aug. 1835. Hansard, 27, 498, 31 March 1835, Damer; 27, 609, 1 April 1835, Rice; 27, 713-4, 728, 2 April 1835, Clements, O'Connell.
35. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 284, 286. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 309, 18 June 1835. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 256.
36. Hansard, 1319-44, 26 June 1835, Morpeth.
37. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/32, Crawford to John Crawford, 27 June 1835. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f310, Costello to O'Brien, 4 July 1835. The Greville Memoirs, III, 215, 30 June 1835.
38. Hansard, 28, 1347-9, 26 June 1835, Shaw; 29, 290-2, 7 June 1835, Shaw; 29, 842-54, 21 July 1835, Lefroy; 29, 969-74, 987-1003, 1067-72, 23 July 1835, Bateson, Jackson, Division; 29, 1121, 27 July 1835, Shaw; 29, 1212-22, 29 July 1835, Shaw, Jackson; 30, 158-9, 164-7, 7 Aug. 1835, Shaw, Plunkett; 30, 403-24, 12 Aug. 1835, Young, A. Lefroy, Verner, Shaw.
39. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (15), Fox to Maxwell, 9 July 1835.
40. Hansard, 28, 1349, 26 June 1835, Walker; 29, 312-3, 8 July 1835, J. Grattan; 29, 822-42, 857-62, 21 July 1835, Spring Rice, French; 29, 974-87, 1058-67, 1067-72, 23 July 1835, Sheil, O'Connell, Division; 29, 1120-2, 27 July 1835, O'Connell; 29, 1196-1220, 29 July 1835, O'Brien, Roche, Walker, O'Brien, Browne, Spring Rice, O'Connell; 30, 25, 34-6, 3 Aug. 1835, Clements, O'Connell; 30, 737-9, 20 Aug. 1835, Clanricarde; 30, 912-36, 24 Aug. 1835, Clanricarde, Conyngham, Plunket, Lansdowne, Duncannon, Division; 30, 1229-35, 1 Sept. 1835, Spring Rice, H. Grattan; 30, 1296-1306, 3 Sept. 1835, Lansdowne, Plunket.
41. Clogher Diocesan Papers, D.I.O. (RG) 1/6/36, Westenra to McDermott, 27 July 1835.
42. *Ibid*, /34, Westenra to McDermott, 26 June 1835.
43. Beresford Papers, APL, Uncat., Rev. Elias Thackeray to Beresford, 15 Aug. 1835.
44. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/32, Crawford to John Crawford, 27 June 1835.
45. *Ibid*, /34, Crawford to John Crawford, 14 July 1835.
46. Hansard, 29, 1222-3, 29 July 1835, Crawford.
47. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/36, Crawford to John Crawford, 31 July 1835.
48. Hansard, 30, 410-1, 12 Aug. 1835, Crawford.

49. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2262, O'Connell to Thomas Russell, 7 July 1835. Hansard, 29, 1120, 27 July 1835, O'Connell.
50. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 315-6, 321, 322, 324, 2-6, 15, 18, 25 July 1835. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 381 (1), Whately to Rice, 9 April 1835. E. J. Whately, Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., Late Archbishop of Dublin (London, 1866), I, 301-23. Hansard, 29, 1116-7, 27 July 1835, Morpeth.
51. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 302, 26 May 1835. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/32, Crawford to John Crawford, 27 June 1835.
52. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (15), Fox to Maxwell, 9 July 1835.
53. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, Londonderry to Buckingham, Aug. 1835.
54. Hansard, 30, 729-45, 20 Aug. 1835, Fitzgerald, Roden; 30, 873-936, 24 Aug. 1835, Westmeath, Roden, Division; 30, 1298-1304, 3 Sept. 1835, Roden, Fitzgerald.
55. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 323, f305, Fitzgerald to Peel, 25 Aug. 1835.
56. The Greville Memoirs, III, 242-6, 27 Aug. 1835.
57. Monteagle Papers, MS 551, Rice to Macaulay, 26 Sept. 1835.
58. William Sharman Crawford, Observations on the Irish Tithe Bill passed by the House of Commons in the last session of the Imperial Parliament, submitted to the consideration of the Electors of Dundalk, in letters addressed to William Brett (Dundalk, 1835). NW, 8, 12, 22 Oct. 1835, 9, 12 Nov. 1835, 21 Dec. 1835.
59. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/44, Crawford to John Crawford, 31 Dec. 1835.
60. Wellington Papers, Port. 35, f92, Beresford to Wellington, 3 Sept. 1835; *ibid*, Port. 36, f5, Beresford to Wellington, 3 Oct. 1835. Beresford MSS, RCBL, Vol. VI, 100, Wellington to Beresford, 29 Sept. 1835; *ibid*, 122, Beresford to Wellington, 3 Oct. 1835. Graham Papers, 30, Graham to Stanley, 26 Sept. 1835. Hansard, 31, 566, 18 Feb. 1836, Sheil.
61. Graham Papers, 30, Graham to Stanley, 28 Nov., 5 Dec. 1835; Stanley to Graham, 1 Dec. 1835.
62. Derby Papers, 132/11, Clare to Stanley, 11 Oct. 1835.
63. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 381 (2), Duncannon to Rice, 23 Sept. 1835.
64. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f200-1, Russell to Mulgrave, 9 Oct. 1835; *ibid*, f202-3, Melbourne to Russell, 13 Oct. 1835; *ibid*, f214-5, Taylor to Russell, 19 Oct. 1835. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/10, Russell to Melbourne, 9 Oct. 1835; *ibid*, /181, 186, Melbourne to Russell, 5, 13 Oct. 1835. Rolfe Russell, Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 140, 145, 146. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, 202, Drummond to Cotter, 14 Oct. 1835.
65. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 298, 300, Whately to Melbourne, 16, 24 Oct. 1835. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f223-4, Melbourne

- to Russell, 22 Oct. 1835; *ibid*, /2A, f99-108, Mulgrave to Russell, 17 Jan. 1836. Derby Papers, 124/1, Whately to Stanley, 27, 28 Jan. 1836. Broadlands MSS, MEL/WH/1, Whately to Melbourne, 22 Jan. 1836. E. J. Whately, Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, I, 324-31, 343-7.
66. Philip Ziegler, Melbourne: a biography of William Lamb, 2nd Viscount Melbourne (London, 1976), 210, citing Grey Papers, Lord Howick's Diary, 28 Nov. 1835. Ellice Papers, MS 15052, f3, Russell to Ellice, 17 Dec. 1835; *ibid*, f5, Ellice to Russell, 22 Dec. 1835; *ibid*, MS 15001, f13, Abercromby to Ellice, 8 Jan. 1836; *ibid*, MS 15047, f73, Mulgrave to Ellice, 1 Jan. 1836.
67. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f241-6, Howick memo, 24 Nov. 1835; *ibid*, f249-50, Holland memo, 24 Nov. 1835; *ibid*, f251-2, Morpeth to Russell, 28 Nov. 1835; *ibid*, f309-10, Russell memo, Nov. 1835. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 329, Nov. 1835.
68. Graham Papers, 30, Stanley to Graham, 24 Nov., 1 Dec. 1835.
69. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2A, f89-96, Mulgrave to Russell, 16 Jan. 1836.
70. *Ibid*, f130-4, 142-6, 158-60, 170-2, Mulgrave to Russell, n.d., 25 Jan., 1, 2 Feb. 1836.
71. Hansard, 31, 565-611, 18 Feb. 1836, Sheil, Jackson, O'Connell, Lefroy, O'Loughlen, Shaw, Rice, Sheil. See also, Hansard, 32, 244-7, 14 March 1836, Roden, Winchilsea.
72. Beresford MSS, RCBL, C/21, Dickinson to Ebrington, 30 Jan. 1836. Dickinson was Domestic Chaplain to Whately.
73. G. Lyne, The General Association of Ireland, 17-25, 92-107. Annual Register, 1836, 294-8. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2A, f297-303, Mulgrave to Russell, 15 March 1836; *ibid*, /2B, f302-4, Mulgrave to Russell, 11 Aug. 1836; *ibid*, /2D, f14-24, Mulgrave to Russell, 5 Nov. 1836. Monteagle Papers, MS 545, Rice to King, 13 Jan. 1837. William Fagan, The Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell (Cork, 1848), II, 510, 590. R. B. O'Brien, Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691-1870 (London, 1888), 358-9. R. B. O'Brien, Fifty years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 502-6. R. B. O'Brien, Thomas Drummond, 222-9, 241, 273. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 189. G. Locker-Lampson, A Consideration of the State of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century (London, 1907), 170-1.
74. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 422, f71, Stanley to Peel, 21 March 1836.
75. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f39-46, Mulgrave to Russell, 15 April 1836.
76. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, April/May 1836.
77. S. J. Reid, Life and Letters of the first Earl of Durham, II, 105, Jones to Durham, 3 May 1836. See also W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (London, 1910-20), I, 328, Memo by Disraeli, n.d..
78. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, Russell to King, 17 April 1836.
79. Hansard, 33, 205-21, 25 April 1836, Morpeth.

80. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2A, f127-8, Mulgrave to Russell, 23 Jan. 1836.
81. Hansard, 33, 1238-74, 1290-6, 1324-5, 1 June 1836, Stanley, Lefroy, Conolly; 33, 1352-5, 2 June 1836, Young; 34, 8-41, 117-22, 3 June 1836, Jackson, Division; 34, 1147-62, 1 July 1836, Plunkett, Shaw, Jackson, Bateson, Perceval; 34, 1190-7, 1247-9, 1259-64, 4 July 1836, Tennent, Shaw, Division.
82. Hansard, 33, 1325-9, 1 June 1836, H. Grattan; 33, 1337-1412, 2 June 1836, Barron, O'Brien, W. Roche, Sheil; 34, 69-84, 108-17, 117-22, 3 June 1836, O'Connell, Rice, Division; 34, 1156-62, 1 July 1836, O'Connell, Finn, Baldwin; 34, 1197-1264, 4 July 1836, M. J. O'Connell, Baldwin, Sheil, O'Connell, Division. Monteagle Papers, MS 542, Rice to Staples, 5 June 1836.
83. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f189-90, Carew to Russell, 24 June 1836.
84. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 1, 5, 8, 29/30 July, 2 Aug. 1836.
85. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f226-7, Tavistock to Russell, 7 July 1836; ibid, f231-2, Bannerman to Russell, 8 July 1836. The Greville Memoirs, III, 295-6, 297-9, 9, 18 July 1836.
86. Ellice Papers, MS 15025, f23, Howick to Ellice, 19 July 1836.
87. A. Aspinall, Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot, 192, Arbuthnot to son, 21 July 1836.
88. Hansard, 35, 435-41, 22 July 1836, Melbourne; 35, 450-516, 25 July 1836, Viscount Beresford, Fitzgerald, Clanricarde, Westmeath, Plunket, Lansdowne, Division, Clanricarde, Primate Beresford, Division.
89. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, July 1836.
90. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f266-7, Abercromby to Melbourne, 25 July 1836. The Greville Memoirs, III, 299-301, 24 July, 7 Aug. 1836. Graham Papers, 32, Graham to Stanley, 26 July 1836. Hansard, 35, 760-860, 2 Aug. 1836, Russell, Abercromby, Shaw, O'Loghlen, Sheil, Division. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 245.
91. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 422, f98, Stanley to Peel, 28 July 1836.
92. Graham Papers, 32, Graham to Stanley, 30 July 1836.
93. Graham Papers, 32, Stanley to Graham, 27 Aug. 1836.
94. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/47, Crawford to John Crawford, 5 April 1836.
95. Ibid, /49, Mrs Crawford to John Crawford, 28/30 April 1836.
96. Hansard, 33, 606, 4 May 1836, Crawford. DEP, 26 May 1836, Crawford to Mullen, 14 May 1836.
97. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/50, Crawford to John Crawford, 26 May 1836.

98. Hansard, 33, 1332, 1 June 1836, Stuart; 34, 1135-50, 1 July 1836, Crawford, Dillon Browne, O'Connell, H. Grattan, Finn, Division.
99. DEP, 7, 28 July 1836, Crawford to O'Connell, 2, 25 July 1836. DEP, 25 Aug., 6 Sept. 1836, Crawford to the Liberal Constituency of Dundalk, 22, 31 Aug. 1836.
100. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2342, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 2 July 1836. G. Lyne, The General Association, 28, 91-107. DEP, 7 July 1836, O'Connell to the people of Ireland, 4 July 1836.
101. DEP, 29 Oct., 19, 26 Nov., 10, 17 Dec. 1836, 14, 19 Jan. (O'Connell to Crawford, 17 Jan. 1837), 21 Jan. 1837. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/53, O'Connell to Crawford, 17 Jan. 1837. R. B. O'Brien, Fifty years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 514-5.
102. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f14-24, Mulgrave to Russell, 5 Nov. 1836; *ibid*, f44-8, Morpeth to Russell, 19 Nov. 1836.
103. *Ibid*, f100-1, Duncannon memo, 3 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f108-12, Russell to Mulgrave, 4 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f163-8, Tavistock to Russell, 12 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f260-1, Melbourne to Russell, 27 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f309, Duncannon to Russell, 1836; *ibid*, /2E, f54, Duncannon to Russell, Jan. 1837. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/283, 287, Melbourne to Russell, 31 Dec. 1836, 5 Jan. 1837. Monteagle Papers, MS 11, 140 (2), Cottenham to Rice, 30 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, MS 13, 382 (11), Russell to Rice, 10 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, MS 13, 386 (10), King to Rice, 16 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, MS 545, Rice to King, 13 Jan. 1837. W. M. Torrens, Memoirs of Melbourne, II, 215, Melbourne to Lansdowne, 26 Dec. 1836. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 286, Taylor to Russell, 2 Jan. 1837; 287, Melbourne to Russell, 5 Jan. 1837. Ziegler, Melbourne, 248-9, citing Grey Papers, Melbourne to Grey, 21 Jan. 1837. See also H. L. Bulwer, Life of Palmerston, II, 21, Palmerston to Temple, 1 Dec. 1836.
104. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f115-6, 190-5, Mulgrave to Russell, 6, 16 Dec. 1836.
105. *Ibid*, f277-8, Leinster to Tavistock, 21 Dec. 1836.
106. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f420, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Nov. 1836.
107. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f268-75, O'Connell to Warburton, 29 Dec. 1836 (also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2369).
108. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f569, Shaw to Roden, 9 Feb. 1837. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 8 Feb. 1837. The Greville Memoirs, III, 354, 22 Feb. 1837. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2383, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 18 Feb. 1837. Hansard, 36, 404-5, 8 Feb. 1837, Russell.
109. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/306, Melbourne to Russell, 9 Feb. 1837. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 288-9.
110. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 357, 26 March 1837.
111. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2E, f69-70, Russell memo to Cabinet, 20 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, f79-82, 160-4, Mulgrave to Russell, 25 Feb., 8 April 1837.
112. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f231, 237, Jackson to Roden, 9, 13 Dec. 1836.

113. Ibid, f251, Jackson to Roden, 24 Dec. 1836. Wellington Papers, Port. 43, f110, Wellington to Roden, 31 Dec. 1836.
114. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f164, Wellington to Peel, 29 Feb. 1837. Wellington Papers, Port. 44, f140, Peel to Wellington, 23 Feb. 1837. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 338-9.
115. DFM, 25 Jan. 1837, Requisition.
116. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f309, Courtown to Roden, 12 Jan. 1837.
117. Ibid, f319, Longfield to Roden, 12 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f357, Farnham to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f367, Hamilton to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f377, Jackson to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837.
118. IFM, 25 Jan. 1837, West, Vesey, Anderson, O'Sullivan, Litton, Courtown, Smith, Crofton, M. Longfield, Clonbrock, Tennent, Pakenham, Archdall. See also Report of the Speeches and Proceedings at the Belfast Society's Fourth Anniversary Dinner... Dec. 20, 1836, Tennent, O'Sullivan, Cooke, Roden.
119. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, HO 30/12/28/6, p12-3, 9 April 1837.
120. Hansard, 38, 408-21, 1 May 1837, Morpeth.
121. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 1 May 1837.
122. DEP, 11 May, 8 June 1837, Crawford to the people of Ireland, 6 May, 2 June 1837. Also DEP, 3 June 1837, Crawford to Johnston, 24 May 1837. Hansard, 38, 463, 3 May 1837, Crawford; 38, 656-7, 5 May 1837, Crawford, Division.
123. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/54, Crawford to John Crawford, 8 May 1837.
124. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2402, 2408, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 26 May, 4 June 1837; 2403, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 31 May 1837; 2406, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 3 June 1837.
125. Wellington Papers, Port. 46, f74, Beresford to Wellington, 2 June 1837. Hansard, 38, 1370-81, 9 June 1837, Crawford, Dillon Browne, Shaw, Division.
126. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f83, Graham to Peel, 15 May 1837. And see below, p363-4.
127. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/55, Crawford to John Crawford, 13 June 1837.
128. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f225, Wharmliffe to Peel, 17 May 1837. See also, *ibid*, f209, Stanley to Peel, 14 May 1837.
129. DEP, 27 June (Fitzpatrick), 4 (Curry), 6 (O'Callaghan, H. Grattan), 8 (T. Martin, O'Connell), 18 (Redington), 20 (J. Grattan, Barron, Somers), 25 (Hutton, Tighe, Evans, Ball), 27 (Power) July, 12 (Wyse, Fitzpatrick), 17 (Roche) Aug. 1837.
130. DEP, 4 July 1837, Crawford to the Secretary of the Dundalk Reform Registry Association, 29 June 1837.

131. DEP, 26 Aug., 2, 16, 19, 21 Sept., 25 Nov. 1837, Crawford to O'Connell, 22, 29 Aug., 12, 16, 19 Sept., 23 Nov. 1837.
132. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f18-9, Abercromby to Russell, 17 Aug. 1837; *ibid*, f113-7, Russell to Melbourne, 13 Sept. 1837; *ibid*, f218-9, Mulgrave to Russell, 11 Dec. 1837. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/38, 43, Russell to Melbourne, 11, 29 Aug. 1837; *ibid*, 387, Melbourne to Russell, 13 Aug. 1837. Ellice Papers, MS 15001, f32, Abercromby to Ellice, 17 Aug. 1837. Home Office Papers, HO 100/251, f106, Russell to Mulgrave, 9 Dec. 1837. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 298, 299, 305.
133. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f31-9, 60-5, Mulgrave to Russell, 20 Aug., 8 Sept. 1837.
134. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 386 (1), Carew to Rice, Autumn 1837; *ibid*, (2), Melbourne to Rice, 21 Sept. 1837.
135. Wellington Papers, Port. 47, f204, Beresford to Wellington, 31 Oct. 1837; *ibid*, f205, Circular from Beresford to Irish Bishops, 31 Oct. 1837; *ibid*, f206, Wellington to Beresford, 3 Nov. 1837.
136. Home Office Papers, HO 100/251, f106, Russell to Mulgrave, 9 Dec. 1837. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2F, f218-9, 237-9, 240-8, Mulgrave to Russell, 11, 23, 27 Dec. 1837. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 310-1.
137. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Morpeth, 2 March 1838.
138. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/351, Shaw to Beresford, 17 March 1838; *ibid*, /352A, Russell to Howley, 15 March 1838; *ibid*, /353A, Howley to Beresford, 16 March 1838; *ibid*, /356, Copy of Resolutions on Irish Tithes sent by Lord John Russell for the Primate's consideration.
139. *Ibid*, /354A, 355A, Beresford to Howley, 20 March 1838. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 311-2.
140. DEP, 11 Nov. 1837, O'Connell to the Protestant Clergy, 9 Nov. 1837. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2505, O'Connell to Mac Hale, c 18 Feb. 1838; 2508, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 27 Nov. 1838.
141. Hansard, 41, 1316-8, 27 March 1838, Russell; 42, 1252-61, 14 May 1838, Morpeth; 42, 1345-53, 15 May 1838, Spring Rice. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/358, Goulburn to Beresford, 2 April 1838.
142. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/446, 465, Melbourne to Russell, 5 Feb., 11 March 1838.
143. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/357, Dean Dawson to Beresford, 4 April 1838; *ibid*, /359, Beresford to Goulburn, 6 April 1838; *ibid*, /361, Stopford to Beresford, 20 April 1838. Hansard, 42, 450-1, 6 April 1838, Wicklow.
144. DEP, 26 April 1838, O'Connell to the Protestant of Ireland, 23 April 1838. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2526, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 14 April 1838; 2530, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 26 April 1838.
145. DEP, 8, 15 May 1838, Crawford to O'Connell, 5, 12 May 1838.

146. Hansard, 42, 1173-1243, 14 May 1838, Russell, Acland, Conolly, Somerville, Lefroy, French; 42, 1263-1353, 15 May 1838, Litton, Redington, Young, Bellew, Shaw, O'Connell, Spring Rice.
147. Hansard, 42, 1353-8, 15 May 1838, Division.
148. Martin was gaoled for two months when he became 'engaged in a sort of feudal foray at the head of some hundreds of his tenants', in a fracas arising out of the disputed possession of a bog. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3A, f9-14, Mulgrave to Russell, 2 Jan. 1838; *ibid*, /3B, f51, E. J. Stanley memo on Acland division, May 1838. DEP, 3, 28 April, 15 May 1838.
149. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 15 May 1838. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, 2540, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 18 May 1838. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 56-8, 13, 15 May 1838. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 382-3, n.d..
150. Beresford MSS, RCBL, MS 81, Stopford letters; 1/4, Stopford to Stopford (son), May 1838. Beresford Papers, AFL, Vol. II, f262, Dean Jackson to Beresford, 19 May 1838.
151. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3B, f20-2, 28-30, Mulgrave to Russell, 11, 21 May 1838. Hansard, 42, 1364-5, 18 May 1838, Russell.
152. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 29, 30 May, 1 June 1838. Hansard, 43, 434-72, 29 May 1838, Peel, O'Connell, Shaw, Clements, O'Brien.
153. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 11, 15 June 1838.
154. NW, 14 June 1838, Crawford to the Editor of the Wexford Independent, 30 May 1838. NW, 16 June 1838, Crawford to the Friends of Religious Liberty in Ulster, 15 June 1838. NW, 28 June 1838, Crawford at public meeting, 25 June 1838. DEP, 19 June 1838.
155. Hansard, 43, 1177-1205, 2 July 1838, Ward, Morpeth, O'Connell, Division. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 2 July 1838.
156. Beresford MSS, RCBL, 1/5, Stopford to Stopford, 20 May 1838. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/359, Beresford to Goulburn, 6 April 1838.
157. Hansard, 43, 1208-12, 2 July 1838, Shaw, Division.
158. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f226, Shaw to Peel, 12 July 1838; *ibid*, f230, Gladstone to Peel, 17 July 1838. See also, Speech of the Rt. Hon. Frederick Shaw, at the Election of the University of Dublin, Thursday, 1st July 1841 (Dublin, 1841), 10-11.
159. Beresford Papers, AFL, Vol. II, f245, 268, 271, Jackson to Beresford, 22 June, 21, 26 July 1838. Hansard, 45, 377, 14 Feb. 1839, Litton.
160. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 19, 23 July 1838. Hansard, 44, 357-62, 19 July 1838, Howick; 44, 534-6, 23 July 1838, O'Connell.
161. Hansard, 44, 530-1, 23 July 1838, Redington; 44, 648-95, 26 July 1838, Browne, Somerville, Peel, Stanley, O'Connell, Bryan, Division; 44, 1116, 9 Aug. 1838, Shaw.

162. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 26, 27 July 1838. By 'giving the Million' he meant the proposal to cancel the repayments of the Million Act loans to the clergy.
163. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/3B, f215-6, Russell to Normanby, 27 July 1838; *ibid*, f230-5, Normanby to Russell, 29 July 1838.
164. Wellington Papers, Port. 52, f35, Clancarty to Wellington, 15 June 1838; *ibid*, f89, 168, Kernan to Wellington, 10, 30 July 1838; *ibid*, f92, Rolleston to Wellington, 10 July 1838; *ibid*, f169, Kyle to Wellington, 30 July 1838.
165. Hansard, 44, 960-6, 3 Aug. 1838, Wicklow; 44, 1104-12, 9 Aug. 1838, Clancarty. Wellington Papers, Port. 53, f4, Wellington to Glengall, 1 Aug. 1838.
166. Wellington Papers, Port. 52, f165, Beresford to Wellington, 28 July 1838; *ibid*, Port. 53, f86, Donoughmore to Wellington, Aug. 1838. Hansard, 44, 930-78, 3 Aug. 1838, Brougham, Fitzgerald, Division.
167. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 3 Aug. 1838. Hansard, 44, 1120, 9 Aug. 1838, O'Connell.
168. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f235, Shaw to Peel, 10 Aug. 1838; *ibid*, f237, Stanley to Peel, 10 Aug. 1838. Hansard, 44, 1172, 13 Aug. 1838, Russell, Stanley.
169. DEP, 4 Aug. 1838, Crawford to O'Connell, 2 Aug. 1838. DEP, 21 Aug. 1838, Crawford in Precursor Association, 18 Aug. 1838. DEP, 11, 13 Oct. 1838, Observations on the present position of the cause of Religious Liberty, respectfully addressed to all real friends of that cause, 6, 10 Oct. 1838.
170. DEP, 21 Aug., 15, 29 Sept., 4, 9, 11, 20, 25 Oct. 1838.
171. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2556, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 26 Sept. 1838.
172. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f263, Tennent to Peel, 13 Oct. 1838.
173. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2552, 2560, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 6 Sept., 4 Oct. 1838. DEP, 21 Aug., 11, 15, 20 Sept., 4 Oct. 1838.
174. DFM, 17 Sept. 1838.
175. Hansard, 47, 104-5, 16 April 1839, Tennent; 51, 738, 29 Jan. 1840, Litton; 52, 253, 254, 14 Feb. 1840, Litton, Shaw.
176. Graham Papers, 35, Graham to Stanley, 21 Aug. 1838; Stanley to Graham, 23 Aug. 1838. A. Aspinall, Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot, 213, Graham to Arbuthnot, 14 Dec. 1839.
177. W. J. O'Neill Daunt, Eighty-five years of Irish History, 1800-1885 (London, 1888), 112-3. N. Costello, John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam (Dublin/London, 1939), 46. Akenson, The Church of Ireland, 193-4. A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 199.
178. Hansard, 45, 950-63, 28 Feb. 1839, Lyndhurst, Wicklow, Roden; 45, 1125-34, 1 March 1839, Bateson, Castlereagh; 45, 1149-62, 4 March 1839, Lyndhurst, Wellington, Wharnccliffe; 46, 46-7, 122, 7 March 1839, Shaw, Jackson; 46, 198, 8 March 1839, Ellis; 47, 108-9, 16 April 1839, Tennent; 47, 176, 17 April 1839, Bateson.

179. Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government entitled to the support of the Irish Liberal Members at the present crisis? ... , 14.
180. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 12, 15 May 1839.
181. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f665, Davern to O'Brien, 2 July 1839.
182. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2656, 2657, 2658, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 20, 21, 24 Aug. 1839; 2663, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 15 Oct. 1839.
183. Ibid, 2699, 2730, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 8 April, 16 July 1840. DEP, 16 April 1840.
184. W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times and Cotemporaries of Lord Cloncurry, 472-3, Cloncurry to Conway, 4 May 1840.
185. NW, 15 Aug. 1840, Crawford at meeting of the Ulster Constitutional Association, 14 Aug. 1840. NW, 23 Oct. 1841, Crawford, Observations Addressed to the Repealers of Ireland, 16 Oct. 1841.
186. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 355-6, 14 Feb. 1841.
187. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 616, f191, Graham to Bonham, 6 Jan. 1841. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 354-5, 14 Feb. 1841, Greville on a conversation with Graham.
188. The Earl of Roden, Observations on Lord Alvanley's Pamphlet on the State of Ireland, and proposed measures for restoring tranquillity to that country (London, 1842), 14-5.
189. Hansard, 64, 1106-14, 7 July 1842, Murphy, Jackson, Sheil, Shaw, M. J. O'Connell, Somerville, Litton, Callaghan, Eliot, Murphy, Division; 65, 379-80, 20 July 1842, Clements.
190. DEM, 24 May, 9 June, 26 July, 18, 25 Aug., 22, 29 Sept., 27 Oct., 17 Nov. 1841, 6, 27 April, 17, 31 Aug., 23 Sept., 28, 30 Dec. 1842, 6, 20 Jan., 22 March, 28 April, 10, 17 May, 15 Sept. 1843.
191. Hansard, 69, 1013, 1045, 29 May 1843, Crawford, Sheil; 69, 1101, 1132, 30 May 1843, Ross, Buller; 69, 1156, 1165, 1174, 1188-9, 1197-1200, 31 May 1843, Wyse, J. O'Brien, Hawes, Listowel, Roebuck; 70, 1589-92, 1610, 1613, 15 June 1843, Ward, Hume, Ross; 70, 15, 38, 41-3, 59-61, 16 June 1843, Crawford, Roebuck, Russell; 70, 104, 109, 118-9, 124-6, 132, 19 June 1843, Gisborne, Williams, Barron, Ellice, Napier; 70, 283-6, 306-7, 317, 318-21, 328, 23 June 1843, Palmerston, M. J. O'Connell, Trelawney, Ward, Crawford; 70, 652-5, 687-94, 716-7, 4 July 1843, Smith O'Brien, Wyse, Wood; 70, 764-6, 779, 786-7, 807-9, 7 July 1843, Ward, Jephson-Norreys, O'Ferrall, Macaulay; 70, 833-7, 865-6, 871-2, 879-80, 885-9, 898, 10 July 1843, Bernal, Stuart, Somerville, Howick, Hall; 70, 915-6, 928, 951, 965-8, 1006-8, 11 July 1843, M. J. O'Connell, Hawes, Ross, Roebuck, Russell; 70, 1020-3, 1031, 1053-4, 1056-9, 1067-71, 12 July 1843, Lurphy, Barron, Hume, Buller, Palmerston; 70, 1132, 14 July 1843, Fortescue; 71, 1-4, 6-7, 31 July 1843, Fortescue, Clanricarde; 71, 118-61, 161-5, 1 Aug. 1843, Ward, Carew; 71, 195-200, 215-8, 2 Aug. 1843, Listowel, Stuart; 71, 446-51, 9 Aug. 1843, Sheil; 71, 695-6, 716-21, 15 Aug. 1843, Camoys, Shrewsbury; 71, 898-9, 903-4, 17 Aug. 1843, Fortescue, Monteagle. Also DEP, 20 July 1843, Murphy to Hayes, 14 July 1843, describing the Church

- as the 'monster grievance'. Hansard, 71, 1-4, 31 July 1843, Fortescue; DEP, 1 Aug. 1843, for Orammore's personal petition, produced in collusion with Wyse (Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 1 Aug. 1843), in favour of a division of all ecclesiastical property between the Churches 'in proportion to their numbers'.
192. Hansard, 69, 1117, 30 May 1843, Bernard; 69, 1184, 31 May 1843, Graham; 69, 1611-2, 15 June 1843, Dungannon; 70, 49-52, 70-1, 16 June 1843, Graham, Stanley; 70, 110-4, 128-9, 19 June 1843, Manners, Milnes; 70, 297, 305-6, 317, 23 June 1843, Peel, Shaw, Dungannon; 70, 710, 4 July 1843, Eliot; 70, 747-9, 769-73, 792-4, 819-22, 7 July 1843, Cochrane, Tennent, Shaw, Graham; 70, 860, 868, 875, 894-6, 900-2, 10 July 1843, Douglas, Rous, Smith, Knight, Jocelyn; 70, 939-41, 944-5, 956-8, 987-95, 11 July 1843, Colquhoun, Bateson, Milnes, Peel; 70, 1026-8, 1038, 1043, 1052-3, 1078-82, 12 July 1843, Bernard, G. Hamilton, A. S. O'Brien, Stanley; 71, 4, 4-5, 31 July 1843, Wellington, Wicklow; 71, 165-74, 1 Aug. 1843, Eliot; 71, 181-95, 200-9, 209-15, 218-9, 2 Aug. 1843, Inglis, Bernard, Cochrane, Hardy; 71, 465-7, 9 Aug. 1843, Peel; 71, 697-8, 723-4, 15 Aug. 1843, Winchilsea, Wicklow. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 530, f257, Clare to Peel, 27 June 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 531, f3, Knight of Kerry to Peel, 7 July 1843. Derby Papers, 125/11, Lambert to Stanley, 31 May 1843. Graham Papers, 64A, Croker to Graham, 9 Aug. 1843.
193. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 1 Aug. 1843. The Greville Memoirs, V, 130, 10 Sept. 1843, Greville on conversation with Bedford.
194. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6, 20 June, 11 July, 1, 4 Aug. 1843.
195. Graham Papers, 9IR, Graham to De Grey, 12 July 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 448, f328, Graham to Peel, 18 June 1843.
196. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 31 July, 1 Aug. 1843.
197. Hansard, 71, 118-61, 1 Aug. 1843, Ward.
198. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1843.
199. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 8 Aug. 1843.
200. Appendix 1.
201. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4C, f81-4, 89-91, 96-8, Palmerston to Russell, 22 July, 22 Oct., 26 Nov. 1843; *ibid*, f85-6, Lord William Russell to Russell, 10 July 1843. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/75, 76, 78, 81, Russell to Palmerston, 24 July, 19 Aug., 15 Sept., 23 Nov. 1843. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (1), Fitzwilliam to Monteagle, 21 Oct. 1843; *ibid*, (3), Russell to Monteagle, 22 Aug., 1 Oct. 1843. Mac Vey Napier, Selection from the Correspondence of the late Mac Vey Napier, Esq. (London, 1879), 448-52. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 521. G. P. Gooch, The Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, 1840-1878 (London, 1925), I, 64-5, 69. H. L. Bulwer, Life of Palmerston, II, 130-3. DEP, 16 Nov. 1843.
202. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 366 (2), Napier to Monteagle, 30 Aug., 1 Dec. 1843; *ibid*, MS 13, 394 (2), Napier to Monteagle, 14 Dec.

- 1843; *ibid.*, (5), Monteagle to Napier, 7 Dec. 1843; *ibid.*, Napier to Monteagle, 25 Dec. 1843. Mao Vey Napier, Selection from the Correspondence of the late Mao Vey Napier, 448-58. (Nassau Senior), Ireland, The Edinburgh Review (Jan. 1844), Vol. LXXIX, No. CLIX, 210-42.
203. Graham Papers, 5IR, Eliot to Graham, 20 Sept. 1843; 6IR, Eliot to Graham, 9, 13, 16 Oct. 1843; Graham to Eliot, 20 Oct. 1843; 13IR, Eliot to Graham, 8, 14 Jan. 1844; Graham to Eliot, 12 Jan. 1844; 57, Graham to Wellington, 11 Jan. 1844; 66C, Graham to Peel, 25 Oct. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 449, f47, 109, 136, Graham to Peel, 22 Sept., 20, 25 Oct. 1843; *ibid.*, f105, Peel to Graham, 19 Oct. 1843. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 65-7.
204. Graham Papers, 13IR, Eliot to Graham, 19 Jan. 1844. The Times, 22 Jan. 1844. DEP, 20 Jan. 1844. Hansard, 72, 73, 1 Feb. 1844, Hume.
205. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4C, f132-7, O'Connell to Buller, 9 Jan. 1844 (also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3047). The Greville Memoirs, V, 155, 26 Jan. 1844.
206. Hansard, 72, 716-21, 757-9, 13 Feb. 1844, Russell, Wyse; 72, 819-20, 14 Feb. 1844, Clements; 72, 935-6, 953-6, 977-91, 15 Feb. 1844, Ross, O'Ferrall, Howick; 72, 1029-35, 1062-8, 16 Feb. 1844, Ward, Buller; 72, 1154, 19 Feb. 1844, J. O'Brien; 72, 1209-19, 20 Feb. 1844, Hawes; 73, 44, 100-5, 22 Feb. 1844, Bellew, Sheil; 73, 170-85, 193, 204-6, 262-4, 23 Feb. 1844, Roebuck, O'Connell, Russell; 73, 279, 285, 299-300, 26 Feb. 1844, Crawford, Rawdon, E. B. Roche. The Greville Memoirs, V, 166-7, 9 March 1844, Greville on conversation with Russell.
207. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3053, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 17 Feb. 1844.
208. Graham Papers, 70, Graham to De Grey, 16 Feb. 1844.
209. Hansard, 72, 784-6, 13 Feb. 1844, Graham; 72, 822-3, 848, 854-5, 14 Feb. 1844, Young, Eliot; 72, 960, 967-70, 15 Feb. 1844, Graham, Shaw; 72, 1036, 1080-96, 16 Feb. 1844, Conolly, Stanley; 72, 1206-7, 19 Feb. 1844, Follett; 72, 1257-61, 20 Feb. 1844, A. S. O'Brien; 73, 38-9, 55-9, 22 Feb. 1844, Gregory, George Hamilton; 73, 163, 210, 241-51, 23 Feb. 1844, Pollock, Peel.
210. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f19, 26, 230, Peel Cabinet memos, 11, 17, n.d. Feb. 1844; *ibid.*, MS 40, 449, f313, Graham to Peel, 24 Jan. 1844. Graham Papers, 71A, Graham to De Grey, 1 March 1844. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 404. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 101-7. See also Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 468, f132, Stanley to Peel, 18 Feb. 1844; *ibid.*, MS 40, 540, f383, Peel to Lady De Grey, 29 Feb. 1844.
211. DEM, 23 Feb. 1844. George Miller, The Present Crisis of the Church of Ireland Considered (Dublin, 1845), 22-5. Hansard, 73, 244-5, 23 Feb. 1844, Peel.
212. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f230, Peel Cabinet memo, 17 Feb. 1844.
213. *Ibid.*, MS 40, 449, f335, 380, Graham to Peel, 3 March, 5 April 1844; *ibid.*, MS 40, 468, f132, Stanley to Peel, 18 Feb. 1844; *ibid.*, MS 40, 541, f14, Saunders to Peel, 3 March 1844; *ibid.*, f17-9, Memos by Stanley, Peel and Wellington, March 1844. Graham Papers, 71A,

- Graham memo, 17 March 1844; Smith's Paper, 15 March 1844; Erck's Paper, n.d.; 72A, Graham to De Grey, 6 April 1844; 14IR, Smith to Graham, 12 Feb. 1844; Graham to De Grey, 19 March 1844; De Grey to Graham, 23 March 1844; 15IR, De Grey to Graham, 4 April 1844; Eliot to Graham, 15 April 1844. Hansard, 76, 286-7, 3 July 1844, Murphy, Eliot, Bellew, Stanley.
214. Graham Papers, 14IR, Graham to De Grey, 9, 19, 20 March 1844; Graham to Sugden, 20 March 1844; 69B, Graham to Stanley, 31 Jan. 1844; 71B, Graham to De Grey, 28 March 1844; Graham to Sugden, 28 March 1844; 72A, Graham to De Grey, 2 April 1844; Peel to Graham, 6 April 1844; 79B, Graham to Heytesbury, 23 Dec. 1844; 82, Graham to Heytesbury, 2, 4 Sept. 1844; Heytesbury to Graham, 20 Sept., 29 Dec. 1844, 19 Feb. 1845; 85, Graham to Heytesbury, 20 Jan. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f32, 346, 374, 398, 434, Graham to Peel, 18 May, 3, 8, 15, 23 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f438, Peel to Graham, 24 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f232, Peel to Beresford, 17 June 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 478, f253, 266, Peel to De Grey, 20 Feb., 10 March 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 542, f74, Peel to Beresford, 3 April 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 553, f140, Peel to Limerick, 11 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, f142, Peel to Beresford, 11 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, f148, Peel to Knox, 16 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, f150, Heytesbury to Peel, 17 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 554, f338, Peel to Limerick, 2 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 558, f181, Peel to Beresford, 25 Jan. 1845.
215. Hansard, 75, 534-85, 11 June 1844, Ward, Eliot, Ross, Shaw, Redington; 75, 587-671, 12 June 1844, Rawdon, Walsh, M. O'Connell, Forbes, D. Browne, George Hamilton, Borthwick, Graham, Russell, Peel, Sheil, Division.
216. Hansard, 75, 1344-5, 25 June 1844, Wicklow, Exeter; 76, 287-93, 3 July 1844, J. O'Brien; 76, 870-1, 15 July 1844, J. O'Brien; 76, 1697, 1703, 1705, 2 Aug. 1844, Monteagle, Wicklow, Campbell. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland ..., 72, Wyse in Parliament, 19 July 1844 (not in Hansard).
217. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (10), Monteagle to Rev. J. G. Porter, 6 Nov. 1844.
218. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f25-8, Bessborough to Russell, 10 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f99-103, Lansdowne to Russell, 3 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, f104-5, Leinster to Russell, 8 Jan. 1845. Broadlands MSS, GC/RU/87, Russell to Palmerston, 28 Dec. 1844. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 77, Russell to Lansdowne, 5 Jan. 1845; 77, Palmerston to Russell, 9 Jan. 1845. (J. W. Croker), Repeal Agitation, The Quarterly Review, Vol. LXXV, No. CL (Dec. 1844), 283. Charles Greville, Past and Present Policy of England towards Ireland (London, 1845), 272-359. Greville also advocated further reforms in the Protestant Church.
219. Hansard, 79, 60-1, 3 April 1845, Gregory; 79, 517-8, 11 April 1845, Grogan; 79, 597-8, 623-4, 631-5, 642-5, 659-65, 14 April 1845, Fremantle, Lefroy, A. S. O'Brien, Gregory, Shaw; 79, 693-7, 15 April 1845, Beresford; 79, 762-6, 789-90, 806-9, 814-8, 16 April 1845, George Hamilton, Goulburn, Bernard, Jocelyn; 79, 918-9, 17 April 1845, Graham; 79, 942-5, 960, 1035-9, 18 April 1845, C. Hamilton, Taylor, Peel; 80, 112, 2 May 1845, Brooke; 80, 623, 632-7, 20 May 1845, Ffolliott, Shaw; 80, 660-1, 21 May 1845, Verner; 80, 1216, 1229, 2 June 1845, Eliot, Cashel; 81, 7-8, 99-104, 109-10, 119-20, 4 June 1845, Clancarty, Charleville, Stanley, Protest by Farnham and Kenyon; 81, 273-6, 283-4, 10 June 1845, Clancarty, Wharnccliffe;

- 81, 572-4, 575, 582-3, 586, 16 June 1845, Wellington, Wicklow, Rosse, Clancarty. The Greville Memoirs, V, 213-4, 6 April 1845; 225, 21 Aug. 1845, Greville discussing Tory fears that Maynooth would leave 'eventually to the complete establishment of the R. C. Church'.
220. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 7 Feb. 1845; 78, Graham to Heytesbury, 7 Nov. 1844.
221. Hansard, 81, 279-82, 10 June 1845, Wicklow. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 565, f11, 315, Croker to Peel, 23, 30 April 1845; *ibid*, f319, Croker to Lockhart, 30 April 1845; *ibid*, f321, Peel to Croker, 1 May 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 567, f193, 338, Croker to Peel, 18 May, 10 June 1845; *ibid*, f195, 199, Peel to Croker, 21, 23 May 1845. The article duly appeared in the June number of the quarterly review. (J. W. Croker), Ireland, The Quarterly Review, Vol. LXXVI, No. CLI (June, 1845), 247. For another advocate of endowment of the Catholic Church, see The Knight of Kerry, A Letter to Sir Robert Peel on the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland (London, 1845).
222. Hansard, 79, 108, 3 April 1845, Duncombe; 79, 818-23, 16 April 1845, Bright; 79, 939-41, 950-4, 999-1004, 18 April 1845, Crawford, Muntz, Duncombe; 79, 1394-8, 1398-9, 1426-7, 28 April 1845, Hindley, Brotherton, Duncombe; 80, 101-3, 121, 2 May 1845, Hindley, Crawford; 80, 186-8, 196-8, 198, 5 May 1845, Crawford, Hindley, Division; 80, 521-4, 524-5, 19 May 1845, Ewart, Marsland; 80, 748-50, 21 May 1845, Duncombe.
223. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f136-9, Ward to Russell, 30 March 1845; *ibid*, f140-1, Ellice to Russell, 31 March 1845. Hansard, 79, 56-7, 93-5, 3 April 1845, Osbourne, Russell; 79, 596, 627-8, 14 April 1845, Hawes, Napier; 79, 712, 748, 15 April 1845, Hume, Murphy; 79, 770-1, 799-802, 814, 841, 16 April 1845, Ellice, Clay, Easthope, Redington; 79, 874-7, 17 April 1845, Grey; 79, 957-8, 1005-6, 1013-4, 18 April 1845, Bellew, Russell; 79, 1124-55, 1155-7, 1175-8, 1180-98, 1208-14, 1227-30, 23 April 1845, Ward, Berkeley, Gibson, Macaulay, Graham, Roebuck, Russell; 79, 1257-60, 1267-72, 1273-82, 1282-9, 1289-94, 1294-5, 1295-8, 1298-1301, 1301-5, 1309-11, 1311-4, 24 April 1845, Bateson, Bernal, Howick, George Hamilton, Osbourne, Bernard, Ellice, Roche, Palmerston, Barron, Division; 79, 1378-82, 1385-7, 1393, 1415-6, 1427-9, 1431-2, 1432-3, 28 April 1845, V. Smith, Dalmeny, Hawes, M. J. O'Connell, Collett, Tancred, Division; 80, 560-2, 19 May 1845, Mangles; 80, 624, 643, 20 May 1845, Jopson-Norreys, Bellew; 80, 686-8, 737-9, 21 May 1845, Wyse, Russell; 81, 70-2, 4 June 1845, Monteagle; 81, 541-6, 16 June 1845, Campbell.
224. Hansard, 79, 1298-9, 24 April 1845, Roche.
225. Hansard, 80, 1022-4, 1024, 1024-6, 1026, 29 May 1845, Murphy, Barron, Fremantle, Roche.
226. Hansard, 82, 703-4, 704-5, 705, 705-7, 707-8, 708, 708-9, 709, 18 July 1845, Denison, Fremantle, Hawes, Graham, Ferguson, Henley, M. J. O'Connell, Grogan. Graham Papers, 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 1, 19 July 1845.
227. Hansard, 82, 1464-6, 1486, 1507, 5 Aug. 1845, Russell, Graham, Sheil.
228. Bourke Papers, Vol. 313, f286, Monteagle to Bourke, 27 Aug. 1845.

229. Downshire Papers, D671/C/356/123, Roden to Downshire, 31 Oct. 1845. DEM, 20 Oct. 1845.
230. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 578, f144, Roden to Jocelyn, 30 Oct. 1845.
231. Graham Papers, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 26 Nov. 1845; 25IR, Hamilton to Heytesbury, 4 Dec. 1845.
232. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 583, f144, Beresford to Peel, 23 Jan. 1846.
233. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f284, Leinster to Russell, 22 Oct. 1845.
234. Ibid, /4E, f20-4, Morpeth to Russell, 4 Dec. 1845.
235. Ibid, f178-80, 223-4, Grey to Russell, 16, 19 Dec. 1845.
236. Ibid, /5A, f50-3, Carew to Russell, 8 Jan. 1846.
237. Ibid, f167-72, 175-8, O'Ferrall to Russell, 17, 26 March 1846.
238. Hansard, 83, 143, 23 Jan. 1846, Hume; 83, 1249-51, 1254, 20 Feb. 1846, Campbell, Monteagle; 84, 101-2, 102-3, 25 Feb. 1846, Russell, O'Connell; 84, 1367-80, 1392, 1405-7, 1408-10, 1419, 23 March 1846, Grey, Fortescue, Fitzwilliam, Clanricarde, Grey; 85, 523, 3 April 1846, O'Connell; 85, 613-4, 622-3, 631, 6 April 1846, R. S. Carew, Browne, Morpeth; 85, 673-4, 7 April 1846, Denison; 85, 737-8, 759, 17 April 1846, J. O'Brien, Ward; 85, 1088, 27 April 1846, McCarthy; 87, 177, 8 June 1846, M. J. O'Connell; 87, 414, 12 June 1846, Browne; 87, 639, 18 June 1846, Armstrong.
239. Hansard, 83, 1251-2, 1252-4, 20 Feb. 1846, St. Germans, Stanley; 84, 98-100, 100-1, 25 Feb. 1846, A. S. O'Brien, Graham; 84, 1384-91, 1414-5, 1416-8, 23 March 1846, Wellington, Londonderry, St. Germans; 87, 401, 12 June 1846, Bernard.
240. Gooch, Later Correspondence of Lord John Russell, I, 108, Wood to Russell. 30 June 1846.
241. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/5C, f116-9, Bessborough to Russell, 11 Sept. 1846.

Chapter 4

Education : primary schools

The years 1831 and 1845 were landmarks in the history of Irish Education. In the former year, the Whigs attempted to establish a system of non-denominational primary education in Ireland, to which it was hoped both Protestants and Roman Catholics would send their children. And in 1845 Peel's Government sought to extend higher education along the same non-denominational principle. Both experiments, especially that in primary education, have been described and analysed from an educational point of view; but there remains scope to examine the views of liberal and Tory politicians of the period, and in particular to note the problems posed for both camps by these aspects of the education question.

In September 1831, Stanley, as Chief Secretary, gave notice of the establishment of the National System of Education, which he described in more detail two months later in his famous letter to the Duke of Leinster. The new system was to receive an endowment from the Government. It was to be administered by a Government-appointed Board of Commissioners, consisting of members of the different Churches. The Board would give financial assistance only to schools which, by omitting religious instruction of a denominational nature from the curriculum, facilitated the mixed education of Protestants and Catholics. Facilities would be given for separate denominational instruction by each Church's own pastors outwith normal schools hours. Existing Government aid to Irish primary education - chiefly to the Kildare Place Society - was to be cut off almost immediately.

Such a system was the logical outcome of events in the preceding two decades. The commission of inquiry into Irish education established in 1806 found serious deficiencies in primary education, dominated as it was by Protestant schools whose proselytizing activities made them objectionable to Catholics and Catholic hedge schools in which the

standard of education was generally very poor. It recommended that the shortcomings should be met by the public endowment of mixed schools in which there would be no interference with 'the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians', this to be achieved by means of separate denominational instruction and the use of Scriptural² extracts during the periods of mixed education.

Though it was envisaged in the report that the system should be administered by a public board, the Government decided instead to use the services of a private society which appeared to be committed to the non-sectarian principles of the commissioners of inquiry. The Kildare Place Society aspired from its origins in 1811 to the promotion of mixed non-denominational education. It soon numbered among its members O'Connell and Lord Fingall, Catholics, and liberal Protestants like Leinster, Downshire and Cloncurry, and received 'cautious sanction' from the Catholic Clergy. In 1816 the Government acceded to the Society's request for financial assistance. The Society's activities expanded remarkably thereafter, within ten years the number of children at affiliated schools rising from 557 to more than 100,000.

However, the rule that the schoolchildren should read the Bible 'without note or comment' was not consonant with Catholic teaching, and, moreover, was violated by individual Protestant school patrons. The management and teachers of the Society remained predominantly Protestant. And it became associated with various Protestant proselytizing institutions. From 1819, the Society was criticized by O'Connell, Cloncurry, Leinster, and the Catholic clergy, and in the course of the next decade Catholic³ children were gradually withdrawn from its schools.

The controversy led to the establishment of a Royal Commission on Irish education in 1824. The commissioners bore witness to the strength of Catholic opposition to the Kildare Place Society. Accordingly, they recommended the safeguards later adopted under the national system - in particular, times to be set aside for the separate instruction of

Protestant and Catholic children in their own catechisms, use of Scriptural extracts during the period of united education, and administration of the new system by a Government-appointed Board.⁴ Its recommendations were, by and large, endorsed by the Select Committee of 1828.⁵

Beyond permitting the initiation of such inquiries, the Tory Government of the 1820's did not act on the growing resentment against exclusive endowment of the Kildare Place Society. However, the accession to power of the Whig administration in November 1830 promised a more sympathetic response to the Catholic sense of grievance. And in the sessions of 1830-1, the old accusers of the Kildare Place Society - Spring Rice and Sir John Newport - found assistance in Parliament from a relatively new, largely Catholic, group of Irish liberal members, comprising O'Connell, O'Ferrall, Wyse, Killeen, O'Brien, Sheil and others. O'Connell took steps to ensure that the Catholic members were in receipt of petitions for presentation to Parliament, and advised that the petitions should demand 'a share in the grant' for (apparently separate) Catholic education.⁶

The liberal-unionists Thomas Wyse and Spring Rice later made strong claims as to their own importance in the formation of the National System. Spring Rice claimed that, 'The scheme was mine'.⁷ In 1827 he had spelt out to the Home Secretary his views - involving a mixed Board, times for separate religious instruction, etc. - and opined that they required the backing of 'a Parliamentary Committee'. He chaired the Select Committee of 1828 and strongly urged its proposals, which reflected his own views, of course, on senior members of the Government, several times speaking of 'my report'.⁸ Writing to Anglesey on the 9th of August 1831 on the decision of the Cabinet to adopt the new system, Stanley referred the Lord Lieutenant to the report of Rice's Select Committee of 1828 'for a full explanation of the proposed system'.⁹ And in his speech in September Stanley said that the Government 'proposed to follow the course recommended by the Committee which sat last session, and of which his

right hon. friend near him (Spring Rice) was Chairman', though that Committee, on the state of the poor in Ireland, merely advised the enactment of the proposals of the earlier reports, dwelling on that of
¹⁰
 1828.

On entering Parliament in 1830, Wyse informed Catholic clerics of his intention to pursue 'without remission' the reform of primary
¹¹
 education in Ireland. On the 9th of December 1830, he submitted to the new Whig Government the 'Heds of a Plan for National Education in Ireland', which included many features of the National System as eventually established—a central Board, separate religious instruction,
¹²
 etc. These views he canvassed with some success among the Catholic prelates and 'several of the most distinguished members of the Protestant and Presbyterian communions' early in 1831.
¹³
 In February he found that Stanley concurred 'in most of my plans .. I am rejoiced to think they will be carried into effect'. A fortnight later he was planning his own education bill, 'it being possible Government may otherwise take the pas and leave me .. in the lurch'. Sheil asked him 'to put off' his efforts. 'He wishes to propose "something grand", but I won't give him the time'. Wyse was still seeing Stanley on the question. After one of their interviews, on the 11th of March, Stanley reported that he found Wyse's proposals 'by no means unreasonable .. In the greatest part' of them 'I entirely concur - if we find .. that such a plan is likely to answer, and to promote a combined education in the country, with all respect to the Kildare Place Society I should be quite ready to throw them over'. But he did not perceive anything original about Wyse's proposals on the running of schools; they were 'to be conducted upon the system recommended
¹⁴
 by Rice's Committee'.

In April 1831 Wyse wrote that his bill gave him 'the opportunity of
¹⁵
 taking the lead. Government have no distinct measure ready'. The General Election intervened, but in July and August Wyse canvassed his ideas widely, winning the approval of Stanley, Spring Rice, Anthony Blake, Sir

John Newport and the Tories Bateson and Gordon. However, even before Wyse's renewed approaches to Stanley, the latter, according to his letter to Anglesey of the 6th of July, had already decided to adopt the new system. On the 8th or 9th of August the Cabinet decided to withdraw the grant from the Kildare Place Society and to give it 'to Schools conducted under the direction of Protestant & Catholic Commissioners, excluding the reading of the Scriptures from School hours - at least not making it compulsory to do so - and providing one day in the week for exclusively religious Education by the Clergy of the respective persuasions'. It was then that Stanley referred Anglesey to Rice's Committee of 1828. It was not until the 14th of August that Stanley asked to see the heads of Wyse's bill and promised that the Government would not oppose its introduction. Wyse was aware that Rice, who had 'humbled others', was a rival, though it was with Rice and More O'Ferrall that, on the 9th of August, Wyse received the permission of the House to bring in 'a Bill to establish a National System of Education in Ireland'. Wyse's principal concern at this time, apart from the danger that the Government would 'take the glory out of my hands' and 'make use of my suggestions & then take the merit', was the possibility of Catholic opposition to his plan of 'joint education'. He reckoned that O'Connell and Sheil were 'for dividing the cash between the two sects'. Sheil warned him that his plan 'will never do, the Priests will be satisfied with nothing less than giving them entire control, no joint schools ...' Wyse felt that Sheil knew nothing of the subject and that separate education 'would be nothing else but sect agst sect'. A Mr. Lynch (later member for Galway?) agreed to help Wyse prepare the bill, but he 'mangled' it so badly that the measure was delayed and Stanley was enabled to 'beat' Wyse to the post. ¹⁶

According to Winifrede Wyse, Stanley took the Government plan 'verbatim from Mr Wyse's bill without the smallest acknowledgement, either then or at any subsequent period'. ¹⁷ Any suggestion that Stanley's brief description of the new system on the 9th of September was taken

'verbatim' from Wyse's bill is manifestly ridiculous (it is clear from comments later made by Wyse that the bill prepared in August was practically the same as that brought in in September).¹⁸ Wyse himself was generally less categorical and in a public letter to Stanley in December 1831¹⁹ claimed that 'in many particulars the instructions are an equal transcript of the Bill introduced in the last session', and proceeded to list the similarities between his bill and the latter; the parallels were indeed close, but not only was the letter not a verbatim copy of the bill, it differed significantly in that Wyse²⁰ stipulated that half of the Board should be Catholic, and that the Board rather than the locality should meet the initial cost of²¹ establishing a school, and his bill omitted all mention of religious²² instruction.

Furthermore, Wyse and Spring Rice were by no means the only influential figures advocating such a system in 1831. For example, in the early part of 1831 the Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin urged members of the Government to adopt a system of united education with separate religious instruction.²³ In March, Anglesey sent Grey a report drawn up by the Chief Remembrancer, Anthony Blake, in which he described and endorsed the recommendations of 1812, 1825 and 1828 as best suited to abatement of the 'inflammation' caused by endowment of the Kildare Place Society and to giving the Government 'an opportunity of shewing to the Catholics as well as to the Protestants its disposition to deal with them in a spirit of kindness and goodwill'. Blake's report was prepared after 'a long discussion' with Anglesey, Plunket and Cloncurry. Anglesey shared Blake's views and continually pressed the issue upon²⁴ members of the Cabinet. And Cloncurry later wrote that shortly before Stanley's speech in September 1831, Anglesey, Blake, Plunket and he had pressed these ideas upon Stanley, though it appeared that they had not succeeded in overcoming his objection that, 'The Church and the Protestants, both of England and Ireland .. would not stand the withdrawal

of the grant from the Kildare - place Society, and the substitution of
 a project for united and merely secular education²⁵.

Spring Rice's Committee of 1828 undoubtedly brought the National System that much closer, for its report was 'short, to-the-point, and unambiguous' and provided another rallying point for the Catholic opponents of the status quo. And Wyse's bill represented a further stage in the consolidation of earlier work. However, the principles in question, and indeed many of the details, had such a long pedigree, and had so many advocates in 1831, that no single individual could properly be described as the architect of the National System.

The system expanded rapidly, from 107,042 children in 789 affiliated schools in 1833 to 507,469^{in 4,109} schools in 1848.²⁷ From the beginning it won the support of Irish liberals. It was praised as a system which made education more easily available, particularly to Catholics, and, moreover, the mixed education it promised to secure was regarded as a means of mitigating differences between Catholics and Protestants. Even Sheil and O'Connell welcomed the new system, the former, according to James Grattan, 'in the Clouds' after Stanley's speech. Newport and Smith O'Brien wrote to thank Stanley for his initiative; O'Brien observed 'with the greatest satisfaction that national education in this country is at last to be placed upon a rational and statesmanlike footing'. Ireland was 'much indebted' to Stanley, he felt, for a system which 'as a healing measure' would prove more effective than even Emancipation.²⁹ James Grattan and Wyse not only defended the new system in Parliament but also privately expressed disgust with the assault of its Tory enemies; it was 'only a rabid effusion of anti-reform disappointment'.³⁰

Only Lord Acheson, the Whig member for Armagh, demurred in Parliament. He warmly defended the Kildare Place Society immediately prior to Stanley's announcement of its disendowment; and in March 1832, though approving of the Government's motives, he felt 'obliged to oppose the plan', convinced as he was that religious differences would cause it

to fail. He also wrote to Stanley to say that he was 'rather inclined to agree' with the views of the Presbyterian opponents of the system.³¹

Lord Downshire, as its President, defended the Kildare Place Society and regretted that it was to lose the public grant; but he agreed to give the new system a trial - it was 'merely an experiment, and it was on that account only that he supported it' - and, with the rest of the Irish liberals,³² opposed Wicklow's hostile motion in March 1832. Irish liberalism in general - from Whigs to O'Connellites - warmly defended the National System in the stormy debates of 1832, and continued to lend it their support in Parliament for several years. It was later said that, 'The formation of the Board was, probably, the only act of the Whigs by which they earned the unqualified plaudits of the Liberal party in Ireland'.³³

Their position on the question was perhaps epitomized by the Duke of Leinster's acceptance of the office of President of the Board of Commissioners.

Wyse's principal complaint was that the system was on 'a slippery foundation' for want of legislative enactment. Endowment by means of annual votes to the Lord Lieutenant gave the system an appearance of impermanence, of experimentation. In addition, he felt that 'to require from a poor parish to contribute to the building of a school is literally to refuse it .. let the Board make the great outlay in the building', and the local people would meet the running costs.³⁴ Wyse's bill of September 1831 was designed to remedy these defects. Stanley, for all his 'crude & unsettled' ideas on the subject, had encouraged Wyse to bring it on, and O'Connell surprised Wyse by approving it.³⁵ However, after the recess, Wyse's closest ally in matters of education, Smith O'Brien, opposed legislative enactment on the grounds that provision by means of annual grants ensured the Board's accountability to Parliament and left more flexibility in the system than would exist if it was based on an Act of Parliament.³⁶ Dr. Bryce of Belfast, another of Wyse's close associates, also advised against proceeding with the bill. And Lord Durham, whom Wyse

found sympathetic to his views on education, 'depreciated .. agitating
 the matter' in this way 'until a ³⁷reformed Parliament'. And Protestants
 were alarmed at his proposal that Catholics should constitute half of
 the Board of Commissioners; only two of the seven members of the first
³⁸Board were Catholic.

Wyse intended, nevertheless, to proceed. He thought it 'absurd to
 hope for either general acquiescence or stability' in the absence
 of legislative sanction, and accused the Government, particularly Stanley,
 of having undermined the prospects of the system by their general
 timidity. 'However, despite all their blunders it is really and rapidly
 advancing .. and with a little more energy and order will advance every
 year ten fold'. Stanley warned against acting 'rashly' on a question of
 such 'vast importance' as Wyse's bill, and Wyse feared opposition from
 O'Connell and Lefroy. But he received encouragement from the Catholic
 Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, James Doyle, and O'Connell's Political
 Union of Ireland. And, 'The Irish members like it generally. O'Ferrall,
³⁹Lambert & all who understand such matters'.

With Parliamentary reform 'engrossing the entire public attention',
 the measure was withheld. Grey's comment on the Tory assault on the new
 system that, 'Had it been necessary to have a bill for this purpose we
 never should have got it through' suggests another reason for the
⁴⁰failure to bring it on. Wyse's defeat in the election of 1832 meant that
 the subject was not raised at all until his return to Parliament in 1835.
 In May of that year, Wyse brought in another bill to give legislative
 sanction to the National System, which he claimed had 'most thoroughly
 succeeded' in so far as it went but was 'confined and comparatively
 feeble in its operation' for want of the 'permanence of legislative
 enactment and because the Board required each parish to pay part of
 the cost of establishing new schools. ⁴¹However, Morpeth agreed to the
 second reading of the bill 'on the understanding that it should not be
 farther proceeded with during the present Session', to allow the
 Government to consider it during the recess, and in July it was referred

42

for the consideration of the Select Committee on Irish Education. Wyse
 43
 persisted with the project for several years, but to no avail. In all
 probability the Whigs felt that their legislative programme already
 contained more than enough controversial Irish questions, and the
 difficulties with the Appropriation clause, with its implications for
 the funding of education, may have delayed a final decision on legislation.

In his speech on May 1835, Wyse described the immense importance of
 education in an age of economic difficulties and extended political
 participation, and indicated that he hoped to secure later the expansion
 of secondary and university education. His ideas were presented in
 greater detail in his magnum opus, published in 1836, in which he
 44
 envisaged a National System for Britain as well as Ireland. This work
 has been described as 'by far the most significant contribution to
 45
 educational theory ever written by an Irish author'.

The year 1836 saw the first concrete manifestation of Catholic
 discontent with the National System, when the Christian Brothers, unhappy
 with the regulations which confined denominational instruction to
 particular hours, began to withdraw their schools. From the beginning
 of 1838, John Mac Hale, the Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, openly
 denounced the system. In a series of public letters, he described a
 variety of grievances, particularly the Protestant preponderance on
 the Board of Commissioners, the denial of the clergy's right exclusively
 to give religious education, the compromise with Protestant principles
 during the periods of united instruction, and the extent and practical
 results of the Board's power to control the books used in the National
 schools. He concluded that there should be a separate Catholic system of
 education. There followed a bitter quarrel within the Catholic clergy,
 Mac Hale leading the assault on the National System, and Archbishop Murray,
 himself a Commissioner, at the head of its proponents, until in January
 1841 the Holy See successfully urged the combatants to avoid further
 public dispute by resolving to allow individual bishops to use their

own discretion in the matter.

At this time, too, there emerged a school of criticism which was separate from both the extreme Catholic and the extreme Protestant positions. Lord Clements, the liberal-unionist member for Co. Leitrim, began to have doubts as a result of the apparent success of the Protestant boycott. In a very long and interesting letter to Morpeth in March 1838, he acknowledged that in successfully educating Catholics the Board had accomplished its principal task, 'for in truth the Protestants in most districts can well afford to organize a scheme of education at their own expense'. But the experiment in the mixed education of Catholics and Protestants was proving unsuccessful;

'Protestants (except in large towns) rarely avail themselves of National Schools .. One would not lightly give up the scheme of combined education, because one hopes every year that the Protestant Clergy will be induced to listen to reason, but as far as my experience goes, I have abandoned my hopes .. I fear that combined education will be for some years the exception, & separate instruction the ordinary rule'.

And he described how, to raise funds for their schools, both the Protestant and Catholic Clergy 'strongly excite the very passions which combined education professes indirectly & gradually to allay'. He proposed 'to conciliate the prejudices of the Protestants ..

'...If it was possible so to modify the schema as to admit of separate grants by the Board to Protestant & Catholic schools, I should consider it a great blessing - particularly if such arrangements could be conducted with the approbation of the present members - who, while they admitted books which explained Protestant or Catholic doctrine, might still exclude books which attacked the doctrines of others, & might still recommend the united system where the prejudices of both parties admitted of its establishment'.

This proposal might well have satisfied moderate Irish Tories, and both Clements and the Irish Tories argued from the same premiss, namely the failure of the National System to secure mixed education. However, Clements' credentials were impeccably liberal, and he evidently had no sympathy with the view taken by the Protestant Clergy. Much of the letter consisted, in fact, of a warning that Catholics would be alienated if the Government pursued a plan to conciliate Protestants by removing

Smith O'Brien and James Grattan, also liberal-unionists, brought their dissatisfaction with the National System to the attention of the House in July 1838. Smith O'Brien objected to 'the partial distribution of the grant', which left some districts without adequate schooling, and proposed that the grant should consequently be increased and the localities given power 'to raise money by assessment', in order that there should be a good school in every parish. Wyse, less aggressively, 'hoped that the success of (existing) schools would induce Government to extend their establishment'. Grattan 'was not prepared to increase the grant, though he wished to see the sums already voted appropriated with the greatest benefit to the country. He objected to the whole proceedings of the board, which, in his opinion, looked more to the quantity than the quality of education introduced and thought that a better system ought to be established'. Grattan, whose remarks had a rather different, more hostile tendency than those of O'Brien and Wyse, noted in his journal that his outburst was 'a good hint to the Board, who will job as all such do .. I am right about the schools. In Roscommon, the National Schools are ridiculous'.

Spring Rice, the Chancellor, was evidently shaken by this 'very disagreeable discussion .. when we were more bitterly attacked by our friends than our foes'. Though he thought the assailants behaved 'unkindly' in publicizing their discontent, he felt the Government had been able to offer a 'very lame & imperfect defence', and he found, on investigation, that 'the financial arrangements of the Commission were not in a satisfactory state', following 'a very loose & imperfect system of procedure, wholly at variance with all our general rule (sic) & indeed with the rules of common sense'. Fearing that the Government would again be 'called to account' when Parliament next voted the estimates, he initiated a thoroughgoing reform of the Board's system of expenditure, involving the 'strict regulation which is applied in every department in which the expenditure of money takes place'.

that the Board had lost 'the confidence of Parliament' and contemplated
⁵³
 resignation.

The Report of the Select Committee on Irish education in August 1838 was arguably a liberal-unionist production. Wyse wrote the first draft of the report and was especially indebted to Smith O'Brien's assistance with it in Committee. And liberal-unionists dominated, numerically speaking, the sittings of the Committee as it considered
⁵⁴
 the report. The Conservative members also attended, but it is doubtful if they concurred in the conclusions of the report and there is some
⁵⁵
 evidence that they were positive dissentients. The report suggested many changes in the National System, including the proposal that the system should be given legislative sanction, that the Board should be empowered to meet the cost of building schools, and that localities should have the power of assessment for promotion of education. More fundamentally, though the point was made only briefly and described as a last resort, it was conceded that if religious differences were such as to render co-operation between the local Churches impossible the
⁵⁶
 Board should be prepared to endow separate, exclusive schools.
⁵⁷

Grattan again brought on the subject in March 1839, when he made a strong attack on the mismanagement of the Board, their 'giving aid in the most indiscriminate and injudicious manner .. to schools which were wholly unworthy of it', and the 'great inequality and unfairness' shown in their distribution of the grant. The masters of the National schools were 'most inefficient and almost contemptible'. And the proposed agricultural schools would bring little benefit if administered along the same lines. Grattan felt that the intention to establish a system of mixed education had been frustrated by the Board's 'criminal' disregard of regulations (involving joint applications for aid by the Protestant and Catholic Clergy) designed to promote endowment of schools in which Protestants and Catholics would be united. He moved for returns which specified the number of Catholics and Protestants in each National school,

and declared that 'if it were found impossible to carry into effect a combined system of education, it would be better to let the grant be divided between the two parties'.⁵⁸

In his journal he lamented the fact that his motion had found no seconder on the liberal side of the House and recognized that he would be 'greatly abused .. The Catholics will be very angry with me'. But 'the system is bad in spite of all that'; though unhappy at having won the approval of the ultra-Tory Standard, he was convinced that his remarks were not only accurate but might 'do good in checking the proceedings' of the Board. He felt that 'their agricultural schools are nonsense & will waste all the money'; and that Morpeth's initial refusal to agree to the returns 'showed a desire for concealment which is bad'.⁶⁰

Morpeth, in reply, said that as a supposed friend of the National System Grattan's censure would damage it more than any attack from professed enemies. He confessed that 'the object of the plan - the system of mixed education - had not met with all the success that could have been desired for it; but to say that it had utterly failed was a misrepresentation'. After replying to the specific points made by Grattan, and affirming his determination to persist with the existing system, he reluctantly agreed even to that part of the motion concerning the religion of the children.⁶¹ Grattan subsequently wrote that the Government 'acted ill about the Education Board .. & were I suspect compromised with them'. He badgered Morpeth for the returns and doubted if the commitment would be met.⁶² On the 2nd of August he noted that his fellow liberal members 'are all against my having a shy at National Board. Sheil abused me, others tell me not to attack it'. But three days later he made what he described as a 'rambling .. but intelligible & useful' speech on education, in the House, in which he complained that his returns were not forthcoming and stated 'that the present system wanted Reform', for though 'good in principle' it was 'deficient in working' and the expenditure of the Board was 'prodigal and uncalled for'. He

felt that the grant should be spent on model schools with 'good well
⁶³
 paid masters'.

Some days later he wrote, 'The Education Return is arrived. It leaves out the distinction of religion & says the Commission would resign if made necessary. This is admitting a failure in this respect..'⁶⁴
 The Board was, in fact, to refuse to make a reliable study and return of the comparative number of Catholics and Protestants in the National schools until the second half of the century.

In an article on Irish education written in 1839 for the London-based Central Society of Education, Smith O'Brien showed regard for both Protestant and Catholic scruples. He contended that the National System had proved satisfactory to 'the public at large' but 'admitted with regret that a great majority of the Protestant Clergy have offered their unremitting opposition to the system', and that 'a considerable section' of the Catholic Clergy had recently voiced their discontent - in sum that,

'there is a very considerable number of estimable and conscientious persons who would resist any plan of joint education and who would only be satisfied with such a system of instruction as should enable them to carry on education upon exclusive principles, conformable to their peculiar views of religious truth'.

Given this, O'Brien resolved that they should 'adopt such a system as shall exclude no portion of the people'. While the principle of the National System represented the optimum solution,

'if the deep-rooted and conscientious convictions of a portion of the community will not allow them to communicate to their children general knowledge apart from that religious teaching which appears to them of essential importance to their eternal welfare, we are not prepared to say that they should be altogether debarred from the advantages derivable, through the means of a National Board, from funds to which they have equally with their fellow-citizens contributed. According to this view, the nunnery school, if it be conducted conformably to the regulations of the Board in regard of secular knowledge, ought to receive aid from the public grant, even though the Catholic Catechism be habitually taught in it, and though it be on that account attended by none but Roman Catholic children. In like manner, the school which has been established under the immediate superintendence of the Protestant clergyman should also be held eligible to receive assistance, even though the religious instruction given in it be an exclusively Protestant character'.

On this vital point, then, O'Brien, Wyse, Clements and Grattan took

essentially the same view. O'Brien suggested, too, that Protestants and Catholics might be offered different versions of the extracts, to meet objections made against the attempted compromises. He felt the Catholic claim to 'a more just representation on the Central Board' was 'irresistible' and though^t, again with Catholic complaints in mind, that 'it would be desirable that the religion of the master should be the same as that of the majority of his scholars. The assistant might, in large schools, be of the same persuasion as the minority'. He contended, too, that the requirement that the locality must provide much of the running expenses of a school discriminated unjustly against poorer districts. Finally O'Brien calculated that even in conjunction with private societies 'not one half of the children of the people of Ireland now receive education'. Given the Government's unwillingness to ask Parliament for the necessary funds, he proposed, like the recent Select Committee, 'that each locality shall be enabled to raise by a local rate a portion of the funds required to establish and maintain its schools'⁶⁵.

In the next session, Grattan renewed his attack on the National System in an unreported speech,⁶⁶ and a year later he still held the opinion that 'the system of education might be greatly improved'.⁶⁷ Coming from disillusioned sympathizers, the attacks of these liberal-unionists might, as Spring Rice and Morpeth feared, have proved particularly damaging. However, Clements, O'Brien and Wyse (Report) were themselves clear that recourse to separate endowment would be a matter for regret, and the Report of the Select Committee in 1838 was especially warm in its approval of the controversial religious aspects of the system.⁶⁸ And neither the views of these critics nor those of Mac Hale elicited a sympathetic response from other liberal members, who were scarcely less prominent in defence of the National System than they had been in the debates of 1832 and 1835. Grattan recognized the unpopularity of his position among his colleagues.⁶⁹ In his pamphlet in 1839, Fitzstephen French, the liberal-unionist member for Roscommon, included, without

qualification, the National System as one of the benefits conferred on
 Ireland by Whig rule. And continuing liberal approval of the system was
 also indicated by the fact that several prominent liberals - all of
 them unionists - joined the Board at this time, including Sir Patrick
 Bellew (1838), Lord Plunket (1840) and the Marquis of Kildare (1841,
 replacing his father as President).

Dillion Browne's motion in August 1839, advocating Mac Hale's views,
 was not seconded. O'Connell was determined to avoid taking sides in the
 controversy and sought only to secure reconciliation between Mac Hale
 and Murray. And the Irish liberal members continued to defend the system
 when it was again assailed by the Irish Tories, pointing to the number
 of children being educated, denying that the system excluded the
 Scriptures, and contending that many Protestants did attend the National
 schools. In 1839, they solidly supported the Government's proposal to
 extend a similar system to England, in the course of which Wyse told
 Stanley that in establishing the National System in Ireland he 'had
 conferred one of the greatest boons on that country that had ever been
 conceded to it by a Government'. Grattan, too, supported the English
 plan, as 'an advocate for a liberal system of education', though he felt,
 rightly, that it would be bitterly opposed and would do much harm,
 showing up the Government's weakness, making ministers unpopular in
 some quarters, and exciting 'the old anti Catholic feeling'. The
 accession of the Presbyterian General Synod in 1840 not only strengthened
 the National System but in Rawdon's view encouraged liberals in their
 determination to uphold it.

After the coming to power of the Conservatives in 1841, a number
 of liberal-unionists united in defence of the National System. Unity was
 facilitated by the facts of Clements's death in 1839 and James Grattan's
 defeat in the General Election. In March 1842, Lansdowne expressed his
 support for the system as an efficient agent of instruction. In July,
 Cloncurry approved of the existing system and opposed the suggestion

that its 'small grant' should be shared with the Church; Monteagle (Spring Rice) similarly opposed state aid to Protestant schools as it would lead to the withdrawal of all Protestants from the National schools and abandonment of the goal of mixed education. In the lower House, M. J. O'Connell, Somerville, Wyse, Murphy and Lord Clements (brother of the above - mentioned) praised the National System and rejoiced in the support accorded to it by Chief Secretary Eliot. They and several of the English members found considerable pleasure, too, in the clash between Eliot and the Irish Conservatives, and taunted the latter over their refusal to divide against the Government. 78

In correspondence with his brother, Wyse praised the 'enlightened & liberal' Eliot and warmly welcomed the improved prospects of the National System. He was euphoric at the 'fierce row' between the Government and its supporters, at the Irish Tory Jackson's rising 'pale with passion' to attack Eliot and the Irish Tories' 'backing him fiercely against Eliot, to the dismay of Stanley .. It was a tremendous explosive treat between Jackson & Eliot, & both felt sorely annoyed .. What a triumph! .. This is what we wanted - the record of the great mass of the Irish supporters against their own Government ..' He concurred fully in the mischievous tactic by which 'Gibson & Wood near me agreed to sacrifice themselves' and divided against the grant in order to embarrass the Irish Conservatives. 79

When the system was assailed by the Irish Conservatives in April 1843, Crawford defended it as the one best suited to promote mixed education and said that separate grants would merely cause disputes between the sects over the relative amounts received; Rose praised both the religious and secular instruction given in the National schools, and William Browne claimed that in Kerry 'the national system of education was most successful, most perfect and free from objection'. In 1843 and 1844 Irish liberals like Wyse, Barron, Murphy, Sheil and Somerville joined in accusing the Government of having undermined the National

System by the appointment to positions in the Church and legal system
80
of men who were opposed to the system - Jackson, Lefroy, Daly, etc.

But Wyse and the O'Connor Don welcomed the Government's general policy on the question and in 1844-6 Wyse, Sheil Monteagle and Ross rejoiced at the number of children - more than 400,000 in 1845 - receiving 'a sound religious and moral education' through the National System.

M. J. O'Connell opposed separate endowment of the Protestant Church Education Society because it would lead to the institution of a Catholic system and subvert 'the present united and useful system, and lead to much sectarian bitterness'.
81
Monteagle was pleased with the Government's

refusal in 1845 to give way to a renewed Irish Tory effort to subvert
82

the system. And the Government's decision in 1845 to grant the Board a Charter of Incorporation finally secured to Wyse's satisfaction the
83
object, stability, for which he had pressed for legislative enactment.

The only dissentients apparently from the liberal consensus were O'Brien and O'Connell. In moving for an inquiry on the State of Ireland in July 1843, O'Brien sympathized with the position of the Irish Protestants:

'I think that they have some ground for complaint. There is no reason why the religious prejudices of the minority of the people should not be respected in the case of the Protestants of Ireland, as well as in the case of the Catholics of England. I greatly prefer as the basis of a national system the principle of mixed education, such as that established by the national board; but if there be sections of the population, either amongst the Catholics or amongst the Protestants, who entertain conscientious objections to any system of education which does not inculcate their own peculiar tenets, I am not prepared to say that they ought to be excluded from all participation in the benefits of a fund to which they contribute in common with the rest of the community'.

And he felt that 'the funds at the command of the national board are altogether inadequate to provide for the due instruction of the population of Ireland'; two years later, by which time he was a repealer, he pointed out that many, indeed most, of Ireland's children did not receive
84
any education from the National schools. O'Brien's views, then, were evidently unchanged from those he had presented in 1838-9.

At the end of 1842 O'Connell declared that 'Catholics have no good

reason to applaud' the National System, though 'it was so much better than any former plan that the people .. very generally availed themselves of it'. He was driven by the logic of his alliance with Mac Hale against the Colleges bill to say privately to Wyse in June 1845, "the National System, we were wrong ever to have accepted it". It spoke volumes, many more, than he intended', wrote Wyse. 'Not that he is de occur opposed to that system .. but that he felt the inconvenience now and inconsistency and saw how much it stood in the way of any blows aimed at the Colleges'. However, in general the liberal members played a rather insignificant role in the primary education debate during the years of Conservative rule, largely content to welcome the Government's continuation of the system and, with perhaps even greater relish, the resultant conflict between the Government and its Irish supporters; desisting still from open expression of the Catholic grievances against the System felt by Mac Hale; and apparently failing to provide O'Brien with new allies, in place of Clements and James Grattan, in the distinctive, liberal-unionist school of criticism which had developed towards the end of the previous decade.

The issue caused Irish Conservatism many more problems. In the months prior to Stanley's speech of September 1831, the Irish Tories had led the defence of the Kildare Place Society in Parliament. Bateson, Conolly, Castlereagh, Jones, Shaw, the two Lefroys, Brydges and Gordon, and Carbery in the Lords, stressed the benefits brought by the Society (amongst which they included Scriptural instruction), denied the accusations of proselytism and claimed that while the Catholic priests opposed the Society, ^{it} and the Scriptural instruction which it provided were popular with the laity. Wyse thought in August 1832 that he had 'quite conciliated' Bateson and Gordon on the question, but Gordon was one of several Irish Tories who objected in September 1831 to the transfer of the grant from the Kildare Place Society to the new system; and James Grattan noted that Lefroy, who also spoke, was 'as low' as Sheil was 'high'. For some time after promulgation of the new scheme the Irish

Tory members continued to defend the Society, in conjunction with the offence against the National System. But after 1833 the Society figured less prominently in the education debate, and, bereft of Government aid,⁸⁸ declined too as a force in Irish education.

Most Irish Protestants, particularly the clergy, reacted to the establishment of the National System with a fierce antipathy. Public meetings were held early in 1832 in Dublin, Belfast, Cork and elsewhere,⁸⁹ at which the system was denounced and petitions forwarded to Parliament. The Synod of Ulster, which united the majority of Irish Presbyterians,⁹⁰ condemned the plan. Seventeen bishops of the Establishment signed a letter to their clergy in March 1832 in opposition to the system, though five others refused to sign the letter, including Archbishop Whately of Dublin, the principal representative of the Establishment on the new⁹¹ Board. The Christian Examiner, representing the evangelical wing of the Established Church, contained a series of condemnatory editorials and⁹² correspondence.

The central theme of this criticism was disapproval of the decision to exclude the Bible during the four or five days each week of combined (Protestant and Catholic) instruction. Scriptural extracts, approved by all the representatives of the different denominations on the Board, would be permitted in the classroom during these 'normal school hours'. But children could handle the entire Bible only during the times set aside for denominational instruction, one or two days each week and before or after school hours, and then only if their respective pastors so wished. The importance attached by Protestants, from the Reformation, to direct lay access to the Scriptures and the fundamentalist character of the evangelical revival of the preceding forty years help to explain the hostility with which Protestants regarded this restriction. That Protestant children were to be denied access to the Bible during most of the week was held to be sufficiently objectionable; that Roman Catholic children might never be able to read the Bible was often described as an

even greater crime. The use of extracts was regarded as beneficial in itself, but it was not compulsory and could not, it was said, be regarded as a substitute for making available 'the entire unmutilated Bible'. And the extracts adopted by the Board were soon to be denounced as favouring Catholic views of controversial points.

93

That exclusion of the Bible during combined instruction was manifestly a concession to Catholic scruples added to Protestant discontent. It was claimed that Catholic theology rather than that of the National Church had dictated Government policy and was now enshrined in the National System. In other ways, too, the new system raised Catholicism to a status which was objectionable to Protestants in general and to the Establishment, with all its pretensions, in particular. The applications for aid of the Protestant and Catholic clergy were apparently to be treated with equal favour. And the system allowed the Catholic priest and the Protestant clergyman the same access to the children of his faith and the same facilities with which to instruct them.

The position and constitution of the Board of Commissioners also inspired resentment. The first Board consisted of three members of the Established Church, one orthodox Presbyterian from the General Synod, one Unitarian and two Roman Catholics. Presbyterians and Establishment Protestants complained that extensive powers would be wielded by Commissioners who were of another religion, with the Unitarian and Catholic Commissioners their common enemy. In particular, they resented the power of the Commissioners to choose the Bible extracts and to exclude books they deemed 'inflammatory'. Also, the veto entrusted to the Commissioners of each religion over the books used by the children of their respective churches during the periods of separate religious instruction was felt to be a dangerous power and was especially inconsonant with Presbyterian principles.

The Irish Tory leaders fully subscribed to these views and joined in the agitation at the beginning of 1832. For example, Lords Donegall,

Dufferin and Rathdowne, James Gordon, M.P., C. R. Dobbs and Sergeant Pennefather appeared at the meetings in Belfast and Dublin in January, and Lord Mountcashell and E. J. Cooper, M.P., sent in their concurrence in the sentiments of the Dublin meeting. Roden, Mandeville, Thomas Lefroy, M.P., Sir Edmund Hayes, M.P., George Hamilton, Col. Conolly, M.P., vigorously attacked the National System at the Dublin meeting on the 17th of January which led to the formation of the Protestant Conservative Society. The Conservative Dublin Evening Mail added its denunciation. And the participants in the Exeter Hall meetings of the 8th and 15th of February, held to oppose the National System, included several Irish Tory peers and sixteen of the Irish Tory M.P.'s.

The opposition to the National System was pursued, too, in Parliament, becoming especially intense from February 1832 when the presentation of petitions from Ireland and Britain facilitated a constant stream of criticism. The Irish Tories led this assault, with Shaw, Lefroy, Bateson and Gordon particularly prominent in the Commons and Roden and Wicklow the principal opponents in the Lords. Whigs regarded this opposition with great disdain, commenting angrily on the 'exaggerated objections', 'malevolence and hypocrisy', and 'party rancour, bigotry & intolerance' of the Tories. The opposition of the politicians was along the same lines as that of the clergy, including the emphasis on the Bible issue and the duty of the State to ensure unrestricted access to it for both Protestants and Catholics. There was no indication of anything other than complete Irish Tory unanimity in opposition to the system in 1832, either in the debates or in the two divisions, on Lord Wicklow's unsuccessful motion in March and when the grant came up later in the Committee of Supply.

The fervour aroused by the education issue in 1832 receded somewhat thereafter. In the Parliamentary session of 1833, Roden, Wicklow and Shaw attacked the system, with the assistance of the Bishops of Exeter and Bristol; one of the petitions presented by Roden against the system came

100

from the Protestant Conservative Society. The limited degree of opposition in Parliament in 1833 reflected the relative decline in agitation against the system, with the consequent scarcity of petitions to Parliament. James Carlile felt that, 'Protestant prejudice against it (the National System) is giving way'.¹⁰¹ Indeed it seemed at one stage in 1833 - at least to Archbishop Whately and his colleagues - that discussion between the Government and the Presbyterians of the General Synod had satisfied the latter as to the acceptability of the system; the negotiations broke down, however, in February 1834, principally on the issue of the visiting rights of Catholic priests.¹⁰³

In 1834, the Parliamentary opposition to the National System was entirely dormant. But Downshire, newly converted to Conservatism, wrote to the Lord Lieutenant in August to suggest the withdrawal of all Government aid, since only Catholics were educated in the system and Protestant education was well supported by the landlords.¹⁰⁴ The issue brought comment by many speakers at the great Irish Tory meetings in Dublin and Hillsborough that Autumn.¹⁰⁵ And, just as the accession to power of the Whigs in November 1830 brought greater attention to Catholic scruples in matters of education, the return four years later of a Conservative Government seemed to promise a more sympathetic treatment of the Protestant grievance. Peel had remained silent throughout the earlier debates, but he and Goulburn told Ellenborough in February 1832 that 'they thought it better under present circumstances to discontinue the grant altogether'. And Wellington had expressed very serious doubts about the new system and voted for Wicklow's motion in 1832.¹⁰⁶ At the end of January 1835, Roden wrote to Peel,

'With respect to the Education question, it is impossible that system now pursued can be continued to the satisfaction of the country. It has completely failed as a measure for General Education. I am prepared to shew the grossest abuses in the application of the funds granted by the Commissioners to the Priests. It will be a difficult subject for the Government to satisfy itself upon. I have already expressed in Parliament my view of the Remedy, & every day convinces me more that it is alone to be found in the withdrawal of all grants of publick money for the purpose, and leaving to private exertion the instruction of the people. Then I

am convinced such a private fund would be raised as would give a sound Scriptural Education to the population at large in spite of the efforts of the Priests'. 107

He went on to stress the need for proselytism among the Roman Catholic population. Two points stand out in this letter, as typifying the position of the Irish Conservatives. The claim that the National System had 'completely failed as a measure for General Education' - that is, of mixed education of Catholics and Protestants - was made even as early as the debates in 1832, when it became clear that Protestants were generally remaining aloof, and was to be a central theme in the Conservative attack on the measure for many years. Secondly, the call for an end to all grants was the most popular alternative proposal among Tory speakers from the formation of the National System, possibly sharing Roden's expectation that Protestant riches would permit the spread of
108
Protestant values.

Peel's reply to Roden studiously avoided reference to the education issue, but the Government had already decided to continue the grant to
109
the National System. On the 2nd of March, Chief Secretary Hardinge announced that 'there is no intention on the part of Government to alter the system of education in Ireland', and added that they would be
110
proposing an increase in the grant. Ellenborough noted that this announcement 'set our friends here (London) in a flame' and induced O'Connell and Sheil to taunt Lefroy with the opinion that the Irish
111
Tories had been 'sold' by the Government. The (Tory) Dublin Evening Mail declared that,

'never was a declaration more dishonest, unjust and unjustifiable. What, before the Parliament is a week in existence, for a Secretary to turn round on that party which helped him to his place and through whose support alone he can expect to maintain his power and wantonly insult them, by not only continuing an establishment to which every Protestant in the land is inimical, but by avowing his intention of placing at their disposal additional means of effecting mischief, thereby adding to the insult! The thing is too monstrous for belief .. does Sir Henry Hardinge suppose - is he weak enough to imagine - that a single Irish member of Parliament, representing a Protestant constituency, would, or, if he were venal enough, dare to vote with him, if this declaration be true and if the determination therein expressed be followed up? We can tell him that there is not one'. 112

Roden wrote to Wellington that he would ask a question in the Lords on the question, 'trusting I shall receive a reply more likely to calm the minds of the Protestants of Ireland .. than the answer which is reported to have been given by Sir Henry Hardinge & which I am sure will produce dismay & disappointment amongst a very large class of the population of the country'.¹¹³ Hardinge confirmed his statement to Wellington, which 'could not have varied even had I consulted Lord Roden', for it was too late to change the estimates prepared by the Whigs. The Government's intention to continue the system and increase the grant was confirmed on the 6th when Wellington replied to that effect to Roden,¹¹⁴ who spoke of 'the extreme anxiety' of Protestants on the question. On the following day Holland noted the 'great dissatisfaction' among Tories over the decision.¹¹⁵ However, the Irish Tory response this time was somewhat muted. The Mail, quoting the Morning Register in corroboration, expected that the increased grant was 'meant to be divided, according as necessity demands, between the New Board and the Kildare Place Society'. This they regarded as 'a prospect of fair dealing', removing 'more than half our objections to the new Board', for restoration of the Kildare Place grant would give Protestants a system their consciences could accept, 'and we fancy it will be a matter of little moment to them what other system maybe patronised.' The Mail resolved to avoid 'a premature or injudicious discussion.'¹¹⁶ Henry Cooke, the Conservative Presbyterian leader, wrote to Roden 'to enquire what really took place when you questioned the Duke of Wellington on the subject of Education. I know how little confidence can be placed in newspaper reports so that I know not what to think. The answer seemed to me to intimate that the Board would stand & that the Kildare Place or some such, should co-exist with it. Under all circumstances, I should not object to such an arrangement'.¹¹⁷

This rumour of a shared grant - based apparently on a somewhat fanciful interpretation of Wellington's words, and almost certainly without foundation in reality - evidently defused opposition. And it

pointed the way to the course taken in the 1840's by the majority of Protestant leaders, when they demanded concurrent endowment of the Protestant and 'National' systems of education. Party politics also affected the Tory response. Charles Fox, soon to be Conservative member for Longford, wrote, 'I wish Shaw & our friends would keep themselves cool .. Attached as I am to Scriptural education I would not oppose or embarrass Government. Much may be done even through the National System

118

with a friendly Government.' Roden announced his intention to ask for returns on the system and stated to Wellington that 'the panic in the minds of our Protestant People of Ireland is very great, in consequence of the decision of the Government on the Education Question. It will be a great point if you are able to remedy it, but in order to know its frightful effects & workings you must have the Returns'. He promised, however, that he would move for the returns 'without saying anything to provoke discussion'. And when Wellington asked him to withhold another motion until the Tithe bill was through the Commons, Roden replied that he had no wish to increase the difficulties of the Government, that,

'much as I must lament the declaration which has been made by Sir H. Hardinge with respect to the system of National Education in Ireland, I have carefully avoided expressing my feelings on the subject and have postponed the consideration of it to a period of the session when I trust it will be least likely to embarrass the Government'. 119

Though hopeful that the Government would later 'consign the Whig education scheme to the extinction it deserves', the (Tory) Dublin University Magazine was unwilling to add to 'the embarrassments of the new ministry' by pressing for immediate action. The Irish Tories in Parliament did not wholly desist from attacking the National System even when the Conservative Government was in power. Speaking in support of a motion for returns, Henry Maxwell and Sir Robert Bateson said that Protestant opposition meant that Protestant children did not attend the National schools, particularly because many of the schools were situated in or near Catholic chapel-yards. In the debates on the Irish Church, Lefroy, Conolly, Bateson, Shaw and Francis Bruen attacked the National

120

schools as essentially Catholic institutions which Protestants could not attend, and advocated 'a general system of education founded on the Gospel'. These remarks were, however, incidental, and the speakers avoided reference to the Government's decision to continue the grant.

After the fall of the Conservative Government the Irish Tories denounced the National System on several occasions. Rice and Sheil castigated the Irish Tories for their disapproval of what the late Government had proposed to support, and Sheil taunted them for having 'remained dumb' when Hardinge announced the decision:

'They sat in accommodating silence, office had struck them dumb, they exhibited a complaisant taciturnity, which, compared with their boisterous lamentations on the mutilation of the word of God, to which they had previously given loose, afforded proof of the facility with which their flexible consciences adapted themselves to the convenience of their political patrons.'

He described how in the Evening Mail's attack on Hardinge 'an ample compensation was made by the indignation of those over whom the Treasury had not exercised its tranquillizing sway'. Castlereagh openly admitted that the Irish Tories had held back earlier in the session in order not 'to embarrass the King's Government'. Jackson attributed his earlier silence to his ignorance of the ways of the House and to his belief that 'a year's notice' of withdrawal of the grant would be justified. He assured Sheil that even had Peel or Hardinge been proposing the vote in July 1835, 'he cared not who the Minister was, he should have risen and opposed it.' Randall Plunkett 'was convinced that the late Government had no intention to support the system of education .. longer than was necessary to enable them to substitute another for it.' Several of these speeches were made in the debate on the Supply in July 1835, when there occurred the first serious assault on the National System seen in the Commons since the stormy debates of 1832. Jackson, Plunkett, Young and a number of English Conservatives contended that many National schools were run by Catholic clergy, sited in Catholic chapel-yards, and used for the purpose of Catholic proselytism, that the Scriptures were

excluded and that, for these reasons, the system was anathema to Protestants. Jackson in particular stressed that 'it was not a system of united education, such as that which it had superseded' - the Kildare Place Society, of which he had been the Honorary Secretary for twenty years and was still a joint Secretary. He warmly defended the Society as having established 'decidedly a scriptural and united system of education.' The question was taken to a division, in which eleven
122
Irish Tories voted and four others paired against the grant.

Irish Toryism contrived, then, to continue, indeed to step up considerably, its opposition to the National System without coming into serious conflict with the Conservative leadership over its decision to retain the system. Roden felt, however, that the affair did damage relations between Peel and Irish Conservatives. Towards the end of 1835, the Conservatives of Derry, led by the Mayor, determined to invite Peel to a meeting in that city. The issue brought Londonderry and Roden into collision. They agreed as to 'the impolicy & folly' of the Derry plan, but Roden disagreed with Londonderry's proposal of a National Banquet in Dublin or, failing that, presentation of a piece of plate:

'A National Banquet in Dublin would also fail. The short time Sir Robert Peel was in power did not gain for him many political adherents and amongst my friends the line adopted on the Education question has made many many cold hearts & lukewarm supporters of a Government who sacrificed so much Principle .. the Piece of Plate would also fail, as the state of our .. clergy demands every farthing that can be spared to be applied to that object.' 123

When Londonderry expressed his dissatisfaction with this response, Roden explained,

'I cannot help thinking that you must have misunderstood my meaning as to your proposition for a National Banquet in Dublin or a Subscription for a Piece of Plate to Sir Robert Peel. I did not intend to express my own feelings on the subject, for much as I regretted the line taken by Sir Robert Peel's Government with respect to the Education Question in Ireland I feel most fully with you the importance of concealing our own opinions on certain occasions for the publick good ...but I intended to state to you confidentially the impossibility of inducing our Conservative Party to unite on such an object and with such a spirit as to make the proposed measure succeed .. at this time such propositions would fail, but I beg leave to assure you I did not wish to imply my own personal objection to them .. I only wished to convey what was my belief as to the opinions of others.' 124

The following sessions saw the National System subjected to strong attack from Conservatives in Parliament, particularly in the House of Lords. In February 1836, Roden and the Bishop of Exeter urged the inclusion in returns of the comparative number of Protestant and Catholic children at the National Schools, 'a question of such cardinal importance .. because if there was not a due proportion of Protestants educated under the system, that system could not be considered to have been successful.' They argued that Protestants had, in fact, refused to make use of the schools, and that the Commissioners withheld the information because they knew this to be the case. Regarding exclusion of the Bible, Roden said the National System 'would produce a famine of the Word of God in the land, which was the greatest curse that could be inflicted on a country.' The Government spokesmen replied that they and the Commissioners believed such returns ^{would} emphasize religious distinctions, contended that many Protestants attended National schools, and that if they did so less than proportionately it was because the number of poorer Protestants was disproportionately small. And they felt that if Protestants remained aloof through the influence of 'agitation' or their own 'fanatical enthusiasm' and 'the delusion of prejudices', it was hardly grounds for abandonment of the system.

Graham and Stanley felt that the success of the system with regard to mixed education was not of the 'cardinal importance' ascribed to it in the Lords, 'since even if it failed as a scheme of combined education, still it held out a better prospect of opening to the Catholic population access to Scriptural Knowledge and Truth than any other plan which had been before adopted or to which the Catholic Hierarchy would consent'. Graham and Primate Beresford, the latter's reasons unclear, discouraged the Bishop of Exeter when he announced that he would move for a Select Committee of the Lords to inquire into the working of the National System, and Graham claimed that the Conservative leaders were opposed 'at this moment.' Wellington approved of the intended discussion but warned

Phillipotts that a vote on the question would prove an embarrassment to the Lords if met with a vote of the lower House. Primate Beresford subsequently dissuaded the Bishop from taking a division. ¹²⁷ The Bishop proceeded with his motion, however, describing a series of defects and practical abuses in the system and claiming that as a result Protestants shunned the system, and that it followed that 'the scheme has failed.' He was supported by the English peers Harrowby and Winchilsea, by Roden and (subsequently) by Wicklow. Roden, taunted by Plunket, said that his reaction to Wellington's 'unsatisfactory' announcement in 1835 had been prevented only by the delay in receiving papers. The Bishop, as agreed with Beresford but much to the regret of Roden and Londonderry, the latter 'thoroughly disgusted' with the Tory leaders, agreed not to press the ¹²⁸ motion to a division.

In the Commons, Jackson echoed the call for an inquiry. He, Perceval, Shaw, Lefroy, Archdall and the English 'Saints' assailed the system for its virtual exclusion of Protestants through exclusion of the Bible, the use of 'garbled' extracts and the siting of schools in Catholic institutions where the teachers were monks and nuns and the Catholic catechism was permitted in the classroom. As the system was 'exclusively Roman Catholic', Jackson and Shaw 'saw no reason why Parliament should not allocate some funds for the instruction of the Protestants'. Spring Rice taunted Lefroy with the fact that the Conservative Government he had supported had upheld the system, while Wyse reminded Lefroy of 'his silence ¹²⁹ on the subject during the late Ministry.'

The ensuing recess brought out differences in the Irish Tory camp. Just as Farnham and Jackson feared that criticism of the Church Temporalities Act at the great Dublin Conservative meeting of January 1837 would alienate ^{Graham} and Stanley, so they were concerned that an attack on the National System might bring the same undesirable result. Jackson suggested to Roden that 'the Resolution as regards Education ought in prudence to be modified. We may attack its working with the utmost severity,

as a purely popish & exclusive system, but is it prudent to attack the plan generally as originally proposed by Lord Stanley? George Hamilton, the member for Dublin, was as hostile to such 'motives of expediency' in this as in the case of the Temporalities Act. Jackson, however, had his way and the meeting adopted a resolution, seconded by Jackson, condemning 'a national system of education which, in its working, is so diametrically opposed to the first duty and highest privilege of Christianity, that the Protestants of Ireland cannot conscientiously avail themselves of the advantages of the National endowment'. According to Jackson the proposal of 'united education' had 'entirely failed' as a result of Protestant hostility to an unscriptural system.

Also in January 1837 Spring Rice admitted to the King that Protestant opposition had not been without effect. The system had, he claimed, 'taken a firm root in the country' and the number of children educated in it was 'daily increasing', but its expansion was obstructed by 'party politics'. In particular the fact that the system was not 'favored by the high Protestant party' had 'led to very calamitous results and in consequence of the withdrawal of one class has given to the system not the reality but the appearance of a sectarian character.' On the 14th Primate Beresford sent Wellington a petition from the Armagh Clergy which condemned the system and asked for the endowment of schools 'to be conducted solely on Protestant principles', in effect 'separate education.' Beresford endorsed the petition. Wellington suggested in reply that he had not concurred in the decision of the last Conservative Government to continue the grant and opined that the system was 'inconsistent with, nay contrary to the very foundations of, the Reformation.' However, he was 'very much afraid' that,

'you will find all the leaders of the Conservative party, as well in the House of Lords, myself excepted, as in the House of Commons, not only pledged to support the joint system of education but Lord Stanley's plan ... there would not be the smallest chance of carrying in either House a proposition to provide for a separate education of the children of the two sects.'

At the end of the month, the Bishop of Exeter informed Roden that

Wellington had persuaded him not to renew his motion for a Select Committee until after Easter and had expressed his opinion that the Lords should not take up an offensive posture on the question. However, ¹³⁴ in February, Russell, pressed in fact by Stanley, announced that he would move for a Select Committee of the Commons, adding his own opinion that the system was 'working well'. Melbourne moved for a Committee of the Lords, conceding that the complaints made against the system required such examination and that inquiry was especially necessary before the system was extended. He was followed by the Bishop of Exeter, who defended his statements of the previous year and alleged other abuses in the system. This attack was supported by the Earl of Wicklow, who said, however, that he would approve of the system if amendments proposed by the clergy of the diocese of Derry and Raphoe were made, particularly their main proposal that children whose parents consented should have access to the Bible during normal school hours. He hoped the Protestant clergy in general would take the same line as those of Derry and Raphoe and that the compromises suggested would form the basis of their reconciliation to the ¹³⁵ system. The moderate line taken in Derry and Raphoe was, however, ¹³⁶ denounced by other clergymen and subsequently abandoned.

The Select Committee of the House of Lords took evidence from March until July 1837, and that of the Commons from April until July. Their proceedings were cut short when the King's death brought the session to a premature end, and the evidence alone was presented. A number of Irish Tory members - Shaw, Hayes, Jackson, A. Lefroy - sat on the Commons Committee, acting in effect as counsel for the prosecution, and Roden, Fitzgerald, Wicklow and Downshire represented Irish Conservatism on the Lords Committee. The evidence received from the dozens of witnesses before the two Committees was greeted by the opponents of the National System as vindication of their views. Eneas Mac Donnell, a Conservative Catholic, informed Downshire that he 'should require much and very different additional evidence to be satisfied that both Protestants and Catholics have not in turn been cheated and humbugged.' ¹³⁷

The Christian Examiner claimed that, 'The evidence before us proves that the great body of the clergy of the Established Church, of the orthodox Presbyterian ministers' and of the Irish gentry were as much opposed to the National System as ever, mainly because of its attitude to Scriptural instruction. In the Commons, Jackson urged the Government to take steps regarding 'the exclusion of the reading of the sacred Scriptures from the schools, by which great dissatisfaction was given to conscientious Protestants', and Perceval said his objections to the system were greater than ever because 'the schools had been a perfect failure as far as regarded the system of joint education.'

However, it was in the Lords that the system was most vigorously assailed, with the Bishop of Exeter again the principal figure. In May 1838, he moved that the National System had 'entirely failed' to promote mixed education, that it did not adequately provide for separate denominational instruction, that the scriptural extracts were defective and generally unused, and in general that the system 'tended to the undue encouragement of the Roman Catholic and discouragement of the Protestant religion in Ireland'. He rejected the recent amendment which permitted schools to give religious instruction at any hour of the day to children whose parents requested it, as liable to facilitate use not of the Bible but of the Catholic catechism. These points Phillipotts argued mainly from the evidence to the Select Committees; he was supported in the subsequent debate by Winchilsea, the Bishop of London, and Roden. The latter had earlier expressed to Londonderry his anxious wish to disprove rumours that his views on the National System had undergone a change.

Wellington agreed with Phillipotts on many of the above points. However, he advised the House to oppose the resolutions, saying that he felt then as he had done in Government in 1835 that the Government's attention to the better working of the system was preferable to its abandonment; and he expressed his reluctance to see the Lords brought into conflict with the Government and the other House on the issue. Two

Irish Tory peers took a similar line. Wicklow, too, accepted the validity of the charges made but, consistent with his earlier espousal of the Derry and Raphoe initiative, opposed any 'total alteration' of a system so long in operation. He thanked the Commissioners for the 'great improvement' in the rules governing religious instruction and, though this concession was attended with new dangers, he felt that, 'If some modification were made with respect to the use of catechisms and other religious books it would relieve the system from much objection and go far to satisfy the Protestant Clergy ..' He 'could not vote for a proposition which would imply censure on the commissioners'. And, while arguing that the system had proved unacceptable to Protestants, 'as a Catholic system he would admit that it did afford something like good and wholesome instruction to the children of that persuasion, such as they had never previously received.'

Lord Fitzgerald defended those who had from 'conscientious motives' opposed the system, but would oppose the resolutions 'because they imputed to the present system of national education a failure which had been partial and which might be guarded against by a different administration.' He understood the difficulties encountered in administering such a system given Ireland's religious and political divisions and felt it was 'undesirable' to proclaim it a failure and propose nothing in its stead. 'He would not abandon the hope which from the commencement he had entertained, of seeing the present system in successful operation, until every fair effort had been tried and found ineffectual.' With even the Irish Conservatives divided, and Wellington opposed, the opponents of the National System lost the subsequent division. Roden, Bandon, Lorton and several other Irish Tories voted in the minority. Downshire wrote to Wellington that he had 'laid the ground effectually for the future sound regulation of the Irish Education System.'

In October 1838 Stanley informed Graham that he still considered the National System to be defensible 'on the ground of the speciality of the

143
 case.' The Irish Tories in the Commons continued in 1839 and 1840 to snipe at the National System, and if they did not initiate the massive debates seen earlier in the Lords, they at least avoided the division revealed by the latter. They stressed particularly the system's 'exclusion' of the Scriptures and its failure as a system of mixed education because Protestant grievances had not been removed. However, it was outside Parliament that the significant developments in the history of Protestant opposition to the National System took place, with the establishment of the Church Education Society in 1839 and, in 1840, the accession of the Synod of Ulster to the National System.

From May 1838 diocesan education societies resolved in favour of the principle of affiliation to a central body. This was duly effected in February 1839 when the Church Education Society was formed to assist schools 'affording to the children of the Church instruction in the Holy Scriptures and in the Catechism and other formularies of the Church, under the direction of the Bishops and parochial clergy, and under the tuition of teachers who are members of the United Church of England and Ireland'. The Society's schools would also receive children of non-Anglican persuasions, to whom the Scriptures would be taught by the Protestant masters. The consenting Bishops of the Church would be the joint-Presidents of the Society, and it would work through the diocesan education societies. It was, then, very much a Church society, unlike that at Kildare Place. The Mail welcomed it as an antidote to the 'non-Scriptural, semi-infidel schools' of the National System.

By the first annual meeting in April 1840, the Society 'already' had 668 schools, with 33,890 children in attendance. Its lay members then included Lords Downshire, Roden, Clancarty, Mayo, Dunsany, Ormonde, Rathdowne, Courtown, Ferrard, Powerscourt and Donoughmore and, from the House of Commons, Shaw, Jackson, Conolly, Litton, Bateson, Lefroy, E. J. Shirley - all Irish Conservatives. Several of these men - namely Downshire, Clancarty, Conolly and Shaw - used the occasion of the annual

meeting for the purpose it was to serve for many years, denunciation
 146
 of the National System.

The formation of the Church Education Society drove the opponents of the National System still farther towards the dual endowment policy. The reluctance of Wellington, Fitzgerald and Wicklow in the previous year to subvert an established system indicated the improbability that the National System would be disendowed, dismantled or substantially altered even by a Conservative Government. The Church Education Society made separate endowment more practicable, and the apparent success of the Society gave some justification to the demand. Their success, too, in attracting Catholic pupils was later used, as shown below, to bolster the case, for the advocates of the Society could claim, with justice, that it was a more successful system of mixed education than the National System and therefore deserving of aid from those who supported that principle - even though the activity of the Church Education Society, drawing away Protestant pupils, contributed to the relative failure of the National System in this respect.

As early as March 1840, the Committee of the Church Education Society recommended that its supporters should petition Parliament to the effect that they 'cannot avail themselves of any system in which instruction in the Holy Scriptures is not recognized as the fundamental principle of Christian education' and therefore 'earnestly entreat your honourable house to devise such means as to your wisdom shall seem fit for affording encouragement and assistance to the schools' of the Church Education
 147
 Society. This initiative achieved only modest success in terms of the
 148
 number of petitions presented.

As indicated above, the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster opposed the National System from their first deliberations on the subject in 1832. The opposition of some of its members reached extraordinary heights of bitterness. However, impelled by the financial difficulties of the Synod's schools and seduced in the first place, by the Board's decision

to permit religious instruction at any time of the day, and, in the second, by the prospect of union with the Secession Church, a smaller Presbyterian body which had accepted the System, the Synod resolved in 1839 to seek an accommodation with the Government. And the latter were made more disposed to compromise by the combination of Mac Halite and Protestant opposition. Negotiations between August 1839 and January 1840 resulted in the affiliation of the Synod's schools on terms which involved important concessions to the Presbyterians, including denial of the right of other clergymen to give religious instruction in their schools, and provision of instruction in Presbyterian tenets to all unless a child's parents demanded his exclusion.

The accession of the Presbyterians alarmed and baffled some members of the Establishment. However, the Church Education Society met on the 19th of February 1840 and resolved that they would not be deflected in their opposition to the National System, though one member, Bishop Mant of Down, recognized that the development made Government aid for the Society's schools less likely. The Conservative press concurred in the Society's decision and reacted with some bitterness against the Synod, with the Mail and the Dublin University Magazine denouncing 'this short-sighted movement', 'this monstrous union' by which the 'romanizing Presbyterians' had 'applied the whole force and influence of their body to establish, strengthen and settle the abomination permanently in the land', at a time when the English people were awakening to the Popish tendencies of the system and when it was 'rapidly going down' as a result of Mac Hale's opposition. They were 'astonished' that the Presbyterians had concurred in giving the priests the power, exercised through the parents, to exclude the Bible. The Presbyterians had become not only abettors in the evils of the National System but had increased those evils, it was claimed, because the terms conceded to the Presbyterians would be seized upon by Catholics and Socinians to facilitate propagation of their beliefs.

The annual meeting of the Church Education Society in April saw a

more restrained reaction, particularly from Downshire who 'regretted that any difference had occurred which could cause a separation in the Protestant body.'¹⁵³ In Parliament, Lord Teignmouth, an Irish Tory Peer who sat for Marylebone, felt, with justice, that while the Synod's course left the Established Church alone bereft of Government aid, it did not render the National System one of mixed education; he said the Presbyterians, Catholics 'and other sectarians looked upon Government merely as treasury agents, bound to supply them with the means of carrying on an exclusive system of education, each according to its own particular views. Throughout the whole of Ireland it was not one combined system of education, but separate systems carried on in an exclusive manner in separate schools.' Jackson predicted, mistakenly, that 'the Government would soon find that the Synod of Ulster were dissatisfied with their system.'¹⁵⁴ Teignmouth's somewhat provocative language apart, the Synod did not come under attack in Parliament. The dispute in Ireland was a bitter one, however, and may have contributed to later differences between the two Protestant churches. At any rate, the fact of the Presbyterian accession left the Established Church in an isolated and weakened position with respect to education.¹⁵⁵

The coming to power of the Conservatives in 1841 brought renewed hope, however, that significant changes would be made in the State system of education. The growth of the Church Education Society, the 'great doubts' expressed by Peel, Graham and Wellington in 1838-9 as to the success of the existing system, and, above all, the opposition on Church principles of the Conservative leaders to the English education plan in 1839 gave Irish Conservatives grounds for such hope. And one Irish clergyman close to Primate Beresford saw Peel's remarks in the Tithe Bill debate in 1838, on 'the injustice of devoting a part of Church income to purpose of an education from which church principles are excluded,' as 'an opening for separate education, which seems after all the only practical expedient for satisfying the demands of both parties'.¹⁵⁷ Beresford

initially advised the clergy to give the new Government time to prepare
 its proposals, advice endorsed by the Evening Mail.¹⁵⁸ However in November
 1841, Beresford informed the Lord Lieutenant of the 'very strong feeling
 amongst the clergy upon the subject' and his 'difficulty in keeping them
¹⁵⁹
 back'.

In the subsequent debate within the Government, Graham, Fitzgerald,
 De Grey and Baron Foster all agreed that the system had failed as one of
 mixed education. However, Graham and Stanley were 'by no means ready to
 renounce' a system which had given Catholics as good an education, in the
 Scriptures especially, as one could imagine the priesthood allowing, and
 Stanley also prized the instances, few though they were, where mixed
 education had been established. Graham feared that changes might cause
 the system 'to degenerate into a system of pure Roman Catholic Education,
 in my judgement infinitely more objectionable than the instruction based
 on the Scriptures, which is now in use'. Stanley regretted the warmth of
 the clergy's views and their failure to mould the 'flexible' system, as
 the Presbyterians had done, to ensure Scriptural education for their own
 flocks. But both were ready, if the clergy insisted, to give a separate
 grant to Protestant education. De Grey and Fitzgerald agreed, the latter
 explicitly endorsing Beresford's demand for endowment of the Church
¹⁶⁰
 Education Society.

Peel advised inquiry, particularly into Beresford's assertion that
 the National System had failed to promote mixed education. He felt that
 endowment of the Church Education Society 'may become absolutely necessary'
 and, given the failings of the National System, involve no aggravation of
 'the evil of separate and distinct education on account of different
 religious tenets. But I think it is pretty clear that the adoption of
 that suggestion will at once ensure in Ireland the establishment of two
 systems. One will be in the hands of the Roman Catholic and the other
 of the Protestant clergy. One will be for the separate instruction of
 Roman Catholics, the other of Protestants', perhaps 'engendering fresh

161

causes of religious animosity'. Important figures in the Administration, then, either advocated separate endowment or were prepared seriously to consider that option.

The Irish Protestants proceeded to air their views. The Rev. Robert Mo Ghee, as well as writing privately to Fitzgerald, began in December a series of four public letters to Stanley in which he assailed the anti-Scriptural National System and warned the Government that their Irish supporters would not allow political factors to affect their opposition

162

to the system. It was suggested in the January issue of the Christian Examiner that the Protestant clergy would accept assistance from the National Board if the latter ceased to make any stipulation as to the religious instruction to be given in the schools, that the Board should concern itself only with secular education. Lord Courtown, writing to Peel, attributed the article to the Rev. Robert Daly, like Mo Ghee an evangelist. Courtown objected to the offering of 'a literary education to the country, without in any way recognizing the Established Church, but on the contrary merely tolerating it, as it would any other religion'. He felt that 'the recognition of the Established Church' was 'the principle which ought to govern any education in this country', that accordingly 'a sum should be appropriated expressly for the schools of the Established Church in every parish: and that another sum should be given in aid of another school in every parish, where a literary education might be procured', though he would allow 'the clergy of different persuasions' to attend the latter schools 'at stated days and hours'.

163

Though Courtown was especially explicit that there must be preferment of the Established Church, it is important to note that simple endowment of the Church Education Society also involved such preferment. The Rev. J. C. Martin also rejected the Christian Examiner plan, in a series of public letters. He demanded endowment of the schools of the Church in a manner which would not involve connecting the Church with 'any partially unscriptural system.' But when the Committee of the Church Education

164

Society threatened in January 1842 to renounce any such connection
Beresford put it to the Secretaries,

'whether it is not injurious to the interests of the Society to raise a discussion on a question which is so completely problematical, & for the determination of which a necessity may never arise. Any division of opinion among the friends of Church Education .. might have a disastrous effect on the prospects of the Society. And I cannot but think that it is beyond the province of the Committee to decide such a question: for it would seem to me that the sanction of a General meeting of the Society would be necessary for declining an overture from the Government, were the Government disposed, of which I see no appearance, 165 to make such an offer as the Committee are about so prematurely to discuss'.

The Committee duly abandoned their original intention and adopted resolutions which rather obscured the issue. These resolutions were to be sent to the various Diocesan Church Education Societies as 'a model form of petition' to Parliament. They were essentially the same as those adopted for that purpose in 1840, involving denunciation of the National System and the request that Parliament should devise means for affording
166
assistance to the Society. Mc Ghee also rejected the Christian Examiner proposal and demanded completely separate endowment of the Church Society, but Fitzgerald differed: 'The plan of united education has failed and may not succeed, but a separate Board would make any approximation not
167
difficult but hopeless.'

Some of the differences in the Protestant camp were emphasized in a letter, published in pamphlet form, which the Protestant Dean of Achonry sent to Stanley in February 1842. The Dean, a supporter of the National System, discriminated between those clergy who believed the catechism of the State Church should be taught to all sects in the schools under their control; those who, taking the line of the Kildare Place Society, wished to have the Scriptures read without note or comment and to exclude catechisms; and those, currently predominant, who would have Anglican doctrine taught to Anglicans and the Scriptures to all sects, as expounded by Anglican masters, the arrangement in the Church Education Society. With regard to endowment, he felt that not even the warmest supporter of the Church Education Society wished their society

to be the sole recipient of public aid. But the Church Education Society was divided between those who wanted all grants withdrawn, those who would have the Church Education Society endowed alongside the National System, and finally, those who proposed endowment without any requirement as to religious instruction.

168

In February 1842 Anthony Blake, a Commissioner, wrote to Peel of the tendency of the National System 'to afford the only means of friendly intercourse between the Government and the great mass of the people' and the only means of purging young Protestants and Catholics of 'sectarian bile'. Separate endowment of Protestant schools would undermine the beneficial effects of mixed education. Perhaps more important, because of his position and because his argument did not involve dubious assumptions as to the present or future success of mixed education, Archbishop Whately wrote on the subject at the end of January to the Bishop of Keath, which letter Blake forwarded to Peel. Whately hoped the extent of the National System, with its 3,000 schools, would dissuade the Government from altering the system. He felt that any change would be harmful because it would raise fears and hopes of further change, and the Commissioners were accordingly united against any concession, including Government support for the Church Education Society.

169

'If the proposal of Government aid to any such Education Society were acceded to, I should consider that as a dismissal of myself (& so would probably several others of the Commissioners.) .. It would be too monstrous a thing to be thought of that a protestant church, which has endowments & to which not a tenth of the poorest classes belong, should have an education grant for the exclusive training of children in its principles & that the Roman Catholics, who have no endowments & who comprise the great bulk of the poor population, should have none for themselves. A separate grant therefore for educating children in their own principles they would doubtless demand, & with perfect justice ... With what force could we insist on the fundamental law of our Board that the schools should be so conducted as not to exclude children of any religious denomination when a Government grant was made to exclusive protestant schools. I could not for a moment maintain what would, then, be so flagrantly unjust a regulation. The Education Board therefore would be at once virtually handed over to the exclusive control of the Roman Catholics; & I accordingly should feel myself an intruder if I even attempted to interfere any further'. 170

This letter must have strengthened the fears expressed by Peel and

Graham the previous November that endowment of the Church's schools would render the National a Catholic system of education. Given Peel's determination to postpone a decision on the education question, he cannot have been greatly pleased when two of his recent appointees, Solicitor-General Jackson and Sergeant Warren, publicly attacked the unscriptural National System in Dublin in February 1842. Jackson felt it was wrong that Parliament should (in effect) endow Catholic education almost exclusively. And the City of Dublin returned a Conservative, William Gregory, who was pledged against the National System.

171

On the 3rd of March 1842, Baron Foster wrote to Fitzgerald that he found much good in the National System - the extent of its operations, the quality of its instruction, and so on - and noted that the Primate had not proposed that the System as such should be altered, only that the Church Education Society should be endowed. 'The great practical objection which is felt and urged against (the National Schools) .. is that in fact they are doing little or almost nothing for the Protestants of the Established Church ... if this state of things is to continue the effects within twenty years will be .. that the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland will become the educated fraction of our population, and that the Protestants of the Established Church will become the comparatively uneducated portion of it', reversing the traditional position. To avert 'so great and so extraordinary an evil' he recommended endowment of the Church Education Society, alongside the National System. Fitzgerald concurred in this conclusion, feeling that the National System had benefited Catholics, but not Protestants, and though the clergy's repudiation of the System was regrettable, 'the protestant peasantry ought not to be left to suffer. And the consequences to that portion of our population which Foster points out are most important'.

172

Peel, however, decided 'to make the usual grant in the usual form this session', expressing reluctance to give two grants to two separate systems and confessedly confirmed in the view that 'the utmost caution

is necessary' by the letters from Blake and Whately. 'We might have an education flame in Ireland which would soon spread to all other combustibles' ¹⁷³. Wellington, Graham and Stanley concurred in the wisdom of continuing the grant for that year; Stanley appeared, indeed, to have decided against separate endowment in principle, as it would break up the existing Board and cause 'widespread dissatisfaction among the best portion of the Roman Catholics & Presbyterians of Ireland' ¹⁷⁴.

The Irish Conservatives continued to act with considerable patience. When, on the 10th of March, Wellington refused to commit the Government to any course, the Mail was satisfied and remained confident of such changes as would meet the Protestant grievance. ¹⁷⁵ The Mail's optimism was not diminished when on the 21st Shaw asked if the Government intended to give Church schools 'a due proportion of the funds' provided for education and was told that the Government would include the grant in the next estimates 'without proposing any alteration in the principles which had regulated its distribution' ¹⁷⁶. Shaw did not comment. The Mail took the same confident line at the beginning of April when, looking forward to the annual meeting of the Church Education Society, 'on which almost wholly depend the fortunes of Scriptural education in Ireland', they rejoiced at the success of the Society, with its growing number of schools and pupils, Protestant and Catholic, and commented that,

'The Legislature has not been pleased to signify (as yet) any sympathy with these exertions to maintain pure Scriptural instruction in Ireland. We cannot think it will be long thus. It is morally impossible that an honest and conscientious Government can be so infected with the wretched liberalism which they themselves profess to discountenance as deliberately to devote the whole educational funds of the country to an institution which the Church of Ireland has for ten years solemnly refused to admit. Whatever they are to do with the "National Board" we do ask, is it common equity or justice to make it the sole and exclusive depository of the public contributions to education?' ¹⁷⁷

At the meeting the Committee reported that the Society had more than 1200 schools, attended by nearly 70,000 children, 20,000 of them Catholics. In some areas, however, the clergy were the sole or principal contributors to the Society; in some cases teachers had had their salaries

reduced or even withdrawn; and the lack of funds severely restricted their teacher-training and inspection activities. The Committee concluded that the 'scantiness' of their means impeded progress and hoped 'that the time is not far distant' when Parliament would grant them assistance; they could not doubt that a Society patronized by most of the prelacy, devoted to Scriptural education, and providing education so extensively to Catholics as well as Protestants, would 'meet countenance and support from a Christian Government'. The same hope and expectation was voiced in almost all of the subsequent speeches, as were the ritualized claims that the National System was unscriptural, did not provide a mixed education of Protestants and Catholics, and did not recognize the special position due to the clergy of the Established Church.

Two of the speeches were especially noteworthy. George Hamilton, temporarily out of Parliament, felt that Peel's accession to power might prove 'a little embarrassing' and require Irish Tories, if disappointed, to evince 'the greatest temper, the greatest forbearance, the greatest patience; but .. it is not the less .. our duty to stand by our principles and to express our conscientious convictions temperately, firmly, emphatically'. Shaw said he was 'disappointed and grieved' at Eliot's answer to him in the House, but urged Conservatives 'to give a general, though not a servile, support to the present Government'. He excused the Government's inaction on several grounds, chief of which he felt was the failure of the Church to agree on and propose a single, practicable plan for alteration of the existing system.

Shaw went on to argue that endowment of the Church Education Society while 'leaving the present board as the national society for the education of the people' would tend 'to unestablish the established church and place it in the light of a sect', and virtually abrogate the Church's 'legitimate right' to be 'the guardians and superintendents of the education of the whole people'. And, as he felt that the State had a religious duty to insist on some degree of Scriptural instruction, he was 'startled' by the

proposal that the Board should endow secular education and leave religious instruction to the discretion of individual patrons. He wished instead to assimilate the practices of England and Ireland, to extend the charter of, and increase the grant to, the (Anglican) National Society to enable it to support the church schools of Ireland; while the National Board should be modified so as to perform the function of the (Dissenters') British and Foreign School Society, for 'objectionable as he considered the present board, his wish was not to be abolish the board until a better substitute was provided for it. He would not deprive his Roman Catholic brethren of the means of educating their children .. but he would claim for the schools in connexion with the established church .. a due share of the public funds granted for national education in this country, and a due preponderance for the church and her ministers in its general superintendence.'

178

Beresford called on Peel on the 1st of June to urge just such a settlement as Shaw suggested, claiming that the leaders of the National Society had agreed to his proposal 'to extend the sphere of action of the National Society for Education.. to Ireland, and to incorporate the separate Church Society now existing in Ireland with the extended National Society'. Graham and De Grey, the latter especially, regarded the idea with some favour, while Goulburn had doubts. But the most forthright reaction came from Chief Secretary Eliot. He felt all would regard adoption of the plan as 'a virtual abandonment' of the National System. This which would please most of the Protestant clergy and gentry and the Mac Halite Catholics, 'but a large portion of the moderate members of both Churches would see with regret such a blow struck at the National Board, under the management of which the great mass of the poor children in Ireland are now receiving an education not only more sound & scriptural than it could have been hoped that the Roman Catholics would tolerate, but an education .. excellent in itself.' And Whately and Dickinson would resign from the Board, leaving it 'almost exclusively

179
 Roman Catholic.' Peel's reply to Beresford deferred a decision and stated that 'many of the objections which would be urged against a separate vote .. would be urged against the proposal .. and the practical result of the two measures would not be very dissimilar.' Beresford was evidently very disappointed with 'the unfavourable tenor' of Peel's letter and again urged endowment of the Church schools. 180

On the 21st of June, Beresford presented petitions sponsored by the Church Education Society, from 441 clergy in four dioceses, and, with Downshire, again presented the Society's expanding role as an educator of both Protestants and Catholics as justification for its endowment out of public funds. Clancarty, too, some days later, supported the prayer of petitions which condemned the National System and requested endowment of the Church Education Society. To the satisfaction of the Dublin Evening Mail he reminded Ministers of their 'recorded sentiments' in Opposition and spoke of 'the support and encouragement due to the religion of the state'. 181 There were, in fact, several dozen petitions presented in 1842, from Ireland, praying for 'encouragement and assistance to schools in connection with the Church Education Society.' 182 These, it was later claimed, were signed by 888 clergymen and 25,000 laymen of the Established Church. 183 In addition, nearly one thousand clergy of the Established Church signed an Address to the Prime Minister, which Jackson transmitted to Peel in July 1842. It stated that,

'in a Land blessed with a revelation from the Almighty, no system of Education of the People can be right which shall not have for its object the communication of the great Truths thus revealed ... The details we would leave to the wisdom of the Government, but we beg leave to state that with the adoption of the principle we have suggested the present system of National Education in Ireland is utterly at variance and as such ought to be abandoned; its distinguishing characteristic being the very opposite of that which we would advocate, excluding from its Schools the written word of God ...' 184

On the 15th of July Carbery, Wicklow, Clancarty and Beresford criticized the National System in the Lords and advocated assistance for the Church Education Society. However, it was in the other House, on the same day, that the storm clouds finally burst. When the vote for the grant

for Irish education came up in the Commons, John Plumptre of Kent East objected on the grounds that 'very few Protestants could feel themselves justified in sending their children to schools under the present system.' He was supported by Anthony Lefroy, who referred approvingly to the petitions of the Irish clergy for a share in the grant, by Captain Jones, who said the National System was 'a complete failure', with Protestants remaining aloof 'because the Scriptures were not used in a complete form', and by the Tory member for Argyll, Alexander Campbell. Eliot then made a remarkable speech, accusing these members of 'gross misrepresentation' regarding the nature of religious instruction in the National schools, and suggesting that the Protestant clergy promoted the Protestant boycott against the wishes of the parents, a boycott which he contended was not successful. He praised the way in which the schools were run and pointed to the increasing number of children in attendance. He 'could not admit that the system was in any respect a failure .. under all the circumstances of Ireland, a system better adapted to the wants of the people of that country could not be adopted.'

This speech brought about the extraordinary spectacle of the Irish Solicitor-General rising to reply to the Chief Secretary. Jackson defended the Kildare Place Society and claimed that the national system had failed to secure its professed object, mixed education, with Protestants and Catholics in almost exclusive schools, and that, 'The great mass of the Protestant people of Ireland were opposed to this... system, both clergy and laity.' The clergy 'could not conscientiously participate in any plan of education from which the Scriptures were excluded. Were they to be censured for this conscientious disapproval of these national schools? Did they merit the rebukes bestowed on them by the noble Lord? It was in the highest degree creditable to them, in his judgement, that they did withhold their countenance and support from such a system of national education ...'

Jackson urged the Government and Parliament 'to reconsider the whole

question' and hoped that 'at least some portion' of the grant might be applied to education conducted upon 'sound principles .. is it fitting that the only portion of the community practically excluded from the benefit of the public educational funds should be the humble Protestants of Ireland and those Roman Catholics who wish to obtain scriptural instruction? This ought not to be so ..' He would not vote against the grant, as the Board had made engagements on the assumption it would be passed. The Irish Conservatives taking part (Jackson abstained) voted 185 unanimously for the grant. However, Wyse wrote that the Irish Tories supported Jackson 'fiercely' 186. In the House on the 18th of July, Gregory of Dublin disapproved of the unscriptural National System and of the 'unnecessary' and 'unworthy' slight cast by Eliot on the Protestant clergy. 187 And Peel found on his return to London 'a disagreeable feeling prevalent among our Irish friends' as a result of the 'unfortunate debate and collision of sentiment' between Eliot and Jackson. 188

Eliot's speech produced a still more furious riposte from the Evening Mail, who protested strongly at Eliot's 'wanton and impolitic censure' of the Protestant clergy and urged his dismissal. The Mail expressed 'the disappointment of the Protestants of Ireland' in the National System, a failing concern, but were still quite confident of eventual redress in the form of a divided grant. 189 Stanley, speaking in the wake of the Eliot-Jackson collision, praised the National System and was evidently in sympathy with Eliot. 190 Graham was annoyed with both Eliot and Jackson. 191 Wellington apparently complained to Eliot about 'a discrepancy between my (Eliot's) language & that of the Lord Primate on the subject of National Education in Ireland.' 192 The Mail carried a report, unconfirmed, that Eliot had been admonished by the Cabinet, and claimed that it was an intimation of this which had headed off a plan by the Irish Tory members, supported by British members, to protest in the House against Eliot's conduct. 193

Eliot again played an important role when he opposed De Grey's

suggestion of Dr. Elrington as Bishop of Meath on the grounds that the appointment of such an 'active, able & uncompromising foe' of the National System as successor to Dickinson, a member of the Board, would 'be generally looked on as a declaration of war against that system. The result would be increased agitation on the subject & consequently increased difficulty in resisting the change which is even now so vehemently demanded by a large body of the Protestant clergy.' Peel duly expressed his opposition to the appointment of Elrington if the latter had taken 'a public and prominent part' against the National System, adding that, given their decision to continue the grant for the moment, 'we must take care that our practical demonstrations are not at variance with our professions.' And Graham felt that Jackson's attack on the National System was an additional factor:

'after that speech from a Law Officer of the Crown in Ireland, the promotion of Dr. Elrington would lead to the secession of the Archbishop of Dublin from the Commission and to a battle royal on the ground of Education which .. is a weak point in our position; and having determined to defend it we must avoid any appearance of irresolution.' 194

De Grey give way on the Elrington question. He also urged Graham to decide soon on the National System, as it was 'a millstone about our necks till it is decided - though I think you may decide as you deem best without fear of consequence.' Eliot, on his return to Ireland, sent Peel an important letter in which he urged the denial of bishoprics to opponents of the National System, 'unless the Government were prepared to abandon the present system', and complained that the lay and clerical appointments to date had led the people to conclude 'that the Government though not bold enough to attempt openly to overturn the system is yet willing to undermine it'. He 'should be sorry to see the working of the present system checked', for Catholics received under it 'a sounder & better education than they would accept under any other', while that education was also available to Protestants if they would accept it. He would regret 'any material change' in the system because any concession to the Protestant clergy would be exploited by Mac Hale: 'we would sound the

alarm & awaken the suspicions of the great body of the Roman Catholics.' And a separate grant to the Church Education Society would, he thought, allow all Anglicans to move their children from the National Schools :

'the National Schools .. would be appropriated entirely to the Roman Catholic children and the doctrines of that Church would be taught in them at the expense of the State, a little Maynooth in every parish. The attempt to bring up together the young of both persuasions would thus be at once & for ever abandoned and the establishment of rival schools in every parish would increase the religious animosity which already exists.'

And the Presbyterians would demand a separate grant, for though reconciled to the System they would 'consider themselves aggrieved' if the Church was 'placed on a different footing from them.' 198

Impatience and alarm were manifested in the Mail at the beginning of August 1842. 199 The education issue featured prominently in the controversial University by-election campaign of August-September 1842, when George Hamilton's opposition to the National System and to the Maynooth grant were regarded in the Press as the issues on which he and the Government differed. Indeed Hamilton himself, in his Address to the Electors, based his candidature on these issues. 200 Protestant feeling against Maynooth and the National System was considered in Government circles to be detrimental to the chances of the Government candidate. 201 But Graham and Peel preferred that their candidate, who eventually withdrew, 'did not at once come into Parliament than that he should carry the seat for the University by any pledge on the subject of Education inconsistent with our cautious and prudent reserve on this tender question'. 202 It was also claimed that Litton, the member for Coleraine, and Sergeant Warren were overlooked for the post of Solicitor-General because of their opposition to the National System, which was, indeed, partly true in the case of Warren. 203 204

Primate Beresford's charge to the clergy of Armagh on the 15th of September brought things to a head. He took the customary line on the unscriptural National System and its failure as a mixed system, described the success of the Church Education Society and its lack of adequate

funds, and stated his expectation that the Government 'would make some change'. The Mail endorsed Beresford's views and shared his confidence that 'reparation' would be made; they agreed too in not insisting on withdrawal of the grant to the National System. On the 1st of October, Beresford sent Peel a printed report of his charge and expressed his 'earnest hope' that the Government would give the question 'their early consideration' and would devise some means of assisting the Church schools, 'which stand in very great need of pecuniary assistance'. Several weeks later, Beresford sent a second letter, an impassioned plea for aid for the Church schools. The latter's lack of funds would drive Anglican children to the National Schools, where, superintended as most of them were by Catholics and Dissenters, their minds would be given 'a bias against the Established Church.' Thus 'Government aid is working wholly against the interest of the Established Church, & in favour of Popery & Dissent.' He again urged endowment of the Church schools by means of extension of the English National Society. Raising the proportion of Catholics and Presbyterians on the National Board might, he felt, be sufficient to induce these sects to be satisfied with the National System even after separate endowment of the Church schools; but even if the Board broke up the situation would be no worse than the present 'were the Roman Catholics to get a separate grant for the advancement of mere literary instruction in their schools.' No such restriction was envisaged, of course, in the schools of the Church.

Beresford's charge and the University by-election row induced Graham to press for a decision of the Cabinet on the question of separate endowment of the Church Education Society. And De Grey again urged some solution of the question, which was 'a source of perpetual embarrassment', particularly regarding appointments; he was clearly of the opinion that the Protestants were irrevocably alienated from the National System, and Peel suspected that he revived the idea of a Commission of Inquiry in the hope that its report would prove unfavourable to it.

The Cabinet met on the 8th of November 1842 and decided against any change in the system of education in Ireland, Peel, in whose reasoning
209
Graham, Stanley and Eliot were in full agreement, was evidently impressed by the extent to which the National System had diffused instruction among the 'poorer classes' in Ireland, particularly among the Catholic population. A separate Protestant grant would stir up 'religious discord' in Ireland and would lead inevitably to endowment of a Catholic system of education, through evolution of the National System, where Catholic doctrines would be taught. This he was sure would be objected to by all who opposed the grant to Maynooth. Such a system he himself felt would be more objectionable than the present, with its large proportion of Protestant Commissioners and in which, overlooking individual instances of abuse, many Catholics received 'a good literary education', encouraging 'the hope of preparing the way for purer and sounder religious principles, by dispelling ignorance and provoking a spirit of inquiry'. And the Presbyterians would require a separate vote for Presbyterian education on seeing the Established Church so aided and on seeing the increasingly Catholic character which the National System would acquire.

He repudiated the assertion that the National System excluded religious instruction and regretted that the Protestant clergy had themselves given force to the objection by failing to use the facilities for such instruction and declining to take an active part in superintending the schools. If religious objections proved 'insuperable', he could not but think, 'considering the revenues of the Church in Ireland, the extent of the possessions of Protestant proprietors and the comparatively limited number of Protestant children for whom gratuitous education is required, that provision might be made for the giving of such education through voluntary exertions.' He contended that a united education would 'counteract the noxious influence of religious bigotry' and was unwilling to contemplate 'the abandonment of all hope ...

'... The great object, at least a great object, is to extend the principle of united education .. by gradually conciliating the confidence

and good will of some of the clergy of the Established Church and inducing them to take that active part in connection with the schools in their immediate neighbourhood which I sincerely wish had been more generally taken at the outset of the experiment.'

In more general terms he hoped that the 'decisive, the exclusive support of the Government' to the National System would 'recommend it to favour among many who have hitherto regarded it with coldness and distrust.'

210

In sum, the decision of Peel and his Cabinet owed much to their realization that they could not consider the merits of an endowment of Church schools in isolation, without looking too at the position of the National System - its achievements, its prospects if maintained and encouraged, and, if the Protestant schools were endowed, its likely future as a Catholic religious system.

In correspondence with Peel, Beresford expressed his 'disappointment & regret' at the decision but accepted that it would not be reversed and confined himself largely to 'the wretched quibble', as Graham described it, as to whether or not the Commissioners of 1812 envisaged endowment of only one system of education. He assured Peel he would try to induce his clergy 'to avoid every appearance of opposition to the Government, or any hostility of feeling against Her Majesty's Ministers on account of the decision ... All noisy agitation upon the subject shall, as far as in my power to prevent it, be avoided.' The decision was announced at the end of November in the form of a circular letter from Beresford and seven other Protestant bishops, as Presidents, to the local secretaries of the Church Education Society. It expressed 'unfeigned regret' but considered it 'most in accordance with the respect which is due and which they are anxious to show, to Her Majesty's Government, to abstain from any further expression of their feelings on the occasion. And to the Members of the Society, who must share in these feelings, they earnestly recommend the same forbearance in expressing them.' They hoped advocacy of the cause of the Society would not involve denunciation of the Government's course. A subsequent appeal for funds from the Committee of the Society duly combined

expressions of disappointment with concurrence in the advice of the
 212
 bishops as to abstention "from every exciting and irritating topic".

The Mail were not disposed, however, to show forbearance in the face of such 'disheartening, disappointing, melancholy' tidings. They argued that the Conservative leaders, once in office, had grown 'enamoured of Popery ... we have a Conservative Government acting on Whig principles.' They roundly denounced Peel, harking back to his role in carrying Emancipation and describing the 'fool's paradise of expectations' he and others in the Cabinet had created by their speeches in Opposition. Eliot, too, was singled out, for having, by his speech of the previous July, 'pledged the entire Ministry' to the course eventually taken. The Mail claimed that only two Tory journals - The Standard in England and The Evening Packet in Ireland, both of them habitually loyal to the Government - supported the decision, and quoted several English
 213
 Tory papers in opposition. The Rev. Robert McGhee again took up his
 214
 pen to denounce the unscriptural National System.

As well as Beresford, Peel received at this time letters on the education question from two other notable Irish Conservatives, Lord Clancarty and the member for Tyrone, Henry Corry. Clancarty wrote what
 215
 Peel described as 'a very long and vehement letter', prior to receiving news of the Cabinet decision, in which he reviewed the Protestant grievances against the National System and lamented that the Government had left the Church 'in the position of a dissenting sect' regarding education, 'contrary to all expectation & in disregard of the feelings & representations of the Clergy.' Though the latter would take an independent line if necessary, 'it is not in opposition to the State that the State religion can or ought to be upheld.' He saw the National System as a bar to the extension of the Protestant religion and, viewing the question 'in a political light', thought that the System encouraged the religion which was hostile to the Union and undermined 'the great bond of union between England & Ireland', the Established Church. He proposed

endowment of the Church Education Society and of a system of secular instruction for non-Anglicans, by which arrangement 'the State would recognize the giving of sound Religious Education upon the principles of the National Church .. The only Religious Education receiving the direct support of the State would be that of the Church Established by the State.' In mid-December, he wrote again to 'most deeply deplore' the Government's decision and to assert the duty of the State to uphold the education in the principles of the Established Church of its members and the instruction in the Scriptures of all who would receive it.

The letters from Henry Corry were perhaps an even better illustration of the importance of the education issue to Irish Conservatives, for Corry was not only relatively moderate in his politics but, as a Lord of the Admiralty, was protesting against the policy of the Administration of which he was a member. He favoured continuation of the grant to the National System as 'the least objectionable' system the Catholics would accept, but urged the 'sacred obligation' to teach Protestant doctrine to Protestant children and to show 'that preference to one recognized creed which is an essential principle of an established religion. The system now in force, so far from showing any such preference, practically excludes the members of the Establishment, by offering them the means of instruction only on conditions which few of them will accept, and with which the conscientious scruples of by far the greater part of the clergy (whose superintendence is of indispensable importance to a sound religious education) will not permit them to cooperate.' The Government should 'recognize the duty of the State to promote in Ireland, as it does in England, education in the doctrines and discipline of the Established Religion.' He would support any such proposal in Parliament even against the wishes of the Government and was prepared, if Peel wished, to resign his office in the Administration.

Peel honoured him with a long exposition of his views on the question, which increased Corry's awareness of the difficulties involved but did

little to convince him; dealing with each point in Peel's reply, he contended that the Protestant clergy were justified in their rejection of the system, that, whether right or wrong, their having done so made the National schools unfit for Protestants, that Protestant proprietors could not provide an education to the standard of the National System, that there was not 'the slightest hope' of attaining mixed education, that the demand, subsequent to endowment of the Church schools, for separate Catholic and Presbyterian system could be resisted on the ground that a 'preference' was owed to the State religion. He fully approved of Beresford's determination to avoid opposition to 'a Government whose strength and stability I believe to be identical with the best interests of the country' and would, if asked, advise the friends of Church education against agitation of the question in Parliament. A notable feature of the correspondence of both Corry and Clancarty was the emphasis, less marked in Parliamentary debates, on the right of the Protestant Church to preferential treatment at the hands of the State.

In February 1843, George Hamilton, on being elected to Parliament by the University, reiterated his opposition to the National System on the issue of exclusion of the Bible and called on the Church Education Society to stand firm on the Scriptural principle :

'However anxious we may be to uphold and support the Government, however alive to the necessity and to the duty of supporting it, it seems to me our duty in this respect to offer them our respectful but firm opposition, not with the desire of embarrassing them, or weakening them, or displacing them; but feeling that we have truth on our side, with the hope that they may be induced to reconsider and alter their views upon this important subject.'

He also endorsed the Bishops' call for forbearance, adding that, 'As a warm and sincere friend of the present administration, however I may feel disappointed, .. I should be the last to throw discredit upon their motives. On the contrary, I feel very strongly and acknowledge readily, the difficulties with which such a question is surrounded'. Captain Maxwell, too, used the occasion of his election to Parliament, for Cavan, to attack the National System. At the end of February, speaking on

Ashley's motion on education in England, Shaw regretted that the Government did not show the same regard for the Established Church in Ireland as they did that in England, a sentiment which was echoed by the Evening Mail, who complained that 'the Church of Ireland is quite thrown overboard, and the poor boon of educating the children of their own creed harshly refused them.' Even the moderate Tory Lord Caledon showed that the Government's course did not affect his rejection of the National System, when he agreed to subscribe to and affiliate the schools on his estate to the Church Education Society.

However, the Irish Conservatives in Parliament, apart from Shaw's brief interjection, held their fire until the grant came before the Committee of Supply on the 7th of April 1843. Shaw then protested that 'while the state respected and made provision for the scruples of those who dissented from the Established Church, it had disregarded the conscientious objections of the members of the Church and refused all educational aid to the poor children of her communion.' He reiterated the familiar arguments against the National System, the restriction on the use of the Scriptures, the failure to promote mixed education; 'with scarcely an exception .. the Members of the Established Church derived no aid from the national grant.' He 'did not say the National Board gave the best possible education even to Roman Catholics and other Dissenters; but still, as regarded them, until a better could be provided, he did not desire the abolition of the present board - all he asked was, that the schools connected with the church should receive at least some share of Parliamentary bounty and support', possibly through union of the Church Education Society and the National Society of England. The Government's decision 'had been the source of deep disappointment and mortification to the Irish clergy and the friends of the Church in Ireland.'

Grogan, Jones, Bernard, George Hamilton and Anthony Lefroy followed in similar vein, though only Jones was so explicit that endowment of the Church Education Society was all that they then required. It was probably

the most formidable protest by Irish Tory members against Conservative Government policy before the Maynooth controversy of 1845. The Evening Mail praised their efforts, though regarding them as hopeless; endorsed their views on the education question, including Shaw's assertion that the Church did not demand withdrawal of aid to the National System; and stated that they were 'truly disgusted' with the Government's attitude, which, they felt, was further justification for their call for 'an Irish Parliamentary party' to protect the interests of Ireland even, or especially, against the Conservative Government.

Frimate Beresford headed the list of signatories to a petition from the clergy of Armagh calling for aid to the Church Education Society, undaunted by the Government's decision and 'their tyrant majority', as the Mail put it; the petitioners claimed it was 'inconsistent' with English practice and 'unjust and oppressive' to refuse aid to their Society when the National System was objectionable to the Protestant clergy and a less successful system of mixed education than the Church Society. A considerable number of such petitions were sent to Parliament from Irish dioceses and parishes in the Spring and Summer of 1843, and others prayed for withdrawal of the grant from the National System. George Hamilton was active in encouraging the preparation of such petitions. Clancarty presented petitions in June 1843 in favour of endowment of the Church Education Society and supported their prayer in much the same terms as he had used in his letters to Peel.

Apart from the debate in the Commons, the most serious protest made was at the annual meeting of the Church Education Society in April 1843. On that occasion, Beresford asked the participants to speak of the Government 'with moderation and forbearance', which advice did not prevent the expression of disappointment with the recent decision and denunciation of the National System by most of the speakers, with Clancarty and the Evening Mail particularly critical of the Government. A number of Irish Tories attacked the National System and the Government's refusal of aid

to the Church Education Society in remarks incidental to discussion of
 227
 general Irish policy in 1843-4. But the intensity of the controversy
 diminished somewhat after the Irish Protestants had recorded their
 initial disappointment. Indeed the Dean of Achonry thought in April 1843
 that opposition to the National System was 'very much on the decline.
 The Protestant gentry are becoming more favourable .. the younger clergy
 of the Established Church are disposed to give the subject an
 228
 unprejudiced consideration ...'

By February 1844 Peel and Graham felt that 'the time has arrived
 when the favor of the Government must be extended to clergymen of the
 Established Church who will aid in promoting' the National System, which
 'may not have succeeded' as 'a scheme of mixed education' but 'as a
 scheme of spiritual instruction for a Roman Catholic population' was
 'eminently successful'. The Government proceeded to increase the grant
 to the system and subsequently agreed to incorporate the National Board
 as 'the most conclusive public demonstration of the unalterable will of
 the Crown on this disputed subject ..(it) would cut off all hope of
 future successful opposition ..(and) the attempts to undermine or to
 229
 overthrow the System will .. be abandoned in despair.' The Evening Mail
 protested venomously when it was rumoured that the Government intended
 230
 to favour friends of the National System. And in July 1844 several Tory
 members, three of them Irish, responded to the proposed grant increase
 with criticism of the system and demands for endowment of the Church
 schools. Wicklow subsequently asserted, however, that 'he believed that
 the system was good and that the feeling against it on the part of the
 231
 clergy was diminishing.'

With the appointment of Lord Heytesbury in July 1844 the Government
 had a Lord Lieutenant who agreed fully with the need to discriminate
 against opponents of the system in the distribution of Church patronage.
 He pursued this policy rigorously, though, so unpopular was the system
 among the clergy, he found it no easy task to find clergymen favourable
 to the system who were not disqualified on other (political or professional)

232
 grounds. The Government's inflexibility was also evident in their refusal to make changes in the system to meet Protestant scruples; in 1844-5 several clergymen, the Bishop of Meath in particular, strove to obtain changes in certain aspects of the system, but all such proposals were deemed contrary to the principles of the system and liable to alienate the Catholics, and the negotiations with the Bishop ended in
 233
 some acrimony.

Also at this time a number of clergymen publicly advocated the Church's recourse to the system, pointing to the hopelessness of continued opposition and the disadvantages it brought to Protestant children, and contending that the rules of the system had evolved to permit each Church virtual control of the religious instruction given to its own
 234
 flock. In October 1844 Eliot and Heytesbury reported that 'the hostility of the Clergy to the National System is rapidly diminishing, even in the
 235
 most Protestant Dioceses.' The 'manifest progress of the National System' was 'probably the immediate cause', thought Heytesbury, of the appearance in January 1845 of an Address from nine of the fourteen Bishops in which they re-affirmed their opposition to the National System - particularly the 'grand and primary objection .. the exclusion of the Scriptures' - and expressed 'a confident hope' that the Government would 'ultimately'
 236
 endow the Church schools.

Though the Lord Lieutenant felt that this Address 'produced very
 237
 little effect', it was the beginning of a serious effort to alter the Government's course. Roden and Clancarty led the way in organizing a meeting of Conservative laymen for the 30th of January. Roden (in the chair), Downshire, Bandon, Rathdowne, Castlemaine, George Hamilton, Bernard, Taylor and Grogan were among those present. The Bishops were congratulated on their Address and it was resolved, 'without any desire .. to embarrass in any way Her Majesty's present Government', that it was their 'most earnest and anxious desire that Her Majesty's Government may be induced to reconsider this important subject; and, while they

have conceded so much to the scruples of other denominations, may regard the just claims of the Established Church in Ireland .. and afford assistance to schools in connexion with the Established Church'. In addition, an address was presented to Beresford from leading Conservatives - including 20 peers and 28 M.P.'s, almost all of them Irish - advocating Scriptural instruction, regretting the Government's refusal either to aid the Church Education Society or to render the National System acceptable to Establishment Protestants, and urging Beresford to renew his demands for redress of the grievance. Most of the signatories did not actually attend the meeting of the laity. Indeed Lord Downshire, apparently anxious to play down the affair and perhaps 'ashamed of the part which he had taken', assured Heytesbury that 'there were not more than ten or twelve people present' at the meeting.

Over the next few months there was 'extreme activity' among the opponents of the National System as they collected signatures in support of the Bishops. The annual meeting of the Church Education Society at the end of March brought such a 'violent & intemperate' attack on the Government's education policy by the Bishop of Cashel that Heytesbury and Graham were both infuriated and made even more determined to withhold patronage from opponents of the system. Shaw and Bernard desisted from assailing the Government, but were no less critical of the National System and regretful that the Church Education Society was encountering difficulties in competition with the endowed system.

The education issue was an important factor in the determination of some leading Irish Tories to force the Government to allow the Earl of Erne to fill a vacancy in the representative peerage in May 1845, Wicklow telling Erne that 'if Belmore be in favour of the national system of education, which I believe he is, the Government will support him; but if you stood against him on that ground, it would ensure you many votes.' And in Parliament, during the debates on the Maynooth and Colleges questions, a considerable number of Irish Tories pressed the education

grievance, emphasizing in particular the contrast between the readiness
to endow Maynooth and the denial of the Church schools.²⁴³

George Hamilton was not without hope in April 1845 that the Government would make concessions on the question. Jocelyn, Lord Roden's son, had pressed Stanley upon it, 'suggesting to him the expediency of making some concessions to the feelings of the Church population as a kind of set off against the Maynooth endowment'. And 'although Lord Stanley had made some objections on the grounds that Dr. Mac Hale would expect a similar concession, his Lordship did not seem so strongly opposed to the suggestion as he (Jocelyn) had expected. Of course', commented Hamilton, 'it would be unwise to build much upon such a conversation. At the same time, it seems not improbable that Government may be disposed, in consideration of the Maynooth endowment bill, to do something to conciliate the Protestants ...'²⁴⁴

The Primate took a similar view of the implications of the Maynooth bill, though he was not optimistic of the result of another negotiation with Peel and evidently felt that the Church would do better to concentrate instead on building up her own schools until it was made clear that the question would not be 'terminated by their extinction.' He had, however, 'promised the noblemen and gentlemen who presented an address to me on this subject to bring it again under the consideration of the Prime Minister.'²⁴⁵ So, at the end of May he wrote to Peel, claiming that a declaration approving of the sentiments of the Dublin meeting of the Conservative laymen had been signed by 1,632 'landed proprietors and gentry', including 33 peers; that 1700 clergymen had petitioned in approval of the Address of the Bishops; and that 60,000 people had signed petitions to Parliament that session similarly rejecting the National System and calling for aid to the Church schools. He pressed for such assistance, contending that the Church Education Society gave 'a scriptural education' to 103,883 children and, with 32,900 Catholics and 13,500 Protestant Dissenters enrolled in its schools, was Ireland's most successful system of mixed education.²⁴⁶

Hamilton wrote to Peel on the 7th of June with a petition on the question. And, 'as one most anxious to see all causes of disagreement and dissension as far as possible removed', he added his 'most earned entreaty' that Peel should consider 'the conscientious convictions' expressed by so many of the Irish Protestants. If he agreed to endow the Church schools there would be 'no disposition' on the part of Protestants 'to make any unreasonable demand or to seek any interference with the National System of Education.'²⁴⁷ On the 17th of June, the Bishop of Cashel presented the petition from the clergy praying for the same measure. He was supported by Lords Wicklow and Clancarty, the latter explicitly²⁴⁸ attacking members of the Government. The Mail concurred in these efforts²⁴⁹ and bitterly assailed the Government. All this pressure yielded not one concession. Peel, in reply to the Primate, and other Ministers in Parliament exulted in 'the remarkable success' of the National System, with more than 400,000 pupils in receipt of a sound religious and literary education. They argued that endowment of the Church schools would lead to separate, denominational systems, extinguishing 'all hope of mixed education', though Graham conceded that 'as a system of united education' the existing system 'had been a failure'. The 'hope' of mixed education was fuelled apparently by the conviction that Protestant hostility was²⁵⁰ abating.

George and Claud Hamilton protested again towards the end of the session, when the estimates for education were voted, and those prominent Irish Tories who founded the Protestant Alliance a few months later named the 'peremptory refusal' to assist Scriptural education as a major Protestant grievance.²⁵¹
 The^{next} annual meeting of the Church Education Society brought forth similar complaints, with George Hamilton especially prominent in lamenting the conduct of the Government.²⁵² There was clearly, however, an awareness that they strove in a lost cause. Over the next few decades, in fact, with successive Governments refusing to concede separate endowment and the Church Education Society increasingly impoverished, there was a gradual

abatement of Protestant hostility to the National System, and recourse
 253
 to it by the Protestant laity and clergy.

There is some evidence that the great question of religious principle was not the only factor determining Irish Tory behaviour in the years after 1831, and in particular that the Protestant opponents of the National System were prepared to exercise restraint when dealing with a Conservative Government. They displayed great patience in 1835 and in the period before the unfavourable decision of November 1842; many prefaced their demands with recognition of the difficulties involved and a statement of their desire not to embarrass the Government; most criticized the National System but only implicitly condemned the Government for its policy; and the Irish Conservatives in Parliament never divided against a Conservative Government on the question. These facts may be adduced as evidence to support the accusation that the Protestant opposition to the National System was a political phenomenon, got up to embarrass the Whigs.

On the other hand, for whatever reason Protestant opposition was begun, it quickly became a question of principle that could not be set aside for the sake of political expediency. The issue produced sufficient public and private expressions of anxiety and dissent from the policy of the Conservative Government, dissent which occasionally involved bitter abuse, to exculpate in a great measure the Irish Conservatives from the charge that their opposition to the National System was primarily political. Their commitment or conviction was such that the issue was one of the major sources of difference between Irish Conservatives and the Governments of Sir Robert Peel.

Chapter 4

1. Hansard, 6, 1249-61, 9 Sept. 1831, Stanley. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment (London/Toronto, 1970), 392-402.
2. Fourteenth Report from the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland, P.P., 1812-3, VI, 221-8.
3. On the Society, see H. Kingsmill Moore, An Unwritten Chapter in the History of Education, Being the History of the Society for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, generally known as the Kildare Place Society, 1811-1831 (London, 1904). Michael A. Lynch, The Kildare Place Society, 1811-1831 (M.A., Cork, 1958). Helen R. Clayton, Societies Formed to Educate the Poor in Ireland in the late 18th and early 19th centuries (D. Phil., Trinity College Dublin, 1980), 149-69, 241-56. William Jacques, The Chief Factors Determining the Developments in Primary Education, Ireland, 1831-1947 (Ph D, Belfast, 1952), 15-23. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, esp. 85-97.
4. First Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry, P.P., 1825, XII, 93-106.
5. Report from the Select Committee to whom the Reports on the subject of Education in Ireland were referred, P.P., 1828, IV, 223-8.
6. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, IV, 1731, O'Connell to Curtis, 26 Nov. 1830; 1733, O'Connell to Murray, 26 Nov. 1830; 1738, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 3 Dec. 1830; 1740, O'Connell to Bennett, 7 Dec. 1830.
7. Monteagle Papers, MS 550, Rice to Bourke, 26 June 1834; *ibid*, MS 553, Rice to Northampton, 14 March 1836.
8. *Ibid*, MS 548, Rice to Lamb, 22 Nov. 1827 (also MS 13, 386 (3)); *ibid*, Rice to Lamb, 2 Jan. 1828; *ibid*, Rice to Doyle, 26 April 1829 (also MS 13, 345), on his approaches to Gower, Anglesey, Wellington, Peel and others; *ibid*, MS 13, 370 (11), Rice to Leveson-Gower, 1828; *ibid*, MS 13, 345, Rice to Doyle, 1828, 31 Aug. 1828. Bourke Papers, MS 8477 (13), Rice to Bourke, 16 April 1829.
9. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/52, Stanley to Anglesey, 9 Aug. 1831.
10. Hansard, 6, 1258, 9 Sept. 1831, Stanley. Report from the Select Committee on the state of the Poor in Ireland, P.P., 1830, VII, 50.
11. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland during the first half of the 19th century: compiled from speeches, letters, &c., contained in the Unpublished Memoirs of the Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Wyse, K.C.B. (Waterford, 1901), 12-4, Slattery to Wyse, 28 Nov. 1830; 14-20, Wyse to Doyle, 30 Nov., 11 Dec. 1830; 20-1, Doyle to Wyse, 31 Dec. 1830.
12. *Ibid*, 21-5. Thomas Wyse, Speech on the extension and improvement of academical, collegiate, and university education in Ireland; at the meeting held for that purpose, at Cork, Nov. 13, 1844. With Notes (Cork, 1845), 41.
13. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 4 Aug. 1831. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland .., 25-6. Hansard, 27, XXXIII, 19 May 1835, Wyse.

14. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (3), Wyse to George Wyse, 25 Feb. 1831; *ibid*, (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 10, 15 March 1831. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/31, Stanley to Anglesey, 11 March 1831.
15. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (3), Wyse to George Wyse, 9, 11 April 1831.
16. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 1, 8, 9 Sept. 1831; *ibid*, (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 15, 21, 25, 26, 29 July, 1, 3, 4, 6, 15, 26 Aug. 1831; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 Sept. 1831. Anglesey Papers, D619/31D/45, 52, Stanley to Anglesey, 6 July, 9 Aug. 1831. Journals of the House of Commons, 1830-1, 86 (2), 737, 9 Aug. 1831. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland .., 26-7.
- X 17. *Ibid*, 27. See also J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862: The Life and Career of an Educator and Diplomat (London, 1939), 153. J. J. Auchmuty, Irish Education: a Historical Survey (Dublin/London, 1937), 82. W. J. Bradley, Sir Thomas Wyse, Irish Pioneer in Education Reform (Ph D, Trinity College Dublin, 1945), 89-90.
18. P.P., 1831, I, 491. House of Commons Journals, 1830-1, 86 (2), 879, 29 Sept. 1831. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 6-7.
19. That is, in Stanley's letter to the Duke of Leinster, not in his speech in Parliament.
20. P.P., 1831, I, Cl. 2.
21. P.P., 1831, I, Cl. 16.
22. DEP, 17 Dec. 1831, Wyse to Stanley, 9 Dec. 1831. See also T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 57-8. In June 1832, Wyse told Lord Shrewsbury that the Board was 'founded.. on my Bill, but not quite in so liberal a spirit.' Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (1), Wyse to Shrewsbury, 15 June 1832. In 1835 he claimed that the system was based 'in a great measure' on his bill. DEP, 20 Jan. 1835. Several years later he wrote that Stanley had copied 'word for word' from his bill. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 16 July 1842. And in 1844 he claimed the bill was 'in a great degree' adopted by Stanley. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 7. See also Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 21 Feb., 22 July 1832; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 26 May, 23 June 1832; *ibid*, (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845. Hansard, 32, 584, 24 March 1836, Wyse; 76, 1133, 19 July 1844, Sheil; 80, 381, 9 May 1845, Sheil. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838, Wyse.
23. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Doyle, II, 253, 256, 271-2, Doyle to Stanley, 12, 17 Jan. 1831, to Parnell, Feb., 8 March 1831.
24. Anglesey Papers, D619/28C/88, 132, 159, Anglesey to Grey, 21 March, 1 July, 14 Aug. 1831; *ibid*, D619/27C/12, 29, Anglesey to Holland, 20 April, 4 July 1831; *ibid*, D619/31I/44, 48, 50, D619/31J/12, Anglesey to Stanley, 3, 9, 15 July, 17 Aug. 1831. Derby Papers, 119/1, Anglesey to Stanley, 3, 9, 15 July, 17 Aug. 1831. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f91, 98, 145, 168, Anglesey to Grey, 21, 31 March, 1 July, 14 Aug. 1831; *ibid*, File of Papers on the Irish Church, f14, Memo by Blake, 1831. Hansard, 1, 421-2, 12 Nov. 1830, Anglesey.
- X 25. Cloncurry, Personal Recollections, 390. See also W. J. Fitzpatrick, The Life, Times and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry, 403-5, 415-6.

26. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 102-4.
27. Ibid, 140.
28. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 146, 9 Sept. 1831. Hansard, 6, 1280-4, 1295-1301, 9 Sept. 1831, Sheil, O'Connell.
29. Derby Papers, 128/1, Newport to Stanley, 10 Sept. 1831; *ibid*, 122/5, O'Brien to Stanley, 18 Sept. 1831.
30. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 147, 28 Feb., 23 March, 9 June 1832. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 14, 24, 28 Feb., 2 March 1832; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 11 June 1832.
31. Derby Papers, 125/7, Acheson to Stanley, 30 Jan. 1832. Hansard, 5, 588, 2 Aug. 1831, Acheson; 10, 1162-7, 6 March 1832, Acheson.
32. Hansard, 1, 422, 12 Nov. 1830, Downshire; 8, 184-5, 7 Oct. 1831, Downshire; 11, 648-50, 22 March 1832, Division; 13, 5, 24 May 1832, Downshire. Downshire had, in fact, in 1830-1, urged the Kildare Place Society to reconsider its practices and constitution in order to lessen opposition, but his advice had been rejected. Downshire Papers, D671/C/178/3, Downshire to Jackson, 6 Feb. 1830. H. Kingsmill Moore, An Unwritten Chapter .., 159-60. See also Downshire Papers, D671/C/2/526/1, Downshire to Reilly, 19 Sept. 1833.
33. DEM, 6 March 1835, quoting the Morning Register.
34. DEP, 17 Dec. 1831, Wyse to Stanley, 9 Dec. 1831. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 426, f124, Wyse to O'Brien, 24 Dec. 1831.
35. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (3), Wyse to George Wyse, 12, 22, 29 Sept., 3 Oct. 1831.
36. *Ibid*, MS 15025 (1), O'Brien to Wyse, 16 Jan. 1832.
37. *Ibid*, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 15, 20, 21 Feb. 1832; *ibid*, (8), Wyse to George Wyse, 23 Feb. 1832.
38. The Christian Examiner and Church of Ireland Magazine, New Series, Vol. I, No. III (March 1832), 217.
39. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 26, 31 Jan., 14, 20, 21, 27, 28 Feb., 2 March, 13, 18 July 1832; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 17, 23 March, 26 May, 16 June, n.d. July 1832; *ibid*, MS 15025 (1), Wyse to Shrewsbury, 15 June 1832. See also Hansard, 14, 808-9, 26 July 1832, Wyse.
40. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f299, Grey to Anglesey, 5 July 1832 (also in Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/116).
41. P.P., 1835, II, 443. Hansard, 27, X-XLVI, 19 May 1835, Wyse.
42. Hansard, 28, 1132, 24 June 1835, Morpeth.
43. Hansard, 32, 583-6, 24 March 1836, Wyse. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f671, Wyse to O'Brien, 10 Sept. 1839. Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into Foundation Schools and Education in Ireland, P.P., 1837-8, VII, 424.

44. Thomas Wyse, Education Reform; or, the Necessity of a National System of Education (London, 1836).
45. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 158.
46. On the dispute, see Emmet Larkin, The Quarrel among the Roman Catholic Hierarchy over the National System of Education in Ireland, 1838-41, in Ray B. Browne, William John Roscelli and Richard Loftus, The Celtic Cross: Studies in Irish Culture and Literature (Purdue, 1964), 121-52. N. Costello, John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam, 37, 61-77. Bernard O'Reilly, John Mac Hale, Archbishop of Tuam: His Life, Times and Correspondence (New York/Cincinnati, 1890), I, 413-76. R. B. O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 174-84. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 204-14. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2508, 2530, 2605, Mac Hale to O'Connell, 27 Feb., 26 April 1838, 16 April 1839.
47. Clements Papers, MS 14, 298, Clements to Morpeth, 27 March 1838.
48. Hansard, 44, 811-2, 30 July 1838, O'Brien, Grattan. The Times, 31 July 1838, O'Brien, Grattan, Wyse.
49. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 30 July, 1 Aug. 1838.
50. Monteagle Papers, MS 533, f139, Rice to Leinster, 29 Nov. 1838.
51. Ibid, f133, Rice to Morpeth, 29 Nov. 1838.
52. Ibid, MS 543, f123, Rice to Whately, 14 Dec. 1838.
53. Ibid, MS 13, 370 (11), Whately to Rice, 4 Dec. 1838. Also on the repercussions of the Commons discussion, see ibid, MS 533, f12, 130, Rice to Kennedy, 15, 28 Nov. 1838; ibid, f21, Rice to Carlile, 15 Nov. 1838; ibid, f148, Rice to Whately, 30 Nov. 1838.
54. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f420, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Nov. 1836; ibid, MS 429, f486, Wyse to O'Brien, 4 Jan. 1839; ibid, MS 430, f599, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Jan. 1839. William Smith O'Brien, Education in Ireland (London, 1839), 141. Hansard, 70, 661-2, 4 July 1843, O'Brien.
55. P.P., 1837-8, VII, 426, Proceedings of the Committee.
56. Ibid., The Limerick Standard, 8 Jan. 1839, Monsell. The Christian Examiner, Third Series, Vol. III, No. XXXVII (Nov. 1838), 740-1.
57. P.P., 1837-8, VII, 345.
58. Hansard, 46, 876-8, 890, 19 March 1839, J. Grattan.
59. By which Grattan often meant the Irish Catholic members.
60. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 19, 20 March 1839.
61. Hansard, 46, 878-83, 890-1, 19 March 1839, Morpeth.
62. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 8 May, 4 June 1839.
63. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 2, 5 Aug. 1839. The Morning Post, 6 Aug. 1839.
64. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 11 Aug. 1839.

65. William Smith O'Brien, Education in Ireland, 147-52, 158-9.
66. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 5 June 1840.
67. Ibid, 28 May 1841. From draft copy of Grattan's speech in the confidence debate; excerpt excluded from final version or not reported. Hansard, 58, 986-8, 2 June 1841, Grattan.
68. P.P., 1837-8, VII, 382-4. See also T. Wyse, Education Reform, 258-71.
69. See especially Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 19, 20 March, 2 Aug. 1839.
70. Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government entitled to the support of the Irish Liberal Members at the Present Crisis?, 12-13.
71. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 130.
72. Hansard, 49, 1259-70, 5 Aug. 1839, Browne.
73. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2526, 2670, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 14 April 1838, 23 Dec. 1839; 2572, 2691, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 19 Nov. 1838, 28 Feb. 1840.
74. Hansard, 43, 246-58, 272-3, 25 May 1838, Lansdowne, Clanricarde; 46, 889-90, 19 March 1839, Rice. The Times, 6 Aug. 1839, M. J. O'Connell, Redington. Hansard, 54, 1157-65, 12 June 1840, Henry Grattan, Redington, Rawdon, Gisborne, Division. See also Monteagle Papers, MS 539, Rice to Lawford, 18 Aug. 1839.
75. Hansard, 45, 289-301, 303, 12 Feb. 1839, Wyse, O'Brien; 47, 1389-91, 1392-4, 4 June 1839, O'Connell, Wyse; 48, 529-45, 19 June 1839, Wyse; 48, 608-22, 681-6, 20 June 1839, O'Connell, Division; 48, 759-61, 777-86, 793-8, 24 June 1839, M. J. O'Connell, Sheil, Division.
76. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 20, 24 June, 5 July 1839.
77. Hansard, 54, 1161-2, 12 June 1840, Rawdon.
78. Hansard, 61, 411-2, 10 March 1842, Lansdowne; 65, 172-221, 15 July 1842, Cloncurry, Monteagle, M. J. O'Connell, V. Smith, Eliot, Somerville, Wyse, Ward, Clements, Murphy, Bernal; 65, 287-8, 293, 18 July 1842, M. J. O'Connell, Buller.
79. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 16 (2), 31 July, 27 Sept. 1842.
80. Hansard, 68, 717-8, 723-4, 725, 7 April 1843, Crawford, Ross, Browne; 69, 1203-4, 31 May 1843, Barron; 70, 118, 19 June 1843, Barron; 70, 870, 10 July 1843, Somerville; 70, 1019-20, 1030, 12 July 1843, Murphy, Barron; 76, 1688, 2 Aug. 1844, Clanricarde; 76, 1860-1, 1863-5, 1866-7, 6 Aug. 1844, Wyse, Sheil, M. J. O'Connell.
81. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland.., 1844, 7-8. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 89, Wyse to Munster Provincial College Committee, Aug, 1845. Hansard, 72, 740-1, 13 Feb. 1844, Wyse; 72, 1232, 20 Feb. 1844, O'Conor Don; 73, 511-2, 4 March 1844, Monteagle; 76, 1122-4, 1140-1, 19 July 1844, Wyse, Ross; 76, 1859-60, 1864, 6 Aug. 1844, Wyse, Sheil; 80, 367, 9 May 1845, Wyse;

- 80, 1142, 30 May 1845, Ross; 81, 644-6, 17 June 1845, Monteagle; 82, 1259-60, 30 July 1845, M. J. O'Connell; 84, 866-7, 10 March 1846, Wyse.
82. Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 394 (4), Monteagle to Whewell, 1845.
83. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 89, Wyse to Munster Provincial College Committee, Aug. 1845.
84. Hansard, 70, 661, 4 July 1843; 81, 1350, 30 June 1845, Smith O'Brien.
85. DEM, 28 Dec. 1842, O'Connell.
86. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 4 Oct. 1845.
87. Ibid, MS 15019 (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 3 Aug. 1831. Personal Journals .. by James Grattan, MS 14, 146, 9 Sept. 1831. Hansard, 6, 1261-1304, 9 Sept. 1831, North, Lefroy, Conolly, Shaw, Gordon (2).
88. H. Kingsmill Moore, An Unwritten Chapter .., XIX-XX. Michael A. Lynch, The Kildare Place Society, 244. W. S. O'Brien, Education in Ireland, 144.
89. See esp., DEM, 4, 11, 13, 27, 30 Jan., 22, 27 Feb., 9, 19 March 1832. National Education: Authentic Report of the very interesting and important speeches at the meeting of the friends of Scriptural Education in the Commercial Buildings, Belfast, upon Tuesday, the 17th January, 1832 (Belfast, 1832).
90. Belfast News Letter (BNL), 17 Jan., 6 July 1832, on meetings of Synod on 11 Jan. and 3 July 1832. The Orthodox Presbyterian, Vol. III, No. XXVI (Nov. 1831), 37-48, 65-7; ibid, No. XXVII (Dec. 1831), 73-83; ibid, No. XXVIII (Jan. 1832), 111-3; ibid, No. XXIX (Feb. 1832), 154-7; ibid, No. XXX (March 1832), 181-94; ibid, No. XXXI (April 1832), 217-28; ibid, No. XXXII (May 1832), 289-92; ibid, No. XXXVIII (Nov. 1832), 57-63. Henry Cooke, National Education: a Sermon Preached in the Presbyterian Church, May Street, Belfast, upon Sunday the 15th of January 1832 (Belfast, 1832).
91. The Christian Examiner, New Series, Vol. 1, No. IV (April 1832), 221-3.
92. Ibid, esp. Nos. II-VI, Feb. - June 1832. However, there is abundant material on the subject from Nov. 1831 until the Autumn of 1832.
93. For example, The Christian Examiner, New Series, Vol. 1, No. X (Oct, 1832), 697-701; ibid, No. XII (Dec. 1832), 810-2.
94. National Education: Authentic Report of .. Speeches .. (Belfast, 1832). DEM, 11 Jan. 1832.
95. DEM, 18 Jan. 1832.
96. DEM, 6, 11, 23, 25 Jan., 3, 6, 8, 24, 29 Feb., 5, 9, 26 March 1832.
97. DEM, 13, 20 Feb. 1832. The Times, 9, 16 Feb. 1832.
98. Grey Papers, Correspondence between Lord Grey and Lord Anglesey, f272, Grey to Anglesey, 23 March 1832. Anglesey Papers, D619/28A/105, Grey to Anglesey, 23 March 1832; ibid, D619/29B/107, Anglesey to Melbourne, 26 March 1832; ibid, D619/29A/65, Melbourne to Anglesey,

- 24 March 1832. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 141, 158-9, 164, 28 Feb., 22, 29 March 1832. The Greville Memoirs, II, 268-9, 273-4, 285, 9, 26 March, 8 April 1832. And see above, p209 on the view taken by Grattan and Wyse.
99. Hansard, 11, 648-50, 22 March 1832, Division; 14, 669, 23 July 1832, Division. Lord Westmeath voted against Wicklow's motion but was at this stage not yet a committed Conservative.
100. Hansard, 16, 778-826, 19 March 1833, Roden, Exeter, Bristol, Wicklow; 18, 1355-8, 1 July 1833, Roden, Wicklow, Exeter; 20, 734, 17 Aug. 1833, Shaw.
101. Grey Papers, File of Papers on Education in Ireland, f4, Carlile to Grey, 31 May 1833. (Rev. James Carlile), Thoughts on the Mixed Character of Government Institutions in Ireland, with particular reference to the National System of Education; extracted from the Belfast News Letter of June 18 and 21, 1833. By a Protestant (London, 1833), 37. Carlile's authorship was acknowledged in Rev. James Carlile, Defence of the National System of Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1838), 38.
102. Anglesey Papers, Uncat., Whately to Anglesey, 29 July 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/7, f151, Blake to Littleton, 17 Aug. 1833; *ibid.*, /432, Whately to Anglesey, 29 July 1833; *ibid.*, /437, Kelly to Littleton, 27 Aug. 1833; *ibid.*, /439, Carlile to Whately, 24 July 1833; *ibid.*, /448, Grey to Furley, 31 July 1833. Grey Papers, File of Papers on Education in Ireland, ff1-18.
103. T. O'Raiheartaigh, 'Mixed education and the Synod of Ulster, 1831-40', Irish Historical Studies, Vol. IX, No. 35 (March 1955), 286-91. Richard P. J. Batterberry, 'The synod of Ulster and the National Board', Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 5th series, Vol. LVIII (1941), 18-28. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 162-76. J. L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, 249-60. R. Finlay Holmes, Henry Cooke, 343-8. John Jamieson, The Influence of the Rev. Henry Cooke on the Political Life of Ulster, 122-36.
104. Wellesley Papers, Add MS 37, 307, f133, Downshire to Wellington, 15 Aug. 1834.
105. An Authentic Report of the Proceedings at the Meeting of the Protestants of Ireland, on the 14th of Aug. 1834, speeches of Lords Roden and Winchilsea and Reverends Martin, Boyton, Beresford (DEM, 15 Aug. 1834). DEM, 31 Oct. 1834, speeches of Lords Londonderry, Roden, Clanwilliam and Castlereagh, M.P., Sir Robert Bateson, M.P., Reverend Cooke.
106. A. Aspinall, Three Early Nineteenth Century Diaries, Lord Ellenborough's Diary, 201, 22 Feb. 1832. Hansard, 10, 881-2, 28 Feb. 1832, Wellington; 11, 636-8, 648-50, 22 March 1832, Wellington, Division; 13, 1273-5, 3 July 1832, Wellington.
107. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 412, f216, Roden to Peel, 30 Jan. 1835.
108. See The Christian Examiner, New Series, Vol. 1, No. II (Feb. 1832), 129; *ibid.*, No. III (March 1832), 217-8, 220. Hansard, 6, 1285, 9 Sept. 1831, Shaw; 10, 893, 28 Feb. 1832, Roden; 10, 1112, 5 March 1832, Bateson; 10, 1187, 1189, 6 March 1832, Bateson, Mandeville; 11, 406, 19 March 1832, A. Lefroy; 12, 83, 9 April 1832, Shaw; 13, 279, 1 June 1832, Roden; 16, 788, 19 March 1833, Roden.

109. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 412, f220, Peel to Roden, 4 Feb. 1835; *ibid*, MS 40, 314, f38, Hardinge to Peel, 3 Feb. 1835.
110. Hansard, 26, 479, 2 March 1835, Hardinge.
111. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/5, p208-9, 3, 4 March 1835.
112. DEM, 6 March 1835.
113. Wellington Papers, Port. 29, f39, Roden to Wellington, 4 March 1835.
114. *Ibid*, f44, Hardinge to Wellington, 4 March 1835. Hansard, 26, 575-6, 6 March 1835, Roden, Wellington.
115. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 281, 7 March 1835.
116. DEM, 9, 11, 16 March 1835.
117. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f49, Cooke to Roden, 10 March 1835.
118. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (14), Fox to Henry Maxwell, M.P., 10 March 1835.
119. Wellington Papers, Port. 29, f91, Roden to Wellington, 9 March 1835; *ibid*, Port. 30, f87, Wellington to Roden, 20 March 1835; *ibid*, f96, Roden to Wellington, 21 March 1835. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f61, Wellington to Roden, 20 March 1835; *ibid*, f65, Roden to Wellington, 21 March 1835.
120. Dublin University Magazine, Vol. 5, No. XXVIII (April 1835), 467-8. The writer - Isaac Butt? - went on to show that his opposition to the National System was undiminished, describing it as a device to put education in the hands of the Catholic priesthood.
121. Hansard, 26, 927-9, 12 March 1835, Maxwell, Bateson; 27, 486-7, 31 March 1835, Lefroy; 27, 797-8, 805, 813-4, 3 April 1835, Conolly, Bateson, Shaw; 27, 850, 6 April 1835, Bruen.
122. Hansard, 27, 1229-33, 19 May 1835, Shaw, Rice, Sheil, Bateson; 28, 589, 10 June 1835, Castlereagh; 29, 462-80, 13 July 1835, Rice, Plunkett, Young, Jackson, Sheil, Jackson; 29, 853, 21 July 1835, Lefroy; 29, 1213-26, 29 July 1835, Jackson, Shaw, Jackson; 30, 165-6, 7 Aug. 1835, Plunkett; 30, 405, 12 Aug. 1835, Young.
123. Roden Papers, D/10/C84, Uncat., Roden to Londonderry, 9 Dec. 1835.
124. *Ibid*, D/10/C84(9), Roden to Londonderry, 23 Dec. 1835.
125. Hansard, 31, 246-71, 11 Feb. 1836, Roden, Lansdowne, Exeter, Plunket, Melbourne.
126. Graham Papers, 30, Graham to Sanders, 24 Oct. 1835; Graham to Stanley, 18 Nov. 1835; 31, Graham to the Bishop of Exeter, 15 March 1836 (two letters); Stanley to Graham, 27 Aug. 1836. G. C. B. Davies, Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 1778-1869 (London, 1954), 335, Correspondence with Beresford and Graham.
127. Wellington Papers, Port. 38, f46, 54, 108, 118, 134, Exeter to Wellington, 15, 17 Feb., 5, 9, 14 March 1836; *ibid*, f47, 55, Wellington to Exeter, 17, 18 Feb. 1836; *ibid*, Port. 39, f2,

Wellington to Exeter, 15 March 1836.

128. Hansard, 32, 274-326, 15 March 1836, Exeter, Harrowby, Roden, Winchilsea; 34, 1122-6, 1 July 1836, Wicklow. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, 230, Londonderry to Buckingham, 17 March 1836.
129. Hansard, 32, 586-9, 24 March 1836, Lefroy, Rice, Wyse; 34, 31-2, 3 June 1836, Jackson; 35, 808, 2 Aug. 1836, Shaw; 35, 1013-21, 8 Aug. 1836, Jackson, Perceval, Shaw, Archdall.
130. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f357, Farnham to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f367, Hamilton to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f377, Jackson to Roden, 14 Jan. 1837.
131. DEM, 25 Jan. 1837, Gort, Jackson. See also Report of the Speeches and Proceedings at the Belfast Society's Fourth Anniversary Dinner... 20 Dec. 1836, Bateson, Cooke, Litton.
132. Monteagle Papers, MS 545, Rice to King, 13 Jan. 1837.
133. Wellington Papers, Port. 44, f34, Beresford to Wellington, 14 Jan. 1837; *ibid*, f39, Wellington to Beresford, 19 Jan. 1837.
134. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f557, Exeter to Roden, 30 Jan. 1837.
135. Hansard, 36, 414-5, 10 Feb. 1837, Stanley, Russell; 36, 1105-47, 28 Feb. 1837, Melbourne, Exeter, Wicklow.
136. Address to the Clergy of Ireland, from the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Derry and Raphoe on the Subject of National Education (Dublin, 1836). D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 195-7. The Christian Examiner, Third Series, Vol. II, No. XIV (Jan. 1837), 18-30; *ibid*, Vol. III, No. XXVII (Jan. 1838), 5-7. The Christian Examiner recommended that the clergy should, instead, apply to Parliament for separate endowment of their own scriptural schools and advocated the provision of purely secular education in all other schools in receipt of assistance from the State. No. XIV, 27-30. They proposed separate endowment again in Nov. 1838. *Ibid*, Vol. III, No. XXXVII (Nov. 1838), 759-60.
137. Downshire Papers, D671/C/12/691, Mac Donnell to Downshire, 26 Aug. 1837.
138. The Christian Examiner, Third Series, Vol. II, No. XXV (Dec. 1837), 867-83; *ibid*, No. XXVI, Supplement 1837, 949-967; *ibid*, Vol. III, No. XXVII (Jan. 1838), 4-7, 52-8; *ibid*, No. XXVIII (Feb. 1838), 93-140; *ibid*, No. XXXVI (Oct. 1838), 670-85.
139. Hansard, 39, 1060, 13 Dec. 1837, Jackson. The Times, 31 July 1838, Perceval.
140. Roden Papers, D/10/C84 (9), Roden to Londonderry, 7 Oct. 1837.
141. Hansard, 43, 221-79, 25 May 1838, Exeter, Wellington, Winchilsea, Wicklow, London, Roden, Fitzgerald, Division.
142. Wellington Papers, Port. 51, f119, Downshire to Wellington, 26 May 1838.
143. Graham Papers, 36, Stanley to Graham, 18 Oct. 1838.
144. Hansard, 45, 285-7, 12 Feb. 1839, Jackson; 46, 883-90, 19 March 1839, Shaw, Teignmouth, S. Maxwell; 48, 756-9, 24 June 1839, Litton; 51, 743-4, 29 Jan. 1840, Litton; 54, 1157-61, 12 June 1840, Teignmouth,

- Bateson, Jackson. The Times, 6 Aug. 1839, Shaw. "The Uniting System does not unite", declared one hostile pamphleteer: A Flea for the Protestants of Ireland; A Letter addressed to the Right Hon. Lord Morpeth, Chief Secretary for Ireland, with proposals for modifying the National System of Education, by A witness before the Committee of Inquiry into "The New Plan of Education in Ireland" (Dublin, 1840), 10.
145. DEM, 18 Feb. 1839. The Christian Examiner, Third Series, Vol. IV, No. XLII (March 1839), 233-8.
146. DEP, 23, 25 April 1840. DEM, 24 April 1840.
147. DEM, 26 Jan., 11 Feb. 1842.
148. House of Lords Journals, 1840, 72, 716; House of Commons Journals, 1840, 95, Index (Ireland-Education).
149. On the general question of the relations between the Synod and the National System, see T. O'Raiheartaigh, 'Mixed education and the Synod of Ulster, 1831-40', Irish Historical Studies, Vol. LX, No. 35 (March 1955), 281-99. Richard P. J. Batterberry, 'The synod of Ulster and the National Board', Irish Ecclesiastical Record, fifth series, Vol. LVI (1940), 548, LVIII (1941), 16, LIX (1942), 61. R. B. O'Brien, Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 132-7. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 161-87, 213. J. L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, 236-62, 322-5, 355-63. W. T. Latimer, A History of the Irish Presbyterians (Belfast, 1902), 449-57. R. Finlay Holmes, Henry Cooke, 296-368, 392-437. John Jamieson, The Influence of the Rev. Henry Cooke on the Political Life of Ulster, 101-45.
150. DEM, 19 Feb. 1840, Thomas Drew to McNeile, n.d..
151. DEM, 21, 26 Feb. 1840. Dublin University Magazine, Vol. 15, No. LXXXVII, March 1840.
152. DEM, 21, 26 Feb., 4, 9 March 1840. D.U.M., Vol. 15, No. LXXXVII-LXXXVIII, March, April 1840.
153. DEP, 23, 25 April 1840, Downshire, Daly, Shaw.
154. Hansard, 54, 1157, 1161-2, 12 June 1840, Teignmouth, Jackson.
155. On the dispute, see also J.L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, 363-70.
156. Hansard, 43, 258-61, 25 May 1838, Wellington; 48, 650, 673, 20 June 1839, Graham, Peel.
157. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol. II, f262, J. E. Jackson, Dean of Armagh, to Beresford, 19 May 1838.
158. DEM, 1 Nov. 1841, Address on 27 Oct. 1841.
159. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f76, De Grey to Peel, 20 Nov. 1841.
160. Ibid, MS 40, 446, f142, Graham to Peel, 24 Nov. 1841; ibid, MS 40, 467, f138, Stanley to Peel, 30 Nov. 1841; ibid, MS 40, 477, f113, De Grey to Peel, 6 Dec. 1841; ibid, MS 40, 462, f77, Fitzgerald to Peel, 23 Dec. 1841; ibid, MS 40, 496, f96, Foster to Peel, 4 Dec.

1841. Graham Papers, 81R, Graham to De Grey, 27 Nov. 1841. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 35-6. See also, Graham Papers, 43, Graham to Brougham, 24 Oct. 1841. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 338.
161. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f90, Peel to De Grey, 27 Nov. 1841.
162. Ibid, MS 40, 462, f77, Fitzgerald to Peel, 23 Dec. 1841. DEM, 8, 15, 17 Dec. 1841, 19 Jan. 1842.
163. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 500, f249, Courtown to Peel, 20 Jan. 1842. It appears that no copy of the article in the Christian Examiner is extant, but its import may be inferred from the comments of others, particularly Edward Newenham Hoare, Dean of Achonry, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P., on the present state of the question of National Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1842), 17-22.
164. DEM, 19, 21 Jan., 11 Feb. 1842.
165. Beresford Papers, AFL, Vol. X, f74, Beresford to the Church Education Society, 21 Jan. 1842; *ibid*, f75, Wade to Maclean, 19 Jan. 1842.
166. DEM, 26 Jan. 1842.
167. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 502, f22, Fitzgerald to Peel, 8 Feb. 1842; *ibid*, f26, McGhee to Fitzgerald, 1 Feb. 1842.
168. Edward Newenham Hoare, A Letter to the Rt. Hon. Lord Stanley, M.P., on the present state of the question of National Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1842).
169. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 501, f257, Blake to Peel, 3 Feb. 1842.
170. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 501, f260, Whately to Dickinson, 28 Jan. 1842. See also E. J. Whately, Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, II, 1, Whately to Senior, 10 March 1842.
171. DEM, 19 Jan. 1842, Gregory; 11 Feb. 1842, Warren, Jackson; 14 Feb. 1842, Editorial.
172. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 462, f104, Fitzgerald to Peel (March 1842); *ibid*, f108, Foster to Fitzgerald, 3 March 1842.
173. *Ibid*, f118, Peel to Fitzgerald, 14 March 1842.
174. *Ibid*, f119-22, Memos by Wellington, Graham and Stanley, March 1842.
175. Hansard, 61, 412, 10 March 1842, Wellington. DEM, 14 March 1842.
176. Hansard, 61, 936-7, 21 March 1842, Shaw, Eliot. DEM, 23 March 1842.
177. DEM, 1 April 1842.
178. DEM, 8 April 1842.
179. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 509, f227, Peel Cabinet Memo, 2 June 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 477, f207, De Grey to Peel, 6 June 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f76, Eliot to Peel, 4 June 1842.
180. *Ibid*, MS 40, 509, f229, 233, Peel to Beresford, 7, 9 June 1842; *ibid*, f231, Beresford to Peel, 8 June 1842.

181. Hansard, 64, 271-2, 21 June 1842, Beresford, Downshire; 64, 547-50, 24 June 1842, Clancarty. DEM, 27 June 1842.
182. House of Commons Journals, 1842, 97, Index; House of Lords Journals, 1842, 74, 580.
183. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 516, f147, Beresford to Peel, 1 Oct. 1842. Hansard, 68, 690, 7 April 1843, Shaw.
184. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 511, f392, Jackson to Peel, 14 July 1842.
185. Hansard, 65, 171-4, 207-21, 15 July 1842, Carbery, Clancarty, Beresford, Wicklow, Plumtre, Lefroy, Campbell, Jones, Eliot, Jackson, Division.
186. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 16 July 1842.
187. Hansard, 65, 305, 18 July 1842, Gregory.
188. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f250, Peel to De Grey, 19 July 1842.
189. DEM, 18, 20, 22, 25, 29 July 1842.
190. Hansard, 65, 216-8, 15 July 1842, Stanley.
191. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f45, 245, Graham to Peel, 17 July, 17 Oct. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, Graham to De Grey, 18 July 1842.
192. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 20 July 1842.
193. DEM, 22 July 1842.
194. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f233, De Grey to Peel, 13 July 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f82, 87, Eliot to Peel, 15, 19 July 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 38.
195. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f85, Peel to Eliot, 16 July 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 447, f43, Peel to Graham, 16 July 1842. Graham Papers, 51, Peel to Graham, 16 July 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 38.
196. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f45, Graham to Peel, 17 July 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 38-9.
197. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 477, f242, De Grey to Peel, 18 July 1842; *ibid*, f246, De Grey to Eliot, 17 July 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, De Grey to Graham, 30 July 1842.
198. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f104, Eliot to Peel, 14 Sept. 1842.
199. DEM, 1, 3 Aug. 1842.
200. DEM, 10, 12, 15, 26, 29 Aug., 2, 5, 7, 9, 14 Sept. 1842, Editorials and excerpts from other journals.
201. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 20 Aug., 3 Sept. 1842.
202. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f64, Peel to Graham, (Aug. 1842); *ibid*, f144, Graham to Peel, 12 Sept. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, Graham to Eliot, 22 Aug. 1842.
203. DEM, 29 Aug., 9 Sept. 1842.

204. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 512, f210, Peel to Sugden, 29 July 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 448, f124, Peel to Eliot, 23 Dec. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, De Grey to Graham, 5 Oct. 1842; Eliot to Graham, 6 Oct. 1842; 54A, Peel to Graham, 4 Oct. 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 41-3.
205. DEM, 19, 21, 26, 30 Sept. 1842. See also speech of Viscount Bernard, M.P., at a Dinner in Bandon, for an equally optimistic view. DEM, 30 Sept. 1842.
206. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 516, f147, Beresford to Peel, 1 Oct. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 518, f142, Beresford to Peel, 8 Nov. 1842.
207. Graham Papers, 5B, Graham to Eliot, 16 Sept. 1842; 1IR, Graham to De Grey, 23 Sept. 1842. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f231, Graham to Peel, 12 Oct. 1842.
208. *Ibid*, MS 40, 477, f287, De Grey to Peel, 11 Oct. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 447, f265, Peel to Graham, 23 Oct. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, De Grey to Graham, 21 Oct. 1842; 54B, Peel to Graham, 23 Oct. 1842.
209. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f231, 325, 359, Graham to Peel, 12 Oct., 14, 22 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 520, f60, Graham memo, 6 Dec. 1842, Stanley memo, n.d.; *ibid*, MS 40, 467, f296, Stanley to Peel, 22 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f149, 173, Eliot to Peel, 18, 30 Nov. 1842. Graham Papers, 1IR, Eliot to Graham, 9 Nov. 1842; Graham to Eliot, 11, 15 Nov. 1842; Graham to De Grey, 9 Nov. 1842; Eliot to Graham, 12 Nov. 1842; 55B, Graham to Eliot, 18 Nov. 1842; Graham to Stanley, 21 Nov. 1842; Stanley to Graham, 22 Nov. 1842. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 356-8. Hansard, 68, 695-9, 721-2, 7 April 1843, Eliot.
210. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 517, f102, Peel to Beresford, 24 Oct. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 518, f152, Peel to Beresford, 12 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, f193, Peel to Corry, 5 Jan. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 520, f9, Peel to Clancarty, 9 Dec. 1842; *ibid*, f54, Peel to Beresford, 3 Dec. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 521, f193, Peel to Corry, 5 Jan. 1843; *ibid*, MS 40, 477, f308, Peel to De Grey, 13 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 480, f145, Peel to Eliot, 13 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 448, f124, Peel to Eliot, 23 Dec. 1842. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 43. Hansard, 68, 710-7, 7 April 1843, Peel.
211. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 447, f359, Graham to Peel, 22 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 518, f158, 169, Beresford to Peel, 15, 24 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, f162, Peel to Beresford, 20 Nov. 1842; *ibid*, MS 40, 520, f64, Beresford to Peel, 9 Dec. 1842. See also Downshire Papers, D671/C/209/23, Beresford to Downshire, 14 April 1843.
212. DEM, 5 Dec. 1842, 4 Jan. 1843. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f193, Eliot to Peel, 4 Dec. 1842. Circular dated 30 Nov. 1842.
213. DEM, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14 Dec. 1842, 2, 4, 9, 13, 16 Jan. 1843.
214. DEM, 12, 16 Dec. 1842, 11 Jan. 1843.
215. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 480, f196, Peel to Eliot, 7 Dec. 1842.
216. *Ibid*, MS 40, 520, f1, 14, Clancarty to Peel, 1, 13 Dec. 1842.
217. *Ibid*, MS 40, 521, f189, Corry to Peel, 30 Dec. 1842; *ibid*, f193, Peel to Corry, 5 Jan. 1843; *ibid*, MS 50, 523, f42, Corry to Peel, 14 Jan. 1843.

218. DEM, 10 Feb. 1843.
219. DEM, 20 Feb. 1843.
220. Hansard, 67, 101-2, 23 Feb. 1843, Shaw. DEM, 3 March 1843. Also *ibid*, 20 March 1843.
221. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol. X, f39, Caledon to Beresford, 6 April 1843.
222. Hansard, 68, 687-720, 7 April 1843, Shaw, Grogan, Jones, Bernard, Hamilton, Lefroy. DEM, 10 April 1843.
223. DEM, 12 April 1843.
224. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol. VIII, f185, Thackeray to Beresford, 24 March 1843.
225. House of Commons Journals, 1843, 98, Index. House of Lords Journals, 1843, 75, 673. Hansard, 69, 1226-8, 1 June 1843, Clancarty.
226. DEM, 19, 21, 24 April 1843.
227. Hansard, 70, 1028, 1038-9, 12 July 1843, Bernard, G. Hamilton; 70, 1130, 14 July 1843, Clancarty; 72, 663, 13 Feb. 1844, Roden; 72, 1225, 20 Feb. 1844, C. Hamilton. DEM, 3, 5, 15 May, 7 June, 5, 12 July, 16 Aug. 1843.
228. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 528, f17, Hoare to Peel, 24 April 1843.
229. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f383, Peel to Lady De Grey, 29 Feb. 1844. Graham Papers, 14IR, Graham to Lady De Grey, 26 Feb. 1844; 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 1 Feb. 1845; Graham Cabinet memo, 12 Feb. 1845; 86, Graham to Heytesbury, 21 Feb. 1845.
230. DEM, 20 March, 8, 10, 22 April, 9 Aug. 1844.
231. Hansard, 76, 1136-42, 19 July 1844, Verner, Plumtre, A. Lefroy, Clive, C. Hamilton; 76, 1701-2, 2 Aug. 1844, Wicklow.
232. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f19, 31, 49, 54, 65, 71, 108, 147, 174, 199, Heytesbury to Peel, 5, 11 Aug., 3, 4, 17, 24 Sept., 23 Oct., 13, 24 Nov., 9 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f23, 57, 157, 181, Peel to Heytesbury, 8 Aug., 5 Sept., 18, 30 Nov. 1844. Graham Papers, 16IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 17 Aug. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 115-21.
233. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f15, Graham to Peel, 11 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 542, f96, Knox to Peel, 4 April 1844; *ibid*, f98, Peel to Knox, 8 April 1844; *ibid*, f281, Kingsmill to Peel, 16 April 1844; *ibid*, f283, Eliot to Peel, 18 April 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 550, f362, Irwin to Peel, 31 Aug. 1844; *ibid*, f366, Peel to Irwin, 2 Sept. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 557, f132, Stopford to Peel, 4 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, f134, Peel to Stopford, 13 Jan. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 560, f48, Hoare to Peel, 15 Feb. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 561, f113, Hoare to Peel, 26 Feb. 1845. Graham Papers, 15IR, Graham to De Grey, 24 April 1844; Ebrington to De Grey, 28 March 1844; 17IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 18, 21, 28 Oct. 1844; Stopford to Heytesbury, 19 26 Oct. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 21, 23, 26, 30 Oct. 1844; Heytesbury to Stopford, 25 Oct. 1844; 18IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 1, 5 Nov. 1844; Heytesbury to Stopford, 1 Nov. 1844; Todd to Gladstone, 1 Nov. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 6 Nov.

- 1844; 19IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 4 Dec. 1844; 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 6, 11 Jan., 17 Feb. 1845; Graham to Eliot, 11 Jan. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 13 Jan. 1845; Eliot to Graham, 21 Jan. 1845; 72B, Peel to Graham, 22 April 1844; 77B, Peel to Graham, 22 Oct. 1844; 78, Graham to Heytesbury, 8 Nov. 1844; 35, Graham to Heytesbury, 9 Jan. 1845; Peel to Graham, 12 Jan. 1845; 86, Graham to Heytesbury, 15, 21 Feb. 1845. Edward A. Stopford, A Report to the Lord Bishop of Meath on the state of Elementary Schools in the Diocese and the Opinion of the Clergy respecting the question of National Education (Dublin, 1845). Edward Stopford, Bishop of Meath, Correspondence with Sir James Graham (no place, 1845). (Edward Newenham Hoare, Dean of Achonry), Letters on National Education: containing suggestions with a view to obtaining the cooperation of the clergy of the Established Church with the Incorporated National Board; by a Dignitary of the Irish Church (Dublin, 1846). DEM, 31 March 1845. Beresford MSS, RCBL, MS 81, 1/9, Stopford to Stopford (son), 30 Nov. 1844; *ibid*, 6/1, Whately to Stopford, 21 Dec. 1844.
234. J. C. Martin, A Defence of the Irish Clergy and a View of their Past and Present Duty with respect to the System of National Education in Ireland (Dublin, 1844). J. M. Hiffernan, Review of the Controversy on National Education in Ireland, revived by the Rev. H. Woodward's "Thoughts on the Points at Issue between the Established Church and the National Board of Education" (Dublin, 1844). Henry Newland, Brief Observations on the Past and Present Condition of the Education of the Poor in Ireland (Dublin, 1845). Henry Newland, Observations on the Past and Present Condition of the Education of the Poor in Ireland, with Remarks on the Lord Primate and Bishops' Address (Dublin, 1845). A few remarks of the Pamphlets of Messrs. Trench, Woodward, Hiffernan, Knox, and Dr Martin on Government Measures which have affected Protestant interests from 1824 to the Present Time and on the Position and Duty of the Church, by a Catholic (Dublin, 1845). Henry Woodward, Thoughts on the Points at Issue between the Established Church and the National Board of Education in Ireland (London, 1844). DEM, 30 Oct., 6, 13, 27 Nov. 1844. DEP, 22 April 1845.
235. Graham Papers, 17IR, Eliot to Graham, 16 Oct. 1844; Heytesbury to Graham, 28 Oct. 1844.
236. *Ibid*, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 11 Jan. 1845. DEM, 10 Jan. 1845. Report from the Lords' Select Committee appointed to inquire into the practical working of the System of National Education in Ireland, P.P., 1854, XV, Pt. II, 1613-6.
237. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 19 Jan. 1845.
238. *Ibid*, Heytesbury to Graham, 14 Jan. 1845. DEM, 31 Jan. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f65, Beresford to Peel, 31 May 1845, enclosure. P.P., 1854, XV, Pt. II, 1605-7.
239. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 2, 3 Feb. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 4 Feb. 1845.
240. *Ibid*, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 3 March 1845.
241. *Ibid*, Heytesbury to Graham, 28, 31 March 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 30 March 1845. DEM, 28 March 1845.
242. Erne Papers, D1939/21/5n/66, Donoughmore to Erne, 17 May 1845; *ibid*, /70, Wicklow to Erne, 20 May 1845; *ibid*, /77, Donoughmore to Erne, 23 May 1845.

243. Hansard, 79, 60, 3 April 1845, Gregory; 79, 663-4, 14 April 1845, Shaw; 79, 696-7, 702, 15 April 1845, Major Beresford, Verner; 79, 766, 805-6, 16 April 1845, George Hamilton, Bernard; 80, 394, 9 May 1845, Shaw; 80, 1179-9, 1258-9, 1293-4, 2 June 1845, Roden, G. Hamilton, Shaw; 81, 22, 4 June 1845, Clancarty; 81, 275, 10 June 1845, Clancarty.
244. Beresford Papers, (T.C.D.), MS 2771, f309, Hamilton to Beresford, 29 April 1845.
245. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/132, Beresford to Stopford, 23 Feb. 1845; *ibid.*, /501, Beresford to Howley, 12 April 1845.
246. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f65, Beresford to Peel, 31 May 1845. *DEM*, 16, 20 June 1845. P.P., 1854, XV, Pt. II, 1605-5. More than 100 petitions were sent to Parliament. House of Commons Journals, 1845, 100, Index. House of Lords Journals, 1845, 77, 1183.
247. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f332, Hamilton to Peel, 7 June 1845.
248. Hansard, 81, 632-53, 17 June 1845, Cashel, Wicklow, Clancarty.
249. *DEM*, 16, 20 June 1845.
250. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f72, 91, Peel to Beresford, 9, 14 June 1845. *DEM*, 16, 20 June 1845. P.P., 1854, XV, Pt. II, 1607-11. Hansard, 80, 350-1, 9 May 1845, Graham; 80, 1151-3, 30 May 1845, Graham; 80, 1280-2, 2 June 1845, Peel; 81, 115, 4 June 1845, Stanley; 81, 637-40, 657-60, 661-3, 17 June 1845, St. Germans, Stanley, Wellington; 81, 1069, 23 June 1845, Graham. See also Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 568, f70, Peel Cabinet memo, 7 June 1845, Peel accepting the truth of Whately's assertion that "any grant great or small to any society would involve the immediate resignation of Mr. Blake and myself and the total extinction of the existing Board of National Education".
251. Hansard, 82, 1257-60, 30 July 1845, G. Hamilton, C. Hamilton. Downshire Papers, D671/C/356/123, Roden to Downshire, 31 Oct. 1845. *DEM*, 20 Oct. 1845, 9 Jan. 1846.
252. *DEM*, 17 April 1846.
253. D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment, 285-94, 370-2.

Chapter 5

Education : colleges

Primary education, then, was surrounded with controversy during the 1830's and 1840's. Developments at the other end of the educational scale, at university level, also brought bitter dispute among Irish politicians. Before the reform of 1845, Ireland had but one university, the University of Dublin, of which Trinity was the only college. It offered its students a wide range of instruction, though 'a decided preference' was given to 'classical and mathematical learning over the practical sciences'.¹ The college drew a substantial income from lands bestowed on it in the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I. Until 1793-4 it had been the preserve of the Established Church for most of its history. Catholics and Dissenters were then admitted to its studies and enabled to receive its degrees. By 1845 more than 100 of the 1500 students were Roman Catholics.² Non-Anglicans remained excluded, however, from the fellowships, most of which were ecclesiastical, from virtually all of the professorships, and from the 70 scholarships. Exclusion from the fellowships meant that the government of the University was confined to Establishment Protestants.³

The University of Dublin was a great deal more 'open' than Oxford or Cambridge. Catholics and Dissenters were, by means of compulsory oaths and practices, wholly excluded from Oxford and prevented in Cambridge from taking a degree. However, in the post-Emancipation era such exclusivity as remained at Dublin was resented by some Catholics. This was especially the case because alternative provision was so inadequate to meet the needs of a Catholic middle class which had grown considerably after the relaxation of the penal laws. Only the Royal Belfast Academical Institution came close to being a college of general higher education. It offered a range of subjects which compared well with that at Trinity, and was 'open' in virtually every respect. However, far from being a northern Trinity, many of its students used it as a

preparation for the latter, the only institution which could confer degrees. In 1834-5 it had only 226 students in the collegiate department, many of them candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. Indeed the whole college was, from its origins, so closely connected with the Presbyterian Churches it can have had little appeal, even apart from the factor of distance, to southern Catholics. And from the 1820's it 'suffered very much', particularly in its special role as educator of the Presbyterian ministry, as a result of orthodox Presbyterian suspicions that it was imbued with Arianism.⁴

Though the proposition of a more extensive system of higher education had a long pedigree by 1830, the liberal and largely Catholic movement of the ensuing years bore little resemblance to earlier initiatives. Ominously for the efforts of the liberals, even proposals for a second Protestant university had foundered on the rock of opposition from Trinity College. Primate Beresford strove as late as 1826 for a university at Armagh 'under the Government of the Established Church' but was told by Chief Secretary Goulburn that the Government would be deterred by the likely cost and that 'there would be an unwillingness to encourage a College which might in some degree be considered as detracting from Trinity College in Dublin.'⁵ It was probable, then, that direct assaults on Trinity, proposals for a second college or university, and even demands for a more extensive 'intermediate' tier of education to serve the Catholic middle classes, would provoke opposition. And that opposition was to be the stronger because in the period under study Dublin University was represented by some of Irish Toryism's most capable and vocal members, namely Frederick Shaw, Thomas Lefroy and George Hamilton.

The most persistent advocate of a more extensive system of higher education in this period was Thomas Wyse, liberal-unionist member for Waterford. He made his first contribution to the debate in 1829 when he alluded briefly to the issue in his Historical Sketch of the Catholic Association. He suggested that 'in concurrence with the Government', the

remains of the Catholic rent should be used to 'establish in a central position, Athlone for instance, a second university', given that Trinity was 'inadequate' to meet Ireland's needs. Also in 1829 James Doyle, Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, produced a pamphlet in which he advocated the establishment of four colleges which unlike Trinity would be fully open to non-Protestants and the middle classes. He too wished to use the surplus funds of the Catholic Association.

When Wyse's interest in education was brought to his attention in November 1830, Doyle wrote to a fellow cleric that Wyse 'should look beyond elementary schools and endeavour to turn the attention of the Government to the establishment of four Provincial Academies, in which the sciences not requiring a previous classical education would be taught to the middle classes of society; for this purpose the funds of Trinity College would be amply sufficient ...' Answering a subsequent letter from Doyle, Wyse wrote that,

'Our whole National Education .. wants reforming .. We should have, for the higher departments of Art and Science, a well arranged system of University Education. Subordinate to this, for the great body of the middle classes, the Provincial Colleges to which you refer ... Our single University from its singleness alone, were it even pure from other defects, would always be of comparative inutility to the country.'

The University's 'riches' made it 'a fit daughter' of the Established Church, and given its 'strenuous idleness' he believed that 'no man save a liver upon the abuse but must be compelled to acknowledge the inferiority of our own boasted Alma Mater' to more modest establishments in Europe. 'The Dublin University is a mere ecclesiastical and I may in some degree add, an anti-National institution. Catholics have their privilege of entering the lists, not of carrying off the crowns of the athletes.' With regard to the solution, he felt that,

'To ameliorate or correct this would be as difficult as to ameliorate or correct the Establishment itself, of which this is the Citadel. The evolution of time (a much more rapid and searching reformer now than formerly) may do it if not prevented by the impatient and just indignation of the country in the interval; but in the House of Parliament nothing can be hoped (sic), and nothing ought to be attempted beyond exposing its abuses and urging the establishment as soon as possible, of a second University. The increase of our population .., the consequent increase of

our intellectual as well as all our other wants, or perhaps more than all our others, the still greater urgency of our claims arising from difference of religion, etc, imperatively demand it. Scotland has four Universities, England has now four, why should not we have two ?'

He 'always had this project at heart', and regretted that his proposal regarding the excess funds of the Catholic Association had been frustrated when 'personal views, personal wants interfered, and public faith was broken and public money lavished with the profligacy of a Committee of the Treasury.'

In his 'Heds of a Plan for National Education' submitted to the Government in December 1830, Wyse proposed that the Government should contribute towards the establishment in all four provinces of 'Provincial Colleges and Academies, for the education of the middle classes of society, in those departments of knowledge most necessary to such classes, Mathematics, Mechanics, Natural Philosophy, Natural History, Agricultural and Commercial Chemistry, etc, etc.' He envisaged that the Provincial Colleges would provide a tier of education immediately below University level, but suggested, somewhat vaguely, that, 'The Provincial Colleges, though principally destined for the middle and professional classes, might be made, where deemed advisable, subsidiary to the University.'

Wyse apparently accepted that University education should remain the preserve of 'the upper classes'. But he contended that though the exclusion of Catholics from the scholarships and fellowships of Trinity College was 'not yet felt as a grievance by the Catholics,' the day must soon come when they would protest against this exclusion. He suggested that the ample funds of Trinity College, then 'in the management and enjoyment of a few', could be made 'available to the many' in one of two ways. Trinity could be 'opened' - that is, Catholics could become eligible for lay fellowships and scholarships in Trinity. Or, if the University was to be regarded as an ecclesiastical Protestant institution, 'it is high time, in justice to the Irish nation, to whose wants such a body cannot be adapted, to found a second University, either taking

advantage of existing institutions or erecting a new University altogether.' ¹⁰

Soon after the introduction of the National System of Education, Wyse made it clear to Stanley that he regarded the new system as 'a small portion of the required reform. The establishment of Provincial Colleges for our middle classes and the opening of the University for our upper are not less important'. He felt that Trinity was 'one of those close boroughs which ought to be opened, that National funds are not given for private uses, and that charters which are against the People and their interests ought to be altered for the People, unless it is wished they should, like Tithes, be altered and reformed, in the first instance, by the people themselves.' ¹¹ In correspondence with his brother in 1831-2, Wyse showed that these questions were never far from his mind. He would not only ~~to~~ open Trinity but ~~to~~ establish the provincial colleges out of the 'surplus revenues' of the University and 'in conjunction' with it, 'with powers of conferring degrees of an inferior kind.' In private conversation he found Spring Rice, Durham and Hume prepared to establish provincial colleges and to open Trinity. Anthony Blake and the Tory Robert Bateson were 'anxious for the Provincial Colleges', and though Wyse found in July 1831 that 'many here (London) laugh at them as mere theory' ¹² he reported a year later that the colleges were 'gaining supporters daily'.

The lengthy Parliamentary debates on Irish education in 1831-2 brought scarcely any discussion of these questions. Wyse himself spoke of his regret that Trinity College was 'comparatively closed against the Catholics', urged the importance of better education of 'the middle classes' in Ireland, and asked the Government to give 'encouragement' to the establishment of colleges open to both Protestants and Catholics. Lefroy replied that Catholics could obtain degrees from Trinity and, regarding their exclusion from fellowships and scholarships, stated that he 'hoped never to see the latitudinarian system .. which admitted of the establishment of opposite professorships, to teach conflicting religious doctrines, ¹³ established in the Dublin University.' Sheil, O'Connell and Henry Grattan

made some very scathing remarks about Trinity College when they protested against its receiving an extra Member under the Reform Bill, denigrating its academic standard, its riches, its Toryism, and the vestiges of its Protestant exclusivity. Crampton, Croker, Lefroy and Shaw leapt to its defence, extolling its academic claims and its historical role of ¹⁴ 'propagation of the Protestant religion.'

These discussions in relation to the Reform Bill were more or less incidental. Two petitions to 'open' Trinity College and for an inquiry ¹⁵ into its 'immense' income were presented without comment. In May 1834, Sheil, like Wyse a Catholic graduate from Dublin, moved for leave to bring in 'a Bill for the admission of Roman Catholics and other Dissenters to Scholarships and certain Professorships, as are unconnected with religious instruction, in the University of Dublin.' Lefroy protested that 'that small beginning was but the first step to the subversion of the Irish University, and, through the subversion of that nursery of the Irish Church, to the total extinction of the Protestant religion in Ireland', and that, Catholics and Dissenters being permitted to take degrees, the existing system was accepted 'without murmur or public remonstrance from the people.' On the motion of another Irish Tory, Colonel Perceval, the House was counted out. Spring Rice was able to state in the following month, with only slight exaggeration, that Ireland's Roman Catholics had ¹⁶ accepted the vestiges of Protestant monopoly at Trinity without complaint.

In May 1835, Wyse, back in Parliament, pressed the need for 'provincial colleges' for the education of the middle classes, one tier below the University. Regarding the latter, he and Sheil presented the House with a simple choice between enlarging the present University by admitting all persuasions to the scholarships and to lay fellowships, and the immediate formation of a second university or another college within the University. Trinity came under attack again in July 1835, from Warburton and O'Connell, and in February 1836 from Cloncurry, with Lefroy again asserting that its liberality was proved by its conferment of degrees upon all. ¹⁷

Thereafter even these sporadic remarks ceased, and the subject was not revived in Parliament until the following decade. In Cork, however, the cause made considerable advances. A group of Cork men had urged the establishment of a college there for nearly ten years, bringing refusals from the Governments of Wellington and Grey. In July 1835, it was planned to approach the Lord Lieutenant on the subject, but Denis Bullen, a doctor in Cork and the prime mover in these efforts, told Wyse that lack of support for the idea, even in Cork, would mean postponement of a petition to Parliament until the report of Wyse's Select Committee was brought out. In October 1837, a meeting was held in Cork to promote the founding of a university in Cork. It was 'respectably, though not numerously, attended'. The City and County members (Barry, liberal-unionist, Callaghan, Beamish and E. B. Roche, repealers) were there and 'promised their zealous cooperation.' A 'permanent committee' was formed 'to carry the design into execution.' James Roche, a local banker and chairman of the committee, subsequently sought O'Connell's endorsement, as it was thought that 'some legislative assistance' would be required.

The cause of reform of higher education in Ireland was given a substantial boost in 1838 with the report of the Select Committee on Irish education, a report for which Wyse was largely responsible (see above, p215). It stressed the importance of the education of 'the middle classes' and asserted that though the University prepared the upper classes and a portion of the middle for 'the learned professions', only in Belfast was there adequate instruction in the agricultural, commercial and manufacturing activities which most of the middle class were destined to pursue. At secondary school level this deficiency should be met with a system of County Academies. And to meet 'the want of a still higher department, intermediate between the Academy and University', it was proposed that the Government should assist in the establishment of 'Provincial Colleges', one 'at least' in each province, with the Academical Institution in Belfast perhaps constituted as the Ulster college. The Report went on:

'The object of these Colleges should be to provide a high degree of education, preparing either for the University or, if the University were not in view, for different public and private, professional and unprofessional careers ... Though it might not be advisable that the Colleges, individually, should be authorized to confer Degrees, it might still be so that a Board, formed of members of each of the four, from the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, and from the University of Dublin and other learned bodies (as might be deemed advisable), should sit in the Capital, and after due examination .. should be empowered to admit to Degrees such candidates as presented themselves from the Provincial Colleges, excepting, however, Degrees in Divinity. Your Committee are not prepared to give an opinion how far such degrees should confer all the privileges incidental to those given by existing Universities. It might be advisable to give a common Charter to the four Colleges, under one common name ... All situations in the Colleges should be open to all religious denominations. No tests should be required.' 21

The ambiguity of the Report as to whether or not the new Colleges were to constitute a second University or an 'intermediate' tier of education persisted throughout much of the subsequent discussion. Soon after the report came out, Wyse suggested a public meeting to Bullen, who responded enthusiastically and observed that the question was one 'upon which we will not receive any assistance from O'Connell. As a matter of detail he does not understand it, and will not meddle with it as he could not give the matter an incendiary character. On this account we shall be able to rally around us a great number of moderate men ...' 22 O'Connell, in fact, warmly approved of the establishment of Provincial Colleges as part of 'a National University', and again denounced the 'egregious nuisance' of Trinity, but, beyond signing the requisition, took no active part in the campaign. 23

Towards the end of September, the Cork Committee decided to support the proposals of the Select Committee and call a meeting to petition for a provincial college in Munster. 24 The meeting was held in Cork on the 15th of November 1838. Five Munster M.P.'s attended - Jephson-Norreys, E. B. Roche, M. J. O'Connell, Francis Beamish and Wyse, and nine other liberal members signed the requisition. Spring Rice and Lansdowne also gave the general proposition of provincial colleges warm endorsement. 25 Munster's three Conservative members - Jackson, Blennerhasset and Thomas - were not involved at any stage. However, Beamish and M. J. O'Connell

claimed that all shades of politics were represented at the meeting and declared that the question was 'neutral territory' between the parties.

Wyse, who was very much the principal speaker and, according to one report, was 'justly styled the parent of the agitation', declared that the movement for Provincial Colleges did not involve 'hostility' to or 'subversion' of Trinity College, that it was merely a question of meeting the needs of people - Roman Catholics and the middle classes - for whom Trinity did not adequately cater; he was also quite clear that the exclusion of Catholics, and lay Protestants, from most of the honours of Trinity necessitated the establishment of another university. Jephson-Norreys, also a liberal-unionist, stressed that while Trinity concentrated on the legal, medical and ecclesiastical professions, areas like engineering, architecture, geology and political economy required greater attention. The meeting endorsed the report of the Select Committee, especially regarding Provincial Colleges, urged the establishment of a college in Cork which would provide the middle class youths of Munster with 'an education of a more practical character than the almost exclusively professional system of instruction afforded by the University', resolved that the peers and representatives of Munster should press the issue in Parliament and with the Government, carried an Address to the Queen, and established an expanded Provincial Committee to work for a Munster College. Two days later Wyse informed his brother that,

'The meeting went off most admirably, it was really one of the most imposing I have seen in Ireland, in point especially of respectability; the numbers also were great and the sympathy of every class very marked and expressive. It is a new thing in this country to see such enthusiasm for a purely intellectual question. We had all religions, professions and orders ... they say I made a marvellous speech. It had a strong effect and removed all that still lingered of doubt on the matter .. the cheers were very encouraging for the future progress of the measure .. I have every hope of succeeding with ministers .. I think with exertion we shall have 60,000 signatures, they cannot resist this ...'

He saw the Provincial Committee as a suitable vehicle for the co-option of advocates and regarded his nomination to its joint-secretaryship (with Bullen) as licence to manage the question in the name of the Province.

The Whig Dublin Evening Post welcomed the prospect of provincial colleges and felt that their attainment was ensured by 'the unanimous feeling of all parties, of every shade of politics or religion.'²⁹ One of the local Tory papers, the Cork Standard, also noted the attendance of representatives of both parties and religions and itself took a favourable view of the project.³⁰ In the letter to his brother, Wyse wrote that 'the Tories made a feeble show of resistance; beyond a few growls of the (Tory Cork) "Constitution", we could hear of nothing.'³¹ But the Dublin Evening Mail were stridently hostile:

'The Popish Hierarchy have long set their hearts on getting into their own hands the exclusive education of the people of Ireland; and, despairing of success through the chartered right of the Dublin University, they are content to undermine its walls and sap its prosperity by means of rival establishments under their own more immediate control.'

The Mail extolled the virtues of Trinity College, including 'her liberality and genuine toleration' towards Roman Catholics, and contended that Trinity, with other existing institutions, adequately coped with Ireland's requirements in respect of higher education.³² But perhaps the principal cloud over these proceedings was the alienation of Smith O'Brien and the Limerick interest over the intended site of the Munster College. On receipt of the invitation of James Roche, O'Brien publicly replied that the College should be sited near Limerick, that he intended 'to stimulate the enlightened minds' of Limerick to urge that city's claims, and that he could not cooperate with those who favoured Cork.³³ Morgan John O'Connell, Bullen and Roche, at the Cork meeting and in subsequent correspondence with O'Brien, deeply regretted that the question of the site of the College had been raised and feared that 'unworthy selfishness' and 'dissension' would undermine a cause which they felt had every prospect of success. Though all three argued the merits of the Cork site, they made a strong appeal to O'Brien to work with them, and Bullen, by way of inducement, wrote that if the college at Cork succeeded 'an irresistible case' could then be made for making Limerick the location of a college to serve the province of Connaught.³⁴

The response of Limerick and O'Brien was more conciliatory than the latter's earlier position. At a meeting of the Limerick Institution on the 11th of December 1838, O'Brien in the chair, it was decided to hold a public meeting in Limerick to press for 'one or more collegiate institutions ...

'The question of site is a subordinate consideration and it would be deeply to be regretted that any unworthy jealousy upon this point should tend to defeat the accomplishment of an object of great national concern. The meeting at Cork has naturally pointed to Cork as the most eligible. Limerick may advance equal, if not superior claims. If only one College be erected, it will be for Parliament to make a selection between the two cities. Probably, however, the most desirable mode of carrying out the object which the Parliamentary Committee had in view will eventually be found to be the establishment of a College at Cork and of another at Limerick.' 35

This was the line taken by O'Brien at the resultant public meeting, on the 5th of January 1839, though he insisted, and the meeting resolved, that if only one college could be obtained in Munster, its centrality and the superiority of its existing educational institutions made Limerick's claims preferable to those of Cork. The extent of common ground was underlined by much else that was stated in the prospectus and at the meeting, particularly concerning the insufficiency of existing instruction of middle class youths in the practical sciences. Though few notable figures actually attended the meeting, the requisition was signed by four Whig peers and eight liberal members of Parliament.³⁶

Wyse's response was quite revelatory of his ultimate object. He contended, in a letter to O'Brien, that there should be only one College in Munster, at Cork, and one, in due course, in each of the other three Provinces. He explained :

'I am desirous to see secured as high a standard of classical, scientific and industrial education as can well be obtained, with the hope of seeing the four Colleges afterwards aggregated into a "Corps Academique" or University ... This can scarcely be attained by multiplying at the outset these establishments. They cannot have the same efficiency or pursue the same high standard as if few.' 37

And after the Limerick meeting he wrote,

'I read your speech very attentively but am not yet brought over to your way of thinking. At the same time your request is only reasonable.

I suspend my judgement until we meet in London. If we can bear so many Colleges well and good, but I am for Colleges remember and not institutions between Colleges & Academies.' 38

There was indeed a considerable gap between their respective objects. While Wyse envisaged the system of University Colleges which was later conceded, O'Brien spoke at the Limerick meeting of a college which youths would enter at 14 years of age and leave at 17, when they could go on to Trinity College.³⁹ The dispute over the site of the Munster college also vexed Spring Rice, who wrote to O'Brien, 'I am very solicitous to see a really efficient academical institution established in the South of Ireland, but I regret much that the selection of any particular site should have been mixed up with this great national question. The tendency of this cannot but be to create disunion & to excite local jealousies.'⁴⁰ But others, including the Whig Lord Listowel, the chairman of the Cork meeting, approved of O'Brien's 'judicious treatment' of the problem and joined him in wishing for more than one college.⁴¹

It was, in fact, the rock of Protestant suspicion on which the proceedings at Limerick all but foundered. The Select Committee Report had suggested that there should be no Chairs of Divinity in the new colleges, and Wyse confirmed at Cork that he thought them unnecessary and a possible source of difference, though he felt that some sort of religious instruction could still be provided in the college.⁴² Lord Dunraven, one of the leading Conservatives in County Limerick, informed O'Brien that he could not attend the Limerick meeting, and indeed, he went on,

'if I rightly understand the object to be the establishment of Collegiate education unconnected with religion, any opinion I express would be in direct condemnation of a principle which I am fully assured will work out evil instead of good. It is part of the system of expediency & philosophy afloat nowadays, and it is very specious & captivating, but .. you will witness great evils flowing from this unscriptural course.'⁴³

Others feared that the colleges would fall into 'bad hands' and 'become "normal schools" for the extension of disorganization.'⁴⁴ The Tory Lord Muskerry withheld his approval on more vague grounds, 'not being at all of opinion that the establishment of Provincial Colleges would tend to

45

the improvement of Ireland, in its moral or social relations.'

Sir Aubrey De Vere, a moderate Conservative of some importance in Limerick politics, took the chair at the meeting and spoke in favour of the proposed colleges, and there were some Conservatives - notably Sir Lucius O'Brien - among the requisitionists of the meeting. O'Brien declared that the question was not a party one, and disclaimed any intention to challenge Trinity College. He opposed the establishment of Chairs of Divinity as conducive to rivalry between the two religions and felt that religious instruction could be provided through more informal channels. The meeting degenerated into 'a scene of turbulent uproar' as local Conservatives, who appear to have swamped the meeting, protested upon these points. They urged the sufficiency of Trinity College, angrily accused the proponents of the colleges of the intention to exclude religious education, and argued that, as such, the proposal was an attempt to extend to higher education the objectionable principles of the National System.

X The Conservative Limerick Standard took the same view of 'this iniquitous proposition for the multiplying of Maynooths.' Lord Clarina, Lord Adare, William Monsell, Archdeacon Maunsell and others signed a Protest against the resolutions, which were passed only after the
46
departure of the Conservatives. Commenting on the movement in general, X the Christian Examiner of January 1839 deprecated the attempt 'to extend to the upper classes of society the principle so banefully embodied in the national system for the lower and to have provincial colleges in which everything is to be taught except religion.' They defended Trinity and described the colleges plan as 'unchristian in its principles and
47
uncalled for by the circumstances of the country.'

Notwithstanding all these difficulties, Wyse was later to describe
48
the Cork and Limerick meetings as immense successes. He felt that the Cork meeting had succeeded in reconciling many Conservatives to the
49
project. In his letter to O'Brien on the 4th of January 1839, he wrote

that the 'great obstacle', public apathy, had been removed, and he regarded the difference over the siting of the Munster College not as a difficulty but as further evidence of the strength of the desire for such a College. Wyse's confidence was shaken by Morpeth's lack of interest when they met later in January, but he resolved that 'we must work on for all that and torment them (the Government) if we cannot instruct them into something good for themselves and the country.'

Many of the developments of the next couple of years were described in a letter which Wyse wrote to the Munster Committee at the end of 1841. The members charged with the Cork and Limerick petitions were deterred from bringing on a motion on the subject by the furore created in 1839 by the Government's proposals for education in England, when the strength of opposition to non-sectarian principles in education was amply demonstrated. Clearly the proponents of Provincial Colleges did not disregard the signs that the issue involved Protestant-Conservative sensibilities. Wyse also described 'the local pretensions & jealousies of the University of Dublin' as a barrier to progress. In April 1839, the Tory Earl of Bandon presented a petition in the Lords from 'the Noblemen, Clergy, Gentry and others resident in the County and City of Cork .., against the establishment of any College likely to follow a plan of instruction not founded on religious truth .., and for which .. no necessity on any view of the case can be reasonably urged', which petition was also presented to the Commons some weeks later. And in May 1839 there was presented in the Commons 'a petition of Lord Dunraven and others, praying the House to refuse their consent to the proposed establishment of Provincial Colleges in the South of Ireland.'

The newly-appointed Lord Lieutenant, Ebrington, was collared by Wyse and responded sympathetically; and Wyse felt that Normanby's replacement of Russell at the Home Office represented further grounds for optimism; he hoped in September 1839 that the ensuing session would see some progress in the question and resolved to work on a Colleges bill

56

during the Parliamentary recess of 1839-40. Smith O'Brien made another contribution to the cause in his article for the Central Society of Education in 1839. He regretted that Catholics and Dissenters should be excluded from the fellowships and scholarships of Trinity, pointing out that this meant exclusion of the great majority of the population from the administration and emoluments of Ireland's only university and contending that this state of things alienated Catholic feelings and deterred many Catholics from entering Trinity. He felt that almost all of the fellowships should be lay, and open to all. His interpretation of the Report of the Select Committee was that it recommended 'a college possessing the character of a university in each of the provinces', with Trinity and the Belfast Institution sufficing for Leinster and Ulster. However, O'Brien himself, consistent with his course at Limerick, saw 'no reason to doubt that Ireland would require and support at least five or six collegiate establishments' and suggested that colleges should be established in Cork, Limerick, Kilkenny, Londonderry and other large towns. He urged Parliament to take the matter in hand, as Cork and Limerick had already called for such establishments.

57

Early in 1840, Wyse and his colleagues at Westminster decided to ask the Government, 'individual members of which had .. expressed themselves favourable', to take up the question, as they had done in 1831 regarding primary education. 'With this view a series of meetings of the Peers and Representatives of Munster were held in New Palace Yard, chaired by Monteagle (Spring Rice), at which it was resolved that the Government should be called on to bring in a bill, and a deputation consisting of Monteagle, O'Brien, Stock and Wyse (all liberal-unionists) was sent to wait on Lord Morpeth. Morpeth and the Chancellor, Sir Francis Baring, met this and subsequent approaches by Wyse with a mixture of sympathy and prevarication, until, at the beginning of 1841, Morpeth promised Wyse that he would bring the subject before the Cabinet. He asked Wyse 'to draw up a report embracing the substance of the several

representations which had been made to him, for the purpose of laying it before the Cabinet.' Wyse duly prepared the report, but withheld it for a time in the expectation that the Parliamentary defeats suffered by the Government that Spring would preclude its consideration; he delivered the report at the beginning of September 1841, when the Government had already resigned, and Morpeth officially transmitted it to his successor, Lord Eliot.⁵⁸

In this report, Wyse stressed the importance of middle class education and the shortcomings of the 'intermediate' and university systems then existing in Ireland. He described the recommendations of the Committee of 1838 with regard to provincial colleges, and the subsequent evidence of the popularity of the idea in Munster, where Wyse felt the first college should be built. Religious instruction, he wrote, would be provided - 'separate for the several communions under the guidance of their respective pastors. This whole question is a matter for grave consideration, both as to principle and application.' Persons of every denomination should, of course, be admissible to the instruction, honours and emoluments of the new colleges. Wyse made it clear that he would prefer to see Trinity College fully 'opened' to all creeds, but that failing this the provincial colleges should be aggregated into a second University. He proposed that there should be only one college in Munster, as this arrangement would be more conducive to efficiency, economy and high academic standards, and though he conceded that 'some transient exhibitions of natural but honourable rivalry' had taken place regarding its location, he felt that all would 'willingly acquiesce' in the Government's eventual decision. The report also included detailed discussion of financial and organizational aspects of the question. It was clearly intended as a blueprint for action, and was eminently suited to the role it was later to fulfil, that of the basic discussion paper circulated to the Conservative Cabinet.

In December 1841 the Munster Committee intended to approach the

59

Conservative Government to urge the necessity of provincial colleges. And Wyse, out of Parliament until the Summer of 1842, intended in the next session to press again for the colleges and to bring on a motion to admit Catholics to the fellowships and scholarships of Trinity College. 'This may produce either a Committee of Inquiry or demand for a Protestant-Catholic Irish National University. I wish to push them

60

into this dilemma.' In May 1843, in a debate on the English Universities, Wyse again contended that Trinity should be opened, and Shaw that its

61

'essentially' Protestant character rendered this 'obviously impossible'.

On the same day Wyse moved successfully that his report of 1841 should be printed, and, that evening in the Reform Club, he was told by Russell that 'he approved of Trinity College being reformed & Maynooth being

62

made a Theological faculty thereof.'

Some days later Wyse wrote that the question was 'gaining ground' and that he planned still to bring on motions on provincial colleges and

63

the University. Smith O'Brien, in July, lamented the exclusive aspects of Trinity College and its inadequacy in a country of the size of Ireland, and he attacked the Government for leaving 'unheeded on the shelves of the Irish office' Wyse's reports of 1838 and 1841 in spite of the enthusiasm with which the idea of provincial colleges had been received in Ireland. He told the House that Wyse was 'deterred from submitting his project to Parliament lest by the opposition of the Ministry its future success may be impeded.' The following month there was a vague

64

reference to the subject in the remonstrance of the liberal-unionist members.

In January 1844, Wyse wrote to O'Brien,

'When we meet I shall make you fully acquainted with the nature and result of my detailed communications on the subject of the Provincial Colleges which followed the arrangements we made just previous to your leaving London, and be very glad to take counsel with you how we are to proceed further .. I am still sanguine as to their establishment. For my own part I am more than ever convinced of their importance & utility .. From letters received from Cork, I do not think there has been any relaxation of the public feeling in favor of the plan; on the contrary, were this moment any indication given in Parliament of cooperation, I have no doubt it would be met with general sympathy ...'

65

In the great debate on the state of Ireland in February 1844, Wyse urged Parliament either to open Trinity or establish a Catholic University, and Clements of Leitrim (also a liberal-unionist) endorsed his call for an extension of higher education. Four days later, Peel brought the subject to the attention of the Cabinet, as an area in which concession might be made:

'... can we do anything or hold out any hope with regard either to the extension of Trinity College, to the increase of the establishment or the widening of its basis in some proportion to the increase of population since the period of its institution? Can we establish schools or provincial academies on the footing of the College at Durham, perfectly open to the Roman Catholic youth of a higher grade than the class which receives its education at the National Schools? Might there not be some system of Roman Catholic Education, not founded like Maynooth for ecclesiastics, not professedly of a religious character, but which without being open to the objections in principle to Maynooth might be accessible to Roman Catholics intended for the Church and might combine with them, as at Oxford & Cambridge, young men destined for secular pursuits?' 66

Stanley responded favourably, wishing 'to see three Colleges established ...

'... one in the north, if necessary, at which the Presbyterians might receive education, one in Munster and one in Connaught, which would be principally though not exclusively Catholic; in which young men destined for the priesthood might receive a liberal ecclesiastical education, in connection with a general education which they would share with others not so destined; and the conversion of Maynooth into a similar establishment; unless it were possible to engraft a R. C. religious education, as a separate branch, on Trinity College, Dublin - and this last I am afraid would be found impracticable.' 67

In closing the Irish debate, Peel merely said he would not rule out consideration of such a step. In a subsequent Cabinet memo he proposed to establish a Commission of Inquiry into Maynooth and higher education:

'It should consider the question, whether combined academical education for clergy and laity be possible. Whether the establishment of Trinity College can be extended, not disturbing the present principles of its constitution and Government ... This Commission might also consider questions connected with instruction in agricultural science and academical instruction for a rather higher class than those admitted into the National School.' 70

This advance in the question undoubtedly owed more to the Repeal threat in Ireland than to the moribund agitation of Wyse and his friends. It was very much a spin-off from consideration of the Maynooth question, which consideration was itself partly a result of the role of Catholic

priests in the Repeal movement. Wyse proceeded to prepare to bring on the subject in Parliament, informing O'Brien in March that, 'Above all I wish we should press on the House the very irrational position (of) ..
⁷¹
 the whole University system.' He gave notice of three motions, on 'the University and Maynooth'; 'on Collegiate education generally, embracing of course Provincial Colleges'; and on 'Subsidiary' (extra-mural)
⁷²
 education, and he was confident 'that something will be done.'

In the first of these motions, the only one which he appears to have tried to bring on, Wyse, too, had clearly come to see the Maynooth question as an integral part of the general issue of higher education. The motion urged the opening of Trinity to Catholics and elevation of Maynooth to the status of 'a theological faculty' of the University, or, alternatively, the 'founding and maintaining a Roman Catholic university with equal rank, emoluments and privileges with those of the University of Dublin.' The motion revived the fears of the Dublin Evening Mail for the security of Trinity College. The Dublin Protestant Operative Association, an aggressively Protestant working class society led by the Rev. Tresham Gregg, attacked it as a scheme whereby 'the state shall place in equal honor and treat of equal importance your (Wyse's) Roman Catholic principles and those of the Protestant Church', and as such a
⁷³
 violation of the Act of Union and the settlement of 1829.

The motion was deferred 'at the request of members of both sides of the House', and subsequently by Wyse's preoccupation with the State Trials
⁷⁴
 controversy. It had, however, the effect of stimulating consideration of the question in the Cabinet. Indeed Wyse discussed the question with Stanley and informed him that he would open his views to the Government
⁷⁵
 if requested to do so. Graham and Wellington were prepared to have the Catholic clergy and laity educated in colleges connected with the existing University, but Goulburn saw 'enormous difficulties' in so opening the 'essentially Protestant' University, not least the effect on its Parliamentary representation. He thought it would be 'more easy to

establish a University in some other Irish town on the footing of the London University, having associated colleges in different provinces, conferring degrees as tests of proficiency in liberal sciences.' On the 12th of April, Graham circulated Wyse's report of 1841, adding that,

'if it be inexpedient to open the University of Dublin more extensively to Roman Catholics, it is a grave question whether it may not be politic to found in Ireland a new University or at least a College, where general instruction without regard to difference of creed may be given by the aid of the State and under the control of the Crown; the means of separate religious instruction being also provided... At all events this is a subject which in the House of Commons will be speedily discussed; and the Cabinet should be prepared to take their line upon it.'

In a covering note to Peel, Graham wrote that Gladstone was so deeply pledged against Maynooth,

'He is more likely to consent to a new college, open to R. Catholics, on a new Foundation, than to any other measure; and tho' Maynooth ought not to remain in its present position, which is worse than useless, yet if we could agree on a grant for founding a Provincial College the Maynooth difficulty might stand over ... There are some absurdities in Wyse's letter to Lord Morpeth; yet I am disposed to think that a Provincial College in the South of Ireland might be useful. The Presbyterians at Belfast have an Institution of this kind'.

Gladstone, in response to the memo, wrote that he could not 'but concur in Sir James Graham's concluding observation, that the Cabinet should be prepared to take their line upon this question; and it seems to me that Mr. Wyse's motion should be anticipated.'

Graham continued to press the question, urging on the 20th of April that, 'We must have an early understanding on the Irish Education Question. I incline to the payment of the debt due by the trustees of Maynooth and to a grant on account for the purpose of founding a Provincial College.' By the beginning of July a decision had been made, much to Graham's relief, and it was also decided that the Government should announce their intention before the end of the session.

On the 19th of July 1844, Wyse, speaking on his University-Maynooth motion without formally bringing it on, called upon the Government to expand Ireland's university system by opening up Trinity College and by annexing Maynooth and the Belfast Academical Institution to the University of Dublin. Failing that, 'the only remedy would be to establish at once a

Catholic University in Ireland', though he would much prefer a system more conducive to mixed education. Peel, after a warm acknowledgement of Wyse's expertise and efforts in the field of education, said that the Government had found the existing provision of higher education to be 'defective'. 'I trust', he went on, 'that we shall, at an early period of next session, propose means for increasing academical (higher) education.' Sheil and Lord John Manners, the Young England Conservative, expressed their pleasure at this announcement, the former suggesting the establishment of a second college in the University of Dublin in which⁸¹ there would be complete equality between the religious denominations.

The Irish Conservative response was hostile. In the House, Edward Grogan, the member for Dublin, urged caution and added that, 'Whatever principles this new college might be founded on, he hoped that the principles of the Protestant Church would be adhered to'.⁸² Augustus Stafford O'Brien, an English member who had close political and family ties with Ireland, was disgusted by the prospect that 'our precious Government is going to found a Popish college next session'.⁸³ The Mail declared that Peel's policy was 'to be consummated next session by the overthrow of the citadel of Irish Protestantism', Trinity College, 'and the erecting on its ruins of a stronghold of Romanism'; if the 'citadel'⁸⁴ were opened it would mean the downfall of the Established Church.

J. H. Todd, a fellow of Trinity College, argued that the College could not be opened further without subverting property rights and perverting it from the purpose for which it was founded, the service of the Protestant Church, merely to gratify a Catholic party whose object was not education, which the College already gave them, but 'power and spoliation.' Lord Adare endorsed this view. Todd, however, was prepared to open the University by adding to it 'a new College for Roman Catholics⁸⁵ alone.'

Wyse was by no means willing, even 'now when the "question" is really growing into a "measure"', to leave matters in the Government's hands.

'I have no faith in professions of Ministers or Parliaments', he informed O'Brien, 'further than the recognition they give to our principles. To work them out must depend on ourselves, I do believe we are now in a condition effectively to do so', and it should be done
86
'with a spirit entire & true'. He wrote at more length to Russell, who had apparently expressed a favourable opinion of the project:

'On such sanction and support as yours I rely much more for final success than on any promise in or out of Parliament of our opponents.. My impression is that the Government is still quite at sea upon the matter and wait some expression on the part of the public here. It is on this ground I am so anxious to have as early as possible an imposing and explicit declaration as to the nature and extent of the proposed reform, being well assured that it will soon be followed by many others. I have since my return here been in active cooperation with my Cork friends for the purpose, & I have every hope the announced Munster Provincial Meeting will fully answer our wishes. Nor is it of less moment in reference to our home parties. There is still a very vehement remnant of the old "sacred Band" of Orangeism even in our Southern districts, the more vehement perhaps because surrounded by Catholics, and they must be met, neutralised or conciliated, and a still more difficult party to deal with, the Catholic Hierarchy and Clergy, who from experience of former treachery are naturally suspicious of the "Greek" professions & gifts of all Tory Governments, and wage I fear a "guerre sourde" even against the most obvious improvements. There is but one mode to proselytise them, a fair, clear and comprehensive view of the whole matter, managed with firmness and temperance.'

He had already discussed the matter with 'some of the more influential' clergy, 'removing many apprehensions', and he hoped that the bishops at their Synod in November would resolve in favour of a specific plan. Their voice if accompanied with petitions from the four provinces and 'a vigorous support from our Benches' would, he felt, 'render it
87
difficult for Sir Robert to withdraw or explain away his pledges.' A meeting was duly held in Cork on the 13th of November, under the auspices of the Munster Provincial College Committee. Listowel again took the chair, and the meeting was attended by a number of liberal M.P.'s, namely Jephson-Norreys, E. B. Roche, Callaghan and Wyse. Other leading liberals, including O'Connell, Lord Stuart De Decies, the Earl of Kermare and John O'Brien, M.P., wrote to express their adherence to the cause.

Wyse was again very much the principal speaker. He rejoiced that, 'The time has at last arrived when we can enter upon a consideration of

this question with some hope of a practical and decisive result.' He stressed yet again the inadequacy of existing provision of higher education, with a University which pursued an 'exclusive' policy towards Catholics and failed to prepare people for 'the practical purposes of society.' Several options faced the Government: aggregation of Provincial Colleges to constitute a University open to all persuasions; the opening up of the University of Dublin, either by opening Trinity or by adding new colleges (including Maynooth and the Belfast Institution); and, as a last resort, the establishment of a Catholic University. The first course would be 'indispensable' in the absence of the other two, but might be desirable in any case. The resolutions of the meeting dealt only with the advocacy of Provincial Colleges and their aggregation into an
88
open university.

The old issue of the location of the Munster College again reared its head. A memorial from the Corporation of Cork to the Lord Lieutenant in October 1844 welcomed the possibility of such a college and urged the
89
claims of Cork. The circular sent out by the Munster Committee concerned only the 'general principle', but Bullen informed O'Brien that they would advocate Cork, and again held out the prospect of a college in Limerick
90
to serve Connaught. Caleb Powell, the second member for County Limerick,
91
anxious not to prejudice Limerick's claims, sought O'Brien's advice. That neither of them attended, or wrote to avow their adhesion to, the meeting suggests that much of the Limerick party again stood aloof, though John O'Brien, a member for the City of Limerick, was one of those who
92
wrote to approve of the proceeding. At the meeting, Wyse took a conciliatory line, declaring that in order to allay 'petty jealousies
93
about localities' he did not insist on only one College in each province. However, the meeting formally resolved that the Munster College should
94
be in Cork.

Meeting another objection, Wyse emphasized the importance of religious instruction in the Provincial Colleges, but, ruling out

Theological Chairs, preferred to leave the pastors of each religion to
 95
 make whatever arrangements they thought best. There were some protests
 made at the meeting by the Cork Protestant Operatives as to the
 insufficiency of this provision, and the Secretary of the Association
 subsequently informed Peel that 'the great majority of the educated
 classes are entirely opposed' to the scheme, 'including almost generally
 the entire clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland.' He not
 only deprecated 'mere secular education' but saw in the scheme a design
 to 'unprotestantize' Trinity College.⁹⁶ The Mail took the same line,
 urging the necessity of religious education in any new colleges and
 declaring their disbelief that the Government would sacrifice 'the
 essence of education .. for the sake of building up .. the flimsy gin-
 palaces of an excitable and unregulated intellect, the haunts of an
 undisciplined, ungodly and degenerating worldly-mindedness.' And they
 again attacked the 'ruinous proposition' to 'unprotestantize', to
 'unchristianize' Trinity College.⁹⁷

Mac Hale warned Peel in July 1844 that Catholics would insist on
 98
 'separate grants for separate education' in 'Catholic provincial colleges.'
 It is clear from Wyse's letter to Russell in October that he had
 already encountered Catholic suspicion of the project. He discussed it
 with Dr Foran, the Catholic Bishop of Waterford, before and after it was
 discussed at the Synod of bishops in November 1844, and was warned that
 at least some of the assembled prelates regarded the project with some
 99
 concern. The Tablet, 'the great Catholic organ' in England, made a
 'fierce attack' on the Cork meeting, and Archbishop Crolly told Eliot
 and Heytesbury 'that he viewed with some distrust Mr Wyse's scheme for
 establishing Provincial Colleges in Ireland. There was, he thought, too
 100
 much philosophy about it.' In December, in the Repeal Association,
 O'Connell asserted his belief that all education should be accompanied
 by 'a high tone of religious feeling', and a fortnight later the clergy
 of Tuam, with Mac Hale in the chair, announced that they would reject

any plan which did not educate Catholics separately and according to
 101
 the Catholic faith.

Thus began an opposition to the Government's colleges plan which
 was to split the Repeal movement and the Catholic Church. The subsequent
 102
 development of this controversy has been fully treated by others, and it
 is proposed to deal here only with the position taken by the Irish
 unionists. Wyse felt in January 1845 that neither Catholics nor
 Protestants had reason to object to the plan which he envisaged, in
 which general and religious education would be kept rigidly separate,
 103
 with the respective churches in sole control of the latter. O'Brien in
 reply described the extent of Catholic alarm; he was told by Wyse that,

'I had partly anticipated from private communications with Protestant
 and especially Catholic prelates much of what has occurred, both in and
 out of the Association. At the former meetings at Cork and Limerick the
 spirit to which you refer did not exhibit itself. Even at that which took
 in November it was confined to very few. Since, it has become more general
 and is participated in by both Churches, more strongly perhaps in ours
 than yours.' 104

He saw that Catholic opposition to mixed education would make the
 opening of Trinity College 'or even the University' extremely difficult.
 And Parliament would never support the establishment of an 'exclusively
 Catholic university.' He envisaged, then, the aggregation of existing
 and newly-established colleges to form 'a joint University', with a
 'fairly proportioned' governing body seated in Dublin. This he felt
 'would not be objected to by a large portion of the clergy'. But he
 conceded that, 'The real difficulty is not the joint university but the
 joint College. You are right in thinking the Clergy wish such Colleges to
 be solely in their hands.' And while he felt that some of the aggregated
 colleges might be exclusive he was anxious that others should be mixed.
 He thus set his face squarely against the Mac Halite position - 'I know
 on what side I shall be found.' Evidently bending, however, in the face
 of the tide of Catholic opinion, he now thought there might be 'Catholic
 and Protestant Chairs for Religion, Moral Philosophy and History', and
 105
 Catholic and Protestant Deans to safeguard religious standards.

When the Queen's Speech and subsequent remarks by Peel saw the Government fully committed to a colleges bill, Wyse's response showed an interesting change in emphasis, for he stressed that 'if a mixed system of education were to be determined on, it was of the utmost importance that due provision should be made for the religious education of the different religious persuasions frequenting such institutions', and he called for consultation with the Protestant and Catholic clergy and laity. He, Bellew, Palmerston and Sheil urged the opening of Trinity College, Bellew reckoning it a preferable course to new colleges. Shaw gave the customary answer that the College was already open to the extent permitted by its 'essentially Protestant' purpose. Roden called on the Lord Lieutenant and 'spoke warmly upon the question of Trinity College, on the maintenance or downfall of which institutions depended, he said, the existence of the Established Church'.

The liberal assault on Trinity merely angered Graham and Heytesbury and did nothing to shake their determination to avoid the 'open rupture with the Protestants of the Established Church' which they believed would follow interference with either Trinity or the University. Their views on this matter had hardened over the previous months. At the end of July 1844 Graham had instructed the Irish Government to consider a scheme of 'Roman Catholic Collegiate education either in connection with the University of Dublin' or as a 'new Royal foundation'. He subsequently wrote of colleges 'probably connected with the Dublin University' and also of 'our promised scheme of Collegiate Education in connection with a National University'. Heytesbury and Peel, originally envisaged a scheme by which Trinity would be united with the new colleges in the University of Dublin. The opening or reducing of Trinity itself was, Heytesbury felt, 'tender ground .. we must take great heed lest in conciliating the Catholics, we do not stir up a Protestant fire that will set Ireland in a blaze.' And he feared that opening even the University would eventually give over the two University seats to the liberals. His letter evidently had an effect

on Peel and Graham, the latter replying that they were

'not prepared, without much more deliberation, to affirm the principle that any new R. Catholic foundation in Ireland .. ought to be affiliated to the Dublin University. We are quite alive to the danger of exciting Protestant jealousies and Protestant fears. Affiliation carries with it participation in the rights of property and of Parliamentary Representation. The introduction of these elements of discord may greatly increase the difficulties inherent in the simple proposition of founding and endowing one or more Colleges, or even a new University, open to all without distinction of creed.'

Graham, too, was unwilling to 'mix up the question of new foundations' with that of the 'improvement' of Trinity. On the same occasion he reminded Heytesbury that 'the plan of Mr Wyse is well worthy
110
of attention.' Heytesbury accepted Graham's reasoning regarding Dublin. They agreed that 'the foundation of a new Institution with the power of granting all degrees, excepting Divinity' would be the course most 'conducive to future harmony and good will.' It was Eliot who suggested the establishment of colleges alone and the deferring of the university question, and it was he who first looked to the absence of religious instruction in the Scottish universities as 'a useful precedent.' The Cabinet agreed in November that Trinity and the University were 'so interwoven that any measure which touches one must affect both, and the revision of ancient charters, the disturbances of the rights of property, the excitement of Protestant alarm, and the violation of Protestant feelings would give rise to the most angry controversy and would call forth an opposition with which it might be difficult to contend.' And, as the training ground of the clergy, Trinity and the University were 'strong defences of the Protestant Church', not least in securing to it a voice in Parliament. So neither Trinity nor the University was to be disturbed.

They planned to found two provincial colleges, probably at Cork and Belfast, and perhaps 'hereafter' a third in the West. The decision as to whether they should be combined in one 'Central University' or made separate universities was deferred. To avoid religious controversy it was decided that no religious instruction would be provided at the expense of the State, though 'facilities', including access to the

lecture rooms, 'should be given .. for the establishment of Divinity
 111
 lectures by the aid of private endowment.' Primate Beresford asked
 Heytesbury about the Government's intentions regarding Trinity, because
 of the 'uneasiness' in the minds of its friends. When the Lord
 Lieutenant showed him Graham's letter on the decision of the Cabinet,
 he expressed his 'unqualified approbation' of that part which dealt with
 112
 Trinity and saw nothing objectionable in the rest. The Catholic Anthony
 Blake renounced 'the project of violating Trinity College or the
 University of Dublin' and 'did not appear to think that any objection
 would be made by the Roman Catholics to the idea of leaving theological
 lectures to private endowment.' He insisted only on 'the necessity of a
 Central University for the purpose of granting degrees.' There seemed,
 then, a prospect of a wide consensus for the Government plan. When Mac
 Hale indicated that he would differ with Wyse and Blake, Graham merely
 rejoiced that the Government had 'succeeded to a wonderful extent in
 113
 dividing the Roman Catholics of Ireland ...'

The attention of the Government was preoccupied, in fact, with the
 demands of the Presbyterians. The 'total failure of all negotiations
 with the Managers and Visitors of the Belfast (Academical) Institution
 to effect a satisfactory arrangement with that seminary' induced a
 Special General Assembly to decide in September 1844 to begin talks with
 the Government to secure 'a College for the education of candidates for
 the Christian ministry, under the superintendence and control of this
 114
 Church.' When this decision was followed up in November the Government
 decided that, according to the principle of their colleges plan, they
 would leave it to the General Assembly to endow privately a 'scheme of
 theological instruction' in connection with the college at Belfast.
 Heytesbury doubted, ^{if} this would satisfy the Presbyterians, but the
 115
 Government were not prepared to establish 'a Presbyterian Maynooth'.

In January 1845 the Presbyterians, with Cooke reluctantly to the
 fore, urged the endowment of a general college in which the laity of

all creeds might receive a literary and scientific education and candidates for the Presbyterian ministry degrees in theology. The theology professors would have to be orthodox Presbyterians and the General Assembly would hold a veto on their appointment. All other professors would have to be trinitarian. The Government of the College would be vested in a faculty of which a part should be chosen by the General Assembly. It was professedly to be a 'Presbyterian College'. Graham was annoyed that Cooke had used 'the unworthy subterfuge of pretended ignorance of our plan' and had subsequently 'the impudence to pretend a doubt of the authenticity of the plan .., declaring that he considers such a scheme proposed by us to be incredible.' He and Heytesbury were unwilling even to negotiate with the Presbyterians and were determined not to concede their 'extravagant demands.'

116

Several deputations of Presbyterian clergymen crossed over to London between February and April 1845 to place their views before the Government. Cooke was prepared to settle for a separate theological college, but the official request of the Presbyterians was reduced eventually to State endowment of Divinity Professorships in connection with the northern college, that is, the same facility in the new college as they already had at the Academical Institution. It was felt in Government that this would be too great a violation of the principle of their measure, and no attempt was made in the colleges bill to meet this or any of the other demands of the Presbyterian clergy. Early in July, the General Assembly resolved, in private session, that the Government plan would not suffice; but they deferred 'any final resolutions on the subject' and decided that they should try to make the new colleges acceptable rather than proceed immediately to build 'a purely Presbyterian College.'

117

118

It was only at the last minute that the Government decided to propose the establishment of three, as opposed to two, colleges. On the

119

9th of May, Graham moved for leave to bring in the Colleges bill. He said that the colleges would probably be cited at Cork, Belfast, and Limerick or Galway. The bill would not bring these colleges together into one University, but Graham hoped that this would be the eventual outcome. Trinity and the University stood in such close relation to the Protestant Church and to each other that neither was to be disturbed; the new university would be a separate establishment.

In order to promote the principle of non-interference with particular religious views, as 'carried into full effect under the Board of National Education', he proposed that in none of the colleges should there be a faculty of theology or public endowment of any teacher of divinity. Instead 'every facility shall be given for the endowment, by means of private benefactions, of professorships of theology, subject to the visitorial power of the Crown; and .. we propose that instruction in theology may be given in the lecture room within the walls of the College', attendance at which lectures would not be compulsory. The Government later agreed to extend the same principle - private endowment combined with State supervision - to the provision of halls of residence. Graham quoted from Wyse's letter to Morpeth as expert testimony in favour of the provincial colleges, and, warmly praising Wyse's efforts in the question, said that to him would belong 'a large portion of the merit' of whatever success the measure achieved.

Of the liberal-unionist members, only Sheil and O'Ferrall took anything like an 'ultra Catholic' line. Sheil regretted 'that no religious instruction of any kind whatever was to be given.' He felt that trusting to private endowment of chairs of divinity 'was leaving it to contingency' and that most of the Catholic clergy 'would object to the plan of Ministers on that ground.' He urged the public endowment of chaplaincies, thought the bill 'ought to make it imperative on every student .. to attend some place of religious worship', and deprecated the failure of the Government to consult the Catholic bishops. Sheil

was, however, quite explicit in his approval of 'mixed secular education'. Speaking on the 2nd of June, after the Catholic bishops had demanded religious safeguards which were a considerable departure from the Government's proposals, O'Ferrall tried to explain and justify Catholic fears. He deprecated 'the want of religious education', and, on the grounds that 'there would be nothing more dangerous than educating the middle classes of Ireland without the restraints of religious teaching and moral training', recommended postponement of the whole question.

Their fellow liberal-unionists took a rather different line, courting opprobrium by giving the measure a general approval. French and Martin joined efforts to have one of the colleges sited in Connaught. Jephson-Norreys told Wyse, on hearing the first of Sheil's many outbursts, "It won't do, the fact is you are a century before your fellow religionists - just listen to Sheil's fanaticism". He said in Parliament that he accepted the measure 'with great pleasure', and thought 'there was an end to all hope of mixed education if the opinion of the Roman Catholic bishops was to be received as decisive by the laity'. Villiers Stuart felt that while the objections of the Catholic bishops must be considered, 'their present proposals were most unreasonable.' Ross of Belfast 'did not think that anything wiser or better, or more adapted to the circumstances of Ireland, could be devised by any Government than the present measure', and told O'Connell he would sooner lose his seat than give way in the face of the latter's denunciation. Sharman Crawford rejected the right of the Catholic bishops to interfere as an attempt at 'domination'.

These men were Protestants, but there was no shortage of support for the measure among Catholic liberal-unionists. Bellew welcomed the bill 'as an illustration of the admission that ascendancy could be no longer acted upon in Ireland' and as 'the best plan of mixed education that could be brought into operation'. Barron warmly defended the proposed system against the accusation that it was 'unchristian',

praised the Government, and promised his 'hearty vote' in support of the measure. Redington approved of mixed education, thought the omission of a chair of theology 'might be wise', and felt that the bishops' demands that the professors of anatomy and geology should be Catholics were unreasonable. He did accept their view that Catholic students of history and moral philosophy should be taught by Catholics, and that 'provision ought to be made for chaplains .. who should have the moral guidance of the youths in these Colleges.'¹²⁵ Esmonde of Wexford¹²⁶ privately 'expressed a warm interest for the success of the new colleges.'

On the religious question, Wyse, like Redington, and like Young Ireland, wished for amendments in the bill in order to conciliate Catholic opinion, but he was very far from joining with the 'ultra Catholic' party. In Parliament he was a firm advocate of mixed education, as a means to promote understanding and remove prejudice.¹²⁷ After Sheil's first attack on the measure, Wyse wrote, 'Sheil's flagrantly clinical outburst very far au fond, his whole outburst for Church supremacy coming from a stray glance which he caught a few hours before (so Bellew tells me)' at a pamphlet written by a professor at the Catholic College at Thurles, in Tipperary, of which Sheil is 'a proprietor - and M.P. for Dungarvan!...

'Its effect on the House was disagreeable ... Sir Robert lamented over Sheil and justified himself, not difficult, for Sheil has read nothing, thought nothing on the question, and had paid little or no attention to what either Sir J. or I said as to details. Hence his floundering from blunder to blunder.'

Wyse felt that in their readiness to 'facilitate endowment of a Chair of Religion', and to 'ensure the strictest jurisdiction on the moral discipline and training of the pupils' the Government did 'more than I had anticipated.' He foresaw no problem in the private endowment of a Catholic Chair in the Munster College. 'So far for religious teaching. Let there be also appointed a Catholic Dean with superintendence over morals, &c ... These are guarantees in our power and the Government promise every sanction & encouragement'.¹²⁸ Writing on the 17th of May,

Wyse happily reported that Dr. Magee, an English Catholic cleric, had expressed his regret to him that the bill was arousing Catholic opposition in Ireland:

'He quite agrees in denying the application of "Godless" education to the Colleges. He says truly with me that it is a matter of pounds, shillings and pence, and if Catholics will contribute they may endow chairs tomorrow, that no fear need be entertained of religion or morals by the course I point out and that he has seen no sort of evil resulting from it in the several Colleges abroad.'

Magee had no fears about mixed education, particularly as the students (in the South) would be principally Catholic: 'This is the opinion of a great number, indeed all the rational men who have at all considered the subject .. They think it one of the greatest boons ever offered to Ireland & the commencement of a new era of intellectual & moral regeneration.' He lamented 'the desertion' of O'Brien, who had refused 'without O'Connell's sanction' to join in petitioning for a college in Limerick, the 'compromising attitude of Young Ireland', as expressed in letters he had received from Davis, 'and above all the ferocious fury of the ultra Catholic or Church Ascendancy party.' He feared that, with the apparent surrender of O'Brien and Davis,

'the battle of the Catholic ascendancy is won. Davis talks of compromises on their side, which appears to me to be surrender of the whole, & Catholic colleges (exclusive) at Cork and Galway, Presbyterian (ditto) at Belfast, Church Est. at Derry ...the result will be, of all this bickering, that the Bill will be withdrawn, O'Connell will gain a bad triumph, and education in that unfortunate country be retarded for many a day. The next point of attack will be the National schools, for be sure that, even in consistency, they cannot leave them alone. Mac Hale will follow up his victory ...' 129

Wyse took the same line in debate, on the second reading rejecting the "godless" epithet and stressing that the Government not only permitted but 'invited' religious instruction, through the provisions regarding use of College rooms ~~and houses~~ and private endowments. He rejected the Catholic bishops' demands that geology and anatomy should be taught by Catholic professors and that the Catholic prelates should be ex officio members of provincial boards of administration. In Committee he argued the advantages of private endowment of religious chairs over state

endowment; he defended the bill against the accusation that it excluded religious instruction, and himself against the charge of John O'Connell and others that by approving of the bill he opposed religious instruction. He said that if the bishops' demands were sanctioned, the result would eventually be the end of mixed education in Ireland, which he accused John O'Connell of having undermined.

130

The latter had, in Ireland, denounced Wyse as an enemy of Catholicism, and called on the Waterford constituency to oust their member. Smith O'Brien regretted the opprobrium brought on Wyse by his general acceptance of the bill:

'In all places and at all times I have asserted and still assert my belief that the cause of education owes more to Mr. Wyse than to anyone who has laboured in this field for the last fifteen years ... he has been most unjustly assailed.'

131

Davis replied,

'I entirely concur in your estimate of what we all owe him & I am confident that it is the weakness not the strength of the Repealers that will oblige them, as I think it will, to dissent from his re-election. On such an occasion when it happens we must not merely protect him at every hazard from insolence, but do him justice.'

132

The divergence between Wyse and the O'Connells culminated in an angry clash in the Commons between him and John O'Connell. On the other hand, Wyse could regard his position as essentially the same as that of the majority of the Catholic bishops. Though the exact import of the bishops' demands immediately became a point of controversy, Wyse took the same view as Young Ireland, that they had not declared outright opposition to the bill. He felt that their demands did not differ substantially from suggestions he himself had made in the House. On

133

134

the 9th of May, following Graham, he had said that 'the moral and religious conduct of the pupils should, in some degree, be taken as a test of their fitness for degrees.' And that 'the persons appointed to the religious chairs should be approved by the bishop of the diocese.'

135

He felt that the subjects of metaphysics, moral philosophy and the philosophy of history should be taught, like religion, by one's fellow

**PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL**

Table A Irish Liberal Voting on Colleges Question, 1845.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
@Acheson	0		0					
@Barron		0	0	0	X			
@Bellew	0	0	X	0		0	0	
@W. Browne	0			0	X			0
@Carew						0	0	
@Cavendish		0					0	
@Chapman		0	0	0		0	0	0
@Clements		0	X					
@Collett		0		0		0	0	
@Corbally		X						
@Dawson		0	0	0				0
@Esmonde			0	0	X	0		0
@Ferguson		0	X				0	
@French		0						
@R. Gore		0		0	X	0	0	
@Hatton	0	0						
@R. Howard		0						
@J-Norreys	0	0	X					
@Layard	0	0						
@T.B. Martin		0	X					
@Murphy			0					
@O'Conor Don				0	X			0
@Rawdon	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0
@Redington		0		0	0	0	0	0
@Ross		0	X	0	0	0	0	
@Sheil	0			0		0		0
@Somerville	0	0	X	0	X	0	0	0
@Stock		0						
@Stuart		0	X	0	0			0
@Fuite				0				
@J. C. Westenra		0						
@Wyse		0	0	0	X			0
Archbold	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
M.J.Blake		0	0	0	X	0		0
V.Blake		0	0			0		0
R.D.Browne			0	0				0
P.S.Butler	0					0		
N.Maher		X	0	0	X			0
J.O'Brien	0	0	0	0	X	0		0
W.S.O'Brien			0	0	X	0	X	0
D.O'Connell			0	0	X			0
J.O'Connell			0	0	X			0
M.J.O'Connell		0	0	0	X	0	X	0
E.B.Roche	0	X	0					
Somers			0	0	X			0
H.White			X					

1. Motion for returns, Trinity College. 2. Second reading.
 3. Fees for religious instruction. 4. Professorial appointments,
 amendment. 5. Professorial appointments, clause. 6. Trinity
 College inquiry. 7. Third reading. 8. Endow halls/religion
 (one-sided division).

0-For X-Against @-Liberal-Unionists

religionists within the system of privately endowed chairs. And, he called on the Government to establish boarding houses in connection with the Colleges, to be run by men approved by 'the ecclesiastical superiors of the different religious persuasions.'

On the second reading he again urged these amendments. And, in Committee, recognizing as he did 'the necessity of religious instruction as the basis and foundation of all education', he seconded the proposal that religious instruction should, until the private endowments could be established, be provided in the colleges by means of fees paid by the students. This proposal divided the liberal-unionists. Wyse was one of 22 Irish liberals, half of them unionists, who supported Russell's motion for endowment of religion by means of endowment of the halls of residence, in which religious instruction would be provided.

The liberal-unionists were more forthright and united in their disapproval of other aspects of the measure. Several of them protested against the proposal that the Government should appoint the professors of the new colleges. Though the Government proposed, by way of concession, that the question should be considered again after three years, the Irish liberals voted unanimously for Wyse's motion for appointment by examination, and by a large majority against the clause.

Though most liberal-unionists were 'pleased with the instalment brought forward', they made it clear that they regarded the establishment of provincial colleges as no more than an instalment. Some wished that the colleges could have been attached to the University of Dublin - in preference even to aggregation into a separate university, on the grounds that a new university would lack prestige and status. Wyse wrote to his brother soon after Graham's unveiling of the measure:

'Nothing .. could have been more satisfactory than the mode and much of the matter of the proposed measure .. It is good as far as it goes, but it doesn't yet go far enough. The Colleges are all right, endowed to a much greater extent than ever I ventured to propose, they are constituted on my plan and we have three instead of one - all which are gains. I wish however for a fourth in Dublin, and above all for something of an University principle avowed.. Hence my efforts to have at least the University of Dublin opened - in preference to a separate

University -- the establishment of a Leinster college as fourth of the provincial colleges in the capital, the aggregation of the four to the University under a governing Senate selected partly from the colleges, T.C.D. included, partly from persons appointed by the Government. Sir J. Graham did not assent or dissent and in this I see grounds for hope. He admitted my principle .. but shrunk from at the moment at least acting upon it. He has not however .. precluded himself from taking the best course later. Had he gone to establish at once an University like (that) of London I much fear the opening of the University of Dublin would have been impracticable. 141

He felt however that the demand for exclusively Catholic colleges jeopardized even the separate university: 'will the Protestant people of this country or of Ireland suffer, ought they to suffer, an exclusively Catholic or Church University in open antagonism with Trinity College.'¹⁴² The campaign against Trinity College was pursued still more vigorously. Several Irish liberal speakers advocated the opening of the College in the debates of ¹⁴³ May and June 1845. Bernal Osborne's motion on the 20th of May for returns of revenue and salaries of Trinity was supported by Sheil and Bellew in the debate, and by all of the Irish liberals who took part in the subsequent division.¹⁴⁴ On the third reading of the Colleges bill, Osborne moved for an inquiry into the revenues and expenditure of Trinity in order to ascertain whether the revenues could support a college which was fully 'open' to Catholics and Protestant Dissenters. This motion occasioned a lengthy debate in which the vestiges of exclusiveness at Trinity were assailed by a succession of liberal speakers, with Bellew, Redington, M. J. O'Connell and Sheil the Irish speakers in favour of the motion. The Irish liberals voted¹⁴⁵ unanimously for the motion.

Wyse, though clear that he, as ever, wanted Trinity opened, regarded the opening of the University as the first priority. The opening of Trinity, he told the House, was an 'entirely distinct' question and one which 'was undoubtedly embarrassed with very serious difficulties'.¹⁴⁶ He wrote to his brother, 'The College is a separate question, on that also with discretion we may later succeed, not by placing it as a bone of political contention, but by regarding the interests of the College

147
 and public.' He felt somewhat exasperated that many of the Catholic opponents of mixed education advocated the opening of Trinity: 'Why, what becomes of the godless system of mixed education, what is this but mixed & how can Catholics who attack the mixed Colleges of Cork &c ask for this!' Opening Trinity 'politically would be a triumph, but how could C. priests who now anathemize mixed education take advantage of it?' 148

The protests against the proposed mode of appointing professors and the omission of reform of the University of Dublin and Trinity College, the 'ultra Catholic' views of Sheil and O'Ferrall, and the less sweeping demands of Redington and Wyse in connection with Catholic grievances, must be kept in perspective. The majority of liberal-unionist speakers, as indicated above, warmly approved of the measure. This was borne out in the divisions on the second and third readings, when the liberal-unionists almost unanimously supported the measure. 149
 O'Ferrall and Sheil abstained on both occasions, but the latter subsequently denounced the measure, stressing the religious issue and the failure to open Trinity. 150
 Wyse was absent on the third reading, but responded enthusiastically to the bill's successful passage through the 151
 Lords. The liberal-unionist position constituted a notable stand against the views of O'Connell and the Catholic bishops, particularly given the vigour of O'Connell's opposition and the remarkably forthright rejection by several of the liberal-unionists of the influence of O'Connell and the advice of the bishops.

Sir Robert Inglis assailed the proposed bill for its leaving religious education 'to the uncertainties of voluntary contributions', and coined the famous description of the colleges as 'a gigantic scheme of Godless education.' 152
 Wyse felt that 'Inglis spoke disconsolately, more to justify his own consistency than with hope. All that cant goes for what it is worth in the House.' 153
 Inglis won support among other English Tory 'Saints', and the Dublin Evening Mail were 'violently opposed' to the bill on the same ground. 154
 Given Irish Tory statements on the subject

in previous years and their views on the place of religious instruction in elementary education in Ireland, it is perhaps surprising that the Irish Tory members did not join in opposing the measure. Instead they voted unanimously for the second reading, and almost unanimously - Archdall being the only dissentient - in favour of the third reading. In debate, Viscount Bernard was their only opponent of the bill, condemning the failure to provide religious education and dismissing the measure as irrelevant to Ireland's problems.

155

Lord Claud Hamilton was particularly happy with the secular nature of the colleges, pointing out that 'many fair schemes had been shipwrecked by an endeavour to inculcate creeds which did not coincide with all parties in Ireland .. it was his conviction that the only principle on which this measure could be successful was to leave the Colleges entirely free of all religion, trusting to the judgement of the parents and guardians the religious education of the students.' His colleagues came, somewhat more tortuously, to the same conclusion. Shaw and George Hamilton accepted that there was 'a great want of good academical institutions for the practical instruction of the middling classes', and though they were clear that they could not give 'unqualified approval' to a measure which 'made no provision for religious instruction', they felt that the bill dealt with 'the complicated difficulties of the case' better than any other plan.

George Hamilton, in particular, was optimistic that the proposed system of private endowments would in a great degree remedy the deficiency in religious instruction. He may well have shared O'Connell's belief that a system of private endowments gave an advantage to 'the Protestants who are rich over the Catholics who are poor.'

156

At the instance of one Irish Tory peer, Lord Lifford, Beresford established a fund out of which it was intended to support a chair of Protestant divinity in each college. Many leading Irish Tories and some Irish Whigs subscribed to the fund. George Hamilton was the principal organizer when efforts were made later

in the decade to give effect to the project. Several thousand pounds were raised, but the plan was abandoned in the face of jealousy from the divinity school at Trinity and, more especially, the possibility of collision with the (clerical) deans of residence.¹⁵⁷

Shaw, Lefroy and George Hamilton, consistent with their opposition to the Maynooth bill, rejected proposals involving public endowment of Catholic instruction in the colleges and halls and of separate Catholic colleges. D. S. Ker was the only Irish Conservative to support Russell's motion for public endowment of the halls. The Irish Tories voted unanimously against the proposal that religious instruction should be funded for a time out of lecture fees, with Shaw asserting that there was 'in principle no great difference between a direct endowment by a grant of money from that House and an enactment that by compulsory fees different religious professors should be in fact maintained.'

Of the Irish Tories only Lord Adare, who sat for Glamorganshire, openly advocated a Catholic college rather than accept a measure which 'did not give the sanction which should be given to religion.' At the same time, an attempt to assert Protestant values elicited only a divided response from Irish Tories: when it was proposed that the principal officers of the colleges should be required to declare that the Scriptures contained the revealed will of God, a test implying criticism of the Catholic attitude to the Bible, four Irish Tories supported and seven¹⁵⁸ opposed the motion.

The Irish Tories were evidently content, too, that Presbyterians claims were disregarded; none of the Irish Tory members expressed an opinion on those claims. It is interesting to note that even the apparent analogy with the National System of Education did not induce Irish Tory members to demand a less secular system of higher education. They argued that the college students would be of such an age that they would be able to bear some responsibility for their own religious education; and that whereas the necessity for religious instruction in the primary schools

arose from the fact that they were used by poorer children, 'whose parents you suppose to be ignorant and who have no opportunity of instruction at home', the middle class parents of the students at the colleges would ensure that their children would receive such instruction. George Hamilton and Shaw also drew a distinction between the present measure's non-interference in religious questions and the positive acceptance in the National System of 'the Roman Catholic doctrine' regarding access to the Scriptures.

159

The Irish Tory members' response to the Colleges bill was evidently influenced by the fact that it did not attempt to reform Trinity College or expand the University of Dublin, a factor explicitly mentioned by Shaw in explanation of his course. He, George Hamilton and Lefroy defended the College against the many attacks made upon its alleged abuses and exclusions, and in the two divisions on the subject were unanimously supported by the rest of the Irish Tories. Neither did Shaw regard the new colleges as a threat to the pre-eminence of Trinity; he was confident that the gentry would continue to send their sons to the latter, which he felt provided a sufficient university education, and that the new institutions 'would be more in the nature of large public day schools than what could be properly termed Colleges' and would in fact send their best pupils to graduate at Trinity.

161

It is clear that the Irish Tory members accepted the reality that the new colleges could not be Protestant institutions or involve preferential treatment of the Established Church. They were therefore ready to accept a system which at least did not unduly encourage its rivals; even colleges which were dangerously irreligious were better than colleges which assisted in the teaching of Catholicism. And they were gratified that the Protestant University of Dublin was not to be violated by legislation, or, in all probability, challenged by strong rivals. There is a basic parallel, in fact, between their attitude to the colleges and their position on the National System of primary

education. The promotion of their own institution - be it Trinity College or the Church Education Society - took first priority, and they were, though far from apathetic, somewhat less concerned about the nature of the education provided for the Catholic population.

The bill had an easy passage through the Lords, with no Irish Tory comment and a favourable reception accorded by the few Irish liberal
162
speakers. Some of the leading Irish Whig Lords - Sligo, Clanricarde and Lansdowne - had been active behind the scenes to secure a college
163
for their own locality, and others - Monteagle and Leinster - had
164
privately indicated their approval.

In August 1845, the Munster Provincial College Committee extended their 'warmest congratulations' to Wyse on 'the triumphant result of his untiring labours in the cause of education obtained in the substantial
165
adoption of his views and measures.' In a lengthy reply Wyse rejoiced at their satisfaction and at other evidence that the bill had found favour, particularly Archbishop Crolly's approval of the measure. He argued again that the interests of religion were secured - that lack of public endowment of Chairs of Religion did not constitute 'Infidelity', as the people had it in their own power to decide if there should be such Chairs; and that they could also endow halls of residence in which there was every likelihood of a strong clerical influence in accordance with the religion of the benefactors. He again rejected the demand that subjects with no apparent connection with religion must be taught by one's fellow-religionists. He was confident, after Graham's pledges on
166
the matter, that the Government would appoint such men to the local Visitorial Boards as would ensure that no attempt would be made in the classrooms or halls to subvert the religious views of the students. And he accused of inconsistency those Catholics - bishops among them - who attacked the irreligion of the colleges bill yet supported the National System.

Regarding the appointment of professors, Wyse accepted that the

first appointments should be vested in the Government and felt that 'the Government gave every hope' that appointment by examination would later be adopted. He was confident, too, that nothing would prevent the promised aggregation of the colleges into a university. But he wished still that it should be as part of the University of Dublin, rather than as a new university, that there should be a fourth college, in Dublin, and that Trinity College should be opened.

167

Wyse provided a detailed and fascinating analysis of the Catholic opposition to the bill in his diary entry for the 4th of October 1845. He was in a reasonably confident mood because he felt that the Repeal Association could stir only the lower classes, while it was the middle classes who would make or break the new colleges, and because he expected that the Pope would pronounce in favour of the colleges. He felt that,

'The whole of this quarrel is a falsity. It is not theological but theocratic .. Theology has a conscience, deals with sin, makes and can make no compromise ... Now in this fight there are all manners of more or less.'

One section of the opposition supported the National schools but denounced the 'infidel' colleges, without demonstrating any relevant difference between them. Another group, 'the pure Mac Halists', attacked both, but, 'only removing the inconsistency a step', apparently approved of the existing universities of Britain and Ireland where there was mixed education and religious education 'is not only not Catholic but anti-Catholic'. And he wondered at the insistence of this group on state endowment of religious instruction when,

'on other questions of state endowment for the Catholic clergy (they) are open mouthed against the bribe, the contamination, who even at first repudiated that of Maynooth as an attempt to corrupt and have since scarcely ceased in vilifying the Government for having thus assaulted so unceremoniously their virtue!.... The whole thing is a falsity, under the show of religion, known I believe to be such by some, adopted because in harmony with other purposes.'

He identified a third, smaller party which objected particularly to the control of the colleges over the halls of residence:

'This is utterly insincere. The whole system must depend upon the character and conduct of the governing body ... No institution is perfect,

no guarantee absolute ... there must be given a certain amount of confidence even to the worst Governments, otherwise what chance for any law coming into force. Caution is just and wise, but distrust absurd and unfair. Legislatures & Government cry for trial. People cry it may be evil, it may be good, therefore we will not try it!... We must content ourselves with probabilities.'

The Government, he felt, would not intentionally undermine their measure by inappropriate decisions. Graham in the House and in conversation with him had promised that the Visitorial Boards which would regulate the halls would be provincial bodies, reflecting local influences, with Catholics predominant in the Catholic provinces, Presbyterians in Ulster. And once it was admitted that the halls would probably be controlled by trustworthy persons the objection was inadmissible, as it was surely better for youths to live under college auspices than to be left to their own devices in private lodging houses. In general Wyse felt that,

'The opposition has other grounds. It is an instalment of justice, a commencement of another system, a recantation of a former policy... This is more valuable than the measure itself, in as much as a principle is of more worth than an application; an instalment promises payment as well as admits a debt; a first step to peace may lead to confidence; confidence gradually to content. It steals a grievance from the Association and dulls the ardour of complaint. All this is inconvenient, discouraging, the market may become flat, shares may fall... There was a predetermination to be discontented.'

Having failed to force the abandonment of the bill, O'Connell and his clerical allies had to defeat its execution:

'The direct interests of both parties are here identical or in harmony. O'Connell wishes the clergy ultras should possess power, that he may employ their power more extensively and entirely to secure his. They on the other side wish that he should possess power, that by his power theirs may be maintained also... The power of the clergy is most forwarded not by amalgamation but seclusion. The real objection .. is not the exclusion or non-endowment of religious education (had it been offered it would have been rejected as unhallowed!) but the amalgamation of the sects .. This amalgamation sanctioned by the state renders the demand for funds for separate institutions inadmissible. Hence no endowment for Colleges purely or exclusively Catholic ...'

The latter colleges 'must sooner or later become ecclesiastical colleges', with only clerical teachers. He thought that the real motive of the Church's attack on the bill involved 'more Church than Religion.' It was,

'to negative the present measure in the hope of afterwards inducing or compelling the Government to establish in lieu a series of Catholic

ecclesiastical colleges or Clergy governed colleges .. with endowments as large or larger than Maynooth. This from a clergy who repudiate endowment, the self-proclaimed martyrs to the voluntary principle!... The object of O'Connell is not less power, less finance. He well knows that judging by the existing pure Catholic colleges he would find in any new Catholic College a corps of Professors, creating a corps of pupils not paid by him but paying him, addressers on public occasions, speakers at monster meetings, indomitable Repeal wardens, unscrupulous paragraph writers, and, above all, perfect Rent collectors. It was not too much to say that the quarrel was not theological but theocratic, not political so much as financial.'

'The means to attain this are worthy of the end' -- with cries of "infidel", "apostate", etc. against those who differed; even Churchmen were so assailed, thereby undermining the whole Church. The unity of the Bishops behind their Memorial criticizing the bill in May was false, 'each (party) disguising rather than sacrificing their real sentiments' on the point on which they had since openly differed, ^{viz.} mixed education, and Mac Hale was therefore wrong to attack 'the secession' of the eight ¹⁶⁸ Bishops. And when the Government made modifications in the bill, O'Connell came over with 'a boast and a lie', reading a letter from Mac ¹⁶⁹ Hale in which it was claimed that the bishops' fears "remain unaltered", when in fact both knew that some bishops were then prepared to accept the bill. 'To whom the concoction of the falsehood belongs is immaterial. Its guilt and folly belongs to both. Both knew it to be a falsehood, and if one circulated the other allowed its circulation.' Wyse took swipes too at 'the fears of Sheil and jealousies of O'F(errall)', and at Russell's 'dread (i.e. Whig party solicitude) lest the priests and ¹⁷⁰ O'Connell should be offended.'

The Government appointed a prominent Catholic scientist, Robert Kane, to the presidency of the Cork college and a local priest, Joseph Kirwan, to that of Galway, the latter decision doing nothing to reconcile the Mail to the new colleges and bringing a protest from the Irish Tory doyens in Roden's new Protestant Alliance. Emerson Tennent, Bateson, Jocelyn and 'many of the members connected with the North of Ireland' urged Cooke's claims to the presidency of Belfast. Cooke himself desired the position. The idea won favour with Graham and the Irish Government,

but Peel convinced Graham that Cooke's declared views on the Catholic religion would make him unsuitable for the leadership of an institution dedicated to mixed education, and the position was given to a relatively obscure Presbyterian minister, Dr. Shuldham Henry of Armagh. Cooke was apparently reconciled to the decision by his appointment, in place of
171
Henry, as agent for the administration of the regium donum.

The choice of a Presbyterian minister for the Belfast presidency was made in spite of the preference of the Catholic Primate for an
172
episcopalian. Crolly was also frustrated when he tried to have the northern college situated at Armagh, where ~~the~~ Presbyterian influence would be less prevalent than at Belfast. With Primate Beresford and others, including Lord Gosford and the former liberal-unionist member for Armagh, Leonard Dobbin, also advocating Armagh, the Government were induced to give the question serious consideration, and eventually, at Peel's suggestion, to establish a Commission to investigate the issue.

The Commission reported in October in favour of Belfast. With the Presbyterians strongly urging the same option, the Government felt impelled to override Crolly's continued pressure. It was felt that 'the first object in founding the Ulster College is to win the confidence and to conciliate the cordial goodwill of the Presbyterian Body... It (the College) must be Presbyterian or it will be worse than useless... The Catholics must be content with the Catholic spirit which will more or less prevail in the Cork & Galway Colleges.' Cork's claims to a college were never seriously questioned. As for the site of the western college, memorials were received during and after the end of the session on behalf of both Limerick and Galway, but the decision in favour of Galway was taken without the fuss made in relation to the northern college. It was thought that Limerick was too close to Cork and that,
173
as a Munster town, its selection would not be 'justice' to Connaught.

Notwithstanding his earlier views and the position which he took in Parliament, Graham expressed a wish several times between May 1845

and February 1846 to open Dublin University, that is, while preserving Trinity College 'inviolate' to affiliate the new colleges to the University. 'Until we discussed this matter in Parliament', he wrote, 'I did not see clearly the advantages of this arrangement.' The only difficulty he foresaw was the likely effect on the Parliamentary representation of the University. However, almost his last act in Government was, with Peel's approval, to write to the Lord Lieutenant that as it was evidently 'inexpedient, if not impossible, to combine these new colleges with the existing University of Dublin' it would be necessary to combine the three colleges into a separate university.¹⁷⁴ The colleges were duly built and, in 1850, were aggregated to form the Queen's University.

In October 1847, the Holy See denounced the new colleges. Even before that Wyse fell victim to Catholic disapproval of his acceptance of the bill, for that issue and the Repeal question were responsible for his defeat in the general election of 1847.¹⁷⁵ The new university achieved 'only a feeble and unprosperous existence' in the face of strong Catholic resistance and the continuing 'academic and social status of Trinity College', though the College in Belfast, to which the majority of Presbyterians became reconciled, was fully successful.¹⁷⁶ As with the National System of Education, Catholic opposition was ultimately to defeat the project. But the National System and the Queen's Colleges were nevertheless milestones in Irish history, marking as they did a further dismantling of Protestant privilege and monopoly. The unionist politicians who figured so prominently in the education controversies were thus playing leading roles in resolving one element of the central question of the politics of the period.

Chapter 5

1. William Smith O'Brien, ^{Education} in Ireland, 169-70. Hansard, 23, 762-3, 8 May 1834, Sheil.
2. Hansard, 80, 1280, 2 June 1845, Peel; 82, 730, 21 July 1845, Stanley.
3. For a particularly good account of the extent of exclusion at Trinity, see Hansard, 23, 761-6, 8 May 1834, Sheil.
4. William Smith O'Brien, Education in Ireland, 167-8. R. B. O'Brien, Fifty years of Concessions to Ireland, I, 94-105. W. D. Killen, Memoir of John Edgar (Belfast, 1867), 181-4. John Jamieson, The History of the Royal Belfast Academical Institutions, 1810-1960 (Belfast, 1959), 1-93. J. L. Porter, The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, 289-94. W. T. Latimer, A History of the Irish Presbyterians, 426-44, 458-9. R. Finlay Holmes, Henry Cooke, 42-290, 360-6, 390-426. John Jamieson, The Influence of the Rev. Henry Cooke on the Political Life of Ulster, 77-100. A. T. Q. Stewart, The Transformation of Presbyterian Radicalism in the North of Ireland, Chs. VII-VIII. T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, Queen's, Belfast, 1845-1949: The History of a University (London, 1959), I, xli-liii.
5. Beresford Papers, APL, Vol x, f58, Beresford to Goulburn, 13 July 1826; *ibid*, f59, Goulburn to Beresford, 18 July 1826.
6. Thomas Wyse, Historical Sketch of the late Catholic Association of Ireland (London, 1829), II, 110.
7. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Doyle, II, 139-43.
8. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 14, Slattery to Wyse, 28 Nov. 1830.
9. *Ibid*, 17-19, Wyse to Doyle, 11 Dec. 1830.
10. *Ibid*, 24-5.
11. DEP, 17 Dec. 1831, Wyse to Stanley, 9 Dec. 1831.
12. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (4), Wyse to George Wyse, 26 July, 3, 26 Aug. 1831; *ibid*, (5), Wyse to George Wyse, 25, 31 Jan., 15, 20, 27 Feb., 18 July 1832; *ibid*, (6), Wyse to George Wyse, 28 May 1832; *ibid*, (8), Wyse to George Wyse, 23 Feb., 7 March 1832. Also, *ibid*, MS 15025 (1), Wyse to Shrewsbury, 15 June 1832.
13. Hansard, 5, 819-20, 5 Aug. 1831, Wyse, Lefroy; 6, 457-8, 23 Aug. 1831, Wyse.
14. Hansard, 3, 879-80, 24 March 1831, Attorney-General Crampton; 9, 624-7, 19 Jan 1832, Sheil, Croker; 12, 1400-1, 23 May 1832, O'Connell, Grattan, Shaw; 13, 599-606, 13 June 1832, Sheil, Lefroy, O'Connell.
15. House of Commons Journals, 1830-1, 86, 768, 19 Aug. 1831, petition of inhabitants of Whitechurch, Co. Cork. *Ibid*, 1831-2, 87, 432, 25 June 1832, petition of the National Political Union.
16. Hansard, 23, 761-7, 8 May 1834, Sheil, Lefroy, Perceval; 24, 665-6, 20 June 1834, Rice.
17. Hansard, 27, 1225-6, 1230-1, 19 May 1835, Wyse, Sheil; 29, 481-2, 13 July 1835, Warburton, Lefroy, O'Connell; 31, 268, 11 Feb. 1836,

- Cloncurry. See also, House of Commons Journals, 1835, 90, 412, 2 July 1835, Petition of Dublin schoolmasters; *ibid*, 1836, 91, 465, 10 June 1836, Petition of Protestant graduates and undergraduates of the University of Dublin.
18. Reports from the Select Committee appointed to examine the state, funds and management of the Diocesan, Royal and other Schools of public Foundation in Ireland, P.P., 1836, XIII, 322-53, Evidence of Denis B. Bullen, 13-14, Aug. 1835.
 19. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (4), Bullen to Wyse, 31 July 1835.
 20. DEP, 4 Nov. 1837. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2471, Roche to O'Connell, 18 Nov. 1837.
 21. Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into Foundation Schools and Education in Ireland, P.P., 1837-8, VII, 408-21.
 22. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (4), Bullen to Wyse, 2 Sept. 1838.
 23. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2565, O'Connell to James Roche, 19 Oct. 1838 (also in The Cork Standard, 2 Nov. 1838).
 24. DEP, 2 Oct. 1838.
 25. Monteagle Papers, MS 534, f217, Spring Rice to James Roche, 27 Oct. 1838 (also in The Cork Standard, 5 Nov. 1838). Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f550, Roche to O'Brien, 24 Oct. 1848.
 26. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838. The Cork Standard, 16 Nov. 1838.
 27. For the Resolutions and Address, see Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 54-9. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838. DEM, 21 Nov. 1838. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .. 1844, 126-8.
 28. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 55-7, Wyse to George Wyse, 17 Nov. 1838.
 29. DEP, 8, 15, 20 Nov. 1838.
 30. The Cork Standard, 16, 19, 21 Nov. 1838.
 31. *Op. cit.*, 55.
 32. DEM, 21 Nov. 1838.
 33. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f550, Roche to O'Brien, 24 Oct. 1838. The Cork Standard, 5 Nov. 1838, O'Brien to Roche, 27 Oct. 1838. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838.
 34. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838, M. J. O'Connell. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f556, 562, 564, Bullen to O'Brien, 19, 26, 27 Nov. 1838; *ibid*, f563, James Roche to O'Brien, 26 Nov. 1838; *ibid*, MS 430, f585, M. J. O'Connell to O'Brien, 25 Dec. 1838.
 35. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (6), Circular of Prospectus. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .. 1844, 128-31.
 36. The Limerick Standard, 8 Jan. 1839. Wyse Papers, MS 15025 (6), Circular of Prospectus. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland ..

- 1844, 128-31. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 567, f188, Memorial of Limerick Corporation, 1845.
37. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f486, Wyse to O'Brien, 4 Jan. 1839. Wyse mistakenly dated this letter 1838.
 38. Ibid, MS 430, f599, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Jan. 1839.
 39. The Limerick Standard, 8 Jan. 1839.
 40. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f571, Spring Rice to O'Brien, 18 Dec. 1838. See also, *ibid*, f575, John Evans to O'Brien, 20 Dec. 1838. Rice had earlier given the Cork organizers similar advice. Monteagle Papers, MS 534, f217, Spring Rice to James Roche, 27 Oct. 1838 (also in The Cork Standard, 5 Nov. 1838).
 41. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f580, Listowel to O'Brien, 23 Dec. 1838; *ibid*, f581, The O'Gorman Mahon to O'Brien, 23 Dec. 1838; *ibid*, f586, James Molony to O'Brien, 27 Dec. 1838.
 42. P.P., 1837-8, VII, 421. DEP, 20 Nov. 1838.
 43. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f588, Dunraven to O'Brien, 29 Dec. 1838.
 44. Ibid, MS 429, f568, Thomas Stoddart to O'Brien, 16 Dec. 1838; *ibid*, MS 430, f578, John Mac Donnell to O'Brien, 21 Dec. 1838.
 45. Ibid, MS 429, f567, Muskerry to O'Brien, 16 Dec. 1838.
 46. The Limerick Standard, 8, 11, 15 Jan. 1839. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 567, f188, Memorial of Limerick Corporation, 1845.
 47. The Christian Examiner, Third Series, Vol. IV, No. XXXIX (Jan. 1839), 1
 48. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 135. Letter Relative to the Establishment and Support of Provincial Colleges in Ireland, P.P., 1843, LI, 341-2.
 49. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 429, f562, Bullen to O'Brien, 26 Nov. 1838.
 50. Ibid, f486, Wyse to O'Brien, 4 Jan. 1839.
 51. Ibid, MS 430, f599, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Jan. 1839.
 52. See T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 135-8, Wyse to Munster Provincial College Committee, 10 Dec. 1841. Draft copy in Wyse Papers, MS 15026 (2), Wyse to Bullen, 18 Nov. 1841.
 53. Wyse Papers, MS 15026 (2), Wyse to Bullen, 18 Nov. 1841. This reference to Trinity was not in the final version of Wyse's letter.
 54. House of Lords Journals, 1839, 71, 226, 29 April 1839. Hansard, 47, 623, 29 April 1839. House of Commons Journals, 1839, 94, 312, 6 June 1839.
 55. House of Commons Journals, 1839, 94, 261, 13 May 1839.
 56. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 430, f671, Wyse to O'Brien, 10 Sept. 1839.
 57. William Smith O'Brien, Education in Ireland, 170-4.

58. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 136-8. For the report, see ibid, 138-40, extracts. Wyse Papers, MS 15026 (2), Wyse to Morpeth, 8 May 1841 (Draft). Letter Relative to the Establishment and Support of Provincial Colleges in Ireland, P.P., 1843, LI, 339. The final report was dated 8 May 1841, but Wyse's intimation in the letter to the Munster Committee that it was not delivered then is confirmed by his diary, which indicates the report was sent to Morpeth on the 2nd of September 1841. Wyse Papers, MS 15018 (3), Wyse diary, 1, 2 Sept. 1841.
59. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 431, f808, Bullen to O'Brien, 16 Dec. 1841.
60. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (9), Wyse to George Wyse, 31 July 1842.
61. Hansard, 69, 896-7, 909, 25 May 1843, Shaw, Wyse.
62. Wyse Papers, MS 15018 (4), Wyse diary, 25 May 1843.
63. Ibid, MS 15019 (10), Wyse to George Wyse, 6 June 1843.
64. Hansard, 70, 661-2, 4 July 1843, O'Brien. Appendix 1.
65. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 443, f1114, Wyse to O'Brien, 18 Jan. 1844. O'Brien had left London in August 1843.
66. Hansard, 72, 753-4, 13 Feb. 1844, Wyse; 72, 819, 14 Feb. 1844, Clements.
67. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f250, Peel Cabinet memo, 17 Feb. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 106.
68. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 468, f132, Stanley to Peel, 18 Feb. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 107-8.
69. Hansard, 73, 252, 23 Feb. 1844, Peel.
70. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f26, Peel Cabinet memo, Feb. 1844.
71. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, f1132, Wyse to O'Brien, 3 March 1844.
72. Ibid, f1140, Wyse to O'Brien, 13 March 1844.
73. Wyse Papers, MS 15036, Address of the Dublin Protestant Operative Association and Refromation Society, to Thomas Wyse, adopted at a general meeting of the Association on 14 March 1844. J. J. Auchmuty, Irish Education, 109. Hansard, 76, 1121-2, 19 July 1844, Wyse. DEM, 1, 6 March 1844.
74. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 433, 1140, 1208, Wyse to O'Brien, 13 March, 12 July 1844. There may also have been procedural difficulties. See DEM, 11, 13 March 1844.
75. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 468, f144, Stanley to Peel, 11 March 1844.
76. Graham Papers, 71A, Graham Cabinet memo, 9 March 1844; Wellington note, n.d.; Goulburn to Wellington, 10 March 1844.
77. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 470, f197, Graham memo, 12 April 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 110.
78. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f12, Graham to Peel, 12 April 1844.

79. Ibid, MS 40, 470, f199, Gladstone to Peel, 20 April 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 110-1, Note by Gladstone, 14 April 1844.
80. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f24, 63, Graham to Peel, 20 April, 3 July 1844.
81. Hansard, 76, 1121-35, 19 July 1844, Wyse, Peel, Sheil, Manners. Winifreda M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland, 65-73.
82. Hansard, 76, 1135-6, 19 July 1844, Grogan.
83. Dunraven Papers, D3196/F/4/16, A. S. O'Brien to Viscount Adare, 20 July 1844.
84. DEM, 22, 24, 29 July 1844.
85. James Henthorn Todd, University of Dublin; Remarks on some Statements attributed to Thomas Wyse, Esq., M.P., in his speech in Parliament on Academical Education in Ireland, July 19th, 1844 (Dublin, 1844). DEM, 1 Nov. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f133, Todd to Gladstone, 24 July 1844; ibid, f166, Adare to Peel, 12 Nov. 1844; ibid, f168, Todd memo, n.d..
86. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1271, Wyse to O'Brien, 6 Nov. 1844.
87. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4C, f267, Wyse to Russell, 25 Oct. 1844. See also DEM, 16 Oct. 1844, Wyse to Roche, 9 Oct. 1844.
88. DEP, 16 Nov. 1844. DEM, 4, 15 Nov. 1844. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844.
89. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland .., 1844, 131. Graham Papers, 171R, Heytesbury to Graham, 23 Oct. 1844.
90. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1265, Bullen to O'Brien, 31 Oct. 1844.
91. Ibid, f1262, Powell to O'Brien, 30 Oct. 1844.
92. DEP, 16 Nov. 1844. Both O'Briens and Powell were repealers by this time.
93. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland ... 1844, 31-2.
94. Ibid, 133. House of Commons Journals, 1845, 100, 167, 20 March 1845, Petition.
95. T. Wyse, Speech on .. education in Ireland... 1844, 33-4.
96. DEM, 15 Nov. 1844. DEP, 16 Nov. 1844, Kemp, Shea. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 556, f36, Kemp to Peel, 16 Dec. 1844.
97. DEM, 15, 18 Nov. 1844.
98. DEM, 26 July 1844, Mac Hale to Peel, 24 July 1844. O'Reilly, Life of Archbishop MacHale, I, 570-1.
99. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 4 Oct. 1845.
100. Graham Papers, 181R, W. Cooke Taylor to Eliot, 29 Nov. 1844; 191R, Eliot to Graham, 9 Dec. 1844.
101. The Times, 4, 25 Dec. 1844.

102. Duffy, Young Ireland, 632-3, 684-726. D. Gwynn, 'O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill', The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Vol. LXIX (1947), 561, 668, 767, 957, 1051; Vol. LXX (1948), 17. D. Gwynn, O'Connell, Davis and the Colleges Bill (Cork, 1948). D. Gwynn, Young Ireland and 1848 (Cork/Oxford, 1949), 40-8. O'Reilly, Life of Archbishop Macfale, I, 570-95, 634-49. Moody and Beckett, Queen's Belfast, I, 24-32, 38. K. B. Nowlan, The Politics of Repeal: a Study in the Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1841-50 (London/Toronto, 1965), 83-9. Nuala Costello, John Mac Hale, 82-90.
103. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1313, Wyse to O'Brien, 23 Jan. 1845.
104. Ibid, f1317, Wyse to O'Brien, 14 Feb. 1845. Wyse was Catholic, O'Brien Protestant.
105. Ibid.
106. Hansard, 77, 4, 83, 98-9, 101, 105-6, 110-1, 112, 4 Feb. 1845, Queen's Speech, Peel, Wyse, Bellew, Shell, Shaw, Palmerston.
107. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 13 Feb. 1845. See also, DEM, 10 Feb. 1845.
108. Graham Papers, 20IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 5, 19, 24 Feb. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 7, 13, 21 Feb. 1845; 86, Graham to Heytesbury, 9 Feb. 1845; Peel to Graham, 21 Feb. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f285, 287, Heytesbury to Peel, 6, 9 Feb. 1845.
109. Graham Papers, 16IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 30 July, 13 Aug., 5 Sept. 1844.
110. Ibid, 17IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 10 Oct. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 12 Oct. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 479, f82, Peel to Heytesbury, 4 Oct. 1844.
111. Graham Papers, 17IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 15 Oct. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 17, 21 Oct. 1844; Eliot to Graham, 17, 23 Oct. 1844; 18IR, Eliot to Graham, 2 Nov. 1844; 77B, Graham to Eliot, 25 Oct. 1844; 79A, Peel to Graham, 4 Dec. 1844; Graham to Peel, 5 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f279, 354, Graham to Peel, 20 Oct., 5 Dec. 1844; ibid, f348, Peel to Graham, 4 Dec. 1844. Home Office Papers, HO 45 OS/1656, f1, Graham to Heytesbury, 26 Nov. 1844 (also in HO 79/9, f159).
112. Graham Papers, 18IR, Beresford to Heytesbury, 7 Nov. 1844; 19IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 3 Dec. 1844; 79A, Graham to Heytesbury, 5 Dec. 1844; Graham to Peel, 5 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f354, 416, Graham to Peel, 5, 18 Dec. 1844.
113. Graham Papers, 18IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 30 Nov. 1844; 19IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 16 Dec. 1844; 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 15 Feb. 1845; 78, Graham to Heytesbury, 30 Nov. 1844; 86, Graham to Heytesbury, 9, 13 Feb. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 450, f388, 416, Graham to Peel, 12, 18, Dec. 1844.
114. Minutes of the General Assembly, 1841-50, 373-81, 17, 18 Sept. 1844.
115. Graham Papers, 18IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 10 Nov. 1844; Graham to Heytesbury, 12 Nov. 1844; 19IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 8, 26 Dec. 1844; 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 10 Jan. 1845; 79A, Peel to Graham, 4 Dec. 1844; Graham to Peel, 10 Dec. 1844. Peel Papers, Add MS 40,

- 450, f348, Peel to Graham, 4 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, f382, Graham to Peel, 10 Dec. 1844; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f197, Heytesbury to Peel, 9 Dec. 1844. Home Office Papers, HO 45 OS/1656, f1, Graham to Heytesbury, 26 Nov. 1844 (also in HO 79/9, f159).
116. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 22, 24, 27, 28 Jan. 1845; Cooke to A^cCourt, 21, 23 Jan. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 25, 29 Jan. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 558, f118, 121, 130, Cooke to Peel, 21, 23, 24 Jan. 1845.
117. Graham Papers, 20IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 15 Feb. 1845; 21IR, Fremantle to Graham, 23 March 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 25 March, 26 April 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 29, 31 March 1845; 22IR, Henry to A^cCourt, 5 July 1845; 87, Graham to Heytesbury, 18 March 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f418, Fremantle to Peel, 4 April 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 559, f180, Brown to Peel, 8 Feb. 1845; *ibid*, f238, Cooke to Peel, 10 Feb. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 563, f325, Edgar to Peel, 27 March 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 564, f410, Brown to Peel, 17 April 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 612, f169, Hanna and Gibson to Peel, 24 March 1845. Minutes of the General Assembly, 1841-50, 413, 4, 5 July 1845. NV, 8 July 1845.
- X 118. W. T. Latimer, A History of the Irish Presbyterians, 477.
119. Graham Papers, 21IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 28 April 1845; 89, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 May 1845.
120. Hansard, 80, 345-66, 9 May 1845, Graham. P.P., 1845, 1, 357, 365.
121. Gwynn, Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 1847, LXIX, 1051. O'Reilly. Life of Archbishop Mac Hale, I, 591-2. Hansard, 80, 1149-51, 30 May 1845, Graham. DEM, 26 May 1845.
122. Hansard, 80, 380-5, 9 May 1845, Sheil; 80, 1134-5, 30 May 1845, Sheil; 80, 1278-9, 2 June 1845, O'Ferrall; 81, 498, 13 June 1845, Sheil; 81, 627-8, 16 June 1845, Sheil; 81, 1366-8, 30 June 1845, Sheil; 82, 357-61, 10 July 1845, Sheil; 82, 1503-4, 5 Aug. 1845, Sheil.
123. DEM, 26 May 1845.
124. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
125. Hansard, 80, 374-5, 375, 403-4, 9 May 1845, Ross, Bellew, Barron; 80, 624, 20 May 1845, Jephson-Norreys; 80, 1141-2, 1158-9, 30 May 1845, Ross, Redington; 80, 1254-5, 2 June 1845, Stuart; 81, 498, 13 June 1845, Jephson-Norreys; 81, 631, 16 June 1845, Jephson-Norreys; 81, 1099-1100, 23 June 1845, Crawford; 81, 1366, 1372, 1373, 1377, 30 June 1845, Ross, Bellew, Crawford.
126. Graham Papers, 92, Peel to Graham, 14 Aug. 1845 (also in Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 451, f179).
127. Hansard, 80, 368, 9 May 1845; 80, 1269, 2 June 1845; 81, 1055-7, 23 June 1845, Wyse.
128. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
129. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 17 May 1845.
130. Hansard, 80, 1269-73, 2 June 1845; 81, 1052-3, 23 June 1845, Wyse.

131. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 434, f1343, O'Brien to Davis, 11 June 1845.
132. Ibid, MS 435, f1350, Davis to O'Brien, 19 June 1845.
133. Hansard, 81, 1052-63, 23 June 1845, Wyse, J. O'Connell.
134. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 26 May 1845.
135. See also *ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
136. Hansard, 80, 367-3, 9 May 1845, Wyse; 80, 1269-73, 2 June 1845, Wyse; 81, 1052-9, 1102-3, 23 June 1845, Wyse, Division. Table A, No. 3.
137. Hansard, 81, 1359, 1359, 1366-8, 30 June 1845, Russell, Wyse, Sheil. The Times, 2 July 1845, one-sided division. Table A, No. 8.
138. Hansard, 80, 369-70, 9 May 1845, Wyse; 80, 1273-4, 2 June 1845, Wyse; 81, 498-9, 13 June 1845, Sheil, Barron; 81, 627, 16 June 1845, Sheil; 81, 1377-91, 30 June 1845, Wyse, Sheil, Barron; 82, 360-1, 10 July 1845, Sheil.
139. Hansard, 81, 1040-4, 23 June 1845, Graham; 81, 1389-93, 30 June 1845, Divisions. Table A, Nos. 4-5.
140. Hansard, 80, 371-2, 375, 383, 9 May 1845, Wyse, Bellew, Sheil; 80, 1274, 2 June 1845, Wyse; 82, 225, 9 July 1845, Wyse; 82, 329, 10 July 1845, Bellew; 82, 1554, 9 Aug. 1845, Wyse.
141. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
142. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, n.d..
143. Hansard, 80, 372-97, 9 May 1845, Wyse, Bellew, Sheil, M. J. O'Connell; 80, 1159, 30 May 1845, Redington; 80, 1274, 1279, 1292, 2 June 1845, Wyse, O'Ferrall, M. J. O'Connell; 81, 1352-3, 30 June 1845, Smith O'Brien.
144. Hansard, 80, 605-13, 20 May 1845, Osborne, Sheil, Bellew, Division. Table A, No. 1.
145. Hansard, 82, 321-79, 10 July 1845, Osborne, Bellew, Redington, M. J. O'Connell, Sheil, Division; 82, 1504, 5 Aug. 1845, Sheil. Table A, No. 6.
146. Hansard, 80, 372, 9 May 1845, Wyse.
147. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
148. *Ibid*, Wyse to George Wyse, 17 May 1845, n.d..
149. Hansard, 80, 1295-7, 2 June 1845; 82, 379-81, 20 July 1845, Divisions. Table A, Nos. 2, 7.
150. Hansard, 82, 1503-4, 5 Aug. 1845, Sheil.
151. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 24 July 1845.
152. Hansard, 80, 377-80, 9 May 1845, Inglis.
153. Wyse Papers, MS 15019 (11), Wyse to George Wyse, 14 May 1845.
154. Graham Papers, 21IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 13 May 1845. DEM, 12, 14, 16, 26 May, 2, 4, 13, 16, 18 June 1845.

155. Hansard, 80, 1295-7, 2 June 1845, Division; 81, 1368-9, 30 June 1845, Bernard; 82, 379-81, 10 July 1845, Division. Table B, Nos. 2, 8.
156. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3149, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 27 June 1845.
157. Beresford Papers (T.C.D.), MS 2771, f310, 312, 313, 315, Lifford to Beresford, 15, 24, 28 May, 6 June 1845; *ibid*, f314, Clogher to Beresford, 4 June 1845; *ibid*, f315, 316, Beresford to Lifford, 6, 7 June 1845; *ibid*, ff334-408, numerous papers concerning the divinity professorships, including much correspondence between Hamilton and Beresford, 1848-50; *ibid*, MS 2772, ff413-7, continuation of series, 1850. Pack-Beresford MSS, D664/A/505, Lord Beresford to Beresford, 14 Oct. 1845. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 12, 23 Aug. 1845.
158. Hansard, 80, 391-5, 398, 9 May 1845, Shaw, Lefroy; 80, 1142-3, 30 May 1845, Adare; 80, 1255-9, 1292-5, 2 June 1845; George Hamilton, Shaw; 81, 1100-3, 23 June 1845, Claud Hamilton, Shaw, Division; 81, 1361, 1373, 30 June 1845, Shaw, Lefroy; 82, 117-8, 7 July 1845, Division; 82, 342, 10 July 1845, George Hamilton. *The Times*, 2 July 1845, one-sided division. Table B, Nos. 3, 6.
159. Hansard, 80, 398, 9 May 1845, Lefroy; 80, 1258-9, 1293-4, 2 June 1845, George Hamilton, Shaw.
160. Hansard, 80, 392, 9 May 1845, Shaw.
161. Hansard, 80, 391-5, 398-9, 9 May 1845, Shaw, Lefroy; 80, 606-7, 612-3, 20 May 1845, Shaw, Division; 80, 1257, 1292-5, 2 June 1845, George Hamilton, Shaw; 81, 1386-8, 30 June 1845, Shaw; 82, 53, 7 July 1845, George Hamilton; 82, 225-6, 8 July 1845, Shaw; 82, 332-42, 349-50, 352-7, 377-9, 10 July 1845, George Hamilton, Lefroy, Shaw, Division. Table B, Nos. 1, 7.
162. Hansard, 82, 783-6, 21 July 1845, Lansdowne; 82, 888-9, 22 July 1845, Lansdowne, Clanricarde, Monteagle.
163. DEM, 26 May 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 567, f271, Clanricarde to Peel, 21 May 1845.
164. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 569, f193, Monteagle to Peel, 21 June 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, f128, Graham to Peel, 5 June 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, f370, Heytesbury to Peel, 23 May 1845. Graham Papers, 90, Graham to Heytesbury, 4 June 1845; 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 5 June 1845. Bourke Papers, Vol. 313, f268, 282, Monteagle to Bourke, 13 May, 8 July 1845. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/4D, f284, Leinster to Russell, 22 Oct. 1845.
165. Graham Papers, 23IR, Fremantle to Graham, 26 Aug. 1845, with the resolutions of the Munster Provincial College Committee, 8 Aug. 1845.
166. Hansard, 80, 1148-9, 30 May 1845; 81, 1042-3, 23 June 1845; 82, 1555, 9 Aug. 1845, Graham.
167. Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on Education Reform in Ireland . . . , 79-97.
168. On the same point, see also Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 435, f1383, O'Malley to O'Brien, 29 Aug. 1845. Graham Papers, 22IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 6 June 1845.

169. Hansard, 81, 1356, 30 June 1845, O'Connell. Graham Papers, 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 1 July 1845.
170. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 4 Oct. 1845. See also *ibid*, 10 Oct. 1845.
171. Graham Papers, 22IR, 23IR, 24IR, 92, 94, Graham to Heytesbury, 18 July, 10, 12, 15, 18(2), 23 Aug., 14 Sept., 18, 20 Oct. 1845; 23IR, 24IR, 25IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 18, 21 Aug., 11 Sept., 15, 24 Oct., 2, 19 Nov., 9 Dec. 1845; 23IR, 24IR, 25IR, Fremantle to Graham, 16, 19, 20, 21 Aug., 9, 16 Sept., 11, 20, 28 Nov., 8 Dec. 1845; 23IR, 24IR, Graham to Fremantle, 18, 22, 23 Aug., 14, 26 Nov. 1845; 92, 94, 95A, Peel to Graham, 14 Aug., 18 Oct., 15, 17 Nov. 1845. Home Office Papers, HO 45 OS/1656, f2, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845 (also in HO 79/9, f183). Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, ff491, 510, 552, 562; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, ff175, 179; *ibid*, MS 40, 452, ff11, 23; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, ff432, 439, 521; *ibid*, MS 40, 573, f460; *ibid*, MS 40, 575, f291; *ibid*, MS 40, 621, f185. DEM, 3, 5, 7 Nov. 1845, 9 Jan. 1846.
172. Graham Papers, 23IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 21 Sept. 1845; Graham to Heytesbury, 24 Sept. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, f448, Fremantle to Peel, 20 Sept. 1845; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, f308, 316, Graham to Peel, 23, 28 Sept. 1845.
173. Graham Papers, 23IR, 24IR, Heytesbury to Graham, 14, 16, 21, 23, 31 Aug., 4, 6, 10, 13, 21, 26, 27 Sept., 1, 3, 15 Oct., 16 Nov. 1845; 23IR, Fremantle to Graham, 16, 20, 21, 29 Aug., 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18 Sept. 1845; 23IR, 24IR, 92, 94, Graham to Heytesbury, 10, 16, 18(2), 20, 23, 26 Aug., 6, 24 Sept., 7, 18, 20 Oct., 18 Nov. 1845; 23IR, Graham to Fremantle, 18, 22, 23 Aug., 9, 14 Sept. 1845; 92, 93, 94, Peel to Graham, 17, 19, 25 Aug., 6, 28 Sept., 7, 18 Oct. 1845; 93, Graham to Peel, 14 Sept. 1845. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 476, ff438, 448, 460, 463, 469, 471; *ibid*, MS 40, 451, ff195, 199, 203, 227, 231, 251, 255, 275, 286, 308, 310, 316, 318, 360; *ibid*, MS 40, 479, ff428, 441, 449, 453, 461; *ibid*, MS 40, 557, ff188, 271; *ibid*, MS 40, 573, f415; *ibid*, MS 40, 579, f280; *ibid*, MS 40, 611, f293; *ibid*, MS 40, 612, f177; *ibid*, MS 40, 613, f84; *ibid*, MS 40, 614, f112. Home Office Papers, HO 45 OS/1656, f2, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845 (also in HO 79/9, f183). Monteagle Papers, MS 13, 395(3), J. O'Brien to Monteagle, 10 Sept. 1845. DEM, 26 May, 9 June 1845. T. G. F. Paterson, 'Proposals for a University at Armagh', Ulster Journal of Archaeology, Third Series, Vol. 8 (1845), 10-11. George Crolly, The Life of The Most Rev. Doctor Crolly, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland (Dublin, 1851), XCV-XCVIII.
174. Graham Papers, 89, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 May 1845; 92, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845; 102, Peel to Graham, 25 June 1846; 22IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 13 July 1845; 23IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 12 Aug., 24 Sept. 1845; 27IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 5 Feb. 1846. Home Office Papers, Ho 45 OS/1656, f2, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845; *ibid*, f7, Graham to Heytesbury, 24 June 1846 (also in HO 79/9, f183, 313). C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, II, 15.
175. Wyse Papers, MS 15026(9), Wyse to Sheehan, 21 July 1847; *ibid*, Wyse to Umwin, 11 Aug. 1847. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 212-4.
176. T. W. Moody, 'The Irish University Question of the Nineteenth Century', History, Vol. XLIII (1958), 98-100. T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, Queen's, Belfast, I, 40 et seq. Richard P.J. Batterberry, 'Sir

Thomas Wyse and Mixed Education', The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 5th Series, Vol. 54 (July 1939), 22-8. C. G. Duffy, My Life in Two Hemispheres (London, 1898), I, 117. J. F. Hennersey, The Failure of the Queen's Colleges and of Mixed Education in Ireland (London, 1859). G. Shaw Lefevre, Peel and O'Connell, 252. P.J. Dowling, A History of Irish Education: a study in conflicting loyalties (Cork, 1971), 167. T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett, eds., Ulster since 1800, second series, a social survey (London, 1957), 196-9. N. Atkinson, Irish Education: a history of educational institutions (Dublin, 1959), 128-34.

Chapter 6

The Municipal Corporations

When the Royal Commissioners began their investigation in 1833 they found the system of corporations in Ireland in a state of disarray. Since the Union, 30 corporations had become extinct and 8 others had ceased to operate.¹ In most of the 60 corporations that remained, functions such as lighting, paving, cleansing and policing were either neglected or performed by other bodies.² The judicial functions of the corporations were administered inefficiently, at great expense, and occasionally in a spirit of politico-religious partisanship.³ Corporations had mismanaged or even misappropriated their property and were generally in financial difficulty.⁴ Their governing bodies were often composed of persons not resident in the town. They were chosen in a variety of ways, but generally without regard for the principle of popular representation.⁵ Indeed most were under the virtual or complete control of an individual 'patron' who nominated the members and officers. The majority of these patrons were Tories, some of them important figures in Irish politics;⁶ but Whigs also controlled a number of corporations.⁷

Even where the corporators were chosen on a more popular basis - as in Cork, Galway and Dublin - the franchise was generally restricted in such a way that Catholics were virtually excluded from municipal government. The co-optive system by which the Corporations operated permitted such exclusion in spite of the fact that the laws against Catholic membership were repealed in 1793.⁸ In only one Corporation - Tuam - was a majority of the governing body Catholic, and Catholics were altogether excluded from the governing bodies of most towns.⁹ The effective or total exclusion of Catholics from municipal government was practised even in corporations under the control of Whig patrons, who were possibly aware of the fact that their influence had little foundation in law and might be rejected if exerted in a direction unpopular with the existing corporators and freemen.¹⁰

The Protestant domination of the Corporations in itself made them objects of Catholic and radical resentment and Protestant and Conservative jealousy. But the practical benefits to those in control of the Corporations were limited. Some corporate officers received payment; indeed this was 'the chief head of expenditure in the greater number of the Corporations possessed of property'. However, the income (derived mainly from property and tolls) of 'very many' Corporations was 'inconsiderable in value and insufficient for the due remuneration of the Corporate officers', with some corporations bereft of property and only Dublin in possession of a large revenue.¹¹ The right of the corporators to control the admission of freemen was a source of patronage of some value, for the freemen were entitled to vote in 20 Parliamentary constituencies, had 'a small share' in controlling municipal affairs in a number of corporations, were generally exempt from tolls and customs,¹² and were accorded 'valuable commercial privileges' in some towns. However, after the Reform Act newly-created honorary freemen and non-resident freemen could not vote in Parliamentary elections; these restrictions and the expansion of the electorate qualifying through the property franchise greatly diminished the electoral importance of control of the Corporations.

With scarcely any attempt made to provide a complete range of services, the corporations did not control municipal affairs to the same extent as their modern counterparts. The powers held under charter by several Guilds to regulate their trades had 'generally fallen into neglect and disuse.'¹³ In fact, the vested interest was in such a state of degeneration that, as the subsequent debate was to show, Irish Conservatives were prepared to abolish the corporations. On the other hand, sufficient was at stake to make transfer of that interest to Catholics a point of contention. Such a transfer might be accompanied with revivification of the powers and status of the Corporations, with their prestige and their debating forum applied to the purposes of

radical agitation, taxing powers exerted to the detriment of Protestant property, and the admission of freemen - as - of - right who would vote in the radical interest in Parliamentary elections. And the Corporations did exercise important judicial functions which gave their governors ¹⁶ direct influence in the community and provided a source of patronage. Transfer of these judicial functions, carrying with it the prospect of their performance in a more egalitarian or pro-Catholic spirit, was especially dreaded by Irish Protestants.

The campaign to secure reform of the corporations began slowly. In his history of the Catholic Association in 1829, Wyse mentioned the corporations only in a footnote, describing them as 'not only obsolete, ¹⁵ but absurd' and calling for their reform. In 1830-1 O'Connell also took ¹⁶ an interest, expressed privately and publicly, in the subject. In January 1831, Melbourne wrote of the intention of the new Whig Government ¹⁷ to remedy 'the abuses of Corporations' in Ireland, but no measure emerged. The following year, French presented a petition from Roscommon 'in favour of Reform of Corporate Bodies.' But it was not until May 1832 that the subject was debated in Parliament. Callaghan and O'Connell then attacked the exclusion of Catholics from Cork Corporation and its offices and James Grattan called for an end to similar 'abuses' in Dublin. O'Connell subsequently attacked 'the beggarly and bigotted members' of Dublin Corporation for their opposition to Reform and their levying of illegal taxes, and accused the Corporation of Londonderry of levying improperly a new toll. He was supported by Sir John Newport, Hume and Henry Grattan, while Dawson and Shaw, who as Recorder of the City of Dublin was in the employ of the Corporation, defended the two Corporations. In July 1832 O'Connell launched a general attack on the corrupt and unjust corporations, ¹⁸ the objects he said of the 'especial disgust' of the Irish people. And in September Wyse ¹⁹ called for 'total alteration of the Municipal System.'

In 1833, with Parliamentary Reform at last out of the way, the

assault on the corporations of Britain and Ireland began in earnest. In February, Althorp moved for a Select Committee on the corporations of England, Wales and Ireland. The announcement was warmly welcomed by the Repealers Roche, Barron and O'Connell, the latter asserting that he 'knew of no greater grievance in Ireland' than the Corporations. He complained of 'the monopoly of authority on the one hand, and the entire destitution of it on the other', citing especially the exclusion of Catholics from the Corporation of Dublin. That Corporation was very much his principal concern; his letters to Fitzpatrick involved the abuses in Dublin, and the measure which he envisaged in 1833-4 was designed to open up only the Corporation of Dublin. In August 1833 and February 1834 he brought in bills for that purpose, but did not press the issue. O'Connell hoped that Corporate reform would help to drive some Irish Tories towards Repeal, and there is some evidence in a letter to Fitzpatrick in April 1833 to support Mac Intyre's view that O'Connell's forbearance arose from a desire not to alienate the Conservatives; but the reason he gave in Parliament for his urging a measure solely for Dublin was the peculiarity of its existing institutions.

The Irish Tories were represented on the Select Committee by Frederick Shaw. He brought over witnesses favourable to the Corporation of Dublin and, in fact, gave evidence himself, on the Recordship. However, the Committee, dominated by liberal members, found that the Corporation of Belfast was not only 'closed' but performed no useful or public function, and they declared that Dublin Corporation, being exclusively Protestant, could not be supposed to command the confidence or respect of the Catholic population, or to be a suitable repository of the considerable property and judicial power in its possession. These were the only Irish Corporations examined, but the Committee recommended further inquiry by a Royal Commission.

The liberal-unionists Dobbin, Wallace and John Martin sat on the

Select Committee and another, Sergeant Louis Perrin, gave evidence on ²⁶ the unsatisfactory nature of the jury system in Dublin. The liberal-unionists held their peace in the brief debates in Parliament in 1833 and 1834, but it was a liberal-unionist member, Perrin, who was made chairman of the subsequent Royal Commission. Perrin was allowed to nominate the rest of the Commissioners, to Anglesey's annoyance; he chose six Catholic barristers (including David Pigot) and 'six liberal ²⁷ Protestants.' In Parliament in August 1833, Shaw claimed that the Commission was a 'mockery of fair dealing', with every member of it inclined against the corporations. He and Lefroy opposed O'Connell's proposed measure for Dublin on the grounds that it pre-empted the results of the inquiry and would effectively give him control of the ²⁸ Corporation.

In February 1835 O'Connell again attacked Dublin Corporation and made a 'thorough Reform in the Corporations, so as to place them under popular control', one of the measures which would reconcile him to the ²⁹ Whig Government and cause him to 'suspend' the agitation for Repeal. The first report of the Commission in 1835 exposed and condemned the abuses discussed above, and concluded that the Corporations 'have long become unpopular and objects of suspicion .. they are, in many instances, of no service to the community; in others, injurious; in all, inefficient and inadequate to the proper purposes and ends of such institutions.' It urged 'a general and complete Reform of the constituencies of the Municipal Corporations in Ireland.' In particular, the Commissioners felt that the freeman constituency could never become sufficiently popular and suggested that the Act of 1828, by which £5 householders could elect a resident board to administer the lighting, cleansing, paving and watching of their town, provided a satisfactory model for ³⁰ the reform of the municipal constituency. The bill which Perrin, as Attorney-General, introduced at the end of July 1835 proposed, in fact, ³¹ a £10 franchise for 7 of the larger towns and £5 for 60 others.

Perrin justified the measure simply with reference to the abuses of the existing corporations and the need to remove them by 'restoring the elective right to the inhabitants at large', as they had proposed in England. He explained that the absence of a system of poor law rating meant that they could not adopt in Ireland the provisions of the English bill, by which possession of a residence qualification and the payment of rates qualified the elector. Spring Rice provided a more revealing insight into Government thinking when in August 1835 he wrote to Newport that,

'the question of Irish Municipal reform .. should always be considered in connection with other principles of policy & not as taken per se. Had it stood alone I think it might have been otherwise framed in many most important particulars & been very much improved. But we were bound by English bill analogies ... If we depopularized the Irish bill by a measure of less extensive Reform than was conceded to (England) & Scotland we gave an immediate continuance to the cry of Repeal & inflicted a permanent wound upon Ireland to meet temporary inconvenience. It is too late to stop to enquire whether safety is now to be purchased by abridging the franchise of the popular party. Civil strength they have ~~lost~~ by the Franchise and by the Reform Bill. Physical strength they possess by their numbers. All that we can do is to endeavour to amalgamate them with English interests & to identify them with English feelings so as to acquire the strength derived from contentment.' 32

The Government, then, was ready, in the era of the Lichfield House Compact, to set aside their apprehension that such a liberal measure would give the corporations over to 'the popular party', in order to prevent the discontent which might revive the Repeal agitation. O'Connell and other repeal members duly obliged by warmly welcoming the bill.

33
 Sharman Crawford thought it 'a bill fully entitled to support.'
 Opposition came entirely from the other side of the House, particularly from the Irish Tories. Shaw, again a principal figure, 'did not deny that there were some abuses and defects in the present system of Corporations which he should wish to remove, and that .. the lapse of time and altered circumstances called for safe and salutary changes.' And he apparently accepted that his own party 'had enjoyed too large a share of municipal authority.' But he claimed that the 'origin and principal use of the Irish Corporations was to secure British connexion

and to encourage the Protestant religion' and he would not transfer them into the hands of those who wished to subvert Protestantism and the connection with Britain. This role, and this danger, meant, he said, that there was no parallel between the positions of England and Ireland. Lefroy and Perceval were similarly apprehensive of the implications of the proposed reform. But the principal objection made by the Irish Tories was against the Government's proceeding with the bill so late in the session.³⁴

The fears of the Irish Tories were shared by King William, who wrote to Russell and Melbourne in August that,

'the character of the people to whom the measure is to be adopted and the local circumstances differ so essentially that His Majesty cannot admit the wisdom of applying to Ireland measures which may be perfectly suited to the more civilized and better organized state of England. He must observe also that he has noticed with suspicion the exultation with which the measure has been received by Mr. D. O'Connell & his Clique and that he cannot feel much pleasure at seeing men, professedly agitators, preferably consulted with respect to .. measures in the country which they desire to disturb.'

Russell replied that it was necessary to convince Protestants and Catholics of the Government's determination to deal out 'impartial justice' in Ireland.³⁵

The bill of 1835 passed through the Commons but was not sent up to the Lords. The English bill, on the other hand, passed into law and at the end of the year produced sweeping Whig-radical victories in the municipal elections, a fact which probably hardened Tory opposition to the Irish measure. During the recess O'Loughlen replaced Perrin as Irish Attorney-General and, Mulgrave reported to Russell, redrafted the bill 'according to my directions as nearly as possible the same as the English Act which passed both Houses

'... I am quite convinced myself (in which I see you perfectly concur) that we ought to give the enemy no extraneous excuse for resistance but ought to oblige them to state that opinion nakedly (if they feel it) which the Recorder debated with so much more complacency than success in presenting the new Lord Mayor to me, "that Ireland could not have the same legislation as England".'³⁶

Perhaps taking a cue from Mulgrave, the Ministry inserted in the

King's Speech and the Address, at the beginning of February, a commitment to legislating on the Irish Corporations 'upon the same principles as those of the Acts which have already passed for England and Scotland.' Peel, who had remained silent during the debates in 1835, and Wellington objected mainly on the procedural aspect of the issue, such a specific pledge not conforming with usage. But Peel, though admitting 'that there must be extensive alterations in the Irish Municipal system', also warned that he would not be influenced by 'fanciful and merely plausible analogies' with Britain and would have to consider 'whether under the pretence of removing one exclusion I shall not be confirming another. I will look to whom power will be given and I will look to what objects the power so given will be directed.' Shaw again expressed his willingness to remove abuses but warned the House against substituting nomination by O'Connell for self-election, transferring power from supporters of the Union and the Church to those who were 'the enemies of England.'

The Government's position that the principle of 'popular election and control' should be applied in Ireland as well as Britain was somewhat undermined by O'Connell's declaration in this debate that reform would convert every corporation into 'a Normal school for teaching the science of peaceful political agitation', a remark later exploited by his opponents. But the most important contribution came from Stanley. He admitted the need for 'the most summary remedy' of the abuses in the Irish Corporations, but he argued that the principles enacted in England might not be applicable in Ireland; he was 'in some instances .. inclined to adopt the radical remedy of total extinction', persuaded as he was that 'greater abuses exist in many of the towns in Ireland, as to the administration of funds and the exclusive system of management, than prevailed in this country.'

The Government won the division on the Address by 41 votes, a margin which impressed Greville and Holland and delighted Mulgrave, who stated

that acquiescence in the amendment 'would have destroyed all the popularity we had been .. building up in Ireland.'³⁸ The Irish Tories voted unanimously with Peel and the Irish liberals were united behind the Government. In the Lords, however, the Ministers 'somewhat hastily and weakly' acquiesced in Wellington's amendment without a division,³⁹ though Clanricarde and Clancurry issued protests. Peel had indicated to his supporters that morning 'that it was of great consequence to shape their proceedings so as to get the support of Stanley', and on the 10th of February he informed Wellington of the likelihood of an alliance with Stanley and Graham against the Whigs. In that letter he described a Conservative meeting held earlier in the day on the Irish Corporations, attended by Shaw, Jackson, Lefroy, Tennent, Fitzgerald (all Irish Tories), Goulburn, Knatchbull and Peel:

'We had a good deal of conversation, the result of which was an impression that the best course and that most satisfactory to the Irish Protestants, would be the abolition of all Corporations without exception, (and) the distinct avowal that the appointment of persons concerned in the nomination of juries & the administration of justice should be placed in the hands of the Crown, rather than that (sic) of any local authorities.'

And 'watching, lighting, paving, &c' could be provided for through the Act of 1828. Peel continued:

'.. Shaw thought there would be no difficulty whatever in prevailing on the existing Corporations voluntarily to tender the surrender of their Corporate Privileges, on the condition that they should be extinguished for the future, and not transferred to an opposite & hostile party. It is startling at first to hear the proposal of the abolition of the Corporation of Dublin, but it is clearly better that it should be abolished than be an instrument in the hands of an Irish faction.'

Stanley and Wellington agreed to the plan, both unwilling to hand the Corporations over to the radicals but aware that there was 'too much evidence of malversation and misgovernment to enable us to attempt to leave the Corporations as they are. The only resource is to introduce the power of the Crown.'⁴⁰ Croker remonstrated in vain against 'so inconsistent & impossible a course as the abolition of the great Irish Corporations .. Why not take the bull by the horns & tell the truth & say that these corporations are the English garrisons & Protestant asylums in Ireland

& are to be treated on that principle... These are no times for fighting under false colors. Your real objection to the proposed reform is the Protestant interest. Say so. Take the high & surest ground.⁴¹

O'Loghlen duly brought in the Municipal Corporations bill, essentially the same bill as that of 1835, and supported it in a speech stressing the extent of abuse in the existing system and the need to treat Ireland equally with Britain. In reply, Peel ruled out 'partial modification' of a system so 'radically bad', with its small electorates, Protestant monopolies and misapplication of funds. But he preferred abolition of the Corporations to the mere transfer of municipal power from one party to another and objected particularly to the bill's continuation of the administration of justice in the hands of councillors who would be party politicians, citing O'Connell's 'Normal school' remark in support of his view that the new Corporations would be political bodies. He would give to the Crown the appointment of the Sheriffs (as Shaw proposed in 1835),⁴² the police and all of the magistracy; vest Corporate property in a special Commission; and provide for lighting,⁴³ cleansing, etc. through the Act of 1828.

The subsequent debates dwelt much on the extent to which principles applied in England were to be applied in Ireland, with Conservatives stressing the dangers of popular control of the Irish Corporations and liberals of every shade asserting the right of Ireland to 'equal justice'. The liberal-unionist members, apart from those in Government, made no contribution to the debates on corporate reform from their commencement in February 1833 until March 1836, but on the 7th of March Crawford supported the prayer of a petition from Belfast for the Government measure; and in the great debate on the 7-8th of March, Woulfe, Smith O'Brien and Villiers Stuart opposed the motion of Lord Francis Egerton, who was acting for the Conservative leaders, to abolish the corporations. They urged the right of Ireland to the same treatment as that accorded to England and rejected the notion that it should be refused simply because

the majority of the new electorate would be Catholic; and they warned that if equal treatment were denied - if the amendment were adopted - O'Connell would be the only beneficiary and the Repeal spirit would be 'revived with irresistible force.' In the subsequent division the Irish liberals voted unanimously and impressively against the motion. ⁴⁴

The Government won the division by 64 votes, which was considered on all sides an even greater margin than predicted. Crawford and O'Connell were confident that the bill would now pass both Houses. ⁴⁵ Perhaps in anticipation of problems in the Lords, however, the Government agreed to take the nomination of the Sheriffs in the eight counties of cities and towns from the new corporations and give it to the Lord Lieutenant - a major concession which drew protests from O'Connell and Bellew. Apart from Attorney-General O'Loughlen, only repealers spoke on the third reading, all of them warmly approving the bill, but both repealers and liberal-unionists voted solidly for the measure, which again passed with a large majority. ⁴⁶

The Irish Tory speakers in these debates pointed to the apparent lack of logic in omitting from the bill some large towns and including others much smaller, to the 'constant excitement' which would be attendant on the municipal elections and, above all, contended that, with the proposed franchises giving an electorate dominated by the priesthood, there would simply be a transfer of exclusive power from Protestants to Catholics. The latter would be empowered to tax Protestant property and would devote corporate influence to agitation, to the advancement of O'Connell's power and to the promotion of Repeal. These political implications meant that the analogy with the English bill was, in their view, inadmissible. Lefroy, Shaw, Conolly, Dunbar and Tennent, generally admitting abuses and defects in existing Corporations, supported Peel's abolitionist course, but Jackson contrived to avoid comment on that proposal and Plunkett, evidently dissatisfied, regretted the sacrifice of 'those Corporations which everywhere have been amongst the best bulwarks

of Protestantism and British interests in Ireland .. it may be most dangerous in a statesman to abandon important muniments of the Protestant Constitution.' However, the Irish Tories, including Plunkett and Jackson, voted unanimously for Egerton's motion. There were no divisions in Committee, but Shaw and his Irish friends kept up a vigorous opposition. Shaw went on to lead the opposition to the third reading, when the Irish Tories voted unanimously against the bill.⁴⁷

The proposed corporations had, even after amendment, several powers of a controversial nature: the management of corporate property, the right to levy a rate for the support of their officers and other, ill-defined purposes, the power to make bye-laws, control over certain descriptions of police, and the right of the mayor elected by the corporations to act as a magistrate during his mayoralty. Above all, however, Conservatives still considered that corporations under the control of O'Connell would be a prestigious and formidable vehicle of agitation. On the 12th of March it was decided unanimously at a meeting attended by Shaw, Lefroy, Fitzgerald and the British Tory leaders that, in spite of the hostile vote of the Commons, the Lords should be asked to abolish the Corporations.⁴⁸ A 'Committee of Irish Conservative members' was 'appointed to collect and arrange the necessary particulars .. and a Bill was framed having for its object the extinction of Corporations.'⁴⁹

The Government measure was duly rejected by the Lords, with the Irish Tories Londonderry, Roden and Fitzgerald among the speakers in opposition. Roden and Fitzgerald approved of the abolitionist course and the latter's motion to extinguish the corporations was supported, without exception, by the Irish Tory peers. Lord Gort, however, later spoke out against this course, regretting that Limerick should be deprived of its corporation, of which he was patron, for the sake of a settlement which would only fuel demands 'which would never cease to be made till the Protestant religion was trampled under foot.' The Irish Whig peers, in debate and in the division lobby, defended the Government

bill against the abolitionists. The motion of the independent Duke of Richmond to give corporations to the seven largest towns, approved by the Government, saw the Irish peers again divided along party lines, the Whigs for and the Conservatives insistent on total abolition.

The Lords sent down 'the Municipal Extinction Bill', embodying Peel's proposals. The Government in deciding on its reaction were subjected to pressures of a conflicting nature. On the 15th of April, in anticipation of the Lords' course, Mulgrave reported from Ireland that,

'there is no other question on which there is such general anxiety, not perhaps that they anticipate any very great actual advantage from it except in the large towns but because they consider it as embodying the principle of equal justice to Ireland ... every division of the Liberal Party will unite in considering the Municipal Bill as the test of equal Rights on points not connected with the Church and it would be very difficult to ensure continued confidence in the Government with our submitting to be beat upon such a point without an appeal to the people. I am thoroughly aware of all the counterbalancing disadvantages of a dissolution, but I am sure in Ireland it will be expected if the Lords relying on the limited nature of our majority in this Parliament throw out the Bill.' 52

Melbourne rejected the proposal of dissolution as 'most absurd, being evidently no remedy for the evil.' Some weeks later, Mulgrave's account of opinion in Ireland was less conclusive than before. William Finn, the repeal member for Kilkenny, had expressed to him a hope that the Government would accept the amended bill and had said he thought the view of 'every sensible liberal man in the country' was that,

'the great object was to destroy the existing corporations (and) that as to anything farther the whole liberal interest would be quite satisfied to leave its management in my hands as long as I remained here. This is confidence with a vengeance! I have not yet been able to ascertain whether he or the newspapers (which take the contrary line).. really speak the sentiments of the Irish Catholics .. I am inclined to believe that what has been done by the Lords has excited general disgust as a stigmatory distinction. What under these circumstances should be done by the Government is a question on which as yet opinions are both divided and unsettled.' 53

According to Palmerston, 'the Irish members all say they would rather have it (the bill) as the Lords are making it than let things continue as they are. To get rid of the Orange corporations would be to them a riddance worth any sacrifice almost ...' Later in the month (May 1836), after the Lords had finished their work, Crawford wrote that,

'Ireland is all on fire' over the behaviour of the peers; but, he informed his son, O'Connell and the Government were, like Finn, prepared to accept the amended bill:

'Dan and the Government were at first for taking the bill as the Lords sent it back to us, giving us no corporations at all. But a portion of the Irish members (among whom I was one and I believe I may say the leader of the mischief) kicked both against Dan and the Government. Dan was obliged to come with us and the Government was obliged to follow whether they would or not, and we are now fallen back upon Repeal once again. Dan says we must have Corporation reform or Repeal and the only way to bring matters about he says is to reform the House of Lords - and he is not far wrong ...I think it was my threat of dividing the House on the Corporations Bill which brought about the change in Dan's views.' 55

James Grattan 'heard O'Connell say in the House to several members we should take what we could get, talking of the abolition of Corporations.. Most of the Irish', including Grattan, were for adopting Richmond's proposal, while, according to Grattan, the English radicals were the party most adamant against compromise. Holland, Disraeli and, several years later, in conversation with Greville, the Duke of Bedford confirmed these accounts so far as they related to O'Connell's readiness to give way. Referring to the compromise subsequently proposed by the Government, O'Connell informed Pigot in July that, 'The Corporate Reform Bill was amended by Lord John against my consent. I protested in private against the compromise but was driven in public to support the party' - ambiguous words which hid the truth that he had preferred not outright defiance to compromise but outright capitulation.

In Parliament the initial reaction of the Irish liberals was one of great indignation; the liberal-unionists Smith O'Brien, Lord Clements, Wyse and Crawford angrily rejected the Lords' bill, as did the repealers David Roche and Dillon Browne. Crawford and Wyse threatened to agitate for Repeal if Ireland was not given 'perfect equality with England'. Russell and Spring Rice similarly rejected the new bill but were prepared to attempt 'a fair and reasonable compromise', much to the dismay of Crawford. Russell showed a disposition towards a firmer line in future proceedings when, at the beginning of June, he urged on

Melbourne 'the creation of 8, 10 or 12 peers' to intimidate and reduce the Tory majority in the Lords, but the response of the Prime Minister was not encouraging. Russell, at any rate, was not abandoning his intention to seek a compromise on the Corporations issue, including his proposals in the covering note^{sent} with his memo to Melbourne on the creation of peers. He proposed to give corporations to eleven large towns and to require 17 others to adopt the Act of 1828, but with corporate property transferred to the Commissioners elected under that ⁶¹ Act.

Mulgrave reported that Plunket 'thought the Liberal Party would not be satisfied with anything short of the summary rejection of the Bill, but I have little doubt myself that the plan of which you sent me the heads will quite content the great majority of our friends ... they would be ready to forego any extreme course which might embarrass' ⁶² the Government. When Russell put the compromise to a meeting of liberal members at the Foreign Office on the 6th, Grattan thought that, 'All ⁶³ seemed satisfied. It retains our principle^{and} gets rid of Lyndhurst's.' In the House Russell urged rejection of the Lords' amendments and insertion of his compromise proposal, modified from the original so as to leave 12 corporations and 20 towns in the second schedule. A succession of liberal-unionists (O'Brien, Clements, O'Loughlen, Crawford and Wyse) and repealers (Callaghan, Dillon Browne, Henry Grattan, Sheil and O'Connell) joined in denouncing the Lords' bill as an insult and a denial of justice to Ireland. O'Loughlen, Attorney-General for Ireland, said the measure and Lyndhurst's famous 'aliens' speech justified agitation for Repeal.

The Irish liberals voted unanimously for rejection of the Lords' bill, and the motion was carried by a majority of 86, a margin which a delighted James Grattan noted was 'about 20 more than was expected ... ⁶⁴ a great triumph.' O'Brien and Clements regretted that more towns were not to be incorporated under Russell's compromise but generally approved of the proposal, and O'Connell, though he had advocated at the meeting

65

at the Foreign Office the addition of five more corporations, in the debate dismissed the number incorporated as 'a mere question of detail.' Crawford, however, protested strongly against the 'degrading compromise.' On the 14th of June he proposed to incorporate 16 towns omitted under the compromise, but his motion to include Bandon, the first of the 16, was lost by 148 votes to 8. O'Connell and most of the liberal-unionists and repealers voted against and only five Irish liberals - Thomas Martin, D. C. Brady and three repealers - joined Crawford. Crawford subsequently declaimed in a letter to his constituents against 'the compromising policy' adopted 'by the distinguished leader of the catholic body' with regard to the corporations bill.

66

67

Shaw, Conolly, George Hamilton and Thomas Lefroy, like the British Conservative speakers, warmly supported the Lords' bill and its extinction of the Corporations, and rejected the Government's compromise as retaining the 'normal schools' in the most important towns and forcing others to adopt the Act of 1828 even against the wishes of their inhabitants. The Irish Tories voted unanimously for the Lords' bill on the 10th of June. When the measure was returned to the Lords the Irish peers again split along party lines. The compromise was defeated and the Government abandoned the measure for the session. Early in July, Smith O'Brien proposed resolutions of 'regret' and 'indignation' at the conduct of the Lords, but was persuaded by other members, including O'Connell, to withdraw the motion.

68

Jackson perhaps presaged his future dissent from the abolitionist course when he seconded Crawford's motion to incorporate Bandon 'because he felt that if there were to be towns added to the list there could not be found a more loyal or more respectable town than that he had the honour to represent.' No other Conservative voted for that motion. But at the end of August, Jackson informed Peel of his view that,

69

'it would not be safe to renew the battle next Session upon the same ground we occupied during the last. There is a very strong feeling,

even amongst our Conservative friends, against the total annihilation of Corporations. Many English Country Gentlemen do not understand the peculiar state & circumstances of Ireland, & they feel great repugnance to the destruction of an ancient institution. This feeling is so prevalent that I much fear, if another division were taken upon the same question, instead of 86 the majority against us would exceed 100.' 70

Wellington commented,

'I understand the feeling which Sergeant Jackson mentions. It prevails to a certain degree in the House of Lords. Men who have not lived in Ireland and even many who have do not understand the relation in which Protestants of the Church of England and Roman Catholics stand towards each other; and they cannot see the consequences of the transfer of local power from the hands of one sect to those of the other.' 71

Jackson and Wellington clearly had in mind those English Conservatives who preferred a safe reform to abolition of the Corporations, though there were also English and Irish Ultras like Inglis, Blackstone, Mansfield, Randal Plunkett and Gort who apparently wished to maintain the status quo. Sir George Clerk, M.P. for Edinburgh and a leading Conservative, informed Peel during the session that he had 'a scruple as to the plan of depriving Ireland altogether of the privilege of Municipal Corporations, lest ... we should sacrifice a principle of justice.' 73 Tavistock had noticed the existence of the more moderate line of dissent among Bedfordshire Conservatives. It manifested itself in debate only in the contribution of Sir Eardley Wilmot and in the tentative behaviour of Jackson, but the increase in the Government's majority against extinction from 64 in March on Egerton's motion to 86 in June was an ominous sign. The Irish Tories, like the English, polled well short of their full complement on both occasions though the Irish actually increased their vote in the second division - 32 (6 of them pairs) for Egerton's motion and 36 (2 pairs) for the Lords' bill, with no defections. 74

In his letter to Peel, Jackson proposed, in order to unite the Conservatives and win over those who voted with Richmond, to preserve corporations in the 33 corporations which sent members to Parliament, but to provide safeguards against the transfer of exclusive power to the Catholics and the establishment of 'legalized schools of agitation' -

namely 'a bona fide qualification which whilst it should admit Roman Catholics to a just share in Municipal Government should not give them a monopoly', by which he meant an independent valuation possibly but not necessarily of more than £10, and 'a strong enactment against discussing or introducing any question at Corporate meetings save only such as concerned municipal business.' He suggested that during the recess they should gather information 'as to the number of houses in each of the boroughs which it might be proposed to retain as Corporations, of the value of £10, £15 & £20, respectively, inhabited by Protestants & Roman Catholics.'

This was 'the first letter' Peel had had 'upon the subject', and he was evidently taken aback by it, 'knowing how strongly he (Jackson) felt the danger that must result from that abuse of municipal institutions in Ireland which he thought inevitable.' Peel, in reply, refused to commit himself on the question even so far as to sanction the inquiries proposed by Jackson. Wellington felt that a regulation against political discussion in corporations could not be enforced and that no mode of valuation could be introduced which would be proof against the bias of barristers whose Whig employees were 'under the dominion of Mr. O'Connell and his faction.' He adhered to the abolitionist course as 'the only chance for the Protestants in the towns.'⁷⁶ He was less dismissive, however, when later in the year Ripon sent a measure which he hoped would 'relieve the House of Lords from the awkward difficulty of rejecting every scheme proposed upon that subject.' Ripon was not 'sanguine as to getting the cooperation of the high flying Tories, who would prefer rejection to any attempt at a compromise.' Wellington agreed that it would be proper to consider a plan 'which would give tolerable security to resident Protestants.'⁷⁷

Mulgrave and Russell felt that the Corporations question should be their 'Cheval de Bataille' in the next session, such were their problems with the Tithe question, though, as Parkes noted, the hurdle of the Lords

would remain even if a dissolution brought Whig gains in the Lower House.⁷⁸
 In Ireland the question of municipal reform contributed to the strength
 of the General Association, which was committed to 'a complete municipal
 reform'; in particular, 'Lyndhurst's (aliens) speech has come up not
 in armed men but in talking and agitating men, eye and subscribing men
 too.'⁷⁹ Jackson wrote to Tennent in December that he felt the issue was
 a 'great embarrassment' and stated that he was 'very anxious to escape
 it by some concession or modification of the proposed measure, but I
 fear that is hopeless without involving the total prostration of
 Protestantism & the enormous increase of the already formidable power
 of O'Connell & the Popish Priests.' He and Wyse both felt that opinion
 in England was much more with the Whigs on the corporations issue than
 on Appropriation, and Jackson conspired with Roden to dictate the 'field
 of battle' by urging the introduction of a Tithe bill before the
 Government could bring on their corporations measure.⁸⁰

In December Mulgrave reported to Russell that Woulfe, liberal-
 unionist member for Cashel and newly-appointed Solicitor-General, and
 Sheil were anxious to restore to the Corporations the right to nominate
 the Sheriffs, feeling that 'the greatest advantage' was given to their
 opponents by 'acknowledging that the new corporations were not fit to
 enjoy privileges which are now possessed by the present ones.' O'Connell,
 though he would not oppose 'any corporate bill brought in by this
 administration', also urged abandonment of the Sheriffs compromise. The
 Government duly acquiesced and the bill of 1837 restored, with slight
 modification, the provision by which the Lord Lieutenant chose the
 Sheriffs out of a list drawn up by the corporations.⁸¹ On the other side,
 the great Irish Tory meeting in Dublin in January 1837 also indicated
 the strength of opposition to any compromise settlement, with a succession
 of speakers underlining their determination to prevent the transfer of
 the corporations 'into other hands dangerous to Church and State.' And
 Gort was reconciled, reluctantly, to the abolitionist course.⁸²

In spite of Holland's apparent readiness to accept 'Richmond's plan or something like it', and the King's sharing Tory fears of Catholic domination of the new corporations,⁸³ the bill introduced by Russell in February 1837 was essentially the same as that brought in twelve months earlier. Though it was rumoured that Peel would allow the measure to pass both Houses if Appropriation was dropped from the Tithe bill,⁸⁴ no intimation was given of this in the debates as Peel and his followers, including John Young of Cavan, Emerson Tennent, Lucas, Vesey, Perceval and Shaw, again supported Egerton's abolitionist motion. However, Young dissented from the view that the new corporations would be used to serve radical-Catholic political interests and evidently hoped for a compromise, and George Young, the Conservative member for Tynemouth, asserted the right of Irish towns to municipal government and his determination to support the bill.⁸⁵

The defeat of Egerton's motion by 80 votes, 16 more than on the same question a year earlier and 20 more than expected,⁸⁶ left the Conservatives 'prodigiously depressed', noted Greville, with Peel 'very much disgusted' at the 'coolness' of his party. Some members had missed the division through 'lukewarmness and indifference'. Wharncliffe 'saw no alternative but the compromise, but (said) that he did not know whether his party would be brought to consent.' Greville pointed out that the Government's (expected) abandonment of appropriation increased the pressure on the Conservatives to compromise on the Corporations.⁸⁷ Shaw informed Roden of the likely abstention of 'Crotcheters' in the Conservative ranks in future divisions, and, as it was 'not a question on which we shall catch one wavering vote', he did not relish the debates to come. He added, astutely, 'I suspect the way the Lords mean to deal with the measure is to postpone it till they see the other Irish ones'.⁸⁸

Peel wrote to Wellington on the 23rd of February complaining of 'the apathy and idleness of our friends', including the absent Bruen and Lefroy, and reporting also that some Tories wished the Church

question brought on because they considered the corporations issue relatively 'unpopular'. Wellington agreed that, 'The division is certainly not very promising. The absence of the Irish members particularly is to be attributed to their fear of offending certain of their constituents. They knew that the vote would be against the amendment and they did not care, or thought that it did not signify, whether the minority was stronger or weaker.' This comment on the absence of Irish Tory members - 28 voted for Egerton, 4 paired and 7 were absent - is interesting, though it is not clear if the pressure to abstain came from moderate Conservatives who would concede a safe reform or from ultras who wished to retain the Protestant Corporations. Wellington, undaunted, recommended a division on the third reading 'even though our numbers should be smaller. Every thing which will shew an interest felt by the leaders in the House of Commons on a Bill on which there will be a decided majority in the House of Lords will be an object.' Earlier, in order to delay the dissolution expected on rejection of the Bill in the Lords, he had urged 'every obstruction that can be made to the passage of the Bill in the House of Commons.'

The Irish liberal-unionists and repealers gave their warm support to the corporations bill in debate and in the division lobby, and the victory on Egerton's motion delighted James Grattan and O'Connell.⁹⁰ The only note of dissent came when, in Committee, Crawford moved that nomination of the sheriffs should be vested absolutely in the corporations, which motion was opposed by the great majority of Irish liberals and easily defeated.⁹¹ Developments in the Conservative camp were, however, of much greater significance. Wellington wrote to Peel in March of 'some waverers in opinion in the House of Lords upon this subject, even among the leaders' ^{the} language and the views of these persons have been in a great degree the cause that the Government have determined to resign and have fixed upon this particular measure as the one which is to bring the question to issue.' Convinced that the Government would

resign on rejection of the measure in the Lords, Peel and Wellington felt that the corporations issue assumed 'on that account a more than ordinary importance'; more was at stake than 'the mere question of the municipal administration of towns which are bankrupt in property.' ⁹²

Peel therefore consulted Stanley and Graham. They shared the fear that the Government would resign if the Lords threw out the bill, leaving the question as the 'principal difficulty' of the new Conservative Government. And there was a danger of 'an open rupture between the Houses of Parliament' on the question. A show of 'moderation and extreme caution' by the Opposition would make the Government's resignation 'indefensible and unintelligible'. The Lords should postpone the second reading for two months, until the Government conceded the omission of appropriation from the Tithe bill and carried a Poor Law with 'a real test of Value founded on rating and bearing immediately both on the elective and municipal franchise.' A corporations bill, suitably amended to secure a bona fide franchise and to protect the administration of justice from 'popular control', ⁹³ could then be conceded.

Peel agreed with this advice. His 'main anxiety' was to ensure that their position in Government would be the same as that in Opposition and ^{he} therefore wanted an immediate decision as to whether there was any possibility of their accepting a measure of municipal reform. He wanted to show a disposition to consider retention of corporations in Ireland lest they should later be unable to maintain their present 'unqualified resistance.' As he wrote in a personal memo in July, some Conservatives objected to the abolitionist policy, most of them wishing 'to retain the existing corporations in Ireland as they stood', but others, including Stanley, Graham and Peel himself, doubting if the policy could be permanently maintained in view of opinion in Ireland and England. And Peel was keenly aware of the 'imminent danger .. of separation from Stanley and Graham.' In addition, he was anxious

to avoid conflict between the two Houses, and to postpone a decision in the Lords in order to use corporate reform as a bargaining counter for a satisfactory settlement of the tithe question.⁹⁴

Wellington was ready to consider a measure which would resolve the differences between the two Houses. But he would not accept the Government measure as it gave power to the 'lowest rabble' and the 'priests and demagogues' to tax an area up to 7 miles from each town; 'I could not bear to be instrumental in imposing upon Gentlemen of Property, particularly upon Irish Protestants living in and in the neighbourhood of these towns, such a system of vexatious tyranny as will be imposed upon them by this bill.' And he feared that postponement of the measure for two months would be regarded by friends as 'an abandonment of the principle of our opposition to the bill', that there was little prospect of their opponents agreeing to 'reasonable' Tithe, Poor-law and Corporations measures, and that compromise on the corporations would not stave off the Government's resignation as that issue was 'the pretext for rather than the cause of that step.'⁹⁵

Lyndhurst and Haddington, too, were unwilling to compromise and advocated rejection of the bill on the second reading in the Lords. But Ellenborough concurred in Peel's reasoning. And Ashburton and Fitzgerald wished to prevent a dissolution on the relatively popular Corporations measure and urged, therefore, postponement instead of rejection of the bill.⁹⁶ At a meeting on the 9th of April, the Conservative leaders, including an apprehensive Wellington, agreed that the Tory leaders in the Commons should facilitate the Lords' approval of the second reading. In the third reading debate in the Commons on the 10-11th of April, Peel, Stanley, Graham and Goulburn 'laid the ground' for the postponement tactic by stating that they would be unable to decide on their precise line, on the possibility of compromise, until they knew the details of the Government's poor-law and tithe measures - particularly until they saw the Church secure against the appropriation threat - though all

were adamant that the corporations bill as it stood would not be acceptable.⁹⁷

Apart from the vote cast by John Martin of Sligo against the measure, the Irish members divided on party lines in the debate and division on the third reading, which was carried by the (reduced) margin of 55 votes.⁹⁸ The Conservative leaders met at Aberdeen's on the 15th of April and decided against opposing the second reading in the Lords. Wellington agreed and undertook to win over the still absent Lyndhurst.⁹⁹ When they met again at Lyndhurst's house on the 23rd of April, Peel contended that they should seek to end conflict between the two Houses, to abandon a line of resistance the Commons would not allow them to maintain in Government, and to exploit their readiness to compromise on this issue in order to win 'a greater preliminary concession from the Commons .., namely the withdrawal of the Appropriation clause.' He accordingly urged the policy of giving a second reading to the bill in the Lords and postponing the Committee until they saw the other Irish measures. This course, he saw, demonstrated a disposition to abandon the extinction policy.¹⁰⁰ It was agreed upon at this meeting and again at 'a very full meeting' of the Tory peers the following day; Cumberland protested, but Lyndhurst only hinted at his dissatisfaction.¹⁰¹ Wellington still had reservations about practical 'inconveniences', but Wharncliffe proceeded to prepare an outline of a bill retaining corporations in Ireland.¹⁰²

The bill was read a second time on the 25th of April. And on the 5th of May and 9th of June, Wellington and Lyndhurst led the Tory lords in securing postponement of the Committee stage. The debates and divisions followed party lines; the Irish Tories Fitzgerald, Wicklow and Roden concurred in the wisdom of the postponement policy and admitted the possibility of a settlement. But Wicklow also indicated that he would have opposed a motion simply to abolish the Corporations, declared himself to have been a dissident from that policy in the previous

session, and supported 'the principle' of the Government measure. He had already indicated to Ellenborough that he wanted the bill with 'a great many essential alterations', including separate treatment of Dublin and a franchise of at least £10. Lyndhurst supported the postponement but attacked the Government and their bill in a 'violent' speech which Ellenborough and Greville thought out of step with the 'conciliatory' intentions of the other Conservative leaders. Ellenborough and an angry Wellington thought it 'very injudicious to revive ..
103
animosities' by such behaviour.

There were some indications of Irish Tory discontent with the new strategy. George Hamilton, the member for Dublin, wrote to Peel in June 1837 with the result of an investigation which showed 'that by no attainable municipal franchise can you prevent the Corporation of Dublin
104
from falling into the hands of the O'Connell party.' And the Knight of Kerry felt that,

'the whole policy is one of compromise on all points at issue. They attach too much importance to the ministerial concession of the "Appropriation Clause" and will in return sacrifice us in the Poor Law and Municipal Bill. The scheme at bottom is to clear away those troublesome measures which might upset a new ministry.' 105

In August Roden wrote to Wellington, 'I do sincerely trust that no system of expediency may lead the Conservative party to consent to a measure' by which 'the Municipal Corporations are transferred from the present hands into the controul of the priests & their myriads^(sic). such
106
a sacrifice of the Protestants of Ireland will be cruel in the extreme.' On the other hand Charles Coote, addressing his constituents in July-August 1837, declared that in his votes on the Corporations issue he had sacrificed his own views for those of the (Tory) majority who supported him; he had always wished for corporate reform in Ireland in the 'same spirit' as that of England, though not 'to the extent' (in terms of the number of towns included) of the Government's last bill; he welcomed Wellington's readiness to concede Corporations.
107

Because Peel and his colleagues were preoccupied with wider

considerations than municipal government in Ireland, no Irish Tory, apart from Fitzgerald, had taken part in the deliberations of the Conservative leaders when they decided upon the new strategy. Nor, to all appearances, were their wishes taken into consideration. Shaw, Lefroy, Tennent and Jackson did take part in subsequent talks, however, when the Conservatives tried to devise the amendments which they would require to render the bill acceptable. The King's death in June 1837 put an end to further progress on the measure that session. In the subsequent general election the Government's bill and the principle of corporate reform figured prominently in the platforms of the Irish liberal members. Some weeks later Crawford, writing publicly to O'Connell, indicated his opposition to compromise when he complained that the satisfactory bill of 1835 had been rendered less acceptable by concessions in 1836-7 with regard to the number of towns which would receive corporations.

In December 1837 Russell sought leave to re-introduce the bill, and Shaw, in reply, indicated his concurrence in the new policy of the Conservative leaders by stating that if the Tithe bill did not violate the property of the Church and if the municipal franchise were based on the valuation under the poor-law, independent of the oath of the voter, he would accept a measure of municipal reform. The foundation of the municipal franchise on the poor-law valuation was one of the inducements used by Peel to win over his colleagues to the new policy. On the 19th of May 1838, about 30 Tory members met at Peel's house and 'unanimously resolved to proceed on the principle of endeavouring to effect a settlement' by amendment of the bill. A Committee, which included Shaw, Jackson, Lefroy, Tennent and Litton, was appointed to consider the amendments.

At the end of the month, Peel proposed in Parliament the creation of corporations in eleven of the largest towns in Ireland, with a uniform franchise of £10 valuation under the poor-law, and he would grant

corporations to other towns if a majority of such a constituency applied to the Lord Lieutenant for a charter. Russell gave these proposals a general welcome, accepting the new basis for the franchise and hopeful that agreement could be found on the amount of the franchise. O'Connell was less conciliatory, but Smith O'Brien saw 'much that was satisfactory' in Peel's plan and welcomed the possibility of settlement of the Irish questions through mutual compromise.

113

On the 1st of June, however, in Committee, Russell, O'Connell and Sheil claimed that the £10 franchise was too high and, on Russell's proposal, a £5 qualification was inserted. In the division, 43 Irish liberals opposed the £10 franchise, but Ferguson broke ranks and voted with the Conservatives. James Grattan abstained. In his journal he showed, as on Tithe, a readiness to compromise. He noted that Peel's plan 'satisfied me ... I am getting what I asked in the Corporation Bill, what we all asked'. He was anxious to secure the settlement of the tithe and corporation questions and feared their loss through 'O'Connell's caprice'. Though 'Sheil says we must talk big', in Grattan's view,

114

'the offer is fair though not all we wish...I do not think we have a right to complain now after having listened to & approved of Peel's offer the night he first made it. Sheil approved of it next day at Brooks. So did others of the Catholics even, & the importance of the Corporation Bill is greatly magnified. It is only in the large towns it is of moment. If we complain in the House they will complain & be dissatisfied in the Country & thus we will diminish the benefit of the Bill as O'Connell has done that of the Poor Bill, & I will not be a party to this... I have spoken to O'Brien, Stuart, & Co about the Corps. bill. They agree with me but are not ready to take any steps .. it is useless our passing acts of Parliament while O'Connell is setting the people not to take them ... I will not support Lord John in his 5.00.' 115

Wyse, too, doubted if the £10 figure was 'too high. Is it really so? This was faintly affirmed & faintly denied on both sides.' His fellow liberal-unionists Jephson and Chapman apparently agreed, and the English liberal Lord Seymour 'expostulated' with his colleagues 'behind the Speaker's chair', contending that the bill should not be lost 'for such a trifle' and that though the 'people of England sympathized with us chiefly on ground of Municipal Bill' they would not tolerate

'anything very fastidious'. Wyse felt that 'compromise' was 'certain'. But, notwithstanding their private views, all of these members - Wyse, Chapman, Jephson and Seymour - voted against the £10 qualification. ¹¹⁶

On the announcement of Peel's plan, Shaw expressed his 'gratification at the prospect of a final and satisfactory adjustment' of the major Irish questions, and it was Shaw who on the 1st of June formally moved the adoption of Peel's proposals. Sixteen Irish Tories voted for the £10 franchise. ¹¹⁷ Primate Beresford's political manager in Armagh was so confident that the £10 qualification based on the poor law would be safe he proposed the extension of corporations to smaller towns in order that Conservative corporations should displace those Commissioners ¹¹⁸ elected by the relatively popular constituencies of the Act of 1828. Charles Fox, formerly Conservative member for Longford, approved 'very highly' of Peel's proposals; 'if he obtains the £10 bona fide or £8 he will secure a good franchise to us, for eventually the Parliamentary Counties will be the same as in Corporations .. I am most anxious about ¹¹⁹ this compromise, which I think betters our condition.'

There is some evidence, however, of Tory discontent. Grattan noted ¹²⁰ that Peel's plan 'did not seem to please the Tories'. According to Greville, after Peel's speech at the end of May 'it was generally understood that everything would be quietly settled, not, however, to the satisfaction of the Tory tail, much growling being heard, both in the Newspapers and among the low retainers of the party'. Regarding the subsequent dispute over the qualification, 'It is supposed that the Tory party have been so urgent that Peel is obliged' to insist on the £10 figure. 'The mob of Tories would be rejoiced to see everything fall to the ground. "Thank God", said one the other night, after the ¹²¹ renewal of hostilities, "there is an end of compromise"'. In the House, ¹²² Disraeli declaimed vaguely against hasty compromise.

One Cork Conservative accepted the need to retain some corporations but was concerned at 'the dangers (to) which .. any insufficiently

123

digested measure would expose Ireland and consequently the Empire.'

Peel, in fact, asked Shaw to investigate the effect of his proposals only after he had made his Commons statement; Shaw's researches indicated that under the proposed franchise the Dublin and Cork constituencies would be equally Protestant and Catholic, Limerick, Londonderry and Sligo would have Protestant majorities, and in Drogheda there would be

124

'a great preponderance of Roman Catholic influence.'

On the 6th of June Russell approached Fremantle and suggested a compromise on the qualification, and Mulgrave was anxious to come to

125

terms on the issue. Morpeth informed O'Connell of the Government's decision to propose an £8 franchise, causing the Irish leader to declare that he was 'disappointed, deeply, bitterly disappointed .. the utter exclusion of the popular voice from municipal corporations will fill

126

the Irish people with a sentiment bordering on despair.' According to James Grattan, at a meeting in the Foreign Office on the 11th 'O'Connell

127

& that party united so much that Lord John .. gave up the 8.00.' That evening in the House, Russell duly upheld and carried the £5 franchise against Peel's £10 amendment and was supported by Woulfe, Sheil and

128

O'Connell in debate and by an impressive 65 Irish liberals in the division.

Ferguson, however, again voted for the £10 figure. And James Grattan was glad of his absence in the countryside, for he remained anxious for a compromise:

'I told Morpeth the Bill must not be lost & that I would support the 10.00 if it so came from Lords..He understood me & said their supporters would not agree to the 10.00. Now I consider that the Lords will not give 5.00... We must compromise.'

On the possibility that intransigence would endanger the tithe and poor law settlements he wrote that,

'I will not incur such a risk & responsibility nor delay the pacification of Ireland for so trifling a gain as 8 instead of 10.00 franchise..O'Connell would rather get rid of the Bill as the Tithe arrangement will not suit him..I say if the Catholics lose in the North in 3 towns they will gain in S.& ought to be satisfied. But O'Connell is only activated by faction, his policy is to prevent any beneficial measure.'

129

The Irish Tory Emerson Tennent supported the £10 franchise in uncompromising terms on the 11th, and 29 Irish Tories followed suit in the division. The latter was lost by only 20 votes, but W. J. Lascelles, the Tory member for Wakefield, voted for the Government, and a week later Lascelles, Philip Pusey, William Miles and Lord Eliot - all English Tories - contended that the £10 valuation according to the poor-law would exceed the Parliamentary £10 qualification and that that qualification was therefore too high. ¹³⁰ Around this time, too, Peel was informed that Sir William Heathcote and Lord Eastnor, 'influential' English Tory members, would be 'very glad indeed if, after the concession of the Government as to Irish Tithes & that concession being confirmed, some course of conciliation could be hit upon by us on the Corporation question which should advance a little towards the Government & give us a hope of a permanent settlement.' ¹³¹

Lucas, Litton and Jackson, following Lascelles and the English waverers, defended the principle of a poor-law franchise, but Lucas added that if it were shown that this method involved a franchise higher than £10 he was ready 'to meet the Hon. Gentlemen opposite fairly on the subject.' ¹³² On the 22nd Lucas informed Peel that he had been 'instrumental in calling a meeting of Irish Members at the Carlton.. simply to consider whether there is any foundation for the assertion that the proposed mode of rating will raise the franchise in Ireland beyond that enjoyed in England, which I confess is my own opinion, and that if so it is best to be ascertained & acted upon now rather than in a future year.' The meeting adjourned 'without any decided opinion being come to', and Lucas assured Peel that 'no hesitation exists in the minds of any Irish members as to maintaining to the fullest extent the principles laid down by you on the subject.' ¹³³ No more was to be heard from this surprisingly moderate element within Irish Conservatism.

The debate on the third reading dwelt mainly on the franchise question, with Peel, supported by Tennent and Shaw in the debate and by

26 Irish Tories in the division, rejecting the bill. Shaw complained that due credit had not been given to the Opposition for its 'large concessions' on the corporations question:

'It had been very difficult to overcome, in the minds of those connected with the existing corporations of Ireland, old prepossessions and former prejudices.. and it was too much to expect that the conditions upon which those concessions had been concurred in could then be departed from.'

There were again English Tory defections - C. B. Wall, Fusey - and, with even Ferguson and James Grattan joining their Irish colleagues in support of the Government, the bill passed with an unexpectedly large majority of ¹³⁴35. In the Lords, however, Lyndhurst urged the substitution of the £10 Poor Law qualification. Lord Gort attacked this compromise as a 'dereliction of principle' and feared that even the amended bill would involve radical government of the large towns. He urged that 'the present corporations should, as last session had been proposed, be abolished altogether and thrown into the hands of the Crown.' Lyndhurst should 'resume that fine manly tone of resistance which last year he had exhibited against this bill.' Lord Wicklow, the only other Irish speaker in the Lords debates, objected to the limitation of corporations to only eleven towns, but he accepted the £10 qualification and the ¹³⁵latter was inserted in the bill. Even as Gort condemned the compromise, Shaw reported to Peel from Dublin that, 'On the whole I believe our Corporation people will be more easily reconciled to the Corporation Bill, provided the £10 bona fide franchise is insisted on, than the ¹³⁶clergy to the Tithe Bill.'

On the 19th of July, according to James Grattan, the Irish liberal members met in the Reform Club and heard O'Connell denounce the amended bill and move the 'proposition that we would not take the bill as it is. All agreed to that. We then differed about the 8.00. I for it, O'Brien ¹³⁷also.' On the following day Russell asked Melbourne to 'convey to O'Connell & the Irish members a pretty clear intimation that we shall not reject the bill on account of the franchise, & that it will be better

to try & amend it hereafter.¹³⁸ The Duke of Leinster, according to Tavistock, thought Russell should 'pass it & reserve to yourself the power of altering it hereafter if it should be found not to work well', and Normanby, the Lord Lieutenant, was apparently indifferent to the fate of the measure. On the other hand Russell thought the amended bill 'very objectionable' and Tavistock informed him that 'you will have great difficulties to encounter among your supporters if you try to pass the Irish Municipal Bill as it is sent to you by the Lords. The general opinion appears to be against it.'¹³⁹

In a public letter on the 28th of July, O'Connell roundly denounced 'the insulting mockery of Corporate reform offered to Ireland by Lord Lyndhurst and the Duke of Wellington.'¹⁴⁰ However, at a second meeting of liberal members on the 31st, Russell, overruling O'Connell, resolved to propose the £8 qualification.¹⁴¹ This he did on the 2nd of August, when this and his other amendments were carried with the aid of a united Irish liberal contingent; even Ferguson and Grattan voted with the Government and, including pairs, 67 Irish liberals supported the £8 franchise, though Hume and O'Connell expressed their dislike of the concession. The Irish Tory Lord Hillsborough paired against his colleagues on the boundary question, and, more significantly, Coote voted for the £8 qualification, as did the English Tories Eliot and Wall. On the other extreme, Inglis maintained his opposition to the 'surrender' of 'those corporations which were the strongholds of Protestantism in Ireland.'¹⁴²

With many members absent the amendments were carried by majorities so small that Grattan saw no hope of moving the Tory Lords,¹⁴³ and the Upper House did indeed reject the principal Commons amendments; the Irish followed party lines except for Wicklow, who considered the £8 qualification an acceptable compromise.¹⁴⁴ The measure was subsequently abandoned for the session, to the regret of James Grattan who felt that the difference in the franchise was not 'worth quarrelling about'; he

would have accepted the Lords' bill. O'Connell, however, in the House, welcomed the Government's 'unceremonious' rejection of a bill which was 'an insult to the people of Ireland' and urged Russell to adopt the English franchise. Outwith Parliament, Crawford described the £8 and £10 franchises as equally destructive of popular rights. Shaw spoke on the other side in equally uncompromising terms. But, according to Greville, Fitzgerald lamented the loss of the bill and would have

conceded all points except the franchise, while Wharncliffe 'told me some time ago that he did not care about the qualification. This shows how dissatisfied the moderate and sensible of the party are with their own proceedings.' Stanley asked Russell's wife to 'tell Lord John that I wish with all my heart he could have made up his mind to have settled all the Irish questions this year.'

The session ended with compromise prevented not so much by the extent of difference between the parties as the extent to which each side felt it had already gone by way of concession. And the widespread desire to settle the Irish questions had produced waverers in both parties. On the other hand, O'Connell's dissatisfaction with the extent of concession and his dedication of the Precursor Society to achieving the English municipal reform in Ireland did not augur well for further compromise from the Government. Developments in the Irish Tory camp also militated against compromise. From October 1838 elements within Dublin Corporation initiated 'a little wholesome agitation' against the course taken by the Conservatives in Parliament. The Tory members were censured for their 'false notions of political expediency' and told that, if they continued in their present course,

'they will be taunted and laughed at by their enemies for having consented so much - pitied or despised by former friends, whom they have neglected or betrayed, and posterity will execrate their memory for having failed to hand down to them, unimpaired, those Protestant institutions for which their forefathers had bled and which by a too confiding nation were entrusted to their keeping .. they have embarrassed themselves by their own crooked and devious policy.'

Shaw in particular was criticized for his consent to the destruction

of Dublin Corporation and his alleged role in causing Peel and Wellington to believe that the corporators accepted 'the principle of the bill of last session.' He was warned that he would face Conservative opposition at the next election if he continued with 'the temporising policy', but Charles Fox wrote to Farnham that, 'The knot opposing Shaw (are) small in number.' The new agitation was supported by the Warder, Packet, and Statesman newspapers, and showed at a public meeting on the 22nd of February 1839 that it comprised both a considerable number of Protestants and important figures like Isaac Butt, J. B. West, George Hamilton, Lord Gort and the Lord Mayor of Dublin. While it was agreed then that they did 'not object to any reform which will not compromise the Protestant charters of the corporation', the necessity of retaining the corporations in Protestant hands was strongly urged and, if that proved impossible, they wished that the corporations 'might be altogether abolished'.

George Hamilton indicated an understanding attitude towards the decision of the party leaders to accept a measure of reform, but he and other speakers contended that even a £10 qualification would see the corporations lost to the Catholics. Butt said,

'I have seen our own friends consent to measures ruinous to Irish Protestantism - I have seen our cause left almost without an advocate - legislators unanimous in a measure for handing over our corporation to our enemies ... had the bill as returned by the Lords, as acceded to by the Conservatives, been passed into a law, it would have established a Popish ascendancy in the corporate towns of Ireland, especially in Dublin. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel had assented to the bill of last session because they were deceived as to its real effect.' 149

The Government clung to the £8 qualification in the bill brought in by Morpeth in February 1839 but added that 'after three years rating the English franchise shall be substituted', that is, as soon as the poor-law rating system was established for the period of the English occupancy requirement - a significant step away from the path of compromise. The liberal-unionists Wyse, Redington and the other Irish liberal speakers welcomed the bill, and the Irish liberals voted

unanimously for it in the divisions on the second reading. Though James Grattan still regretted the failure to accept the Lords bill of the previous year, others apparently urged the Government to persist with their measure.

151

In the February debate Inglis again said that he wished to maintain the old Protestant corporations. But it was the course taken by the Irish Tory members which was particularly remarkable, one which suggested that they had been influenced by the developments in Dublin. Shaw not only rejected the new franchise proposal but stated that he 'thought still that it would have been better to extinguish corporations altogether in Ireland.' At the beginning of March, Goulburn, probably acting for the absent Peel, intimated his readiness to consent to the second reading of the bill. However, Bateson, Castlereagh, Viscount Dungannon (an Irish Tory sitting for Durham), Jackson and Maxwell joined the English diehards Inglis and Blackstone in protesting against this course, with Bateson calling 'upon the Protestants of Ireland to rally and oppose a measure which was only the beginning of an attempt to put down every Protestant institution in that country.' 14 Irish Tories voted against proceeding with the second reading, and none against, though several English Conservatives supported the Government.

Russell won the division but agreed to a postponement. When the bill came on again Stanley said he would agree to the second reading because he felt pledged to a measure of reform after the Church and poor-law settlements. He was supported by Shaw, Jackson and Peel in this reasoning, though all three said they would have preferred the abolition of all corporations and Shaw appeared to be particularly regretful that the Opposition had given up that policy. However, Inglis, Blackstone, Disraeli and the Irish Tories Litton, Maxwell and Ellis spoke against the second reading, though Ellis and Litton agreed that there ought to be a reform of the Irish corporations. In the division 10 Irish Tory members voted with Peel and the Government and 12 voted

in the minority. Roden wrote on the 6th of March that,

'I am quite disgusted at the passive course adopted by our Leaders & particularly with their intended policy on the Irish Corporation Bill. Not considering myself in any way pledged to them on their policy & being determined not to take any office under them were they in power tomorrow, I feel myself quite free, & I rejoiced much at Bateson's line as well as others' the other night in the House of Commons & I shall take a similar one whenever the Bill reaches our House.' 153

Litton subsequently wrote to Peel from Ireland, on hearing that the opposition to the second reading had caused Peel 'annoyance and unpleasantness', to explain that the Irish Tory members had twice met openly at the Carlton to discuss their course and, though aware that Peel would support the second reading, had received no communication as to Peel's having 'any wish upon the subject of the course we should adopt...

'Our reasons were, firstly, that we thought that our opposition, though unsuccessful, would strengthen the hands of our leaders and of the Lords in the effort to secure a bill as little injurious to the interests of our party in Ireland as the present state of the question would admit of. And, secondly, because we thought that it would be cheering and encouraging to our Irish Protestants to observe that all that could be done had been done to avert a measure which they considered as one very injurious to their interests, that it would tend to arouse them from a state of apathy into which their political defeats & disappointments & the insults of the Irish Government, had thrown them.. We also considered that it could not for a moment lead to an idea that there was a division in the Conservative camp...I can say with certainty that the good results we had hoped for, in this country, did arise .. and that the Conservative party in this country did derive comfort & satisfaction from a debate in which it was manifest that those who opposed & those who supported the amendment, alike, felt a deep interest in their welfare & a sympathy with their feelings.

'I must, however, add, and very distinctly state ^{that} if it had been intimated to us that in your view our opposition could have militated against your plans for the general interests of the party, we should have abstained from voting against the second reading. All of us, I do believe, (for myself I can speak with certainty), would have deemed such a course to have been perfectly consistent with principle, where all admit the Corporation reform is necessary & where our main objection to (the) present bill is its unjust provisions as to qualification, much of which might have been discussed & opposed in Committee ...there is no man more alive to the absolute necessity which exists that each man should yield his own judgement and views to those of the distinguished leader whom we have selected as our head & guide in every thing in which principle is not actually involved.' 154

It was a rather more deferential letter than Roden's, and suggests that the position of at least some Irish Tory rebels was not so very distant from that of Peel. In Committee, Jackson objected to the taxing

powers of the proposed corporations. Shaw led the attack on the Government's franchise proposals and moved the substitution of the £10 Poor-law qualification. He was supported by Jackson and Peel in debate, the former stating that he had 'given offence to many constituencies and amongst the rest to his own by the concession he had already made in offering to agree to a 10l. franchise.' 15 Irish Tories voted with Shaw, but Coote supported the Government's £8 figure and was joined by several English Tories. Lord Eliot spoke in favour of the £8 franchise and attacked the intolerant language of the Protestant agitators in Dublin. However, he and all of the Irish Tories, including Coote, voted against the proposal to give the English franchise in Ireland after three years.

The Irish liberals were united behind the Government on these points, apart from Ferguson's objection that the English system would enfranchise persons not subscribing to municipal funds. Inglis attacked the bill on the third reading and was supported by Colonel Perceval of Sligo, who had supported the second reading 'in the hope that the Government would adopt a 10 l rating' and been disappointed to find that far from concession it was provided that 'at the end of three years there would be no rating at all. He should have preferred that corporations should have been abolished altogether.' The division followed party lines in a small House.

The Government won all of these divisions with ease and thus careered towards the inevitable conflict with the Lords. Leading Tory peers met at Apsley House and agreed to allow the second reading and move their amendments in Committee. But, true to promise, Roden opposed the second reading; he supported 'the abolition of all corporations', contended that the bill would create 'normal schools of agitation' and give radicals control of important areas of patronage and the administration of justice, and described 'the state of panic' which had seized the people of Ireland at the prospect of 'a bill calculated to

crush them.' Roden was opposed by the Irish Whigs Stuart De Decies and Lurgan and by Wellington and Wicklow. Wellington felt the bill, though unacceptable as it stood, could be rendered safe in Committee, but Wicklow was prepared to accept the bill and said he would not support amendments in Committee which effectively defeated the measure. 157
 Only 8 peers, 7 of them Irish, voted against the second reading. One of the Irish Tory malcontents, Lord Dunsany, acted against the advice of his son, Randal Plunkett, who wanted the Lords to pass a measure in order to remove this 'perpetual stumbling block to every administration', though he also felt that the Government bill, if not amended, would 158
 deprive the Tories of every Parliamentary borough in Ireland.

Wicklow supported the £8 qualification in Committee, but, with the assistance of the other Irish Tories, Lyndhurst carried the £10 franchise, and the Lords also rejected the adoption after three years of the English franchise, gave the appointment of Sheriffs exclusively to the Lord Lieutenant, and threw out the Government's belated proposal to transfer to the new corporations the taxing powers of grand juries. Fitzgerald remained hopeful, ^{however} that the bill would pass, 'as there is a general feeling on the subject of getting rid of this annual debate...I should indeed 159
 regret its loss.' The Irish Whig Conyngham regretted, at the third reading, that 'their Lordships had declared that Irishmen were unfit to enjoy municipal privileges' with amendments that would ensure rejection of the bill in the Commons. Gort was again unhappy, admitting that 'the measure was deprived of its worst features by the amendments' but convinced that 'this great objection remained, that it took from the Protestants of Ireland the corporations which were entrusted to them 160
 centuries ago'.

O'Connell informed Fitzpatrick that he would never accept the amended Bill, but when Ebrington urged that there was not a 'reasonable prospect of obtaining better terms by further delay' O'Connell agreed not to oppose the bill beyond protesting 'very strongly against considering this a full

161

or adequate measure of corporate reform.' Wyse felt that 'in his heart' O'Connell wished to accept the Lords' bill, as did Sheil and Shaw, but not O'Ferrall; Wyse reckoned that in practice 'even the Lords' franchise

162

will be low.' However, on the 7th of August the Speaker adjudged that the amendment regarding taxation was a breach of Commons privilege.

Shaw contested this decision in the House and wrote to Peel describing his own anxiety to see the amended bill passed and the Duke of Wellington's growing doubts:

'The Duke has just called me aside in the House of Lords & he seems inclined .. to throw out the bill if he can, on the ground that people are getting tired of it & that we shall either get a better hereafter or altogether abolish Irish Corporations. I believe you agree with me that on the whole it would be very desirable to pass the bill. I mean without any compromise on our part, not giving up either the £10 franchise, the freemen or this Grand Jury question which as regards Dublin would be very important ...perhaps you might think it well to give the Duke a line on the subject.' 163

Graham also noted that the Duke 'appears to wish that the measure should not pass'.¹⁶⁴ Charles Fox, reversing his opinion of the previous year, welcomed the news that the bill would not pass: 'For my own part I fear it so much that even as it is I would as soon it did not pass.'¹⁶⁵ Russell announced the abandonment of the bill on the 9th of August on the question of privilege, and Shaw followed with a statement insisting on the Lords amendments but deducing from Russell's speech that the Government would give way on these points. 'To this', Shaw informed Peel, 'Lord John neither assented nor did he dissent.' Russell and Spring Rice told Shaw privately that it would be 'difficult & awkward on their part to bring in a new bill adopting the Lords amendments this session, but that such a course might be taken early next session .. His (Russell's) speech however, with the construction he allowed me to put upon it, is a virtual surrender of their Bill to ours ...For my own part, I should be glad the Bill was passed this session.' According to Shaw's account, though the words do not appear in Hansard, he said that he 'saw no reason why such a bill should not be passed through both Houses without delay or almost observation', upon which Inglis 'got up & finding fault

with my course & my willingness to accept the Bill even as amended by
 the Lords said he still entertained all his objections, &c.'¹⁶⁶

On the 12th, Russell said he 'entertained a strong hope' that a bill would pass both Houses early in the next session. Shaw objected to the idea that he had 'a peculiar favour for this bill...

'... the contrary was the fact. He was desirous of the abolition of all the existing corporations in Ireland without adopting others in their place ... But as regarded the present bill, believing that the leaders of the Conservative parties in both Houses had agreed to the terms of settlement as it now stood, he had waived his own sentiments in deference to theirs, and was prepared to yield to it, rather than allow matters to remain in their present unsettled state - the cause of constant alarm and annoyance.'

O'Connell made what Granville Somerset called 'a somewhat long & a violent harangue against the Lords, their amendments, &c', stressing particularly the failure to treat Ireland and England equally, while Somerville, the only liberal-unionist speaker, merely expressed his 'deep regret that this bill was still further delayed .. the loss of
 this measure would excite a deep feeling of disappointment.'¹⁶⁷

The loss of the bill on 'a mere technical question of privilege'¹⁶⁸ augured well for settlement of the issue in 1840, but the final stage of the long struggle was not bereft of difficulty. On the Address Somerville fondly hoped that that Session would see the question 'finally and satisfactorily set at rest', and Morpeth on bringing in the new bill said that they were influenced in their conciliatory course by the readiness of the Irish liberal members to compromise for the sake of a settlement. The bill included the £10 qualification and omitted the Grand Jury taxation provision, but involved the adoption of the English franchise after three years' poor rating. Litton and Jackson declaimed vaguely against the transfer of the corporations to Catholic control and Jackson, Tennent and Peel advocated some provision by which towns would not be compelled under the bill to receive corporations.

Peel's tone was conciliatory, however, and in February 1840 he supported the second reading of the bill. Shaw and Jackson also took

that line, Shaw claiming that retention of the existing corporations was 'not possible or desirable' and, though still convinced that abolition would have been the best course, admitting that it was no longer practicable, 'in no small degree on account of those .. who now opposed the present bill refusing their support to that mode of settlement.' He felt they must either accept a bill similar to the present or 'leave the question in its present unsettled and unsatisfactory condition, a festering sore inflaming the feelings of the most violent of both parties in Ireland and the subject of constant and angry party contention' in the House. Jackson was willing to honour the pledges of his leaders by supporting the second reading but contended that the bill would transfer exclusive corporate power to Catholics; he specified amendments in the franchise which he would move 'with the view of counteracting the exclusion of Protestants' and urged again the exclusion of towns unwilling to accept corporations.

Litton was the only speaker to support Inglis's motion to reject the bill, admitting the need for reform but feeling that the bill went so far to transfer corporate power to different and unworthy hands that it would be better to draw up a new bill than seek to amend the present measure. Verner subsequently defended his vote in similar terms and urged total abolition of corporations. Eight Irish Tories voted for the second reading and six against, while 40 Irish liberals voted for the bill. At the same time there was another meeting of the friends of Dublin Corporation, including George Hamilton, West, Isaac Butt and several leading corporators, at which the bill was rejected outright on the ground that, 'adopting though it does the amendments made by the Conservative party during the last session', it would 'inevitably give to the anti-Protestant and anti-English party in Ireland the complete and entire control of almost all the municipalities of the kingdom.' Butt made a major speech in which he predicted that the new corporators would perpetrate abuses in taxation, patronage, Parliamentary elections and

political agitation; and he claimed that the liberal poor-law valuers were overvaluing houses in order to confer the municipal franchise. 170

The Irish Tory members, led by Shaw and Jackson, attempted to secure various amendments in the bill, notably the admission of freemen to the new municipal franchise, the omission of the proposal to adopt the English franchise at a later stage, a proviso effectively to gerrymander the electoral system in the Conservative interest, restriction of the corporations' powers of patronage, the rendering optional acceptance of corporations, and the exclusion of Belfast and Galway. The Irish Tories supported all of these propositions unanimously, except in the case of the freeman franchise when John Young of Cavan 'could not see how it would be just to admit a rabble of 700 or 800 men (in Dublin) to vote along with the rate-payers' and voted against the motion.

All of these propositions were rejected, with the aid of a united Irish liberal body. O'Connell was privately convinced that the bill would give him control of Dublin and, though some Irish liberals objected, evinced a disposition to show 'generosity and forgiveness of disarmed opponents' by carrying an amendment to compensate the deposed aldermen of Dublin.

Even before the bill left Committee, Verner and Perceval opined that it would 'transfer the Irish corporations from one party to another' and Jackson argued that this would be the outcome of rejection of their amendments. On the third reading, Tennent, Perceval and Maxwell spoke in favour of George Sinclair's motion to reject the bill. Tennent thought the alarms of some Dublin corporators 'highly excited and exaggerated' but deprecated the expense and political turmoil which would be attached to the proposed system and urged total abolition of corporations, and Perceval lamented the transfer of powers to the enemies of 'English connection' and 'the institutions of the country'. Shaw 'did not approve of the bill in its present shape' but was prepared to send it to the Lords for amendment as the only course by which the question could be

settled. In the division, he and Peel were joined by only two Irish Tories, Coote and Irving, in support of the third reading, while nine Irish Tories voted in the minority. The Irish liberals voted solidly
172
for the bill.

At the end of March, Lord Fitzgerald said he would again vote for the second reading of the bill, causing Londonderry to accuse him of
173
deserting the Irish corporations. Roden wrote to Londonderry from Ireland that,

'I have seen with very sincere regret the progress of this tremendous Municipal Bill which our Protestant Conservative Peers!! are going to allow to be read a second time, & which, do what they will with it in Committee, will still leave it a tremendous blow against Protestantism in this Country. O'Connell said long ago "give me the Corporation Bill & I have all I want", & yet with this declaration & unanswerable facts brought before the House they are going to run us into Ruin. I am sorry Lady Roden's very uncertain state of health will not allow me to leave here yet, so as to afford me the opportunity of resisting with you the second reading of this measure. I divided the House of Lords on that stage of the Bill last year & had very little support from our side of 174 the House...I think Lord Fitzgerald's dogmatic obstinacy was well noticed.'

The Marquess of Westmeath declaimed against the 'wicked, mischievous and plundering bill' on several occasions before it finally came up for second reading on the 4th of May, and on that occasion he and Mountcashell spoke in favour of Winchilsea's motion to reject the measure. But the reading was again easily carried after Wellington gave it his support, though he was concerned that the valuation under the poor-law was not giving the expected security as to the qualification and gave notice of
175
amendments intended in Committee. The Marquis of Donegall subsequently informed Wellington that he was 'much interested in the defeat of the Municipal bill, in common with the entire Conservatives of Belfast, & it will be most pleasing to me & satisfactory to them if I can augment your patriotic advocacy in opposing the injury & injustice intended in this
176
additional attempt to weaken the Constitution.'

In addition to the second reading, the Lords also agreed, at the request of Dublin Corporation, that they should hear Counsel on behalf of the petitioners against the bill, and on the 14-15th of May Sir

Charles Wetherell and Isaac Butt duly appeared at the Bar of the House to urge rejection of the bill even if amended to require a £10 qualification for the franchise. Roden was particularly impressed with Butt's speech and claimed that even if the bill were amended as in 1839 it would 'bring ruin on Ireland.' And, also as a result of Butt's speech, Wellington was 'convinced' that a transfer of municipal power would bring 'the greatest danger to the Protestant interest in Ireland.' The possibility that the Duke would oppose the passing of the bill greatly alarmed Peel and Graham, who felt they were pledged to the giving of corporations and could not revert to the abolitionist course.

However, after Wellington was again impressed with the need to settle the question, the Lords proceeded to make the amendments which would render the bill acceptable. Galway was removed from the first schedule to leave only ten corporations created immediately under the bill, the right of freemen to vote in Parliamentary elections was secured in a controversial manner, the appointment of sheriffs was again given absolutely to the Lord Lieutenant, and adoption of the English franchise after three years and the separate bill to give corporations the taxation powers of grand juries were both rejected. Except that Clanricarde supported and Wicklow opposed the exclusion of Galway, the Irish followed party lines on these points. Wynford's motion to exclude Dublin was supported by the Irish Tories Carbery, Westmeath, Glengall and Londonderry in debate and others in the division, but Wicklow and Wellington demurred and were joined in the division not only by the Government and the Irish Whigs but by the Irish Tories Clanwilliam, Hawarden and Clonbrock. The advocates of Wynford's motion had no confidence that the Lords' amendments would avert the dangers which the bill posed to property and Church; but the Ultra peers did not make the full-scale assault which might have been expected on the third reading.

In June George Wyse had written from Ireland that the liberal party were 'so apprehensive here that the Abolition would be the consequence

of the accession of the Tories that almost any Bill constituting the Body as a reformed Body would be accepted here.' Lyndhurst assured Peel, who feared that some of the Lords' amendments would cause the loss of the bill, that Duncannon had indicated a disposition to 'give way' on those questions. When the bill was returned to the Commons, though James Grattan, William Roche and members of the Ministry protested at some of the amendments they gave way for the sake of securing a settlement. And the Ultras among the Conservative members similarly allowed the bill to pass quietly into the statute books.

Shaw survived, thanks to the Lords, the attempt under the bill to make his Recordship of Dublin inconsistent with membership of Parliament. His problems did not end there, however, for his role in settling the issue was vigorously denounced by other Conservatives; he acknowledged in the House that he had been vilified by the Conservative Press in both Ireland and England and was induced to explain again that he regretted that the corporations had not been altogether abolished but had felt the need to settle the 'long-vexed question', though he was 'not sanguine as to the working of the measure, particularly in the first instance.' Later in the year Shaw was caused 'much annoyance & vexation' when first it was insinuated in the Press that Wellington said he had been 'deceived and betrayed' by Shaw, which allegation Wellington later publicly denied, and then when Lyndhurst wrote to Isaac Butt that Shaw had contended against postponement of the corporation bill in 1840 on the grounds that it would 'prolong and embitter the dissensions which already prevailed among the Conservatives of Ireland on the subject .. and that the effect would be to break up the Conservative party in that country.' Shaw admitted the use of such words but complained that Lyndhurst had furnished 'my notorious adversary with materials which would be obviously used to my annoyance.'

Some of the corporators of Dublin put up James King, brother of Lord Kingston, in opposition to Shaw for the University seat in the

general election of 1841. Charles Fox wrote that 'King's conduct in .. producing a fruitless contest in the College is most mischievous .. if he applies to me he shall have a bit of my mind.' Jackson and Shaw felt the challenge would fail, and its futility was demonstrated when nearly 1100 University electors - a majority of the constituency - subsequently signed a declaration of support for Shaw, with many who had differed with him on the bill - such as S. R. Maxwell, Litton, Perceval, Fox and George Hamilton - rallying to his side.

The adhesion of such a number ensured Shaw's election without a contest; but he proceeded at the hustings to attack vigorously his critics, attributing the original hostility of the corporators to his refusal to help them plunder corporate property, and explaining that he had agreed, reluctantly, to abandon the extinction policy only when the party leadership had decided its unpopularity in the Commons made it no longer tenable. He subsequently complained to Peel that his election had caused him 'a good deal of personal anxiety & annoyance.' George Hamilton earlier withdrew from the contest for the City after the Corporation had resolved that no candidate for the City representation should be supported who did not pledge himself to oppose Shaw's return for the university - an unnecessary step on Hamilton's part, for the Tories elected, West and Grogan, were not required so to pledge themselves.

The Dublin Evening Mail alone of the four Tory newspapers in Dublin had supported Shaw on the corporations question, with such vigour indeed that in December 1839 its editor was convicted of libel for his attacks on one of Shaw's leading opponents. In July-August 1841 the Mail predicted a Conservative victory in Dublin in the first municipal elections under the new law, and attributed the reluctance of its rivals to contest the election to a desire to vindicate their attacks on Shaw and predictions of Catholic domination of the new system. But early in September Lord Glengall complained in Parliament of malpractice in the making up of the new burgess role in Dublin and forecast a radical

victory. Glengall and West presented petitions to Parliament from the Corporation on this point. Graham and Wellington, now in Government, were not pleased, and the Duke favoured legal action 'to save the City of Dublin from falling into the hands of a mischievous party.' However, the elections proceeded and in Dublin yielded 47 liberal councillors and aldermen, most of them repealers, and 13 Conservatives. The Mail attributed the result to the Government's failure to interfere in the Conservative interest and, above all, to the determination of 'quasi-Conservatives' to fulfil their prophecies, inducing the Packet to reply that the Mail was anxious to 'cast blame anywhere rather than lay it at the door of the valiant and immortal Frederick Shaw.'

O'Connell was duly elected Lord Mayor of Dublin, the first Catholic to fill that office for 150 years. Graham remained upset that the poor-law valuation in Dublin had been so manipulated that the municipal franchise was 'polluted by undue admission and exclusion fraudulently contrived.' But when he consented to the bill he had 'calculated that, notwithstanding every precaution, power in Dublin must pass in the first instance from the hands of the Conservatives into the hands of Radicals and Repealers. On the balance of evils I took this as the least.' And Graham and Eliot had little sympathy with the Cashel Protestants who sent a memorial to the Government to complain that the incorporation of Cashel, requested, according to the Act, by a majority of rate-payers, would transfer municipal power from Protestants to Catholics - 'this evil was contemplated by the Legislature & in the hope of counteracting benefits it was disregarded.'

The application from Cashel was eventually rejected on other grounds, and Wexford, in 1845, was to be the only town ever added to the original list of ten corporations. De Grey deprecated the use of the repeal rent in Dublin to pay 'the rates requisite to enable persons to vote for the Municipal offices.' But, though Peel felt that the elevation of 'that consummate impostor', O'Connell, was 'a public scandal' he and Jackson

agreed that the fact that his new position would inevitably involve the taking of unpopular decisions meant it might 'prove ultimately a damper to his influence & popularity in the country.' Eliot was apparently hopeful that if O'Connell were given the Mayoralty every year, with a salary, his 'good humour' over the election might continue and agitation to keep up the repeal rent would become 'less indispensable
192
to him.' Richard Bourke's son reported that O'Connell's election was 'looked upon without dissatisfaction even by Tories, & our party (the liberal-unionists) are naturally very joyful at seeing the day when a Roman Catholic & a liberal is suffered to hold this rank to which his
193
services have so well entitled him ...'

Of the ten corporations elected under the new system in 1841 and 1842, the Conservatives won control of only one, Belfast. Liberal-unionists constituted a majority in the corporation in Londonderry, and repealers were dominant in the others. The breach in Irish Tory ranks remained, the opponents of Shaw attributing the evils of the new system to 'the Freddy Shaw act', while the Mail continued to accuse the old corporators of having attacked Shaw because he refused to advocate their pecuniary interests. The Mail revived old differences when in November 1842 they attacked Isaac Butt for his praise of the liberals on the Corporation of Dublin. Paradoxically, it was the Mail which assailed Chief Secretary Eliot for his role in the creation of the new corporations and his failure to bring in legislation on Irish Tory grievances against the new bodies, while the Packet defended Eliot as the servant of the Conservative Government. However, the Tory press united in launching a constant stream of abuse against the repeal corporations in 1841-3 - their partisanship in the distribution of patronage and creation of freemen, their general profligacy, and their attempts to solve their financial problems by means of additional taxation.
194

In the Spring of 1842 a number of Dubliners petitioned Parliament for the abolition of the Corporation of Dublin and urged William Gregory,

the young Tory member for the City, 'to take the sense of the House' on that point. Peel replied to Gregory's request for advice that Parliament had reached the present settlement with too much difficulty to entertain its undoing. And he pointed out that 'the great objection' to a reformed municipal body in Dublin, 'that it would become a formidable debating assembly partaking of the character of a provincial parliament, that Mr. O'Connell would probably be elected Lord Mayor and would derive from the possession of that office a great increase of dangerous influence - and that the cause of Repeal would be promoted', had proved a groundless apprehension. Instead, 'The power to tax is exercised, unpopular functions are performed .. the party with which (the councillors) are connected loses more influence than it gains by the possession of municipal authority.'¹⁹⁵ Gregory accepted this advice against the proposed initiative.

Even before the passing of the corporation bill, O'Connell had made 'the omission to give the Irish full corporate reform' one of the 'four different heads of grievance' on which he planned to renew the agitation¹⁹⁶ for repeal. In the summer and autumn of 1841 he complained in Parliament and in Ireland of the failure to give his country the ratepayer franchise of the English municipalities and his nephew spoke of 'the monstrous inequality of the municipal franchise.'¹⁹⁷ However, soon after his success in Dublin O'Connell ceased to agitate the question, and municipal reform was omitted from the list of the five objects of Repealers which O'Connell¹⁹⁸ formulated in 1842-3.

The only liberal-unionist to make a strong protest against the Act was Sharman Crawford, who publicly attacked the measure, and, especially, the quiet acceptance of it by O'Connell and the other Irish liberal members.¹⁹⁹ Furthermore, the conduct of Dublin Corporation during the year of O'Connell's mayoralty dissatisfied some liberals. The independent repeal newspaper, the Freeman's Journal, expressed disappointment that far from bringing the expected relief the new Corporation planned an

X additional burden on the Dublin ratepayers in the form of a 'borough rate', while the Whiggish Dublin Monitor joined in this complaint and attacked the Corporation for its dismissal of employees out of mere party interest and at considerable expense in the form of compensation. X In November 1842 the Monitor reviewed the record of the reformed Dublin Corporation in its first 12 months and concluded that it had failed to effect any good, with expenditure and debt as high as previously and patronage merely redistributed towards the friends of the new corporators and not reduced.
200

In February 1843 O'Connell brought the question of Repeal before the Corporation of Dublin. George Roe, the Protestant liberal-unionist who had succeeded O'Connell as Lord Mayor, deprecated the introduction of politics into the Corporation, and O'Connell was opposed by several liberal-unionist councillors. O'Connell carried the motion to petition Parliament for Repeal by 41 votes to 15, with the corporations issue intruding only marginally in his list of Irish grievances. Most of the other corporations outside Ulster subsequently adopted similar resolutions. X The Mail recognized immediately that Repeal had made 'a rapid stride. It has advanced from the platform of a seditious assembly to the council-table of legitimate municipal government ..(it) arrays itself in all the imposing details of corporate authority.' The abolition of the corporations was urged. Eliot was again abused for his role in creating what was finally a fully-pledged 'normal school' of agitation.

X Indicating the depth of past difference, the principal Irish Tory speaker in the debate in Dublin Corporation, Isaac Butt, was criticized in the Mail for his failure to do justice to the unionist case. The Mail's campaign against the Corporation continued in the succeeding months with a determined campaign of resistance to the borough rate, on the grounds that it was 'illegal' under the Act and therefore unenforceable, and levied only because the Corporation had had to compensate unfairly dismissed officers in order to place their own

supporters. In addition they criticized the Government's regulatory bill of 1843 as tending to increase the powers of the Corporations. In the Lords in May 1843 the Irish Tory Glengall described the new Corporations as 'the greatest nuisance that existed or that probably could exist', particularly in the tendency of municipal politics to obstruct the working of the poor-law.

When the liberal-unionists launched their campaign for 'justice to Ireland' at the end of May 1843, the corporations grievance was given an airing, though much less fully than the Church, land and Parliamentary franchise issues. The liberal-unionists Smith O'Brien, Sheil, Wyse, O'Ferrall and M. J. O'Connell, and several of the leading English Whigs, arraigned the Conservatives for their refusal in Opposition to allow Ireland the liberal municipal reform granted in England. Peel acknowledged that the municipal franchise was 'still incomplete and imperfect', but pointed to the 'great transfer of power' which had nevertheless taken place. And Shaw replied that he had been 'maligned and unjustly vituperated' because the Act went too far to meet Catholic demands, and contended that even with the higher qualification in Ireland Protestant property was inadequately represented; and Glengall described the new corporations as 'repeal conventions'. When the regulatory bill of 1843 came up for discussion, Smith O'Brien, Wyse, Ross and Jephson-Norreys urged, as a step towards equality with England, a relaxation of impediments to the franchise in Dublin, but the Government, with George Hamilton's blessing, refused to entertain any such fundamental alteration.

The liberal-unionists complained in their Remonstrance to the British people in August 1843, 'Our Municipal Rights are abridged in comparison with yours. Our Corporate Franchises are limited by needless and harassing restrictions ... We demand the assimilation of municipal rights in both kingdoms.' O'Connell subsequently showed a revived interest in the subject, for example in January 1844 listing corporate reform as one of the measures which would 'mitigate the present ardent

205
 desire for Repeal.' And the grievance was urged briefly during the
 206
 Irish debates of February 1844.

In November 1843 Glengall told Wellington that the Corporations
 were 'a horrible nuisance - they have nothing to do in reality - & they
 207
 are all repealers except Belfast.' In February 1844 Peel, contemplating
 the commencement of a more liberal Irish policy in response to the
 Repeal agitation, recognized that the Government had 'nothing to lose'
 with regard to the municipal franchise:

'As it stands at present, in all the leading towns of the South of
 Ireland it secures the election of a majority of repealers...Nothing can
 be worse than the municipal constituency as it at present exists - and
 there is no prospect of improvement...We incur the risk of little or no
 loss by extending the franchise and perhaps we take away the cause for
 hostile combination by removing an alleged grievance.'

He was prepared to offer Ireland 'substantial equality', with 'the
 difference in nominal equality nothing unfavorable to Ireland', and
 accordingly proposed the adoption of the English ratepaying franchise
 208
 and occupation requirement. In April Eliot duly submitted this proposal
 to Parliament, where only Wyse uttered a few words of welcome. The
 liberal press entirely omitted any comment on the bill, though the
 repealer Smith O'Brien wrote privately of the 'doubts' in Ireland 'about
 its real intention & operation - I am persuaded it will act as an
 encroachment upon the municipal rights of the People rather than as an
 extension', and Maurice O'Connell described the bill in Parliament as a
 'cruel mockery of the people of Ireland'. The Tory Mail briefly
 deprecated the proposal to transfer 'still further power to the democratic
 body' and stated their desire 'to abolish corporations altogether.' When
 the bill was later abandoned, apparently because of the loss of the
 Parliamentary franchise bill with which it was brought in, Shaw stated his
 209
 disapproval of the measure as it stood and his satisfaction at its fate.

During the recess Graham instructed Eliot to ensure that the
 municipal bill would be palatable to the liberals:

'if indeed any change can be discovered to give it a more popular
 character than it now has; for it is a measure of unqualified concession,

yielding all that was heretofore demanded, and placing the municipal franchise in Ireland on the identical footing of the same franchise in England. Faction itself, one would have thought, must have been baffled in finding a flaw in this Bill.'

Eliot duly took the matter in hand and a bill was prepared which gave the English franchise to Ireland, but, pressed by the repealer E. B. Roche in May 1845, Peel explained that the other Irish measures of that session, would be given precedence. Only Campbell and Russell subsequently pressed the issue, but the session ended without the appearance of the bill; Graham thought the Maynooth and Colleges measures more urgent, but he assured the House that the Government were still committed to a measure establishing 'complete equality' of the municipal franchises. In April 1845, O'Connell did display a continuing interest in the subject, though it was with typical exaggeration that he wrote to Mahony that,

'there is one measure which the Ministry may carry in a week and render themselves popular by it. I mean the recasting of our Corporate Reform Act and making it equivalent with the English Act. It is a bitter insult and a palpable injustice and a direct contradiction of anything deserving of being a Union that the people of Ireland should not have the same corporate powers in point of law with the people of England and Scotland...All that would be necessary would be to redress the injustice done by Recorder Shaw and by Lord Lyndhurst in spoiling the Irish Municipal Act. This would include the nomination of sheriff...' 211

The Government continued during the recess^{to} plan a measure which would 'place the Corporations of Ireland on an equal footing with the Municipalities in England.' The session of 1846 saw much discussion of the reforms required by Ireland, as alternatives to the proposed coercion. O'Connell, Somerville, Sheil and others continued to press the corporations issue and Peel duly promised a bill to 'assimilate' the municipal franchises of England and Ireland. But the Government, much preoccupied, did not introduce the measure. Soon after the accession of the Whigs in July 1846 the Government planned a corporations bill which the new Lord Lieutenant felt 'should as nearly as possible be the English bill where applicable to this country', but no such measure was passed until 1849.

Two ~~other~~ postscripts are worthy of note: Shaw's role in the Corporations question was invoked when in 1847 his right to represent the University was again unsuccessfully challenged by a Conservative. ²¹⁵ And, writing 40 years after the first municipal reform, Gavan Duffy was able to claim that the liberal Corporation of Dublin had, following O'Connell's advice, elected alternately Catholic and Protestant mayors every year from 1841, while in Belfast only half-a-dozen Catholics had been elected to the Corporation in 38 years, one at a time, 'and the ²¹⁶ mayor has been uniformly a Protestant and in every case but two a Tory.'

The issue of the Irish corporations acquired perhaps an undue importance when from 1835 it became a test of the principle of equal justice for Ireland. 'Most of the Irish', according to James Grattan, himself and O'Connell included, were nevertheless prepared to compromise as early as May 1836, and were eventually forced in 1840 to accept a measure which clearly negated the principle of equal treatment. Sharman Crawford was, as on tithes, less disposed to compromise; he resisted its proponents in 1836 and denounced them for their acquiescence in the measure of 1840. The issue ceased soon afterwards to figure prominently in the list of Irish grievances, though it was still occasionally cited when Irish liberals asserted Ireland's right to equal treatment. With nine of the ten corporations under their control, Irish liberals had achieved all that they could ever have expected from a more liberal franchise. In addition, the perversion of the new corporations to the ends of the Repeal movement and the instances of jobbing, partisanship and profligacy possibly dulled the enthusiasm of liberal-unionists for a more liberal reform.

Most Irish Tories had conceded from an early stage that their monopolies could not be sustained and duly acquiesced in the abolition of the old corporations. But the majority of Irish Tory members opposed the bill of 1840 and their fears were borne out when most of the new corporations were added to the armoury of the Repeal movement. The

issue brought, too, the most bitter dispute within Irish Conservatism since Emancipation, with the virtual leader of the group in Parliament not only opposed by most of his colleagues but vigorously assailed by sections of the Tory party in Dublin. The Irish Tories, through the division in their ranks and the loss of the corporations were, then, the principal sufferers from the Conservative leadership's acquiescence in reform, a line of policy taken up by Peel apparently without regard for Irish Tory views and interests.

Chapter 6

1. Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Municipal Corporations in Ireland, P.P., 1835, XXVII, 14.
2. Ibid, 45.
- X 3. Ibid, 32-7. John J. Jebb, Municipal Government in Ireland, Mediaeval and Modern (London, 1918), 185-97.
4. P.P., 1835, XXVII, 39-42. Jebb, 197-202.
5. P.P., 1835, XXVII, 14-15, 17-30, 64.
6. For example, Roden, Bandon, Donegall, Enniskillen, Castlemaine, Gort, Charleville and Mayo were patrons of Corporations.
7. For example, Shannon, Devonshire, Headfort and Leinster were Whig patrons.
8. Jebb, 167-71.
9. P.P., 1835, XXVII, 22.
10. For an example of a challenge to a too-liberal patron, the Marquis of Headfort, see P.P., 1835, XXVII, 373.
11. Ibid, 39-42, 45, 66.
12. Ibid, ~~39-42~~ 14-15, 19, 30. Jebb, 171-6.
13. P.P., 1835, XXVII, 31.
14. Ibid, 32-7, 44-5, 65. Jebb, 185-97.
- X 15. Thomas Wyse, Historical Sketch of the late Catholic Association, II, 117.
16. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, IV, 1740, O'Connell to Bennett, 7 Dec. 1830; 1758, O'Connell to O'Mara, 22 Jan. 1831. FJ, 9 Jan., 2 Oct. 1830.
17. Home Office Papers, HO 122/15, f118, Melbourne to Stanley, 2 Jan. 1831.
18. Hansard, 9, 1232, 3 Feb. 1832, French; 12, 1401-2, 23 May 1832, Callaghan, O'Connell, J. Grattan; 13, 156-8, 25 May 1832, O'Connell; 13, 294-7, 1 June 1832, O'Connell, Shaw, Newport, Dawson, Hume, H. Grattan; 14, 863-4, 13 July 1832, O'Connell.
- X 19. J. J. Auchmuty, Sir Thomas Wyse, 141, Wyse to the Electors of the City of Waterford, Sept. 1832.
20. Hansard, 15, 645-54, 14 Feb. 1833, Althorp, O'Connell, Roche, Barron.
- X 21. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1955a, 1956, 1961, 1963, 1964, 1969, 1971, 1987, 1989, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 15, 17 Feb., 6, 11, 13 March, 3, 18 April, 21, 26 June 1833. Hansard, 20, 264-9, 1 Aug. 1833; 21, 86, 4 Feb. 1834; 21, 764-76, 25 Feb. 1834, O'Connell.

22. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1957, 1997, 2008, 2010, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 21 Feb., 5 Aug., 13, 17 Sept. 1833.
23. Ibid, 1969, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 3 April 1833. A Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 229-30. Hansard, 20, 264, 1 Aug. 1833; 21, 764-6, 25 Feb. 1834, O'Connell.
24. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1961, 1969, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 6 March, 3 April 1833. Report from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of the Municipal Corporations in England and Wales and Ireland, P.P., 1833, XIII, 227-9.
25. Ibid, 5-7.
26. Ibid, 281-2.
27. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 1990, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 5 July 1833. Hatherton Papers, D260/M/01/Vol. 2, p28, 43, Littleton to Anglesey, 2, 9 July 1833; *ibid*, p147, Littleton to Wellesley, 31 Aug. 1833; *ibid*, D260/M/01/6, f385, 449, /7, f75, Anglesey to Littleton, 7, 15 July, 8 Aug. 1833 (also in Anglesey Papers, D619/31E/21, 26; D619/31L/22, 26, 35).
28. Hansard, 20, 266-9, 1 Aug. 1833, Shaw, Lefroy.
29. Hansard, 26, 406-8, 26 Feb. 1835, O'Connell. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2216, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 27 Feb. 1835.
30. P.P., 1835, XXVII, 27-8, 45-6.
31. P.P., 1835, II, 1. Hansard, 29, 1288-1311, 31 July 1835, Ferrin.
32. Monteagle Papers, MS 551, Spring Rice to Sir John Newport, 19 Aug. 1835. See also Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 307-8, Melbourne to the King, 15 Aug. 1835.
33. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/37, Crawford to John Crawford, 1 Aug. 1835. Hansard, 29, 1314-25, 31 July 1835, O'Connell, W. Roche, H. Grattan, Sheil; 30, 233-4, 10 Aug. 1835, Ruthven; 30, 398-9, 12 Aug. 1835, O'Connell; 30, 616-8, 17 Aug. 1835, O'Connell, Baldwin.
34. Hansard, 29, 2, 29 June 1835, Farnham; 29, 1311-25, 31 July 1835, Shaw, Lefroy, Plunkett, Perceval; 30, 231-6, 10 Aug. 1835, Perceval, Shaw; 30, 396-400, 12 Aug. 1835, Shaw, A. Lefroy; 30, 618, 17 Aug. 1835, Kirk.
35. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/1E, f181-3, The King to Russell, 15 Aug. 1835; *ibid*, f187-8, Sir H. Taylor to Russell, 22 Sept. 1835. Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 257, The King to Russell, 14, 15 Aug. 1835. Sanders, Lord Melbourne's Papers, 303-11, The King to Melbourne, 16 Aug. 1835.
36. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2A, f97-8, 99-108, Mulgrave to Russell, 17 (2) Jan. 1836.
37. Hansard, 31, 12-14, ~~13~~ 41-104, 4 Feb. 1836, Wellington, Peel, Russell, Stanley, Howick, Palmerston, O'Connell, Shaw.

38. The Greville Memoirs, III, 277, 5 Feb. 1836. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2A, f212-6, Mulgrave to Russell, 11 Feb. 1836. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 341. Hansard, 31, 104-8, 4 Feb. 1836, Division. Notebooks of James Grattan, MS 3853, 6 Feb. 1836.
39. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 341.
40. The Greville Memoirs, III, 278, 6 Feb. 1836. Wellington Papers, Port. 38, f31, Peel to Wellington, 10 Feb. 1836; *ibid*, f33, Wellington to Peel, 11 Feb. 1836. Graham Papers, 31, Graham to Peel, 12 Feb. 1836. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f125, 129, Wellington to Peel, 11, 13 Feb. 1836; *ibid*, MS 40, 318, f54, Graham to Peel, 12 Feb. 1836. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 244. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 322.
41. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 321, f209, Croker to Peel, 1836.
42. Hansard, 29, 1312-3, 31 July 1835, Shaw.
43. Hansard, 31, 1019-76, 29 Feb. 1836, O'Loghlen, Peel. In common with the Government measure he would also give the appointment of the Recorders to the Crown.
44. Hansard, 31, 1301-2, 1357-64, 7 March 1836, Crawford, Woulfe; 32, 1-7, 11-13, 119-24, 8 March 1836, O'Brien, Stuart, Division.
45. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2312, 2317, O'Connell to Mullen, 9, 17 March 1836; 2320, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 22 March 1836. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/47, Crawford to John Crawford, 5 April 1836. The Greville Memoirs, III, 288, 10 March 1836. Knatchbull to Lady Knatchbull, 8 March 1836, Kentish Family, 227, cited by A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 242. Buckingham and Chandos, Memoirs, II, 228, Londonderry to Buckingham, 9 March 1836.
46. Hansard, 32, 432-3, 18 March 1836, O'Connell; 32, 683-752, 28 March 1836, W. Roche, R. M. Bellew, Sheil, O'Loghlen, Division.
47. Hansard, 31, 1100-3, 29 Feb. 1836, Conolly; 31, 1302-57, 7 March 1836, Dunbar, Tennent, Lefroy, Jackson; 32, 7-11, 24-36, 119-24, 8 March 1836, Plunkett, Tennent, Division; 32, 254-69, 14 March 1836, Shaw, Conolly; 32, 429-37, 18 March 1836, Shaw, Lefroy, Perceval; 32, 497-501, 22 March 1836, Shaw, Lefroy, Plunkett, Damer; 32, 514-6, 23 March 1836, Shaw, Young, Plunkett; 32, 653-67, 747-52, 28 March 1836, Shaw, Division.
48. Wellington Papers, Port. 38, f130, Peel to Wellington, 12 March 1836. The Greville Memoirs, III, 289, 12 March 1836.
49. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 565, f172, J. C. Bernard (Secretary of the Committee) to Peel, 25 April 1845.
50. Hansard, 32, 1013-4, 14 April 1836, Londonderry; 32, 1114-5, 1142-52, 1164, 1166, 18 April 1836, Fitzgerald, Lansdowne, Clanricarde, Roden; 33, 233-60, 304-5, 306-9, 26 April 1836, Fitzgerald, Division; 33, 708-30, 9 May 1836, Clanricarde, Conyngham, Londonderry, Lansdowne, Clanricarde; 33, 911-4, 16 May 1836, Lansdowne, Clanricarde, Roden; 33, 1043-62, 18 May 1836, Lansdowne, Clanricarde, Gort, Richmond, Lansdowne, Division.
51. Personal Journals ... by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 18 May 1836.

52. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f39-46, Mulgrave to Russell, 15 April 1836.
53. Ibid, f65-6, Melbourne to Russell, 18 April 1836; *ibid*, f105-8, Mulgrave to Russell, 3 May 1836.
54. H. L. Bulwer, Life of Palmerston, II, 10, Palmerston to Temple, 2 May 1836.
55. Sharman Crawford MSS, D856/D/50, Crawford to John Crawford, 26 May 1836.
56. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 20 May, 6 June 1836.
57. Kriegel, The Holland House Diaries, 341. W. F. Monypenny and G. E. Buckle, The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, I, 323, Memo by Disraeli, n.d.. The Greville Memoirs, V, 65, 28 Dec. 1842. According to Bedford, 'The Lords made amendments .. and the question arose whether Government should take them or reject them. O'Connell strenuously urged their acceptance and asked if it was not a good thing to get rid of the old corporations on any terms; but John (Russell) and the Government, after much discussion, resolved to reject them... O'Connell had some communication with Normanby (Mulgrave) from which he inferred that Government had resolved not to take the Bill, upon which he immediately determined to anticipate this decision and to proclaim his own hostility to the amended Bill, in order that its rejection might appear to be attributable to him; and accordingly he published a violent letter in the newspapers in which he said that the Bill ought to be indignantly kicked off the table, or some such words.' This letter appeared in The Morning Chronicle, 19 May 1836, O'Connell to the People of England, 17 May 1836. In another public letter O'Connell confessed that he had had a change of mind. See W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 58-9, O'Connell to Barrett, 16 May 1836.
58. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2343, O'Connell to Pigot, 2 July 1836.
59. Mac Intyre was evidently unaware of O'Connell's role in this matter. See A. Mac Intyre, The Liberator, 244-6.
60. Hansard, 33, 1087-1117, 19 May 1836, O'Brien, Russell, Clements, Rice, Browne, Roche, Wyse, Crawford.
61. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f148-9, Melbourne to Russell, 5 June 1836; *ibid*, f152-3, Russell Cabinet Memo, 5 June 1836. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/21, Russell to Melbourne, 5 June 1836. Rollo Russell, The Early Correspondence of Lord John Russell, II, 185-7.
62. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f154-8, Mulgrave to Russell, 7 June 1836.
63. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 6 June 1836.
64. *Ibid*, 10 June 1836.
65. *Ibid*, 6 June 1836.
66. Hansard, 34, 217-88, 9 June 1836, Russell, O'Brien, Clements, O'Lohlen, Callaghan, Browne; 34, 308-410, 10 June 1836, Crawford, Wyse, H. Grattan, Sheil, O'Connell, Division; 34, 520-2, 14 June 1836, Crawford. House of Commons Divisions, 1836, 159.

67. DEP, 9 July 1836, Crawford to his constituents, 5 July 1836. See also DEP, 28 July 1836, Crawford to O'Connell, 25 July 1836.
68. Hansard, 33, 1106-8, 19 May 1836, Shaw; 34, 258-84, 9 June 1836, Conolly, Hamilton, Shaw; 34, 311-6, 405-10, 10 June 1836, Lefroy, Division; 34, 902-9, 955, 964-7, 27 June 1836, Clanricarde, Westmeath, Division; 34, 1067-77, 30 June 1836, Russell; 34, 1281, 5 July 1836, O'Brien. See Recollections of Lord Broughton, V, 57-8, on Melbourne's opinion against resignation.
69. Hansard, 34, 522, 14 June 1836, Jackson. House of Commons Divisions, 1836, 159.
70. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 424, f113, Jackson to Peel, 31 Aug. 1836. 86 was the majority against the Lords' amendments in June. Hansard, 34, 405-10, 10 June 1836, Division.
71. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f155, Wellington to Peel, 8 Sept. 1836.
72. Hansard, 32, 7-11, 8 March 1836, Plunkett; 32, 667-8, 680-1, 28 March 1836, Blackstone, Inglis; 32, 1152-60, 18 April 1836, Mansfield; 33, 1052-3, 18 May 1836, Gort.
73. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f76, Clerk to Peel, n.d..
74. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2B, f167-70, Tavistock to Russell, 12 June 1836.
75. Hansard, 32, 119-24, 8 March 1836, Division; 34, 405-10, 10 June 1836, Division; 34, 522-3, 14 June 1836, Wilmot. There were 39 Irish Tory members in March 1836 and 41 in June.
76. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 424, f113, Jackson to Peel, 31 Aug. 1836; *ibid*, MS 40, 310, f155, Wellington to Peel, 8 Sept. 1836. Wellington Papers, Port. 42, f88, Peel to Wellington, 4 Sept. 1836; *ibid*, f89, Wellington to Peel, 8 Sept. 1836.
77. Wellington Papers, Port. 43, f113, Ripon to Wellington, 27 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f114, Wellington to Ripon, 2 Jan. 1837. Graham Papers, 32, Ripon to Graham, 26 Dec. 1836.
78. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2C, f110-2, Mulgrave to Russell, 13 Sept. 1836; *ibid*, f224-8, Joseph Parkes to Russell, 6 Oct. 1836; *ibid*, /2D, f108-12, Russell to Mulgrave, 4 Dec. 1836.
79. *Ibid*, f113-4, Russell to Thomas Moore, 6 Dec. 1836.
80. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f251, Jackson to Roden, 24 Dec. 1836. Emerson Tennent Papers, D2922/C/6, Jackson to Tennent, 10 Dec. 1836. Smith O'Brien Papers, MS 428, f420, Wyse to O'Brien, 26 Nov. 1836.
81. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f209-10, 236-7, Mulgrave to Russell, 17, 22 Dec. 1836; *ibid*, f268-75, O'Connell to Warburton, 29 Dec. 1836 (latter also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, V, 2369).
82. DEM, 25 Jan. 1837, Gort, Jackson, Clonbrook, Tennent, Pakenham. Also Report of the Speeches and Proceedings at the Belfast Society's Fourth Anniversary Dinner..., Dec. 20, 1836, Tennent.
83. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2D, f326, Holland to Russell, 1836. Walpole. Lord John Russell, I, 286, Sir H. Taylor to Russell, 2 Jan. 1837.

84. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2383, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 18 Feb. 1837. See also Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 357, n.d..
85. Hansard, 36, 300-1, 8 Feb. 1837, Lucas; 36, 694-7, 715-33, 20 Feb. 1837, J. Young, Tennent; 36, 799-855, 21 Feb. 1837, Vesey, G. Young, Perceval, Shaw; 36, 936-52, 22 Feb. 1837, Peel.
86. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 22 Feb. 1837. Kriegel, Holland House Diaries, 356, n.d.. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/2E, f79-82, Mulgrave to Russell, 25 Feb. 1837.
87. The Greville Memoirs, III, 354-7, 25 Feb. 1837.
88. Roden Papers, Vol. 12, f619, Shaw to Roden, 23 Feb. 1837.
89. Wellington Papers, Port. 39, f140, Peel to Wellington, 23 Feb. 1837; *ibid*, f142, Wellington to Peel, 24 Feb. 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f162, 164, Wellington to Peel, 22, 24 Feb. 1837. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 338-40.
90. Hansard, 36, 6, 31 Jan. 1837, Fingall; 36, 295-300, 8 Feb. 1837, Browne, Roche; 36, 690-4, 20 Feb. 1837, R. M. Bellew; 36, 791-4, 21 Feb. 1837, O'Brien; 36, 868-962, 22 Feb. 1837, Clements, Walker, M. J. O'Connell, Woulfe, Sheil, O'Connell, Division. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 148, 22 Feb. 1837. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2386, O'Connell to Barrett, 25 Feb. 1837; 2390, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 6 March 1837.
91. Hansard, 37, 672-5, 20 March 1837, Crawford, Division. O'Connell explained in the General Association that he would have supported Crawford if he had not known that the amendment would have given the Lords an additional reason to reject the bill. DEP, 28 March 1837. Crawford expressed his anger in a letter to the liberals of Dundalk. NI, 1 April 1837, Crawford to the Secretary of the Dundalk Reform Registry Association, 25 March 1837.
92. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f48, 52, Peel to Wellington, 22, 23 March 1837; *ibid*, f50, 53, Wellington to Peel, 23, 24 March 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f168, 172, Wellington to Peel, 23, 24 March 1837. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 340-3.
93. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f64, 75, Graham to Peel, 27 March, 2 April 1837.
94. Graham Papers, 33, Peel to Graham, 28 March 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f160, Purport of Sir Robert Peel's communications with Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham after the receipt of Sir James Graham's letter of the 27 March; *ibid*, f176, Paper read by Peel at meeting of 23rd April 1837; *ibid*, f301, Peel memo, 4 July 1837. See also MS 40, 428, f217, Peel memo, n.d.. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f94, f110, Peel to Wellington, 9, 15 April 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p1-5, 7 April 1837. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 336-8, 344-7, 433-5.
95. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f174, Wellington to Peel, 31 March 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p1-5, 7 April 1837. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f80, Wellington to Peel, 31 March 1837.
96. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f183, Lyndhurst to Wellington, 6 April 1837; *ibid*, f186, Fitzgerald to Peel, 7 April 1837; *ibid*, MS 40, 423,

- f131, Ashburton to Peel, 6 April 1837; *ibid*, MS 40, 316, f204, Lyndhurst to Peel, 14 April 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p1-17, 7, 8, 9, 10 April 1837.
97. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f139, Memo on meeting on Irish Corporations, (9 April 1837); *ibid*, MS 40, 310, f195, Wellington to Peel, 15 April 1837; *ibid*, MS 40, 316, f206, Peel to Lyndhurst, 18 April 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p11-16, 9 April 1837. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f112, Wellington to Peel, 15 April 1837. Hansard, 37, 938, 962-3, 10 April 1837, Goulburn, Stanley; 37, 1082-3, 1102-10, 11 April 1837, Graham, Peel. Lyndhurst was then in Paris.
98. Hansard, 37, 942-97, 10 April 1837, G. Hamilton, R. D. Browne, Verner, R. M. Bellew, H. Grattan, Woulfe, Rice, Shaw; 37, 1051-9, 1063-6, 1110-5, 11 April 1836, O'Connell, W. Roche, Division.
Peel to Wellington,
99. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f110, 15 April 1837; *ibid*, f112, Wellington to Peel, 15 April 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f195, Wellington to Peel, 15 April 1837.
100. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f176, Paper read by Peel at meeting of 23rs April 1837.
101. *Ibid*, MS 40, 323, f364, Fitzgerald to Peel, 24 April 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p38-41, 23, 24 April 1837. See also Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 323, f368, Fitzgerald to Peel, n.d..
102. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 310, f200, 203, Wellington to Peel, 3, 4 May 1837; MS 40, 425, f223, Wharnccliffe memo, 29 April 1837.
103. Hansard, 38, 550-602, 5 May 1837, Wellington, Fitzgerald, Wicklow, Roden, Division; 37, 1308-31, 9 June 1837, Lyndhurst, Division. The Greville Memoirs, III, 367, 11 June 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p16-7, 102-3, 107-8, 10 April, 9, 11 June 1837.
104. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f204, Hamilton to Peel, June 1837.
105. Knight of Kerry Papers, MS 2077, f92, Note by Knight of Kerry, 23 May 1838.
106. Wellington Papers, Port. 47, f40, Roden to Wellington, 12 Aug. 1837.
107. IEP, 13 July, 12 Aug. 1837.
108. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p54-6, 84, 86, 92-4, 97-101, 107, 2, 28, 30, 31 May, 4, 7, 10 June 1837. Ellenborough's Journal (*ibid*, p1-108, 7 April-11 June 1837) is the single best manuscript source on developments in 1837.
109. IEP, 27 June (Fitzpatrick), 4 (Curry), 6 (O'Callaghan, H. Grattan), 8 (T. Martin, O'Connell), 18 (Redington), 20 (J. Grattan, Barron, Somers, O'Connell), 25 (Hutton, Tighe, Evans, Ball) July, 1 (Hutton, O'Connell), 8 (Evans, Mahony), 12 (Wyse, Fitzpatrick), 17 (Roche), Aug. 1837.
110. IEP, 26 Aug., 2, 19 Sept., 14 Nov. 1837, Crawford to O'Connell, 22, 29 Aug., 16 Sept., 9 Nov. 1837.

111. Hansard, 39, 602-9, 5 Dec. 1837, Russell, Shaw. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 423, f176, Paper read by Peel at meeting of 23rd April 1837; *ibid*, MS 40, 424, f344, Stanley to Peel, 14 Feb. 1838. Wellington Papers, Port. 45, f94, Peel to Wellington, 9 April 1837. Ellenborough Papers, Political Journal, PRO 30/12/28/6, p1-5, 7 April 1837. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 344-6. See also Graham Papers, 34, Stanley to Graham, 3 Sept., 8 Oct. 1837; Graham to Stanley, 9 Nov. 1837; Graham to Peel, 14 Nov. 1837. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f64, 123, Graham to Peel, 27 March 1837, 25 March 1838.
112. Graham Papers, 35, Graham to Stanley, 20 May 1838. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 262-3.
113. Hansard, 43, 448-72, 29 May 1838, Peel, Russell, O'Connell, O'Brien.
114. Hansard, 43, 515-42, 1 June 1838, Russell, O'Connell, Sheil, Division.
115. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 29, 30 May, 1, 6, 8 June 1838.
116. Wyse Papers, MS 15018 (2), Wyse diary, 1 June 1838. Hansard, 43, 540-2, 1 June 1838, Division.
117. Hansard, 43, 470-1, 29 May 1838, Shaw; 43, 515, 534, 540-2, 1 June 1838, Shaw, Division.
118. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f120, W. Paton to Beresford, 4 June 1838.
119. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (21), Fox to Henry Maxwell, 4 June 1838.
120. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 29 May 1838.
121. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 63, 3 June 1838.
122. Hansard, 43, 514-5, 1 June 1838, Disraeli.
123. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f104, J. C. Bernard to Peel, 26 May 1838.
124. *Ibid*, f123, 130, Shaw to Peel, 5, 9 June 1838.
125. *Ibid*, f125, Fremantle to Peel, 7 June 1838. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 63-4, 7, 16 June 1838.
126. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2543, O'Connell to Morpeth, 10 June 1838.
127. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 15 June 1838.
128. Hansard, 43, 618-56, 11 June 1838, Peel, Russell, Woulfe, Sheil, O'Connell, Division.
129. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 11, 15 June 1838.
130. Hansard, 43, 642-6, 652-6, 11 June 1838, Tennent, Division; 43, 787-9, 18 June 1838, Lascelles, Miles, Pusey, Eliot. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 314, f252, Somerset to Hardinge, 28 June 1838, on his scolding of Eliot, who was 'evidently ashamed of himself'.
131. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f422, Planta to Peel, 1838.
132. Hansard, 43, 789-92, 18 June 1838, Lucas, Litton, Jackson.

133. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f158, Lucas to Peel, 22 June 1838.
134. Hansard, 43, 1049-75, 25 June 1838, Tennent, Wall, Peel, Shaw, Division. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 25 June 1838.
135. Hansard, 44, 150-67, 12 July 1838, Lyndhurst, Gort, Wicklow; 44, 715-6, 27 July 1838, Wicklow.
136. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 425, f226, Shaw to Peel, 12 July 1838.
137. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 19 July 1838.
138. Broadlands MSS, MEL/RU/51, Russell to Melbourne, 20 July 1838.
139. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/38, f215-6, Russell to Normanby, 27 July 1838; *ibid*, f225-9, Tavistock to Russell, 29 July 1838; *ibid*, f230-5, Normanby to Russell, 29 July 1838.
140. W. J. Fitzpatrick, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, II, 144-6, O'Connell to Barrett, 28 July 1838.
141. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 31 July 1838.
142. Hansard, 44, 871-925, 2 Aug. 1838, Russell, Division, Russell, Hume, O'Connell, Inglis, Division, Unlisted Divisions; 44, 995-7, 3 Aug. 1838, Division. House of Commons Divisions, 1838, 455-8 (the division lists omitted by Hansard). The Times, 4 Aug. 1838, Divisions with pairs.
143. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 2 Aug. 1838.
144. Hansard, 44, 1037-40, 7 Aug. 1838, Wicklow, Division.
145. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 9 Aug. 1838.
146. Hansard, 44, 1115-21, 9 Aug. 1838, Shaw, O'Connell. The Greville Memoirs, IV, 89, 20 Aug. 1838. DEP, 21 Aug. 1838, Crawford in Precursor Association, 18 Aug. 1838.
147. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/30, f133-5, Stanley to Lady John Russell, Aug. 1838.
148. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2552, 2560, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 6 Sept., 4 Oct. 1838; 2559, O'Connell to Pigot, 30 Sept. 1838.
149. Anon., An Epitome of the Case of Irish Corporations, intended for the perusal of Protestants generally, and especially submitted to the dispassionate judgement of the Members of the Imperial Legislature (Dublin, 1839). Comprising reports of meetings on 19 Oct., 28 Dec. 1838, 1, 22 Feb. 1839. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (24), Fox to Farnham, 15 Jan. 1839.
150. Hansard, 45, 359-78, 14 Feb. 1839, Morpeth, Wyse, Barron, Redington. See also Fitzstephen French, The Question, are the Government Entitled to the Support of the Irish Liberal Members at the Present Crisis ? ...(London, 1839), 14.
151. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 8 March 1839. Russell Papers, PRO 30/22/30, f327-8, Spring Rice to Russell, 31 May 1839.

152. Hansard, 45, 364-72, 14 Feb. 1839, Shaw, Inglis; 45, 1124-43, 1 March 1839, Goulburn, Inglis, Bateson, Dungannon, Castlereagh, Jackson, Blackstone, S. R. Maxwell, Division, Russell; 46, 169-202, 8 March 1839, Stanley, Inglis, Blackstone, Shaw, Disraeli, Litton, Peel, S. R. Maxwell, Jackson, Ellis, Division.
153. Roden Papers, D/10/C84(10), Roden to Londonderry, 6 March 1839.
154. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f29, Litton to Peel, 23 May 1839.
155. Hansard, 48, 1012-4, 28 June 1839, Jackson; 48, 1213-31, 4 July 1839, Shaw, Ferguson, Eliot, Jackson, Peel, Divisions; 49, 344-7, 15 July 1839, Inglis, Perceval, Division. Ferguson voted for the third reading. James Grattan paired for the Government at both the Committee and third reading stages. Personal Journals... by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 4, 15 July 1839.
156. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f76, Ellenborough to Peel, 17 July 1839.
157. Hansard, 49, 607-20, 22 July 1839, Roden, Stuart De Decies, Lurgan, Wellington, Wicklow, Division. The 7 Irish Tory dissentients were Roden, Charleville, Glengall, Bandon, Gort, Dunsany and Farnham, leading figures in their party.
158. Wellington Papers, Port. 60, f89, Plunkett to Dunsany, 19 July 1839.
159. Bourke Papers, Vol. 315, f441, Clare to Bourke, 30 July 1839, quoting Fitzgerald. Hansard, 49, 760-5, 25 July 1839, Wicklow, Division.
160. Hansard, 49, 1203, 1207, 5 Aug. 1839, Conyngham, Gort.
161. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2643, 2645, 2646, 2648, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 5, 7, 8, 9 Aug. 1839; 2644, 2649, Ebrington to O'Connell, 6, 10 Aug. 1839; 2647, O'Connell to Ebrington, 8 Aug. 1839.
162. Wyse Papers, p5078, Wyse diary, 9 Aug. 1839.
163. Hansard, 50, 3-5, 7 Aug. 1839, Speaker, Shaw. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f91, Shaw to Peel, 8 Aug. 1839.
164. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f152, Graham to Peel, 7 Aug. 1839. See also Aberdeen Papers, Add MS 43, 060, f202, Wellington to Aberdeen, 20 July 1839.
165. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (27), Fox to Farnham, 8 Aug. 1839.
166. Hansard, 50, 137-8, 9 Aug. 1839, Russell, Shaw, Inglis. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f95, Shaw to Peel, 9 Aug. 1839. See also Walpole, Lord John Russell, I, 340-1, on the Cabinet's decision.
167. Hansard, 50, 196-207, 12 Aug. 1839, Russell, Shaw, O'Connell, Somerville. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 427, f108, Somerset to Peel, 12 Aug. 1839.
168. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2649, Ebrington to O'Connell, 10 Aug. 1839.
169. Hansard, 51, 108-9, 16 Jan. 1840, Somerville; 51, 641-9, 27 Jan. 1840, Morpeth, Jackson, Litton, Tennent, Peel; 52, 250-75, 14 Feb. 1840, Inglis, Litton, Shaw, Jackson, Peel, Division; 52, 524-5, 24 Feb. 1840, Verner.

170. Isaac Butt, Speech of Isaac Butt, esq., delivered at the great Protestant meeting in Dublin on Thursday, February 13th, 1840 (London, 1840). DEM, 14 Feb. 1840.
171. Hansard, 52, 525-44, 24 Feb. 1840, Shaw, Pigot, O'Connell, Jackson, Litton, Perceval, Lynch, Conolly, O'Brien, Curry, Divisions; 52, 778-84, 28 Feb. 1840, Dunbar, Litton, Jackson, Blake, Lynch, O'Connell, W. Roche, Bellew, M. J. O'Connell, Perceval, Young, Divisions; 52, 874-8, 3 March 1840, Perceval, Pigot, O'Connell, Verner, Perceval, Pigot, Hutton, Division. Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 3 March 1840. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2687, 2689, O'Connell to Fitzpatrick, 15, 20 Feb. 1840; 2687a, O'Connell to Pigot, 18 Feb. 1840.
172. Hansard, 52, 779-82, 28 Feb. 1840, Jackson; 52, 875-6, 3 March 1840, Verner, Perceval; 52, 1051-70, 9 March 1840, Sinclair, Tennent, Shaw, Perceval, S. R. Maxwell, Division.
173. Hansard, 53, 223-5, 30 March 1840, Fitzgerald, Londonderry.
174. Roden Papers, D/10/C84 (13), Roden to Londonderry, 1 April 1840.
175. Hansard, 53, 479-80, 2 April 1840, Westmeath; 53, 544-6, 6 April 1840, Westmeath; 53, 620-5, 7 April 1840, Westmeath; 53, 956-7, 10 April 1840, Westmeath; 53, 1164-80, 4 May 1840, Wellington, Winchilsea, Westmeath, Mountcashell, Unlisted Division.
176. Wellington Papers, Port. 68, f45, Donegall to Wellington, 12 May 1840.
177. House of Lords Journal, 1840, 72, 259, 297, 301. Isaac Butt, Irish Corporation Bill: A Speech delivered at the Bar of the House of Lords on Friday, the 15th of May, 1840, in Defence of the City of Dublin: on the order for going into Committee on the Irish Corporation Bill (London, 1840).
178. Hansard, 54, 493-4, 22 May 1840, Roden.
179. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 318, f196, 200, Graham to Peel, 9, 14 June 1840; *ibid*, f202, Arbuthnot to Graham, 10 June 1840; *ibid*, MS 40, 428, f217, Peel memo, n.d.. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, II, 433-43.
180. Hansard, 54, 1101-10, 12 June 1840; 55, 161-92, 29 June 1840, Londonderry, Lyndhurst, Clanricarde, Wicklow, Division, Westmeath, Stuart De Decies; 55, 438-51, 6 July 1840, Wynford, Carbery, Wicklow, Westmeath, Glengall, Wellington, Exeter, Londonderry, Division; 55, 1174-7, 31 July 1840, Exeter.
181. Wyse Papers, MS 15020 (4), George Wyse to Wyse, 20 June 1840. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 316, f220, Lyndhurst to Peel, 1840. Hansard, 55, 1216-21, 3 Aug. 1840, Morpeth, J. Grattan, W. Roche, Pigot, Russell; 55, 1389, 7 Aug. 1840, Morpeth. See also, Personal Journals ...by James Grattan, MS 14, 149, 3 Aug. 1840.
182. Hansard, 55, 1389-92, 7 Aug. 1840, Shaw.
183. Wellington Papers, Port. 72, f157, Wellington to Shaw, 28 Nov. 1840. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 428, f389, 402, 406, Shaw to Peel, 20 Nov., 1, 3 Dec. 1840; *ibid*, f403, Lyndhurst to Shaw, 24 Nov. 1840. Speech of the Rt. Hon. Frederick Shaw, at the Election of the University of Dublin (Dublin, 1841), 19-20. The Times, 6, 17, 26 Nov., 7 Dec. 1840. See also, T. De Vere White, The Road of Excess (Dublin, 1945), 52-7.

184. Farnham Papers, MS 18, 613 (33), Fox to Farnham, 20 June 1841.
185. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 429, f337, Jackson to Peel, 18 June 1841. Speech of the Rt. Hon. Frederick Shaw, at the Election of the University of Dublin. DEM, 28 June, 2 July 1841.
186. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 485, f256, Shaw to Peel, 20 July 1841.
187. It was said that the real reason for Hamilton's withdrawal was his expectation that Lefroy's elevation to the bench would create an early vacancy in the University. DEM, 26, 28 May, 16 June 1841, 5, 8 Aug. 1842.
188. DEM, 4 Dec. 1839. T. De Vere White, The Road of Excess, 35-8.
189. DEM, 23, 28 July, 2, 4, 6, 9, 13, 30 Aug., 8 Sept. 1841.
190. Hansard, 59, 498-9, 7 Sept. 1841, Glengall. Graham Papers, 42, Wellington to Graham, 8, 27 Sept. 1841. Wellington Papers, Port. 78, f53, Wellington to Graham, 8 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, Port. 79, f33, Wellington to Graham, 27 Sept. 1841. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 446, f36, Graham to Peel, 25 Sept. 1841.
191. DEM, 11, 18, 27, 29 Oct., 1 Nov. 1841.
192. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 446, f36, Graham to Peel, 25 Sept. 1841; *ibid*, f262, Peel to Graham, 29 Dec. 1841; *ibid*, MS 40, 492, f171, Jackson to Peel, 16 Oct. 1841; *ibid*, f174, Peel to Jackson, 22 Oct. 1841. Graham Papers, 81R, De Grey to Graham, 18 Oct. 1841; Eliot to Graham, 21, 28, 31 Oct. 1841; Graham to Eliot, 21, 24 Oct. 1841; 44, Graham to De Grey, 1 Nov. 1841. Towns in Ireland from which Petitions have been presented to Her Majesty for Charters of Incorporation, P.P., 1845, XLV, 317. Jebb, Municipal Government in Ireland, 240.
193. Bourke Papers, Vol. 315, f542, Bourke to Bourke, 2 Nov. 1841.
194. DEM, 8, 10, Sept., 27, 29 Oct., 3, 8, 24 Nov., 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 22, 24, Dec. 1841, 5, 14, 17, 19 Jan., 4, 18, 21, 23, 25 Feb., 2, 16, 18, 25, 28 March, 4, 6, 15, 18, 25 April, 9 May, 10 June, 13, 20, 27, 29 July, 1, 3, 5, 24, 31 Aug., 5 Sept., 12, 21, 26, 28, 31 Oct., 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 23, 25, 28 Nov., 2, 5, 9, 30 Dec. 1842, 11, 13, 18, 23, 25 Jan., 8 Feb. 1843.
195. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 509, f104, Gregory to Peel, 24 May 1842; *ibid*, f106, Peel to Gregory, 25 May 1842. DEM, 27 April 1842.
196. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VI, 2699, 2730, O'Connell to Mac Hale, 8 April, 16 July 1840.
197. Hansard, 59, 395-8, 27 Aug. 1841, O'Connell; 59, 592, 17 Sept. 1841, M. J. O'Connell. DEM, 24 May, 9 June, 26 July, 15, 29 Sept. 1841.
198. DEM, 23 Sept. 1842, 6 Jan. 1843.
199. NY, 15 Aug. 1840, Crawford at meeting of the Ulster Constitutional Association, 14 Aug. 1840. NY, 22 Aug. 1840, Crawford to the Secretary of the Loyal National Repeal Association, 18 Aug. 1840. NY, 23 Oct. 1841, Crawford, Observations addressed to the Repealers of Ireland, 16 Oct. 1841.
200. DEM, 18 Feb. 1842 (quoting Freeman's Journal), 25 Feb., 15 July, 1 Aug., 7 Nov. 1842 (quoting Monitor).

201. DEM, 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 22, 24, 27, 29, 31 March, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28 April, 1, 3, 10, 24, May, 7, 21 June, 12, 19 July, 2, 4, 23, 25 Aug. 1843. Duffy, Young Ireland, 192-212.
202. Hansard, 68, 1375, 8 May 1843, Glengall.
203. Hansard, 69, 1045-6, 30 May 1843, Sheil; 70, 57, 16 June 1843, Russell; 70, 323, 23 June 1843, Wyse; 70, 655-6, 716, 4 July 1843, Smith O'Brien, C. Wood; 70, 785, 790, 7 July 1843, O'Ferrall, Shaw; 70, 889, 10 July 1843, Howick; 70, 912, 1000, 1006, 11 July 1843, M. J. O'Connell, Peel, Russell; 70, 1071, 12 July 1843, Palmerston; 70, 1139, 14 July 1843, Glengall; 71, 490-1, 10 Aug. 1843, Smith O'Brien, Eliot, Wyse, Ross, Graham, Norreys, Hamilton. See also DEP, 20 July 1843, Murphy to Hayes, 14 July 1843.
204. Appendix 1.
205. Russell Papers, IR0 30/22/4C, f132-7, O'Connell to Buller, 9 Jan. 1844. M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3047, O'Connell to Buller, 9 Jan. 1844. See also *ibid.*, 3034, O'Connell to Campbell, 9 Sept. 1843. DEM, 15 Sept. 1843 (O'Connell).
206. Hansard, 72, 716, 738, 741, 13 Feb. 1844, Russell, Wyse; 72, 845-6, 14 Feb. 1844, Sir G. Grey; 72, 879-80, 15 Feb. 1844, Monteagle; 73, 189, 203, 23 Feb. 1844, O'Connell; 73, 278-9, 26 Feb. 1844, Crawford. See also DEP, 20 Jan. 1844, petition of the Charlemont House Whigs.
207. Wellington Papers, Pprt. 114, f21, Glengall to Wellington, 30 Nov. 1843.
208. Peel Papers, Add MS 40, 540, f26, 230, Peel Cabinet memos, n.d., 17 Feb. 1844. Graham Papers, 70, Graham Cabinet memo, 26 Feb. 1844. C. S. Parker, Sir Robert Peel, III, 106-7.
209. Hansard, 73, 1704-5, 1723, 1 April 1844, Eliot, Wyse; 75, 597-8, 12 June 1844, M. O'Connell; 76, 152, 1 July 1844, Shaw. P.P., 1844, I, 447. M. D. Jephson, An Anglo-Irish Miscellany, 230, Smith O'Brien to Norreys, 28 April 1844. DEM, 3 April 1844.
210. Graham Papers, 19IR, Eliot to Graham, 27 Dec. 1844; 79B, Graham to Eliot, 24 Dec. 1844; 87, Graham to Heytesbury, 13 March 1845. Hansard, 80, 174-5, 5 May 1845, E. B. Roche, Peel; 81, 546, 16 June 1845, Campbell; 81, 1037, 23 June 1845, E. B. Roche, Graham; 82, 1457-8, 1483-4, 5 Aug. 1845, Russell, Graham. C. S. Parker, Life and Letters of Sir James Graham, I, 424.
211. Rathcon Papers, MS 18, 304, O'Connell to Mahony, 25 April 1845 (also in M. O'Connell, Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, VII, 3141).
212. Graham Papers, 92, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845; 24IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 7 Nov. 1845; Heytesbury to Graham, 9 Nov. 1845; 27IR, Graham to Heytesbury, 25 Feb. 1846. Home Office Papers, HO 79/9, f183, Graham to Heytesbury, 10 Aug. 1845.
213. Hansard, 83, 1391-2, 23 Feb. 1846, O'Connell, Peel; 84, 1393, 1411, 23 March 1846, Fortescue, Clanricarde; 85, 293, 317, 30 March 1846, Somerville, Russell; 85, 523, 3 April 1846, O'Connell; 85, 1039-40, 24 April 1846, J. O'Connell; 85, 1088, 27 April 1846, McCarthy; 87, 133, 8 June 1846, Somerville; 87, 1002, 25 June 1846, Sheil. See also DEM, 7 Jan. 1846 (O'Connell).

214. Russell Papers, FRC 30/22/5C, f116-9, Bessborough to Russell, 11 Sept. 1846; *ibid.*, /5E, Russell to Bessborough, 6 Nov. 1846; *ibid.*, f174, Russell to Labouchere, 24 Nov. 1846; *ibid.*, f186-7, Labouchere to Russell, 25 Nov. 1846; *ibid.*, /5F, f191, Bessborough to Russell, 15 Dec. 1846. P.P., 1849, IV, 271.
215. T. De Vere White, The Road of Excess, 89-90.
216. Duffy, Young Ireland, 186-7. Also W. J. O. Daunt, Eighty-Five Years of Irish History, 388-9.