

Theme 3 – Ireland

Subtheme 1 – Social and economic themes

Transcripts for other primary sources

Where the commentary refers to only sections of letters, these passages are shown in *red*.

Contents

- Ne C 9522 – Printed return of the murders and attempted murders committed in Ireland between 1 Jan and 28 May 1846; 8 Jun. 1846
- Ne C 9542/1-2 – Letter from W. Sharman Crawford, Crawfordsburn, Ireland, to [H.F. Pelham-Clinton] Earl of Lincoln [later 5th Duke of Newcastle under Lyne]; 5 Jun. 1847
- Ne C 9339/2 - Police report of outrage, Mullingar, Westmeath, Ireland; 7 Jun. 1846. Printed form with MS annotation and an appended statement written in MS
- Ne C 9352/1 - Letter from R. Pennefather, Dublin Castle, Ireland, to [H. Pelham-Clinton] Earl of Lincoln [later 5th Duke of Newcastle-under Lyne]; 22 Jun. 1846
- My 171/1 - Letter from Sir Robert Peel, Whitehall, to the Earl of Charleville; 18 April n.y.
- Ne C 9274/1 - Leaflet 'The Question of Ecclesiastical Endowments' by Sir R.H. Inglis; n.d. [c.1845]
- Pw H 165/1-2 - Letter from Lord G. Bentinck, House of Commons, London, to [W.H.C. Cavendish-Scott-Bentinck] 4th Duke of Portland; 7 Apr. 1835
- Galway Ga C 1/44 - Printed copy of Lord Rossmore's suggestion to Lord Anglesey, requesting the election of 7 resident peers to the representative peerage of Ireland; 5 Feb. 1831
- My 371 - Letter from the Earl of Rosse, Parsonstown, to the Countess of Charleville; 15 Jan. 1833

Subject: Coercion and Conciliation

Ne C 9522 – Printed return of the murders and attempted murders committed in Ireland between 1 Jan and 28 May 1846; 8 Jun. 1846 [fire-damaged].

MS inscription on the final leaf [page 6] in Lincoln's hand: -

Observe that homicides are committed generally & necessarily so in the day –

Homicides are no test as to the necessity of the night clauses –

Attempts to murder are almost always by night

Same obs. applies to most cases, but robbery of arms -

Ne C 9542/1-2 – Letter from W. Sharman Crawford, Crawfordsburn, Ireland, to [H.F. Pelham-Clinton] Earl of Lincoln [later 5th Duke of Newcastle under Lyne]; 5 Jun. 1847

Private

My Lord

Being sincerely anxious that some means should be devised of preventing that waste of public time which is threatened on the subject of the Irish life protection bill – I take (what I admit might be considered) a very great liberty in submitting to your Lordships consideration a few points in connection with that subject.-

The great objection which every man who has any regard for public rights must feel with overwhelming force – is to that provision which renders a person found out of his house in certain proscribed hours liable to transportation for Seven years: - now might not this provision be altered: - might not power be given to the police to arrest Strangers or Suspicious persons found out at night (or even in day time) – and to detain such persons and bring them before a court of Magistrates next day – and the Magistrates to have power to cause them to give bail to keep the peace or to appear at Sessions to answer

p.2

answer any charges which might be brought against them but not subject to transportation merely for the offence created by the Act – For my own part I ever have and ever must oppose any bill which has in it a curfew clause of this kind – but I am not prepared to say that extra powers are not necessary – nor would I oppose the principle – (under proper modifications) – of taxing a disordered district for the expences of protecting the public peace in that district – and I believe there are many members of Parliament, who entertain the same views I do –

But what I particularly wish in confidence is to call to your Lordships recollection the circumstances connected with the Whig bill of 1835 – You will find that this bill was supported by O Connell and all the leading liberal Irish Members – it was only opposed by Mr Smith O Brien and myself – It had in it the curfew clause – but the difference between your present bill and that bill was that the offence was punishable only as a misdemeanour by fine and imprisonment: by the present bill it is made a transportable felony offence

p.3

offence for seven years punishment. The bill of 1835 had also another clause of the most oppressive and vexatious description (see the 11th Sect:) authorizing domiciliary visits at night. – This bill as I have said was supported by O Connell and the Irish members: - Then I would ask – if the Government altered and modified the curfew clause of their present bill – Is it possible the O Connell party could have grounds for factionous opposition – Independently of their original Support of the Melbourne bill – I can call your Lordships attention to another circumstance which you may not be aware of – I have already mentioned that in the year 1835 – Mr Smith O Brien and I opposed the bill: - and in the year 1837 on the 25th of May – (see Mirror of Parliament for 1837 page 1601) I moved for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Act of Act of [*sic*] 1835 – you will see I was opposed by Mr O Connell – in a Short but very remarkable Speech which is given in the Mirror of Parliament – (It is altogether omitted in Hansard:) – I was seconded by Smith O Brien and

p.4

and I divided the House – (see the division list Mirror of Parliament 1837 – May 25 – page XLIII) – we divided only 5 besides the Tellers – only 3 Irish members –

and two English – but if you look to the Majority against us you will find the names of Daniel O Connell – and Morgan John O Connell in that Majority: - Now after this and after the speech of O Connell (to which I have referred you) – If the Government would modify that objectionable clause – O Connell and his party would be placed without a foot to stand on in offering a factious opposition: - certainly S O Brien and myself are free from that dilemma – but although I never could support any bill with the curfew clause – I for one would not join in a prolonged opposition – if that clause were rendered less objectionable both in its form, and the punishment resulting from its violation –

My Lord I am induced to hope that you will feel that these hints are suggested by a kind feeling towards the Government – I really am anxious that when so kind a disposition is manifested towards Ireland – the Government should not be harassed through the means of vexatious motives emanating

p. 5 [Ne C 9542/2]

emanating from parties, who are not in my judgment in a position justly to give that opposition. I am however to request that you will consider this communication strictly confidential – It requires no answer – I expect to be at my post on Monday: - If it should in any degree be acted on – it will never be mentioned by me that I made any suggestion on the subject – and it will give me true gratification if I should have reason to think that I have been of any service –

I remain – My Lord –
Yr. obed[ien]t
Wm Sharman Crawford

To The Earl of Lincoln
&c &c &c -

Ne C 9339/2 - Police report of outrage, Mullingar, Westmeath, Ireland; 7 Jun. 1846. Printed form with MS annotation and an appended statement written in MS

Printed form with MS annotation and an appended statement written in MS

[The incident took place 1/5 miles from Ballinea Police Station and was reported by Bryan Kenny on the evening of the 6th. A Reward of £100 is to be offered and it is deemed expedient to enter the description in the *Hue-and-Cry*. Informations / Inquiries were made before magistrate Mr Reilly]

Mullingar 7th June 46

I have to report that on yesterday evening about 9 o’C P.M as Bryan Kenny a respectable Farmer was returning home from Mullingar he was fired at from behind a ditch by some person unknown and wounded with slugs in the Back.

Immediately after the occurrence I visited the scene and sent parties in every direction in search of the offender but without effect. The motive for this outrage is that Kenny took some land from which Christ[ophe]r Rooney was dispossessed of about two years ago

DeCourcy Ireland
Sub Insp[ecto]r

Firing at the Person
(Agrarian)

W Miller
8th June – 46

I Send Copy to Chief Secretary
II Transmit to His Excellency
R.P. June 8 / 46

Cop[ie]d [initials] Ent[ered] 8 June W.N.
II d 8 P.M.

A Approved
R.P. June 9 / 46

Ent 10 June W.N.
Rec[eived] & Ordered 11-
T.T.

Ne C 9352/1 - Letter from R. Pennefather, Dublin Castle, Ireland, to [H. Pelham-Clinton] Earl of Lincoln [later 5th Duke of Newcastle-under Lyne]; 22 Jun. 1846

Monday
2 ½ o'clock

My dear Lord

I send you a return of the strength of the Constabulary force for every County in Ireland, in consequence of some observations made by Lord John Russell in answer to Sir Robert Peels speech on the Coercion Bill, the five Counties recently alluded to as being most disturbed are marked in red Ink. You will at once see that they enjoy

p.2

a very large proportion of the force Tipperary having 1064 men above 1/10th of the entire strength and Roscommon a very small County 515.

In Tipperary there are also 6 Stipendiary Magistrates.

Messrs Jones at	Thurles
Talnteau [?]	Cashel
Shaw	Caher [Cahir] or Clonmel
Hunt Tipp	Tipperary
Redmond	Carrick on Suir
Pollock	Nenagh

and also Mr J. Kelly stationed at

p.3

Shinrone in the Kings County on the borders of Tipperary and whose district is principally in Tipperary

Clare has three Stipendiaries

Messrs Leyne at	Ennis
Bailey	Tulla
Bell.	Miltown Malbay.

Limerick 5 –

Messrs Lohes.	Limerick City
Macy	Castle Connell
Goold.	Rathkeale
Smyth.	Abbeyfeale
Barron.	Bruff. though lately resident at Charleville in the Co of Cork on the border of Limerick his district is altogether in Limerick.

p.4

[Endorsement:]

1846 June 22

Mr Pennefather to Lo[rd] Lincoln

Strength of Constab[ular]y Force in each Co[unty]

Roscommon. 3.

Messrs Wray at	Castlerea
Blake.	Elphin
Derimy	Roscommon

Leitrim 3.

Messrs Leever's at	Mohill
Slade	Manorhamilton
Kelly	Ballynamore

Believe me to be
Yours very faithfully
Michael Pennefather

The Earl of Lincoln MP
&c –

Subject: Land and Hunger

My 171/1 - Letter from Sir Robert Peel, Whitehall, to the Earl of Charleville; 18 April n.y.

My dear Lord

As there is no public Matter in which I take a greater interest, than in those Connected with the internal improvement of Ireland – by those means which are

the natural and by far the most efficacious and permanent means, namely the exertions and concert of individuals interested in the prosperity of the Country – I make no scruple in

p.2

returning to you the Letter which I recently received from you, with comments upon some passages of it. made by Sir John Burgoyne with the view of removing misconception – and facilitating the local improvements in which you take an interest.

Let me advise you to take an opportunity of personally Conferring with the board of Works in Ireland – of going

p.3

through the Conversation with the members of that board – the practical difficulties which you find or apprehend in the working of the Drainage act.

If they can be removed by explanation – so much the better – If not, let us consider whether the Law can or ought to be amended.

If I were a local proprietor in Ireland I would call a meeting

p.4

of a few other proprietors similarly circumstanced in respect to local interests – and thoroughly discuss the several points connected with them.

Aide-toi et le ciel t'aidera should be the motto and ruling principle in these matters of every Irish Proprietor – The great Cause of the backwardness of Ireland as to improvement – is the unwise interference of the Government and reliance on the Government instead of individual exertion.

p. 5 [My 171/2]

Believe me my dear Lord
very faithfully yours
Robert Peel

The Earl of Charleville

Subject: The Established Church

Ne C 9274/1 - Leaflet 'The Question of Ecclesiastical Endowments' by Sir R.H. Inglis; n.d. [c.1845]

*The Question of **ECCLESIASTICAL ENDOWMENTS**, &c. &c.*

Those endowments, as regards Ireland, were chiefly made between the sixth and eleventh centuries, and were derived for the support of those who published the Gospel and administered its ordinances.

Neither Romish errors nor Popish ascendancy had then pervaded the Irish Church – an usurpation of these followed – but the Creed of the present Irish Church is essentially that of St Patrick, and her present bishops trace their succession down to his times.

In regard to England, the date of her first endowments is so ancient as to be lost. They were all, however, made to her, as the Church of England – *whose history presents a series of perpetual protests and negations, of that pontifical usurpation to which, for a time, her proudest rulers were forced to submit*, but which at the Reformation, one, as wilful as a Pope shook off, while the Church, as she was competent to do, reformed herself, retaining her endowments. And as to all such endowments, they were generally as much made upon the Voluntary Principle as any now existing. To regulate them – to remove abusers and violators of the trust may be the duty of the nation's senate, but to confiscate or divert them is as clear an act of spoliation as it would be to apply the charity of Lady Hewley to the building of a theatre.

At the Reformation the nation interfered with the endowments now existing, only so far as to assign them to such alone as professed the original principles of the British Church, reformed from Romish errors, and freed from Popish supremacy, and the nation so willed from a general conviction that the Protestant Faith of the reformed Church was *True*, and that Romanism was *false*. It is, therefore, only upon the principle of our possessing what the nation generally believes to be the Truth of God, that we, as a Church, possess those funds.

Sir R. Peel now proposes to lower the meteor standard of "Truth" – he has by intention struck that flag, and trampling it under foot he exclaims, "I see no *religious* objection to the endowment of Popery!" – The question now is, "Does the Nation hold with the Prime Minister?" Only by a Dissolution of Parliament can this question be answered.

Mr. Ward, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Macaulay, and others, raise another standard, and inscribe upon it "All or none." They ask the Nation to take its election of one of these – "Endow all – make the test of eligibility simply a *numerical* one; or else endow none, and take the present endowments away and apply them to the liquidation of the public debt." – Again the question arises, "Is this the mind of Britain?" Only a Dissolution of Parliament can answer this inquiry.

To the question of "endow *all*," the Churchman gives his negative; - to that of "endow none," the Independent or Congregationalist gives full assent, and says, "endow none, abolish all endowments." The inquiry then is, "What says Great Britain to this? Will she give up her Church?" If she agrees to do this, we remonstrate, we warn; if she still says "We want no longer a National Religious Establishment," then we hold on till power expels us, labouring meanwhile to convince our country of her error. But if Britain says "I will not resign my Church; I will stimulate to amendment, to zeal, and to charity; but destroy it not, for a blessing is in it" – then we thank God, and take courage.

But that we may be not unready nor disjointed, let such lawful plans of concentrated action be contrived as may enable those who esteem the patronage of "the Truth" by the State to be lawful and right, to act conjointly and with effect. Those plans now demand close and *immediate* attention, since it is believed that the assault will be intensely prosecuted.

Churchmen who value the Truth more than all the emoluments that a Minister of State can bestow, must now band together, both Clergy and Laity, in God's

name, and strive together "for the standard of Protestant Truth," as long as a shred of it "remains." – (*Sir R. H. Inglis.*)

Pw H 165/1-2 - Letter from Lord G. Bentinck, House of Commons, London, to [W.H.C. Cavendish-Scott-Bentinck] 4th Duke of Portland; 7 Apr. 1835

My dear Father

I have to thank you for the perusal of E. Denison's letter & your answer to it the latter I have forwarded to him the former as well as a letter from Lucy giving an unfortunate account of an accident to Freddy I have sent to you under separate covers. -

With the single exception of the view

p.2

you take of the immutability of the bargain with the Irish Protestants I entirely agree in opinion with you. - I have always maintained that were it practicable to make the Roman Catholick the established Church of the three R. C. Provinces of Ireland the wisest policy of the Government of the Empire would be to do that; - but till the House of Lords is abolished & the present King dragged from the throne

p.3

my solemn conviction is that such a scheme is altogether impracticable; - & more than this My confident opinion is that if such a proposition was to be plainly and openly put forth in the H. of C.s not 200 members would be found to support it. - Agreeing with Lord Stanley that it is preposterous to imagine that the Irish Roman Catholicks will be satisfied with what he termed

p.4

the dry bones of a resolution pledging the House of Commons to appropriate a contingent surplus which may be expected to arise fifty one years hence to purposes of general education whilst in the interim they continue to pay Roman Catholick Tithes to a Protestant Church; - I am satisfied that Lord John Russell's resolution can not be considered in any practical sense of the word a final settlement of the question. -

p.5 [Pw H 165/2]

In justification of the opinion I have ventured that 200 members would not be found in the H. of Cs to vote for the establishment of the Roman Catholick Church of [struck through] in Ireland I have only to refer to Spring Rice & to Fowell Buxton the Leader of the Saints on the Opposition side of the House neither of whom will consent to the principle of any such appropriation. -

Lord Brougham declared that he would not consent to the diversion of "the fraction of a farthing to any such purpose". - Under

p.6

these circumstances I do not think it presumptuous to affirm that no final settlement of that kind could be carried through any branch of the Legislature. -

With respect to the payment of the Irish Catholic Priests out of parliamentary funds I have ever thought that it was the greatest misfortune that Mr Canning in 1825 failed to carry the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill with what were then called "the wings" the wing which he

p.7

supported being that which went to pay the Roman Catholic Clergy; - I do not apprehend that either Stanley or Graham would object to such a proposition. -

But the main consideration with me has been how can a safe Government for the Empire be constituted which will carry into effect the spirit of Lord John Russell's resolution; - it is clear that with the combined views of Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, & Sir James

p.8

Graham upon the Irish Church question no Administration formed out of the ranks of the Opposition can stand a week that does not conciliate to itself the support of O Connell & Warburton; - stripped of the followings of those two Leaders Lord John Russell can not command at the very outside 200 votes in the H. of Commons. -

What is to be the composition of the new Government I know not; - but my opinion is that neither L[or]d Grey or L[or]d Melbourne will be at the head of it. -

Ever most affectionately yours
G. Bentinck

Subject: Politics and Electioneering

Galway Ga C 1/44 - Printed copy of Lord Rossmore's suggestion to Lord Anglesey, requesting the election of 7 resident peers to the representative peerage of Ireland (vacancies created by the creation or absorption of the 28 Union Peers allowed in 1800 under subsequent British or Union peerage creations); 5 Feb. 1831

[Manuscript annotation:]

9 Bryanstone Square
29th June 31

My Lord

Should my Suggestion as above succeed, may I hope for one vote out of the 7 y[ou]r L[ordshi]p. will have to give?

I have the Honor to be My Lord
Yr very sincere Servant
Rossmore

Visc[oun]t Galway

My 371 - Letter from the Earl of Rosse, Parsonstown, to the Countess of Charleville; 15 Jan. 1833

My dear Lady Charleville

The terrible contest in which we have been engaged will apologize for my not having written to you. I should have been most happy to have been of any assistance to Lord Tullamoore, but I soon saw that I could have done nothing effective for him, and that the attempt would have been fatal to Oxmantown. I told Mr Berry, when he first came here with Lord Tullamoore that my Catholic tenantry said they would rather abandon their farms and go to America, than vote for a conservative candidate: and without some considerable portion of the Catholics, as they were the greater number, it would be impossible to succeed, especially as the Protestants were so divided. With strong recollection of all the kindness I have received from you and Lord Charleville, I had thus no power of manifesting it. There was a time, and not very long since, when I could have done much.

p.2

The Catholics in this town voted simply for Oxmantown, but those who are my tenants every where else gave one vote to FitzSimon, against all Oxmantown's exertions, and eight of them, voted simply for FitzSimon.

Oxmantown set out with the promises of a large majority, but they were dissolved by the system of intimidation. Under this influence, and under the influence of Bernard who coalesced with FitzSimon near 200 protestants who had promised Oxmantown voted against him. A great difficulty arose from this coalition being at first recall and all along disavowed. Though it had been long rumoured we were unwilling to credit it. But when on the first day some of Bernard's relations and protestant tenants as Mr Lander &c &c, all persons of orange principles, were brought forward by Bernard to vote for him & FitzSimon, it was impossible to doubt it. At the close of the poll that day, Mr Costello, the principal agent of FitzSimon, returned public thanks to Col. Bernard for the assistance that he had afforded to FitzSimon, and said that he should be assisted in return. Still they disavowed

p.3

the junction. The Gentlemen, however, of the county were not to be duped. They became indignant & exasperated. And acting as agents they scattered themselves in all directions over the county and brought forward such numbers to poll simply for Oxmantown, as decided the election in his favour.

The most remarkable part of the contest was the system of intimidation; a power unknown heretofore in our county. About a fortnight before the election bands of armed men visited in the night the houses of the freeholders, robbing them of their arms, which they said they would return after the election, and swearing them to vote for the popular candidate. If the electors would not swear, they were beaten & threatened with death. Several Priests in their chapels; FitzSimon himself; Costello his agent and other declaimers continually harangued the people, in all parts of the county. The excitement & terror thus produced was

horrible. The voters for Oxmantown were obliged to move to the election in large bodies escorted by the

p.4

military. There were considerable detachments from the 50th and 91st regiments sent into the county for the occasion. Also a large force of cavalry of the Carabiniers & 10th Hussars; And some artillery with two field pieces; the whole commanded by Major General Sir John Brehan. Yet the military were continually insulted & pelted with stones. All this time FitzSimon and Bernard and their friends were moving everywhere unmolested. The street of Philipstown was a scene of continual riot & warfare between the gentlemen and the mob. The gentlemen could not venture to move without their pistols in their hands. And it was necessary to protect even Oxmantown's tally room all the time with a guard of soldiers. While the election was going on there were parties going at night through the county, forcing open the houses of freeholders, dragging them out, putting them on their knees, and swearing them to vote for FitzSimon & Bernard. The gentlemen were all on Oxmantown's side except Vaughan, Atkinson, Mooney & Drought. The three latter were offended because they were not made Deputy Lieutenants. Lords Downshire, Maryboro, Downs, Lansdown & Ashtown were all on our side. Mr Ponsonby who gave his interest to Oxmantown

p. 5 [My 371/2]

and Bernard had 70 tenants registered, yet not one of them voted for Oxmantown; nor did one of Armstrong of Gallen's. Lord Digby's Catholic tenants voted simply the first day for FitzSimon, and when the junction was more developed they voted for him & Bernard. Though Lord Downshire gave his interest solely to Oxmantown, none of his Catholic tenants voted for him.

In the course of the poll the junction was announced from Bernard's press, in printed placards, calling on the freeholders to vote for him & FitzSimon against the tithe – supported Oxmantown, yet even to this moment Bernard denies a junction.

The Secretary of the Political club at Tullamoore says that the agreement was, that FitzSimon should, in the beginning, poll single votes, but as soon as he found himself safe, that then he was to give his second votes to Bernard, in consideration of which Bernard had agreed that from that time he would bear FitzSimon's expenses as well as his own – And Captain Westenra told Mr Bennett that the only question discussed in the committee was whether FitzSimon should begin to poll for Bernard at 12. or at 3 O Clock the second day; and they decided on the latter.

Sometime before the election FitzSimon sent a gentleman

p.6

to me to offer his support & that of all his friends at Oxmantown on condition that I would leave my Catholic tenants at liberty as to their second votes. This proposal, which would have been at once fatal to Bernard, I rejected.

The first indication which I had of Bernard's clandestine stratagems was just before the election, from a letter which he wrote to Mr Ponsonby, in which he requested that Ponsonby would order his tenants to vote simply for him, though he knew that Ponsonby had promised to support Oxmantown also, but even still, I could not believe, that Bernard had gone so far as to make a coalition with

FitzSimon, which was directly contrary to all the intimations which I had all along received from him –

I am with most affectionate regards to Lord Charleville – not forgetting Mrs Marly
ever most faithfully yours
Rosse