

AN
A B R I D G M E N T
OF THE
EVIDENCE
GIVEN BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE,

Appointed in 1835,

TO CONSIDER THE MOST EFFECTUAL MEANS OF PREVENTING
BRIBERY, CORRUPTION AND INTIMIDATION,
IN THE
ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SERVE IN PARLIAMENT.
WITH REMARKS.

Printed for "THE REFORM ASSOCIATION," 3, Cleveland Row.

LONDON :
JAMES RIDGWAY AND SONS, 169, PICCADILLY.

1837.

A BRIDGMENT

OF THE

EVIDENCE

GIVEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

APPOINTED IN 1832

LONDON:
PRINTED BY T. BRETTELL, RUPERT STREET, HAYMARKET.

BRIBERY, CORRUPTION, AND INTIMIDATION

IN THE

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SEAT IN PARLIAMENT

WITH REMARKS

Printed for "The Reform Association," B. (London, 1832)

LONDON

JAMES RIDGWAY AND SONS, 14, PICCADILLY

THE following pages consist mainly of Extracts from the Evidence taken in 1835 by the Committee of the House of Commons on Bribery. Out of 700 folio pages, a selection has been made of the greater portion of the most interesting parts, in order to expose, without partiality, the disgraceful extent of the Bribery and Intimidation practised. The spectacle unfolded, presents a species of treason against the representative principle—a conspiracy against the rights of the people. This most unprincipled work is going on day by day. The recent case of Bridgewater is a sufficient demonstration that all which has yet been done in the way of exposure and punishment, has not prevented open and shameless Bribery. Re-action must come, or the liberties of the nation will be in serious danger. To exhibit the necessity for this re-action, and to quicken the public mind on this subject, have been the leading objects of the present compilation. The labour of the task will be amply repaid, if the objects be accomplished.

M.

London, June 1837.

The following pages consist mainly of Extracts from the Evidence taken in 1835 by the Committee of the House of Commons on Bribery. Out of 700 folio pages, a selection has been made of the greater portion of the most interesting parts, in order to expose, without partiality, the disgraceful extent of the Bribery and Intimidation practised. The spectacle unfolded, presents a species of treason against the representative principle—a conspiracy against the rights of the people. This most unprincipled work is going on day by day. The recent case of Bridgeman is a sufficient demonstration that all which has yet been done in the way of exposure and punishment, has not prevented open and shameless Bribery. Reaction must come, or the liberties of the nation will be in serious danger. To exhibit the necessity for this reaction, and to quicken the public mind on this subject, have been the leading objects of the present compilation. The labour of the task will be amply repaid, if the objects be accomplished.

London, June 1837.

CONTENTS.

BOROUGHES.

BRIBERY.

	<i>Page</i>
<i>England</i> At HEREFORD, on evidence of Mr. James	3
IPSWICH, Mr. Cowell	4
NORWICH, Messrs. Edwards and Staff .	6
BRISTOL, Mr. Visger	8
—— John Scott	10
—— Mr. Sircom	} 11
LEICESTER, Mr. Hudson	}
HARWICH, Mr. Florance	} 14
WARWICK, STAFFORD, &c., Mr. Parkes. }	}
Bribery, practice of, Mr. Cockburn .	21
<i>Ireland</i> NEWRY, Mr. Caraher	21
TRALEE, Mr. Supple	22

INTIMIDATION.

<i>England and Wales</i> ... At CAMBRIDGE, on evidence of Mr.	
Gunning	23
WESTMINSTER, Mr. Florance	29

	<i>Page</i>
<i>England and Wales..</i> At IPSWICH, Mr. Cowell . . .	31
LEICESTER, Mr. Hudson . . .	35
DENBIGH, &c., Mr. Edgworth . . .	36
RIPON, Mr. Lunn . . .	37
HALIFAX, Mr. Craven . . .	38
BIRMINGHAM, Mr. Gilbert . . .	41
EXETER, Mr. Terrell . . .	44
HEREFORD, Mr. James . . .	45
MARY-LE-BONE, Mr. Wardell . . .	46
<i>Ireland.....</i> At CASHEL, on evidence of Mr. Fitzgerald .	47
Mr. O'Brien .	49
Mr. Willcocks .	53
NEWRY, Mr. Caraher . . .	54
CARLOW, Rev. J. Maher . . .	} 55
CLONMELL, John Looby . . .	
YOUGHALL, Messrs. Hamilton .	60, 63
Intimidation, in respect of voting, un- known in New England, Mr. Ticknor	59

UNDUE INFLUENCE.

<i>England</i> At COVENTRY, on evidence of Mr.	
Troughton . . .	63
LEICESTER, Mr. Hudson . . .	67
HEREFORD, Mr. James . . .	68
IPSWICH, Mr. Cowell . . .	70
NORWICH, Messrs. Edwards and Staff	} 71
EXETER, Mr. Terrell . . .	
BRISTOL, John Scott . . .	} 72
----- Mr. Visger . . .	
HEREFORD, }	
COVENTRY, } Mr. Parkes . . .	75
LEICESTER, }	

COUNTIES.

BRIBERY.

	<i>Page</i>
Few or no allegations of Bribery in Counties ; on evidence of Messrs. Cockburn, Skerratt, James, and Parkes.	76
Mr. Florance	77

INTIMIDATION AND UNDUE INFLUENCE.

<i>England and Wales</i> ...In CHESHIRE, on evidence of Mr. Skerratt.	77
ESSEX, Mr. Florance	80
DEVONSHIRE, Mr. Terrell	82
WARWICKSHIRE, and in Boroughs of other Counties, Mr. Parkes	92
DENBIGHSHIRE, Mr. Roberts	96
————— Mr. Edgworth	101
<i>Ireland</i>CLARE, on evidence of Rev. M. Duggin.	102
WATERFORD, Rev. J. Sheehan	108
LIMERICK, Mr. Fitzgerald	114
KERRY, Mr. Brownrigg	115
———— Mr. Morris Brennan	116
———— Mr. Mc Cartie	119
———— Mr. Morris Brennan	122
WEXFORD, Mr. Hays Hatton	124
MEATH, Mr. Despard	126
———— Mr. Mullen	126
———— Edward Dowling, Esq.	128
CARLOW, Rev. J. Maher	128

<i>Ireland</i>	CARLOW, Colonel Bruen	} 129
	— Mr. Carroll	
	QUEEN'S COUNTY, Mr. Lalor	
<i>Scotland</i>	COUNTY OF AYR, on evidence of Mr. Andrewes	} 141
	Mr. Hugh Campbell.	

THE BALLOT.

Opinions concerning,		
of M. de Tocqueville	142
Mr. Parkes	143

REMEDIAL MEASURES

GENERALLY.

Suggestions for, referred to 146

NOTES.

Referring to

p. 1, Sir R. Peel's Tamworth Address	} 148
73, The Bristol Charities	

*Abridgment of Evidence given in 1835, before the Select
Committee on Bribery, Corruption and Intimidation at
Elections.*

WE submit these extracts to the calm consideration of the people of England. The professed object of our representative system, is to secure the rights of the people, by entrusting a certain portion of the government to their representatives. We admit and support the prerogative of the King. We admit the privileges of the Aristocracy. Yet we cannot look tamely on, whilst the power which is essential for the wholesome control of the Kingly authority, and of the privileges of the Peers, is sapped to its foundation. Shall the rich, the influential and the titled, intimidate or corrupt the elector, and fraudulently transfer to themselves the influence of the nation? This question, the middle classes of the people must answer. They are the productive classes of the country: from their industry, skill and enterprise, flow all the prosperity of the country. They have a deep interest in the answers to be given, for if the progress of the intimidation and corruption now so widely practised be not restrained, the middle classes will have as much cause to fear from the misery and exasperation of those below them, as from the unsoundness and debasement of those, who in external advantages may be above them. The Tories know, that unless they can regain a majority in Parliament their reign is over in England. Sir Robert Peel in his celebrated Tamworth manifesto declared, that the true scene of political combat would be henceforth in the courts of registration. The people of England, properly to appreciate the value of this assertion of Sir Robert Peel's, ought to consult the numbers on recent divisions; where they will find a majority of twenty-three only on church rates, and much such a number on the appropriation principle. Several Liberal members have notified that they do not intend again to encounter a contested election among corrupt constituencies. Mr. Hall at Monmouth, and Mr. Elphinstone at Hastings, two liberal and independent men, have come to this determination*. The Tories are restrained by no such considerations. For generations the Tories have plundered the public. Corruption has been a source of fortune to them. *They, at*

* We are much gratified to perceive that Mr. Hall and Mr. Elphinstone have been invited to become Candidates for the greatest Boroughs in England, Marylebone and Liverpool; and this too, primarily, because they have had the courage to renounce connection with corrupt boroughs. This is a healthy symptom, and we rejoice to find the people in large constituencies thus honest.

all events, are not so imbecile as to refuse a trifling sum out of their gains, to maintain the "edifice" of Toryism. If the labouring classes, generally, imbibe the notion that the representative system is unsound, because the exercise of the franchise is unprotected, they may seek out some short and easy path, by which they may attempt, not only to make sure of the free exercise of the franchise, but to obtain a share of electoral power, much greater than that which they now enjoy. It is to avoid this mischief, it is to provide for the quiet and silent, yet steady and certain march of the whole people towards a better and sounder state, that we now call upon that class on which we have main reliance, to bestir themselves whilst there is yet time. We do not exaggerate, when we affirm that the freedom, not of England only, but of other free nations, may be involved in the result. To European tyranny, at least, we are the great obstacle. The interesting changes now in progress in the old countries of Europe—the gradual but sure elevation of the people in the scale of existence—the change from ancient prejudices and modes of action, almost as potent to influence and improve the moral, as change in the distribution and application of mechanical power, has been to improve the physical condition of man—the tranquil and philosophic progress of freedom in which the necessity for the advance is demonstrated before it is made—all these great considerations, so pregnant with good to England and to the world, depend upon the preservation of the freedom and purity of our representative system, and upon the prevalence of the conviction that it is free.

From a perusal of these extracts, it will be evident that any circumstance which would render the effect of intimidation and bribery uncertain, would be a vast improvement. It is true, we have a volume of statutes framed with care, professedly to punish those who should be proved to be guilty of any of these offences. Laws, unless they embody the opinion, and command the respect of the public, are worse than useless. The Constituent body of this country has been thoroughly debased under the system which has been so long pursued, and we must awaken once more in the minds of the people, a love and a reverence for public virtue, before much permanent good can be attained. The people must be taught that the highest morality, that which is more important than any other, is the discharge of our duty to our country. We have lost much of our faith in the power of the existing laws to restrain the debasement here recorded. Laws like these are at variance with our habits. We must be educated before we can understand them. The corrupt elector regards a law against bribery as an interference with his franchise. The previous practice of ages of corruption has prevented his attaining the moral elevation from which he would discern a higher influence, which would guide him in the exercise of his elective franchise. We must show him, among other things, that his very selfishness is interested in his fidelity to his country, and that his temporary individual interests are as nothing when compared with the

benefits which he would derive from a well regulated and an equitable Government.

The Committee did not limit the inquiry into the mere existence and practice of bribery and intimidation, they also proceeded to collect evidence as to the remedy for these evils. From parties best qualified, by their experience and knowledge of elections, both as to the law and the practice, much valuable information was obtained as to the method of conducting elections here, in the United States, and in France. Among the persons examined on these most interesting topics, were M. de Tocqueville, Mr. Joseph Parkes, Mr. Goddard, &c., &c. We should gladly have printed at length the important testimony given by these gentlemen, but we have already exceeded the limits originally proposed, and we can only assure our readers that the testimony we are compelled to omit, is exceedingly valuable, not only for the information it contains, but for the remedial measures which it suggests; and we earnestly recommend it to the attentive perusal of all parties interested in this vital inquiry. We may be the better excused for this omission, inasmuch as our primary object is to awaken the public feeling into action. We wish to possess the nation with a determined spirit, not merely of strength to complain, but of vigour to inquire and to reform. It is vain to expect to triumph in these struggles, without earnest zeal and much labour. We do not disguise the strength of our enemies—we do not under-estimate their power, but we know their cause to be the cause of a faction, and their object, self-interest. It is with them a pecuniary question, and they have always regarded any interference with political abuse, as an intermeddling with private property. Vigilance and action, are the price which the people must pay for liberty, and the state of that nation is hopeless, where the people are not in cases of this nature both vigilant and active.

BRIBERY.

Mr. JOHN JAMES, of Hereford,

853, 854. BELIEVES bribery to have existed at Hereford, since the passing of the Reform Bill, to a much more considerable extent than before.

855. To what do you attribute its existing to a more alarming extent since the passing the Reform Bill?—To the great desire the conservatives had to secure the election of their political friend.

856. Do you allude to the two last elections?—Yes.

857. Has the bribery you speak of been direct or indirect, or both?—Direct and indirect, both.

858. In what mode has the direct bribery been carried on, so as to evade the statute?—I must beg leave to decline answering that question.

859. Do you mean that direct bribery has been done to a voter previous to the election, in order to induce him to vote for a particular candidate?—Yes, I apprehend so.

860. Do you mean that money has been paid previous to the election?—Certainly.

861. Has it been in the form of gift or loan?—Both; on one side only by way of loan.

862. Was it the political partisans that generally advanced the money on loan?
—Yes; I believe a banker was the person who furnished the money.

863. Were those loans ever repaid?—I cannot speak as to all, but some certainly were not.

864. Were promissory notes or bonds given for the amount?—Promissory notes were given.

865. Have you known payment demanded?—Yes, and the parties arrested.

866. In those instances in which you have known the payment demanded, and the parties arrested, have the parties receiving the loan and who were called upon to repay the loan voted for that particular candidate or not?—No, he has voted against the candidate.

867. Have you known the payment of a loan demanded in any case where the party receiving the loan voted for the candidate on whose behalf he received it?
—No, I know nothing of the kind.

868. Then was not the promissory note a security for the vote?—Yes, it must have been considered as such security.

869. In those cases where the parties have been arrested in the way you mentioned, were the parties by whom the loans were advanced the bankers of the place?—The notes were given to the solicitor who conducted the election, but I have stated that sums of money were considered to come from a banker.

870. Can you state any thing as to the amount of those loans?—One cheque brought to ——— a week before the election, was to the amount of 33*l*.

871. What class of voters was it who received those loans?—The man that received the cheque was ——— who lived in a 10*l*. house, and who was a little tradesman.

872. Did he receive the cheque, and give his note of hand for the sum?—He did.

876. Has the system of bribery by loans been general?—On one side to a considerable extent.

877. Has the bribery at the places within your knowledge, on behalf of the particular candidates, been conducted by one individual as agent for that purpose?—Certainly not; many persons are employed.

878. Is that with a view of rendering detection more difficult?—Not exactly.

879. What is the object of employing more persons than one?—There are several reasons why several are employed; a certain class of persons are more accessible to one than another.

880. Has the system prevailed of paying money after the election for the votes given?—To a very small amount.

881. Before the passing the Reform Bill, was it the practice of giving so much money for each vote given?—It was scarcely known what bribery was before the passing of the Reform Bill in one of the places of which I have spoken.

959. Have you seen the bribery oath refused by those to whom it has been tendered?—Never; I believe the man who takes the money will always take the oath. (pp. 50, 51, 54.)

Mr. CHARLES COWELL, *Ipswich*.

1286. In 1826 did you not say money was given both before and after the polling?—Yes.

1287. Was it given openly by both parties without much attempt at concealment?—It was not given openly.

1288. What was the mode of distributing it?—A friend, for instance, of the voters would receive the money from another person in some circuitous way, and then distribute it among them; and a poor voter took perhaps 20*s*. or 30*s*. for his vote, and it was paid in this circuitous way.

1289. What was then the number of voters?—About 1,000 or 1,100.

1290. What was the price paid for a vote to those who received the bribe?—I should suppose from 20*s*. up to 50*l*.

1291. Did the price advance as they approached the termination of the election?—Yes; it advanced to as much as 30*l*.

1292. Was the election close run?—Very; there was not a difference of 10.

1293. Was the bribery oath administered?—I think it never was administered at Ipswich till the last election.

1294. Are you aware that in 1826 there was a previous agreement between the candidates or their committees, or their agents, that the bribery oath should not be administered on both sides?—I do not think the thing was ever contemplated; I am not aware that it was ever considered; I do not think the bribery oath was ever administered in Ipswich till the last election, and then I individually named two or three cases in which it should be administered; and from my experience at that election I think it never will be the practice to administer the bribery oath again, because it only gives rise to perjury, without having the slightest influence on the voter.

1295. Are you of opinion that the man who would receive a bribe would be also likely to take the bribery oath without reluctance or scruple?—I am quite of that opinion, as a general rule.

1296. In those cases in which you required the bribery oath to be tendered at the last election, had you strong reason to suppose that the parties had been bribed?—I had no doubt of it.

1297. Did any of the parties, to whom the bribery oath was so tendered, refuse to take it?—I was not present when the oath was required to be taken, but I was told by a friend of mine, who was inspector at one of the booths, that an individual, who was known to be bribed, having confessed it before he went to the poll, when the bribery oath was tendered to him, and he came to the words "promise or inducement," stopped, and the people around gave a cheer, and said he could not swallow it; the returning officer said he did not understand it, and repeated the words again, and he hesitated again; I was told, I was not present, but the third time, to use the expression of my friend, he gulped it.

1298. Did he vote?—Yes, he took the oath, and voted.

1299. Is that the only instance you are aware of, in which the oath was not willingly taken, or taken without hesitation?—I was not witness to the fact; I was merely told it by a friend.

1300. Is that man personally known to you, who went up and took the oath, having confessed beforehand that he had received a bribe?—He is personally known to me.

1324. In what mode was the bribery practised at the last election? Was it direct bribery by the payment of money, as on the former election of 1826?—Yes, by direct payment of money in several instances.

1325. What was the most usual form in which it was practised?—A London barrister came down as the friend of one of the candidates, and he was introduced as the representative of one of the candidates to the voters, and was left in Ipswich as his representative, while he went to attend to his professional business; the name of that barrister was Mr. ——— who has been proved before a Committee of the House of Commons, and has by their decision been declared to be guilty of bribery.

1326. Is that the Mr. ——— mentioned in the resolution of the Ipswich Committee as having been proved to have been guilty of bribery?—He is the man.

1327. Have other persons also been named in that resolution as having been guilty of bribery?—Three persons have been held guilty of bribery by that resolution.

1328. Did ——— give money directly to the voters?—They did.

1329. Were there more forms than one in which they did it?—My statement in answer must be partly inferential, from the circumstances of the case. It appears to me, from what I saw of the election, that they had several individuals without character and without station in society, who were employed for the purpose of drinking with certain voters, getting from them a knowledge of their pecuniary situation, and then tampering with them for their vote, and bringing them to those individuals.

1330. Were the individuals who paid the money employed on behalf of the candidates, or any of them as agents for those purposes?—One of them, as I before stated, was introduced as the representative of one of the candidates, while the candidate was absent from Ipswich, and was left by him there to attend to his interest, he himself stating that fact.

1339. Was any person proposed to be examined who had himself received a bribe in order to induce him to vote?—Several persons were examined who received bribes.

1340. Did any of those persons so examined refuse to give evidence on the subject?—Not one of them; they all gave evidence.

1341. Was their evidence of a nature to criminate themselves?—Certainly.

1342. Did they claim any protection?—I did not hear they did; I do not think they did.

1343. Did this bribery take place before the election began, or after the election had actually commenced?—Instances have come under my knowledge of bribery having been committed some days previous to the election.

1344. Can you state what was the state of the poll at the close of the first day?—We were in a minority, I think, of something under 30.

1345. Was there much difference between the relative position of the candidates on the first day and the second day?—Not any great difference; but I should say that in consequence of the system of treating commenced by our opponents on the first morning of the election, they headed us above 100 in the space of an hour or two on the first day.

1346. In what mode was that treating carried on?—They had parochial breakfasts at public-houses.

1347. Did the voters come from those breakfasts up to the poll?—Yes; they came from those houses in bodies to the poll.

1348. Did a large number of the voters breakfast generally at each of these public-houses?—Yes.

1349. Was the mere breakfast sufficient in your mind to induce the people to vote in a particular way?—I can scarcely answer the question; my impression is, that all doubtful men, and men who would be tempted by a bribe, would naturally be taken to such a situation, because it prevented the possibility of our encouraging them to vote according to their own judgment; we could not see them before they voted.

1350. What did they eat and drink at the public-houses?—I understand they had all sorts of cold meat, hot beef steaks, &c., and what spirits they chose to have. (pp. 71, 73, 74.)

Mr. T. EDWARDS and Mr. JOHN R. STAFF, *Norwich.*

2416. Was there a contest for municipal officers in the year 1832?—There was a very serious contest for sheriff in August 1832.

2417. Was that at a period when an early dissolution of Parliament was expected? The Reform Bill passed in June previous to that, and we had an anticipation of a general election.

2418. At the election was there very considerable bribery?—I think I never knew or heard of so much bribery at the sheriff's election before; the contest ran very close at the finish of the election.

2419. Are the sheriffs the returning officers?—They are, for Members of Parliament.

2420. Do you find that the freemen who have voted upon being paid at the municipal elections, adhere to the party that paid them at the next contest?—I think there is a great portion of them that do; but I think there is a portion of them always in the market, that if any thing intervenes between that time by which they would be better paid, they would take it; if any municipal election occurred subsequent to that, I think they would then be buyable if they had a better offer.

2421. At the election in 1832, did you find that most of the persons that had supported your party at the election for sheriff, also supported your party at the election for Members of Parliament?—We had a great defalcation of them, because they were subsequently bought.

2422. To what circumstance do you attribute that defalcation?—I attribute it to their being bought at the general election in 1832. I have no doubt of their being bought.

2423. Are you at all cognizant of the means by which they were bought at that general election?—I believe that they were bought by persons who had been in the habit of canvassing, and they were entrusted with money; where they got the money from is no business of mine, and I know not.

2424. Do you presume that they were bought at the general election in the same way that they were bought at the previous local election?—I am certain they were, because I had one of the men that were bought, who brought the money into our committee-room and deposited the money when he was bought; he was bought openly in the street.

2425. Had it been the practice at previous Parliamentary elections for the borough in which you reside, to buy votes in the same way in which they were bought at the municipal elections, or was a different system pursued formerly?—A different system was pursued.

2426. By both parties in the borough?—By both parties.

2427. Will you describe the mode in which they were bought under the old system?—I think they were bought by the patronage of the corporation in some degree, by the aldermen giving our corporation charities, promising turns to the voters, or to voters' children.

2428. What are the general sums paid?—After an election there was what we call head-money paid; after the time had expired in which the Members could be petitioned against; we waited till after that time.

2429. What was the understanding with the voters about this head-money?—The understanding was that they were to have half a sovereign for each candidate, a sovereign each voter.

2430. In what way was that understanding communicated to them?—It was generally taken for granted that it was so.

2431. The custom of the place?—The custom of the place, and sometimes they used to say I expect to be put on as a chairman, and also to have the money after the election.

2432. In the event of their being refused to be put on as a chairman, in that case would they go to the other party?—Yes, and we frequently have done it; but when the contest runs high, neither party refuses it.

2433. Have you ever known any person who had applied to the other party for any appointment of this kind being refused, and coming to your party and getting it granted, and then giving you his vote?—Yes.

2434. What is the appointment of chairman?—Persons to carry a chair; there are about 50 to carry the chair, and we have known as many as 700 or 800 paid, although they do not carry.

2435. Are those voters themselves or connexions of the voters?—Since the Flag and Colour Bill has passed, they cannot be voters. Now when we are canvassing they say, "You must put on my son or my father;" they make a regular claim.

2436. Does that system still continue?—Not to the extent that it did; but it does to a very large extent now.

2437. On both sides?—On both sides.

2438. Do you conceive that to be a mode of bribery?—It is an indirect bribe, certainly.

2439. Are there any persons besides chairmen that are bribed in that way?—There are what are called the chair posse, and there are what they call the sheriff's posse. It often happens that we cannot promise a man's son to be a chairman because the list is full, and we say, "You shall be what they call a chair posse," that is, a man to walk by the side of the chair and take care of it; and sometimes we are obliged to pay him as much as though he was one of the chairmen.

2440. Are they also put upon the band?—Every freeman who can play upon an instrument, or fancies that he can play, makes a claim to be put upon the band; the fact is, that we cannot make a band without non-freemen.

2441. With regard to the flag-bearers, are they in the same situation?—Yes; we try to satisfy them with being flag-bearers, and if we cannot satisfy them with that, we put them on the chair.

2442. Is the pay of the flag-bearers less than that of the chairmen?—It is.

2443. It is, in fact, a mode of paying the electors?—Yes, and the applications for various situations average three-fourths of the constituents.

2444. What is the total number of the constituents?—When I say three-fourths, I speak of one side; the registration is 4018.

2445. Are there many applications of the 10% householders for those situations?

—Yes, there are many from them; the fact is, that in that place the small 10*l*. householders would become as contaminated as the others.

2505. Does it not operate as a great disadvantage to a party not having a contest on every possible occasion; do not the voters feel that it is a very bad policy for them to belong to a party which does not bribe them at every successive election?—Yes, they get dissatisfied; and if they go on any length of time, the men themselves will make an opposition; but unless they are paid, there never is any serious contest.

2506. Is not the result of this system almost always to produce a contest, in order that the voters may get paid?—Yes.

2507. Is the canvass of the freemen, that is, the corrupt part of it, carried on between individual and individual, or with the freemen assembled in masses?—Between individual and individual.

2508. Do you think that it is easy, by the mode which you adopt in carrying on bribery at the municipal elections, to evade the law which attaches penalties only when the bribery can be traced to the agents of the candidates?—Yes, I think it does. The fact is, that if there is a general election, at which neither party chooses to bribe, and the men become dissatisfied, you can then, at the next municipal election, pay them for the general election.

2509. Do the municipal elections afford an opportunity not only for bribing the men beforehand, as a sort of retaining fee, but for afterwards keeping them in check by the expectation of their receiving a reward for their votes at the Parliamentary election, by the payment at the next municipal election?—It has been done, and it is so now, I have no doubt; being losers, we have not paid.

2510. Do you think that the system that prevails there, of coupling the two elections, enables you to cloak the contract which has taken place at the Parliamentary election, by the payment in fulfilment of the contract, as for the municipal election?—Yes, I do. I have no doubt the election might be obtained in this way. The parties would say, "We cannot give you any thing for the general election; if you choose to trust to us, we shall have a contest for sheriff, or we shall have a contest for mayor, and we will treat you then as well as the others do."

2511. How would you bribe the 10*l*. householders?—We could not bribe the 10*l*. householders in that way, but there is always such a proportion of men to be purchased in this way, that would always swamp the householders and the freeholders.

5236. Is there much bribery at the elections for Members of Parliament on the night that elapses between the two days of polling?—I never knew any direct bribery for Members of Parliament before the election of 1832.

2476. You say that since the Reform Bill there has been no bribery at the Parliamentary elections of the same nature that took place at the municipal elections on your side?—On my side, certainly not; the fact is, I never knew our side go to direct bribery except by chairmen, posse and treating.

2477. The direct bribery on your side in 1832, was entirely carried on at the previous municipal election?—The direct bribery was at the municipal election and at the sheriff's election I have mentioned.

2478. Did you lose the two Members of Parliament for not bribing them?—We did.

2479. Did your opponents bribe?—Yes they did.

2480. Have you any evidence of that?—There is the evidence of ——— and others upon that subject.

2481. Could that bribery be traced to the candidates so as to affect their seats?—No, it could not.

2482. Is it within your knowledge that by the adherents and partisans bribery was carried on on the other side?—To an enormous extent; I am certain, from my knowledge of the constituency, that unless they had had a very strong influence indeed, they would never have done it. (pp. 135, 136, 140, 141.)

HARMAN VISGER, ESQ.

6308. WHERE do you reside?—At Bristol.

6309. How long have you lived there?—All my life.

6310. What are you?—A manufacturer and merchant.

6408. Was it not given in evidence before the committee that sat to inquire into the validity of the return of the election of 1832, that polling money was given on that occasion?—I could not say polling money; but for attendance on nomination day, 3s. was given to a large number of men. I had it before me, from persons who paid a good deal.

6409. Besides that, was it not given in evidence, that on the day of polling, a great many orders for drink were distributed?—Yes, I saw them at what they called the “bribery box,” which I can describe to you.

6410. You saw it yourself?—Yes, I stood by and saw hundreds going and coming. We call it the “bribery box.”

6411. What was it you saw?—It was a house and a bow-window fronting the street. At two sides of the window the shutters were up; the other side, a pane of glass was removed, and a sliding panel was substituted, and the rest boarded up. A regular stream of men came in and handed in a paper, and received out another paper. The paper handed in I saw, in a great number of instances.

6412. What was the nature of the paper handed in?—The paper handed in was what we call the scrip, being the number and name of the individual, which was given to each man to facilitate the poll.

6413. And which was the certificate that he had polled in a particular manner?—I am not sure that it was marked so, but it was the scrip of his own party; and although it may not be regarded as a certificate, the inference was that he had polled for his own party. He then received another paper in exchange, which, from subsequent inquiries, was proved to be an order on different public houses. I saw one myself, and I asked a man, “What have they given you?” He showed me, and I saw the name of White Horse, that being the name of a public-house in the parish where my premises are situate.

6414. What was the object of this bow-window and this sliding panel?—In order, as it appeared to me, that it might be done in secrecy.

6415. And did the man put in his paper with one hand and receive another paper?—Yes.

6416. This was an order for drink for another amount?—I think it was subsequently ascertained to be 3s.; I think I should remark that it was only on one side this was done.

6417. Was the offer made to the other side, are you aware?—I have already stated that, with the exception of 5*l.* or 6*l.*, which I have heard was spent on the Liberal side at Bedminster, in the suburbs, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and such is my entire conviction, that there was not one pint of beer given on the Liberal side.

6399. Have you heard of 7*s.* being paid as polling money?—I think it was 7*s.* 6*d.*

6400. Per head?—Per vote.

6401. Before the Reform Bill?—Yes, before the Reform Bill.

6402. Have both sides paid it?—Yes.

6403. If a man split a vote between the parties directly opposed to one another in politics, each candidate paid it?—I apprehend they generally did; certainly those opposed to each other in politics; but persons of the same politics were generally opponents.

6404. It went by the name of the compliment?—No, polling-money.

6405. What politics were those persons you refer to?—There was generally a Tory returned, by almost general consent, and the opposition lay between the two Whigs—an aristocratic Whig and a liberal Whig.

6406. Are you speaking of the elections between 1812 and 1830?—Yes, the old elections.

6407. Did it not come out before the committee who sat on the election of 1832, that polling money was paid?—The election committee of 1832—there was 3*s.* paid to a large number.

6559. Was there not also a society formed, under the name of the “Conservative Operative Society?”—There was.

6560. Which was very instrumental in inducing the freemen to co-operate together in support of one of the political parties in Bristol?—I view it as nothing but a cloak for systematic bribery.

6561. And that bribery directed principally against freemen?—Almost entirely. I may remark here, that by means of that society an expedient for virtually paying polling-money appears to have been hit upon.

6562. When was that association formed?—I have the book of rules, in June.

6563. Give us the year?—June 1832.

6636. Then you have no doubt whatever of this society having been intended as an instrument to promote the electioneering views of the Blue party?—Not the slightest.

6637. Did it appear that after polling they received any money or any order for drink?—At the bribery box?

6638. At the bribery box, in the way you described yesterday?—Yes; also what was called Blue beef at Christmas, which I believe was a cunning way of avoiding the name of polling-money.

6639. There was also a distribution of beef at Christmas, was there?—There was.

6640. To the members of the Operative Society?—Yes, and to all who voted.

6641. It was distributed under the name of Charity?—It was distributed very ostentatiously under the name of Blue beef. I saw some splendid oxen decorated with blue ribbons driven about the city about Christmas, and which were understood to be the oxen which were to be given to the voters on the Blue interest; this was Christmas 1832. I do not know whether I should remark here that there was another distribution of beef subsequent to the late election, ostentatiously advertised, which I will read. This is the Tory paper; the organ of the Tory party; Felix Farley's Bristol Journal, 21st March, 1835. "A subscription, amounting to about 800*l.*, has been raised in this city for the purpose of enabling the Conservative operatives to celebrate the triumph of their principles at the last election; it will be distributed amongst them in the course of a few days in bread and beef, that mode being considered preferable to a public entertainment, in which the wives and children of the voters would not have participated: the men will receive about 14*lbs.* of prime beef, and three quartern loaves." I saw cart loads of bread, and in one or two places crowds waiting about to receive this. There is no doubt whatever that they did thus receive this which was promised, and the value is as near as possible the 7*s.* 6*d.* polling-money. A petition was presented to Parliament, setting forth these facts, but at the time it was ridiculed. (pp. 375, 376, 392, 395, 396.)

JOHN SCOTT.

6745. WHERE do you reside?—At Bristol.

6746. What business are you?—A cabinet maker and joiner.

6747. How long have you lived there?—All my lifetime.

6748. Were you secretary of the Conservative Operative Association?—Yes.

6876. In some of the late elections do you ever remember bribes being given?—I have heard talk of them, but I have never had any myself.

6877. Did you ever carry about any money yourself?—Yes, I carried last year the money I got for the subscription.

6878. In some of the late elections to distribute to the voters to induce them to vote?—Never.

6879. Used they to distribute after the election?—Yes, the polling money.

6880. Not more than that?—I never saw any more; sometimes it was 15*s.* or 7*s.* 6*d.* a side, polling-money, the winning parties; that was a standing rule. It was 4*s.* 6*d.* when I recollect it first.

6881. Do you know a person of the name of ————— in Montague-street?—I cannot say I do.

6882. He split his vote, and was refused to have any of the beef that was distributed afterwards?—I do not know him, but I know some who split their votes who had only half the allowance of bread and beef, because they split their votes.

6883. Are the workmen generally expected to vote as their masters wish?—Mostly.

6884. Do you know of any men who have been dismissed because they

voted against the wish of their employer?—At that time I could have named some, but I have not any particular proof of it.

6885. There are many who have been discharged, but the master does not assign a reason?—Yes.

6798. Do you know any thing about the distribution of beef after the election?—Yes.

6799. What can you say about that?—It was given to those who polled in the Blue interest.

6800. Had you any of it?—Yes.

6891. Did you collect any of the subscriptions for that?—No.

6892. Who paid for that?—That I cannot say. (pp. 402, 404, 406.)

MR. JOHN SIRCOM.

6921. Do you live at Bristol?—I do.

6922. How long have you lived there?—Forty-four years.

6923. What is your business?—My business is an accountant, and teacher of mathematics.

6924. You are in the Blue Interest, are you not?—I am decidedly, and ever have been.

6925. Had you any thing to do with the formation of the Operative Conservative Association?—I had, after it had first commenced.

6958. In what way were you concerned in it?—I took on myself the office of treasurer to the Association.

6959. Who appointed you to that office?—The committee.

6960. Which committee?—The committee of the Operatives' Association.

7106. Had you anything to do with the distribution of what is called the Blue beef?—Nothing more than being a subscriber in the parish to which I belonged.

7107. Did you assist in distributing the beef?—Not in my own parish; but I saw the beef.

7108. Did you attend the day the beef was distributed?—I cannot say I attended at any one particular place; I saw the beef in a good many places.

7109. Did you or did you not attend at any place where the beef was distributed?—Not for the purpose of distribution.

7110. For what purpose then?—Merely to see the manner in which it was laid out.

7111. You were present then when it was distributed?—No; I was not at any one place where the beef was distributed, I only casually looked in before it was distributed.

7112. Did you subscribe towards the fund?—I did in 1835 subscribe my 10s. the same as any other committee-man in the district.

7113. It was given to those who voted in the Blue interest?—Whether householders or freemen; I wish that to be particularly expressed; and if they gave to one candidate one vote and the other the other, it was still the same; there was no distinction.

7114. Did you give to any householders who were not freemen?—There was no distinction made.

7115. They were all in the Blue interest to whom the beef was given?—No; you would not call a man who gave his vote for Sir John Hobhouse a Blue.

7116. Did any one receive any of the Blue beef unless he had given one vote in the Blue interest?—Certainly not. (pp. 407, 408, 409, 414.)

MR. JAMES HUDSON.

2120. What are you, and where do you reside?—A manufacturer, living at Leicester.

2121. Have you taken an active part at the last elections for Leicester?—Yes, till the last; I was so completely disgusted with the proceedings in 1832 that I was determined to have nothing more to do with them.

2122. Will the evidence you have to give refer to elections previous?—Generally up to the last time.

2123. From what period do you begin?—I have been generally acquainted with them from my youth; I was very active in the celebrated election of Manners and Babington; I think that must be about 35 years ago; but we knew very little about the corrupt working of an election till 1826. Mr. Babington and Mr. Smith previously represented the town; Mr. Smith for about 25 years, and Mr. Babington about 20 years, and Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Pares a short time. In 1826 the system commenced working in good earnest.

2124. Has that system continued ever since?—It has.

2125. Will you describe the manner in which that system works, in the first place with regard to bribery?—Simply in this way, that those who have the best purse are sure to be returned; politics are comparatively immaterial.

2126. In what shape was the bribe administered?—In a variety of ways; the general rule is to give a district ticket at the commencement; the town is divided into districts.

2127. Are those districts each under the superintendence of a committee?—Yes, or rather of an agent; two agents are appointed, connected with the general committee, to superintend particular districts.

2128. Are those district tickets given by those agents?—They are given by the agents of the committee from some of the workers of the committee. I find a vote in districts No. 8 or 2, or whatever it may be, I take it to the committee, and I get a ticket from one of the leaders of that committee that the man belongs to districts 2 or 8; the working of that ticket at the last election was this, that a district ticket for the —— party gave that man free access to all the public-houses for eating and drinking the whole of the time, and I think we never had so much eating and drinking and drunkenness as we had at the last election.

2129. That district ticket gives free access to all the public-houses for eating and drinking the whole of the time?—Yes, the man shows his ticket, and he eats and drinks what he likes, and is never asked to pay for any thing.

2130. Does that free access to the public-houses upon showing the ticket continue after the teste of the writ?—That ticket is given on the commencement of the canvass, or as shortly after as the voter is found, who applies for it, and it continues till the election is over, except that at the last election, the election of 1835, that ticket, after having been available for the whole of the canvass and the polling, was available on the Saturday night after the election was over, in this way, that they went to one of the agents of the committee and received 1*l.* in part of payment of money due to them till they could have a settlement of the account for their services; those district tickets, I should explain, are all supposed to carry with them the value of a constable's ticket for 3*s.* 6*d.*, or 5*s.*, or 7*s.* a day while the election lasts.

2135. Referring to the district tickets which are distributed before the election, they bear the value, you say, of 3*s.* 6*d.* to 5*s.* a day?—That is the understanding given by the runners or agents; they have no specific value put upon them.

2136. What do they bear upon them, what is written upon them?—It is a mere ticket or card, with the districts and the initials of one of the clerks.

2137. No name of the candidate?—No.

2138. Have they any seal upon them, or any distinguishing mark besides the initial of the clerk?—No.

2139. Are there any instances within your knowledge of their being sold for actual money?—No, they are only available by being presented by the person to whom they have been delivered; the name is called over, and the ticket referred to.

2140. Is the name of the party written upon the ticket?—Yes, it is.

2141. The name of the party is called over, and the money is paid?—Yes; when he presents his ticket on the Saturday evening after the election, his name is called over, and the district referred to; one gentleman says it is all

right; a sovereign is thrown down, and they say you may take that till we have power to settle with you.

2142. When is the final settlement?—I cannot tell that. In the election of 1835, all who voted for one of the parties received a second ticket at the inn where the committee sat; the voter, as soon as he had polled, went with the agent or runner to the committee-room, there he received a ticket with a stamp; that ticket which he received in the committee-room he was instructed to take to the head quarters of the party; he was admitted by that ticket singly into a room, and was paid by a stranger 10s.; they received 30s. besides their keep during the election.

2143. At any former elections with which you have been conversant, have you ever seen a similar practice resorted to as that you have described with reference to the polling tickets with the seal upon them?—Tickets had been given regularly by both parties at the last three elections, to my certain knowledge.

2144. At the polling?—During the canvass.

2145. You have spoken of two tickets, first the ticket which bears a value of from 3s. 6d. to 5s. a day, that is given at the canvass?—Yes.

2146. You say there is a second ticket given at the polling, is the giving of that new ticket at the polling a new practice, or was that an old practice which has existed at former elections?—An old practice.

2147. Will you confine your description of it to what you have known take place at former elections, at the election of 1832 for instance?—The arrangements of 1832 were made in the same way by the agents of the different parties, they took a ticket, and that was understood between the parties to bear a certain value which the different committees paid afterwards.

2148. Did they give also a ticket at the polling?—Not generally.

2149. Were there instances in which those were given?—Yes, certainly.

2150. How were those tickets afterwards paid?—By the committees.

2151. They paid both classes of tickets equally?—Yes.

2152. Were they paid by a stranger at former elections?—Certainly not; the case of the 10s. ticket I referred to in the election of 1835, was a remarkable case.

2153. What means have you of knowing that such payment was made, did any body tell you who had received money in that way?—Oh yes, I have been upon the committees myself at former elections.

2154. And have yourself paid those tickets?—I have known that payments were made from my own workmen, I know the last election, the election of 1832; probably I could speak to that more particularly by stating that I was on Mr. Evans's committee: Mr. Evans protested against purchasing votes, and his committee met for the purpose of waiting upon him; I was one of that deputation to tell him he would lose his election without, and he said, "Very well, then, I will lose it. I am obliged to you gentlemen, for your services as a committee; but if I am not to have them without making an improper use of my money, I must decline their services; I will not consent to a single shilling being spent for the purchase of a vote, but the ordinary expenses of out-voters must be paid." At that election the voters were paid by ——— and his committee.

2155. You know that they were paid?—I do.

2171. Are those district agents generally professional men?—Never.

2172. Have you ever acted as a district agent?—Yes, in 1832.

2205. The parties who receive the tickets which procure the treating are generally freemen?—Yes.

2206. Are any of them 10l. householders?—No; I should say that the 10l. householders, with very few exceptions, are not capable of being bribed.

2164. Do both parties pay alike, or is there a competition between two candidates standing for the borough?—A promise is made of a larger sum during the canvass than is generally paid, but the variation of price is on the second morning; there are a great number of the voters, after the state of the poll on the first evening is known, come into the market to know who will give them the most.

2165. Have those persons previously received tickets?—Yes, they have been feasting all the time; if they have been living on the candidate for a week, they do not consider themselves under an obligation to vote for him; they have their bargain to make afterwards as to money.

2166. They have their bargain to make as to the polling money?—Yes.

2167. Then the polling money is not a fixed sum?—No.

2168. With what description of persons do they make that bargain?—With one of the district agents; the committee appoint district agents.

2169. Is it upon the faith of the assurance of those district agents that they give their vote?—Unquestionably.

2170. They afterwards receive a ticket which they change for money?—Yes, after they have voted they exhibit their ticket; the list is then looked to, to see whether they have polled for the party, and then they receive their money.

2173. What are the instructions given to the public-houses about the reception of those persons who came with the tickets?—The houses are opened by individuals of the party.

2174. By district agents also?—Yes, by district agents also; they are opened first under the pretext of finding accommodation for the out-voters.

2175. Is that at an early period of the canvass before the election?—Yes.

2176. Is the landlord instructed to give meat and drink to any person bringing those tickets?—When the houses are opened there is one of the agents or district managers has the superintendence of that house from the committee; one of the committee generally visits that house every evening to take the chair and drink the health of their friends; it is under the direction of the committee agent, who allows voters to take there what they please.

2177. Does he make a bargain with the innkeeper?—No, I think not.

2178. Who makes the bargain with the innkeeper?—I do not think there is any bargain with him.

2179. The innkeeper provides the meat and drink, and trusts to the committee?—Yes.

2180. That money is never paid probably till the 14 days is expired?—There were several applications made by innkeepers, and they were told none of the bills could be paid till a certain time, that was until the rejection of the petition: they have been paid in part since, I believe.

2181. At the elections with which you have been conversant, was the same practice pursued?—In 1826 the expense was so enormous they did not get money enough to pay them for several years; they spent about 60,000*l.* on that occasion.

2182. Is that within your knowledge?—Yes. (pp. 120, 121, 122, 123.)

MR. JAMES FLORANCE.

693. WHAT is the number of voters at Harwich?—About 220 recorded voters.

694. How many of those have actually given their votes at any election since the passing of the Reform Bill?—The largest number, I think, was 198 at one election; at the last election 160, as nearly as I remember.

695. Is the number of voters, in your opinion, so small, that you believe the whole body of voters are within the reach of the purse of the candidates, if they chose to exercise bribery?—No. There are many persons of such thorough respectability in that small constituency, that they are not the subject of bribery; but there is an inferior party quite sufficient to turn the scale at an election, who are unquestionably open to bribery. I know about 20 or 25 of the lowest class of voters, who always wait until the second day of the election; and my own belief is that they receive considerable sums to give their votes, and they can make either scale preponderate. (p. 42.)

MR. JOSEPH PARKES.

1593. You have been engaged a good deal in electioneering affairs?—I have.

1594. As well in elections as in conducting cases on petitions before Committees?—I have.

1595. And also in conducting prosecutions for bribery?—I have. I will state to the Committee where locally I have acted; I have been employed in Cornwall 12 or 13 years since, and had the active management as the clerk on the Camelford Committee of Inquiry, which was a very noted case; I was an agent for Mr. Evans at Leicester, in the noted contest of 1826, and I was a principal agent of Mr. Spooner at Stafford, in the contest with Mr. Beaumont in 1827; I have been at two Coventry contested elections, in the borough of Warwick, and I have acted in the counties of Worcester, Warwick, and Stafford; also under the old system as a solicitor in Birmingham, I have been engaged frequently in finding out and sending considerable numbers of non-resident freemen, who, in a large town like Birmingham, belong to Liverpool, Bristol, Norwich, Worcester, and other towns; I was concerned for the Liverpool Disfranchisement Bill and the Warwick Bill; I also conducted Mr. Tennyson's contests at Stamford, and the subsequent contest by Mr. Gregory; I have now some peculiar cases from York and Leicester.

1596. Can you give the Committee any statement of the modes of bribery which you have observed practised at any of those elections?—I have seen various modes of bribery in practice, which I might class as direct bribery in small constituencies, and also bribery in larger constituencies. The close corporation system in Cornwall was quite a distinct bribery, and was conducted by the agents of the candidates and voters, but that I need not trouble the Committee about, because in point of fact small corporations are in Schedule (A.) such as Camelford, where there were but 25 votes. A deputation of electors generally made an arrangement for a certain sum of money, which was divided, generally, in equal proportions among the corporators.

1597. Does any similar distinction exist in the system of bribery pursued by the smaller constituencies now extant, such as Stamford, which is small as compared with Coventry and Leicester?—I consider that almost every place has a system of corruption peculiar to itself, where the same end is obtained, and the same system of corrupt practices prevail, but in different modes; I have seen many gentlemen openly pay down agreed sums, and before the poll, and I have been privy, that is, I have had a personal knowledge: generally speaking, the bribery is contracted to be done after the expiration of the period for petitioning; I am now confining my observations to direct money bribery, but which of course I do not consider to be the only species of bribery; money's worth is equally bribery. The most open system I have ever personally known practised is in Stafford, and where they have a very peculiar system of voting, which I will explain to the Committee, because it involves their system of bribery. The freemen there vote by the alphabet of their surnames; the consequence is, in a close run election, the persons who represent the lower names in the alphabet, below M particularly, exact very much larger sums than the electors of the earlier letters in the alphabet; and I have been present when very remarkable arrangements were made.

1598. A late letter is considered a lucky thing at Stafford?—It is considered a great risk, because the electors' gain very much depends upon the poll; about the middle of the alphabet a man may get little or nothing for his vote; one later has the chance of getting a larger bribe. I do not think the shrewd men in Stafford like to be low down in the alphabet, but it is the popular notion in Stafford that they get more by being later in the alphabet. The system of bribery at Stafford is rather altered at present from what it was 30 years since. There existed, I was informed by old freemen, a very singular club in Stafford, which they kept to a maximum number, or rather, to a minimum number, sufficient to carry the election, and they shared the money which the candidates brought; and it is singular that the club had a *tail* to it, that is, a class of voters who did not belong to the society, but who were candidates to get in, in case of vacancy, by death or otherwise; the tail frequently voted without money bribes two or three elections, for the chance of getting into the club. The club always maintained a sufficient majority, but not more than sufficient, in order that the plunder might not be too much subdivided. But the club has been long broken up. I have seen in Stafford an open treaty in our room by a very considerable number of the leading masters of the borough, who came to make

bargains for the men, consisting of the first shoemakers in Stafford, men of some opulence, who have been the bargainers for the price to be paid to the men; and I have seen the price of a boot rise from 5*l.* up to 14*l.* during the progress of the poll with two candidates, one raising the price above the other; and I have seen an instance of one of our own committee-men polling against us under a bribe, after he had sat with us three weeks. On our canvassing arrangements I have seen the bank notes paid to the masters for the men, where the masters were active electioneers on a certain side, and they made the bargain and took the money for the men, giving it to the men after they had polled, and on that occasion the agents of the losing candidate, Mr. ———, spent upwards of 6,000*l.* in treating, bribery and corrupt practices. I cannot state that I have a personal correct knowledge of the sum spent by Mr. ———, but I should think Mr. ——— must have spent from 12,000*l.* to 14,000*l.* in the town; and for weeks during our expenditure (as we originally contended with another candidate), and during the days of the polling, the most brutal drunkenness prevailed throughout the town among the lower classes. With the last election for Stafford I am not at all conversant.

1599. When was the last election for Stafford you were cognizant of?—the election on the death of Mr. Iremonger, after the election of 1826. The principal direct money bribery I have seen in the payment of money, has related principally to freemen; and what I am cognizant of from arrangements in other towns, and known practically, has been the system of bribery by some customary given sum paid the freemen; these sums vary: a very low sum is paid at Leicester, but which is so influential, that if not paid to one-sixth or one-fifth of the constituency they will not vote for a candidate.

1600. How is the arrangement made?—It is generally by honorary engagement with the agents.

1601. What is the sum?—In Leicester I think it varies from 1*l.* to 2*l.*; in York the sum is notorious to election agents; for a plumper 2*l.*, and for a single vote 1*l.* in cash; and in Hull there is a direct money payment to them.

1602. Has that been since the passing of the Reform Bill?—Yes.

1603. With that description of persons are those honorary arrangements made?—In point of fact they are always made, I should say, with, or indirectly through, the principal agent for the candidate, the gentleman most in his confidence in regard to the money arrangements; though he is not the mechanical perpetrator of the bribery, he is affected with a complete knowledge of it; for example, in the case of Stafford, which I attended, of course I had too much good sense to pay any single person myself. Mr. Ingleby, a most respectable solicitor of Birmingham, the principal agent with me, being my senior, we both of us detested the system, but certainly we were all cognizant of the arrangements made, and I should say we were so far implicated, that though we did not know exactly how it was paid, or by whom the money was drawn from our resources for doing it, we had a knowledge therefore, though participation in the offence could not be traced home to us.

1604. Who were the mechanical agents?—In the case of Stafford I can state now how it was done; we took a very respectable innkeeper of London, who was in our confidence, who lived at another inn, and through whom all the bank notes passed, and it was managed with certain parties from another confidential stranger who would take the money and dole it out to the masters. The money I frequently saw paid to the masters. That individual was sent out of the way, the London innkeeper I mean, pending the chance of a petition; indeed I have known in my own personal knowledge and practice, several individuals sent to France; I have known a clergyman in a Cornish borough sent to France; and out of the way many weeks; I have known a very respectable merchant in London, who managed a Cornish borough, sent out of the way to avoid the service of summons, and, as a clerk, I have gone backwards and forwards to him during the whole investigation of the committee.

1605. In those honorary engagements, who are the mechanical agents, as you have expressed yourself?—The mechanical agents are two or three confidential persons, generally strangers to the electors, brought down to pay the money; I should say that all the different sections of the bribed in the town have some

leading agent or active electioneerer, on whose word they can rely, and who is put in communication with the starnger.

1606. They look to a person upon whose assurance they rely?—I could name individuals in five or six towns, but I do not think it would be right, in whom the clubs had confidence, and if he gives them his word that he has secured their interest, they vote, and if it is not given, it is a hazardous contested election.

1607. Do they receive a sort of assurance from him that all will be right, or words to that effect?—Yes, that is the context of the understanding. There is another description of direct money bribery in my view, in relation to the freemen, very important to state, and that is, the habit of paying for their admission; that of course is now limited to the time of taking up their admission under the Reform Act, but it still continues previous to the registration; and it is notorious that the active agents of particular local parties of the town, or of particular candidates, are in the habit of regularly paying admission money to the town clerks, which I consider a direct money bribery, for this reason, that it is in my own personal knowledge if one candidate will not do it to secure their future votes by paying for their freedom, they will go over to the other side who will do it. The third class of money bribery, the most extensively carried on, is the payment of rates, and that is the only department of bribery that I can say I have been mechanically engaged in; indeed we have always had great doubt how far it was illegal; it has by most committees been held to be legal, but it is a conflicting doctrine: we never considered that we were doing acts of bribery. In the town of ——— I have known the agents take from the bank, or from the candidate's purse, money to pay up rates.

1608. ——— is a scot and lot borough?—Yes; I have also done the same in Stamford, and have ordered it to be done, and paid for it for two candidates.

1609. Stamford is a scot and lot borough also?—Yes; no freemen.

1610. Amongst what class of persons were those payments chiefly made?—For the most part the needy scot and lotters, and sometimes in instances that would surprise the Committee; persons who ought not to receive such a bribe from the candidates have had their rates paid up.

1611. Any 10*l.* householders?—I cannot state that it does affect the 10*l.* householders; I have known a 10*l.* householder a pauper, but only as a singular exception.

1612. Have any applications been made as to the paupers to pay the rate?—Constantly made, and particularly by the wives; indeed I might say that they, perhaps, for the poor voters, take almost a more active management of election concerns, as to the money, than the men. All agents (the first step in a scot and lot borough) ascertain the non-payment of rates, and in many instances we go and pay for persons whom we know to be in our own interest, and unknown to them, and for those who may be out of the town, in order to secure their votes.

1613. In that case it is *bonâ fide* a loan?—It is, sometimes; then, to carry out this part of the subject, I should state that there is an extensive payment now in counties of the shilling for voters; indeed I have gone with my friends and registered 150 at a time, paying all the shillings myself.

1614. Do they refuse to vote, unless the shilling is paid for them?—I cannot exactly say that they have made it a money bargain, but they object very much to the shilling; they think it an imposition and invasion of the right they ought to have without payment of a shilling; but, from their neglect to pay it, and the condition of some, we are in the habit of paying for many.

1615. Do you mean to say that the shilling operates as a bribe?—Yes; I should say it frequently did, in a limited degree, in many instances; I have been well aware of a number of persons so poor, that they could not conveniently pay that shilling for the purpose of obtaining their vote; and I can state a curious fact as to the northern division of Warwickshire, the other day, where the shilling payment operated very considerably in the division, near Coventry, in which there lived a number of poorer weavers. The Conservative agent registered 80 or 90 votes, who lived in a district particularly favourable to the liberal candidates; when our canvassers went to canvass the new voters put on the last year, they found a very honourable feeling among them; they would not promise us their

votes from the other party until we had repaid the shilling to the agent; I authorized a person to repay the money, four or five pounds, and I believe he did; they split for the most opposite candidates, the most Tory and the most Radical one, and I believe they all promised to vote exclusively for the Reformers at the next election, and I really believe it was a very honest feeling that they owed their votes to the Tory agent who had registered them, and from a feeling of gratitude. Being an important number, we had a good deal to do with them, and treated them accordingly.

1616. You have given evidence as to systematic payment of money; have you any experience of bribery carried on by more casual payments going on during the poll?—I should say that a considerable degree of bribery exists in loans of money, part of which are meant to be repaid, and part never are. I have seen a note-case of such vouchers, and it is a very ordinary practice to avoid the appearance of bribery, varying from 10s., on bits of paper, up to 5*l.* and 10*l.* and 20*l.* It is a very common practice to pay rent, because in many instances a landlord may be a man of opposite politics, and threatening his tenant, the voter goes to the party he adheres to, claiming assistance to pay his rent. I think there is another considerable class of bribery, in money's worth, promising premises to persons when vacant, and promising situations, and promising accommodation land to them. I have known numerous instances where accommodation land, in the neighbourhood of towns, is the most influential consideration which can be presented to electors.

1617. Employment?—Yes, and employment. In some towns the treating really amounts to bribery; the access to a public-house for weeks, for the saving their own money, and getting twice as much spirits and fermented liquors as they are accustomed to, is in point of fact a gift of money and material influence.

1618. Are those loans of money and payments of rents, and promises of premises, and so forth, effected principally through the agency of the individuals connected as partisans with the candidates, and not as recognised agents?—I should say that the latter, *viz.* grants of premises, are effected very much indeed among the active partisans and committee-men; but a great number of arrangements connected with such bribes come through the agent, are made directly through the agents, who know the individual connected with the party most likely to induce the voter, by promise, to vote. The Committee are probably aware that in many towns there are particular gifts of money's worth, pigs particularly; the evidence on the Corporation Commission shows, in one particular town, a pig is usually an additional bribe with money.

1619. It is not a cant phrase for the price of a pig?—No. Some towns are happily free from bribery, until, like a rot, it once begins, and then I have never known it leave a town; in Coventry, where there are the most corrupt practices, it has never been in my knowledge that either party has given money; I dare say there may have been instances without my knowledge, yet I doubt the degree, though it is a corrupt town in respect of elections.

1620. How do you mean corrupt?—There is the most systematic treating I have ever known prevail there, and the best managed. It has never been brought home to any candidate, though there have been many election petitions.

1621. Have the goodness to describe it?—The treating has long gone in Coventry by the name of "hot suppers and hot breakfasts," and there is a peculiar election beverage in Coventry, without which numbers of freemen hang back and are unwilling to vote, it is called "butter'd ale." The public-houses are open on both sides; the parties are known as the Sky-blue and the Dark-blue, or corporation and anti-corporation party, and both parties equally treat; there is a series of public-houses opened, and I should consider, as far as regards that, the innkeepers are thus subjected to a very direct bribery, and for this reason, in all towns I have known, in Stamford and Warwick, and Leicester and Stafford, the innkeeper comes to the committee room and makes a most direct bargain, "If you do not open my house, I will not vote for you." The profit they get by the treating of a particular candidate, is a most direct bribe to the innkeepers; as a proof, I have known one innkeeper change sides in Stamford, for the purpose of getting a better treating candidate, and change his votes.

1622. How long before the election does the treating begin?—It does not

begin long before, but it is carried on up to the very day of the poll, after the teste of the writ.

1623. Are you of opinion the innkeepers carry many votes along with them?—No, I do not think that they do; I think that the innkeeper is more often under the power of certain parties who frequent his house; he is not generally a man of much influence; indeed I know a very remarkable instance to the contrary: in the last election at Birmingham, where the innkeepers and beershop-keepers were much incensed against the popular candidates, Mr. Attwood and Mr. Scholefield, and where they threatened to oppose them for votes on the subject of the Beer Bill, and by which a great hubbub was created in the town, the non-electors frequenting their houses put out a public advertisement, calling upon the electors and non-electors to visit the publicans, and remind them of their interest, and thus to coerce their votes.

1624. Was that effectual?—Yes, I understand it was, and that the innkeepers, or many probably, voted contrary to their declared intentions.

1625. They were intimidated by their customers?—Yes, and I believe the Committee, if they inquire as to Stafford, may learn some very particular circumstances connected with the innkeepers there.

1626. You have stated that this treating at Coventry has never been brought home to any of the candidates, will you explain the mode in which it is kept out of legal cognizance?—I speak only with the knowledge of one side; I believe it is hardly possible to trace the treating system; I should say it is impossible to trace the money paid to the innkeepers to any person connected with the election, or to any candidate, but I should decline to explain why, and I do not believe there are above two or three of the most active agents in Coventry who are acquainted with the mode; I am sure the majority of the Committee are not.

1627. But the thing is notoriously done, and has never yet been detected?—It has not.

1628. Though allegations of treating have been contained in the petitions?—I cannot speak from personal knowledge of the allegations without referring to the petitions, but almost every return has been attacked on petition, and of course the party would have proved treating, if they could have availed themselves of the proof.

1629. Would it have been probable that if the one side had attempted to bring evidence of treating against the other, the other side would have retaliated?—Probably they would, and I think there is a very honourable feeling in some towns, not to avail themselves in their petitions of the corrupt practice indulged in by both parties, and particularly as to the freemen. I know we made a written arrangement in Stafford, that we would discourage any petition for bribery, and no person promoting a petition for bribery could ever appear at a second election in Stafford, with the least possible chance. I mentioned to the Committee, that peculiar customs prevail in particular towns; some towns are particularly free from certain practices of corruption, and other towns from other practices. I never heard in my life of a bribed voter at Warwick, till the election of 1831, though a native of Warwick, and present at many elections, and the demoralizing effect of it was most lamentable when once commenced. I heard it insinuated to have taken place in 1831, I am not sure it was practised then, but in 1832 it was most openly practised.

1630. Extensively?—The extent of it I should say was limited; but then the Committee should know that the previous return had been carried by only 16 or 17 votes.

1631. Have you observed a perceptible difference in the morality of the town since that practice commenced?—Very great indeed, from bribery and other corrupt expenditure of money, and also in the state of society. The consequences of these profligate contests are, I conceive, most extremely lamentable and injurious to the town; I do not speak with reference to any party, but I speak with reference to the conduct of both parties, not in bribery, because I firmly believe the liberal party do not bribe, but as to the state of society from party feeling and other expenditure.

1632. With reference to the state of society and the mischief, can you give details?—I should say that all parties in Warwick, before the contest under the

Reform Bill, lived on very amicable terms, both the higher and the lower classes in the town. It is scarcely credible what has subsequently been the effect of party spirit among all classes of society, even between gentlemen and the lower classes, and the consequences have also been most injurious to shopkeepers. The customers extensively transferred their custom, and the tradesmen complain that the wealthy landed proprietors and gentry in the neighbourhood have left them and gone to others; to a certain extent I should think both parties have practically resorted to very exclusive dealing, and all parties, more or less, suffered in their custom. Indeed I know that no prominent member of either party, generally speaking, would have now any dealings with men of opposite party principles; I know that intimate personal friends, and men who used to meet at the same table, are now on hostile terms, and that they speak one of another in language exceedingly disgraceful and very lamentable.

1633. Do you connect this with the introduction of direct bribery in the town?—No, with the general system, the mode of conducting elections, the party spirit engendered by the system.

1634. Do you conceive it to be consequent on the introduction of direct bribery?—Not consequent on the introduction of bribery alone, but resulting from the whole system of treating, and the election petition presented to expose the corruption, and the legal proceedings afterwards instituted.

1635. You have said that before 1831 no bribery had ever been practised in Warwick, do you mean to confine that expression to the payment of money?—Yes.

1636. A species of indirect bribery by loans and payment of rent and rates, and promising employment, and so forth, you believe to have been practised to a certain extent?—No, there was only one contest, to be called a contest, in Warwick previous to 1831, which was on the loss of the Catholic Relief Bill, there was a vacancy by the death of Mr. Charles Mills; Mr. Tomes was then a candidate, and a Mr. Wynn, a stranger, contested against Mr. Tomes, and made a very miserable poll; that was the commencement of any opposition between the two parties. There had previously been a sort of tacit understanding that the representation was divided between Lord Warwick's party and the independent party, and to show what little impression political opinions had with the constituency, Mr. Mills, who was the representative of the independent party, was as decided a politician as Sir Charles Greville; but to secure the independence of the town in one return, many Tory gentlemen who did not approve of the return of two Members in the interest of Lord Warwick, united with the Whig party to secure one independent representative at that time; this was about 20 years since, and the Tory influence in the independent party being the strongest, they selected individuals of consonant political opinions, and Mr. Mills being connected with property in the town and neighbourhood, and a London banker of very high character, was selected as the individual. When he died the liberal party had increased their numbers, and then they selected a liberal candidate; but I should say a great number of the old Tory party promoted Mr. Tome's election too; then on the Reform Bill the contest began by the return on the part of the liberal party of two Members, to the exclusion of Sir Charles Greville, and by a majority of only about 16 or 20.

1637. You say that bribery was not practised on one side though it was on the other, do you confine your expression of bribery to the payment of money?—Except to the payment of rates; both sides paid rates, but I have never known an individual of the liberal party give a direct money bribe otherwise than by paying rates. I should however say that a great deal of most improper conduct prevailed with that party by the arrangement of masters as to employment, and so on. I have been cognizant of a number of cases which I consider extremely corrupt.

1638. Do the political partisans on the liberal side pay money?—I should say there have been loans and assistance and arrangements for rent, and for the change of premises when they were turned out of their home by the opposite party, all of which were extremely improper modes of influencing voters.

1639. Offered for the purpose, and understood by the person to whom they are offered as being for the purpose of influencing his vote?—Most distinctly so. (pp. 88—93.)

ALEXANDER EDMUND COCKBURN, Esq.

3743. It is understood that you have had considerable practice before Committees of the House of Commons?—I have had some practice.

3744. And you have published Reports of proceedings that have taken place before Committees?—I have attended before almost all Committees which have sat during the last two or three Sessions, with the view of reporting the cases that came before them. (p. 210.)

3803. Is it your opinion that the practice of bribery has increased or diminished of late years?—My knowledge of the proceedings and practice of Committees has commenced with the Reform Act; but from the experience I have had before Committees, and from several cases which have come under my own knowledge, which have not been brought before Parliament in consequence of the anticipation of the difficulty of proof, I am convinced that whether it proceeds from the candidates or not, the practice of bribing goes on to an extent of which neither the public nor the legislature have any conception. (p. 217.)

3766—3759. You state that the great difficulty in detecting bribery arises from the present state of the law of evidence?—The principal difficulty, I should think, arises from that cause. I would say that, as the law now stands, I can conceive no case, except a case of actual infatuation, in which, if bribery is tolerably well managed, conviction would be possible. (pp. 213—212.)

These facts of bribery by system, are a ready source of perjury, and a deep blot upon our national character. Nor do they stand alone, but are mixed up, as in the case of Warwick, Stafford, &c., given in evidence by Mr. Parkes, with numerous other evils. And, what makes them so much the more disgraceful, they are appropriate, wherever they exist, to men of a station in society, who—resolute alike that they shall themselves be *protected by secrecy in the mode of obtaining votes*, and that the reputable tradesman shall be *exposed to publicity in that of giving them, with whatever injury to himself and family*—ought to blush not to feel better than to subject themselves to the undeniable charge of originating, and of keeping up the whole mischief. Till this state of things is brought to a complete end, never let either the position of the last witness be forgotten, or the words in which it is expressed: “*I can conceive no case, except a case of actual infatuation, in which, if bribery is tolerably well managed, conviction would be possible.*”

Scotland, as far as the evidence goes, appears to be comparatively clear of the guilt. But in Ireland there are instances, two of which shall be the finishing of this revolting picture. The one was at Newry, and is on the evidence of

JOHN CARAHER, Esq.

7389. WHAT is your profession?—A merchant.

7390. Do you reside in Newry?—I do.

7391. Have you been acquainted with the proceedings at the Newry elections?—Yes, I have.

7450. What are the number of votes at Newry?—I really forget.

7451. About?—About 850.

7452. Is there much desire among the voters to have the ballot?—Yes, there is; at the election of 1832, when Lord Marcus Hill stood, bribery was carried to such an extent at the election, that we desired any relief we could get as to it. (pp. 431,—435.)

The other, which gives five persons by name, bribers and bribed, was at Tralee, and is thus detailed in the statement of

Mr. DANIEL SUPPLE, JUNIOR.

12061. WHERE do you live?—In Tralee.

12062. What is your business?—That of a solicitor.

12063. Were you active during the late election?—I was.

12064. What part did you take?—The popular part.

12065. How long have you been employed as an election agent in Tralee?—I believe since the year 1818.

12118. Do you know a man of the name of——, a voter?—Yes, I know him.

12119. Do you know any circumstance relating to his vote?—I know on the election preceding the last he promised to vote for Mr. O'Connell; he afterwards voted for Denny; at the last election he promised not to vote for either party, but however he was put on the table on Mr. Denny's tally, and I tendered the bribery oath, and he refused to give his vote on that occasion; he afterwards informed me, that previous to his coming on the table he got from a man named——, whose name I mentioned yesterday, a sum of 35*l.*, and from a man of the name of——, a sum of 5*l.*, making altogether 40*l.*; that his name was put on two or three tallies; before that he declined coming forwards until he got the money, and that he actually had the 40*l.* in his pocket at the time I tendered the bribery oath, and which 40*l.* he retained, as he informed me.

12120. Did he show you the 40*l.*?—No, but from the appearance in his condition and change in his situation of life from that which it was before the election, he evidently must have got money somewhere.

12121. Did he say where he got the money?—He told me he got it from——, who was one of the out-agents acting on the part of Mr. Denny.

12122. Was it in Mr. Denny's committee-room?—In Mr. Denny's committee-room, immediately before he was put forwards; Mr. Denny got his voters into the room adjoining the court-house, and all they had to do was to pass from the window of his committee-room into the polling booth.

12123. Was the money given in the committee-room?—In the committee-room.

12124. So open an act of bribery as giving a man so large a sum of money as 40*l.* in a committee-room?—So he told me.

12125. Might it not be done very privately in the committee-room?—I do not know how it was done, I only mention what——stated to me; and the way I come by the knowledge of this fact was this, a petition preferred against Mr. O'Connell, and my being concerned for him as his agent, it was my duty to try and find out all the evidence that would bear on the case, and I have taken down here from the lips of each witness that were ready to come forwards to depose to these facts; I have the memorandum I took on that occasion from the lips of each witness.

12107. Have you any other case?—There was a man of the name of——, a tailor, this person also promised to support Mr. O'Connell, and, as he informed me, repeated applications were made to him on the part of Mr. Denny by some of his agents, one of the name of——, who was in the employment of Sir Edward Denny,——; and another, a man of the name of——; he also informed me, that he was to get a sum of 25*l.* for a cloak, provided he went to Killarney, and did not return till the election was over, and that on his return he should get a sum of 15*l.*; the offer was originally made, as he informed me, by——; subsequently——went to his house, and after some conversation with——'s wife, it was agreed that the cloak, which was hanging up, should be given for 25*l.*, and thereupon 10*l.* was paid, and the cloak delivered. Subsequently——voted for Mr. O'Connell, and at the very last Tralee sessions a civil bill was brought at the suit of this——against——, for the balance of the price of the cloak, insisting upon it as goods sold and delivered; on the hearing of that civil bill, Mr.——was produced as a witness, who was present at the bargain, and he proved the sale and delivery of the cloak; but on the cross-examination it appeared, that part of the condition was, that he should leave the town, and not return until the election was over; of course the barrister, viewing it in that light, dismissed the process.

12108. Were you engaged in that?—I was the attorney for the plaintiff, the case was afterwards reported in the Tralee Mercury.

12109. On what ground was the process dismissed?—The consideration being immoral, that was the decision of the court; —, the defendant, was in court, and on behalf of the plaintiff I offered to refer the matter to the oath of —, who was in court, but he declined to come forward, or deny having made purchase of the cloak; he refused to come forward. The case was fairly reported in the *Tralee Mercury*, and afterwards copied into the *Pilot*, and this before me is a fair report of the facts of that trial. I also hold in my hand the *Kerry Evening Post*, a paper in the interest of the Denny family, and it does not deny the fact of the sale and purchase by —, which I also beg to hand in, if the Committee consider them as evidence.

12110. Have you given a correct outline of the process?—I have.

12111. You are an attorney by profession?—I am. (pp. 698, 700, 702.)

The profligacy of the bribery practised at the same election, (of 1835) at Dublin, by modes in certain respects peculiar, is a matter of notoriety, from circumstances attending the petition against the return, and its defence. The decision in this case, however, was not till after the termination of the sittings of the Committee on Bribery and Intimidation. We now proceed with Extracts, important in no ordinary degree, considering the large portion of the constituency deterred from honest voting by the ruin in which such voting would involve themselves and families; that ruin, which the domineering spirit, whichever side it actuates, brings upon the respectable elector, upon whom, as he is not to be bribed, it vents itself by *exclusive dealing*; the customer assuming to himself the right of his tradesman's franchise, the landlord of his tenant's: neither are instances wanting in which clergymen thus demean themselves. So it is that men can arrogate to themselves to be the exclusive beneficiaries of laws, made expressly for the protection and benefit of others; to direct the judgment of those to whom the law has expressly given the privilege of judging for themselves.

INTIMIDATION.

Mr. F. I. GUNNING.

1. ARE you in the profession of the law at Cambridge?—Yes, I am a solicitor.
2. Have you resided at Cambridge some years past?—I have been residing there twelve years.
3. Have you been concerned at all in any of the recent elections for Members of Parliament at Cambridge professionally?—I have been concerned professionally in all the three elections since the passing of the Reform Bill.
64. Have you any suggestions to make to the Committee with regard to the kind of influence besides bribes, practised at elections, within your cognizance?—With regard to intimidation, I should say that the intimidation that is exercised at Cambridge is principally by the University.
65. State the different modes in which that intimidation is exercised?—I will state one mode in which the — has the power, and which he has exercised, of controlling voters.
66. What power has he over the voters for the borough of Cambridge?—I will state first, that in last November Term the young men *in statu pupillaris* at Cambridge that were residing out of the walls in lodgings within the borough, were 567, according to the return of the University officer. No person can receive an under-graduate as a lodger, unless he has a licence to do so. — has the power of granting licences at his pleasure, or suspending them, or withholding them, without assigning any reason for doing so; and

the suspension of a licence of that nature would be in many cases the ruin of the individual on whom such a power was exercised. Previous to the election in June last, ——— for the time being, who has very strong political feelings, sent round the ——— of the University (who is the officer who delivers notices to these parties to attend on the subject of licensing), to many persons so circumstanced to request their vote for a certain candidate; to many persons so situated, that message would be a command, and it would be acted upon. I have not any doubt that was done very extensively.

67. It was merely to request the individuals that they would vote for a particular individual?—Yes, a request that they would vote for such a candidate.

68. They acted, then, under the fear of having their licences withdrawn?—I have no doubt they did, and I will mention one case in which I conceive that power was exercised.

69. Was it exercised before or after the vote was given?—It was threatened before, and executed afterwards. Before the election in June last, the day appointed for licensing lodging-houses, was named by ———.

70. Are these licences renewable annually?—I believe annually; at all events periodically. After the day was appointed for granting these licences, an event took place which caused an election for Cambridge; ——— then altered the day for licensing lodging-houses, and appointed a day subsequent to the election.

71. Would the day originally fixed upon have interfered with the proceedings at the election?—If I recollect right, the day originally fixed was the Thursday in the week, and the nomination took place on the following Monday or Tuesday, and it would not have interfered. The day was postponed to the day subsequent to the election; no cause was assigned why it was deferred.

72. Do you remember the day it was postponed to?—I do not.

73. Was the day shortly after the election?—I believe within a week or ten days after the election.

74—5. Do you know of any instance in which you believe the licence was withdrawn in consequence of the particular manner in which the lodging-house keeper had given his vote?—I know an instance in which I think it was withdrawn because the voter had voted in a particular way. That voter was sent for by ——— before any election was contemplated, and ——— then told him, that in consequence of his having employed myself to apply to a young man, a bachelor of arts, for money due to him for lodgings, he should consider about the propriety of withholding his licence. I would state, that with regard to the part I took in it, my clerk was applied to, and he wrote a letter in the common way, requesting payment of the money. No process was served upon him; no proceedings were taken against him; and by the direction of ——— he came to my office and paid the money, thus acknowledging the justness of the debt. After ——— had called this voter before him, the election was appointed, and the day for the licensing was postponed; he then sent either his butler or the marshal to the voter, and requested that he would vote in a given way. The voter said he could not; he had promised his vote; and has he had promised, so he would vote, and so he did vote. He afterwards applied to the college of St. John's (who had before given him a certificate), but who then refused it. He then applied to Trinity College, who granted the certificate, signed by the master and Mr. Musgrave; and with that he applied for a licence; ——— positively refused it, and from that period to the present he has not had one.

76. Was any reason alleged at the time for the refusal?—The same reason was alleged, that he had employed me to write to a young man *in statu pupillaris* for money.

89. Is ——— also one of the magistrates who licenses public-houses within the precincts of the borough?—No licence can be granted but by the ———.

90. Was any influence exercised over the publicans?—No further than that the ———'s butler was sent round to them, to state that he had desired him to call upon them, and request their votes for a particular candidate; that he did that by the direction of ———.

91. Had that request, in your opinion, much influence over the manner they

exercised their votes?—I have no doubt it had some; I am assured that persons in expectation of a licence voted in consequence of that expectation.

92. Have the tutors of the colleges much influence over the tradesmen?—The tutors of the colleges have considerable influence.

93. In what way?—I will state one fact: at the last election 107 college servants voted; 70 voted plumpers for one candidate, Mr. Knight; 32 voted for Mr. Rice and Mr. Pryme; and there were 5 split votes between the two parties.

94. Can you state any instance of intimidation exercised by college tutors to influence voters; the class of voters I allude to are the 107 college servants?—My opinion would rather go to tradesmen. With regard to the college servants, I have been told many have stated they wished they could vote the other way.

95. Have the college tutors the power of exercising an influence over the tradesmen in the town?—A very considerable power.

96. In what way?—There are a certain number of tradesmen in the town whose bills are charged to the tutors: they are put in the college bills, and paid by the guardians or parents of the young men. When a young man comes up to college, a gyp is sent round with him to various tradesmen, and the student is recommended to employ them. If the tutors of the college should refuse to take in the bills of the tradesman, it obviously deprives him of a great deal of business.

97. Or they can pay their bills a little sooner or later?—Yes, they may inconvenience them certainly in that way, and it may have an influence upon them.

98. Do you believe any improper influence is exercised by the college tutors over tradesmen?—I do.

99. Can you give an instance?—Yes, I will give an instance in which a tailor was sent for by the tutor of a college at the first election (1832).

100. Could you, if required, give the name of the tutor and the college, and of the tradesman?—Certainly I could, if required. The circumstances were these: the voter was sent for by the tutor of the college, and required to vote for one of the three candidates. He stated he had promised his vote to the other candidates, and it was impossible. The tutor said, "If you are not with me, you are against me, and you must take the consequences." The man ultimately agreed to give one vote to one of the candidates whom he promised to vote for, and the other according to the tutor's wishes. On the day of the election the tutor twice sent to the man to state that he was waiting at the hustings to see him poll, and the man at last went with the tutor to poll, and he gave one vote for the tutor's friend and one for the other candidate, and the expression he used to me was, that when he left the hustings he felt that every one was pointing the finger of scorn at him for having deviated from principles, or something to that effect. From that time to the present he has never received any order from the college. His bills are not taken in, nor has he received any order from the college.

101. In that case there was a threat before voting, and punishment after voting?—Yes.

102. Have you any other instance?—Yes, there is another instance with respect to a shoemaker, whose bills were taken in; I can mention the name of the college and the name of the voter if necessary. He has voted uniformly for one party, the liberal party at Cambridge. Since the last election he was sent for by the tutor of a college who produced a bill of his against a young man, amounting to 3*l.* or 4*l.*, and who remarked, "There is one pair of shoes charged for here when the young man was not at Cambridge:" the voter said yes, he had sent, by the order of the young man, a pair of shoes to his residence in the country, and that was the pair he charged for. The tutor said, "That is against my order, and I shall no longer take in your bills." He does not take in the bills.

103. Is the practice of furnishing articles to young men not at Cambridge against the order?—I am not aware of any such order. There is another case with regard to the same voter and the tutor of another college. He sent for the voter and he stated to him he understood he had voted in a particular way, having promised to vote in another way, and he should not take in his bills. The voter inquired who gave him that information, and begged to know the authority on which the tutor made the charge. The tutor mentioned the name of the person who had told him (and whose name I can repeat if necessary.) The voter called

upon that person, and remonstrated with him, and was told by him that he thought he had voted so; but he refused to go to the tutor, and put him right on the subject. His bills are not now taken in by the college.

104. Was there in the last instance any allegation on the part of the tutor of improper conduct with regard to his dealing?—Not any. I could mention many instances. There is one more which I will give: a builder who had been in the habit of doing business for one of the colleges, was sent for immediately before the last election by the bursar of the college, who told him he was about to make alterations in the college, and consulted with him about the mode of its being done. He then said, "By the way, which way do you vote?" The voter answered, he voted for the liberal side; and being pressed to know whether he would not vote for the other side, and refusing to do so, the bursar said, "I will send for you when I want you again. I have changed my mind about the building." The result is, he has not been employed by the college again.

105. Have the buildings been executed?—No, nor do I believe any were intended to be executed.

106. You have given instances of parties being excluded from employment in consequence of their votes; do you know of any instance of parties being taken into employment in consequence of their votes?—I can state no instance of that nature.

107. Besides tutors of colleges, do you know any individuals in the college threatening to withdraw their custom, and afterwards having executed their threats in consequence of the vote given?—Yes, I do know of an instance of a threat before voting, and I know of an instance of a withdrawal of custom after voting. I will state two instances by _____ for the time being. The cases were these; two tradesmen, who are partners as booksellers, both voted in 1832 for the liberal candidates; before that period they had been uniformly employed, as I understand, by _____ to furnish the stationery required by the University: after they had so voted I understand the custom of _____ for the time being was withdrawn, and the subsequent _____ have not resorted again to those tradesmen: at the next election both parties refrained from voting at all, and at the last election they both voted for the Tory candidate.

108. Was any reason assigned in that case for the withdrawal of the custom?—Not the least reason.

109. Has the custom been since given to them?—I am not aware whether it has or not. With respect to those tradesmen, I will mention two colleges who had ordered their prize-books from them, but withdrew their custom also after the first vote. After the election in June 1834, two men employed in the University Press were discharged for alleged incompetence. One of those men has been restored; he did not vote at the last election, but he is known to entertain very strong political opinions.

110. When was he restored?—Very recently before the late election; and, as a proof of the capacity of the other, he has since been regularly employed in Messrs. Hansard's printing-office.

111. How did the man vote at the last election who was restored?—He did not vote at all.

112. Have you any other cases of individuals?—I will mention the case of an individual, the head of a college in the University; he sent his butler in June last to a voter (the voter being the college gardener), to require his vote. The man respectfully refused to promise his vote, and he was then sent for by the head of the college, who stated to him that he felt strongly upon the subject of the approaching election, and he would have no servant in his establishment who did not do as he himself thought fit.

113. Were you present at the conversation?—No, but I had it from the voter's own lips; and the voter is in London at the present moment, and can be produced. He did vote for Mr. Rice, and was discharged, and he is now employed in the Regent's Park.

114. Do you know of any instance of persons, not heads of colleges or tutors, withdrawing their custom from tradesmen, in consequence of their mode of voting?—Withdrawing employment from them. I will mention the case of _____, who is a brewer, and had employed a man a great many years as his

cooper; he is discharged since the election in June; he voted for the liberal party.

115. Had he previously applied to the party for his vote? I cannot speak to that.

116. Did the ——— take an active part for either of the candidates?—Yes, for one of the candidates, but not for the candidate for whom the man voted. There was another instance which occurred at the last election, at which a voter was discharged, because he voted for the liberal party; he was discharged by his master within a week afterwards, upon the express ground that he had given a vote for the party to whom his master was opposed.

117. Was the servant discharged in consequence of his absenting himself from his master's business for the purpose of voting?—No; I think the expression was, "What do you mean by voting for a damned radical like him?" and he discharged him.

118. Are there any more instances?—I have known instances in which parties have stated they have suffered by the withdrawal of custom generally.

119. Are those instances, instances which have had the effect of making people vote contrary to their conscientious feelings?—I believe a great many voters vote contrary to their conscientious opinions, from an apprehension that the punishment which has been exercised upon some will be also exercised upon them, unless they vote in a particular way.

120. Has it the effect in any case of deterring persons entitled to vote from registering their votes?—I am aware of only one case in which a party has expressed an intention of not being registered.

121. Has it the effect of inducing registered voters not to vote at all?—Yes, in many instances; I have known persons to leave the town for the whole period of the election.

122. What number of unpolled voters were there at the last election?—I think 60 good votes.

123. Out of how many?—About 1450.

124. Do you believe a large proportion of those 60 abstained from voting in consequence of their feeling it might be prejudicial to their interest if they mixed in political matters?—I believe some of them did.

125. If they voted on one particular side?—Yes; if they voted as they conscientiously wished to vote, it would interfere with their interest, and they therefore abstained from voting.

126. Has not a circular been signed by many members of the University, and sent round, condemning the practice of punishing voters?—Yes, this is the circular:—

" Cambridge 11th March, 1835.

" IN consequence of a very general impression, that intimidation and persecution were employed by some members of the University at the late elections for this town, we, the undersigned resident members of the Senate, deem it our duty to make a public declaration of our sentiments on this subject.

" We look upon the elective franchise as a sacred trust, for the conscientious discharge of which a man is deeply responsible; and every species of undue interference, directly or indirectly, with that trust, (such as threatening tradesmen with loss of business, or dismissing dependants for daring to judge and act in opposition to the political principles of their employers), is, in our opinion, a gross breach of public and private morality; being an attempt to constrain a man to do that which his conscience disapproves, by appealing to his fears and his interests.

" We trust that every friend of religion and morality, to whatever party he may belong, will agree with us in condemning proceedings so discreditable; which, by their cruel and degrading operation, tend to destroy the independence, the welfare, and the peace of mind, of very many of our fellow-countrymen.

M. Davy, D.D. Master of Caius.

J. Lamb, D.D. Master of Corpus Christi.

S. Lee, D.D. Trinity, Regius Professor of Hebrew.

H. J. H. Bond, M.D. Corpus Christi.

J. Cumming, M.A. Trinity, Professor of Chemistry.
 A. Sedgwick, M.A. Fellow of Trinity, Woodwardian Professor.
 T. Musgrave, M.A. Fellow of Trinity, Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic.
 J. S. Henslow, M.A. St. John's, Professor of Botany.
 G. B. Airy, M.A. Trinity, Professor of Astronomy.
 T. S. Hughes, B.D. Emmanuel.
 J. Romilly, A.M. Fellow of Trinity, Registrar of the University.
 G. A. Browne, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 J. Bowstead, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Corpus.
 C. Thirlwall, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 J. Hind, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Sidney.
 St. John Lucas, M.A. Downing.
 George Thackeray, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 L. W. Sampson, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 G. Craufurd Heath, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 R. Sheepshanks, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 H. Battiscombe, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 James Packe, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 J. Heaviside, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Sidney.
 F. Serocold Pearce, M.A. Jesus.
 Jos. Shaw, M.A. Fellow of Christ's.
 G. W. Craufurd, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 H. Gunning, M.A. Christ's.
 H. Arlett, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke.
 H. Calthrop, M.A. Fellow and Bursar of Corpus.
 T. B. Burcham, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 C. C. Babington, M.A. St. John's.
 S. W. Waud, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Magdalene.
 R. Dawes, M.A. Fellow and Tutor of Downing.
 P. Blakiston, M.A. Emmanuel.
 H. L. Jones, M.A. Fellow of Magdalene.
 C. Lofft, M.A. Fellow of King's.
 J. Croft, M.A. Fellow of Christ's.
 R. W. Rothman, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 J. Saunders, M.A. Fellow of Sidney.
 J. N. Peill, M.A. Fellow and Dean of Queen's.
 W. D. Rangeley, M.A. Fellow of Queen's.
 A. Thurtell, M.A. Fellow of Caius.
 R. Murphy, M.A. Fellow of Caius.
 J. Tinkler, M.A. Fellow of Corpus.
 A. Fitch, M.A. Christ's.
 B. D. Walsh, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 J. Mills, M.A. Fellow of Pembroke.
 G. Leapingwell, M.A. Corpus.
 R. Pashley, M.A. Fellow of Trinity.
 J. Kemble, M.A. Trinity.
 J. L. Cameron, M.A. Trinity.

127. What effect do you anticipate from that circular; do you think it will be operative at the next election to prevent the intimidation you speak of?—I think to a given extent it might; I do not think it will effectually; I think there is but one mode at Cambridge that will.

128. What is that mode?—The ballot. I think nothing but the ballot will have the effect. I am speaking against my former opinions; but from what I have seen, I am satisfied that nothing but the ballot will protect the timid and dependent voter.

154. You have spoken of the influence exercised over voters by persons in the situation of heads of houses, and tutors of colleges; do you know of intimidation arising from any other source from the populace; has not the fear of the populace had an influence over the lower class of tradesmen, such as hucksters and shopkeepers?—I should think not, certainly.

155. Would publicans be fearful of losing their customers if they were known to vote in favour of the unpopular candidate?—I think not.

156. Is there any intimidation arising from the popular feeling in consequence of a person voting in favour of the unpopular candidate; and does he not incur any risk of injury to his person or property, by having his windows broken?—No, I think I can state the converse of that. One of the candidates at the election at Cambridge, in June last, had in his employment a considerable number of bullies, who were paid to conduct and protect the flags, and who were in the habit, after the election in the evening, of proceeding with torches and music round the town, and have broken and done much mischief to the windows and houses of the partisans of the liberal candidates.

157. Were parties well protected to the poll against popular violence?—Yes; there was no violence, except on the part of the hired men. (pp. 1, 5—12.)

Mr. JAMES FLORANCE.

345. WHERE do you reside?—My office is in Parliament-street, Westminster. I reside at Fulham.

346. You are a solicitor, I believe?—Yes.

347. Have you been long in practice as a solicitor?—For nearly twenty years. I was admitted in February 1816.

348. In the course of your professional practice have you had much experience in the conduct of elections?—Very early I was engaged for Lord George Cavendish, and for Sir Godfrey Webster.

349. In what election?—The Sussex election, about 16 or 17 years ago.

350. Have you had more recent experience than that?—Yes, within the last seven or eight years, in several county and borough elections.

615. In what form do you consider that undue influence is mostly exercised, taking the counties and the boroughs separately?—With reference to Westminster, where there is a large constituency, I think the undue influence of persons in office ought to be repressed by some means or other.

616. Can you state the fact of any undue influence which occurred at the last election, of your own knowledge?—I can.

617. Would you be prepared with regard to those cases, to hand the names privately to the Chairman, for the purpose of authenticating them?—Certainly; but it is only upon the understanding that I do not improperly avail myself of or violate my professional privilege.

618. You are speaking of the last election?—Yes.

619. With that understanding give us some specimens, consisting of facts, of the mode in which the undue influence is exercised?—I speak of great men's liveried servants coming into a committee room and asking for information, and asking for their bills to stick up in tradesmen's shops, and inquiring what particular persons had a right to vote, and asking for canvassing cards of the candidate, and saying at the same time, So-and-so is our tradesman, and he shall vote so-and-so; and that Such-a-person is our tradesman, and these large bills shall be stuck over his shop.

620. Are you speaking of an official person?—No; a person of high station and influence.

621. Have you known whether they have stuck up those bills in the windows of voters who have been opposed in politics to the persons on whose behalf the bills were procured?—I have no doubt whatever they were taken to the tradesmen of that person.

622. Independently of whatever might be the opinions of the tradesmen to whom they were taken?—Yes, for the purpose of influencing them. I know also the servants of one of the public establishments had continued access to the committee-room, for the express purpose of getting cards to deliver to particular persons who might be influenced by that establishment.

623. When you speak of particular persons who might be influenced by that establishment, do you mean the tradesmen who were in the habit of supplying the establishment with articles for their use?—Yes, I do.

624. Did instances come within your special knowledge, in which solicitations were conveyed to those tradesmen by the servants or managers of the establishment?—I have seen many respectable voters who have told me that they had received hints from certain parties as to the way they should give their votes, meaning the parties connected with the public establishment.

625. When those voters mentioned what you have stated, did they seem to be under an impression that if they had not given their votes in that way it would have been to their detriment in business?—Yes. On the other hand perhaps I might be at liberty to say, that the influence of both parties was in a very curious position at the last election; a Tory administration had just got into office, and there was a strong belief current that they would not last long, and the fear of offending the succeeding administration operated very powerfully.

626. Do you state that from having actually heard voters express themselves so as to their fear from either the one or the other?—Yes, from my conversation in canvassing, I ascertained that to be the fact.

627. From the declaration of voters, who stated to you that they were under that influence?—Yes.

628. Do you mean to say that the apprehension of a number of the constituency included the application made by the servants of the establishment on behalf of a candidate?—No; with respect to voters influenced by the servants of particular persons, I think that influence is very great, and had an influence on the voter. With respect to the class of persons under the influence of pleasing or displeasing the succeeding administration, I think the class was much larger, many of them were prevented from voting for fear of offending the parties who would next come in; that arose from the state of things.

629. Then the effect of the expectation of evil from both parties had the effect of making them not vote at all?—Yes.

630. Is not the apprehension of having their custom withdrawn in boroughs, the usual form in which undue influence operates?—I must say that at Harwich, where the corporation influence is prevalent, I have known persons nearly ruined by adopting a line of politics in opposition to the corporation. I knew a tradesman, a most respectable man, who at one time had all the business of the members of the corporation, but who, in consequence of taking a course of politics opposed to the corporation, was almost ruined.

631. And is not the custom generally withdrawn without any reason being assigned for withdrawing the custom?—Yes; shortly after this individual took an active part, the influential members of the corporation called upon him for his accounts. That I have been told by the individual himself.

632. Was the destruction of the business, and the ruin of that individual, known in Harwich, and did it excite attention and talk?—It did; it was frequently said, "What a fool that man is; he is ruining himself by opposing the corporation."

633. Does not this fear operate more powerfully upon the political conduct of tradesmen, than the amount of money usually paid to voters can be expected to do?—I think it is more influential than money.

634. Is it not a question of life and death to the tradesman and his family?—Yes, it virtually operates so.

635. You have spoken of the influence exercised over tradesmen proceeding from classes above them; does it come within your knowledge of a similar influence being exercised over them by apprehensions from the class below them, from the working classes, who would give their custom to tradesmen or withdraw it from them, according as they voted in accordance with, or in opposition to their wishes?—I believe the lower classes of voters in Westminster and the small householders to be far more independent, and far less likely to be influenced, than the superior class of tradesmen are, and I do not think the lower classes unduly influence the upper class of tradesmen.

636. In Tothill-street for instance, and the lower parts of Westminster, do you not know that to be the fact?—I think they are less liable to the influence of threat.

637. Is it required of tradesmen, or is it for the benefit of tradesmen to exhibit the name of the popular candidate in their windows, and does their custom with their neighbours very much depend upon that circumstance?—I am unable to speak positively about the effect of such exhibition, all I can say is, that a tradesman of a great man has stuck bills in his windows in a particular candidate's interest, and my own opinion is, that he would have lost the great man's custom if he refused to do it.

638. Do you know of tradesmen being influenced in the votes they give at an election, for fear of losing the custom of the lower people?—I am not, I confess, at all aware of that.

639. Did you ever know of bills being stuck by tradesmen in a smaller way, at the beck of a number of poor men?—No.

640. If it were so, the ballot would be an equal protection against intimidation of that kind?—Yes, in my judgment and belief.

641. Has the apprehension of the loss of their licences in the minds of publicans, if they happened to displease the magistrate who demanded their vote, had the effect of influencing the vote of publicans within your knowledge?—It has not.

642. You spoke of some voters who, being under the influence of an expectation of evil from particular parties, thought it best to give no vote at all; was the number of these voters very considerable?—I believe it to be very considerable, and very extensive.

679. Will you state what you were going to observe with regard to the corporation of Harwich?—I think its influence is very great, and very unduly used.

680. In what mode does that undue influence display itself?—By the members of the corporation withholding or giving their support to a particular class of voters.

681. What do you mean by their support?—That they would withdraw their custom from persons who did not vote as the corporation and as the members of the corporation would desire.

682. Is that the custom of the corporation collectively, or the custom of members of the corporation as individuals?—It is with reference to the custom of those individuals separately, because as a corporation in the aggregate they have very little custom, I believe.

683. Are they the most influential persons in the town?—Yes.

684. And the wealthiest?—Yes.

685. I think you said a large number of persons were kept from voting at Westminster by intimidation?—Not by intimidation, as such.

686. By apprehension?—By apprehension of losing their customers.

687. What is the constituency of Westminster; are you aware?—I think the recorded constituency of Westminster was about 13,000 at the last election.

688. What was the greatest number who voted?—Only 4,500; but the number that might have voted was, I consider, about 11,000.

689. So that there were 6,000 who did not vote who might have voted?—Yes.

690. Was the poll kept open the whole of the two days?—It was.

691. Do you think a large portion of that 6,000 was kept away by their apprehensions?—I think one half of them were; but the influence of the peculiar position of parties was very considerable at the last election.

692. You allude to the uncertainty of the continuance of the ministers?—Yes; they had just acquired office, but were not thought likely to retain it. (pp. 23, 38, 42.)

Mr. CHARLES COWELL, *Ipswich*.

1460. DOES bribery exist among the better class of shopkeepers, as well as the lower order of shopkeepers?—No, I do not think bribery exists, but intimidation does.

1461. Do you conceive the ballot would be a preventive of bribery at Ipswich?—Yes, my sentiments are very strong upon the subject; I consider the ballot is the only security for the independence of the suffrages.

1462. Have you known bribes being given to parties to induce them not to vote at all?—I do not know of any instances; I have heard of such cases.

1463. You have stated that you do not think bribery extends to the better class of shopkeepers?—Yes.

1464. Have you not stated there was a great difference in the amount of bribes tendered, running from 30s. to 30l.?—Yes, that was with respect to the election of 1826.

1465. Was that difference in the amount of the bribes owing to the difference of the class of voters bribed, or the difference in point of time at which the bribe was tendered?—Both circumstances would operate somewhat, but principally I should say it was the time.

1466. Now, with reference to the exercise of intimidation, I think you stated that although the better class of shopkeepers were not much attacked in the way of bribes, yet that considerable intimidation was exercised over them?—Yes, con-

siderable intimidation has been exercised; I know several of the most respectable shopkeepers who would not vote at all at the last election, fearing to prejudice themselves with their customers.

1467. Do you know of any instance in which actual threats have been used before an election to deter them from voting at all, or from voting on any particular side?—I know of a gentleman who called on a shopkeeper, and attempted to influence him; but it certainly there had not that effect, for he was a wealthy shopkeeper, and a Quaker, and no circumstance would have influenced his vote.

1468. Do you know instances in which custom has been actually withdrawn after an election, in consequence of the manner in which any particular voter voted?—I know of several instances where individuals have been threatened with the loss of custom if they had voted in a certain way, and the accounts were paid up after they had voted contrary to the wishes of those persons.

1469. Does an apprehension exist in the minds of a considerable number of the shopkeepers of Ipswich, that if they exercised their franchise in a particular way, they would suffer in their business in consequence?—That impression exists to a great extent.

1470. Were those instances you mentioned at the last election?—Yes.

1471. From what class do they apprehend they will suffer in their custom, if they vote in a particular way?—There is a general impression in Ipswich, and I believe it is correct to a certain extent (how far I cannot exactly say), that the Tory party are consolidating and concentrating their power over the tradesmen of the town to bring it to bear upon the election. Without absolutely asserting such is the fact, I can take upon me to say there is a general impression that they are doing it.

1472. Is it by the principal customers in the town, or in the country around the town?—The principal customers of the tradesmen in the town, and the country for several miles round.

1743. Can you state any fact to justify that impression?—One of our witnesses, during the present inquiry, has sworn to the fact that one of the candidates told him that the Tory party had arranged a plan of exclusive dealing, and the impression has gone forth that that is true, and I have been told repeatedly by persons that they do believe it to be true.

1474. Can you state, since the election has taken place, in the beginning of January, that any instances of exclusive dealing have taken place?—A gentleman in the same trade as myself employed a butcher, who lived opposite to his counting-house, and he has vessels which this butcher supplied with meat; this man voted on the morning of the second day for Mr. Morrison and Mr. Wason; the gentleman called in a day or two afterwards, and desired that his account should be sent in; and he has bought nothing further of him, and would not even allow him to have coals or malt from his warehouse, but told him he would have nothing further to do with him. The man came to my counting-house, and told me the fact, and asked me whether I would have any objection to let him have coals and malt, saying the other party had determined to ruin him if possible; and he asked me whether I could, under those circumstances, have any objection to allow my captains to buy of him sometimes, as he was fearful of being ruined in consequence of the exercise of his franchise according to his inclinations.

1475. Was that man, who determined to close the account, was he strongly interested on the Tory side?—Yes.

1476. Which side do the gentlemen and clergymen in the neighbourhood of Ipswich take in politics?—The Tory side.

1477. Have they endeavoured to influence the votes of the tradesmen whom they employ?—One clergyman I know, who has made himself conspicuous at the elections, has closed an account with a friend of mine.

1478. Are you aware whether, previous to doing this, he intimated his intention of doing so, in the event of your friend voting against him?—I am not aware of that.

1479. Are you aware how long he was in the habit of dealing with him previously?—I am not aware of all the circumstances, but I believe ever since the gentleman came into Suffolk; he had not been there very long.

1480. Then, those two of the many instances you can mention, are the only two you happen to recollect?—I could mention other instances of exclusive dealing, and accounts closing.

1481. You have no doubt many instances have existed?—I have no doubt many more existed.

1482. Does a general belief exist in the minds of tradesmen, that if they vote in any particular manner, their conduct in voting is likely to be visited upon them in the withdrawal of custom?—Yes; when I went round canvassing I was told this repeatedly,—“We were injured last time in consequence of voting for Mr. Morrison and Mr. Wason, and they have not protected us by the ballot, and we do not think we are called on to make the same sacrifice again for them;” that was the frequent reply that was made to me when I was canvassing.

1483. Do you know whether the persons who gave that answer to you, voted at all at the last election, and whom they voted for?—Several of them did not vote at all.

1484. In the course of your canvass, did you find voters who told you, “We are willing to vote for you, if a case of necessity arises, or we are sent for, but we would rather not be called upon to vote, unless it is a case of necessity?”—Many.

1485. In point of fact, did you call upon voters who made that answer to you, to come up and vote on the second day?—I did, and was, at the time the poll closed, with two very respectable tradesmen in Ipswich, who placed themselves in my hands in this way; one of them sent a message to me about nine or ten o'clock in the morning of the second day, requesting to see me; I called, and he told me it would be very unpleasant for him and his friends to be called upon to vote, they wished not to vote; but if at any time I could come to them and say we had reason to believe their votes would turn the election, they would not hesitate to come up and poll; they said, we will leave it to you altogether, as a point of honour, but do not call upon us unless our votes are essential to carry the election; if they are we will come, but do not place us in the situation of offending our friends, if we merely swell the minority; and in consequence I waited with the gentlemen till the poll closed, and did not ask them to go and vote. Several more tradesmen acted on the same principle, and did not vote.

1486. In most of the cases where custom is withdrawn, supposed to be in consequence of voting, has it been done without the party withdrawing the custom assigning any reason for it, but being totally silent?—I think, generally speaking, the reason has not been assigned.

1491. When a gentleman has gone into the shop of a tradesman with whom he has been in the habit of dealing, and asked for his vote with an appearance of great interest, is not the effect upon that tradesman's mind such as to induce him to believe that if he does not give the vote, he runs great risk of the loss of that gentleman's custom, whether he holds out any direct threat or not?—Without a doubt, and I have known instances in which it has produced that effect.

1492. Have you not yourself people under your own influence in giving their votes?—Yes.

1493. Did you not make an application to the carter you mentioned because the carter was in your employment?—I made the application to him because I happened accidentally to meet him in the street.

1494. If you had not employed the carter, if you had met him accidentally in the street, would you have applied to him?—Probably not.

1495. Did you not exercise to a certain extent an influence over him, as his employer?—Doubtless.

1496. Did you, in making the application to him, indirectly express or intimate to him the relation in which you and he stood towards each other?—I do not believe I did; it was not necessary for me to do so; I was a large employer of his, and he felt the influence, I am persuaded, when I asked him.

1497. You stated that in 1832 there was a great deal of political excitement in Ipswich, are there not some classes of tradesmen who are under the influence of the gentry, and another class under the influence of the mass of the people?

—Yes.

1498. In times of political excitement, do you not think there is a class of

tradesmen who would be controlled by the exercise of what is called public opinion in giving their votes?—I think in our constituency it would not have that effect; they certainly are influenced by public opinion in the same way as every man is influenced to a certain extent by the opinions of the persons around him.

1499. Can you not conceive the case of a conservative tradesman being controlled and intimidated by the exercise of popular feeling?—Not among our constituency.

1500. Are there many publicans in Ipswich?—Yes, about 100.

1501. Do they depend for their custom upon the body of the people?—Yes, I think they do.

1502. If in 1832 many of the publicans had voted in the Tory interest, do you not think they would have suffered injury from it?—No, for this reason; the corporation, with their funds and places, have always a great power over a certain class, or certain number of the poorer class of the community, who would support such publicans.

1503. Would not publicans in their interest have lost some of their customers among the popular party?—I dare say they would.

1504. Does not the popular party exercise a control on the one side as well as the corporation on the other, and would not the ballot correct both?—The ballot would undoubtedly correct both.

1505. Is it not desirable that a tradesman of conservative principles should give his vote according to his conscience?—Beyond a doubt.

1506. And if there was any control exercised over his vote at present by reason of his customers being of reform principles, the ballot would correct that control as well as the influence of the gentry in the other cases?—Yes.

1507. Do you think the ballot would protect parties who were required by their employers not to vote at all?—It certainly would not protect them, because they would be seen entering the booth; for instance, I have several men whom I employ who are voters, and though I did not see them myself go in, other persons would inform me.

1508. Suppose you made it a condition of their remaining in your employment that they should not vote at all, would the ballot protect them in voting?—Of course it would not.

1509. But would it not restrain your interference, or that of any other master, to the simple case of voting or not voting?—Certainly.

1510. Then would it not reduce the mischief to one-half?—Undoubtedly.

1511. Is it not the mischief of preventing men desirous of voting on one side from not voting at all, only one-half the mischief occasioned by compelling men to vote against their consciences?—Certainly.

1512. Is there any feeling in favour of the ballot gaining ground at Ipswich?—The events at the last election I would say have materially strengthened the feeling in favour of the ballot; for instance, many of my own particular friends, who were heretofore strongly opposed to the ballot, have now declared themselves converts to the ballot.

1513. Do not tradesmen feel themselves now exposed to inconveniences from which the ballot would relieve them?—Certainly.

1514. In referring to the last election, do you mean the intimidation that was used, or the extent that bribery was practised?—Both.

1515. Have they become advocates for the ballot partly from the feeling that it would check the extent to which bribery has been committed?—Yes.

1516. With a view to the general morality of the town?—Yes, the pure exercise of the suffrages.

1517. Who grants publicans licences at Ipswich?—The magistrates.

1518. Are they borough magistrates?—Yes.

1519. Connected with the corporation?—As the charter is constituted, both parties in the corporation are magistrates.

1520. Do you believe the granting publicans licences is made use of for election purposes?—I do not think it is.

1521. Is that because there are two parties, and the one party would counter-vail the other?—Exactly so.

1522. Is it within your experience that, in the course of your canvass, a great many persons have concealed from the canvassers and their neighbours what their intentions were with respect to their vote up to the very last period of the poll?—I think many have done so.

1523. Have they done so with a view to the protection of their own interests?—Many I have known to do it with a view to prevent the exercise of intimidation.

1580. Is there a disposition on the part of the Whig or the Tory party to enter into any undertaking as to exclusive dealing?—I never heard of it beyond what I have stated.

1581. Not as a means of defence?—I have not.

1582. Do you yourself prefer dealing with those who vote with you?—I will tell you what I have done since the last election; I have employed as my tradesmen two or three persons simply from the fact of their having been discharged by the other party.

1583. Do you think you would be doing a right thing to withdraw your custom from a tradesman, with whom you had dealt for some years, and who had given you no cause of dissatisfaction, simply because he voted upon the opposite side to you at the election?—I should not.

1584. Was the custom which you distributed after the last election amongst the tradesmen withdrawn from persons who voted in the opposite interest to you?—I would not say that it was withdrawn at all, but that I extended it among these; I have not withdrawn it, but merely extended it amongst those, in consequence of their having been injured by the withdrawal of custom by the opposite party.

1585. Then, instead of employing one, you have employed four or five?—Yes. (pp. 80, 84—87.)

MR. JAMES HUDSON.

2256. Is there any system of exclusive dealing resorted to by either party in the town of Leicester?—Yes, there is a great deal of very bad feeling after an election.

2257. Is there any on the part of workmen and people in that class of life?—That depends upon how the state of trade is; if trade is very good, we are anxious to please our men, and do not contend the point with them; if trade is bad, a man does not dare vote against the wishes of his master; many of them are told, if you do not vote for me, I will take your frames from you; but that is generally met, as there is a considerable portion of manufacturers on both sides. In 1832, there were a great number of frames changed hands. In 1832, it was said, if you do not vote for us, we will turn you off; that brought forward the opponents, that work would be given to any extent to men who lost their work by their vote.

2258. Did that cause any ill feeling between the masters and the workmen as a class?—No; this year trade has been very good, and it was about as much our interest to please our men, as our men to please us.

2259. The last election they voted pretty much as they pleased?—Yes, they did so, with this difference, that on the one part there were open houses the whole of the time, on the other there were not, and the men rather chose to go where they would get plenty of eating and drinking.

2260. When trade is good, is there any influence exercised by men over the tradespeople who supply them?—No; there are a number of retail shopkeepers decline to vote altogether; they do not vote, because they know they shall lose some of their customers if they do; the election is followed by a very ill feeling.

2261. Customers of what class?—I heard a conversation with a lady, and she said, "We should not think now of dealing with a man who voted against us;" it is a feeling which is now increasing very much.

2262. Do you find persons keeping the small provision shops under any influence; persons not dealing with the higher classes?—No.

2263. Do not you find them under obligation to the lower classes?—No, the obligation is the other way; they make advances to our workmen on their wages;

they are generally in debt to the shopkeepers; they consider that they keep pretty straight if they pay on the Saturday night for what they have had during the week, and they consider themselves entitled to credit for another week. (p. 127.)

MR. THOMAS EDGORTH.

3077. You are a solicitor at Wrexham, in Denbighshire?—I am.

3078. Have you had a knowledge of the elections for the Denbigh county, and also the elections for a district of boroughs in Denbighshire?—For the boroughs, as far as regards Wrexham and Holt.

3079. What are the boroughs?—The boroughs were Denbigh, Ruthin and Holt; and under the Reform Act, Wrexham, added to those three boroughs.

3080. Does your knowledge extend to the two elections since the Reform Act passed?—Yes.

3081. Was there any contest in the last election, and also at the preceding election?—There was both times,

3091. Are you acquainted with any instances of influence exercised over the electors, to induce them to vote against their own preference?—Yes, I am acquainted with many. 3098. There is a case that made very great talk at the time; the man kept a public-house in the town, and worked as a journeyman saddler with a person who has the largest concern of that kind in Wrexham, and works for most of the families in the neighbourhood; he had promised Mr. Madocks, and he came to me a few days before the polling, in a very excited state; he said, "I am afraid I shall come to harm through voting for Mr. Madocks;" I said, "I hope not: what is the matter?" "Why, my mistress has just sent for me to say, that if I vote for Mr. Madocks she will give me the bag," meaning thereby that she would discharge him from employment. "Oh!" I said, "she will never do that;" he said, "I am afraid she will; I have worked for her 25 years too;" and he seemed very much excited: I said, "Well, what do you mean to do?" "Do," he said: "I will vote for Mr. Madocks, if I go to the parish," and he threw his hat upon the table in great excitement. He persisted in voting for Mr. Madocks, and he was discharged from his work, and he has now set up a small place for himself; he keeps a public-house, and a supper was given at his house by some of those that thought with him, as a sort of recompense. There was a stone-mason who had promised his vote for Mr. Madocks; I passed his yard, and in consequence of what I heard, I went to him, and I said, "Was he going to vote for Mr. Wilson Jones?" he said he was; I said, "What is the reason of that, after promising Mr. Madocks?"—"Well," he said, "a lady in the neighbourhood," whom he mentioned, "has called upon me, and said that I shall not do any more work for her if I do not vote for Mr. Jones, and I have done a great deal, and I expect to do more, and I cannot lose my living." 3099. There was another person who was very warm for Mr. Madocks in the early part of the canvass, so much so that a relation of his, an old man, having previously promised Mr. Wilson Jones, and who seemed very steady in his determination to keep his promise—his nephew, who is the elector I am speaking of now, said he was sure that his uncle had not understood the matter entirely, because he knew that his political principles were favourable to Mr. Madocks, and that he would take care to explain how the matter stood, and he was sure that he would then vote for Mr. Madocks. This elector himself was sent for up to one of the inns, a short time previous to the election, and a gentleman for whom he had done a good deal of work, pressed him very much to vote for Mr. Wilson Jones; in fact there were two or three there whose names were mentioned; one of them was very warm, and said that if he did not vote for Mr. Wilson Jones, he should never set his foot on his premises again; and the elector told me afterwards that a relation of his is a tenant of this gentleman, and wished to be allowed some draining tiles from his landlord; his landlord said he should not have them without he voted for Mr. Wilson Jones; he did vote for Mr. Wilson Jones, but his uncle whom he had prevailed upon, and to whom he had taken so much pains to explain Mr. Madocks's political principles, voted for Mr. Madocks. This interference

of the neighbouring gentry caused many of the electors not to vote all; though they had promised to vote for Mr. Madocks, they would not go so far to break their words and vote against him, but they were afraid to vote for him; I have several instances of that; one, an old man, kept out of the way the first day; the second day he was seen at a distance by some one, and a regular chase was commenced after him; some of the townsmen thought they had sufficient influence to bring him up to vote if they could discover him; however, he could not be found anywhere; I myself joined in the search for him. I met him shortly afterwards, and ascertained why he did not vote; he said that so many of his customers in the neighbourhood had requested him to vote for Mr. Wilson Jones, that he was afraid to vote for Mr. Madocks. 3100. There was another person, a shopkeeper in the town, he certainly did vote, but he said he did it at a very great risk, for he had been called upon by so many of the neighbouring gentry, who were all good customers; that he had been harassed very much indeed about it. They had argued with him in this way: "You are going to vote against our interests, and we support you, and we do not see why you should not support us;" and he told me that one in particular, whose name was mentioned, had ceased to come to his shop since he had voted; I have been told of that by other electors, that gentlemen in the neighbourhood who had previously dealt with them, had ceased to do so since the election. I know two instances besides the one I have now mentioned, of two different gentlemen in the neighbourhood and two different tradesmen, and the expression made use of by the tradesmen was, "I am afraid I have lost Mr. So-and-so's custom, for he has not been in the shop since the election. There was another voter whom I always looked upon as a man of decided political principles, a man of respectable business, always expressed himself strongly upon political questions, and when he was canvassed, he declined promising his vote to Mr. Madocks, which I was very much surprised at; however, he resolutely refused to promise, and eventually voted for Mr. Wilson Jones; I asked him after the election was over why it so happened; he said, "I was so situated that I was obliged to sacrifice my wishes to the wants of my family." I said to him, "Had any thing been said to you?" I mentioned a gentleman's name whom he alluded to, and said, "Did he say any thing to you?" he said, "No, but sufficient hints have been given to me, and I knew what the consequence would be if I did otherwise." Now very recently an association has been formed in the town for the purpose of registering, and small subscriptions of about 5s. a-piece have been given by different tradesmen; this person has given more than any of them, but he has given it as an anonymous donation; he told me that he did not dare to let his name be seen to such a thing.

3101. But he told you himself that he was the anonymous donor?—Yes, I received it through the medium of a third person, and I said to him a short time afterwards, "I think I received a sum of money on your account." "Yes," he said, "you did, but it must not be known that I gave it." (pp. 180—183.)

MR. JAMES LUNN.

3194. You are a resident at Ripon, I believe?—Yes.

3195. What is your profession or business there?—A grocer.

3196. Have you had experience of the last two elections at the town of Ripon?—Yes, I was engaged in them both.

3361. With regard to shopkeepers in Ripon, are you acquainted with any case in which shopkeepers have sustained loss of custom from any quarter, in consequence of their having voted in 1832?—I must speak of myself; to speak on my own account, we did sustain loss; Mr. ———— was a great friend of ————, and he was a very good friend of ours, but when the election for 1832 took place, he immediately withdrew his account; up to that time he was a very good customer.

3362. Were you employed in the register of voters at Ripon in 1833?—Do you mean in the barrister's court?

3363. Yes.—I sat there every day.

3364. You were employed?—No, I was not employed; but I happened to be on the committee, and I was requested to go there.

3365. You acted, however, as a solicitor in opposing the votes of those who were supposed to be in the Conservative interest?—Yes.

3366. You acted gratuitously?—Yes.

3367. Being a member of a committee formed for that purpose?—Yes.

3368. Was this withdrawing of custom preceded by any notification to you that if you acted in a certain way the custom would be withdrawn?—Not at all.

3369. Or that it had been withdrawn in consequence of your taking a certain political part?—It was withdrawn without giving any reason.

3370. To whom was the custom transferred?—To shopkeepers of the opposite interest, of course.

3371. Do you know their names?—I dare say it was a good deal divided after it was taken from us. Mr. ——— used to pay us about a hundred a year, I dare say.

3372. It seldom occurs in these cases that there is any previous threat, or reason assigned afterwards, that the custom has been withdrawn in consequence of the political part a person has taken?—It was taken away without giving any reason, in my case, and I should think in other cases.

3373. Can you give me the names of any persons Mr. ——— has employed since he left you?—There is Mr. ——— and Mr. ——— and Mr. ———

3374. He has transferred his custom to them?—Yes.

3375. How long have you been a grocer?—Nine years.

3376. Is this the first occasion on which you voted on that side of the question?—I had no vote till the passing of the Reform Bill; the voting was confined to burgage tenements.

3377. Have you had an accession of custom from other quarters?—Yes.

3378. Were there any other accounts that you lost?—Yes, we lost Dr. ———'s.

3379. Was that a valuable custom to you?—Yes, it was a very good account.

3380. Probably this disposition to deal with parties of the same political opinions with the customer prevailed on both sides, both on the popular and the anti-popular side?—Very likely it might.

3381. You think it did?—I think it very likely; there was a great deal of bad feeling at the time.

3382. Had any of the persons who have transferred their accounts to you since the election of 1832, been in the habit of dealing previously with tradesmen in the opposite political interest; you were understood to say that certain parties had transferred their accounts to you?—I was asked whether we had acquired any fresh customers, and I said we had.

3383. Now had any of these fresh customers been in the habit, previously, of dealing with parties in the opposite political interest to yourself?—I should think they had.

3384. Therefore this practice prevailed on both sides?—Yes, I believe it did. (pp. 190, 197, 198.)

MR. WILLIAM CRAVEN.

3422. You are a solicitor at Halifax I believe?—Yes.

3423. And clerk to the magistrates?—Yes.

3424. You have a partner who takes the opposite side of the question, have you not?—Yes.

3425. What is the name of that partner?—Stansfield.

3426. You were upon the committee of the Blue interest, I believe, at the last two elections at Halifax?—Yes.

3427. You did not come up on purpose for this occasion, and have not, it is feared, very perfect information as to the number of voters and inhabitants?—I dare say I could tell within a few.

3428. Can you tell how many voters were on the register in 1832?—From 500 to 520.

3429. And in 1835?—About 640.

3466. Had you occasion in the course of the election (of 1832,) to canvass any persons?—Yes.

3467. During the polling days?—No, I do not think I did; I think I was at one of the booths as a check clerk.

3468. How long before the nomination day was it that you canvassed?—I canvassed up to the time of the nomination. I was merely actually not canvassing when I was in the booths.

3469. The feeling among the labouring classes was very strongly on the one side and against the Blue interest?—It was.

3470. In the course of your canvass did you find any voters who were influenced by fear of that?—Yes.

3471. What class of persons especially did you find subject to that influence?—Beer-shop keepers and small shopkeepers.

3472. Did they give you any reason for not voting for the Blues?—I have no doubt there were several of them; I can recollect one in particular, who stated he should be very glad, but he really dared not, for he should have some injury committed upon him.

3473. Did you hear from any voters that the lower classes came to them and told them if they did not vote for their candidates they would refrain from coming to their houses?—I do not recollect that at the first election.

3474. Do you mean, you do not remember an instance of that kind coming within your knowledge, or that you did not hear of such a thing?—I heard of such a thing at the first election, but I did not hear it from any of the parties themselves.

3475. Did you hear it from parties who induced you to believe it?—Certainly.

3476. How did the beer-shop keepers and small provision keepers in general vote upon that occasion?—With very few exceptions, in favour of Mr. Stocks or Mr. Briggs.

3477. You are of opinion, from your knowledge of those persons, that there were a considerable portion of them who voted for Mr. Stocks and Mr. Briggs, in consequence of the fear of losing custom, and not in consequence of their political opinions?—Certainly.

3478. Were there any of these beer-shop keepers or small tradesmen who actually lost the custom of the working classes in consequence of the votes which they had given at the election of 1832?—Not that I know of.

3479. Have you heard of any such instances?—I think there have been instances, but at the moment I cannot recollect the parties, and I should like to recollect them before I stated it.

3480. Was there any resolution adopted and promulgated by the working classes, or small shopkeepers, with reference to confining their dealings to those who supported their interest?—Not at that election.

3481. Did you in the course of your canvass at the last election hear that they had been injured by voting for Mr. Wortley at the last election?—I have no doubt of it.

3482. Were those persons from whom you have heard that, small shopkeepers, or in that class of life?—They were small shopkeepers.

3483. In the year 1835, were the labouring classes still, with some exceptions, in the Yellow interest that is opposed to Mr. Wortley?—Yes, but not so strongly as on the former occasion.

3484. Who were the candidates in 1835?—Mr. Wood, Mr. Wortley, and Mr. Prothero.

3485. Mr. Wood and Mr. Prothero being in the Yellow interest?—Yes.

3486. Now before the nomination day in 1835, was there any public meeting called by advertisement, placard, or otherwise?—There was a meeting of the non-voters expressly called to support the interest of their party.

3487. The Yellow party?—The Yellow party.

3488. Do you happen to know whether there were meetings of that description called, not only in Halifax, but also in the other townships in the parish?—No, I do not.

3489. Do you remember such a meeting being called in the township of Ovendon?—No, I do not.

3490. Where were they to meet?—They met, I believe, at the Lancastrian school-room; it was at a school-room, I recollect.

3491. What meeting are you now speaking of?—A meeting of the non-electors.

3492. Previous to the election of 1835?—Yes.

3493. Do you remember a meeting being called by placard to meet on the nomination day before the Museum?—Yes, there was a placard issued a day or two before the election, stating that non-electors would meet in Harrison-lane, and from thence would go to the place of nomination.

3494. Is Harrison-lane where the Lancastrian school-room is?—No, it is not; they are two distinct meetings.

3495. The meeting of which you spoke at the Lancastrian school, was a meeting of the non-voters, to discuss who they should support?—Yes.

3496. But the meeting to which your attention is called was one to be held in the open air, and to proceed to Harrison-lane, and from thence to the place of nomination?—Yes.

3497. Is that an open space in the town?—Yes.

3498. In consequence of that placard, did large bodies of non-voters come from several townships in the parish with bands and flags?—I believe there were; I did not see them myself, but I believe there were large bodies.

3499. Was it not notorious?—It was notorious that large numbers did assemble; there were not so many there as were expected, but they joined them in their way to the place of nomination.

3500. Did you attend the nomination?—I did.

3501. Did they go to the nomination in that array?—Yes, I saw there a large flag, with "Non-electors" upon it.

3502. Those words were upon the flag?—Yes.

3503. In what numbers did they attend the nomination, do you think; what proportion did the non-electors coming from a distance bear to the multitude of persons who came from the borough itself?—I should think there must have been three or four to one of the non-electors; that is, there were three or four to one residing out of the borough, as compared with those residing in the borough.

3504. Were the labouring classes within the borough more divided; that is, more favourable to the Blue interest than the mass of the labouring classes throughout the parish?—Certainly.

3505. At the nomination in 1835, were the proceedings interrupted?—They were, but not to that extent that they were interrupted before.

3506. Did they allow the proposer or seconder of Mr. Wortley, or Mr. Wortley himself to be heard?—Very imperfectly.

3507. Had you the means of observing whether those interruptions came principally from the inhabitants of the town, or from the persons who had so marched in?—From the persons who had marched in.

3508. Did you remain to the end of the proceedings at the nomination?—Yes.

3509. The nomination was held in the Piece Hall, was it not?—Yes.

3510. That is the woollen market?—The market for woollen goods.

3511. Now did these bodies of persons attend also upon the days of the polling?—Yes.

3512. In considerable numbers?—In very great numbers.

3513. During the first day, Mr. Wood and Mr. Prothero were at the head of the poll, were they not?—Yes.

3514. Mr. Wortley was a few votes behind?—About 12 or 13 votes behind Mr. Prothero.

3515. Was there any disturbance that night?—I think not that night.

3516. After the close of the poll on the first day, were you one of those who examined into the numbers of the remaining voters?—Yes.

3517. Did you, upon that examination, find that there was enough to give a considerable majority of promised voters for Mr. Wortley?—Yes; when I say a considerable majority, it was about 10, which we thought considerable.

3526. There were not above 100 voters left unpolled?—About 100
3527. Can you give any reason for so large a number of Mr. Wortley's voters having refrained from voting on the first day?—There were several declined to come up, in the hope that we might do without them, and who would rather not vote than vote.
3528. On what ground?—On account of their customers.
3529. In what class?—Among the lower orders, and from the parish.
3530. What description of tradesmen principally?—Small shopkeepers.
3531. Is Halifax a very considerable market?—A very large one indeed.
3532. And do a great number of persons come in from the parish on market days?—Very great numbers.
3533. And do those persons deal with the small shopkeepers in Halifax?—They do.
3534. You say you were present at the nomination; do you remember hearing at the hustings, any thing said about exclusive dealing; did you hear the proposer or seconder of Mr. Wood say any thing of that kind?—Yes, I recollect Mr. ——— making an observation, the bearing of which was, that if the Blues had the wealth and respectability of the place with them, he hoped that the non-electors would show them that they had also their money to spend, and that they had a degree of influence they might exercise as well.
3535. Did not the Yellow party complain of intimidation having been used by the Blues?—There was something said about it.
3536. And the Blues complained of intimidation used by the Yellows?—Yes.
3537. There was mutual recrimination?—Yes.
3538. In consequence of which were these expressions used by Mr. ——— on the hustings?—I have no doubt about it. (pp. 199, 201, 203.)

MR. JAMES GILBERT.

4101. WHERE do you reside?—At Birmingham.
4102. What are you?—I am a licensed victualler and wine merchant.
4103. Did you take a part in the last election for the borough of Birmingham?—Yes, and I canvassed for Richard Spooner, esq.
4104. Was any extensive system of intimidation in practice at that election among the lower classes of non-electors, by which the votes of a considerable number of electors were influenced?—Yes, there was.
4105. Can you give any instance that came within your own knowledge?—I can in one instance state, that a person of the name of ——— had promised, and when I called on him to vote, he said he was not aware how the town was situate, or he should not have promised me; but that his customers had waited upon him, and he found that if he voted for Mr. Spooner, he should be ruined.
4106. What trade was he?—He was a victualler.
4107. Was his district principally among the lower classes of non-electors?—I should think they were. I canvassed another landlord, and when I went to canvass him, he put up his finger, and said, "Hush! hush! they will hear you in the kitchen, and if they hear you, I am ruined." He confessed that his heart was with Mr. Spooner, but that he durst not vote. Another instance was with a pork-butcher in Suffolk-street; the landlord waited on him with me.
4176. Have you always been a committee-man at the late elections?—I never was a committee-man in my life.
4177. Have you attended the committee to give assistance and information?—I have attended and offered my services.
4178. Have they been accepted?—Yes.
4179. Did you assist the committee in canvassing?—Yes.
4180. You are a partisan on the Tory side?—Yes, I have taken a part and have always been proud to do it; it has been a hobby all through my life; I have done it for 40 years.
4181. Are there many of the lower class in Birmingham enrolled in the Political Union?—There are.
4182. Do you think the system of political union contributes to the system of exclusive dealing?—Yes; and if there had never been the Political Union, Mr. Richard Spooner would have been now in the House.

4183. Are there many other persons in Birmingham on your side who are as strong partisans as you are; do not you think many of the men had rather have no vote at all?—I am sure I cannot say; I have never heard them say; I have heard their wives say that they wish they had no vote when they have suffered by it, but a good Tory never flinches.

4184. Do you think a good Whig would flinch?—I am sure I cannot say; I never kept much company with them.

4185. Do you know whether the system of exclusive dealing has ever been the subject of discussion in the Political Union?—Yes, it has; I have been told it has been discussed, and I have had a person come and told me that a knife has been drawn that is to take away my life, and cautioned me not to go out.

4186. Do you know whether any such discussion has taken place at the meeting of the Political Union?—It was at a meeting.

4187. Do you know whether such a resolution has been passed at the Political Union?—I have heard it was passed, and passed against me, but I have no proof; but I have heard such an one is not to be dealt with, and such an one is not, and you will be the first to fall.

4188. Has there been any resolution passed on the subject of exclusive dealing?—I have never seen the resolution.

4189. Do you mean to say that the Tories of Birmingham do not prefer dealing with men of their own political feelings?—I am sorry to say, but I can say that they will not sacrifice anything for the good of that cause; they would be better than they are if they would stick up for their party as they ought to do.

4190. You think that the Tories ought to deal with persons of their own way of feeling?—Yes, I think they ought to deal with me, but they do not, they leave me to fight it out, and that is a proof that the Tories do not stick one to another as the Political Union do.

4191. Do not you think that very disgraceful to them?—I do not know; they are good, and do not like to unite, they like every one to be free.

4192. Did the gentlemen and clergymen in the neighbourhood of the town come in to canvass previously to the election?—I never saw one canvass, and I never saw, all the time that I went to the committee, a clergyman of the church persuasion there all the time.

4193. Did the gentry?—Yes, they came in, a good many of them.

4194. Did you ever know any neighbouring gentleman, any squire come in, and take the least part in an election?—Not the neighbours, I have known those in the town.

4195. By the gentry you mean the opulent tradesmen of Birmingham?—Yes, I could mention names if it were wished.

4196. You know of no interference from the neighbouring squires?—Yes, Squire Taylor was the chairman.

4197. He is a banker in Birmingham?—Yes, but he lives out.

4198. You say you have never known the clergy of the church canvassing, do dissenting ministers canvass?—I have been informed they have, but during my canvass I did not meet with any of them, and particularly Mr. East has laid very great stress on his congregation.

4199. And the Catholic clergymen?—Yes.

4165. Did the dissenting ministers in Birmingham take an active part in the election?—They did indeed; and one Catholic man was very active.

4200. Have master manufacturers much influence over the operatives as regards their votes?—Yes, and by calling them together, I have heard of their making speeches to them, and telling them, which is a very great stroke of deceit, this is the reason why we have to pay you such low wages; if this Reform were got, we should pay you better wages; and I have known them screw the men down, and tell them if the Reform could be got through they could raise their wages.

4201. There are master manufacturers who act in this way probably, both Whig and Tory?—No, the Tory side never preach up about Reform, for it does no good.

4202. Though they do not preach about Reform, they preach about something else perhaps, in order to influence their votes?—I believe the chief that they preach on is that the church has been in danger.

4166. When did you hear this sermon about the church being in danger?—I think that is since the election.

4167. The church was never in danger before the election?—No, I never heard a sermon preached on the subject before the election.

4205. Do you know of any instances of master manufacturers turning away their operatives because they did not vote as they wished?—I do not know of a single instance.

4206. You have not heard of one?—No I do not think any men are so independent as the mechanics of Birmingham, because they can go to almost the next door and get work.

4207. Are there many operatives in Birmingham voters?—A 10*l*. house there is a very small house; where I live there are arches under the new market-place, my house adjoins the new market-place, and they are assessed at 12*l*. 10*s*. for arches like those, consequently there being those little dealers' shops kept, they favour the lower orders for their custom.

4208. In point of fact, the man who is not independent in Birmingham, is the tradesmen whose customers lie among the populace?—Yes, they are all dependent on the populace.

4209. Do not you think it would be a good thing that they should be able to give their vote without being subjected to losing their custom?—I can never bring my mind to do any thing in secret.

4210. Do not you think that those who are not able to give their votes in the way they are now given, could without inconvenience, give their votes secretly?—If a man has a vote, its being secret at the time for whom he voted, it would be a benefit, but still I think, unless it was known what party they voted for, it would create almost a greater jealousy than there is now.

4211. A man would not lose his custom in that case?—If he would not say whom he voted for, a man would go and ask him, and if he would not be frank, he would be sure to be condemned as a Tory, then away goes his business; Birmingham is in such a state, that at the times of election he must tell whom he will vote for, or he would lose his custom.

4212. How would they know whether he told the truth or not?—If he was to tell a falsity, it is ten to one but that would be made out afterwards.

4213. How?—I think there could be no way of voting but it must be known when they come to cast up the numbers, and there would always be the surmise one way, and then another seeing those names, it would be possible to make them out.

4214. If it was known, why should they go to ask him?—If they asked him then, and he told them he voted on the other side, and it then got wind that he did not poll on that side, I think that the injury would be more serious than it is now.

4215. Supposing that it never did get wind?—Then it might be a benefit.

4216. Supposing you contrived, as the gentlemen in the clubs in London contrive, to vote so that it never can be known how the man has voted, and it is never known unless the man chooses to declare it?—Though I should never be an advocate for that, I must say that it would be a benefit to me.

4217. Are there a considerable number of voters of Birmingham 10*l*. householders who do not care about politics?—I should think not, they must be either one party or another.

4218. Why must they be?—Because they are hardly looked upon as members of society if they do not vote for one or other.

4219. But for intimidation, do you not think Spooner would have been returned?—I do.

4235. Do that class of persons in Birmingham discuss politics in the public-houses?—Yes, and in the factories.

4236. Do you think that if a man had voted in secret he would be able to keep the secret?—I cannot say; I think they would be able to get it out if he was not a man of very great nerve; if he would not say who it was, they would say then "Damn you, you are ashamed of it, you have voted on the Tory side."

4237. You think they would punish him equally?—Yes.

4238. Would the ease of honest men be increased by that secret voting?—It would do away with that violent party spirit; I think it might in time do away with a great deal of it.

4239. Do you think they would punish the man equally who refused to tell them how he had voted, as the man who told them he had voted against their side?—I think that they would for a time perhaps.

4240. That would not be the case for many elections, you mean?—Yes.

4241. You think it would not after a time?—It might do it away.

4242. Do you think that it would do that away when there was a contest?—It is the seeing a man going up to vote that rouses this spirit—father and son will hardly speak to one another.

4168. You have suffered yourself severely by your vote?—I have.

4169. Do not you think it a very hard thing that you should suffer by giving an honest vote?—Yes; they have come and said, "You have been a Tory long enough, if you will turn to us we will bring you a house-full of custom."

4170. That is a form of bribery, is not it?—They have said, probably you will be ruined by sticking to that party; and I have said, "I have been brought up as one, and will go to the workhouse as one, sooner than turn."

4231. Your opinions, in consequence of your being an active partisan and a bold man, were well known; but take the case of a person who has never taken any active part, and who is quite nervous about these matters, it would be better for him?—Yes, it would, I believe; if it was done in that way that nobody knew how they voted, Spooner would have been returned.

4232. Therefore, many voted against their opinions?—Yes.

4233. Would it not be a great point to have their votes agree with their opinions?—Yes.

4234. Do not you think it would have been a great thing for the pork-butcher to have been enabled to vote as he wished?—Yes, for the man was so frightened that he did not vote.

4171. Do not you think that it is very hard an honest man should be injured by conscientiously exercising his will?—Certainly. (pp. 241, 242, 245—248.)

Mr. JAMES TERRELL.

2878. Is there much influence exercised in Exeter by customers over their tradespeople?—A good deal; in canvassing for Exeter I have frequently received the answer, "Any gentleman that will vote for the ballot shall have my suffrage," for the intimidation used by the customers on the tradesmen is sufficient in many cases to deter them from giving a conscientious vote.

2879. The influence of the gentlemen in the neighbourhood is sufficient in many cases to deter them from giving a conscientious vote?—Yes.

2880. Is the influence of the clergy sufficient in many cases to deter from giving a conscientious vote?—The clergy have no very general influence in Exeter, for there are no tithes under which they can exercise any influence except that moral influence which a respectable man will have over his neighbour.

2881. Is there any influence exercised over the beer dealers and publicans?—The influence over the publicans was much greater before the licensing system was altered than it is now.

2882. Is there any influence exercised by the lower orders on the small shopkeepers or publicans?—Certainly not the least; there may be a preference given to a particular house where their politics predominated.

2883. Have you known any case of an Union or a Friendly Society taking away their custom from one house and transferring it to another on the ground of politics?—I have not.

2884. In the course of the canvass for the city of Exeter, where you have stated you often heard persons say that they were influenced by their customers, was that answer given you by persons who were likely to give that as a mere excuse, or was it from persons whose opinions you were previously acquainted with, and whom you had reason to expect to support your party if left to themselves?—I believe a great number of the shopkeepers in Exeter are deterred from

giving their votes according to their consciences, by the intimidation used by persons who deal with them, and influence their votes.

2885. Are those customers resident in the town?—Yes, and in the neighbourhood as well; I do not mean to say that it is not exercised on both sides, for I have been too long accustomed to committee-rooms not to know that it is a question after each day's poll, "Who can influence this man, and who can lay the screw on another?" But the influence is much more powerful against us than for us. (p. 167.)

Mr. JOHN JAMES.

737. WHEN was there a contested election for the city of Hereford?—In the month of January last.

738. Was there a contest at the election of 1832 also?—Yes.

984. With regard to the modes in which intimidation is practised in the borough, will you state the different forms in which it exists?—Intimidation is practised in towns by the threat of taking away your own custom, and by inducing others, over whom you have influence, to take away theirs too, and by a general threat of doing all the injury to the tradesman within the range of your power.

985. Do the licensing magistrates exercise any influence over publicans?—They have the power of suspension and granting, and it is fair to presume they do.

986. Who are the licensing magistrates in Hereford?—The aldermen of the city.

987. Does the fear of the loss of their licences act upon publicans?—I have no doubt it does; I have known an instance where a man in Hereford supported the corporation, and who stated to me that the only reason they voted against us was, that he was promised a licence for his house.

988. Do you think the fear of losing their licence acts upon publicans with respect to the county as well as the borough?—No, I should say not, as to the county.

989. Do you think the fear of losing the licence operates in a great degree to counterbalance the effect upon publicans, which you have before spoken of, arising out of the system of treating?—I think the fear of losing the licence, or rather the natural anxiety for publicans to stand well with the magistrates, in the event supposing any complaint is made to the magistrate against a publican for having kept his house open beyond a certain hour, or for doing any thing improper in his house, if he votes the same way with the magistrate he may come off better than if he voted in a contrary way.

990. Do the gentlemen in the neighbourhood of the city of Hereford interfere much?—They do, very much.

991. By threats to tradesmen of the loss of custom?—Yes.

992. What class of tradesmen are they principally operated upon in this way?—Retail tradesmen.

993. Smiths and saddlers?—Yes, hatters, grocers, tinmen, and that description of tradesmen, and ladies' shoemakers.

994. Have you known instances of any threats having been carried into effect subsequently to the election?—I have.

995. Extensively?—Yes.

996. Has it been to the serious injury of certain individuals?—Yes, of many persons.

997. Does that effect generally last for a length of time, or is it transitory?—Not transitory.

998. Do they assign a reason for taking away the custom?—In a variety of instances they assign a reason, but in the greater variety of instances they act silently.

999. Has the corporation any means of exercising intimidation over freemen as freemen?—Yes, and I will name an instance of a freeman making an application to an alderman for his support to obtain some object which he had in view, when he was desired to sit down in the alderman's hall till he could refer to the poll-book; upon referring to the poll-book he found the applicant had voted against the corporation at the last election, when he was dismissed, and

told that he, the alderman, only supported his friends; he only supported those who supported him.

1000. Was that support to enable him to get in an almshouse?—It was to obtain something in the gift of the corporation.

1001. Do the ——— exercise much influence?—Yes, I think they do.

1002. Are there many masons and artisans employed in the cathedral?—There must be certainly.

1003. How many resident ——— are there at Hereford?—Only one resident ——— at a time I believe.

1004. Are they gentlemen who generally carry their threats into effect?—Indeed I believe they are.

1005. Do you know of any instance in which they have carried their threats into execution?—One, I believe.

1006. Do you know of any instance in which a tradesman having refused to vote for the candidate canvassed for by one of these gentlemen, that that tradesman has been deprived of his custom?—Yes, I do; there was an election dispute between a voter and some clergymen about his vote, and I think one of the ——— was implicated or named in the matter.

1007. What was the man?—A painter and glazier.

1008. Was that at the last election?—No, in 1832.

1009. Is the tradesman who is threatened by the clergymen with the loss of custom, convinced that that threat is more likely to be executed than if it was given by any other man?—Yes, I have reason to believe he is.

1010. Do the clergymen in the country parishes in the neighbourhood canvass much during the election for the city of Hereford?—Yes, the country clergyman interferes in the city, and in his immediate neighbourhood.

1011. Do they canvass their own tradesmen?—Yes, and their friends' tradesmen; they canvass all they can. (pp. 45—55.)

JOHN WARDELL, ESQ.

7187. I Believe you are, or have been, one of the churchwardens of the parish of Mary-le-bone?—I am one of the churchwardens; Lord Kenyon is the other.

7188. When were you so appointed?—I was so appointed at Easter last. The preceding year I was sidesman.

7189. Will you explain what is a sidesman?—Sidesmen are deputies or assistants to the churchwarden, and act as churchwarden in his absence.

7190. How many sidesmen are there in the parish?—Two.

7285. Have you ever been present at the polling place in a rural district?—I have given my vote in a rural district: I think I have voted in Cheshire.

7286. Have any such means of intimidation been had recourse to in Mary-le-bone?—Not that I am aware of; solicitation, of course, is not intimidation; great solicitation for votes has taken place.

7287. And does much canvassing take place beforehand?—Great canvassing. (7297.) This is one mode of canvassing, a person of some consequence leaves a card of that kind, and consequently a tradesman does not know how to act, if a good customer on the other side has also called on him. I have known persons who did not pay their rates up to the time on purpose to be disqualified.

7295. No threats on the part of customers to withdraw their business from a tradesman unless he would vote as they wished?—I cannot answer that question; but I know pretty well that a great number of tradesmen in our parish would rather be without the elective franchise. (pp. 418, 423.)

We have no evidence that influence, or intimidation in any form, is exercised over voters in the Scottish boroughs in any measure comparable with those in the English and the Irish. The former of these we have seen enough of: we proceed to the latter.

GERALD FITZGERALD, ESQ.

5239. IN what county in Ireland do you reside?—In the county of Tipperary.

5240. Do you hold any official situation?—I am resident magistrate of police for that county.

5241. How long have you yourself been resident magistrate?—I have been residing as a magistrate for the county for the last thirteen years; I have been a Government magistrate for nearly six years; I have been stationed at Cashel for something better than five years.

5445. Where is the last place you attended a city election?—Cashel.

5446. Were you at the last contested election?—No, not at the last; I was at the previous one, and at several in the county.

5447. Can you mention any facts as to intimidation that took place at the time the election was going on in Cashel?—I do not think that we had any acts of intimidation. I have a report from Mr. Pennefather as to undue influence.

5448. On whose part was this influence made use of?—On the part of the parish priest.

5449. Did those priests go up with the people to the hustings?—Many I saw myself.

5450. Did the other side bring up their voters under that fear or intimidation?—They went up under no expectation of violence, because it appeared that they had no chance of success; indeed, I must say that, at the last contested election in Cashel, it was conducted with a great deal of good humour and no violence; but there was a great deal of undue influence and improper interference on the part of the priests with the tenants of Mr. Pennefather on the commons of Cashel, all of whom had pledged themselves to vote for him. I hold in my hand a report from Mr. Pennefather's agent upon this subject.

5451. Will you read that report?—"Cashel, 17th February, 1835. Dear Sir,—As professional agent on behalf of Mr. Pennefather of Newark, upon the late election for Cashel, I have been requested by him and his brother William, to afford you all the information in my power upon the subject of the undue influence and intimidation used by the Roman Catholic priests, and Mr. Pennefather's consequent defeat upon that occasion. And this I am the more anxious to do from the consideration that Government ought to be supplied with all facts bearing generally upon this point, in order to form sufficient grounds for applying to Parliament to adopt some practical remedy for such an abuse; I hasten therefore to put you in possession of such facts relative to this interference as have come to my knowledge, premising that from the difficulties of procuring information against a R ————, increased by an unwillingness to communicate with me from ———— of the employment in which I was engaged, I was unable to procure information respecting many acts done by them, which were matters of notoriety in Cashel, and which consequently I am obliged to omit here. There are about 245 electors for this borough, upwards of 80 of whom are the tenants of the Messrs. Pennefather on the commons lands, and who are all of that class of persons most liable to be influenced by the dictum of their clergy. Almost all the respectable inhabitants of the city and these common tenants pledged themselves to support Mr. Pennefather upon the election, and had the latter fulfilled their promises, he would undoubtedly have been returned by a respectable majority. Those opposed to his election, the repealers and radicals, joined by the Roman Catholic priests, exerted themselves with perseverance and success to compel that class of the electors, who were most particularly under priestly influence, to break the promises they had made their landlords, and to vote for Serjeant Perrin. They made frequent excursions to the commons in large mobs, headed by the priest or his coadjutors and itinerant mob orators, all of whom addressed the people in inflammatory language, from stages erected for the purpose, in different places on the commons, and also from platforms erected in the city, the tenor of which was that the electors should vote for their country and their religion. Serjeant Perrin was introduced to an immense assemblage in the city on new-year's day by the parish priest, M'Donnell, who accompanied him into town at the head of a large party of his supporters, and upon that occasion the priest addressed the multitude present from the platform, telling them, amongst other things, "that Mr.

Perrin was the friend of freedom, who was pledged to cleanse their foul and abominable corporation, and who under God should do so; and he called on them to lay their votes on the altar of their country by electing Mr. Perrin." In the priest's visits to the commons and his interviews with the tenants, he threatened them with the deprivation of the rites of their religion; "that he would melt them off the face of the earth; that he would put the sickness on them, that they should not dare to vote as they liked, but as he (the priest) liked; that if they did, the grass should grow at their door," wiping his boots there at the time. He also held stations (places for holding confessions) at the houses of those electors who were the most difficult to gain over, and upon those occasions threatened or cajoled or exposed them, as best suited his views. He kept, or said he kept, a list of all who would vote for Mr. Pennefather, and that this should lie on his chimney-piece for public inspection. In one of his speeches from the platform in the city to a large assemblage, he said, "that any man who would vote for Pennefather would be guilty of the blood of those who were killed at Rathcormac, and that the wives of the electors should throw their arms round their husbands and prevent them by force from disgracing themselves by voting for Pennefather." This priest, or his coadjutor, in his chapel on a Sunday immediately before the election, told his congregation that he had proof that the Pennefathers had hired five or six men to assassinate somebody (meaning of course himself), and had paid them a part of the money in hand; he alluded to this in a speech at the commons, saying, "He might be *assassinated*; but as long as he pleased his parishioners he cared for nobody. From these amongst numerous instances of intimidation and undue interference by the Roman Catholic priests, it followed as a natural consequence that the tenantry of the Messrs. Pennefather on the commons were induced to vote, and did vote, against their landlords contrary to their promises, freely and positively given, and also contrary to their own wishes; and thus Mr. Perrin was elected by a large majority. Should any other facts in corroboration of the foregoing statement come to my knowledge, I shall be happy to communicate them. (signed) Thomas Pennefather."

5452. Did you apply to Mr. Pennefather, who acted as the agent of one of the candidates?—I wrote to Mr. William Pennefather, who is the brother of the candidate, to ask if any instance of violence or intimidation had come to his knowledge.

5453. Do you not think that you applied to a source the most interested and partial to which you could apply, swayed by strong partisanship, and affected by the strongest influence both of a public and a domestic kind?—I applied to that individual who I thought was capable of giving the most information as to the means that were used over his tenants to induce them to vote against his wish.

5454. Did you apply to Serjeant Perrin, or any body on his side in politics, to know whether any influence had been used?—No, I did not think that necessary; the serjeant had a most overwhelming majority, three to one.

5455. Was there any intimidation which came to your knowledge, which might have induced you to make that inquiry respecting Mr. Pennefather?—Most certainly not; and residing at Cashel, nothing of that kind could occur without coming to my knowledge.

5456. Had you been aware that Mr. Pennefather, or his agent, had applied themselves to coerce any voter improperly, you would have felt it your duty to make inquiries of the adverse party?—Certainly, if that influence had been exercised in such a way as to tend to a disturbance or breach of the law, I should.

6175. Did not a great many of the respectable shopkeepers of the town vote for Mr. Perrin?—A great number of the respectable shopkeepers of the town voted for Mr. Perrin; I have been informed that several of those who did vote for him had promised to vote for Mr. Pennefather.

6176. But you do not know that?—I do not.

6177. A great many of them?—I will not say a great many of them, some of them; I think I heard of ———, a baker.

6178. It is mentioned in the letter of Mr. Pennefather, that Mr. Perrin was brought into the town by Mr. M'Donnel, the parish priest, on New-year's day; do you mean to say that the parish priest came into the town with Mr. Perrin on

that day?—I did not see the procession, therefore I cannot answer the question. I was in Cashel at the time; I heard a great deal of shouting at the upper end of the town, and I knew that the procession had arrived in the town upon that occasion, but who accompanied it, or who were the individuals forming the head or tail of it, I cannot say.

6179. Have you not heard that the parish priest did not come in with Mr. Perrin?—I never did.

6180. You know nothing of that circumstance but from hearsay?—Of my own knowledge I know nothing of it, further than having heard the noise and shouting.

5461. Can you state any particular instances of priests using threats to enforce the votes?—No, I cannot of my own knowledge. I know nothing about that.

5462. Do you know of the priest producing certificates of men who were to vote out of his own pocket at the hustings?—No, I cannot say that I do. I have heard of instances where the priests did get possession of the certificates of registry, and where Mr. O'Brien, who exercises extensive influence, did so, but the people found out that they could vote whether they had those certificates or not.

5463. If the persons went up who were attended by the priests, and voted contrary to the way which the priests expected, would they not have been subject to violence?—I think they would have been subject at all events to very unpleasant feeling among their own immediate friends and neighbours.

5464. Did you ever know a Protestant clergyman in that place take the part which the priest has done?—If it was his intention, he has not the power; he is a gentleman who does not interfere at all; he has not a vote.

5465. Do you conceive that the tenants called commoners voted at the last election agreeably to their political wishes or not?—I dare say agreeably to their political wishes they did; but I do think that if they were left unbiassed, they would be induced to vote with their landlord. They are peculiarly circumstanced in respect to property; they hold leases under Mr. Pennefather of the commons, and a question has been raised about the validity of that lease. They have been told that the lease is a bad one; that the person who made the lease had no right to make it.

5466. Did Mr. Pennefather turn out some of the voters who voted contrary to his wishes on the election before the last?—I do not remember that he did; but since the last contested election, I think he has looked for rents that were due to him from those tenants that he otherwise would not have looked for.

5467. Do you think it is possible that the intimidation, and the inflammatory speeches that have been used, may have been used to enable the tenants to plead to their landlords, as justification for their votes, the violence that might be exercised against them by other parties, as well as their landlords; that is, to furnish the tenant with an apology to the landlord, presuming that the tenant wished to vote against his landlord?—I am quite sure that the inducements that were held out to the people, were held out because they were considered to be the most likely to attain the object in view.

5468. Do you think that a tenant, who was afraid of his landlord, but who wished to vote with the people, would be glad of the excuse to his landlord that he was threatened by the people?—To be sure he would; most undoubtedly. The great mass of these tenants owed one, two, and some of them three years' rent.

5469. Therefore, if they voted against Mr. Pennefather, they ran great risk of the whole of this arrear being demanded of them?—Yes.

5470. If, on the other hand, they voted in favour of the landlord, they ran great risk of annoyance and violence on the part of the people?—Yes.

5471. Therefore, which ever way they voted, a great amount of evil was likely to overtake them?—Yes, that is the fact. (pp. 305, 319, 321.)

JOHN O'BRIEN, Esq.

8992. I BELIEVE you are a medical gentleman?—Yes.

8993. Living in Cashel?—Yes.

8994. Do you remember the election at Cashel in January last?—I do.
8995. Who were the candidates?—Captain —— and the present Attorney-General for Ireland, then Serjeant Perrin.
8996. Did you take an active part in that election?—I did.
8997. For whom?—For Serjeant Perrin.
8998. For the popular candidate?—Yes.
8999. Did most of the independent and wealthy inhabitants of Cashel vote for the popular candidate?—Almost all of them.
9000. Are they persons likely to be intimidated or coerced to vote contrary to their own political opinions?—They are not; not one that voted could be coerced, in my opinion.
9001. Were there any of the voters who had previously promised the anti-popular candidate, and were forced, by intimidation on the part of the friends of the popular candidate, to break that promise by intimidation?—There was no intimidation whatever on the side of the popular candidate. I believe there were two persons in Cashel who did promise the unpopular candidate, and who did not vote for him afterwards. One of them was most particularly circumstanced. Mr. ——, the barrister, was first a candidate for Cashel before Mr. ——, and he canvassed the electors for one day; and one of these two I have mentioned were persons with whom Captain —— dealt very extensively; he was a woollen-draper; and Mrs. Captain —— sent a message to this person stating that she did not require him to vote for Mr. ——, the barrister, and as the captain was not a candidate he might vote for whom he pleased; and he promised us, and he kept his promise.
9002. Was Mr. M. —— that you mentioned a candidate in the anti-popular interest?—Yes, and he canvassed the city one day.
9003. Do you know the parish priest of Cashel?—Very well.
9004. Is he a violent politician or otherwise?—He is not a violent, not even an active politician; he is not a political priest by any means.
9005. Does he usually busy himself much in elections?—He took no part whatever in the January election until the day of Mr. ——'s arrival.
9006. What day was that?—The 1st of January.
9007. How many days before the election?—Fourteen days.
9008. Do you recollect a meeting that took place at the commons or race-course?—I do.
9009. Was Dr. M'Donnell the parish priest there?—He was.
9010. Did you hear him address the people in favour of the popular candidate?—I did.
9011. Were you present at the entire of that address?—I was.
9012. Did that parish priest use any expressions, such as the following—"That he would deprive the voters of the rites of their religion, that he would bring the sickness upon them, that he would melt them, that the grass should grow at their doors," if they did not vote the way he wished them?—He did not, certainly; he did not use any of those expressions.
9013. Could he have used them without your hearing them?—He could not.
9014. Would the popular candidate have been returned at that election, whether the parish priest interfered or not?—He would. I should perhaps mention that before the parish priest took any part whatsoever in it, we had 140 promises out of 250, soon after we sent the requisition to Mr. —— . Mr. ——, I should beg to say, did not call upon us, we called upon him at an early period.
9015. Was there any threat or intimidation used on the part of the popular candidate or his friends, to induce any voters to vote on the popular side at that election?—No, not the slightest.
9016. Were there any threats or intimidation used on the part of the anti-popular candidate, to induce persons to vote for that candidate at that election?—There were.
9017. Can you state any instance?—Mr. ——, has in his possession at present a large tract of the commons lands. On his part of the commons there

are 59 electors, that is, of those who were electors at the last January election; and there were six tenants also of the anti-popular candidate, and they canvassed these repeatedly.

9018. Who?—The anti-popular candidate and his friends; they occupied a house at which they treated them with whiskey; it was a kind of rendezvous, and they threatened to turn out of their houses those who did not vote for them who were tenants at will; they particularly threatened one man of the name of

9019. What was the threat used?—That they would turn him out of his house.

9020. Have any of those threats been put into execution to your knowledge?—Immediately after the election they commenced a system of what I would call extreme hardship to the tenants; they sent four armed drivers to the commons, and kept them there off and on for nearly three months.

9021. Was this any expense to the tenants?—Wherever there was a seizure the tenant had to pay the expenses.

9022. Was there any exclusive dealing, either threatened or put into execution, upon any shopkeeper in the town of Cashel for the unpopular candidate?—Yes, the two persons I spoke of, who promised him, and who voted afterwards, against him, the custom of Mr. ———, and every one of his connexion was withdrawn.

9023. Do you imagine that those voters voted for the popular candidate in consequence of their own opinion coinciding with the political opinions of the popular candidate, or in consequence of intimidation?—I am satisfied that they voted for the popular candidate in consequence of his political opinions coinciding with theirs.

9024. Are you aware of a Protestant voter of the name of ———, having promised to vote for the popular candidate, and being obliged to break that promise?—I am aware of such a thing, he declined voting.

9025. Why did he decline voting?—He was applied to by two clergymen of the Established Church, requesting his interest, and putting a very strong case to him why he ought to vote for Mr. ———, and he consequently applied to me to interfere with Mr. ———, to let him off his promise, and he would not vote at all.

9026. Had it not been for the influence of the Protestant clergymen, do you believe he would have kept his promise, and voted for the popular candidate?—I am satisfied he would.

9027. Was the influence so great that it induced this man to wish to retract his promise?—He is an intimate friend, and has an agency under ——— and ——— who applied to him was ———; and the other ——— who applied to him was a relative of, or connected with his wife.

9030. Do you know an attorney living in Cashel who acted as an agent of the unpopular candidate?—Yes.

9031. Did he use any threats to induce persons to vote for his employer?—His son is also an attorney, and was a paid agent at the election; he had two clerks who were voters, and he threatened to discharge them both unless they voted with him.

9032. Did they vote with him?—They voted for the popular candidate, and he did discharge them.

9037. With respect to the expressions stated to have been made use of by the parish priest, might he not use them without your hearing them?—It is quite impossible; I accompanied him to the commons, and stood on the table with him.

9038. Were you present at every address he made to the people?—I was there was not an elector canvassed that I was not present at.

9039. And at his general harangues were you present also?—I was; he never harangued them except on the two occasions.

9040. You said, there was no intimidation on the part of the popular candidate or his friends; are you aware that any person has been injured by the popular candidate or his friends since the election, for having voted for the

anti-popular candidate?—Not a single case; there has been perfect good feeling since that.

9041. There was a rumour, that the parish priest had said a cross should be affixed to the doors of two bakers if they did not vote for the popular candidate; and that, in consequence of that, they have suffered injury. Do you believe such a threat was used, or have they suffered any injury in consequence?—I am quite satisfied there was no such threat used; and I am quite satisfied that no person has been injured in trade.

9042. Where there not windows broken?—We had illuminations on the night the election terminated, and those who voted for the unpopular candidate did not illuminate; but there was not a single pane of glass broken. I should state, as a fact, that it was only by intimidation, undue influence, and a system of bullying, that the opposite party could have had the least chance of success.

9043. Do you know any thing of Clonmel?—I do.

9044. You have stated that there are certain facts which you have heard, and which you believe relating to the last election at Clonmel, upon which you can give evidence to the Committee; now before you give evidence as to those facts, we wish to be informed what the nature of the evidence is upon which your belief is founded?—Cashel is only twelve miles distant from Clonmel, I am constantly in the habit of going there, and I am acquainted with a great many of the people there.

9045. Have those facts been communicated to you by trustworthy persons, persons whom you are in the habit of believing upon their assertion in ordinary transactions, and have they been communicated to you by those persons, as being within their knowledge?—They have been communicated to me by trustworthy persons, and as facts within their own knowledge. One particular fact was the case of a miller who was turned out of employment for having voted for the popular candidate. I have heard and believe that there was an extensive system of persecution carried on by the unsuccessful candidate and his friends. I have heard and believe, and it is the general prevailing belief in my part of the country, that the election of 1832 did not cost the successful candidate a shilling, and it cost the unsuccessful candidate a large amount; I have heard 4,000*l*. I should mention, with regard to Cashel, that the election of Cashel cost Mr. ———, the successful candidate, 5*l*. 12*s*.

9046. Was there any subscription?—I suppose the cost for printing, and messengers, and watchmen, was something under 40*l*.

9047. Was that defrayed by subscription?—Yes.

9048. That was the total amount of the expense?—Yes; and it cost the opposite party 600*l*.

9049. On what authority do you speak of that?—On the authority of their agent. I made a charge on him of persecuting the tenants (hé is a good-natured, sensible man, and has acted kindly since the election); and he said it cost the unsuccessful candidate 600*l*.

9050. Did he allege that as a reason why he was forcing the tenants to pay their rents?—Yes; he alleged that as a reason, why the unsuccessful candidate and his brother were forcing the tenants to pay their rents. There is a circumstance which it is necessary for me to explain, with regard to what is called the breaking of the promises of the tenants on the commons. For some weeks before Mr. ———'s arrival in Cashel, Mr. ———, the other candidate and his friends, were canvassing, and we found that they had made use of the names of respectable persons in Cashel to endeavour to induce persons to act as they did; they stated that some of the most influential persons in Cashel had promised them, and they mentioned the parish priest as their friend. We told them (the electors on the commons) that promises made under false representations were not binding.

9051. Do you believe that those men who so voted for the popular candidate voted in accordance with their own political opinions?—I am satisfied they did, and of the 58 who voted for the unpopular candidate, I am satisfied that the majority would not have voted for him if they thought their votes would have returned him.

9052. Do you mean that their political opinions were really adverse to those of

the unpopular candidate?—The political opinions of the majority, or at least a moiety of them. (pp. 508, 510.)

JOHN WILLCOCKS, ESQ.

5490. You are a stipendiary magistrate in the county of Tipperary?—I am chief magistrate of police.

5491. How long have you held that office in the county?—Since 1832. I was appointed chief constable in 1821, and chief magistrate in 1832.

5567. Which do you consider the most efficacious, the influence of the landlord over his tenant, or the influence of the priest over his parishioner?—I think the priest can take the tenant from the landlord, and I think they have done it in many instances.

5568. Then the priest, in fact, exercises his influence for political purposes?—No doubt of it.

5569. Does not the landlord exercise his influence for political purposes also?—I believe such things may have occurred, but I cannot state an instance of a landlord turning a tenant out in consequence of the vote he has given. After Mr. ——— had given his vote, I heard Mr. Bagwell say, "I am glad that Mr. ——— has voted as he has done; I did not ask him for his vote. Mr. ——— has been under compliments to me; I am better pleased than if I had a 100*l.* that he voted as he did."

5570. So that while this persecution is going on upon the other side, and unjust influence used to compel persons to vote contrary to their wishes, and according to the wishes of the priests, the landlords have not, according to your information, punished their tenants for having voted contrary to their wishes?—I believe that Mr. Pennefather said that he would look for the arrears of rent from the tenants upon the commons of Cashel; that as they chose to go against his interest, he would not pay them any respect, or be kind to them as he was heretofore, and Mr. Pennefather was proverbial for his kindness to the tenantry; for the eleven years I was in Cashel, I never heard any complaints against him; he was always held up as a most excellent landlord.

5571. Do you know whether subsequent to that election, Mr. Pennefather had actually ejected tenants from their holdings?—I do not believe he ejected any one, but I believe he distrained for arrears of rent.

5572. Which he would not have distrained for if those men had voted for him?—Probably not.

5573. Then you believe that Mr. Pennefather having done that which the law allows him to do, namely, to obtain his rent, has exercised the influence of a landlord according to the means which the law allows him?—Certainly.

5574. Does not the law allow the interference of the priest to canvass voters at the election?—I do not think it prevents it.

5575. Do you consider that the kindness done by a landlord to his tenant, in suspending any demand for rent, is a legitimate influence of property?—I do.

5576. Do you consider that it is a legitimate exercise of power for the priest to harangue his parishioners in the chapel, or to canvass them in their houses with a crucifix in his hand, bringing into operation the spiritual influence of religion, in order to make men act according to his wishes in a temporal matter?—My opinion is, that neither a Roman Catholic nor a Protestant clergyman ought to interfere in politics.

5577. Do you consider that that is a legitimate influence which a priest ought to exercise, by using spiritual power within his church, or by producing a crucifix to the voter, in order to influence him in voting?—I think it is not.

5578. Do you then consider that the one exercising the legitimate influence of property is justified, and that the other exercising a spiritual influence is not justified?—I do; if I have a tenant living under me, and I am kind to him, doing every thing I can for his benefit, and the benefit of his family, and I wish the honour of being Member of Parliament, and that man refuses to gratify me in that honour, I think all ties are severed between us.

5579. Supposing that man differs from you in a great political question, do you still think you are entitled to his vote?—I think it is the legitimate right of the

landlord to have the vote of his tenant. I think I am better entitled to it than a stranger.

5580. Supposing any one had done you a service, and he was to come and ask you to repay that by going to vote for Mr. O'Connell, would you not think it hard?—No; if he was my landlord, if he was a kind landlord to me, as Mr. Pennefather is to his tenants, I think I ought to go in whatever way he pleased; if he himself was concerned, if I was in that situation myself, if I did not vote for him I would not vote against him.

5581. You mean, that if your political sentiments were so strong that you could not give your landlord your vote, you would neutralize your vote by not voting at all?—Certainly.

5582. Do you conceive that, as a voter, your regard for your landlord ought to be superior to your regard for the good of the country?—If there was a candidate who I thought was going not for the good of the country, I would not vote for him.

5583. Even though your landlord should require you?—Even though my landlord should require me.

5584. If you thought proper to withhold your vote from your landlord, would not you think that you would fairly forfeit any claim upon him for kindness or indulgence to you?—No doubt whatever.

5585. Or the renewal of your lease?—I should think that all ties of reciprocity and good feeling were severed between us.

5586. Then you think it was the intention of the legislature to give the franchise solely for the benefit of the landlord?—I cannot say what the intention of the legislature was; I am only saying how I would act myself.

5587. Would it not be better, upon that supposition, to give the landlord a certain number of votes, according to the number of his tenants?—(pp. 323 328—330.)

J. CARAHER, ESQ., *Newry.*

7437. WAS there interference of the landed proprietors on the occasion of the last election?—Yes; on the last election, ————, shortly before it commenced, wrote to his agent, saying, that he wished his interest to be given in favour of Sir Thomas Staples. This gentleman went with Sir Thomas and his party to canvass the tenants.

7438. Do you know whether any notices have been served on any of those?—Yes.

7439. Since?—Immediately after it.

7440. Upon those who voted in favour of Mr. Brady?—Yes.

7441. Were the notices served on all ————'s tenants who had voted for Mr. Brady?—They were, and served immediately after the election, and I believe at some time previous to the 1st May last, a good many of those, who also voted for Sir Thomas Staples, were served with notices. It was noticed in the *Newry Examiner*, shortly after the first class of notices were served, the hardship on the tenantry of these notices being served, ————, having seen this paragraph in the *Newry Examiner*, ———— wrote a letter to the editor of the *Examiner*, disavowing any knowledge whatever of these notices.

7442. Have any of the parties, who received notice since the election of 1835, actually quitted?—The time has not arrived yet; November next is the time.

7443. Have any of the tradesmen been injured in their custom through this election, (at Newry, in 1835) in consequence of the votes they gave?—They have been on both sides since that, to some extent, I believe.

7444. In what way?—Those persons who supported Mr. Brady and voted for him, Mr. Brady's opponents have ceased to deal with them, and have told them in some instances they would not.

7445. Has that happened in many instances?—Yes; in many I believe.

7446. And they also state that the same thing happened on the other side, that Mr. Brady's supporters had discontinued dealing with those who supported Sir Thomas Staples?—Yes, I understand so, in retaliation. (p. 434.)

REV. JAMES MAHER, *Carlow*.

10275. Has exclusive dealing been resorted to by the people?—I believe not to any great extent.

10276. Has it been resorted to by the gentry?—I have heard traders in Carlow stating, that in consequence of their voting for the liberal party, 20 pass books were closed with some of them by the gentlemen of the county; they ceased to deal with them any longer, and transferred their dealing and custom elsewhere, and on the other side there was a degree of reaction.

10277. So that exclusive dealing has been carried on on both sides?—Yes.

10278. In this state of things, do you not think an elector in humble circumstances, dependent on his landlord on the one hand, dependent, perhaps, on public opinion for his domestic peace and tranquillity on the other, is placed, at an election, in a very calamitous condition?—I do; I think he is very unfortunately circumstanced.

10279. Do you not think it would be much better for the great body of the electors to be deprived of their franchise than that the present system should be allowed to continue?—I have often said it, and have heard other clergymen declare that the electors have reason to curse the day that a Reform Legislature invested them with the dangerous privilege of voting for or against candidates to represent Irish counties in Parliament. I could give instances of persons, farmers, one or two or three years ago, who are now, in consequence of their votes, reduced to the condition of day labourers, and some of them are beggars.

10280. You consider that the great majority of the people themselves would be happy to be deprived of this franchise?—No; but I say the Legislature that invested them with the privilege ought to take better care of them and grant them protection in the exercise of their privilege, and that is what they desire. (p. 584.)

During this period, such was the extent to which the non-dealing principle was applied, that we find men proverbial for being benevolent, turned into resentful political partisans: an honest and a valuable foreman in a concern, is dismissed for voting as he thought right.

JOHN LOOBY.

9519. WHERE do you reside?—At Clonmel.

9520. What is your profession?—A miller.

9521. Are you a master miller?—A foreman miller; we call our employers the masters; I have been the foreman.

9522. Who was your master?—Mr. ———

9523. Have you a vote for the borough of Clonmel?—Yes, I have.

9524. Were you canvassed by any persons previous to the two last elections?—I had been canvassed by Mr. Bagwell.

9525. By any of Mr. Bagwell's friends?—No, Sir, by himself personally.

9526. Did you vote for Mr. Bagwell?—No, Sir, I voted for Mr. Ronayne.

9527. Did you vote for Mr. Ronayne at both elections?—No, Sir, at the first election I had been canvassed by Mr. Bagwell, he called on me, and I told him that I could not give my vote until the day of the election, I was not prepared then; the election came on, and I told Mr. Ronayne, in case he wanted me, that I would vote for him; Mr. Ronayne had a sufficient majority without me, and he did not call on me.

9528. Why did you tell Mr. Ronayne that you would not vote for him, unless he wanted you?—Because I was certain I would be disemployed.

9529. Who by?—By Mr. ———

9530. By your master?—By my master.

9536. Then at the second election did you vote?—I voted at the second election.

9537. Well, what was the consequence?—The consequence was, I have been discharged.

9538. Who discharged you?—Mr. ———

9539. How long after the election did he discharge you?—The second day after the election I got my discharge, which I can show you.

9540. Produce it, will you?—This is it.—[*The following Paper was then read*]
 “John Looby worked with us as a miller for upwards of seven years, during which time he conducted himself to our satisfaction, being sober, honest and attentive to his business. We now discharge him, having first paid all wages. Clonmel, 1 Month 21, 1835.”

9547. When was anything said to you first about quitting your employment?—The night previous to the election.

9548. Who spoke to you?—I will repeat to you what happened verbatim. The evening previous to the election I had not been apprised, as I usually used to be, that I was to be up that night, for generally any machinery that was out of order in the day-time I received directions to have it repaired at night, so as to be ready to work the following day. I had been apprised the evening previous to the election that there were new brushes to be put into the flour machine. I went home, was in the act of taking a cup of tea, when the steward came in and told me I was to be up that night. “Very well, Sir,” said I, “I shall attend; what is the hour?”—“About ten o’clock,” said he. I went to the mill at ten o’clock, or a few minutes afterwards, to get what little materials were wanting for it, brushes and one thing or another. I had the machine done at four o’clock in the morning; worked hard at it, never knowing the drift in having me up that night. After the job was finished, I came down and sat opposite the kiln fire; I had not been there long, when I was tapped on the shoulder by the steward; he slept in the mill: “John,” said he, “is the job finished?”—“Yes, it is,” said I. “You are wanted in the office,” said he. I went, and saw Master ———: “John,” said he, “I want you down to ———.” “What, after having been up all this night? it would be rather severe for me to go now,” said I. “Oh come, come now,” says he, “get yourself ready at once, and come away.” Said I, “What might be said now, in case I went away, but that I was bribed?”—“Oh,” said he, making answer, “I want to have nothing at all to do about elections; but come with me, I want you to come to my mill.”—“Master ———,” says I, “that is too severe after a hard night’s work to require of me, but stop until three o’clock in the day, and I will go with you.”—“Oh, come, come,” says he, “John put on your clothes at once, come off,” says he, “to ———.”—“Well, Sir, stop for a moment,” says I; I wanted to collect myself, he being rather a good employer, with the exception of his wanting me to go against my will and my conscience; they paid me what I earned, honestly. I went over to my house, which was about 100 yards from the mill door, and apprised my mistress. “Why,” says she, “it is very hard to ask you to go out of town after a hard night’s work.” I had not been there more than five minutes when the steward ran after me, and said, “John, what is keeping you?”—“Well, Sir, I have made up my mind not to go,” said I. “Come, John, I have nothing at all to do with that,” said he; and I accordingly went to the mill again; there was a horse and gig at the door, and a person, as I should suppose him to be, his brother, holding the reins of the horse, and a coachman’s cloak wrapped round him. “John,” says he, “are you ready to come with me?” “No, Sir,” says I, “I am not.”—“Is that what you are going to do,” said he, “after all the kindness that we have shown you?”—“Master ———,” says I, “I will go with you to any place if you will allow me till three o’clock in the day, but I cannot think of going now;” I wanted him to have allowed me to have stopped until three o’clock in the day, and then I would have voted. “Well, take your choice,” said he, “to go into that gig now, or to walk out that door.”—“Well, Sir, I will walk out the door;” I walked to my own house, and I assure you I thought myself to be a discharged man out of their employment. He overtook me, he got into the gig, and whipped the horse as hard as possible. Now my mistress happened to be at the door: “Mrs. Looby, is it not a hard thing that John will not come with me?” says he. “Sir,” says she, “it is rather too severe after a hard night’s work to ask him to go with you now.” Said I, “If you will allow me until three o’clock, I will go with you.”—“No,” was the reply. “Come now,” says he, “and I will make you comfortable, and any money that Mrs. Looby wants she can get it at the office.”—“Allow me until nine o’clock, Sir,” said I.

"But you will vote before nine o'clock," says he. I said, "I would." With that he drove off, and I walked in and told my wife. "It is a bad job," says she. "There is no help for it," said I, "I will not barter my conscience, I will go as my interior dictates to me." I cleaned myself and repaired to Mr. Ronayne's lodging with a gentleman of Clonmel; I told Mr. Ronayne what had occurred as I have repeated to you, nearly in the same words; Mr. Ronayne started, and said it was very severe, and that they were nearly done, as he supposed. I left Mr. Ronayne, and I had not seen him for a good part of the day. I went home about, as I might think, nine o'clock in the morning, and Mr. ———, sent his cashier for me to my house again to come to his office. I went over with the cashier: "John," said he "are you prepared to go with Master ——— to ———?" "No, Sir," said I, "I am not."—"Why so?" said he. "I mean to vote," says I, "and then I will go to any part that you will require me to go after voting." So in the interim between he and I speaking, Mr. Ronayne and some other gentlemen passed by the window: they were apprised that I was inside; I was locked in the office at the time; the moment they got me in the office they locked the door, Mr. ——— did; he perceived Mr. Ronayne coming in: "———," said he "turn out them fellows." Master ——— went out, and what occurred between him and Mr. Ronayne I cannot say, because I heard nothing in the office at the time; but I suppose that there were some angry words, for I could hear only the noise, and I said I would go out and settle the affair at once. Mr. ——— thought to keep me inside, but I went to the door and unlocked the office door myself and walked out; I could hear nothing that occurred outside, but I asked the gentlemen, "Is it me you want?"—"Yes," said one of the gentlemen, making answer. "I am with my employer, but I will be with you in a few minutes," says I, returning in from Mr. Ronayne and the gentlemen that accompanied him. I went into the office and they went away. "Well now, is not this pretty work?" says Mr. ———. "Well, what can I do?" said I; "if you receive any harsh language in the street, how can I help that? have you seen me a moment absent from my business? I have been with you eight years all but two months, and you have nothing to say against me, only this alone, that I am going now to vote as I think proper: you vote for your principles, and why not allow me to do the same?"—"Then we can never look on you again," said he. "I cannot help that, Sir," said I. There were some persons coming into the office just at that time, and I walked out. I went down the street, and I remained that part of the day away, until the next, and I voted the next day for Mr. Ronayne. The day after I voted, I called in at the office to know whether I was to be employed or discharged. Mr. ——— was not there. I was desired to call again. I left word for Mr. ———, that I had called there. I called the second time, and he had not been there. Well, the day after I called I met with him; he was standing by the office fire: "What do you want?" said he, when I entered the office. "Mr. ———," said I, "I come to know whether I am to be employed or discharged?"—"What!" said he, flying into a passion, "have you the face and assurance to come to look to be employed after what you have done?"—"What did I do, Sir," said I; "have you any thing to say against me during the eight years all but two months that I have been with you?"—"No," said he, "only voting for that ——— who called my brother a ruffian, and if I had it in my power I would string him and the priests up;" he used the word string to the best of my knowledge. "Well, we can never look on you again," said he, "with the same confidence, nor can we think of having you in our establishment."—"Well, Sir, there is no help for it," said I, "I only voted according to my principles."—"We can never look on you with any respect." "Well, Sir," said I, "if I thought you did not respect me as I merited, I could not think of living in your concern. I have taught four apprentices in your establishment; they are now well able to work, and you have nothing to say against me, only voting as my principle directed me."—"No," said he, "we never can look on you as the same;" and he repeated those words several times. "Well, there is no help for it," said I, "all I expect is my discharge, and I hope you will give me my merit." He gave me my discharge.

9549. Did he give you this discharge at that time?—Not that day: "My time

is rather taken up now," said he; and I called the next day with the expectation that he would forget things, for I was advised by some friends to take him coolly after a day or two, or I believe three days, thinking that his passion would then be over; so I did, but it was all of no use, he wrote that discharge which you have seen; not that indeed, but another, which I did not think fit to receive, having been principal miller for him for eight years, where there was, I believe, on an average, 40,000 barrels of wheat manufactured in a year, and I the principal miller, mounting the machinery, and seeing that every thing was done to his satisfaction.

9550. You say he wrote something else, did you receive that?—I did; I returned it, I did not think it a suitable one.

9551. What was the substance of it?—It was not so fair a one as the present, and I made an objection to it.

9552. Did you make an objection to it on your first receiving it as not being sufficient?—Yes, as not being sufficient for the capacity which I held in his concern, and the objection which I made to that one which you now have in your hand was, that he left out "principal or head miller."

9553. When did you receive this?—Three or four days after the election.

9554. When did he give you the one which you returned?—The day previous to receiving that.

9555. How many days was it after that conversation which you have been just detailing about stringing up the priests?—It was three days after that.

9556. And the day after you received this?—Yes.

9557. What was your objection to the first?—I did not think it sufficient for me to take to show to any gentleman, there was neither "principal" nor "head miller" mentioned.

9558. But the first one I am speaking of?—In the first one it was not mentioned "that he had conducted our business."

9559. This is as follows: "John Looby worked with us as miller for upwards of seven years, during which time he conducted himself to our satisfaction, being sober, honest and attentive to his business; we now discharge him, having first paid all wages. Clonmel, 1 month 21, 1835. ———." Now will you state what there is contained in that which was not contained in the one before that?—I will give you an idea of what was in the one I received before this: "John Looby worked with us as miller 'for upwards' of seven years;"—"for seven years" the other was;—"during which time he conducted himself to our satisfaction, being sober;" this had been in the other, "he conducted himself sober, honest and attentive to his business;"—"conducted himself to our satisfaction" is what he has put in this.

9560. And that was omitted in the first?—Yes, "sober, honest and attentive to his business." Then it was the cashier handed me that; Mr. ——— wrote it. I made an objection: "Well, John," said he, "I will show this to Mr. ———, when he comes in." "Has he any thing to say against me?" said I. "No, John," says the cashier, "I do not think he has, he could not have any thing to say against you."

9561. The cashier said that?—Yes: "and I have no doubt he will give it to you as you require," said he; he omitted this, "principal or head miller," because why? many a man might act as a miller, he might be a night miller or an assistant miller, but I was a general miller; I am a general workman, I know how to repair stones, to dress stones, and mount machinery, and see corn kiln-dried; and I know how flour should be dressed, lofts kept in order, and every thing of that kind.

9562. In fact, you are acquainted with every part of the business of a flour-mill?—Yes.

9563. You are a millwright, I suppose, are you not?—No, I am not.

9564. But you went to repair machinery?—Yes, if a machine is out of order, the iron about it; or if it wants new brushes in the interior of the machine, I mount those new myself.

9565. That is the duty of the head miller to do, is it not?—Yes.

9566. Did you enter into Mr. ———'s service young?—Yes, I did.

9567. What age were you?—I was born the 5th of February, 1804 or 1805, and I entered his service on the 16th April, 1827. (pp. 542—546.)

They manage these matters differently in America, where, as in one of the two following instances, (both of which relate to servants) even a man of colour is a stranger to the idea of concealing the side on which he votes, though for purposes of convenience the method of voting is by ballot. As for the master's resentment, should the vote be on the opposite side, there is scarcely an outrage that would be considered greater.

GEORGE TICKNOR, ESQ.

9053. IN what part of the United States do you reside?—In Boston.

9054. How long have you resided there?—All my life.

9055. You are now travelling?—I have been absent from the United States for two months; I have always lived, except occasional absences, at Boston; I have never been domiciled any where else.

9081. Do such things ever occur within your knowledge as the threatening tradesmen or persons in dependent situations in case they refuse to vote as certain persons require them?—I should think never; perhaps I can here state my opinion better upon that subject by mentioning two acts which have occurred to my recollection since I was desired to come before the Committee. A gentleman in New Hampshire, whom I mention on this occasion, because at the time of which I speak, he had probably as much political influence as any man in New Hampshire, and because he was as much interested in politics as any man in New Hampshire, and was at one time a member of the Senate of the United States; he related to me the fact not long before I left home, so that it is quite fresh in my memory: a confidential servant who had lived with him for many years, was desired by him to attend at a certain election and vote; it was the only occasion on which this gentleman ever interested himself to procure the attendance of one of his servants to vote; he spoke to the servant on the morning of the election, and asked him to go down; the servant replied that he had not intended to vote at that election; that he cared nothing about it, but that he had now lived with this gentleman many years, was very much attached to him, and had great reason to be attached to him, and therefore he ought to tell him frankly, that if he were to go down to the poll, he should vote against him and his friends as he always had done. I mention this entire frankness on the part of the servant, because it shows that the servant felt that that sort of frankness would not interfere with the relation that subsisted between himself and his master.

9082. Was this servant a white or a black?—A white. The other case that I was going to mention was that of a black, and I thought might be appropriate to the purpose of the Committee, because his master was a man of as large personal fortune as probably any gentlemen in New England. On the morning of an important election, when he and his friends were very anxious in a sharply contested election to elect their candidate, the wife of this gentleman told him that she would save him one vote that day, for that one of her servants, a black man, who she knew would vote against him, because he had formerly lived with the opposing candidate, and was quite fond of him, should be occupied that forenoon, so that he should not be able to go to the poll; the gentleman smiled, and said very little about it, but had occasion to be absent from home; when he came back to dinner, his wife told him that she had employed that servant in bottling wine the whole forenoon in the cellar, so that he should not be able to go to the poll; he said he thought it was very ingenious, but was doubtful whether she had succeeded. They sat down to table at dinner, and this servant occupied his usual place behind his mistress's chair; the gentleman said to his servant, "Well, Scipio, whom did you vote for to-day?"—"I voted for Massa so-and-so; I like Massa so-and so very well; I used to live with him: he was very good to me."—"But," said his mistress to him, "I told you to bottle the wine this forenoon." He said, "Yes, Ma'am, I bottled the wine, but there were not corks

enough, and I went to Massa so-and-so for corks, and he lives close by the poll, and while he counted the corks, you know, I went in and voted." I mention both these facts, because they are as strong, probably, as could be afforded, under any circumstances, to prove that one individual does not by wealth or power directly influence the vote of another. In the case of those persons, though as dependent as any one is with us, one upon a person of the very highest political consideration, and the other of the very highest consideration for his fortune, the gentlemen had no sort of influence upon two servants living in their family.

9083. Neither of those servants was discharged in consequence of acting in the manner you have described?—Of course not; the political man would never have ceased to be reproached with it, if he had done it.

9084. Do you think that it entered into the thoughts of the master in either case to feel any offence against his servant?—No, I am sure it did not, for I have heard them tell the stories to my great satisfaction and amusement; it is from themselves I heard it.

9085. The remarkable fact in the story of the black being, rather the ingenuity with which he evaded the mistress's trap than the fact of the master having retained him?—The remarkable fact is the entire frankness with which he told the truth of his having voted as he did; he was aware that he had outwitted his mistress, and was very willing to tell her so. (pp. 513, 514.)

If these American occurrences raise a smile in persons of English or Irish habits, what is the feeling with which the narrative of the Clonmel miller, or the following of two booksellers at Youghall, would be heard in America? Or what will be the verdict, in such cases, of the posterity of our present race of Conservative anti-reformers, who have for aim, by system, to make voters vassals, to the end that so made, they may so keep them?

MR. JOHN HAMILTON.

9126. You are a bookseller in Youghall?—Yes.

9127. Have you taken any part at any of the elections for the town of Youghall?—No.

9128. Have you ever voted?—No.

9129. Have you a vote?—I have.

9130. What were your reasons for not voting?—I did not fully approve of either of the candidates, or their principles; that was the reason.

9131. Who were the two candidates?—Mr. Smith and John O'Connell.

9132. Were you solicited by either or both candidates to vote?—I was warmly solicited by Mr. Smith's partisans.

9133. What was the degree of warmth?—A great many people waited on me, ladies, and others of the first respectability in the neighbourhood.

9134. Did they hint any thing, directly or indirectly, as to what would be the consequences of your not voting?—They did.

9135. Who did?—There was John ——— sent down from the committee to say, that if I did not vote, I would be ruined in my business, and that another person would be set up in opposition.

9136. Whose authority did he quote for sending you this message?—The committee's, he came down from the committee.

9137. What was that committee composed of?—Gentlemen in the town, his friends.

9138. Was it composed very much of your customers?—It was entirely, I believe; in fact, I had been the only person in that business in the town for 20 years.

9139. What answer did you give to Mr. ———?—He was told I could not come forward consistently with my principles, whatever the result might be.

9140. You are a dissenter?—Yes.

9141. You refused to vote at all?—Yes.

9142. Were you afterwards solicited by Mr. O'Connell's party?—I was not, because they knew my principles; they said that if I did not vote against them, they were quite satisfied.

9143. Had you many customers among Mr. O'Connell's party?—I have more now than I had before, I had not many then.

9144. Are you a Presbyterian?—No; I am a Baptist.

9145. In consequence of your not voting, has any custom been withdrawn from you?—Almost entirely.

9146. Who have withdrawn their custom?—All the Conservative party in Youghall; there are very few of my Protestant customers remain.

9147. How many persons can you state to have withdrawn their custom from you in consequence of your not voting?—I could not say the number, but all people in the town and neighbourhood of that party.

9148. Have you a list of those?—No; but I have some documents that were sent me by some of the principal people, saying that they would deal no more.

[*The Witness delivered in the same, which were read, as follows:*]

"The list of the House of Commons not being in this Almanack, it will not do for Mrs. ———, so she returns it; and begs Mr. Hamilton will send her in her account, as she does not intend taking any more periodicals from him."

"Mrs. ——— sends Mr. Hamilton the amount of her account; if he has got Paxton for December, she, of course, will take it, but in future she will get that and Rennie's, and any other things she may want in his line from Mr. Barry. ——— in Cork, January 19th, 1835."

"Mr. ——— returns Mr. Hamilton the magazines he last got from him, having found them faulty in many respects, neither will he require any more in future."

9149. Have you any more communications of the same sort?—Not written; but I had a great number of verbal messages.

9150. Did you receive those communications immediately after the election?—Yes.

9151. Where the copies that you sent imperfect as is alleged?—No, it is necessary to state with regard to that, to show that they were not imperfect, that I sold them a week after that in the regular way of business, and there was no fault found with them.

9152. Those magazines that are referred to in one of the letters you had been in the habit of supplying?—Yes, Chambers' Journal and some other magazines.

9153. And no fault had been found before?—No.

9154. Have you any doubt that it was in consequence of the part you took in the election, that the supplying the magazines was withdrawn from you?—I have not the least doubt that that was the reason.

9155. Were many of those verbal communications made to you to the same effect?—A great many.

9156. How many should you think?—I should suppose some dozens.

3157. Have you the name of the parties?—I have not.

9158. Are they principally Catholic or Protestant customers who have withdrawn their custom?—Principally Protestant; my business chiefly lay among the Protestants.

9159. Did any of those customers that continued to deal with you, inform you that they had been solicited to withdraw dealing from you?—They did frequently.

9160. Can you give any instance of the kind?—Yes, I could refer to some who have told me that they were repeatedly requested to withdraw their custom.

9161. Had you a stock in hand intended for that class of persons?—Yes.

9162. Of what description?—Principally Protestant books, that could be sold only among a certain class.

9163. Do you expect that you will sustain a considerable loss from having to dispose of this stock?—Yes.

9164. Is Mr. John ———, the ——— of the corporation of Youghall?—
He was at that time.

9165. Did he take any part against you in consequence of what you had done at the election?—A very active part.

9166. What did he do?—He declared in my shop—I did not hear it; but I am fully confident of the truth of it; my son who is here could state it.

MR. GEORGE HAMILTON.

9167. WHAT did you hear Mr. ———, who was ——— of the corporation, state in your father's shop?—I heard him state, that since he would not vote after being told the reason of his not voting, he never would take a shilling's worth of goods himself, and that he would never deal with him again, or allow any body else that he could prevent, and that he would do all in his power to injure him.

9168. *To Mr. John Hamilton*] Did he carry his threats into execution?—He did.

9169. In what way?—In every possible way that he could; the greatest part of the customers withdrew; and it was principally through his influence, I have no doubt.

9170. Did any of your former customers tell you that Mr. ——— had used his influence with them to injure you in your business?—No, they did not absolutely tell me so; they told me that they were solicited, but they did not say by whom, and I did not ask; I thought it rather indelicate to ask that.

9171. Is Mr. ——— a man of influence?—Yes.

9172. Is he supposed to be a wealthy man?—Yes, he is considerably wealthy.

9173. He lives in a respectable station in life?—Yes.

9174. Had you an account with the corporation previous to this election?—Yes, and had been in the habit of supplying them with stationery for 10 or 15 years.

9175. You supplied him also on his private account?—Yes.

9176. Did he close the corporation account?—It was not he who closed it; but it was partly through his influence, I have no doubt.

9177. Was there any establishment in bookselling on a par with yours in Youghall previous to this?—No.

9178. Did they carry their threats into execution, and set up a shop as a rival to yours?—They did.

9179. Did the corporation transfer their business from your shop to that of the rival shop?—They did.

9180. How long was this after the election?—Perhaps about two months after the election.

9181. Did they ever assign any reason why they transferred their business?—They have in a general way assigned a reason, that it was on account of my not voting.

9182. You do not mean that the corporation, as a corporation, assigned a reason?—No, I do not think they did.

9183. Did any individuals belonging to the corporation give you any hint, that it was on account of the part you took in the election that their business was removed from your shop?—I really cannot recollect that they did, though we knew the reason very well.

9195. Is ——— the ——— of Youghall?—He is at present.

9196. Did he deal with you before?—He did.

9197. On account of the parish or on his own account?—On his own account.

9198. Did he withdraw the account?—He did.

9199. Did he take any step which convinced you that he was angry with you on account of the part that you took in the election?—Yes; he was very angry, and said that he would never darken the door again, that he would never enter the shop.

9200. Did he come into your shop to ———?—He did not.

9201. Why?—I suppose on account of his promise.

9202. Did he come to the outside of the door?—He did, and had me called out into the hall.

9203. Did the liberal party have recourse to any measures of the same kind, in withdrawing their custom from persons of the Conservative interest?—They did for a few months after the election.

9204. Since the ferment of the election has gone by, have they continued their test of exclusive dealing?—No, in a great measure it is given up on their sides.—[*George Hamilton.*]—In as far as the shops that had been particularly marked at the time have been since the election thronged as much as ever.

9205. Have any of the parties who withdrew their custom from you shortly after the election returned to you since?—[*John Hamilton.*]—Not a single individual.

9206. It is stated in one of the notes sent to you, that some of the goods you had delivered previous to the election were returned upon your hands by the buyer?—Yes.

9207. Did this happen in more than one instance?—Only in two instances.—[*George Hamilton.*]—In three instances; two persisted, and one took it back because we persisted; the reason they gave was that there was no list of ministers; we convinced them that no list could have it, and we referred them to the note, which said when a new ministry was chosen he would publish it gratis, and on that showing they could not but take it, but they never have had any thing since.

9208. Did you take an active part in the election?—No.

9209. [To *John Hamilton.*]—Did you take any part?—No, I did not vote at all.

9210. Did you ask any one else to vote?—No.

9216. What is the name of the new stationer set up?—

9217. Do many persons belonging to the liberal party deal with him?—No, I should think very few.—[*Mr. George Hamilton.*]—It is not natural to suppose so; it is since the election that he has set up, within a week of the election.

9218. Has there been any reduction in the price of the articles of stationery in Youghall since there were two rival shops?—[*Mr. John Hamilton.*]—I do not think there has been: we were very low before.

9219. He has not brought down the price?—No.

9220. You have stated that several of the customers of the liberal side have returned to deal with shops which were strongly marked, are those shops reckoned to be the shops which supply the best articles of the kind in which they deal?—I do not know that they are particularly good, or better articles than other shops.

9221. What reason do you suppose existed for those liberal customers, after having taken away their business from the liberal shopkeepers, to whom they had gone, to return to the persons whom they had formerly employed?—I cannot exactly say.—[*Mr. George Hamilton.*]—They were displeased with them for the time for voting contrary to the liberal members, as they conceived they had some claim upon them, as they were shopkeepers that did business with their party.

9222. But having employed a liberal shopkeeper, would not the same reason induce them to remain there?—[*Mr. John Hamilton.*]—They thought good to give up the exclusive business, they saw the folly of it.

9223. They thought it better to go to the shop where they could get the best articles, without reference to the political principles of the party who sold them?—Yes.

9224. Might not the same reasons have applied to the parties who went to Mr. ———'s shop?—They might; but I think hardly any person will say that the things are sold cheaper in his place than in mine.

9225. Or that his articles are superior in quality?—No. (pp. 516—519.)

Besides bribery direct, and the intimidation of exclusive dealing, there are various other modes of extinguishing freedom; some of the more prominent of which we must give.

Mr. T. B. TROUGHTON.

1061. ARE you resident Coventry?—I am.

1062. How long have you resided there?—All my life.

1063. Have you had experience in elections of Members of Parliament for Coventry?—Yes, I have taken great interest in them since 1818.

1064. Have you taken an interest in elections from 1818 down to the last election two months ago?—I have.

1065. Have you always taken an interest on one side?—Invariably.

1066. Have you been concerned in the management of the elections on behalf of the candidate opposed to the corporation?—Yes, I have taken a great interest in it.

1067. Have you had the direction of the proceedings up to a certain extent?—Yes, to a certain extent, I have.

1068. Has there been, in any election of which you have knowledge, any or much bribery?—I believe there has been no direct bribery: I am not aware of any direct bribery.

1069. Has there been any indirect mode of influencing voters practised?—Treating has certainly been adopted on both sides.

1070. Has the treating been to a considerable extent on both sides?—I should say not to so great an extent as it is in many places; it has generally consisted of ale drinking, and what is called buttered ale.

1071. Have the public-houses been kept open at the expense either of the candidates or their partisans?—Yes, but I should say that I do not think at Coventry, as far as my own knowledge goes, there is unlimited treating on our part; that is a practice I have kept very much aloof from; I cannot speak with any great certainty upon that point; the point to which I would wish to direct the attention of the Committee is the practice of paying for the admission of freemen.

1072. State what you know with respect to that?—I should perhaps state, first of all, that at Coventry, by the local Act, the freemen are compelled to send in their claims on the first Tuesday of the month, and they are to be admitted on the last Tuesday of the month; and between the first Tuesday and the last Tuesday it has been the custom for canvassing to go on amongst the persons who have or who claim to have the right of being admitted, and they have been paid for on both sides.

1073. What sum has it been usual to pay, or what sum have you known paid for the admission of each individual freeman?—It is regulated by Act of Parliament—1*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.*, 1*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.* for the stamp and the parchment, and 3*s.* fees, paid to the town-clerk for the admission.

1074. Are those the entire fees charged upon the admission?—Yes.

1075. Is it the custom for the candidates on both sides to defray the entire expense?—No, but it has been paid for, I believe; it was paid for many years by the corporation on the one side, and a club was formed in the opposite interest, and it was paid for by subscriptions from that club. I am speaking of the party I take an interest in. We have not paid it to my knowledge for the last three or four years; it has been paid for on the other side, and we certainly have lost voters in consequence of not having paid it. It was understood that they were to vote for the side of the persons who paid it, and I have known instances of persons whose admissions have been paid for by the corporation party, that have come over to our side and said, that if we would pay them back the money they would vote for us.

1076. Do you think the corporation pay for these admissions out of the corporate funds?—I do not think the corporation, at the present time, do pay for them out of the corporate funds.

1077. Have the corporation discontinued payment as long as you have?—No, not the corporation party; but my belief is, that it has not for the last two or three years been paid out of the corporation funds.

1078. What reason had you for ceasing payment?—We were tired of it, and we thought our party was sufficiently strong.

1079. Have the number of freemen, admitted since the Reform Bill, decreased, as compared with the number admitted before the passing of the Reform Bill?—I cannot say; I think it is about the same.

1080. Do you know what is the average number admitted annually?—I cannot state that; there is always a great number on the eve of an election; at

the present time there are upon the church doors upwards of 130, and I attribute that to this Circular, which I will hand in:—

“SIR,

“Coventry, April 2, 1835.

“A society is commenced for the purpose of raising a fund to assist those friends, on Conservative principles, who have not the means to take up the freedom of the city, in order that they may have a vote at an election, to add to the strength of that party.

“I am instructed by the committee to solicit the favour of a donation, which will be gratefully acknowledged.

“N. B.—Subscriptions received by ———, treasurer, and at ———’s, bankers.”

“————, Secretary.

And I do not hesitate to say I shall feel it incumbent, in some manner, to counteract what is going on. I do not think it safe to the party I am interested for, to suffer them to pay entirely, and us not to pay. With respect to Mr. ———, who is mentioned in this circular, he was ——— on our last petition, in 1832.

1081. Who is Mr. ———, the party whose name is subscribed to the circular?—He is ———, a principal man in ———.

1082. Does he hold any office under the corporation?—I believe not. Mr. ——— is also in the council.

1083. Is it Mr. ——— the ———?—Yes.

1084. Are you aware whether the payments on the admission of freemen, made by the corporation, were made out of the corporate funds, or from subscriptions handed to them by individuals?—I am not in the secrets of the corporation. I know the impression at Coventry was, that they used to be paid out of the corporate funds originally.

1085. Was the money you speak of, as having asked to be given by you, for the purpose of taking it to the other side?—Yes.

1086. Is there any expectation among those parties who are entitled to the admission of freemen, who might also happen to be poor; is there any expectation on their minds of having the fees for admission discharged for them on one side or the other?—Yes, and I think we have lost strength; our party is not so strong as it would have been, if we had adopted the means which have been adopted by the other side.

1087. How is the freedom of Coventry acquired, by birth and servitude?—By seven years’ servitude; the indentures are to be enrolled with the clerk of the peace when they are bound, and at the expiration of the seven years, the names of the parties are put on the church doors, and publicity is given to them; and on the first Tuesday of the month they are examined before the council, and on the last Tuesday in the month they are admitted.

1088. Then freedom is acquired by servitude?—Yes.

1089. What is the aggregate number of the freemen of Coventry?—About 2,700 or 2,800.

1090. Are the greater number of those yearly admitted in a poor situation of life?—Yes.

1091. So that a great number of the new admissions would be of persons to whom the payment of the fees of admission would be an object of desire?—Certainly.

1092. Of what does the payment of the 1*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.* consist?—Of 1*l.* for the stamp, and 6*d.* for the parchment, and 3*s.* to the clerk, for fees of admission.

1093. Do you think that if the stamp duty was taken off, the payment of 3*s.* to the town clerk would be easily defrayed by the poor freemen?—I do, and I think the 3*s.* is not more than a compensation to the town clerk for the trouble he has.

1094. Have you any thing further to state with reference to the habit of paying for the admission of poor freemen by both parties at Coventry?—No.

1095. Has that habit continued ever since you have had any knowledge of the

elections?—Yes, since the election of 1818, but I have no doubt it had been in existence many years prior.

1096. Can you state or give us any idea of the given expenses incurred at Coventry on any one election by either side; does your knowledge extend to that fact?—No, I know nothing of the money matters.

1097. Are there any indirect means of influencing voters resorted to at Coventry?—My own opinion is that the charities of the corporation have a very powerful influence in the election.

1098. Are those charities administered by the corporation?—Almost exclusively; there are a few other charities, but the great bulk are administered by the corporation.

1099. Can you state what those charities are which are administered by the corporation?—They are very numerous; there is Sir Thomas White's charity, by which 4*l.* is given to a certain number of freemen annually.

1100. Can you tell what number?—I should think about 200. There is another charity, by which sums of 50*l.* are to be lent to individuals who can give security; they have got a large sum of money in hand from them, for they cannot get rid of them, something like 8,000*l.* or 10,000*l.*

1101. How are the individuals to whom that 4*l.* is given chosen?—Entirely by the selection of the council.

1102. Are the individuals who are to benefit by this donation annually selected by the council?—They are.

1103. Of how many do the council consist?—The council consists, by the charter, of 31, but they are now only about 20.

1104. Is this council permanent?—Yes.

1105. Is the donation of 4*l.* per annum given to the same men year after year after they once receive it, or are the individuals who receive it elected each year?—I believe the corporation have now made an order that persons are not eligible to have it a second time under a certain number of years, eight or nine years I think, which certainly gives a much fairer chance to other parties; I think they have done it in the spirit of fairness.

1106. Is it supposed, or is there reason to believe that the person selected to benefit by the donation are freemen who have voted with the corporation?—There is a strong impression to that effect. There are various other charities which I should say there is a greater outcry about than this.

1107. What are those charities?—There is Bablake hospital, which consists of 7*s.* a week to poor men, with a place to live in, or it may be paid to them out.

1108. To how many poor men are the benefits of this hospital extended?—It is limited according to the funds, some years more than others, as the leases fall in.

1109. Do you know what the ordinary annual revenue of it is?—No; but it is very considerable indeed.

1110. Must they be freemen, to receive it?—I think it is not essential to be freemen.

1111. In point of fact, are those who partake of the benefit of the hospital all freemen?—The great bulk are freemen who have voted for the corporation all their lives, and it is considered as a reward.

1112. Do they vote for the corporation at the time they are in possession of the charity?—No, the right of voting is taken away from them by the decision of the House.

1113. Are there other charities which you can state, administered by the corporation?—There is Billinge's charity and Wheatley's charity; there are a great many charities.

1114. In point of fact, is it the understanding amongst the great body of the freemen, that the way for them to be admitted to derive benefit from these charities is to vote with the corporation?—The strong impression of the freemen on our part is, that if they do vote with the corporation, they shall have a much greater share of the charities than if they voted on the other side.

1115. You state that that is the impression among the great body of the freemen on your side?—Yes.

1116. Did the Commissioners for Corporate Inquiry investigate the subject as

to the corporation of Coventry, when they made their circuit?—They did. I know there was evidence gone into.

1117. Did you yourself give any evidence before the Commissioners?—I was not examined.

1118. Are the vacancies supplied by election?—They are.

1119. How are the mayor and aldermen chosen?—By the council. (pp. 60-62.)

MR. JAMES HUDSON.

2215. Is there any influence exercised over the voters for the borough of Leicester through the medium of charities?—Yes: I consider the corporation influence by means of their charities, trust monies and other monies which pass through their hands, at least six or seven hundred besides.

2216. Are those six or seven hundred of the same class as those you describe as accessible to money bribery?—No, they are moving in rather a more elevated sphere, a great number of them; in those six or seven hundred I would include the corporate body of seventy-two.

2217. Do you mean to say they are influenced by distributions of charities?—Yes, I do; I can show that they receive charities to the extent they ought not to do.

2218. Is it your belief, that in the distribution of those charities regard is had to the votes at the elections of the persons receiving the charities?—Yes; probably in reference to the more respectable portion, the voters know that the very sum of money, what is called Sir Thomas White's money, now amounting to 18,000*l.*, is so used; the original object was to lend it out to poor young tradesmen, at 50*l.* each, for nine years, without interest, if they conducted themselves well; they had then 40*l.* for seven years longer, without interest recently; the reason assigned by the corporation is that they have got so much money now that they must let it out in hundreds instead of fifties. I do not give them quite credit for that motive, but that it is to make the benefit more exclusive, that they may be more particular about their sureties; that accommodation given to 360 industrious tradesmen, at 50*l.* would do a great deal of good to any town; but as it is lent out in hundreds, it gives accommodation to 180, and that is given with a distinct understanding, I have no hesitation in saying from political motives—"You shall have this money if you will serve us."

2219. Are you acquainted with any who have been benefited from that charity?—Yes, who have had the hundreds; I think the corporation have had it all themselves, and their sons too, some of them.

2220. You say that they have restricted it to 180 instead of giving it to 360?—Yes.

2221. You say that it is given with a view to political objects?—Yes.

2222. How do you account for the corporation confining that political influence to 180 instead of 360?—It is because they wish to take the personal benefit to themselves instead of poor tradesmen.

2223. You say it is used to influence votes at the election, and yet you say that the corporation prefer securing 180 to 360 votes; how do you account for that?—This I say has taken place from the increased monies; it is increasing every year, and they say that they enlarge the sum because they can as well give a hundred as fifty; but they have been giving it the last few years exclusively to their political friends.

2224. Do not you think that, if they had given 50*l.* to 360 political friends, they would have had a greater advantage in regard to the poll than by giving 100*l.* to 180?—It is questionable whether they could have found a sufficient number for it; but now few sums only become vacant each year.

2225. It is lent without interest?—Yes.

2226. Are there securities required?—Yes.

2227. Does not the loan of 100*l.* reach a different class from those who would avail themselves of 50*l.*?—Yes, to be sure it does.

2228. Are the persons who receive the loans of 100*l.* those likely to be accessible to direct bribery?—They are men moving in a sphere of life that would not receive bribery at elections.

2229. Are you aware there is a similar fund also, Sir Thomas White's, at Nottingham?—Yes, at Nottingham, Coventry, Leicester, Warwick and Northampton.

2232. Have you read the Corporation Reports?—I have not. The money is seldom the whole of it out, for the mayor for the year, as one of his perquisites, has the interest of this money when not out.

2233. That is, the interest of the money when not lent?—Yes.

2234. Are you acquainted with any of the parties who have received this loan from the corporation?—I know many personally.

2235. Are they retail tradesmen?—Some are professional gentlemen; they are principally the corporation and their immediate friends and the publicans.

2236. Are there any instances of parties who have received loans of money though voting on the side opposed to the corporation?—Yes, in some cases; from 1822 to 1831 they granted the money to 117; in that election, out of the 117, there were seventy-six voted for the corporation candidates and four against them.

2237. Is the loan resumable when it has once been made?—It is lent for nine years certain without interest, with two good securities.

2238. At the end of those nine years is it uniformly repaid?—It is repaid; in the year 1832 they granted the money to eleven, ten of whom voted for them and one against them.

2239. Have you known any instances of their refusing to advance money to the parties on the other side in politics?—I have.

2240. In those cases were there respectable sureties tendered?—As good as the town could produce.

2241. While the parties keep the money they are independent of the corporation?—Yes; but then there is a sort of feeling obligation.

2242. Would not that prevent persons of an opposite bias in politics making the application?—In some cases, when they think that the individual is a little wavering which way he shall go, they make him an offer of the money to get him over.

2381. Is it the practice to pay for the admissions of freemen in Leicester?—Yes, they give them the needful on both sides.

2382. What is the fee?—There are three different sums; I think the admission of the eldest son of a freeman is 1*l.* 8*s.* or 1*l.* 9*s.*; the admission of the other sons is rather more.

2383. Has it been the practice of the two sides in Leicester to pay for the admission of freemen?—Ever since 1826.

2384. Has that gone on ever since the Reform Bill?—Yes, the consideration is before the registration, with a view to have his freedom.

2385. Is it done now before the registration just as it used to be done just before the poll?—Yes.

2386. To as great an extent?—Yes, of the young part of them: the young man promises to support the side who pay the 1*l.* 8*s.* to 1*l.* 10*s.* or 1*l.* 12*s.* (pp. 125, 126, 133.)

Mr. JOHN JAMES, *Hereford.*

892. Do you speak of voters accessible to direct bribery?—Direct and indirect.

893. What are the modes of indirect bribery to which you have adverted?—There are a great variety of them.

894. Specify some of them?—Inducements to a voter to record his vote against his conscience by a promise of custom, and if he be a poor freeman, by the promise of the hospital; and by distributing among other freemen also the funds of charities to a large amount which our corporation possess; and I find the clergymen not only the most persevering and unscrupulous canvassers, but also the best keepers of their promises in not continuing their custom or otherwise.

895. Do you mean that when a clergyman threatens to take away his custom he executes that threat more heroically than other persons do?—Yes, he always fulfils his promise.

896. Are you speaking of the particular class of clergymen within your own cognizance?—Yes.

897-8. What do you mean by unscrupulous?—A clergyman generally is a good political partisan; a voter cannot get rid of him; he is not satisfied with the voter's saying, I cannot vote for your friend, because I prefer the political principles of the other gentleman; he is not content with that, but he brings all his influence to bear to an immense extent.

899. Do you mean by unscrupulous canvasser a man who would not be satisfied with the first answer, but who would follow it up?—Decidedly, by threats made that the clergyman's custom should be withdrawn, and the custom of all others over whom he has any influence, and it has been done.

900. Under whose control are the hospitals you spoke of?—Under the control of the corporation.

901. How many are there?—There are four hospitals under the corporation, and one under a gentleman, who is also of the same political principles as the corporation.

902. Do you mean that when indirect bribery is carried on by means of those hospitals, that persons are admitted to the hospitals or almshouses in consequence of the votes which they give?—Just so, as fast as they can fulfil their promises.

903. How many persons do the hospitals or almshouses contain?—Twenty-eight I think.

904. Do they altogether contain twenty-eight poor men?—Yes.

905. How many vacancies are there in a year upon an average?—I cannot exactly say how many; there are some vacancies to be filled up in every year.

906. Is it an understood thing among those freemen that the only way of obtaining admission into those hospitals is by voting according to the presumed wishes of the corporation?—It is.

907. Do you believe that the majority of persons in those hospitals have been admitted in consequence of their votes at elections?—Not the majority, but the whole of them, with the exception of one individual.

908. Was there any particular reason for making that exception as to that one individual?—Yes; I have no doubt there was.

909. Is any thing paid for the admission of freemen?—Yes, there is.

910. Since the passing of the Reform Bill, has there been any payment on the part of the candidates for the admission of freemen?—None at all, because none have applied.

911. Previous to the passing of the Reform Bill, are you aware that any expense was incurred by the candidate for the admission of freeman with a view to their votes at the election?—I know money was paid at that period for such purpose.

912. What was the admission fee?—About 2*l*. I think.

913. How do you account for the practice having been discontinued since the passing of the Reform Bill?—From the want of freemen to be admitted.

914. Why are not freemen as much willing and ready to be admitted now as they were prior to the passing of the Reform Bill?—Because the mode of obtaining their freedom by marriage is done away with; it can only be by birth or servitude for the purpose of an election.

915. Are there not the sons of freemen, and also apprentices just coming out of their time, to whom the same assistance might be extended now as was prior to the passing of the Reform Bill?—Certainly; in answer to the first part of the question, as to obtaining freedom by birth, the eldest sons of freemen not resident do not apply, because their fathers are not registered.

916. Does not the diminution arise from two sources, from the abolition of obtaining freedom by marriage and the abolition of non-resident freemen?—Yes, and also the custom is very much diminished of binding apprentices for seven years. A man to obtain freedom by apprenticeship must serve his apprentice to a freeman, and not an elector. (pp. 51, 52.)

Mr. C. COWELL.

1438. With respect to the influence which the corporations may exercise upon voters, have they any charities under their control at Ipswich?—Large charity funds and large corporate funds.

1439. Are those corporation and charity funds impartially distributed among the different freemen, whatever their political opinions may be?—Certainly, some few deserving individuals are placed upon the corporation charities; but, generally speaking, they are used for election purposes.

1440. Is it the impression among the general body of the freemen, that the way for them to derive any benefit from those charities, is to vote with the corporation?—Yes, and one case of bribery, which we have established upon our petition, is an instance of an individual voting in consequence of the promise he received that he should be placed upon the foundation of one of those charities.

1441. Who appoints to those charities; is it the corporation; and what officers of the corporation?—I believe the most wealthy charity is under the direction of a warden and two or three assistants; I think they are appointed out of the portmen or common councilmen; I am not quite certain; but the Corporation Commission Inquiry has gone into evidence upon those points.

1442. What is the amount of the charities?—I think they produce an income of between 2,000*l.* and 3,000*l.* a year.

1443. Do you mean to say that that sum of money is applied principally to election purposes?—I am not able to answer the question to that extent; I would merely say that it is largely applied to the exercise of electioneering influence.

1444. Is it usual to give a bribe to the wife of the voter without his knowledge, and afterwards for the wife to induce the elector to vote, without any direct statement by her that she has got the money?—I do not know whether that is done or not; there have been reports to that effect at Ipswich during the election.

1393. Are there a considerable number of the freemen of Ipswich in a poor and dependent station of life?—Most of them.

1394. Are they in a low station of life?—Most of them are in a dependent station of life.

1395. Are most of them in the employment of the manufacturers or tradesmen of the town?—A large number of them are persons employed by others; very few indeed of them obtain their living by using their own capital.

1396. How is the freedom at Ipswich acquired?—By birth and servitude.

1397. Is it by servitude to a freeman, or to any person in the town?—To a freeman for seven years.

1398. Are there any fees upon admission?—Yes, there are fees upon admission, which I explained to the Corporation Commissioners, before whom I gave evidence; and in my opinion the payment for the admission of these freemen is used as an instrument of bribery.

1399. What is the amount?—I am not certain whether it is 3*l.* or 4*l.*

1400. Does a large portion of that 3*l.* or 4*l.* consist of the stamp?—I do not know.

1401. Are there a great number of respectable tradesmen and manufacturers at Ipswich who are not freemen?—A large portion of what is called the respectability and wealth and intelligence of the town have no connection whatever with the corporation. I will not answer for its being quite correct, but I do not believe that among the whole of the freemen, including the corporation, there are 40 individuals who pay at the rate of 10*l.* a year in poor's rates.

1402. You mentioned just now the fact of these admission fees being an instrument of bribery; was it the practice, before the Reform Bill, to pay for the admission fees of freemen?—It was the practice of the candidates to pay the admission fees on both sides, the universal practice; and the freemen, generally speaking, waited for an election in order that they might obtain their freedom without cost.

1403. Was it just upon the eve of an election that these freemen were admitted in general?—During the election.

1404. Was it in order to qualify them to vote?—Yes; there generally was a great court held the day before the election, at which a great number were admitted.

1405. Since the Reform Bill, has that practice gone on of paying the admission fees?—Since the Reform Bill it has not been done at all. When I answer that question, I am answering only with reference to our own friends; the corporation is in the hands of our opponents.

1406. Were there large admissions of freemen either immediately previous or during either of the late elections?—Of the registration, I presume is meant.

1407. Were there large admissions made previously to the registration?—I do not think there was. I would wish to state one fact, that not having paid the fees of admission, and having from principle refrained from paying them, many of our young freemen are not admitted, and are waiting to be admitted whenever we are ready to pay the money; we have declined paying it, and they were not registered at the last election.

1408. Was there any expectation on their part that some political friends in the borough would pay their admission fees as freemen?—Certainly there was, and several of them have come to me and asked me to pay them, and I have consulted some of my friends upon the propriety of forming a committee, and subscribing a certain sum annually to pay for them, because they are individuals in so poor a station of life that they cannot afford to pay the 3*l*.; they have not the means.

1409. Has any such association been formed?—No.

1410. Has any association for a similar purpose been formed on the other side by your opponents, that you are aware of?—I do not think there has.

1411. Has there been any talk of such an association in the town?—Not that I am aware of.

1412. Do you know any instances in which applications were made by freemen at the last registration to pay for their admissions, and which were refused?—Yes, I remember a case or two of individuals who asked me whether I could arrange a plan for it, and wished to know what plan was adopted.

1413. Did you refuse to arrange such a plan?—I did. (pp. 77, 79.)

Mr. T. EDWARDS and Mr. JOHN R. STAFF, *Norwich*.

2425. Had it been the practice at previous Parliamentary elections for the borough in which you reside, to buy votes in the same way in which they were bought at the municipal elections, or was a different system pursued formerly?—A different system was pursued.

2426. By both parties in the borough?—By both parties.

2427. Will you describe the mode in which they were bought under the old system?—I think they were bought by the patronage of the corporation in some degree, by the alderman giving our corporation charities, promising turns to the voters, or to voters' children. (p. 137.)

Mr. JAMES TERRELL.

2873. With reference to the city of Exeter, are you aware of any sources of influence there affecting the elections with which you have been acquainted?—I think in the Exeter election for the city, the great evil we find in the Exeter election is, the influence of the corporation over the freemen.

2874. Exercised through what means?—There are some very considerable charities and almshouses in the hands of the corporation; those almshouses have always been given to the freemen, though in most cases they are for the benefit of the inhabitants generally; that has operated as an influence directly on the freemen occupying those almshouses, and indirectly as a temptation to others in case of vacancy.

2875. Has evidence upon the subject of the political influence of the corporation patronage been given to the corporation commissioners?—In the municipal corporation report there is the statement that those charities have been given to the freemen in preference, and in addition to that, they have considerable

property in Exeter, and their tradesmen and their tradesmen's journeymen being frequently freemen also, give them a decided preponderance with that class of voters. (pp. 166, 167.)

JOHN SCOTT.

6826. Do you think that a freeman who votes in the Blue interest has a better chance of obtaining relief from the charities in Bristol than if he voted on the opposite side?—In some he has, but in some he has not; it depends on what alderman the gifts are under.

6827. Has he a better chance on the whole if he votes in the Blue interest?—
Yes, and has a better chance of getting a child into the school.

6828. The members of the Conservative Operative Society, you think they would have a better chance of getting charitable relief?—Yes, because they get a recommendation from the committee.

6829. Do you know any men who have applied for charity and were refused because they have voted on the Liberal side?—No, I cannot say I do; I know some time back there were many instances; I could have recollected when I was here before. They have a mark which they make on the petition. The clergyman when he signs it makes a bit of a mark, and so the party knows the ground on which he is working, as I have been informed.

6830. Were there any members expelled from this Operative Conservative Society because they were supposed to be inclined to the Liberal party?—A vast number.

6845. Men used to delay taking out their freedom till the election arrived ?
—Yes.

6846. Did they pay themselves for taking out their freedom?—The Members did, or the candidates' friends.

6847. And that after the polling began?—Till the last moment of polling.
(pp. 404, 405.)

HARMAN VISGER, ESQ.

6357. Now we will go through the practices in former times, and without criminalizing individuals, can you state how it occurred at Bristol, was the taking up of the freedom of freemen immediately previous to the election, or even during the election, one of the corrupt practices that was had recourse to?—It was always the second, or third, or fourth day of the election; it was never done previous to the election; it was done to a great extent, and avowedly and openly.

6358. The claims to the freedom were suffered to accumulate between one election and another till the election arrived?—Yes.

6359. Was it supposed generally that directly or indirectly the candidates or their friends advanced the money necessary to take up these freedoms?—Directly and avowedly on both sides.

6360. Can you give any instance of this, as to the election of 1774?—There is a very strong instance in the Report of the Corporation Commissioners.

6361. Then give us that.—I have got the particulars of the election, and the votes for each.

Crager	- -	Old voters	-	-	-	-	2,168
		New voters	-	-	-	-	1,397
		TOTAL	-				3,565
Burke	- -	Old voters	-	-	-	-	1,553
		New voters	-	-	-	-	1,154
		TOTAL	-				2,707
Brickdale	-	Old voters	-	-	-	-	1,684
		New voters	-	-	-	-	772
		TOTAL	-				2,456

6362. So that it appears that Mr. Burke carried his election by taking up more new freedoms than his opponent Mr. Brickdale?—Yes, it does.

6363. Now do the Corporation Commissioners advert to the election of 1812?—I think they give most contested elections for some years back.

6364. They state, do they not, that the Bristol return for 1813 includes the period from the 29th September, 1812, on which day Parliament was dissolved; in that year 1,720 were admitted instead of 50, which is about the average number of ordinary years?—Speaking from my recollection, something to that extent.

6365. The return of 1826 without going into the numbers, was Mr. ———'s return effected by the same means?—It was effected by all the usual means of electioneering.

6366. Had not his antagonist a majority on the first day's poll?—Yes.

6367. And was it then determined by his friends to have recourse to the taking up of freedoms; and was not from 700 to 800 applications made on the part of claimants to the freedom to Mr. ———'s committee?—I know that Mr. ———'s election was in the greatest possible danger, and they decided on taking up freedoms, and spending all that was requisite, and it was turned by that means.

6425. Now have the charities in Bristol been much diverted from their purposes, and made use of as a means of exercising Parliamentary influence?—I do not know that they have been much diverted from their purpose, but I know they have been a very powerful means of Parliamentary influence.

6426. Was it generally understood by freemen, that unless they voted agreeably to the wishes of those in whose hands the distribution of the charities was vested, any application for participating in the charity was not likely to be successful?—I should say it was the universal and entire conviction*.

6427. Did you ever read the evidence of a person named Leach, given before the election committee of 1812, in which this passage occurs:—"Q. Are the freemen of the parish where you reside entitled to any charity monies?—A. I have had it (meaning charity), but on account of polling for ———: I could not get it this last time. Q. Did you make any application for charity money?—A. Yes, I had my petition before Christmas from the principal gentlemen of the parish. I took it to Mr. ——— to have it signed, and he said, he wondered at my impudence. He said he came to me to ask the favour to vote for ———; I refused him, and he would not sign it. Q. Was it necessary that Mr. ——— should sign it?—A. Yes, he was the ——— of the parish. Q. Did you go any further with that petition?—A. My wife went to the minister of the parish and had it signed, and then I lodged it in Mr. Wilkinson's hands, and he lodged it at the council-house, but I had nothing. Q. What is the amount of that charity?—A. Three pounds, Mrs. Pelloquin's money."—I had my attention called to that passage in the printed evidence.

6429. Have you seen any estimate of the charities that are vested in the corporation?—I have.

6430. And which they have the power to distribute?—I have it made out.

6431. Have the goodness to read it.—Here is a compilation of the Bristol charities, and from that the memorandum has been taken,

6432. Prepared by yourself?—Not prepared by myself, but prepared by a friend of mine at my request.

6433. And from the report of the corporation commissioners?—From the compilation of what related to Bristol in the charity commissioners' reports.

6434. Then, in fact, all you state there has been derived from the report of the charity commissioners of the charities at Bristol?—I believe it to be fully and correctly taken.

6435. Will you just be so good as to read it?

Mr. VISGER then read an elaborate statement of the CHARITIES AT BRISTOL.

Grand Total Loan, money and corn fund.....	£. 6260
General Charities in money, food, clothes, &c. annually disbursed, exclusive of sermons	16,895
The general Corporation Charities (Mr. Visger observes) in doles of bread, &c., pass also through the hands of the Churchwardens: the total he says) is less	

* See Note at the end.

than in strictness it should be, from a desire not to overstate, and from the practice adopted of stating every thing as nearly as possible in round numbers."

6436. Now, the distribution of the charities alluded to is principally in the hands of the corporation and parochial authorities, is it not?—Principally; and as to that in the corporation, the sanction of the parochial authorities is frequently asked.

6437. Are these self-elected bodies?—I believe every vestry, and there are 18 in number in Bristol, have the closest principle of self-election.

6438. Now the authorities adverted to, are they principally composed of the members of one political party?—They are avowedly and openly the election committees of one party; I have seen the books myself in which electioneering proceedings were regularly recorded on the minutes.

6439. The vestry books?—Yes.

6440. In times past?—Perhaps 10 or 15 years ago.

6441. Can you give us an instance?—A letter had been received from a committee room, White Lion, to go canvassing for ———, or something like that, I will not speak precisely, and there was a resolution thereupon recorded.

6442. Can you give, in proof of the belief prevailing among the freemen, that these charities are distributed principally among the supporters of one political party, any answer given by freemen to persons canvassing for Messrs. Bailey and Hobhouse in 1834?—I have heard so many things as to that, that it is impossible to enumerate them; I heard particularly that those who subsequently might receive charity, said it would not do for poor men to fly in the face of those who could do them good.

6443. Did you hear a man say so yourself?—No, it was reported to me at the time.

6444. Do you know, in the case of Mrs. Pelloquin's charity, whether that in particular has been misapplied?—I have heard that it is very common to give it with the understanding that it shall be subdivided.

6445. Ought it not, according to the bequest, be given in sums of 6*l.* to poor householders?—Yes, I am told so.

6446. What do you mean by subdivided?—I have heard from a source which has left no doubt as to the fact on my mind, that it was given to a family on an understanding that others were to participate in it; a pound a piece, or something in that way.

6447. Christmas gifts, what is the nature of them at Bristol?—I cannot give you any information as to the detail of the charities.

6448. But there are what are called Christmas gifts distributed by the parochial authorities?—There are many.

6449. Parochial vestries?—Many; I have read the accounts of them on the boards in the church.

6450. How are these distributed?—By the vestries and the churchwardens.

6451. Is it generally believed that they are distributed in order to serve political and electioneering purposes?—It is generally believed that they are distributed with reference to political and electioneering purposes.

6452. Do you know any thing of the Oalston guinea; does it go by the name of the Blue guinea?—I know it is a society called charitable, but virtually political.

6453. Is there a practice that when a freeman applies for a gift, he always takes with him a copy of his freedom, and that when his vote has been favourable, his freedom is marked with blue ink?—In fact, the copy of the freedom is proof; I have seen numbers of them marked with blue ink in various places, according to the elections in which they voted.

6454. Is his freedom being marked with blue considered as a passport for success in applying for charitable relief?—The mark with blue is deemed a proof of his having voted in favour of the Tory party. It is marked in different parts of the copy according to different elections, and that is supposed to be a passport to success.

6455. Did you ever hear of a petition which was brought to a gentleman of

liberal principles for signature, and one of the documents given in support of the petition was, that the applicant had always supported the Blue party by his vote?—I have heard such a thing stated, and laughed at.

6456. Laughed at because it was not believed?—No, laughed at for his giving such a reason to the Liberal party, mistaking him for the opposite party. (pp. 377—384.)

MR. JOSEPH PARKES.

1829. Do you know whether there is an abuse of charities for election purposes in corporation towns?—Very extensive.

1830. Can you give any instances?—Yes; in Hereford the almshouses; and it is notorious in Coventry and Leicester. I cannot state the instances, but it is admitted by all parties that the administration of the charities is political. I know it has been so among my own partisans; I know that admission into a particular charity has been made an inducement to persons to poll in a particular way; I do not mean to say that has been confined to one political party.

1831. Is not that the necessary consequence of having popular elections to those charities?—No, few are popular; I think the charities might be advisably put on a very different footing.

1832. Supposing that the voting was by ballot, would not that influence cease?—I think it would.

1833. If he had a political feeling coinciding with the corporation, he would vote with it; but if not, he would vote according to his conscience?—Yes, and possess the charity too, if he did not disclose which way he voted.

1834. The charity pensioners are generally persons of no political feeling before they are elected to the charity?—No, I do not say that; but they feel it necessary to merge their feelings.

1835. They are not elected for election objects?—Yes, frequently; I consider a great many of them elected to serve the electioneering purposes of particular parties, having previously given their promise to vote.

1836. The party introduced into the almshouse is supposed to be of the political feeling of the party putting him in?—Yes, by profession.

1837. Therefore the ballot would be an inducement to him to violate his profession?—Yes, it would enable him to do it; but I consider that a much less evil than the other case; that is, voting contrary to his political opinion is a greater evil than breaking a dishonest promise.

1838. In the one case he is violating his moral feeling, and in the other his political?—I consider it a moral violation in both cases.

1839. Does not the man who votes for Mr. A. say, by that he considers Mr. A. the most fit person to be returned to Parliament?—I think at least his duty is to vote for the person he thinks most fit, and that there cannot be a greater violation of moral obligation than to vote contrary to his conscience.

1840. A man is elected to a corporation charity, being a liberal man; being there as a liberal man, he votes the next day for the liberal candidate; the ballot would enable him to vote for what you would call the illiberal candidate?—Yes; and I think that would be justifiable, if he thought the illiberal candidate the proper one.

1841. Would it not be better if he had changed his opinion, that he should have an opportunity of expressing that?—Yes; and we all know that very great alterations in national opinions have taken place in the last two or three years, and that further may occur in the next two or three years.

1842. They cannot turn him out of the charity in consequence of his vote?—No; but the man may still be under influence that will prevent his exercising his franchise, only he may not like to do that in open voting which he would under the ballot.

1843. Do you hold it to be a man's duty who has been elected into a corporation, always to vote as the corporation may dictate to him afterwards?—No.

1844. Would not you consider that as great an intrusion upon his liberty of

conscience as their dictating to him what verdict he should give if he was a jurymen on a trial?—Just as much. (p. 109.)

Further evidence by Mr. Parkes relative to undue influence in boroughs, will be adduced when we come to his answers to a question upon it in counties.

Hitherto we have attended to boroughs, with little deviation into counties. Against the counties few charges of bribery have been brought forward; but, as the evidence has shown, they are open, to an alarming extent, to those of intimidation, by influence of various kinds which cannot be too much reprobated.

BRIBERY.

A. E. COCKBURN, Esq.

3804. HAVE any cases come under your knowledge of bribery in county elections?—No.

Mr. JAMES SKERRATT.

3846. You are a solicitor in Cheshire, are you not?—I am.

3847. At what place?—At Sandbach.

3848. Have you had any experience in elections?—I have.

3849. In what elections?—In the elections for the county of Cheshire.

3850. In any other?—No.

3851. For both divisions of the county of Cheshire?—Before the county was divided, I had for the county generally; since it was divided, only for the southern division.

3852. Have there been any contests in that county since your experience commenced?—There has never been any contest that has come to polling since the year 1736 till the year 1832.

3853. Were there ever preparations for a contest before or since?—Many.

3859. Have you experienced much bribery in the county?—No, very little.

3860. Have you become acquainted with any?—Merely some instances; there have been two or three instances of about a sovereign at a time given to poor freeholders—what they call the 40s. freeholder, that has been in poor circumstances; I believe about three instances have taken place.

3861. Within your own knowledge?—Not exactly within my own knowledge, but from hearsay.

3862. Have you reason to believe that your information is correct?—One man told me that he was taken into a field and had six sovereigns offered him if he would vote for the Tory candidate, but he refused to take them.

3863. But bribery has not been carried to such an extent in the county elections as materially to influence the election in your opinion?—Not at all. (pp. 221, 222.)

Mr. JOHN JAMES, *County of Hereford.*

839. Now with regard to bribery, have you known bribery carried on to any extent in a county election?—No, not at all; the constituency is too large for any operation of that kind.

840. Have you ever had any experience of the last day of a hard contested election for a county?—Yes, it was a very severe contest in 1818 for a day or two. (p. 49.)

Mr. JOSEPH PARKES.

1640. HAVE you any thing to add to the information you have given as to the different modes of corruption and bribery?—No, I am not aware that I

have a knowledge of any other mode of corruption that I should class under as bribery.

1641. Have you any thing to say as to counties?—In counties I should say that bribery in a direct sense was rarely known or practised.

1642. Have you ever been cognizant of any improper act in counties?—I cannot say that I have any knowledge of any direct act of bribery in counties, and I attribute that in a great degree to the large number of the constituency.

1643. Have you been cognizant of a hard run election for a county?—Yes. I have known the numbers within 20 or 30, and the second day dependent on the superior exertion of parties, but I have never heard any proposition of bribing an individual; it is never till late at night or early the next morning now that we know who have not voted. (pp. 93, 94.)

MR. JAMES FLORANCE.

568. Do you know of any particular acts of bribery in the purchasing of votes with money, previously to a county election?—I have known in my experience that it does occur, but only in three or four instances, where it has been brought to my knowledge, and where the fact having been bruited about, the bribery oath has been a sufficient test to prevent them from voting. Certainly with respect to county elections, I do not believe that bribery can be said to exist.

569. To what cause do you attribute the practice of bribery being less frequent at county than borough elections?—The respectability of the county electors is far superior to that of borough electors, and independently of that, the constituency in general is much larger, and more dispersed.

570. Do you imagine that if the borough constituency were composed of the same class of persons as the county constituency, that bribery would be much less frequent?—Yes.

571. Do you not think the fact of the county constituency being so scattered, prevents the parties who wish to bribe from doing so?—Very much so.

572. Do you not think also the fact that many of them being also subject to the constant paramount influence of landlords, prevents people from offering bribes, inasmuch as they could not offer any bribe which would weigh against that?—Independently of the influence of the landlords, which I consider to be very great, I consider the class of individuals precludes the possibility of tempting them with bribes; the influence of landlords in agricultural counties is very considerable, and the only remedy I can suggest would be secret suffrage, if practicable. (pp. 35, 36.)

INTIMIDATION AND UNDUE INFLUENCE.

MR. JAMES SKERRATT, *Cheshire.*

3856. WERE you on the very eve of a contest on the last general election?—Yes.

3858. Do you think that undue influences still prevail?—I think to a great extent.

3865. Has there been much intimidation in order to influence the elections in your experience?—I believe there has.

3866. What is the worst and most injurious form in which that intimidation has been practised?—The worst is in our division of the county, the influence possessed by the county magistrates.

3867. Do you think that the authority of the magistrates has been used with a view unduly to influence the election?—I have no doubt of it.

3868. Can you give any instances without mentioning names?—I think I can; I can state one instance where a magistrate of the county met with a voter that had voted for the Reform side before, and asked him to give him his vote, and he told him that he could not, he should wish to vote for the other party; then he said, "I will take it in spite of you; what have you to say to that?" or words to that effect.

3869. Did anything follow in consequence?—The man if it had gone to a polling, though he had promised his vote to one candidate, would not have given it.

3870. You understood this from him?—I have written down to Cheshire since I have been in London; I had heard of the circumstance before, and I believed it to be perfectly true; and I had answer bringing it as near home as I think it could be.

3871. What was the reason that induced the voter to make this change in consequence of this threat; what power would this gentleman have had of enforcing this threat?—The man is a carpenter, and he worked for the agent of this gentleman, who is a joiner and builder; and he considered if he did not vote as this gentleman told him, he should be turned out of the employ of his master.

3872. What influence did the magistrate possess over his master?—His master was ————— to the magistrate.

3873. Then the influence exerted had nothing to do with the magisterial power which the gentleman used?—That single act has nothing at all to do with the magisterial influence, but that individual is in the commission of the peace.

3874. You have mentioned it on this occasion because you think it improper that persons in the office of magistrate should exercise that kind of intimidation, even where it is owing to their property and not to their office?—I think he ought not; it is improper.

3875. Do the magistrates in the interest of the Reform candidates exercise any influence of that kind?—I have never heard of an instance.

3876. Have you in any instance known a magistrate use his influence as a magistrate, that influence which he derived from the authority vested in him as a magistrate, to influence persons who came under his influence in that capacity?—Yes.

3877. In what instances?—I know an instance of an overseer of the poor of a township; he went to a magistrate to get his assessment signed, to allow him a rate; the magistrate knew that the man was going to do whatever he could for the Reform candidate, and he refused to sign the assessment, and would not state any reason why he did refuse, but did refuse to do it.

3878. Have you any reason to suspect that that was on account of the overseer's politics?—Every reason to suspect it, for he sent for the overseer a few days after and did sign it.

3879. Had the man changed his politics in the interim?—He had not, but it was noised about the country that the magistrate had refused to sign an assessment for the relief of the poor because the overseer was employing himself to get votes, and canvassing for the Reform candidate, and we considered that that was the reason why he signed the assessment.

3880. You suppose that it was in consequence of the publicity thus given to the transaction that the magistrate altered his conduct?—Yes.

3881. How many magistrates are there in that division?—Generally three.

3882. This application was not made at the petty sessions, but at his private house?—I am not aware; the general way is to go to two of the magistrates, if they want an assessment signed, and there should not be a petty session at the time.

3883. How often are there petty sessions held?—Once a fortnight; I think they are as often signed by the magistrates at their own houses as at petty sessions; and I think we have never a case of any difficulty which requires to be brought before the petty sessions.

3884. Have you any reason to suppose that the magistrate refused to sign the rate at the time, on account of any thing suspicious in the rate, which induced him to require the assistance of his brother magistrates?—I am certain he had no occasion whatever of that sort, and that was not his motive.

3885. Was the rate signed afterwards in his own house or at petty sessions?—At his clerk's office.

3886. Without the assistance of his brother magistrates?—Yes; I have the statement of the overseer.

3887. Was the preamble to the signature written by his clerk?—I think the whole of the assessments are filled up by the magistrate's clerk.

3888. Had that been written by the magistrate's clerk?—We have no assessments but what the preamble is filled up by the magistrate's clerk, for they will not allow the magistrate to sign any assessment without it.

3889. Had it in the first instance been so drawn up by the magistrate's clerk?—I cannot speak with certainty, but I believe it had.

3890. Do you believe that written statement of the overseer's to be correct?—Yes.

3891. Do you believe that he is correct when he says that the magistrate refused to sign the assessment for the relief of the poor of the said township ———, without assigning any reason for his so doing?—I do.

3892. But he verily believes that the reason for his so doing was because the overseer was not a Tory, and why he is able to state such his belief is, that at the time the magistrate refused to sign the assessment, party spirit was running very high in the town and neighbourhood; but some short time afterwards, when things had become more reconciled, the magistrate met him, and said that if he would bring his assessment up to the office of his clerk, he would sign it, which he accordingly did; and consequently, the very same assessment which that magistrate had previously refused to sign as before stated, was then signed by him and another; do you believe that statement to be correct?—I do.

3893. Was it drawn up by the man himself, or under his inspection?—It is drawn from the man's own words by a clerk of mine.

3894. Was there any other proof of the dislike of the magistrates shown to this man?—Yes.

3895. In his capacity as a tradesman?—Yes.

3896. What is his trade?—His trade is a printer and stationer.

3897. What was that proof of dislike?—He had printed the whole of the precepts, warrants and summonses that the magistrates used for several years previous to the election in 1832; he was called upon soon after that time to deliver in his account for printing by the magistrate's clerk; but after he had delivered it in, the printing was removed from him: no reason was assigned whatever, and he has never printed for them since.

3898. Had any fault been found with him for his mode of conducting the business?—None.

3899. Do you know whether that was done by the magistrate's orders?—I cannot state that.

3900. Do the magistrates pay for those articles?—The clerk pays for them.

3901. Have the magistrates any thing to do with the payment of them, or the ordering of them?—They may have to do with the ordering, but not the payment.

3902. Have they any thing to do with the ordering?—I do not know; but they may direct the clerk, I should suppose.

3903. Do you believe the clerk would have done it without the wish of the magistrates being expressed?—I believe not.

3904. Did you ever know an instance where a magistrate interfered in regard to the supply or the pay of those articles?—I do not.

3905. Do you know an instance where he was cognizant of it?—It is impossible I could be aware of it.

3906. Was this the assistant overseer or the principal overseer?—He has acted in both capacities.

3907. Is he appointed by the vestry?—At the time he was acting, then he was a hired overseer to the overseer that was appointed; he had no salary from the parish; we appoint our officers, and if those officers do not choose to act themselves, they pay others for acting.

3908. He was paid by the overseer?—Yes.

3909. In what respect would the giving or withholding of his signature to that assessment enable the magistrate to exercise any influence over him in regard to the election?—It might intimidate him so that he might decline taking any part whatever in elections, because it might detain him in doing any business with the magistrates.

3910. What injury would be done to the man?—It would retard him from going on with his business.

3911. Was there any other magistrate to whom he might apply?—There were three acting, but all acting in the same way; and one is ———, and the other was acting along with them, and they did nothing but with the cognizance of each other.

3912. Was this the nearest magistrate?—Yes.

3913. The one to whom he habitually applied to sign the rate?—Yes.

3914. Do you suppose that, if, after the refusal of that magistrate, he had taken the rate to another, he would not have refused?—If he had known that the one had refused, the other would have refused to sign it, I should think.

3915. Do you not think that he would have asked him, why do not you take it to the nearest magistrate?—Yes.

3916. Do not you think that the second magistrate would be quite right in refusing?—I think he would when the first had refused.

3917. Did any of the magistrates reside in the township ———?—Yes.

3918. Are their properties assessed for the poor?—Yes, they are.

3919. Then he has as much interest in the rates being duly collected as any other inhabitants?—According to the amount of the property for which he was assessed he had an interest.

3920. What is the man's interest in having rates collected, part of which he has to pay?—The chief interest he can have is to have them well collected up, so that he shall have the burden of the whole rate kept at as low a scale as he can.

3921. Does he compromise that by not signing the assessment?—The poor must have their pay paid to them every week, and by a magistrate refusing to sign a rate, he places the overseer in a very awkward state.

3922. But the injury to the overseer is greater than to the magistrate himself?—It is because he is bound to provide money for the poor.

3923. Overseers are generally men that have business of their own; this man was a printer?—Yes.

3924. It could not, therefore, be very convenient to him in the course of his trade to go to the magistrate to wait upon him to have the rate signed?—Very inconvenient.

3925. Is it the general impression in your part of the country, that magistrates exercise a great influence over the overseers of the poor?—Many people think they do. I have another instance I can name of the present overseer of the poor, who is acting in his own capacity, not as a hired servant. There has been within these two or three months, I have not the date with me, a declaration of confidence passed throughout the country which was agreed to at a meeting held at the Royal Hotel in Chester, expressing their confidence in Lord Melbourne and the present administration, and the overseer ———, who is a Reformer, and has been for some time, refused to sign that declaration, and the reason which he assigned was, that if he did do it, he should never be able to get any business done by the magistrates.

3926. Is he an independent man in other respects in circumstances?—He is so much so, that I handed him a copy of the declaration and he took it into an adjoining parish, and got it signed by many individuals there, when he would not interfere in it in his own town.

3927. Had he ever before he became an overseer, exhibited a similar dread of the consequences of showing his political opinions?—Never; there was not a man more bold in his political disposition than he was. (p. 221—225.)

MR. JAMES FLORANCE.

647. ARE you aware that in the towns of Essex, not boroughs, there are many of the leaseholders who have abstained from registering themselves as voters for the county, in consequence of being politically opposed to the politics of their principal customers?—I am not aware of that.

648. Have you been employed as an agent to procure the registration of voters in Essex?—Yes, ever since the Reform Act.

649. Have you observed any unwillingness on the part of county voters to be registered?—Very little; I have had a great deal to do with registrations before the revising barristers, before an election.

650. What do you infer from your practical experience before the revising barristers, that there is an apathy with respect to, or a desire to be placed on the register, or an unwillingness to be placed upon it?—It depends very much indeed upon the prospect of an election; immediately after a contest great apathy exists as to their names being properly inserted in the register.

651. You think there is a great deal of apathy after an election, and when no other election is immediately expected?—Yes.

652. But what have you observed when an election is anticipated at an early period?—There is a strong struggle to get registered, as the sure means to secure the election itself.

653. Are you able to state whether that struggle is on the part of the agents of the political parties, or the landlord, or the individual voter whose name is to be placed on the register?—On the part of the agent of the political candidate, identified with the particular voter.

654. Did the clergymen in Essex interfere much at the elections in which you have been concerned?—They certainly took a very decided part.

655. On which side?—I think of the class of clergymen who interfered at the last election, a large majority were conservative in their politics.

656. Did the dissenting ministers take an active part?—Undoubtedly.

657. On which side?—The opposite side.

658. In what mode did the clergymen interfere?—By canvassing; I know nothing beyond that.

659. Was there any intimidation used by clergymen?—I think not.

660. Any undue influence, to your knowledge?—Not beyond that influence which the station as a minister would give them; I think they would not condescend to intimidate, or to say any thing that could intimidate.

661. Do you know any instance of a clergyman threatening to withdraw his custom?—I do not.

662. Do you know any instance of his actually withdrawing his custom?—No.

663. Do you know any instance of that character as to dissenting ministers?—Not to that length; even among dissenting congregations, by having been engaged on both sides at different times, I have heard complaints of the interference and influence of their minister.

664. By whom were those complaints made?—By the members of the congregation who entertained different political opinions from their pastor.

665. Did they state the nature of the influence and interference of which they complained?—Not minutely, but in general terms they did.

666. What was the nature of the influence and interference?—Having the information merely from hearsay, and of a general kind, I can only imagine it to be the personal visitation and calling on the parties by the minister.

667. Do you mean using their influence as a spiritual guide for secular purposes?—Yes.

668. Is it inconsistent with the functions of a minister of religion to canvass voters for political objects?—Yes; at least in my own opinion.

669. And was that the view they took of it?—Yes.

670. And availing himself of the facility of the interference he had in his spiritual character, in order to carry on his political purposes?—Yes, in order to gain votes for the party he thought right.

671. Did this apply to any one class of dissenters, or all in general?—There are not many distinct classes of dissenters in Essex; they are chiefly the same denomination.

672. What is that?—Independents.

673. And it is of them you speak?—Yes. If I might speak of Colchester at the last election, where I was engaged by the Conservatives, there was an attempt made at Colchester to place on the register an almsman of an almshouse. The trustees of that almshouse were dissenters, and I know the object was to establish a principle, that one of the almsmen should be got on the register, and if he had been allowed to be entered on the register, then a considerable number

of these almsmen would have been allowed to be registered, and who were completely under the influence of the dissenting trustees, the majority of whom had the patronage in them.

674. Were those almsmen themselves dissenters?—I understood they were; and because they were dissenters they were chosen almsmen. I am now speaking of the influence which dissenters used with respect to those almsmen.

675. Could they influence all dissenters to vote against their known political opinions?—I think the dissenters in Essex, almost to a man, adopt one line of politics; they are all of the Yellow party; they are Reformers as opposed to Tories and Anti-Reformers. With respect to the influence, I think this was in itself an abuse, though perhaps fair when opposed to influence on the other side, and if this one almsman had been permitted to be registered, all the rest would have been inserted in the register, and the whole of them unquestionably would have been Yellows.

676. Do you think they would have been of the Yellow party, irrespective of the influence of the dissenting minister?—They had no connexion with the minister, but the trustees happened to be dissenters.

677. Do you think that the body of dissenters generally who have votes in the county of Essex, are influenced by their ministers to vote differently from what they would if that influence had not been exercised?—I do not think they are unduly influenced by their ministers, who in general are of the same kind of politics as the body of the congregation; I speak only as to the fact that undue influence might exist, with reference to a minister who did not entertain such political opinions as the large majority of the congregation did.

678. Have you ever known a clergyman of the Established Church attempt to exercise precisely the same influence as the trustees of the almshouses or charity?—I have not myself known that. (pp. 40—42.)

MR. JAMES TERRELL.

2694. You reside in Exeter?—I do.

2695. Have you been conversant with the Devonshire and Exeter elections?—I have been engaged in the whole of the elections for the county of Devon since 1816, and in 1830 and since have had the principal management.

2696. Have you since the last election compiled any papers illustrative of the course which the votes took under different influences?—I have prepared an analysis of them; there are seven districts in the south of Devon; I have extracted the votes from the poll-books and the check-books, and compared them with the registry, and have divided them into freeholders and leaseholders, and have then divided them as to those who voted for Lord John Russell and those who voted for Mr. Parker.

DISTRICTS.	FREEHOLDERS.		LEASEHOLDERS.	
	Russell.	Parker.	Russell.	Parker.
Exeter.....	217	411	189	510
Oakhampton	112	90	98	71
Honiton	251	299	168	279
Newton	517	528	312	404
Tavistock	133	31	180	66
Plymouth	340	246	102	208
Kingsbridge	324	292	185	302
	1894	1897	1234	1840
				1234
Mr. Parker's Majority of Leaseholders				606

2698. What do you mean by the word "leaseholders?"—I mean those who hold leases for 99 years, or 50*l.* renters. In Devonshire it is the case with a great many of the landlords that their tenancies go on without any fresh lease being given; there is a perfect understanding on which they proceed.

2699. Have you in preparing this also made any note of the different properties?—I have, in pencil.

2700. Have you the means of showing, from your knowledge of the county, any of those districts in which a considerable number of persons voted on rights other than freehold, in whose hands the freehold is?—I can do it in almost every case.

2701. Can you specify any particular parishes or divisions in the last election, where the vote of the tenant following that of the landlord was particularly remarkable?—Yes, in a great number of cases.

2702. Have the goodness to point them out?—One case I would more particularly call the attention of the Committee to, arises in the Newton district; here are three parishes immediately adjoining each other, the parishes of Rattery, Staverton and Broadhempstone. In the parish of Rattery there were 21 votes polled at this election; only one was a freeholder, the other 20 were leaseholders, or 50*l.* renters.

2703. Do you mean tenants at will?—It is a tenancy from year to year.

2704. The men may be put out at the mercy of their landlords?—Yes, or they may have leases for seven years; I cannot say how that is.

2705. Are any of the persons those who hold leases for lives?—I believe not in Rattery; they are ordinary renting tenants, I conceive.

2706. Voting under the 50*l.* clause?—I apprehend so; in the election of 1832 those voters all voted for Mr. Bulteel, the Reform candidate.

2707. Are they all under the same landlord?—Yes, the whole.

2708. How did the landlord vote at that election?—He voted with Mr. Bulteel in the last election, they all, with the exception of one, voted for Mr. Parker, the Conservative candidate.

2709. How did the landlord vote?—The landlord voted for Mr. Parker.

2710. Was there any peculiarity about that exception of one?—No, I am not aware of any peculiarity.

2711. To whom does that parish belong?—To Sir Walter Carew. The next parish to which I would call the attention of the Committee is the parish of Staverton, which is adjoining the parish of Rattery; 41 votes were polled, three freeholders and 24 leaseholders for Lord John Russell, and five freeholders and nine leaseholders for Mr. Parker; the land in that parish belongs to the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, who have the great tithes; their leases are granted for 21 years, which leases are renewed every seven years; persons holding such leases consider their tenure very good, because deans and chapters never refuse to renew at the end of the seven years; then they grant a fresh lease for 21.

2712. Do they consider themselves dependent upon the dean and chapter?—Very little, with the exception of the influence which the tithes would have upon the parish, for they always find the deans and chapters very ready to renew.

2713. Are those tenants the same class of persons as the tenants in the other parish?—I would observe that in the three parishes I have adverted to, they are the same class of yeomen. In Staverton, the number that voted for Mr. Parker were five freeholders and nine leaseholders, and for Lord John Russell, three freeholders and 24 leaseholders; the nine and five include the chapter clerk of Exeter and their surveyor.

2714. You stated that two individuals of those who voted for Mr. Parker held offices, from which you would draw the inference that those were influenced by their offices; do you know if any individuals who voted for Lord John Russell were thus influenced?—I believe not; I would state that they are as intelligent and respectable a set of yeomen as any in the county of Devon. In the parish of Broadhempstone the voters are nearly all freeholders; there are 29 freeholders in that parish who voted for Lord John Russell, and four leaseholders; five freeholders voted for Mr. Parker, and one leaseholder; of those six who voted for Mr. Parker, three reside out of the parish at a distance, and of the other three, one was the clergyman.

2715. How many of Lord John's freeholders reside out of the parish?—Only three.

2716. Are the bulk of those 29 freeholders of the same class of voters as the persons in Staverton and Rattery?—I should say, taking the three parishes together, they would form one class of people; they are in the habit of associating together; they are a very intelligent set of men.

2717. Who is the owner of the parish of Broadhempstone principally?—There is no great owner of that parish, they are all freeholders.

2718. Do you consider that the bulk of the freeholders in Staverton and Broadhempstone are independent of any influence?—In Broadhempstone most decidedly; in Staverton a very slight influence; the influence of the landlord, being that of the dean and chapter, for the reason I have before stated, I think is not a very powerful one in respect of the leases; the influence of the tithes being in their hands perhaps might have some weight.

2719. Are the tithes let on lease?—They are leased by the dean and chapter for 21 years to a middle-man, who holds them; I rather believe it is their own surveyor.

2720. Were you acquainted before the election with the political sentiments of the voters in those three parishes?—I have been in the habit of associating with the yeomanry of that neighbourhood a good deal within the last few years.

2721. Are you of opinion that the same opinions in politics existed amongst those persons as among the others of which you have already spoken?—I am.

2722. Does that circumstance of your knowledge of their political opinions give rise to the supposition in your mind that the change which took place in the Rattery voters took place in consequence of the change of opinion of the landlord?—It does.

2723. Had you any conversation with any of them on the subject?—I do not know particularly; I have had a good deal of conversation with the yeomen in that neighbourhood by frequently meeting them.

2724. Is there any other parish or district to which you wish to refer as illustrative of the general principle you have stated?—In the district immediately round Exeter, those voters who poll at Exeter, there were 189 only of the leaseholders and 50% renters who voted for Lord John Russell, while 510 voted for Mr. Parker; it will be seen from the list of the Exeter district, that in many parishes Lord John Russell had not a single voter of the leaseholders. I might instance some of the more prominent cases of Colaton Raleigh, ——— there were 22 leaseholders voted for Mr. Parker, not one for Lord John; in the parish of Dunsford, 24 leaseholders for Mr. Parker and one for Lord John.

2725. To whom does that parish belong?—To ——— principally.

2726. Are you sufficiently acquainted with those parishes to say, by references to your poll book, how the same class of persons voted when they voted in respect of their freehold qualifications?—There are but nine freeholders in the parish of Dunsford, they also voted for Mr. Parker.

2727. Are they the same description of persons?—Yes, they are small freeholders, who also probably rent lands.

2728. Have you any freeholders in Colaton Raleigh?—There are seven.

2729. How did they vote?—For Mr. Parker.

2730. Are you sufficiently acquainted with those places to say whether the freeholders of those parishes are the same class, or of a class above or below the renters who voted?—I should say about the same; in the parish of Exminster there were 24 leaseholders for Mr. Parker and one for Lord John Russell; freeholders, 13 for Mr. Parker and one for Lord John.

2731. One leaseholder and one freeholder?—Yes; in the parish of Kenn, 13 leaseholders and 21 freeholders voted for Mr. Parker, and only one freeholder for Lord John, and I believe he lives out of the parish.

2732. In the course of your communication with the voters in the county, are you aware of any instances of persons who have voted contrary to their inclinations in consequence of any superior influence exercised over them?—I know many cases; some of the tenants have told me of it, and told me the circumstances, but they have told it me in confidence, because they say if it was known

that they had repeated it, they should lose their interest with their landlords, and that would be almost as bad for them as if they had voted against their landlord's wish; I can mention one, but I am not allowed to give names, which is a very prominent case. A yeoman, who ever since 1816 has been a most active man on our side, and has canvassed on our side of the question and taken a very active interest, attended the nomination; on his return he received a letter from his landlord, requesting that he would not oppose Mr. Parker; I have seen him since, and he told me he thought he might then have been allowed to be quiet, but on the Sunday his landlord called on him, and compelled him, though, as he told me, with tears in his eyes, to go to the poll and vote for Mr. Parker.

2733. What do you mean by compelled him?—By the influence which was used.

2734. What do you mean by influence?—I do not mean by threats, but he had no lease, and his capital being embarked in his farm, and he having a family, he was afraid that if he offended his landlord he should not get his lease promised him: that it would be ruinous to him.

2735. He did not say that his landlord threatened that it would be the worse for him if he did not vote for Mr. Parker?—He did not state to me the words used, but that the influence was so used as to afford that presumption.

2736. You think the tears in his eyes afforded an indication of the state of his mind?—Yes.

2737. He had the prospect of obtaining a great benefit from the landlord?—I have no idea that the landlord would have turned him out, but he felt himself under that obligation to the landlord, and the fear of offending him, that induced him to vote against his conscience.

2738. Do you think the influence on his mind was fear of loss or wish for advantage?—Not hope of advantage; for as to the lease, I understand the landlord is too respectable a man to have inflicted any injury upon him even if he had voted for Lord John Russell, but still he felt the importance of keeping the good will of the landlord.

2739. You say you had been previously well acquainted with this man, and know his political sentiments?—For the last 19 years.

2740. Having known him well, do you attribute the change in his vote to any change in his political sentiments?—Certainly not; he has been with me since the election to explain it; he said he was anxious that his political reputation should stand well.

2741. Have you any influence over him in any way in the way of business?—Not the least.

2742. Or any of your clients?—Not the least; he is a man very respectable in his station, a man of strong mind and good property.

2743. Can you mention any other?—Yes, in the next case I might, without any breach of confidence, mention the names, for the voter came to our committee-room and stated the circumstance in public. There were two Members of Parliament, I think, Mr. Divett and Mr. Charles Buller, present. Mr. ——— who rents a very large farm under ———; he and his brother have always been very active partisans on our side in politics, and up to the Saturday previous to the election, which was on the Monday, he was very actively canvassing for Lord John Russell, and was at our committee-room I believe on the Friday, the market day. On the Sunday, the day before the election, ——— went to him and requested him to vote for Mr. Parker; he told us he had refused to do so, but that intimidation was used to the extent upon him that he was prevented from voting at all, and he did not vote.

2744. Did he state the nature of the intimidation?—He said that ——— had influenced him; I do not know that he had threatened ——— but that he had used that sort of influence upon him which it was impossible for him to resist.

2745. There is a difference between influence and intimidation?—It certainly went beyond due influence in the case of a man of Mr. ———'s station as a yeoman, and his well-known feeling as a politician.

2746. Did he state what ——— had stated to him?—I cannot

state the words Mr. — used, but he gave us to understand that influence and intimidation had been used, which prevented his voting.

2747. He reported that that which had been said to him had alarmed him as to the consequences which might ensue to himself if he gave a vote against Mr. Parker?—Certainly.

2748. Can you state distinctly that he was alarmed as to what would occur to him if he voted against Mr. Parker?—I cannot state the words, but I think that the influence which was used towards him prevented him coming to the poll; he very strongly resisted the application to vote for Mr. Parker.

2749. Is he still in the occupation of his land?—Yes.

2750. In other cases, of which you say many have come before you in this way, where persons have stated that intimidation has been used, has the conversation which you have had with those persons upon whom it has been so used, led you to believe that threats have been actually used, or that a sort of hint or intimation has been given which was quite enough to impress upon the mind of the person influenced what the consequences would be?—In some cases there have been direct threats, but more generally influence of a strong nature, perhaps not justifying the term intimidation.

2751. Do you think any law which prohibited persons from making a direct threat, or punished any person making a direct threat, would have any influence in preventing that sort of indirect intimation or hint?—No, I do not think the influence used is such as would enable a prosecutor to make out a case; the landlords would invite all their tenantry to breakfast on the day of election, and the thing would be understood.

2752. Is the hint ever conveyed in an intimation that the rent day will occur soon after, or that there are certain covenants which have not been performed?—No, I rather think not; but the general understanding is sufficiently operative upon their minds.

2753. Do you think that when the agent or steward of the landowner calls upon a tenant and asks him for his vote, and presses him more or less for it, it is understood by the tenant that bad consequences will ensue if he does not give his vote in a particular way?—I rather think in those parishes where the influence of the landlord is very strong, though the terms may not be very distinct, the voters generally understand that they must go with the landlord; I will instance the parish of Broadclist, belonging to Sir Thomas Acland; one freeholder only and five leaseholders voted for Lord John, and 19 freeholders (most of whom, I believe, are leaseholders also) and 33 leaseholders voted for Mr. Parker, making 52 against six; now in 1832 nearly all those men voted for Mr. Bulteel, the Reform candidate; in 1835 they voted for Mr. Parker, the conservative candidate.

2754. Had they changed their landlord in the mean time?—No, Sir Thomas Acland in one instance supported Mr. Bulteel, and in 1835, he supported Mr. Parker.

2755. Did Sir Thomas Acland vote himself in 1832?—I think he did; those votes were not canvassed I apprehend strongly, but they understood that Sir Thomas Acland supported a particular candidate, and they went with him; Sir Thomas Acland has a great moral influence over his tenantry, being a very excellent man.

2756. Independent of that moral influence which Sir Thomas Acland has ever been known to possess over all persons connected with him, supposing that parish to be in the hands of a landlord who did not even reside in the country, and of whose merits they knew nothing, do you apprehend the same course would be pursued?—No; I think if they were let alone, and there was no influence of the landlord over them, a great part of them, with the yeomanry generally of the county of Devon, would vote as strongly almost as they did in Broadhempstone.

2757. Do you think that if there was the vote by ballot, the influence of so good a man as Sir Thomas Acland would so weigh with them that they would comply with his wishes though he had no means of enforcing that compliance?—I think that Sir Thomas Acland's legitimate influence over them in his own neighbourhood is very considerable, but I think that a very large proportion

of those persons would have voted for Lord John Russell if they could have done it privately.

2758. That the moral influence of Sir Thomas Acland would have been destroyed?—I have not said that; I think a very considerable portion of them, if they could have voted secretly, would have voted for Lord John Russell.

2759. You think that the vote by ballot would impair the effect of the moral influence?—No.

2760. Do you consider that a moral influence which induces a man to vote against his conscience?—No; what I mean by moral influence is, that if Sir Thomas Acland called his tenants together and reasoned with them on politics, his persuasion would induce many to vote with him, even if the ballot existed; but I think that a great many would vote, if they could privately, against his present political opinions.

2761. They would retain their own opinions in spite of the opinion of Sir Thomas Acland?—I think they would; a very large number of voters in the county of Devon who are on the registry did not come to the poll, because if they had, they would have offended their landlords in not voting as they wished them, and a very large number are not on the registry, fearing that by voting they would affect their interests.

2762. The intimidation in the county of Devon, then, does not go to the extent of forcing the voters to vote, but when their opinions are adverse to those of their landlords, they remain neuter?—Not exactly so; I think the influence in Devonshire varies in different districts.

2763. You say a large proportion of the voters in the county did not vote in consequence of wishing to vote differently from the line their landlords wished them to adopt, and that in consequence of that they were not forced to vote but remained neutral; the intimidation exercised in the county of Devon went to the extent, then, not of inducing them to vote but to remain neutral?—In many instances; but in a very great number of cases they were led to poll against their own wishes; a great many had promised to vote for Lord John Russell, and were afterwards kept from the poll; for instance, in the parish of Alphington there are 12 who did not poll.

2764. Are they leaseholders or freeholders?—Leaseholders for lives, mostly holding houses worth more than 10*l.* a year renewable on lives; I believe a very large proportion of those 12 had promised Lord John, but on the Sunday, the day previous to the election, ——— canvassed the parish, and they were kept from the poll.

2765. What is the whole number of the constituency and the number polled?—I think there were 6,865 polled; there are more than 8,000 on the registry.

2766. Without going into the detail, do you know of many cases similar to that of Mr. ——— where a similar influence has been used over the tenants?—I know many other cases, but I feel restrained from giving the particulars of them, from the injury that it would cause to the parties.

2767. Have you reason, from a previous knowledge of the parties and their assurances, to believe that their votes being given on the other side, or withheld from your side, was not from the moral influence of the landlord, or from any party spirit voting with the landlord, or from any change of political sentiment, but from a fear of the consequences?—I believe that such influence, amounting in many cases to intimidation, operated very powerfully on a large portion of the electors of Devon, of the leaseholders particularly; a very large number of freeholders are also leaseholders with a quantity of land which they rent in addition to their freehold.

2768. Upon those who are registered as freeholders there is still frequently the same species of influence in respect of that fact?—Yes.

2769. So that if a man votes for one farm, the influence exerted over him may be in respect of another farm?—A man may be a 40*s.* freeholder perhaps, and yet he rents a farm of 100*l.* or 200*l.* a year.

2770. Have you many freeholders in Devonshire who hold under two landlords?—Yes, but not very frequently.

2771. Do you know of any who hold under landlords of opposite politics?—I have heard of some cases of that sort.

2772. Do you know what course persons so situate pursued?—Whichever interest predominated, I suppose would prevail: it might very often happen that the influence has been used on one side and not on the other; I have known many instances where gentlemen have not chosen to use that influence.

2773. Do you know of any case of persons so situate who have refrained from voting at all?—Yes, there are many such cases no doubt; that would be the position in which the voter would endeavour to put himself if he could.

2774. So that in the case of landlords having opposite wills, the tenant is reduced to that alternative?—Yes, certainly.

2775. Have you known any other class of persons who exercise influence in a pecuniary way over voters besides the landlords?—Yes; I have one case of a gentleman, a magistrate for the county of Devon, who had leased some houses to a man some years ago, who laid out a good deal of money upon them; he owes this gentleman 500*l.* on mortgage: the magistrate called upon him previous to the election and asked him for his vote for Mr. Parker; this voter had always been very marked in his politics for a great many years, in fact, I believe always as a reformer, and he refused to vote for Mr. Parker; he was asked to be neutral, which he also refused; on the day of the election he was going to the Castle to vote, and in the Castle yard this gentleman, the mortgagee, in the presence of a large concourse of people, called out and asked him how he was going to vote; he said he was going to vote for Lord John Russell; he then said, “then I insist upon your paying me that 500*l.* you owe me upon mortgage:” the voter went up and voted for Lord John, and the next day this gentleman went to the tenants (he has eight or ten tenants of the property) and inquired what rents they paid; he has demanded payment of his money, and a transfer of the mortgage is now making, which I suppose will put this voter to an expense of between 10*l.* and 20*l.*

2776. Will he get the money on any better terms in consequence of the change?—No, certainly not.

2777. Do you give this as an instance of the species of influence which is exercised by creditors over debtors, or do you merely give it as a solitary fact?—I do not think that in Devonshire the influence of a creditor over his debtor would operate to a very great extent except in the case of landlords, who are generally very large creditors of their tenants from the state of agriculture; the tenants are not in a situation to pay their rents well up, and, therefore, the influence of the landlords upon them is, particularly at the present time, very powerful.

2778. Do you think that, as a class of professional men, the attorneys who have pecuniary transactions with their clients exercise any influence over them?—Their influence is certainly rather powerful, but I should think respectable attorneys would be very cautious in exercising it to any extent; I know one instance myself where a man, who is a freeholder, whose property is mortgaged very deeply to a client of mine, came to me a few days before the election; I knew the man's political principles were very strongly marked on our side, he had in former elections voted with us; he came to me and said that influence had been used to induce him to vote for Mr. Parker; I asked him if his interest was likely to be affected if he voted for Lord John Russell; he said it would, for that after he had voted for Lord John Russell in 1832, he suffered in his business; he is a carpenter, and keeps a public-house; I told him if his interest was likely to be affected by it, he had better not vote at all, though I knew that in voting for Lord John Russell he would vote according to his conscience; he told me he would not vote at all; but on the second day of the election, I found he had been brought in and voted for Mr. Parker; he left word at my office that influence had been used upon him to that extent he could not resist; that he had confidence in me that it would not injure him in respect of his mortgage, but that he should have suffered from the other party if he had not voted for them.

2779. That is a case in which the excuse he alleged of having had influence used over him might have been suggested by his apprehension of what the consequences might have been if he had voted for Mr. Parker without such influence?—Yes.

2780. Does not that circumstance distinguish the case from the others you

have stated, where you had no influence over the parties?—I rather state that as a proof that the attorneys do not always use the influence which they possess; this man was in a situation, with a long arrear of interest, that I might have seriously injured him; he lives in a parish where every voter except one voted against us, and that person not a resident in the parish.

2781. Do you know any case in which any individual who has voted for Lord John Russell has been injured by his landlord for so doing?—The time is very short, but I think not; but I believe the principle of Lord John Russell's friends has generally been not to influence one to vote against his conscience.

2782. Do you know of any such case?—I do not.

2783. You say your party have abstained from using that influence?—There were, I know, many instances of gentlemen who have had their tenants vote against them.

2784. You know many persons who have voted against the wishes of their landlords?—Where influence has been used upon them, or their political bias was very strong on the one side, and the landlord on the other, has not pressed his influence over the tenant so as to compel him to vote with him.

2785. Do you think he could have done it?—Yes, the influence of a landlord over his tenant of land is such as to be almost irresistible.

2786. Do you know of instances where persons have come to you and told you that their landlords had pressed them to vote, but that they were determined to vote according to their consciences, and who have so voted?—Yes, I mentioned the name of Mr. —; the brother of Mr. —, who is a tenant of —, was pressed in the same way, but he was a man of stern independence and of independent property, and he voted for us.

2787. He has not been injured for having so voted?—There has no time gone by to speak upon that subject; I should think he would not be.

2788. Is he a man who, from his property, is to be considered a very good tenant, whom in these times a landlord would not like to lose?—He is a very good tenant.

2789. A rent day has not elapsed since the election?—No.

2790. Your party you say abstained entirely from using such influence?—I will not say entirely, because I cannot be answerable for every one.

2791. Lord John Russell had a very large majority, as well of leaseholders as of freeholders, in the district of Tavistock, do you attribute that entirely to their reforming principle or the influence exercised?—Tavistock is at some distance from me, and I do not know so much of that district, but I should think the influence used there on Lord John Russell's side was powerful—from what I know of the people of Tavistock and that neighbourhood, I believe they are very zealous partisans of the cause of Reform; certainly they are in the town of Tavistock.

2792. Are you aware of the difference of voters in that district between 1832 and 1835?—I am not aware of any great difference; they voted in 1835 generally as they voted in 1832. There is one property of Sir Ralph Lopes, who in 1832 supported Lord John; in 1835 the influence has been the other way; I was looking yesterday with a gentleman of Devonport, which is nearer to Sir Ralph Lopes's property, he told me that Sir Ralph had used his influence in favour of Mr. Parker, but it appeared that his tenants were rather obstinate, and that they did not all follow his wishes.

2793. Is Sir Ralph Lopes's property within the Tavistock district?—Part in Tavistock and part in Plymouth. There is one parish, of Buckland Monachorum, which is the property of Sir Ralph Lopes; there 13 freeholders voted for Lord John, and only one for Mr. Parker; and six leaseholders for Lord John, and only one for Mr. Parker, which astonished me very much. I heard that the parish all belonged to Sir Ralph Lopes; that goes to a certain extent to illustrate what I have stated, that I believe in the neighbourhood of Tavistock they are all essentially Reformers, that they have a strong political feeling.

2794. Sir Ralph Lopes's influence succeeded in some instances and failed in many others?—Yes.

2795-6. There has been no change in that part of the Tavistock district where the Bedford property exists?—I am not aware that there has been a change; the fact is, we polled 313 against 91.

2797. Did any of Sir Ralph Lopes's tenants vote in conformity with his wishes?—I believe some of them did in the parish of Bickleigh, five against four.

2798. Although in some instances Sir Ralph Lopes failed in influencing his tenants, in others he succeeded?—That is asking me perhaps to speak upon the individual voters; I cannot speak positively, it is a long distance from me.

2799. Do you know in the election of 1832 for which candidate Sir Ralph Lopes's tenants voted?—Yes; they generally voted for Lord John and Mr. Bulteel.

2800. Were they at the late election equally divided, or nearly so?—No, we had the most of them; I perceive we had 19 to 2 in Buckland Monachorum, which belongs to him.

2801. Do you know whether Sir Ralph Lopes used any menace or intimidation?—I do not think that he did; the public spirit I have heard was excited against him a good deal at Plymouth.

2802. Do you think he has, since that, taken any steps against those who voted against him?—I do not think he has; I think Sir R. Lopes too good a man to do so.

2803. You know that he was, at the time of the passing of the Reform Bill, an advocate for the Bill?—He was: I perceive that in the parish of Tamerton Folliott, 34 voted against seven; a part of that parish I understand belongs to Sir Ralph Lopes, but the other part, I understand, to Mr. Radcliffe, his brother-in-law.

2804. Did Mr. Radcliffe also change his opinion?—No: I believe he was opposed to Lord John in the election of 1832.

2805. Do you know the district of Oakhampton?—I know something of it.

2806. What is the condition of property there?—In some part of the district the voters are a low class of yeomanry. Oakhampton is 22 miles from Exeter; in the part nearer to Exeter they are more enlightened, but in the western and north-western part they are an inferior class.

2807. In the hands of which party is the property?—There are two gentlemen there of the names of Mr. Hamlyn and Mr. Newton, who have very considerable influence, who are with us, and Mr. Arundel, of Lifton, who has considerable influence on the other side. In South Tawton there are a considerable number; there are a good many freeholders and not many leaseholders; there are but few; Mr. Acland (not Sir Thomas), but the principal proprietor, is with us; in this parish we polled 31 freeholders to 10, and 12 leaseholders to 3.

2808. Are those small freeholders to whom you allude persons influenced by employment as labourers?—Some of them are, in parishes like that of Alphington, near Exeter; we have a good many small leaseholders holding small cottages at 10*l.* a year and upwards, for 99 years, determinable on three lives, they are under considerable influence from the landlord; for if a life dies, it is of importance to get a renewal; and I have heard of an instance where ——— intimated to a voter, if he did not vote for Mr. Parker, he might want another life on his house by and by.

2809. Are many of them labourers?—I should think none, or very few, go so low as that; some of them shoemakers and tailors, blacksmiths and carpenters, and so on.

2810. You have stated that certain landlords have changed their opinions, you have not alluded to any possibility of their tenants having changed their opinions also; do not you think it possible that the changes of political feeling may extend to others besides landlords?—Yes, I think there might be among so large a constituency many instances of change of feeling, but I think the change of feeling has been most generally from the Conservative to the Reform party among the mass of yeomanry.

2820. You think that out of a constituency of 8,000 voters, the number

influenced by the "No popery" cry has not been more than 150?—I conjecture that among the mass of people, of the lower orders in particular, where the influence has been much attempted, it might perhaps amount to a couple of hundred, but I speak speculatively as to the number.

2821. If you conceive that the change of opinion among the yeomanry has been rather to Reform than against it, how do you account for the different result of those two contests?—Since the election in 1832 the Conservatives have been very active in their registration; they have been very vigilant; the other party certainly have not been; the difference between the registration of 1832 and the registration of 1834 amounts to 760, of whom I believe not less than 600 are of our opponents, and I believe that the influence has been carried out much stronger by the landowners upon their tenants than ever has been before.

2822. You have stated that there was a change in opinion amongst the yeomanry, rather from the opinions of the Conservatives to those of Reformers, can you tell the Committee whether or not, amongst the great interests of the landowners, there has or has not been any change the other way, whether any great interests have changed the other way?—I should in explanation state that there were two or three of the landowners that voted for Mr. Bulteel, perhaps from personal feeling rather than political feeling; I think I might venture to say so of Sir Thomas Acland and Sir Walter Carew; that influence is now thrown wholly upon Mr. Parker; while it was thrown on Mr. Bulteel only, the Conservative party gained nothing and we lost nothing, but now it is a loss of so much.

2823. Are you not of opinion the change you have spoken of in the opinions of the yeomanry has been more than counterbalanced by the change of opinion and of conduct on the part of the great landlords?—I think it has.

2824. There is one source of influence which you have not adverted to, which is the influence of tithe owners, has that any effect, or has it been used in any way?—I believe the influence of the clergy is very powerful against us; though we have from 200 to 300 parishes, there were not above six clergymen who voted for Lord John, and of those only three or four were benefited in the division, and I believe the influence of the large body of the clergy, which was in every part excited against us, both in reference to their tithes, and their being in many cases magistrates, also operated very powerfully on the late election.

2825. Are you acquainted with any instances where the voters, whose opinions you were previously acquainted with, were induced to vote contrary to what you conceived to have been their inclinations, by any apprehension from the tithe owner of their parish, whether lay or ecclesiastic?—I have no particular evidence to refer to of any direct intimidation of that sort; their influence is very powerful in some districts, in others it is not; and in some instances where the clergyman is very hostile to his parishioners, his attempt at influence sometimes leads to a counteraction.

2826. Have the goodness to explain in what way the influence of the clergy having the tithes operates?—The clergyman in most parishes compounds with his parishioners; if he would wish to influence by his tithes, he would intimate something about taking tithes in kind, which is a considerable cause of terror to the yeomanry; rather than submit to that, which is a great loss to them as well as the clergyman, they would be induced to concede their own opinion.

2827. Do not you think that the clergyman suffers more from drawing his tithes than the farmer?—Intelligent men say that the clergyman and the farmer each lose a quarter, and that one half is really sacrificed by the system of taking tithes in kind; but a farmer would dread the operation of his corn being taken in kind, he would rather make a sacrifice than submit to the loss and inconvenience.

2828. Is it any compensation to the tenant for his loss that the clergyman will lose one-fourth in addition?—No, certainly not.

2829. Is it any compensation to the clergyman that the tenant will lose one-fourth in addition?—No, certainly not; but he will make a sacrifice in one case to attain his object in others.

2830. Are there any instances of that going on in Devonshire?—We hear of it every now and then.

2831. With a view to election purposes?—I have not said that, but that a clergyman will thereby keep up his power over his parishioners.

2832. Can clergymen under such circumstances as that of a sudden election on an acceptance of office, effect a change by the tithe influence which may affect the votes?—I have said that by the tithe system there is a power by which the rector or vicar might maintain a general influence over his parishioners, and that that influence might be used for election purposes.

2833. Do not you think that the anxiety to exert that influence operates to keep up an hostility to clergymen?—Yes, I say it does; and in instances where the clergyman is a very excellent man, and takes moderate tithes, he possesses a considerable influence in that way.

2834. Do you think that the influence exercised of late on the part of clergymen as it regards tithe, has had a great effect in turning the election against Lord John Russell?—I have not gone quite to that extent, but I state that the general influence may be, and I believe has been used by the clergyman on his parishioners for election purposes, and there is another great influence the clergyman has where he is a magistrate, and we have a great many clerical magistrates in Devonshire.

2835. You say that the loss by the clergyman is no compensation to the farmer; do you not think that the loss by the clergyman is a pretty good security against its being carried to any extent?—No, for he would take the tithe in kind of only one or two farmers at a time, till he has drawn them to a higher system of composition; I do not mean to speak of clergymen generally.

2836. Have the goodness to specify any case in which you know of this description of influence having been used?—I have stated before that I give evidence of no particular case, but I speak of the general effect.

2837. May not a clergyman compound with one and refuse to compound with another?—Yes, certainly.

2838. So that a clergyman has it in his power to select one or two individuals in his parish upon whom he may inflict his resentment?—Certainly.

2839. And thus do them a great injury, while to himself the damage is comparatively small?—Just so.

2840. Although you do not know any instance where a clergyman has used any menace, or carried any menace into execution, do not you think that the knowledge among the parishioners that the power is vested in the clergyman, coupled also with the knowledge of his political bias, must give him a powerful influence in his parish?—Yes.

2841. Do you conceive that the clergy in Devonshire have exercised a great influence through their tithes over their parishioners?—Certainly, the influence of the nature I have mentioned; when the question was put in the marked way whether I knew of any particular cases, I say I do not give evidence of any; if I am asked whether that sort of influence does exist, and whether it had been used generally, whether expressly or implied, I should say yes.

2871. Did not the clergy associate Lord John Russell with the cry which is designated as that of "No popery"?—Certainly. (pp. 150, 155—166.)

MR. JOSEPH PARKES.

1644. To what extent have you known the opening of houses, and treating voters?—To an enormous extent; I believe the election of Mr. Frank Lawley for Warwickshire cost him very little less than 30,000*l.*; he paid 2,600*l.* or 2,700*l.*, but that was under the old system of polling; the limiting of the number of days has very much economised county elections as respects the candidates, but much improvement might be still effected.

1645. Have you known the treating begin long before the day of election?—No, I have not; the treating is now very limited as to time in counties, and chiefly confined to the lower class of voters.

1646. Is it done under the name of refreshment?—Previous to the polling it is done in the counties by what is called "shepherding." If you have a district where there are a number of people in a humble condition of life, in the weaving or manufacturing districts for instance, you cannot secure their votes safely

without opening some neighbouring public-house, inviting them at night, and not only addressing them, but giving them beer and victuals.

1647. On the day of setting out for the poll they breakfast perhaps?—A great deal of treating takes place, as well on the day of the nomination as on the polling days.

1648. In a county, have you ever known great expense, in the way of treating, incurred during the canvass?—Very considerable expense indeed; on a canvass, some treating, during the canvassing, in the instance I have pointed out; but I should say that the treating in county elections is much confined to the days of the poll. I have analysed the bills for county elections; two of them I have analysed for the county of Warwick. If you give the least license for treating, you are run up many thousand pounds; unless you are a very experienced agent, and moderate in allowing discretion, you may have the expense doubled, by the folly of the agents and the excess of treating.

1649. You conceive it very difficult, if once you begin any thing like treating, to keep it within moderate bounds?—There is hardly any mode of putting an end to county treating, but by subdividing the places of polling much more than at present, and a very strict law.

1650. If you cannot prevent some expense being incurred by persons coming from a distance, might not some mode be adopted of issuing tickets by the sheriff or under-sheriff?—This is the first time I heard such a suggestion, but I think it practicable.

1651. If the expense was incurred out of a public fund, would not each of the voters consider himself entitled to it?—I should say the man was much better away, who required his conduct money, and treating, to bring him to a county election.

1652. Have you ever known orders of that kind issued by the candidates to the voters?—I have, in towns; it is a very common thing to issue a 5s. treating ticket to a public-house, and, in order to save a per centage upon it, to cash it yourself. The holder would generally rather take 4s. in money than consume it at the public-house; 5s. in entertainment is of less value than what is called a discount ticket.

1653. Treating in counties takes place very openly?—Yes, because to a certain extent it is not considered illegal.

1654. Is it not within your knowledge that both candidates have made arrangements that they would treat to a certain extent?—It is by no means uncommon for two candidates of opposite opinions to make bargains that they will divide the expense of treating, and conduct money. I have often done it myself.

1655. Since the Reform Bill?—Yes.

1656. In fact, this treating in county elections does not operate as bribery?—I think it does not.

1657. Still, would a candidate stand a chance of being elected if he refused?—I have known an instance of voters coming to the agents of a candidate, and saying, “if you do not give us a breakfast, and take us to the poll, we will not vote for you;” and I have known even in towns, the place of county poll, the little managing-men, the “shepherds,” say, “unless you will allow the voters a breakfast, and take them up to the poll, they will not vote.” I do not think this ought to be considered as bribery, but it is a most corrupt practice, and ought to be terminated.

1658. Suppose you refuse them the entertainment and conveyance, would they vote for the other party?—I do not think that they all would; I think a large per centage of them would not appear at all; they would however be exposed to the risk of the other party, on the second day, giving them a treat, and polling them.

1659. Is there money paid to them to convey them?—No; in counties we generally make the carriage arrangement. The treating in towns is carried to an enormous extent in amount of money.

1660. There it begins long before the election?—Yes, and it is singular that it is in effect recognised as legal, up to the teste of the writ, by the very Act made to prevent it.

1661. Supposing any portion of the statute were amended, and it was made equally illegal before as after the teste of the writ, do you think that would have a considerable effect?—Yes, and for this reason: that in a great many towns the parties discontinue open treating on the day on which they apprehend the writs will issue from London, the strictest orders being frequently given by the agents to stop the treating, except in towns, such as Coventry, where a particular mode prevails, or in Stafford, where all parties openly treat.

1662. Is not there a particular system for treating after the election?—In many places there are tickets given by candidates' agents; all the electors who have voted in a particular interest have a ticket; the superior class a 10s. or 15s. ticket, and the inferior voters a smaller one. I have known those cashed repeatedly, instead of taking the dinner.

1725. From what you have stated in a previous part of your examination, the Committee collect, that a great deal of bribery is generated by the progress of the poll?—By the protraction of the poll. I think that almost all the second day's expense might be saved, except that which is incurred in the conveyance of voters. The expenditure on the second day in counties is very often excessive, the parties sending expresses in the night, and chaises and four; and I have known a most considerable expenditure to obtain the last few hours only 50 or 60 votes; I have incurred 20*l.* expense in getting a single vote the second day.

1726. Is not the knowledge of the state of the poll always a source of a great deal of bribery when the election is near run?—It is in towns; I am not aware that it is in counties at all.

1727. In counties it is not in fact known till the end of the first day?—No; in my opinion a close poll, the secrecy of the poll, would be very beneficial in towns where there was only a single seat: but I should be doubtful how far it would be beneficial to keep the whole secret in the majority of the towns in England, where the local return is of two Members.

1728. Why would you make the distinction?—The numerous body unpolled should have the power of splitting where there are two Members and more than two candidates.

1729. Supposing the election is confined to one day?—The splitting can take place only by the knowledge of the progress of the poll. I consider it to be constitutional and proper that the voter should have the power of dividing his vote in such cases, according to the state of the poll. In many cases a very material alteration would take place on the second day, if the poll was secret instead of known during its progress.

1730. In place of establishing a system of secret voting, you would be disposed to recommend the announcing the state of the poll from time to time?—I am not prepared to express a decided opinion upon that.

1731. Would not the effect of making that declaration of the state of the poll from time to time be to render nugatory the attempt to give the votes, secretly?—Yes; the question refers to the ballot; if the ballot was established, I should say it was preferable to declare the poll periodically, than to keep it secret till the conclusion; that is, where two Members represent a town.

1732. Could you prevent a person standing by as agent for each of the parties, watching the people as they gave their votes?—In open voting it could not be concealed of course.

1733. With regard to the question of threats and intimidation, and corrupt influence of that species, will you describe that which has come under your observation?—That class of influence is most extensive, and in many instances, of most pernicious operation, equally in counties as towns; I believe that it occasions a most fraudulent exercise of the franchise, and to a very great extent.

1734. Take counties in the first instance, describe the class of persons on whom it operates?—In counties the smaller freeholders are naturally very much under the influence of those on whom they are dependent for their subsistence, and of course the tenants are extremely dependent.

1735. The master over the labourer?—Yes, and the clergymen I know to have most extensive influence in many places.

1736. A minister over a congregation, whether dissenting or otherwise?—Unquestionably; of course I am not now confining myself to any party allusion.

1737. The creditor over the debtor?—It applies so much to the tenantry that the poll book is almost a topography of the estates, and it is irrational to suppose, whatever the reasonable or the proper influence of the landlord over the tenantry, that their political opinions are so extremely similar, as in the case of 30 tenants that the whole shall go with the landlord.

1738. Have you known a case in which, from the change of politics on the part of the landlord, the tenantry have voted differently on one election from what they did on the election immediately previous?—I have known the most remarkable instances;—I have known a landlord correspond with a candidate on the subject of the corn laws, and I have known him send a list of the whole of his tenants, and that he should come with them and vote one way or the other, according to the explanation he received from the candidate. I have known other remarkable circumstances; I will not mention names, but I know the fact of the resident agent of a considerable property, the agent being of a class of political opinion different from the politics of his non-resident master, promising all the votes of the estate to a candidate. I wrote to London to a high family to influence this steward the other way, and the tenants were in consequence all polled contrary to their original promise through the above agent.

1739. Is it a common thing for a candidate to ask permission of a landlord to canvass his tenants?—It is, ordinarily. I do not consider it always an act of propriety to canvass amongst the tenants of a landlord on either side, and particularly on my own side, without having the landowner's leave, and it is a common practice for us to write to request leave to canvass them.

1740. Suppose leave is refused, what would be the common practice?—The common practice is to canvass them without leave, unless there are relations with the landlord, which make it an awkward matter. I know a remarkable instance the other day of intimidation, and I will mention all the circumstances; they are known, and were matter of discussion in the county. Before Mr. Gregory was a declared candidate for the northern division of Warwickshire, we were getting up a requisition to him; I found in the register a new class of electors, between the year 1832 and last year, eight or ten electors who are brethren of Lord Leicester's hospital at Warwick; they are a corporation interested in their own foundation entitled to freehold votes. I personally obtained the signatures of the majority to the requisition; I saw seven of them sign; two I did not find at home; they belonged to what are called the popular party, the Blue party, in Warwick, and had, most of them, acted with that party. They were particularly inimical to Mr. Dugdale, because they happened to have a tithe cause with him; I state that to account for their natural feeling. A few days before polling I directed arrangements to be made for bringing them up, and I received a letter from the individual who went with me to them, stating that they could not come, because of the political feeling of ————, who was reported to have said that if they went to vote for Mr. Gregory, he would disfranchise them, the statutes of the hospital prevented their going a mile or two out of the town without leave. I wrote to remonstrate, and received an answer that the individual had seen ————, that he was very decided, that he had taken up a very decided opinion as to the church question, though he had always previously acted with us, and that nothing could induce him to give them leave. I saw ———— myself come up with some of these men in two chaises to Coventry, and poll them against Mr. Gregory, though they had signed the requisition to him, I stood by while it was done, and heard some strong exclamations at the poll upon the subject by some of our party. With respect to intimidation, I could hardly over-rate the effect of it; I will give a proof of that. In Stamford I have canvassed three times; I was present at Mr. Tennyson's elections; the notices to quit had a material effect upon the voters; I was extremely struck with the fact of considerable numbers of the electors voting there against their notorious wishes and principles. I kept a note book of the answers of a great majority of the scot and lot voters on Mr. Gregory's canvass, and entered in this book the answers, which avowed at least the desires of two-thirds of the electors. I canvassed to vote with the popular candidate;

those who nevertheless refused to promise, stated that they must vote with the Exeter and other influence, from various reasons; some, that they must not offend the persons they depended upon; some, that they must follow those who dealt with them; some, that they dealt with other individuals who gave them credit; and I do not doubt that under secret voting these suffrages would have been recorded very differently indeed; I am not now entering into the question of expediency of the two modes of voting, but that of the willing exercise of the franchise; but for the influence and intimidation, and the sinister interests of various minds, the poll would be exceedingly different. We have had most remarkable instances in Warwick; shopkeepers of a particular class, who are exceedingly dependent on particular classes of society, are obliged to go with the class that deals with them. I have known persons express a most anxious desire not to be registered both for counties and towns. I know on my own personal knowledge a great number of tenants desire not to be registered, because they knew they should be placed under circumstances in which they must act contrary to their feelings; I know a great deal of exclusive dealing has taken place on both sides, for the open and avowed purpose of influencing elections. I do not confine it to one side.

1741. You are aware of threats not only being made, but carried into effect?—Yes. I know that a system of exclusive dealing was proposed in the borough of Walsall, against Mr. Foster, and I have known it take place in other towns.

1742. By what public evidence was that notified?—I have seen it in hand-bills, and in public associations formed for the express purpose of encouraging exclusive dealing.

1743. The threat has not been generally made beforehand, but the punishment takes place afterwards, in the way of withdrawing custom?—It is not always carried into effect.

1744. Is it not often done by previous suggestion, where it is not intended to be carried into effect, if the party does not attend to it?—Yes, I know this interference with the franchise exists to an extraordinary degree, even among the superior class of shopkeepers, and in new boroughs, and I have seen many men under circumstances of very great distress indeed; very public spirited men, in a remarkable manner, even in Birmingham, where there are upwards of 4,000 electors, tortured as to their votes. A very public-spirited man there has come to me and said, though I knew his liberal opinions, that he was so and so connected with various classes of different political men; that he really felt the possession of the franchise a nuisance to him; that he hardly knew how to vote; and I know electors oftentimes seriously injure themselves by their voting.

1745. Have you known that on both sides?—Yes; there is another large class who might by their votes influence the returns, whom both sides prevent from polling. Sometimes, if parties find they cannot get an elector to promise to vote for them, they get the man to go out of the town. I have seen bribery of voters to go out of the town, that they might not vote against a party; and in close run elections, many Members of the Committee must know, that a common object of the electioneers is thus to prevent certain people from voting, and that an election is often won by prevailing upon electors not to vote. (pp. 94, 95, 100—102.)

Mr. OWEN OWEN ROBERTS, *Denbigh County.*

1968. At the election of 1832, were any threats held out to the tenants to your knowledge?—There were.

1966. What was the nature of the threats?—To turn them out of their farms unless they voted for a certain candidate.

1970. In what manner did that come to your knowledge?—I saw a letter to one tenant, and had the tenant's own declaration also.

1971. What was the nature of the letter?—Stating that unless he voted in such a way, he should not hold the fields, which were ————— which were near ———.

1972. From whom was the letter?—From the landlord to his tenant.

1973. Was that a single instance, or do you know of more?—I know of a great number more, but not so distinct.

1974. In what shape were they?—There was one man who possessed extensive property in the county of Denbigh, who lost a farm that he held upon which he had laid out a great deal of money; he lost his farm and was turned out of it in consequence of refusing to vote as his landlord wished.

1975. Was he turned out in consequence of having refused to vote in accordance with the request of his landlord?—Yes, he stated that himself to me.

1976. Was that at the last election?—No, the last but one.

1977. How did that person vote after he had been turned out of his farm at the last election?—He voted for the candidate whom he wished to have supported the time before.

1978. Do you know of any other instance?—There are the instances of the ——— property; they were every one of them attempted to be induced to vote for a certain candidate at a former election, but they refused to do so; there are about thirty of them, I think; fearing the threats would be carried into effect, after the example of Mr. ———, the gentleman who was turned out, they became alarmed, and every one of those tenants voted for the candidate adverse to the one they voted for before.

1979. Is that on the property of the same gentleman as Mr. ——— held his farm?—No, another estate.

1980. Are you acquainted with any of the farmers upon the estate you mention?—I am.

1981. Do you frequently attend them professionally?—No, they were too far off; but I know them well.

1982. Are you acquainted with their political sentiments?—I am.

1983. Did they tell you it was in consequence of the apprehensions they had, by reason of Mr. ——— having been turned out, that they were induced to vote at the last election contrary to their inclinations?—Several of them did; it was a question that excited great interest throughout the whole county.

1984. Are you, in the course of your professional practice, acquainted with the opinions and feelings of many of the farmers in the county?—Yes, as well as any person can be.

1985. Do you know many instances of men whose political opinions you are acquainted with in that class, voting contrary to their political opinions?—I do.

1986. Have you ever conversed with those men upon the subject?—I have.

1987. Have they given any reason for departing from their political opinions?—Yes; that they were afraid either of their landlords or some other persons.

1988. What class of men do you mean by "other persons"?—Attornies.

1989. The agents?—Yes, the agents.

1990. The agents for the landlords?—Yes.

1991. Is there any source of power which you have heard alluded to, as possessed by the attornies, which you conceive the attornies to exercise over the tenants?—Of course, when they have deeds in their possession, or owe them money.

1992. Have you ever known instances of persons alleging the power which particular attornies have over them as a reason for their votes?—I do know them well.

1993. Do they not generally owe them money?—They generally do; there is one attorney who is agent for almost all the great political families in the country of certain politics, and he was ——— who turned Mr. ——— out, and the effect of that example was tremendous throughout the whole country.

1994. You are a medical man?—I am.

1995. Have not medical men a good deal of influence among their patients?—I do not know; I never fancied I had any.

1996. Are not your patients a great many of them, of the poorer classes, con-

siderably in debt to you?—No, I seldom have book debts, I generally get payment at once.

1997. When the men on ——— property gave reasons for not voting, did you ask them the reason; were you not discussing with them upon the subject why they had not voted?—I do not know how the conversation commenced, but it was a notorious thing, known to every body.

1998. Were any of the persons directly or indirectly under your influence?—Not the slightest.

1999. None owed you money?—None, of the ——— tenants.

2000. Are you not in the habit of talking politics with your acquaintance?—Very often.

2001. You say that there were many persons who voted differently to what they did at the former election?—Yes.

2002. Can you name any one individual?———, of ———.

2003. Did he vote on the other side at the last election?—Yes, and all the tenants on the estate.

2004. Did he tell you he changed on that account?—He said he was obliged to do so.

2005. Did he tell you that himself?—Yes.

2006. What did he tell you?—He said he hoped he should soon see the ballot, in order to protect him and others in what they did, from being compelled so to act.

2007. Was that the substance of it?—Yes.

2008. You said all the tenants on one estate voted differently at the last election to the way they voted before?—Yes.

2009. What did you say was the reason for their doing so?—That they were afraid of being turned out of their farms in the way Mr. ——— was.

2010. Did they vote contrary to the wishes of their landlord at the previous election?—They did.

2011. Were they turned out on that occasion?—No; Mr. ——— had been turned out, and it was a specimen of what would be done, and they were afraid of being turned out in the same way.

2012. By whom?—By the landlord.

2013. Then you think all landlords are alike?—No, I do not.

2014. Are you prepared to say that those tenants on that particular estate were directly threatened by their landlords to be turned out if they did not vote at the next election?—I have no doubt in my own mind that that was the case.

2015. And the reason of their not being turned out was, having voted according to their inclinations at the former election?—No, that was not the reason.

2016. Had any change taken place between the two elections?—There had.

2017. Were the landlords of different politics?—I believe they were the same politics, but there was some dispute between the landed proprietors at the time of the former election.

2018. Was the same gentleman agent to both those landlords?—I think not.

2019. Have you not known, in your political experience, persons changing their political sentiments without the force of intimidation and bribery being practised on them?—I know many instances of that being the case, but these are instances in which they professed the same principles, and voted contrary to them.

2020. Do I understand your answer to be, that these people thought they were voting for the same principles as they did on the former occasion?—No, quite the contrary; they were persons of good education, and not so ignorant as that.

2021. Did they know they were giving a different vote to what they gave before?—Yes.

2022. Have you not known instances of persons changing their political opinions without the influence of intimidation or bribery being used?—I have not the least doubt there are many cases.

2023. Do you not know to a perfect certainty, that some of these persons

changed their mode of voting in consequence of being under apprehension if they did not do so, of having their sins visited upon their heads by their landlords?—Most certainly.

2024. Had you any conversation with those persons by which you were led to believe by them, that though they had changed their votes they had not changed their opinions?—Certainly.

2025. You say there was a new landlord?—Yes.

2026. Had he made any application to them to vote?—Undoubtedly, the orders they received were from ———.

2027. And not from ———?—I do not know whether direct from ——— or ———. I presume ——— does nothing in these matters but what ——— authorizes.

2028. You do not know positively whether they received orders or not?—I have only their declaration for it.

2029. Did they tell you they received orders to vote for a particular candidate?—They did, some of them.

2030. Did ——— tell you so?—He did not; but he said he was compelled to do it.

2049. You mentioned the instance of ———, who occupied accommodation land that was near ———?—Yes.

2050. Was ——— a man of property?—No, ——— was the man of property.

2051. I am speaking of the man who was turned out of the accommodation lands?—He was threatened to be turned out.

2052. Can you give some other instances of persons being turned out in a similar way?—I was at the Carnarvon election, and I could only get there on the polling day.

2053. You say one instance was quite enough to intimidate the whole county of Denbigh?—Yes, and I think it very likely to do so when there was a gentleman of 400*l.* or 500*l.* a year turned out of his farm.

2054. You said you did not know whether that gentleman was agent for the new landlord ———?—No, I am not talking of the same person.

2055. Mr. ——— was the tenant of a gentleman who had a particular agent, and you say his being turned out of his farm terrified the whole county of Denbigh, because the gentleman's agent for that property was agent for other property?—I said the same gentleman was the general law agent of most of the great landed proprietors of that part of the country, of a certain political party.

2056. Then he was not the law agent of the gentleman who owned ——— property?—No.

2057. Did Mr. ——— tell you himself that he was turned out for voting?—He did, for not voting.

2058. Had he it in black and white that that was the reason assigned?—I do not know that. Mr. ——— was a respectable man, and he would not have stated a thing of the kind if it were not so, and every body believes it to have been so.

2059. At all events it was not an act of gross oppression, as the man was a man of property?—I think the injustice is the same, and it is not less an injustice because a man can afford it.

2060. This gentleman's being turned out of his farm was a loss to him?—Yes, a great loss.

2061. And his being able to bear that loss was merely his good fortune?—Yes.

2062. Was his landlord a good landlord?—Yes, in every respect except politics.

2063. Was he a good landlord or not?—I believe he was, I always heard him well spoken of.

2064. Had ——— laid out any money on the farm from which he was turned out?—A great deal; he was obliged to build a new house for himself upon his own land.

2065. He was a freeholder, and had some land of his own in the county?—Yes of the value of 400*l.* or 500*l.* a-year.

2066. Was the turning out of so good a tenant by the landlord considered a sufficient answer to the allegation so frequently made, that a landlord never turns a good tenant out?—Certainly.

2067. Did he choose ——— as a person to turn out, in order that he might have a man able to bear it?—I do not think he did; but it was perhaps by way of making an example to others of what they were to expect if they acted in the same way when they saw a rich man so treated.

2068. Did the landlords in the whole county of Denbigh meet together for the purpose of choosing a person to make a fit example of?—I cannot say that, but landlords meet sometimes for very curious purposes. I can mention other instances which took place after the last Carnarvon borough election but two.

2069. Who were the candidates?—Sir Charles Paget and Mr. Ormsby Gore. There were three persons at that time that voted, and their landlords were not aware that they were burgesses, but they voted for Sir Charles Paget, and they had notice to quit their farms, though they were not subsequently turned out.

2070. Do you know how the men voted at the next election?—They were disfranchised at the next election. A strong remonstrance was made to the gentleman upon the injustice of his treating his tenants so, when he never let them know what his political opinions were himself, or his bias.

2071. Who made the remonstrance?—I did, by letter.

2072. To whom did you write?—To the landlord.

2073. What answer did you receive from the landlord?—I never received any answer from the landlord, but the tenants informed me they were allowed to stop on their farms.

2074. Did you see the notice to quit from the landlord?—I did not.

2075. What induced you to write the letter of remonstrance?—From the application of the men to me.

2076. Did you consider that was a case of intimidation?—It was decidedly so; it was a threat, though it seemed to have a retrospective effect.

2077. Did the landlord interfere with them before the election?—No, he did not know they were voters.

2078. Is there any means which you can suggest to the Committee for putting a stop to the practices of which you state your friends complain?—I think the only effectual mode to prevent the intimidation would be the ballot.

2079. Was that always your opinion?—No, it was not; I was opposed to it till I saw what took place at the last election.

2080. Do you think there are many persons of the class you allude to, who entertain the same opinion that you now entertain upon the subject?—It has become very general through the country since the last two elections.

2081. Do farmers talk about it?—Yes, farmers as well as voters for boroughs; it is generally called for throughout the part of the principality with which I am intimate; independent of that, I think it would be requisite, for the prevention of the practices of corruption as well as intimidation, that some means should be taken that every candidate should make a statement or take an oath that he would not make any use of any means of intimidation or corruption, or pay any more than the legal expenses of the election, and that the amount should be filed in the same way as his qualification before the Member took his seat; and that he would not, directly or indirectly, pay any more than is contained in the account filed.

2095. In canvassing boroughs and counties, have you not observed that a great many persons have kept their intentions secret till the last moment?—A great number.

2096. With what intention do they keep their votes secret till the last moment?—In some cases to avoid intimidation; when they have been canvassed they often state we are anxious to vote, but we are afraid.

2097. If there are persons who do conceal their votes for some time up to the period when the poll commences, do you not imagine that from the same

motive those persons will take equal pains to conceal their votes after the polling takes place?—Most undoubtedly they would, if the ballot took place. (pp. 110, 111, 114, 117, 119.)

Mr. T. EDGORTH, *Denbigh County.*

3114. WERE any tenants who voted contrary to the wishes of their landlords ejected by them or punished by them in any way?—No; I know of no instance in the county of a tenant suffering from having voted contrary to his landlord's wishes, but I know scarcely any instance of a tenant having voted contrary to his landlord's wishes.

3115. Among the agricultural tenants, you are not aware of any tenant having suffered for having voted contrary to his landlord's wishes?—No.

3116. But you are also not aware of any agricultural tenant having voted against his landlord's wishes?—I cannot now bring to mind any case.

3118. Did not you mention the case of a small labouring man who, in consequence of having voted for Mr. ———, had been dismissed from his employment?—Yes, but he was not a tenant, it was his own freehold that he voted for. It is set down as a general principle, that the tenants vote according to their landlords' wishes; there was a great difference in the numbers in one of the polling districts at the last contest from the one in 1832. I asked the professional agent what was the reason of the difference: "Why," he said, "such and such a property has been sold since the last election, and the person who has bought it is of different politics from the one that owned it before, and there are 14 votes there."

3118* Were they the same individual tenants?—I believe they were; he did not mention that there had been any change in the tenantry.

3120. You are understood to say that this mode of exercising influence is the uniform practice of the country; that it is not confined to any particular class of politicians, but that it is universal throughout the country on both sides?—Yes.

3121. You do not mean to throw it upon the one side more than the other?—No; I thought it right to mention the last case of ———, to show that I do not wish to cast aspersions upon one side more than the other; I dare say had there been more Whig landlords in the neighbourhood of Wrexham, influence would have been exercised on their part.

3122. Upon whichever side the owner of the property is, upon that side you calculate that the votes of the tenants will go?—Yes.

3123. In general, among a tenantry, is there any strong political feeling; are not a great many of them divested of political opinions altogether?—I think a great many of them have a political feeling.

3124. Are there not a great many that have not?—Yes.

3125. Do you not consider that among the agriculturists of Denbighshire, the majority are altogether divested of political feelings?—It is a difficult question to answer at once, but I do not think it is so.

3126. Is not it possible that they may have a confidence in their landlord's political opinion rather than their own?—No; I have been out with Mr. Biddulph canvassing, and he has had many answers such as this, "I cannot vote for you, my landlord is on the other side, but I wish you every success."

3127. Might not that be from courtesy?—No; it was said in a different manner; I was asked whether the votes of the tenants had been changed in consequence of the politics of their landlords. I can mention a case in which the tenantry of a large property, in the year 1832, voted for the Honourable Mr. Kenyon, whose politics were opposed to Mr. Biddulph; their landlord is a relative of Mr. Kenyon, though his principles are not similar to his, but in this last instance, Mr. Kenyon not having become a candidate, all those tenants voted for Mr. Biddulph by the wish of their landlord, and it made a very great change in the votes, and not only the tenants, but the tenants' friends and relatives, those whom the tenants could influence.

3157. Has Sir Watkin a great many tenants in the county?—In one part of the county he has many tenants.

3158. Have those tenants been long upon the land?—Yes; Sir Watkin is a very good landlord.

3159. Do not you think it is possible that many of those tenants are induced from motives of gratitude and good feeling to vote according to the wishes of their landlord?—The bulk of his tenantry reside within a short distance of Mr. Biddulph's residence; they would have been as desirous of pleasing him as a neighbour, as to please Sir Watkin as a landlord.

3160. Do not you consider the influence of the landlord as greater than the influence of a neighbour?—Certainly.

3161. Do you mean the direct influence of the landlord or the moral influence of the landlord?—I should say the direct influence.

3162. You mean that the moral influence of a neighbouring gentleman may be occasionally greater than the moral influence of a non-resident landlord, but that the direct influence of a non-resident landlord will generally outweigh the moral influence of a neighbouring gentleman?—Yes.

3163. Do you think that that motive of attachment from gratitude is likely to have arisen in those cases which you have mentioned, of properties very recently changed?—There the direct influence of the landlord must of course outweigh any other influence, because the property was purchased within two years.

3164. Is it probable that any very great family attachment could have grown up within that time?—No; especially in Wales.

3181. Supposing you were a landlord, and on the liberal side in politics, would not you wish that your tenants should be on the same side of politics as you yourself?—I should prefer it, no doubt.

3182. If the ballot were established, do not you conceive that men of property, who might take a Conservative view of things, would in such case take very good care to have a particular class of men for tenants, who would agree with them in politics, and even make a sacrifice for that purpose, by which means a great number of men would be thrown out of that fair competition which property now has?—Yes, but I think that all this would cease after two or three elections; that the general excitement which always precedes an election would in a great degree cease, where persons could not be sure that any exertions they might make would meet with success. (pp. 184—186, 188, 189.)

REV. MALACHI DUGGIN.

5700. You are a parish priest?—I am.

5701. In what place?—In Moyarta and Kilbally Owen, in the county of Clare.

5702. How long have you been a parish priest?—Twenty-one years and a half.

5703. What is the extent of your parish?—About 16 miles English.

5704. Have you had an opportunity of knowing whether any persecution has been practised by landlords in the county of Clare, in consequence of the tenants voting against their wishes at the elections?—I have this year known an instance of persecution.

5705. Did you attend the election of Mr. O'Connell in the year 1828?—I did.

5706. Was a great effort made by the popular party to carry that election?—The greatest possible.

5707. And on the other hand, the strongest possible efforts were made by the gentry and the aristocracy to secure the election of Lord Fitzgerald?—The greatest possible.

5708. So that there was a fierce collision between the people and the gentry?—The efforts on both sides were almost carried to extremes.

5709. Did the Roman Catholic clergy use very strong efforts to effect the election of Mr. O'Connell?—They did, because Catholic emancipation was then in view.

5710. Did you yourself take a part in those exertions?—I did.

5711. Upon the other hand, were great exertions made by the gentry?—The greatest possible; there was intense anxiety on both sides.

5712. Were you present yourself at the election?—I was.

5713. Did you see the landlords attending the booths at the election?—I did.

5714. Were the booths, on the other hand, also attended by the priests?—In general they were.

5715. So that the landlords and the priests were the two leading parties?—They were.

5716. Did the landlords use any menaces at the booths themselves against the tenants?—I cannot give instances, because I was not present at the booths. I attended the tally-rooms, and the people I brought with me to the election, to keep them to order.

5717. Are you aware of threats having being used by the landlords during the election?—I have heard of it.

5718. Do you believe it?—I did believe it, and I believe that they did every thing in their power to punish the people afterwards. I have known it, but not of my own knowledge, as I live in a district in which there is no gentry.

5719. Did the landlords bring their tenants for the purpose of voting for Mr. Fitzgerald?—They did, and the tenants turned against their landlords, after they had mingled with the general crowd.

5720. Did you hear, and do you believe, that at the election very strong menaces were used by the landlords?—I did, several times.

5721. By almost all the landlords in the county?—By almost all the landlords in the county, and all the middle men; both parties were present at the election.

5722. What was the nature of the threats used?—That they would, upon a future day, be revenged of the tenantry for their conduct on that occasion.

5723. That they would drive them, and eject them?—That they would drive them, and exact their rent with rigour, and eject them.

5724. After the election took place, did the excitement continue?—The excitement continued for some time.

5725. Did the landlords proceed to carry their threats into effect?—They did, but it was difficult for the landlords to carry their threats into execution; the threat was general, and there was no possibility of turning out nearly the whole tenantry of the county. I was myself present on one occasion, where leases given in war time were demanded from the tenants. In those leases there was a high rent specified; the rent was abated to half, and the agent demanded, in the name of the landlord, to give up the old leases. The tenants said they did not see why they should give up their leases, though in themselves useless to them, and the agent pressed the giving it up; as they conceived them to be useless, they suspected the agent was actuated by some motive hostile to them in demanding the leases, and they said they would choose the alternative of paying the sum specified in the lease rather than give up the lease; and so they paid double the rent that they had paid before.

5726. Was this in consequence of the election?—The agent did not make use of any language that would make me believe it was in consequence of the election, but the general feeling of the people was, that it was in consequence of the election, to deprive them of the power of having a vote in future, and that they should depend upon the will of the landlord.

5727. Have you any doubt that this proceeding was adopted in consequence of those men voting against the wishes of the landlord?—From that one fact I could not take upon myself to say; but when I heard that the demanding of the leases became general, and that that was the measure adopted by the landlords to deprive the tenants of the power of voting, I believed then it was in consequence of the opposition they showed in the year 1828 to the landlords.

5728. Was a system of extensive persecution carried on by the landlords in the county of Clare against the tenants after the election?—There was, but not by all the landlords.

5729. Was it general?—It was general, but there were exceptions. There are some of the landlords that are kind and benevolent, and they left the people to act as they pleased; but generally speaking, there was a spirit in the county that had for its object the turning out of all the tenants that voted against Lord Fitzgerald.

5730. Was there an extensive system of ejectment and of distraining carried on after the election?—That I cannot, of my own knowledge, declare, but I believe there was a general spirit of hostility, and so general that the landlords could not enter upon a general extermination.

5731. Do you believe that many persons at that election voted against Mr. O'Connell for fear of the consequences from their landlords?—I know that they did.

5732. Have you known, since that election, at subsequent elections, menaces used by landlords to compel their tenants to vote according to their wishes?—I have.

5733. Have you known of persecution being exercised by landlords after subsequent elections, in consequence of the tenants voting against their wishes?—I have.

5734. Does that system of persecution continue to this very day?—It is not acted upon with the same virulence that it was then, but there is, I am sorry to say, a spirit of great hostility reigning between the landlords and the tenants; it is on the increase for the last two years.

5735. Do you attribute this to the collision between the tenants and the landlords arising from elections?—I do not think it entirely arises from that. The election of Clare in 1828 may have given an impetus to the public feelings, it may have instructed the people in their own moral strength; but before the election of 1828 there were a great number of ejectments, and the rents were exacted with a great deal of rigour.

5736. Do you believe that the efforts made by the landlords to control the tenants in the exercise of the elective franchise have tended to produce disorganization and immorality in the county of Clare?—I believe they tended in a great measure to convulse it in 1831; it was as peaceable a county as any in Ireland from time immemorial until that year; and what I stated before, of the intention manifested by the landlords of taking away the leases and turning out the tenants, increased the spirit of hostility on the part of the tenants, and brought them to that state of convulsion with which the Committee must be already acquainted.

5737. And this you attribute to the domination attempted to be exercised by the landlords over the tenants?—I attribute it to that domination which they exercised over the tenants in not leaving them to act according to the impulse of their own judgments.

5738. You took a very strong part in the election of 1828; have you taken so strong a part in elections since?—No: I went often since to the elections unaccompanied, and voted according as I pleased. In 1830 or 1831, there was a strong feeling evinced to return popular Members for the county; at that period I voted for Mr. Lucius O'Brien, one of the highest and most respectable of the aristocracy of the county; my reason for doing so was, to try to bring about a reconciliation, and to show the landed proprietors that we had no interest but the good of the community in acting as we did in 1828, and that we did not want exclusive rights or a Catholic domination, but equal rights.

5739. You voted against the popular feeling?—I did; and when I came home, though the parishes I hold are the place of my nativity, my friends told me that one of the chapels would be closed against me on the following Sunday for voting as I did; I avoided going there for some time, till the feeling subsided; at the expiration of a month I went to this chapel, I spoke on the subject to the people, and gave them the same reasons that I have stated now to the Committee, that I did it for their good, to bring about a reconciliation; that we did not want any

thing like a division between ourselves and the landlords, nor did we want exclusive rights, but merely equal rights, and as we had gained Catholic emancipation, that would be the beginning of future good.

5740. So that it appears that instead of your controlling the people, the people attempted to control you?—I am sure that if in the year 1828 I had gone against the popular feeling, I should have lost, perhaps, my parishes, as a priest did in that county, who went against the popular feeling.

5760. You have said that you would think it your duty to assist the people in forming a better organization; what description of organization do you allude to?—Good laws.

5761. What do you mean by organization?—Organization may be either for a good or a bad purpose. I said a better organized state of things.

5762. Do you mean a political association of the people to secure good laws?—Yes.

5765. If you had a very strong bias in favour of the popular candidate, should you consider yourself justified, as a priest within the chapel, in exhorting the congregation to vote for the popular candidate against the opposing candidate?—I do not think I would be justified in doing so, except upon extraordinary occasions, such as the election of 1828.

5766. Have you ever done it?—I have.

5767. Repeatedly?—I did, at that time, and on another occasion.

5768. During divine service?—Not during divine service.

5769. Within the walls of the chapel, after the congregation had been assembled for divine service?—After divine service was over, and the people were ready to disperse for their homes.

5772. You consider yourself justified to interfere within your chapel, according to the exigency of the case?—Latterly I have not interfered much in my chapel.

5773. If any exigency were to arise, which in your opinion called for your interference, according to your own individual judgment of that exigency you would, as a parish priest, interfere?—I would, outside the chapel, interfere with the people, if the exigency was great.

5788. You have stated that the landlords proceeded against their tenants in several instances at the election of 1828; and you stated that you knew one instance?—The instance that I had in my view at the time related to the last election.

5789. What was the nature of that instance?—A tenant voted for the two popular candidates; in a little time after the election the landlord sent a parcel of men on his turbary to cut it. This bog he had under lease, together with his land, for 20 years; the landlord told him he should give up this and take in exchange a worse bog, and the tenant said he would not give up his right. The landlord sent men to cut the bog, and the sons of the freeholder came and collared the men who were in the act of cutting the bog and turned them off. The landlord then ordered those men, the freeholder's sons, to be summoned, and the freeholder summoned the men who were cutting the turf; the consequence was, that the sons of the tenant, or one of them rather, was bound to stand his trial at the next quarter sessions.

5792. Did you know any instance in the year 1828?—Yes; I know an instance of distraining, where I myself gave money to some of the tenants, when their cattle were seized after the election for rent, which otherwise would not have been called for for some time.

5793. Was not the rent due?—It was due, but it would not have been called for for some time; there is always a dead gale on every farm almost in Ireland. This gale of rent is never demanded till the expiration of the lease.

5794. You stated that at the election of 1828 you knew people who voted against Mr. O'Connell from fear of their landlords; can you mention any instances?—Yes; one man from my own parish came to me upon that occasion, and told me that he would be ruined for ever if he voted for Mr. O'Connell; he stated the situation in which he was placed with regard to his landlord. I said

to him to vote for Mr. Fitzgerald, and not to ruin himself and family, as he held his little farm at the good-will of the landlord; and he did so.

5795. You have stated, that Catholic emancipation was considered as a foundation on which a superstructure was to be raised. What was the superstructure that you contemplated?—Employment for the people; a moderate system of Poor Laws; reclamation of the waste lands; revision of the magistracy; and the removal or modification of such other things as we found to be sources of discontent.

5796. Were any of those things dependent upon the question of Catholic emancipation?—No.

5797. You said you were certain there would be no peace till the tithe system was settled; what do you mean by the settlement of the tithe system?—To settle it upon some ground that would prevent the people and the proprietors from coming into collision.

5798. You mean to say that the tithe system ought to be abolished after the lives of the present incumbents?—No; I do not mean that, but where there is no Protestant congregation, I think it would be unjust that a Catholic population should pay tithes. One of my parishes has no resident Protestant in it, but though there is no Protestant there, I would not wish that the clergyman during his life should be deprived of support.

5799. Do you consider the tithe system to be the only remaining cause of grievance?—No; that is only one of the grievances. I think the anomalous relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland is one cause of grievance, and I think the manner in which justice is administered in many districts in Ireland is another cause of grievance.

6247. You have been examined as to the influence used by Catholic clergymen at elections; is it, as far as you understand it, that it is in his spiritual or in his temporal capacity, that the clergyman exercises his influence at an election?—In his temporal capacity, as a civilian.

6248. You have yourself interfered, upon one occasion, in election matters, among your own flock?—I have.

6249. Did you, on that occasion, ever threaten voters with a deprivation of the rites of the church, or insinuate to them that a deprivation of the rites of the church would be the consequence, if they voted in a manner which you deemed not consistent with the interests of their country and their religion?—I never did, because I could not act in that manner, as I conceived that my acting to promote the good of the people was of a temporal nature, and that in my spiritual capacity I could not take notice of their political conduct; I would not be allowed by my superiors, even if I was inclined to deprive them of their spiritual rites, to withhold them from those persons.

6250. Are the Committee to understand that it is your opinion, that if you had deprived, or threatened to deprive, any of your flock of the rites of the church, you would have incurred the displeasure of your superiors?—I certainly am of that opinion.

6251. Do you believe that it is generally understood amongst your brethren, the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland?—It is understood by the priests with whom I have acquaintance, and I know in the province of Munster about 100 priests; they cannot hold out any spiritual threats, or withhold the rites of their religion, from any person who may vote against the popular cause.

6252. Does this impression, which you say exists in your mind, and in the minds of those clergymen with whom you are acquainted, arise out of any general instructions given you by any superior?—Not from any general instructions given me by my superiors, but I conceive it to be my duty not to mix spirituals and temporals; and when I co-operate with the people to remove an evil, either political or civil, I act in my capacity as a civilian, not in my capacity as a clergyman.

6253. Do you conceive that you would be entitled to demand from any of your flock, when in confession, any disclosure of their political views?—I would not be

warranted; I am not allowed to ask even the name of the penitent, or his place of residence; I am not allowed to ask any thing but his sins.

6254. Supposing one of your flock to inform you, during confession, of his political views or intentions, or of any of his past political acts, should you feel yourself justified in revealing it?—I could not reveal it.

6266. This day and on the last occasion, you consider that every Catholic clergyman has an individual judgment and discretion, which he is permitted to exercise on all occasions and in every circumstance, except as regards confession, where you are limited and tied down by strict rules, but that within your chapels, you are justified in acting on political matters according to your judgment?—We have no other place to speak to the people in case of emergencies but the chapels; and it is my practice and the practice of the clergymen of the county of Clare, not to mingle those political addresses with the divine service, only whenever the people are spoken to, and are told that such and such a thing is to be done for the removal of such and such a grievance: all the addresses, as far as I am acquainted with the politics used by the Roman Catholic clergy, tend to elect fit and proper persons of the liberal party to represent the people in Parliament; this is the sum total of the addresses in general.

6275. It is its coming from the clergyman which has the effect?—Yes; the people look upon the clergyman as being better acquainted with their condition than any other man.

6276. Have you never heard of threats, or denouncing a person for voting, as it was called, against his religion?—I have often heard from others that the priests in other parts of the country have threatened to denounce them; but I beg to say, that it is a common practice in Ireland for the lower orders who are about a landlord or a magistrate, or any man in power, to tell those respective persons that the priest used such and such language on such a day, that he threatened vengeance against the people if they did not vote for such a person, and that he threatened vengeance against the opposite party; they use this language principally with the landlord when he calls for his rent, as an apology for their conduct in voting against his wish, and to throw the blame on the priest, who is out of the power of the landlord.

6280. Do you know of instances in which the power of the landlord you refer to has been exercised?—I do. The last day I did not recollect the public instances I have seen of persecution; after the election of 1828, the following year, and at the end of that year, I saw the cattle of a whole estate carried into the town of Kilrush, to be sold off by auction; the people were so alarmed at this sweeping conduct of the agent, that they devised every means to protect themselves, and to further this object they appointed a counter auctioneer in the town, who, at the sale and on the second bidding, offered double or treble the value of the cattle, and by his so doing he frustrated the sale, for the people discovered that three biddings were necessary to constitute a legal sale. I saw in a pound, convenient to my own residence, the cattle of an entire estate driven; and the tenantry resorted to another extraordinary measure; they collected all the unstamped receipts that the agent gave for the last twelve months, and when he threatened to sell their cattle, they threatened in turn to send these up to the stamp-office in Dublin, in order to fine him. I have another melancholy fact to relate, which occurred within the last two months: a widow in the county of Clare, holding a farm of 45 acres of land for the last 26 years, although she paid up the rent the last May-day and did not owe a penny arrear, was turned out with eight children on the world by the landlord, because at the last election, her brother voted for the liberal candidate; some gentlemen of the neighbourhood interfered for her; the parish priest and another gentleman particularly begged of the landlord to leave her the house and the grass of a cow for 12 months, but to no effect.

6281. How do you connect the two instances of cattle being put up to auction with any motive on the part of the landlord, connected with the votes of the tenantry?—The tenantry all voted for Mr. O'Connell; the landlord was a particular friend of Lord Fitzgerald, the ——— was his agent; if the Committee wish, I will give the names.

6302. The landlords in Ireland are in the habit of oppressing their tenants, independent of the election?—They are.

6303. Generally?—The landlords in my parish are as good landlords as can be, with very few exceptions.

6304. Is there any understanding on the part of the tenants, that they are expected to vote at elections according to the wishes of their landlords?—There is; and a general understanding among the people at large that the freeholders will make a due use of their freehold at the election, and they are spurred on by the people to this exercise of their franchise; the 10% freeholders, as a body, are as intelligent as any other class of the community: some would feel indignant, if any gentleman came to dictate to them at the approach of an election.

6305. You mean, that they resist any such influence on the part of the landlords, if there is any attempt on the part of the landlords to exercise it?—They would resist it out of the power of the landlord; but very few who do not owe in that county half a year's rent, what is called a dead gale, which is left on the land until the termination of the lease; if an independent freeholder, who paid up his rent to that dead gale, should politically offend his landlord, he has it in his power still to annoy him, by distraining him for this gale; and it has been put in practice this very year. (pp. 335, 337, 339, 340, 341, 370—375.)

REV. JOHN SHEEHAN.

7545. You are, I believe, a Roman Catholic clergyman?—I am.

7546. You are a parish priest of the city of Waterford?—I am.

7547. Were you in the city of Waterford during the election that took place in the year 1826?—I was, but not parish priest at that time.

7548. You were a curate at that time?—I was attached to a chapel there, and I was chaplain to an hospital.

7549. Who were the candidates at the election of 1826?—Lord George Beresford, the late Mr. Richard Power, of Clashmore, and Mr. Henry Villiers Stewart.

7550. At that period great efforts were made, I believe, by the Roman Catholics to accomplish emancipation?—There were.

7551. Lord George Beresford and the Beresford family, which he represented, were opposed to Catholic emancipation?—They were.

7552. Did you and many of the Roman Catholic clergy interfere at that election?—We did.

7553. Are you aware whether many tenants at that election voted against the wishes of their landlords?—I am.

7554. Do you know whether, immediately previous to that election, many landlords in that county in the interest of the Beresford family, employed any threats against their tenants, in order to induce them to vote in compliance with their wishes?—I am aware they did employ threats.

7555. Did they threaten to eject, to distrain, to demand arrears of rent, in the event of their tenancy not voting according to their wishes?—That was the tendency of their threats.

7556. The estate of the Marquis of Waterford is considerable in that county?—Very considerable.

7557. And his relatives, and his connexions, and persons attached to his family, have also large property in that county?—They have.

7558. How did the election terminate?—In the return of Mr. Power and Mr. Stewart, Lord George resigned when he found the tenants generally voted against him.

7559. Lord George Beresford went to the poll?—He did.

7560. During how many days did he stand the contest?—I think four, I cannot be exact.

7561. After the election had terminated, are you aware whether many landlords in the county of Waterford adopted measures of severity towards their tenants for having voted against them?—I am.

7562. The Roman Catholic Association was at that time in existence?—It was.

7563. Was any application made to the Roman Catholic Association for pecuniary assistance?—Several applications.

7564. In order to afford relief to persons who had been ejected by their landlords?—As well to afford relief to them, as to sustain those against whom decrees were sought in consequence of arrears of rent.

7565. By decrees, you mean decrees of the Civil Bill Court?—Yes; decrees of the Civil Bill Court.

7566. You have mentioned an extensive system of what I may call persecution, was instituted?—Yes.

7567. Are you now able to go into the details of that persecution?—The lands of ——— of ——— are very extensive in the county of Waterford. Several were made forty shilling freeholders for electioneering purposes; the lives in the leases, were generally very old, and upon the dropping of any of those lives ejectments were brought.

7568. Those ejectments were brought in consequence of the tenants having disobeyed the injunctions of their landlords at the election?—I am quite satisfied that if they had voted with ———, they would have been continued in their places.

7569. In fact, no doubt existed on the subject, nor was it ever denied?—I am not aware it ever was denied; I never heard it denied.

7570. Can you state the number of persons who were deprived of their farms upon the ——— estate, in consequence of their having voted against ——— at the election of 1826?—When I speak of numbers, of course I cannot be accurate in the precise numbers; but I should suppose that at least 700 persons have been dispossessed, I do not mean the same number of families, but 700 souls have been put out of their habitations since 1826 to the present time.

7571. Do you mean to say that so large a number as 700 individuals have been deprived of their farms and dwellings in consequence of their having voted themselves, or in consequence of persons connected with them having voted against the wishes of their landlord?—227 souls have been ejected within the last two months, and their houses have been levelled, at a place called ———.

7572. You speak of what took place within the last two months?—The reason I make that observation is this, the ——— of ———, the present ———, I take to be a man who gives himself very little trouble about politics, and I am unwilling to attribute any political motive to him in what has been done on the present occasion.

7573. Let us go back to the year 1826, in what month was the election of 1826?—In June.

7574. Can you state the number of persons who were ejected within a twelve-month afterwards, in consequence of their having voted at that election against ———?—I can state, that I myself paid the passage-money of several of them to America.

7575. I ask you, are you able to state, without being precise as to 10 or 20, what you conceive to be the number of persons who suffered within one twelvemonth from June 1826, for having voted against ———?—I should conceive between two and three hundred people suffered within one twelvemonth after it.

7576. Do you mean to say upon the ——— estate only?—Upon the ——— estate. When I say suffered, I do not mean ejected, for this reason, that their lives did not drop, and that those who were in arrears were protected by the Association.

7577. Do you know what the amount of money advanced for the relief of persecuted tenants was, within one twelvemonth from the election of 1826, by the Roman Catholic Association?—About 2,200*l*.

7578. What was the largest sum advanced to an individual, can you state that?—The largest sum advanced to an individual was, I believe, very near 200*l*.; that 200*l*. was advanced to a man of the name of ———, who was not a tenant of ——— of ———.

7579. Will you state the events connected with the persecution of ———?—

He was largely in arrear with a gentleman of the name of ———.

7580. ——— voted against ———?—Yes.

7581. What took place in consequence of this?—I believe his cattle were distrained by Mr. ———; I think so; how the distress was effected I do not know, because he lives at a remote part of the county of Waterford; the protection association, of which Mr. Wyse, one of the Members for Waterford, was then a member, transmitted money through a Mr. O'Brien for the purpose of paying ———'s debts to his landlord.

7603. You were present at the election?—I voted at the two last elections for the city of Waterford.

7604. Do you know whether, at the subsequent election, the same system of intimidation was adopted by the landlords with respect to their tenants?—Not on the same extensive scale, but I know the system of intimidation is continued up to this very moment in the city of Waterford.

7605. You take upon yourself to state that at the subsequent election intimidation, though not upon so large a scale, yet to a considerable extent, was exercised towards the tenants by their landlords in the county of Waterford?—I do.

7606. Not only that threats were used, but that those threats were carried into effect?—I cannot say much with regard to threats being carried into effect, because those persons who before were in the habit of threatening, succeeded at the election subsequent to that of 1826; that is, Lord ——— was returned in lieu of Mr. Stewart, when Mr. Stewart resigned the representation.

7607. Did the persecution that was exercised towards the tenants tend to produce pauperism and demoralizing results in the county of Waterford?—Unquestionably it tended to produce pauperism, but as to demoralization, I owe it to the character of the peasantry to say that I believe there was not a single person of them brought before the magistrates for any violation of the peace.

7608. Of that dispossessed tenantry?—Yes.

7609. You were summoned by the chairman of this committee to attend it?—I got a summons from W. H. Ord, Esq., franked by Charles Buller.

7610. Now was the system of persecution to which you have alluded instituted by ——— on the avowed principle of punishment in consequence of the steps taken by his tenantry?—I believe it was for this reason. I did not hear it from him myself, but it was so generally reported abroad, that it must be true. These people were generally desired to go to Mr. O'Connell or the priests when in difficulty, either on account of their arrears of rent, or because the lives on their leases had dropped.

7611. Had those people living on the ——— formerly received relief when in distress from the family of ——— of ———?—A great many were constantly employed on the ———.

7612. What number should you imagine?—I cannot speak to the number, but I know that there were several villages; there was the village of ———, ———, and ———.

7613. Might there be 40 or 50 families?—In ——— and ——— and ———, I suppose there must have been 150 families: I am not over the mark.

7614. Giving to the wife and children four to each family, that would be 800 or 900 persons employed by ———?—I have not said how many, but a number of them were employed; what the number is I cannot exactly state.

7615. I think you stated that at ——— there were 230 souls who had been ejected, and their cottages levelled, within the last three or four months?—I beg pardon, I have made a mistake; it is 229 persons within the last 12 months, and all the houses have been levelled, and these poor people are now scattered among the neighbouring farms.

7616. Those persons were formerly employed about the ——— of ———?—Not at all; they live eight or ten miles from ———.

7617. The other individuals to whom you first alluded, who live round ———, a great proportion of them were employed by ———?—Yes.

7618. Those persons, when ——— stood for the county in 1826, voted generally against their landlord, ———?—They did.

7619. So that the obligation of mutual acts of kindness and gratitude between landlord and tenant was so far interfered with on this occasion, that instead of the former good-will which prevailed, the landlord was induced to be severe with the tenant for having voted against his ————. The landlords were induced to be severe; they acted from a conscientious motive, and he punished them.

7620. Now, were these 40s. freeholders in a great degree originally made for the purpose of giving political influence to that family?—I dare say that was the intention of ———— for a great portion were made in March 1825. It was the system of ———— to keep these poor men completely dependent, for the lives were always very advanced which he put into the leases.

7621. So that, in your opinion, these tenants were made freeholders for the express purpose of giving political influence to that family?—That was his intention.

7622. Well, those individuals, upon conscientious grounds or motives, voted against their landlord in favour of the popular candidate?—Unquestionably.

7623. Then, having been made for political motives, and they having voted against their landlord, do you consider there is any thing very extraordinary that the ———— should subsequently deprive them of their freehold, they having voted against his interest?—I think, as an honest man, he should have praised them for their integrity.

7624. You therefore think that ———— has not been influenced to eject those numerous tenants from any desire to improve his farms, the speculation of political influence having totally failed; but that he has acted, even for the last three months, where these 229 persons have been ejected on political grounds?—I think, if they were of equal use to him still, as he expected originally, he would still continue them.

7625. But the political influence having failed, do you attribute a vindictive motive of severity or persecution by the ejectment of these 229 persons?—I have stated before, ———— does not give himself much trouble, I believe, about politics, but I believe there is a feeling of anger still against them in consequence of their conduct in 1826, because the political influence of the family has been completely destroyed in that county.

7626. But as you stated that these freeholders were made for a political object, and the political object having (now nine or ten years ago) failed, is it not natural to attribute the ejecting of these men to there being no longer any necessity for their being freeholders, rather than to a vindictive motive or to a motive of persecution, more particularly as you state ———— is not a person much influenced by political considerations?—If we could disconnect the present conduct of ———— from the conduct pursued by them immediately subsequent to the election, it may be possible to attribute such a motive to ————, that is, to disconnect it altogether from persecution.

7627. Are you not aware that, in the value of property, the great subdivision of property has been considered to be very detrimental to the interest of the landlord, and that the compensation fund was the political influence that this subdivision of property gave him, but that when that influence ceased, that it was very natural that he should revert again to the best mode of distributing his farms in larger portions?—That is a question of political economy; he may have that motive, but I have already observed, that if these men still continued to be of the same use as was anticipated when they were made freeholders, that notwithstanding his desire of improving his estate by letting it out into large farms, he would still continue them; besides, there are portions of his estates from which men are now about to be ejected at the coming assizes, for which they are competent to pay their rents, and which land cannot be made very available for any agricultural purpose, inasmuch as it is extremely mountainous; I will not say mountainous, but it is very sterile, it is land that is worth very little.

7628. Still do you mean to say, by the arrangements that are about to be made by ————, for the ejectment of these individuals, that there is to be a positive agricultural loss to his family?—I should think so, because he, it is said, intends to plant on the ground.

7629. Now ———, when he ejected these men, of course ejected them, having the power according to law?—Certainly.

7630. So that when the tenants did not fulfil the objects for which they were made freeholders, the landlord got rid of them when it no longer suited his purpose?—Yes.

7631. I think you said that the system of intimidation continued up to this moment, will you be so good as to state cases of intimidation which have continued up to this moment?—I will state one case, the case of the tenants of Mr. ———, a gentleman of large landed property, as well in the liberties of the city, as in the county of Waterford; I believe he resides in ———; a great portion of his tenantry live within the liberties of the city of ———. At the late election for the city of ———, they were all determined, with the exception of one or two, who were generally supposed to have received bribes to vote for what we consider the liberal candidates, namely, Wyse and Byrne, and against Mr. Christmas. A letter was produced, purporting to come from Mr. ———, commanding them to vote for Mr. Christmas, and they were thrown into a great apprehension in consequence of it, and because they had no leases; they remained from voting altogether.

7632. This was at the last election for the city of Waterford?—Yes; and unquestionably they would have all voted, with the exception of the two I have mentioned before, instantly against Mr. Christmas, if not for the threat in that letter.

7633. Then as it appears, by your opinion, that these tenants in the present temper and political feeling of Ireland, will vote for the popular candidate against the wishes of their landlord, and as the landlord created those freeholders with the understanding that they were to vote for his interests, are you surprised that landlord should, when that influence is turned against him for which purpose the freeholders were made, are you surprised he should endeavour to neutralize or get rid of that influence?—I never heard there was any understanding whatever between Mr. ——— and his tenants, that they should vote for any particular person.

7634. Did you never understand there was such a feeling between the Marquis of Waterford and his tenantry; and was it not very generally understood in that part of Ireland when the 40s. freeholders were made in the manner you have described?—I believe the county of Waterford was so long an heir-loom to the Beresfords without even a contest, that until Mr. Stewart appeared to contest the county, there was very little understanding between the Marquis of Waterford and his tenants about electioneering at all.

7635. But you stated in 1825, a few months preceding the election in 1826, that a large number of freeholders had been made for this very purpose of voting, and that it is now, in 1835, the greater proportion of those freeholders made in 1825, which are now sought to be ejected in consequence of the falling in of their leases, therefore, in your opinion, is it not evident that the freeholders having in 1825 been made for one particular purpose, namely, the influence of the Beresford family, or to support the influence of that family, that an understanding did exist at the time they were made freeholders, that they should vote in favour of that influence?—I believe they were made prior to the public announcement of Mr. Stewart's intending to contest the county, and ——— may have had some private intimation, that he would in all probability seek the representation when he came of age. But I was not aware, nor have I ever heard, that when they did register those persons, that they exacted any promise whatever from them, that they would vote agreeably to their wishes.

7636. I do not speak of any precise promise, but I speak of an understanding existing, that when these freeholders were made, it was understood by them that they would support the ——— family, they being tenants under the ———?—The ——— may have that understanding in their own minds; but I am sure they never communicated it to their tenants. I believe the ——— never contemplated there would be such a moral uprising against their influence as did take place.

7637. Have they, after that failure in 1826, continued to make freeholders?—

Yes; they made more 10*l*. freeholders subsequent to the Emancipation Bill than any other family in the county of Waterford.

7638. Were those persons generally Catholics or Protestants?—The tenantry generally of the county of Waterford are Catholics.

7645. You stated, there were upwards of 200 persons who had suffered, and then you said you must explain it, for they have not really suffered, for the ejectments have not been put in force; and as to the rents that were due, that they had been assisted in them by the Roman Catholic Association; how then did they suffer?—I was then giving an answer to the question of an honourable Member explanatory of the views of the ——— in persecuting the people, they put them to the cost of bringing them into court for arrears that had been long due, although the sums were very trifling in themselves; they did not suffer subsequently, because the Catholic Association stepped in with their money and assisted them.

7646. Then their sufferings were more those arising from threats than actual loss?—They did every thing they possibly could do to eject them; but in consequence of an error committed by the assistant barrister in decreeing beyond the jurisdiction of his court, they were continued in their places.

7655. In appealing to the lower classes, did you and the other clergy who interfered in the election, principally dwell on a particular construction attached by you to the oath against bribery?—Yes.

7656. And that the taking of a bribe at an election is generally followed by perjury?—Yes.

7657. You held out to the voters, that they were bound not to accept money, and not to vote in consequence of any promise of worldly advantage?—Yes.

7658. That construction you consider to be the legitimate one to be put on that oath?—Yes.

7659. And it was by appealing to that oath, and not by any threat of temporal loss, that you endeavoured to sway the minds of the Roman Catholic voters?—Yes.

7660. Although you spoke but once at a public assembly in one particular chapel, immediately with reference to the election, did you and the other clergy speak generally upon the construction of the oath, without reference to the individual candidates who were to stand at the election?—With regard to the bribery oath, I felt it my duty to caution the people at mass on Sunday against perjury; I told them, that there was no security for life or property if an oath could be trifled with; I enlarged upon it as one of the greatest crimes against the Godhead, inasmuch as it makes him a party to a falsehood.

7661. Did you, or did any Roman Catholic priest, to your knowledge, threaten the voters with popular vengeance, and with their ruin, if they disobeyed the desire of the popular leaders?—No, I confined myself exclusively to an elucidation of their moral duties, without the slightest reference to any of the candidates. I never recollect, when officiating as clergyman, having introduced the name of any political man with a view of arraying public feeling against him.

7662. You are aware that, since Roman Catholic emancipation, the Roman Catholics have interfered in elections?—They have.

7664. Did you conceive it to be your duty to interfere to a certain extent at elections since emancipation?—Yes.

7665. Why?—To produce better government for the country, and to put an end to the system that is every day marked by bloodshed, and the keeping the different portions of Irishmen asunder.

7666. Did you conceive it to be your moral duty to interpose with a view to the correction of a system of things from which immorality of the worst sort is derived?—Certainly.

7667. I suppose you refer to the tithe system?—Yes.

7668. Do you conceive that if the system of ballot were introduced into Ireland, that the Roman Catholic clergymen, through the confessional or through any opportunities afforded him by his clerical relation with his penitents, to be able to obtain knowledge of the manner in which an elector had voted, or of the manner in which at an ensuing election he would intend to vote?—It would be a monstrous abuse of his ministry to seek such information through the confessional.

7669. Do you limit your answer to the seeking it through a confessional, properly so called, or do you extend it to that part of the question put to you by the Committee, which related to the opportunities which his spiritual calling might otherwise afford to him?—I extend my answer to both branches of the question.

7670. Have you ever asked at confessions of any elector how he had voted, or how he would vote?—Never, and never shall.

7671. Are you convinced that if the ballot were introduced, the Roman Catholic clergy would not employ the confidence reposed in them in confessional, for the purpose of swaying voters at elections?—I am sure they would not.

7672. Do you conceive that if a better system of government were introduced into Ireland, the Roman Catholic clergy would remit in a great measure their political interference?—I am sure they would.

7673. Now you say that you have not interfered so much in election matters since Catholic emancipation has passed, but that you have felt it your duty to interfere on the subject of tithes?—I have interfered very little on the question of tithes, for this plain reason, that residing in the city where tithes did not exist, the question did not press upon me; but I have voted for those whom I knew would vote in the House of Commons for a change of the system.

7674. When you talk of a change of the system, do you mean an alleviation of tithes from the poorer classes, or do you mean that no tithes whatsoever is to be paid to the Protestant clergy; do you wish for the total abolition of it?—I should wish to see tithes altogether extinguished; but when I say that I think Government is bound to provide an adequate support for every gentleman who has already entered the Protestant ministry, because they did so under the conviction that they would be provided for. (pp. 442—450.)

GERALD FITZGERALD, ESQ.

5239. IN what county in Ireland do you reside?—In the county of Tipperary.

5240. Do you hold any official situation?—I am resident magistrate of police for that county.

5322. You, as a stipendiary magistrate, have very often had occasion to exert yourself for the purpose of detecting offenders?—Certainly, it is my duty.

5323. Have you in some instances been instrumental in obtaining the discovery of offenders through the intervention of the clergy?—Yes, I have.

5324. Does not your experience of the Roman Catholic clergy, which appears to have existed to some extent, at least in your official capacity, lead you to the conclusion that the Roman Catholic clergy are bound by secrecy respecting every thing that is communicated in confession?—I have always heard that they are.

5325. Do not you believe that Roman Catholic priests keep secret communications made to them by offenders?—I believe they do; I have heard it always stated that communications made under the seal of confession were sacred.

5326. Do you recollect a case where you yourself usefully interposed with respect to the murderers of Shea, in which the discovery of the offence was obtained by the refusal of the priest to give absolution to the witness, till the witness should give information to the Government, though the priest himself was bound to secrecy?—The witness so stated upon the table.

5327. So that in that case the priest did not make the disclosure, though he insisted upon the witness making the disclosure for the purposes of justice?—The witness so stated upon the table.

5328. Then your conclusion is, that the priest is bound to secrecy in the first place, and the priest observes secrecy?—As to his observing secrecy, I have formed no opinion; I have always understood that the priest was bound to secrecy, and I believe that he does keep secret those communications made in confession, but I cannot state positively.

5329. It is your opinion, from your knowledge of the Catholic priesthood, that they do not disclose what is made known to them in confession?—I believe not.

5330. Then supposing the priest were to inquire of the penitent how he voted, the priest would be bound to secrecy?—I take it that he would not dis-

close to any one person how that individual voted, but it would serve as a future land-mark to the priest how he could exert his influence upon that individual, supposing that that individual had voted in any way opposed to the wishes of the priest.

5331. But if a number of Roman Catholic clergymen of respectability were produced as witnesses upon the subject, of which they must have better cognizance than yourself, and they were all to concur in asserting, that it would be criminal upon the part of the priest to ask any question with respect to the vote, and still more criminal to make a disclosure; do not you think that such evidence in the first place must be much preferable to your conjecture, and would it not lead you to think that the confessional could not be used as a means for counteracting the secrecy of the ballot?—Mine is merely conjecture, and must be taken according to its value.

5332. Assuming that the priest does not reveal what passes between him and his penitent at confession, may not a priest, occasionally displaying, as you have said, his political power, exercise over his penitent an influence interfering so far with the free wishes of the voter as to induce that voter to vote according to the popular wishes; for instance, has he not the power of spiritual consolation to that individual in giving him when sick, or after any crime he may have committed, absolution; has he not a great spiritual influence and control over that individual, and if the secret power of the ballot were to be established, would not the priest have a much larger power and influence than any other individual in Ireland?—I do conceive that he would have not only an indirect influence as to the immediate election, but he would have a direct influence as to all future elections, because if he became apprized, under the seal of confession, how an elector had voted on a particular election, and that that vote was given against the priest's wishes, of course the priest would direct his influence at a future election to induce that elector to vote differently than he had done before, and according to the views of the priest on the particular occasion. (pp. 305, 312, 314.)

HENRY JOHN BROWNRIGG, ESQ.

4584. WHAT office do you hold?—I am sub-inspector of the county of Kerry, and a magistrate of the county.

4585. You were employed in the county of Kerry previous to and during the late election in January last?—I was.

4590. What were the general features of intimidation exhibited at that election, was it a system of intimidation pursued by means of the priests exercising undue influence, or was it merely by the mob, or by both?—As far as I have understood, from reports made to me, the influence of the priests contributed very much to influence the votes of the electors. The influence of the mob in some cases, I believe also to have had the same effect.

4591. Are you aware of a speech, alleged to have been made by Mr. Daniel O'Connell at the association in Dublin, and published in the Kerry paper, which speech in substance had a passage to this effect: "I go to-morrow down to the county to oppose the Knight of Kerry. I will tell you more, that there is not a Catholic in that county who will be base enough to vote for the Knight of Kerry, who shall not have on his door a death's head and cross bones painted, to show what a miscreant that Catholic must be." In any placards, papers, or printed documents in the county of Kerry, has such a passage come to your knowledge, as being alleged to have been uttered by Mr. O'Connell?—Yes.

4592. What interpretation was put upon those words by the people in general in the county of Kerry?—The prevalent opinion amongst the people was, that those words marked them out as persons who were likely to suffer, either in their person or otherwise, if they voted contrary to the popular candidates.

4593. Do you know directly, from any Catholic gentlemen of your acquaintance, in talking of words so remarkable as those, what was, in their estimation, as Catholic gentlemen of education, the interpretation which they put upon those words?—I have heard several discuss it. I recollect in one instance in particular, a Catholic gentleman saying, that the very circumstance of that threat, as he

called it, being held out, would induce him to vote directly the contrary way to what he otherwise would be disposed; that is, that he would not vote for Mr. O'Connell, but against him.

4594. Then the interpretation in that gentleman's mind, being an educated person, was, that it was meant as a threat by Mr. O'Connell, which he was determined to oppose by voting contrary to the way he had originally intended?—Certainly.

4595. But with the lower orders of Catholics, who are not in the independent position of this gentleman, and who interpreted this part of the speech as a threat, were they likely to oppose the popular candidates?—I think they viewed it in the same light; but I do not think they were disposed to act in the same way.

4596. Have you any doubt, from all you have heard in the county from others, as well as your own interpretation upon that passage, that it was taken generally as a threat, denouncing those as miscreants who should vote against the popular candidates in favour of the Knight of Kerry?—I certainly think that the people did consider it as a threat.

4597. Do you know any fact that occurred in the county of Kerry afterwards, when Mr. O'Connell came down, which confirmed that view, that the speech was taken as a threat?—Do you know whether Mr. O'Connell, in the county of Kerry, at Tralee, from a balcony or platform, in front of the Commercial Reading Rooms, addressed the people on one day, and that he stated in substance, as it has been printed in the Kerry papers, "that there was not a demon in Hell more base than the Catholic who should vote for the Knight of Kerry," and then these words were repeated, "I will have a death's head and cross bones painted or printed on a placard, and posted on the door of any Catholic who votes for him?"—I heard those words used in substance by Mr. O'Connell.

4598. Did you hear the first part, "that there was no demon in Hell more base than the Catholic who should vote for the Knight of Kerry?"—I did.

4599. Do not you think that this speech, taken in connection with the public speech made at Dublin, was calculated to alarm any Catholic of the lower orders if he voted for the Knight of Kerry?—I think so.

4600. Is there not every reason to believe that he would be insulted and beaten, and that he would be liable to be injured in his trade, to have his property injured, and perhaps his life placed in danger?—I would not, perhaps, go the whole length as to his life being endangered, because I have never heard any person express it so far as that; but I do believe, that the Catholics in general considered that if they voted contrary to the wishes of Mr. O'Connell, they would be injured in their trade.

4601. Are they not liable to have their property injured by voting against Mr. O'Connell?—Certainly. (pp. 264—266.)

MR. MORRIS BRENNAN.

7757. You reside in the county of Kerry?—I do.

7933. Did you ever hear any thing of a death's head and cross bones?—Every body must have heard of that.

7934. You do not believe there was such a thing?—No, I do not.

7935. Do you mean to say you did not believe there was any reference made to death's head and cross bones?—I have heard of it very often.

7936. Do you believe such a thing took place, and of the allusion being made use of at the election for the purpose of influencing the votes?—No.

7939. You do not believe that any person in addressing the people on the part of Mr. Mullins or Mr. O'Connell threatened that a death's head and cross bones should be put at the people's doors if they did not vote for them?—No, I never heard such expressions used.

7940. You never heard that such language was ascribed to any person; you do not believe that they did use that language in addressing the people?—No, I never heard it used, but I heard of it through the newspapers.

7941. Did you hear O'Connell address the people at Tralee from a window, or from a balcony, after his arrival from Dublin?—No.

7942. Did you ever hear that he had made use of this expression, that if any individual voter did not support the popular candidates, a death's head and cross bones should be fixed over his door; and that that man who would not vote for the popular candidates, and for his religion, would be a base miscreant, or words in substance to that effect?—I heard that imputed to him; but I did not believe it, nor do I believe it, as the impression on my mind is that he denied it.

7943. Are you any relative of Mr. O'Connell's?—A very near relative.

7944. What relation are you to him?—I believe a first or second cousin, or something of that sort.

7945. Do you mean to say you do not believe Mr. O'Connell said that?—I do not, if he denied it; but I heard it imputed to him.

7946. You do not believe a word of it?—I do not believe a word of it, as I understood he denied it: but I heard it imputed to him.

7758. You were appointed a collector of the grand jury cess of the barony of Magonihy?—I was.

7759. In January 1830?—Yes.

7760. I believe that you were elected by a large majority of the magistrates of the county?—Yes.

7761. Up to what time did you continue elected?—Up to the last Spring assizes, March 1835.

7762. What was the situation worth?—About 200*l.* a-year.

7763. Did you take any part in the last election?—Yes, I voted with Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Mullins.

7764. You are a relation of Mr. O'Connell?—I am.

7765. For whom did you take an active part?—On behalf of Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Mullins.

7766. Were you after the election dismissed from your situation?—I was.

7767. Was there any charge preferred against you with respect to the manner in which you had performed the duties of your situation?—None. The question which a gentleman, the treasurer of the county, asked was, whether there was any fault to be found with me; and the answer was, that during my appointment (a period of between five and six years, from January 1830 to March 1835), there could not be a more correct or regular officer; those were almost exactly the words used by him.

7768. Was there any instance of a collector being dismissed excepting from misconduct?—No instances in that county; nor from the inquiries I have made, in any other county in Ireland.

7769. When you were candidate for the situation in January 1830, you had for your competitor a Mr. John M'Carthy?—Yes.

7770. After the last election at the Spring assizes, Mr. M'Carthy was substituted in your place?—Yes.

7771. For whom did M'Carthy vote?—For the Knight of Kerry.

7772. Did he exert himself for the Knight of Kerry?—He did, very much.

7773. When you received intimation that there was an effort to be made to deprive you of your situation, did you apply to any of the deputy lieutenants of the county?—I did, to a Mr. ———, a deputy lieutenant of the county.

7774. What did Mr. ——— state to you?—Mr. ——— first stated, on my asking him whether it was possible that the report was true, that I was going to be deprived of my situation merely because I had taken an active part for the popular candidates at the last election, he admitted that to be the fact; but first said that his motive for promising to vote against me was because the gentleman who was going to be substituted had agreed to collect at a lower rate; to which I replied, that if the grand jury thought it reasonable, generally speaking, to reduce the salaries of the high constables, I would either do it at that lower rate, or give up the situation quietly. He then said, the fact is (or something to this effect), from the part you have taken in the last election, Mr. ———, ———, and myself, in a conversation at my house the other day, had determined, under all circumstances, to remove you. He said, at the same time, I feel a difficulty, and consider it an injustice to remove you without cause; but he said then, from

the part ———— has taken against you, I think you have no chance, or something to that effect; and he then said, he had seen and read ————'s letter to ————, directing him to canvass the grand jury against you.

7775. Have you heard of any declaration made by Mr. ————, the ———— of the county?—When the grand jury were voting on the occasion, this said Mr. ———— and Mr. ———— declared that their only reason for voting against me was from the part I had taken at the last election; they declared it in open court, because the grand jury sat in open court.

7776. Did you apply to Mr. ———— to interest himself with his son in your favour?—I did.

7777. What answer did Mr. ———— give you?—Mr. ———— said, that his son had promised to vote against me, or would vote against me; and that in doing so, he would be influenced by the part ———— had taken against me; and that he, Mr. ————, had seen ————'s letter to ————, desiring him to canvass all the members of the grand jury for Mr. M'Carthy against me.

7778. Before your dismissal did any person appear as a member of the grand jury to interpose, and ask whether there was any complaint against you?—Yes.

7779. Who was that?—Mr. John O'Connell.

7780. The father of Mr. Morgan John O'Connell, the member for the county?—Yes.

7781. What answer was there made?—There was no reply; he asked the question twice; two days before they had voted Mr. J. O'Connell asked, if there was any complaint to be made of any of the collectors of the grand jury cess, as that, if there was, it would be fair to state so then, so as to give them an opportunity of meeting any charge made against them.

7782. Now in two days afterwards, when it became necessary for the collector of cess to enter into fresh securities according to the custom, did the treasurer of the county say any thing?—The treasurer of the county was asked, whether there was any complaint made to him of Mr. Brennan, one of the collectors of cess.

7783. Who asked this question?—Mr. J. O'Connell.

7784. Before the grand jury?—Yes.

7785. In public?—Yes; to which he replied, no.

7786. And upon the treasurer declaring there was no complaint against you, was any further question asked of the treasurer?—Whether he had himself (the treasurer) any cause to find fault with me as a collector; to which he replied as I said before, that during my appointment, there could not be a more correct and regular officer, or something to that effect.

7787. Did you tender good security?—Yes, the persons who were always my surety, excepting on one occasion, when one of them was ill, was John and James O'Connell.

7788. Both gentlemen of large fortune?—Yes.

7789. What was the amount of the security?—Five or six thousand pounds.

7790. Have you any doubt that ———— did, in consequence of the part which you took at the election, exert himself to deprive you of your situation?—I have no doubt of it, as Mr. ———— declared he had read his ———— letter, and it had influenced him.

7791. Pray, before you were dismissed from your situation, and Mr. M'Carthy, the partisan of the Knight of Kerry, was substituted for you, had you been applied to to do the business at a lower rate?—No.

7792. But afterwards, when Mr. ———— told you in the first instance that Mr. M'Carthy had offered to do the business at a lower rate, you offered to do it yourself at a lower rate?—Yes.

7793. So that you are positive that on that ground you were not dismissed?—Certainly.

7794. Was there ever any deficiency in any of your accounts?—Never.

7795. Did you ever require any further time to pay in the account?—I always paid in within the time prescribed by Act of Parliament, which I believe is either two or three days before the assizes.

7796. I believe you were the last in the county to collect, and the first to pay in?—I was the last person, from every information that I could collect, that commenced collecting, and the treasurer invariably told me I was the first person to pay in.

7797. Did you ever return any part of your barony in arrear?—Never, which a great number of other persons were in the habit of doing.

7798. How many baronies are there in the county?—Eight.

7799. How many collectors?—Seven.

7800. One person did then collect for two baronies?—Yes.

7801. How many of the collectors voted for Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Mullins?—Two.

7802. Were they dismissed?—They were; one of those collectors who was dismissed had two baronies, and he was deprived of one of them.

7803. How many of the collectors voted for the Knight of Kerry?—Three, I think.

7804. How many collectors exerted themselves for the Knight of Kerry?—Four.

7805. Did those gentlemen take an active part in the election?—Very active part.

7806. For the Knight of Kerry?—Yes.

7807. Were any of them dismissed?—None. (pp. 454—6, 460, 462.)

Mr. JOHN M'CARTIE.

11694. Do you hold any official situation in the county of Kerry?—I am collector of the baronial cess for the barony of Magonihy.

11892. You say you are a baronial collector, when were you appointed?—At the last spring assizes.

11893. Is that since the election?—Yes, it was.

11894. When you were candidate for the office were you supported by a majority of the grand jury?—Decidedly.

11895. Were you, on a former occasion, a candidate for this office?—I was.

11896. Who was the successful candidate?—Mr. Brennan.

11897. If you heard it said, that Mr. Brennan had stated that he had beaten you by a large majority on that occasion, should you say that statement was correct?—Certainly not.

11898. What was the majority when Mr. Brennan on the former occasion beat you?—One.

11899. What were the numbers that voted on both sides?—Twenty-three was the usual number of the grand jury.

11900. When on the late occasion you were a successful candidate, what was the division?—I believe it was 19 to 4, I had 19 and he had 4.

11901. There were two divisions, one by the magistrates, and the other by the grand jury?—There were.

11902. Was this before the grand jury?—It was. The death of Mr. Gallwey, the late high constable or collector, was before the assizes a very short time; the magistrates had it in their power to elect an officer *pro tempore*.

11903. Brennan had a large majority of the magistrates?—Yes, he had; because he continued during the lifetime of Mr. Gallwey to canvass the magistrates.

11904. The majority to which you allude was a simple majority, which determined the appointment of the candidates before the grand jury, and not the result before the grand jury?—Just so.

11905. The numbers you have given to the Committee related to the final decision of the grand jury, and not the decision of the magistrates?—Yes.

11906. Lord Kenmare's agent supported you on the first occasion as well as the last?—Yes, he did.

11907. How long had Brennan held the office?—From 1830.

11908. Was there any complaint made against his administration of his office?—There were no public complaints; it is not for me to say, and I have a delicacy in saying any thing upon the subject.

11909. Did he not offer you on the last occasion to collect the cess at a lower

rate than that at which you offered, or which you have since received?—He offered to collect it at four-pence in the pound.

11910. What is the usual sum received?—The grand jury have presented it to me at nine-pence in the pound; it was tried by the judge at the assizes, and he decided with the grand jury.

11911. Do you not conceive that the grand jury are the best judges what the allowance should be, and that it is not a rule what a person when out-bated should offer to take it at?—I think that they are the best judges.

11912. Have you any objection to state what is the total amount you have received for collecting?—I have as yet received nothing.

11913. What do you believe to be the annual sum?—It is a per centage; it varies according to the amount to be collected.

11914. One year with another, at the rate of nine-pence, what will it be?—About £.160 to £.200 a-year; I think the sum was, in the whole, last year £.3,000.

11915. The securities offered by Brennan were quite unexceptionable?—They were.

11916. He had been in office six years, and without any complaint brought before the grand jury, immediately after the election you succeeded in putting him out?—Yes; but I had determined, and had been requested to offer myself as a candidate on the first favourable opportunity.

11917. You let the assizes pass without putting it forward?—Yes, whatever the time was.

11918. Then came the eleventh assize; after a contested election the grand jury were all in favour of the Knight of Kerry; and they put out the man that had been collector, whose securities were unexceptionable, and against whom there had been no public charge?—Yes.

11919. You consider yourself to be at liberty to be a candidate for that office at any period which is most likely to be successful?—Yes, certainly.

11696. In your opinion what was the disposition of the freeholders at the last election in January 1835, as regards the candidates who were then brought forward for the county, namely, for the Knight of Kerry and Mr. Morgan John O'Connell?—I know a great many of them residing in the parish I reside in, were anxious to vote for their landlords and for Mr. O'Connell, to give one vote for Mr. O'Connell and one for the Knight of Kerry.

11697. The disposition of the freeholders at large was favourable to the Knight of Kerry?—I should think it was.

11723. Are you aware whether the Roman Catholic priests upon that occasion took any particular part, or any active part in that election, either by canvassing previous to the election, or attending the votes during the election which took place in January 1835?—I am.

11724. State to the Committee any facts which have come to your knowledge, and on the accuracy of which you can rely, that they have so interfered?—I have been present when a Roman Catholic clergyman told the voters that they should not vote for the Knight of Kerry.

11725. Where did this occur?—It occurred in one of the Roman Catholic chapels.

11726. When the congregation were assembled for divine service?—Yes.

11727. What was the particular manner in which the priest described that, was it by mentioning the candidate by name, or generally that they should vote for the popular candidates?—He mentioned them by name.

11728. Do you consider, from the manner in which this took place, it was an actual canvass by the priest in his chapel during the time the congregation were assembled for divine service?—I do.

11729. Are you a Protestant or a Roman Catholic?—I am a Roman Catholic.

11730. Were you frequenting the chapel at the time?—I was.

11731. You have no doubt of the accuracy of the statement you now make to the Committee?—None whatever.

11732. Did you ever hear in any chapel any denunciations made against the Knight of Kerry, as an Orangeman, or a person adverse to the interests of the Roman Catholic clergy, or any causes assigned by the priests for their active

interference against the Knight of Kerry, because he was an Orangeman or renegade?—I cannot recollect that he was called an Orangeman upon that occasion.

11733. Was he designated as a supporter of the tithe system?—He was; and they were told it would be voting against their country and against their religion, if they did support him.

11734. Was that on the occasion to which you allude?—It was.

11735. Where was this?—In the chapel.

11736. In what chapel?—In the chapel of ———.

11737. Who was the clergyman officiating?—The Reverend Mr. ———.

11752. Do you think that the interference of the priests turned the election against the Knight of Kerry?—I do.

11753. You are confident of that?—I am quite satisfied of it.

11754. Do you know any other instance than that you have related, where you were present and heard the priests address the people against the Knight of Kerry, and in favour of the popular candidates, any other instance in which priests interfered with the election?—I have heard it was very general, that there was no chapel in the county where the priests did not take a very active part.

11755. In the same manner as you heard that one priest in the chapel you frequent?—To the same effect.

11756. Have you heard this from Roman Catholic gentlemen on whose veracity and accuracy you can rely?—I have.

11757. Have you any doubt of the prevalence of the influence exercised by the priests within their chapels and during divine service, to turn the voters from their original promise in favour of the Knight of Kerry to the popular candidates?—I have not.

11758. Did the priests in the different baronies collect together the freeholders, and did they bring them up to the poll, keeping them as much as possible from the influence of their landlords?—They did.

11759. Did the priests as it were come to the hustings with those people?—They did; I saw them at the booths.

11795. Have you heard of ——— refusing permission to a tenant to buy limestone from certain quarries in consequence of the vote he gave?—I know ——— has prevented lime and limestone from being got generally throughout the county.

11796. What do you mean by generally throughout the county, do you mean to say that he refuses to all his tenants permission to buy limestone, when it is almost necessary to the cultivation of their farms?—Without an annual application he does.

11797. Do you know any instance of the annual application being refused?—I have never been refused it myself: I am not a tenant of ———, nor do I reside upon his land, but I am obliged to make the application.

11798. Have you known any persons refused?—I have known persons refused.

11799. Have you known any tenant of ———'s to be refused the annual application since the election, and have you known the reason stated why?—I have heard generally that ——— withdrew his permission from all persons.

11800. From what persons?—From his tenantry, and as well from all others who had leave.

11801. From those who had not voted as he wished?—I have heard so.

11802. Did he equally refuse you?—Generally, every person.

11803. Has he refused you this year?—No, I have not as yet applied for it.

11804. Do you mean to say ——— has given a general refusal this year to all persons to take limestone?—I say he has been doing it for the last six or eight years.

11805. Is it his habit to do it?—It is.

11806. Not to grant it without particular application?—Without an annual application.

11807. Is it his habit to confine the permission to his tenantry?—No.

11808. Does he give the preference to them?—Yes, that has been the usual habit.

11809. But since the election he has refused that permission to some of his own tenantry?—I have heard so.

11810. You have already stated that ——— is reckoned to be a very indulgent and good landlord?—Very much so. (pp. 684—688. 692, 693.)

MR. MORRIS BRENNAN.

7808. You have stated ——— took an active part at the election?—Yes.

7809. Are you aware of his having after the election visited any of his tenants with any privations or hardships?—I know persons whom he refused liberty for lime and lime-stone.

7810. Were they then tenants on his estate?—Some were, and others were not.

7811. Those individuals were deprived of the privileges given to them by ——— before the election, in consequence of their having voted against his desire?—Yes. (p. 456.)

Thus much, in this place, for the spirit of intimidation and retaliation, which on the one side could ‘speak daggers,’ and which on the other, could ‘use them.’

MR. JOHN HAYS HATTON.

4292. WHAT is your rank?—Chief constable of police.

4293. How long have you held that situation?—Nearly thirteen years.

4294. What were you before you held that situation?—I was in private life before that for some time.

4295. Where do you live now?—At New Ross.

4296. You are a resident there?—Yes.

4303. Who were the candidates at the last election for the county of Wexford?—Mr. Power and Mr. Maher, Mr. Redmond and Mr. Cliffe.

4304. Mr. Power and Mr. Maher are the two sitting Members?—Yes.

4305. Mr. Cliffe and Mr. Redmond were the two unsuccessful candidates?—Yes.

4306. Is Mr. Redmond a Catholic?—He is.

4371. Now, subsequent to the election, has it come to your knowledge, or have you made any report to the Government, of any violences committed by any individuals upon the persons of those who voted against the popular candidates?—Yes.

4372. In what manner have they been visited with the vengeance of the populace?—Some of them were assaulted, and others were ill-treated, at the chapels where they went to mass.

4373. When you say they were assaulted, you mean they were violently beaten?—They were.

4374. Because there are reports to that effect, are there not?—Yes.

4375. As to the ill-treatment in the chapel, were not some of them thrust out from the chapel in consequence of having voted against the popular candidates?—I do not think they were pulled out, but their seats were pulled up and broken; and there were notices posted, calling on the people not to work for them. They came to me, and complained about it.

4376. Do you recollect that at that election there was a placard posted up in Wexford, signed “Daniel O’Connell?”—In Ross; I do not recollect it in Wexford.

4377. It was addressed to the men of Ross, and to the men of Wexford?—It was; it was in Ross I saw it.

4378. Is this one of the placards of the same description as those which you saw?—[*Showing a printed Paper to the Witness.*]—It is.

4379. In this placard are these words used:—

“Let them take down and publish in their parishes the names of any, if there be any, traitors to Ireland.”

"Let there be no violence, no force, no outrage. One single act of violence, force, or outrage, would ruin our cause, and give a triumph to our enemies.

"I therefore conjure you, in the name of the God of Peace, to injure no man by any species of force or violence, or outrage whatsoever.

"But post up the names of the traitors to Ireland: let no man deal with them—let no woman speak to them—let the children laugh them to scorn.

"Miserable traitors, and doubly traitors if they ever pretended to be honest!!"

Do you recollect that these placards were posted up during that election?—I do.

4436. You say that Mr. Redmond had, in a speech at the hustings, insulted the priests as a body?—He had made some allusions to them, which I knew from several Roman Catholic clergymen very much offended them.

4437. And you believe those insults had led to irritation in the minds of the priests?—I believe so.

4438. Are you aware of the purport of his language which caused them to be offended?—Yes.

4439. State it?—He said he would never consent to the county of Wexford being made a clerical borough by the priests.

4440. He began the attack on the priests?—He certainly began there.

4449. What evil do you suppose the Roman Catholic voters apprehend as a consequence of disobeying their priests, or voting against his wishes?—That of committing a very serious crime—perjury.

4450. You just now mentioned you could state the explanation of the bribery oath given by the priests, by means of which they sway the people at the election; have the goodness to state to the Committee what that construction of the oath is?—I have it here, and I will hand it in.

[The printed Paper was put in, and read.]

"THE SANCTITY OF AN OATH.

"The doctrine of the Catholic Church teaches that the elector is bound in conscience to support the candidate whom he disinterestedly and dispassionately judges to be more worthy of trust, and who will more promote the public good; this is obvious, as the franchise is given, NOT for his own private advantage, but for the good of the community.

"Every oath ought to be taken in truth, justice, and necessity! and any oath taken in order to commit a sinful act, is a profanation of its sanctity!

"From these doctrines, these consequences evidently follow:

"Any person who votes for the candidate whom he believes less worthy and less calculated to advance the general good, is guilty of sin, because he commits an act of injustice against the public interest.

"Any person who swears, though his oath be true, in order to enable him to give such a sinful vote, adds to the act of injustice the crime of gross profanation! because he invokes the holy name of God for the purpose of violating a moral duty, which violation is condemned, or ought to be condemned by his conscience.

"According to the terms of the bribery oath, it is obvious that any person having received, or had directly or indirectly any gift or reward, or any promise for any money, office, or employment, in order to give his vote at an election, cannot swear in truth; and if he do swear, he calls upon the holy name of God to bear testimony to a falsehood, and is guilty of the horrid crime of perjury!

<p>"William Brennan, James Crane, Patrick Murphy, John Furlong,</p>	<p>Francis Doyle, George Chapman, Patrick Kelly."</p>
---	---

4451. You said just now you thought all interference at elections ought to be prevented?—I think so.

4452. Your expression was that a voter ought to be allowed to vote as he wished?—Perfectly independent, that is my idea.

4453. Do you think a voter ought to be influenced by his landlord or by his customers, by the terror of losing land or custom, in consequence of voting against their wishes?—I think not.

4454. Now, is not there considerable intimidation exercised by the landlords in Wexford over their tenantry, to induce them to vote as they wish?—I believe there is.

4455. Have you heard of any instances since the election, of tenants who had voted against their landlords having notice to quit, or being turned out of their estates?—I have.

4458. Do you recollect the election at the borough of Ross?—Yes.

4459. Do you recollect any instance of a landlord threatening his tenant because he had voted for the popular candidate?—I heard so.

4460. Were you present at the time?—I was not.

4461. Was it notorious?—It was so stated; it was stated he could not give him a lease of some premises he had built on.

4462. In consequence of his vote?—In consequence of his voting against his wishes.

4463. Some premises that he had built on?—That he had built on.

4464. On the faith of getting a lease?—Yes.

4465. Did he state that at the poll?—No; I heard the report; I do not speak from having witnessed the transaction, but I heard it generally stated in the town.

4466. Do you believe it?—I do.

4492. You said you thought a voter ought to be left to himself, free from the control of the priests and the populace, on the one hand, and the landlord on the other?—I think a man ought to be left to his own conscience, to do as he pleases with his vote.

4513. The priest employs the bribery oath by way of intimidation?—He does.

4513. The landlord can resort to the notice to quit?—He can.

4514. Do you not think the landlord is much better provided with instruments of influence than the priest?—There is powerful influence on both sides.

4515. But the ballot would put an end to both?—I think it would. (pp. 250, 251, 255, 258—261.)

GEORGE DESPARD, ESQ.

5800. WHAT are you?—I am a resident magistrate for the County of Meath, and sub-inspector of Police.

5982. You said that, in your opinion, if the people were not excited by priests and agitators, that they would be quiet; do you believe that if an election was carried on quietly, that the voters would vote according to the wish of their landlords, or according to what may be termed popular feeling?—I am quite sure that if the people were let alone, the landlords would have very great influence with them.

5983. Now I ask you, from what you know of the country people, of the small voters in that county, do you consider that they would be glad if they had no vote to give, but were allowed quietly to remain on their farms, and to have no qualification?—I believe there are a great many of them would be very glad to be rid of their franchise at this moment.

5984. Would their wish of being qualified arise from the circumstance of their now being placed in a difficult position between the wish of their landlords on the one hand, and the intimidation and influence exercised by agitators and priests on the other?—Certainly, that is the very position in which they are unfortunately placed.

6006. You said that you believe that many of the tenants were anxious to be deprived of their elective franchise on account of the embarrassment in which they are placed on both sides?—I have heard some of them express such opinions.

6007. And that anxiety arose from the pressure of the priesthood and the agitators on the one hand, and of the landlords on the other?—Precisely so.

6008. Then the landlords do exercise some pressure?—They may. I do not know of any instance, as I have already stated.

6098. Do you mean to say, that the Catholic voters of the county of Meath are favourable to Conservative politics?—Indeed, I do not mean to say any thing of the kind; but I think that very many of them would be glad to go with their landlords from the feeling of self that is in every man, his own anxiety to benefit himself.

6099. But if that feeling of self did not exist, and there was no interference on the one hand by the priests and the people, and on the other by the landlords, that they were quite free from influence on either side, which do you suppose the Catholic voters of that county would have voted for of their own free-will, for the Conservative candidates or for the popular candidates?—I could scarcely imagine such a state of things.

6103. Supposing it were possible so to arrange the mode of voting, that the voter could vote in secret, and the secret could be kept, how do you think they would then vote?—I cannot suppose that, because it is impossible for secrecy to be observed when a man must tell to his Roman Catholic clergymen how he has voted.

6104. But supposing it was possible that the secret could be kept, how do you think the man would vote?—I must suppose the character of the Roman Catholic religion to be entirely changed before I could suppose that.

6105. But suppose he could vote secretly, and the secret could be kept, how do you think he would be disposed to vote?—If I could suppose how the secret could be kept, I could give you an answer.

6106. Well, then, do suppose it?—I think he would go with his landlord generally.

6107. Why do you think he would?—Because he would know whom he wished to return; and the landlord would know whether the body of his tenantry was going against him or not, and he would then be still dissatisfied.

6108. But you are supposing in that answer the secret would not be kept?—I take it the number of votes given against the candidate would, to a certain degree, disclose the secret, and therefore the feeling of dissatisfaction would continue.

6109. But is it impossible to give any proof to the landlord that the voter had voted in any particular way?—I am only giving an opinion, and my opinion is, that it would be impossible to prevent that kind of proof being given.

6110. Suppose no other proof could be given to the landlord than the assertion of the voter himself, how, in that case, do you think that they would vote?—Supposing the landlords to support one person, and supposing the popular party to support another person, I think the landlords would feel sore if the popular candidate was returned, although they might not know how their tenants, individually, had voted.

6141. Are not the priests, and the gentlemen whom you designate agitators (I do not mean to put it in an offensive way), Roman Catholics and Protestants?—The Roman Catholic gentlemen of the country are not, in my opinion, agitators.

6142. Do not the priests, and the gentlemen whom you designate agitators, use every influence they possess to induce the people to give up Ribbon, and other secret associations?—Why, I do not know any gentlemen connected with what they call agitation, I mean in the higher class of gentry of the Roman Catholics; on the contrary, those whom I have the pleasure of knowing are moderate liberal-minded men, who do not all enter into or approve of the system; with respect to the priests, I know in my own town one Roman Catholic clergyman, who, in consequence of the enormous increase

of the Ribbon system within the last two months, addressed his flock from the altar, cautioning them against it, told them that he knew there were people swearing them in every day, and that he would denounce them by name if they did not give it up. (pp. 342, 354, 355, 361, 362, 364.)

ROBERT MULLEN, Esq., M.D.

8246. WHERE do you reside?—At Dunshaughlin, in the county of Meath.

8247. I believe you are a member of the Meath Club?—I am secretary to the Meath Club, and have been since 1830.

8248. What is the Meath Club?—It is a political association for the registration of voters, and to secure the return of popular members.

8249. How long have you been in that capacity?—Since 1830.

8250. How many elections have there been since?—Five, three of them were contested; and at two elections the unsuccessful candidates retired on the day of nomination.

8251. Have you taken a part at those elections?—I have taken a very active part.

8252. Are you aware of any threats having been employed by landlords, in order to induce their tenants to vote according to the wishes of the landlords?—I am aware of several instances in which threats have been employed in order to induce tenants to vote according to the wishes of the landlords, and against the wishes of the tenants. I have seen a letter from a noble lord, directed to his agent, for the purpose of being shown to his tenants.

8253. Have you an extract of that letter?—I have.

[The following Letter was put in and read.]

“I shall make it a point to know from you (if there are any) the names of all such of my tenants who do not wish to oblige me with their interest, and will not go to vote. Time may come when they may want me to oblige them; we may then fairly toss up our pretensions and strike the balance. If there are any who have refused to oblige me by going, through a pretence of fear, I beg you will ask them again from me, and let me know their answer.”

8254. Can you produce the original of that letter?—I can.

8255. Who is the nobleman?—

8256. Can you refer to any other written document, for the purpose of establishing intimidation on the part of the landlords?—Yes, ejectments have been served on tenants during the election, some of which I have in my possession.

8257. Can you refer to any other letters by which intimidation on the part of the landlord can be established?—I have three letters, written by a landlord since the last election.

8258. Have the goodness to produce them; are those the originals?—These are the originals addressed to the tenants.

[The following Letter was then put in and read, addressed to
Mr. ———, ———.]

“———, 25th March, 1835.

“———,—I give you notice, that I require payment from you on my next day of receiving the year’s rent of your holding, due to me this day. I have given you my reasons already for this. Your’s, ———”

He was always in the habit of taking half a year’s rent when the year’s rent was due; he then called for the whole year’s rent.

8259. What is the date of that letter?—The 25th of March, 1835. The usual time of receiving the rent was the first week in June, and he usually received the half year’s rent due the preceding September in that week. There is a letter from the same gentleman directed to Mr. ———, of ———.

[The following Letter was then put in and read, addressed to
Mr. ———; ———.]

“ ———, —In such times of agitation as these it is not safe to leave a landlord's arrears of rent uncollected. I therefore give you notice that I shall require at the usual day for my rents being paid your year's rent falling due this day.

“ 25th March, 1835.

Your's truly, ———”

Here is another letter for the same rent:

[The following Letter was put in and read, addressed to Mr. ———, ———.]

“ 25th March, 1835.

“ Dear ———, —As I before told you, I shall require of you, at the next day for paying your rents, to pay me one year's rent due this day. In such times of agitation landlords must get in their arrears.

“ Your's truly, ———”

8260. Were the persons to whom those letters were addressed electors of the county?—They were, and they voted at the last election.

8261. How did they vote?—For the present sitting members, Mr. Grattan and Mr. Morgan O'Connell.

8262. Are you aware of tenants being threatened with the service of ejectments if they did not vote as their landlords desired?—Yes, I heard so from the tenants themselves, and I have an ejectment that was served during the canvass at the last election.

8263. Have you any doubt the serving of ejectments was threatened by landlords?—I have not.

8264. And that ejectments were served in consequence?—I have not.

8271. Who were the candidates at the second election that you alluded to, where the police were employed?—At the first election the Hon. Mr. Bligh and Mr. H. Grattan were the candidates; at the last election, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Morgan O'Connell, the Hon. Mr. Plunkett, and Mr. Lambart.

8272. Have you during the election seen the landlords and their agents in attendance upon the booths while their tenants were voting?—I have.

8273. Do you believe that the landlords and agents attended for the purpose of influencing the tenants to vote as the landlords desired?—That is my conviction.

8274. Have you any doubt about it?—I have not.

8275. Were any tenants upon the estate of ——— and of ——— dispossessed and distrained in consequence of their voting against the wishes of their landlords?—They were.

8276. Were penalties enforced against those refractory tenants which otherwise would not have been insisted on?—There were.

8277. What were those penalties?—There was a man of the name of ———; he was bound by his lease to slate his house under a penalty of 50*l.*; he never did it for many years, and after the election he was sued for the penalty, and was obliged to pay it.

8278. Might the penalty have been recovered on any previous occasion?—It might, as I understood.

8279. Do you believe that in any instance the electors have been induced by the popular party to vote against their real sentiments and feelings?—I have never known an instance.

8280. Have you known many tenants who have declined voting for the popular party from fear of incurring the displeasure of their landlords?—I have.

8281. Do you know of landlords preventing their tenants from registering, lest they should act against the wishes of their landlords?—I have seen it very generally practised at the registration after the Reform Bill.

8282. In what manner was that done?—Some of the tenants told me the facts; I saw myself a landlord come into court to oppose the registering of a tenant (who had already been registered) as a 20*l.* voter. This landlord had

polled the same tenant a twelvemonth before as a 50*l.* voter, and the tenant took the qualification-oath in his presence; he procured the will of this tenant's late father from the executor, and endeavoured to disqualify as a 20*l.* voter the very tenant who had at his own instance taken the oath of qualification as a 50*l.* voter the year before.

8283. Was the man disqualified?—He was not; he established his qualification.

8284. Do you believe that any Protestant electors have been prevented by popular intimidation from voting according to their wishes?—I do not think there were; there were 17 Protestant electors voted for Mr. Grattan and Mr. O'Connell at the last election; eight of them resided out of the county, and of course could not be affected by any agitation in it. Most of the others were 50*l.* freeholders, and they are a class upon whom intimidation very seldom operates; seven of them were 50*l.* freeholders, one a 20*l.* freeholder, and the other a 10*l.* freeholder.

8285. What was the total number of voters who voted at the last election, do you recollect?—I think nearly 1200.

8286. Of what religious persuasion are you?—A Roman Catholic.

8287. Do you know of ——— having gone at night to the houses of his tenants, and having taken them to his ——— for the purpose of preventing them from voting?—Yes, I have heard of it.

8288. Do you believe it?—I believe it; it was the same ——— of whom I spoke before, ———.

8289. Is he a Roman Catholic?—He is.

8290. Who did ——— support, the popular candidates or the unpopular candidates?—He supported Mr. Bligh, the unpopular candidate. As I have mentioned ———'s name, it is due to him to state that he has never since interfered in the elections, and has allowed his tenants to vote as they wish, nor has he persecuted any of his tenants who voted against his wishes in 1831. (pp. 471—473.)

EDWARD DOWLING, ESQ.

12252. ARE we to understand you, that you hear very general complaints amongst tradesmen of your own class in the town of Carlow, that their profits and dealings are interfered with, in consequence of the votes which they give at elections?—Very much. (p. 711.)

REV. JAMES MAHER.

9865. I BELIEVE you are a Roman Catholic clergyman, residing in the county of Carlow?—Yes, I am.

9866. What station do you hold in the Roman Catholic Church?—I am administrator of the parish of Carlow.

9867. Are you an elector of the county of Carlow?—I am.

9868. Are you a member of the county Liberal Club?—I am.

9869. How many Roman Catholic priests of the county of Carlow are members of that club?—Only two; I believe myself and another Catholic clergyman.

9870. How many Roman Catholic clergymen are there in the county?—About 30, or very nearly 30.

9874. A considerable body of the gentry of the county of Carlow are leagued together against the party which is commonly called popular?—I believe the majority of the gentlemen of the county are leagued together against the popular party; there are some very honourable exceptions among the gentlemen of the county.

9875. But the majority are leagued together for the purpose of returning candidates who profess Conservative principles?—They are.

9879. Before the election took place was any intimation given by landlords that they would eject or distrain their tenants, or serve them with notices to quit, in the event of their disobeying their orders?—A number of such notices has been given. (pp. 562, 563.)

COLONEL HENRY BRUEN.

10824. Do you consider the prosecution of the freeholders by the landlords, to which Father Maher has deposed, originated in their desire to coerce their tenants in every respect, or that it had originated in a league on the part of the priests to coerce their flocks to acquire political power?—Why, the real fact of the matter is, that the gentlemen of the county of Carlow, if they had asserted their rights as they ought to have done long since, would have prevented their county from becoming the seat of the dreadful scenes of violence and disorder which it has; and it is owing to their foolish kindness that the priests have been able to obtain the power that they have.

10836. You spoke of the landlords not asserting their rights, and you mentioned their omission to assert their rights as an instance of foolish kindness; what right had the landlords of Carlow to assert in that case?—They had a right to keep a servant or discharge him; to keep a tenant on their estates who was greatly in arrear, or to eject him.

10844. Have you punished, or attempted to punish, any tenants of your's on your extensive estates who have punctually paid their rents to you, and who bear a good and peaceable character, because they may have voted against your wish at elections?—I took 17 acres of land from a man of the name of Keogh, under those circumstances.

10845. State the particulars?—Keogh came to me, and he stated that he was most anxious and ready and willing to support me, but that he had been threatened so severely, and he was in such danger, that he thought it was impossible he could support me; I then endeavoured to prevail on him to vote for me; he told me that he would rather lay at my mercy than at that of the other side. This man held 17 acres of bog land, not, as Mr. Maher says, that by way of cheapening other land that he held too high, but merely as a favour, and those were the 17 acres of land that I took from him. (pp. 622, 623.)

Since this Evidence was taken by the Committee of the House, disclosures have been made of proceedings in Carlow, which render further extracts from the report unnecessary. We refer in particular to a statement of persecutions on the part of certain landlords, in the county of Carlow, referred to in a petition of Mr. Vigors, to the House of Commons. London, 1836.

MR. T. H. CARROLL.

11587. HERE is a letter from Dr. Nolan, the bishop of the diocese, dated Carlow, January the 7th, in which are these words—"Shall we then stand by as idle spectators of so momentous a contest—we, who are so completely identified with our people in all their interests and all their sufferings? I answer, emphatically, No! The people stand in need of our assistance in this emergency; and we owe to them our most zealous co-operation in an object so evidently good, as their peaceful and legal endeavours to free themselves from the thralldom of Conservative oppression, and the crying grievances of an unjust and sanguinary tithe system. We are bound to give them our assistance, by instruction, advice, exhortation. And it is necessary to explain to the electors the real nature of the question on which they are now called to determine by their votes." Now, do you not understand this letter of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese to be an instruction to his clergy to interfere in the elections, and to do every thing that they could to promote the objects of those candidates who, by their public professions, are known to be in favour of getting rid of tithes, and holding up the maintenance of tithes as a crying grievance, as an unjust and a sanguinary system?—I do. I had the honour of the acquaintance once of that gentleman,

and up to the writing of that letter, I very frequently praised him for his meekness and his temperate conduct. I never knew him an agitator until he wrote that letter. I replied to that letter which purported to be his.

11588. You have heard an extract from a letter; do not you think, in order to form a judgment of that letter, the whole context ought to be read?—Why, I think it frequently happens that a sentence may be perfect, and its meaning well understood, without the context. In other cases the sentence would not be perfect without the context.

11589. A part only of that letter has been read to you?—That is all, but I recollect the substance of the whole well.

11590. Here is another passage further on, in the same letter, which states, “Need the electors be informed of the true character of the ministry? If they be unacquainted with the professed and uniform principles of the men who compose it, passing events will tell them. Two or three sanguinary tithe massacres have occurred since the accession of the present ministry to power; not perpetrated, indeed, by their orders, but certainly in the well-founded hope of protection and indemnity from them. Are they to be informed of the Tory or Conservative principles? Surely they cannot have so soon forgotten those notable speeches and resolutions, in which the Catholic tenantry are devoted to extermination from the lands in which they and their fathers have toiled, unless, besides paying their rack-rents, they deliver themselves up in abject vassalage to the lords of the soil?” Do you recollect such a passage in the letter of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese, dated in Carlow?—I do, and I will tell you my reason why I recollect it. On one occasion, I addressed myself a letter to the Roman Catholic electors of the county, and I went into an historical detail of that party called the Tories for 40 or 50 years, and I showed historically that it so happened, that there was not a concession ever made to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, that it was [not?] the Tory party that granted that concession. I wrote that letter in reply to the bishop.

11594. Will you hand in the letter to which the previous questions have referred, and from which the extracts have been taken?—This is it:

[*The Letter is as follows:*]

“Dear Reverend Sir,

“Braganza House, Carlow,
7th January, 1834.

“HAVING been consulted by some of our clergy on the expediency of our taking a part in the present elections, I deem it necessary to address my answer generally, to the priests of at least this part of the diocese. My wish, as it is the express wish of all the Catholics in Ireland, is, that we should, if it were possible, keep aloof from all interference in political concerns. This, however, must be subject to the modification of circumstances; and I am decidedly of opinion, that the present critical and most important juncture of public affairs not only justifies, but imperatively calls for our most active and energetic exertions. I will state my reasons briefly. The best and dearest interests, religious as well as political, of our people and country, are at this moment at stake.

“A new administration has been called into power, avowedly for the purpose of supporting the temporalities of the Church, by law established, and the principles of the Tory anti-reforming or Conservative party in England and Ireland. His Majesty, desiring to ascertain whether a ministry, formed for such objects, and on such principles, shall be likely to possess the confidence of the nation, has dissolved the late Parliament, and calls on the electors to make known to him their wishes and opinions, by the free and independent exercise of their legal right of choosing their representatives for a new one. The present general election then is the most important that perhaps ever occurred in this country, for on its result depends the future improvement, peace and prosperity, of Ireland, or the perpetual continuance of the poverty, misery and degradation of her people. Shall we then stand by as idle spectators of so momentous a

contest? We are so completely identified with our people in all their interests and in all their sufferings, I answer, emphatically, no! The people stand in need of our assistance in this emergency, and we owe to them our most zealous co-operation in an object so evidently good, as their peaceful and legal endeavours to free themselves from the thralldom of Conservative oppression, and the crying grievances of an unjust and sanguinary tithe system. We are bound to give them our assistance by instruction, advice, exhortation: and it is necessary to explain to the electors the real nature of the question on which they are now called on to determine by their votes. The question before the electors now is, not whether this or that candidate be a man of wealth or limited fortune, a man of amiable manners and private worth, or a haughty aristocrat and bad landlord, a man of mental powers and literary acquirements, or a half-educated squire; but simply this—will they, by their votes, do all in their power to support an administration which is determined to check the progress of salutary improvement to all the civil institutions of the empire; to uphold and perpetuate in Ireland the enormous abuses of a Church establishment, from which the people never received aught but evil; to place the education of our youth in the hands of proselytising fanatics, and to deliver the Catholic population again to the domination of the old ascendancy faction. Need the electors be informed of the true character of this ministry? If they be unacquainted with the professed and uniform principles of the men who compose it, passing events will tell them, two or three sanguinary tithe massacres have occurred since the accession of the present ministry to power, not perpetrated indeed by their orders, but certainly in the well-founded hope of protection and indemnity from them. Are they to be informed of the Tory or Conservative principles? Surely they cannot have so soon forgotten those notable speeches and resolutions, in which the Catholic tenantry are devoted to extermination, from the lands in which they and their fathers have toiled, unless, besides paying their rack-rents, they deliver themselves up in abject vassalage to the lords of the soil. Here again is the plain question for the electors: will they give their support to such a ministry, their sanction to such principles, their approbation to such proceedings? Can any honest, independent, conscientious freeholder, particularly can any Catholic freeholder, who desires to see the reign of justice, charity and peace in his native land, do so? I should be extremely sorry to answer in the affirmative. Let not the electors be deluded by specious and plausible professions of liberality from any candidates whom they know to be identified with the party, to whose bad principles and selfish anti-national interests, the new ministry is pledged. The question, at the present crisis I repeat, turns not so much on the personal merits or demerits of any individual candidate, as on the paramount interests of the country, and the well-known principles of the Tory Government. After having explained to the freeholders of your parish the real state of the question in which they have solemnly to decide, your duty, Sir, is to instruct them in the conscientious obligations of electors, for they are not to understand that the elective privilege is intended by the laws as a matter of traffic, to be disposed of for private emolument or favour, but a sacred trust confided to them for the public good, and therefore to be exercised for the public good, with strict adherence to integrity, and according to the pure dictates of conscience. Their attention is to be most particularly directed to the nature and obligation of the oaths which are to be administered to them; the oath of qualification and the oath against bribery. However, I am so fully convinced of your own competency to give the necessary instructions on this important subject, that I feel it sufficient now merely to advert to it. Impress on the minds of your people the great importance of unanimity. Unanimity constitutes our strength; division, always the bane of our unhappy country, would now be fatal. If the honest independent freeholders, without distinction of creeds, stand together with one heart and one mind in the peaceful assertion of their constitutional rights, they must be triumphant; the power of their opponents shall be as chaff before them, and they may laugh to scorn the vindictive threats of disappointed ambition. The popular election committee has already given the example of that unanimity, and a proof of the total absence of all sectarian views and pre-

judices from their councils, for, though principally Catholics, they have preferred in their selection of candidates for the borough and county, three Protestants to three Catholics, of wealth, talent and respectability. Above all things exhort them to observe inviolably strict obedience to the laws, and a peaceful, sober, orderly line of conduct. Implore of them to avoid all excess and intemperance; to abstain from intoxicating liquors, and to "refrain themselves from all appearance of evil." Remind them of the necessity of practising patience and forbearance, lest they should be provoked to a violation of the peace by designing and evil-minded persons. In conclusion, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that it is at this juncture indispensably necessary that we exert for the common good of our country all our energy and zeal; but I trust it shall be with prudence and charity, and in a manner befitting the sacred station which we have the honour of holding, in order "that he who is on the contrary part may be afraid, having no evil to say of us." "Be vigilant," therefore, "labour in all things," rebuke the unquiet, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient towards all men. See that none render evil for evil to any man, but ever follow that which is good towards each other and towards all men; and may the God of Peace himself sanctify you in all things, that your whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless in the coming of our Lord.

"I remain, &c. &c.

"EDWARD NOLAN, Bishop, &c."

To the Rev. ———

—(pp. 671—673.)

This letter we counsel the best friends of Ireland to peruse again and again, as a pattern of the manner in which sound political sentiment (for such it is for the most part) can be expressed amidst unparalleled excitement, in terms to which the hearer can listen and upon which the speaker can reflect with satisfaction entire; sentiment giving a vigour to a just cause not impaired by gratuitous advantage to its enemies.

PATRICK LALOR, Esq.

9301. You are resident in the Queen's County, and you represented the Queen's County in the last Parliament, and you were a candidate to represent it at the late election?—I did represent it for the last Parliament, and was a candidate at the late election.

9302. Who were the candidates at that election, and also at the former election?—At the former election there were Sir Charles Coote, Mr. Peter Gale, and myself; at the last election there were Sir Charles Coote, the Hon. Thomas Vesey, Mr. Robert Cassidy, and myself.

9303. Can you state the number of persons who voted at both the elections?—I cannot with exactness; I think about 1,200 at the former and 1,300 at the latter.

9304. How did the numbers stand at the close of the poll?—The first election I was 77 of a majority above Sir Charles Coote, and he was 11 of a majority above Mr. Gale; and at the last election I believe Sir Charles's majority over me was about the same that mine was over him before, and Mr. Vesey's 22 over me. I do not recollect Mr. Cassidy's number.

9305. Was any influence used in the way of intimidation by landlords at the last election within your knowledge?—Yes, a vast deal; but I must say of course that many of those things I was not a witness to; many of them were so public that every body witnessed, and those that were not so, I can only state from information received from the parties concerned.

9306. The Committee wish you to state all the facts which you have taken pains to inquire into and to verify, and which you conceive yourself to have heard on competent authority?—At the first election, what we call the Conser-

vative or Orange party were quite unprepared for the event that took place; they had no conception, I believe, that there was any danger of Sir Charles Coote's return, and they did not use much intimidation before the election, but on the event turning out as it did, that he was near being put out, their resentment became very fierce, and of course the time for intimidation was then passed by, but they inflicted punishments of a very grievous nature upon many of the voters who voted contrary to what they thought they ought to have done, in the shape of ejectments for non-payment of rent, legal proceedings, what we call latitats, driving their cattle, taking turf bogs from them and commonage that was heretofore in their possession, and in every ——— a system of persecution existed both through ——— and ——— and ———. It would be too much to venture to say that ——— partook of it, but many were punished, I believe even beyond the law, in consequence of their having voted. I do not say that they were entirely voters that were punished in this manner, but friends and relatives, and in fact the whole bulk of the population who came in contact with the authorities.

9307. Did these facts take place immediately after the election of 1832?—Yes, and they have continued more or less ever since, before the last election, and immediately after it (of course) the persecution became stronger, and it has in some small degree died away; but I believe it is only for want of victims that, having persecuted almost the whole of them, it has in some degree ceased for want of other objects.

9308. Have any instances come within your own knowledge, of parties who immediately after the election of 1832 were ejected from their tenancies?—No, I cannot say that I know any that were actually put out of possession, but I know a great many that ejectments were served upon; and the popular party, feeling that those men were brought to that dilemma in consequence of having taken part in the election, they conceived themselves bound to stand between the landlords and those men, and in many instances they raised sums of money in order to protect those that were not able to protect themselves; some were able to protect themselves, and paid the costs of ten or eleven pounds, and in other cases it was paid by public subscription.

9309. What is the amount of costs which attends the suing out of an ejectment?—I understand the first expense, that is, if it is paid very soon, is about 11*l.*; it will, perhaps, amount to 40*l.* or 50*l.* if it runs on to the last.

9310. Were there several cases which happened, in which tenants having been served with an ejectment, were assisted by the public by means of a subscription to pay their rent?—Very many.

9314. Are there many cases in which Catholic tenants have been ejected and Protestant tenants substituted, since the election of 1832?—A vast number; and the spirit for doing so seems rather upon the increase; within the last two months I know a large district which has been depopulated by ———, for the purpose, as I believe, and in fact it is acknowledged, of putting Protestant tenants in their places.

9315. When you say "depopulated," you mean that the Catholic tenantry were ejected and Protestant tenants put in their places?—Yes, and in all cases a much smaller number put in their places.

9316. May not the motive of that process which you call depopulation be, that the landlord was desirous to put into his farm more substantial people, who would farm the land better than the poor tenants expelled?—No, I am quite convinced that the contrary is the fact; they will get a great deal worse species of tenantry, that is, a tenantry that will pay a great deal less rent; some of the colonies, if I may call them so, as they are called in the county, have been established two or three years, and, as I understand, they have not paid one fourth of what they contracted for, although it was a much less sum than the old tenants would have paid.

9317. Have you known instances of considerable distress suffered by tenants in consequence of being ejected?—Certainly; I have known several instances;

in fact, the event of the last election, that of Sir Charles Coote and of Mr. Vesey being returned, was entirely owing to the intimidation and the losses that ——— particularly ——— suffered after the election of 1832; and certainly many of them were reduced to very great straits, in consequence of the persecution used against them. There are other ——— I believe, persecuted as much; but ———, more ——— suffered persecution than ——— any other; and I know well that they did suffer, and that that was the cause why they voted as they did at the last election; they told me before the last election took place, that if there could be from three to five hundred pounds put in a fund that they could be made certain would be made available to them, to meet persecution of that kind, they would gladly give their votes as they wished themselves and as the public wished them; but that under the circumstances of their being left unprotected as they were before, they could not venture to do so; there were two or three reasons why that could not be complied with; in the first place I did not like the principle of it, and in the next place perhaps it was not convenient to give them so much money; but I am quite certain the men were sincere; it was not to be given in the shape of a bribe, but as a protection against future persecution, in the event of being distrained upon for rent, or being ejected.

9318. Did those ——— tell you so themselves?—They did, and they named the person's hands in whom they wished to have the money placed.

9320. Are there any other modes in which influence is exercised by landlords over their tenants?—I believe I mentioned all that can possibly be; I mentioned that they exercised this influence first as landlords, in the next place as magistrates, and again as jurors; and I do not know of any other way in which they can persecute.

9321. How is their influence exercised as magistrates?—There seems to be a line of demarcation drawn by the magistracy and squirearchy of the country between the Protestant population and those of the Catholic who voted with them, and the remainder of the Catholic population, because on one side there are all those who they consider have voted and acted as they call the right way, and on the other side they know and feel that the population is anxious that the present state of things should be altered; that is, that they should have freedom of election, and of course that that would bring about many changes towards the amelioration of their condition; and hence there is a sort of war raging between the ——— magistracy in my county and the population; ——— I know a case in the town of ——— since the last election, a feud that grew out of the election, where one man, a Protestant, put out the eye of another, and for which he was summoned before the magistrates; and in place of referring it to a jury at the assizes, they adjudicated upon it in a summary way, and they fined the man who put the other man's eye out 11., and they fined the man whose eye was put out 10s.

9322. Were those men Protestants?—The man whose eye was put out was a Roman Catholic, the other was a Protestant. Besides, this pound did not go to the man, it went, as such fines do, to the County Infirmary.

9323. Had any provocation been given by the Roman Catholic to the Protestant?—I was not present, but I conceive that there was not, because if there was sufficient provocation they would not have fined the man a pound. I conceive that it is almost impossible that both parties, in a case of that kind, can have been in fault; either one or the other must have been the aggressor. But the cases are so numerous, that to those who are acquainted with that country it would be needless to dwell upon them. But to the Committee it may be necessary to give instances. There was a written notice put up in the town of ———, after the first election in 1832, desiring the people not to deal with certain persons named in the notice; and I believe, as far as I could learn from the opinion of the lawyers, it was couched in such a way as not to be an infringement upon any known law. The writing of this was traced to a man, at least it was written upon the back of a letter which was directed to him, and upon that species of evidence he was found guilty, and sentenced to be transported for seven years. He suffered a year's imprisonment, and then

conceiving (as I believe) the man had not a right to be found guilty, they remitted the sentence. He was sent as far as Cork, and kept there in a hulk until discharged.

9324. Who were the persons against whom the notice was directed; were they persons that had voted in favour of the popular side?—Against the popular side.

9325. Were there any notices put up, recommending exclusive dealing on either side at the last election?—I am pretty sure there was, though I did not see them, perhaps very many upon the popular side. But in all cases that I am aware of, from beginning to end, the whole spirit of that non-dealing system grew up among the people as a matter of defence, not of aggression; because, in all cases that I am aware of, the gentry withdrew their dealing some time before the first election. But any that remained after the first election were withdrawn then, and this system of persecution that I have described commenced; and it was as a matter of defence that the practice grew up, rather than matter of aggression. I have a notice of a resolution adopted at a public meeting, which is in some way explanatory of that, which I will read. It was held at the town of Monrath, a parish meeting for the parish of M'Rath: "Resolved, That persecutions exist against the honest freeholders, who conscientiously voted for Lalor and Cassidy, and also against some who even voted for Lalor and Coote, by vexatious and unwarrantable proceedings, and that we will expose to the world the authors and actors in such tyrannical persecution."

9326. What date was that?—It was either the latter end of January or the beginning of February. There was also a resolution passed, to the purport of saying that they would not deal or leave their money with any of those persons who acted contrary to what were considered the interests of the public, or rather recommending that to be done.

9327. Did they promulgate that resolution in the newspapers?—They did.

9328. Did they represent it as self-defence against proceedings of a similar kind emanating from the other side?—Exactly.

9329. Is it within your knowledge that any gentleman taking an opposite side in politics withdrew their custom from tradesmen in the towns in consequence of those tradesmen not voting as the gentlemen wished?—Yes, of course: almost all that I can speak of as from my own knowledge is where the fact was notorious; but I know many cases, from the shopkeeper and brewers down to the working tradesman; I know a working tradesman, a smith, from whom a gentleman took his custom directly after the election; I am not sure whether he had a vote or not, because those that went to the election and shouted were equally persecuted as those that had votes.

9330. Do you know of any respectable shopkeepers having suffered in the way of their trade?—I must also say that it was only in a few cases that Protestant gentlemen had dealt with Catholic shopkeepers for many years before that; I remember there were two Quakers voted at the last election for Mr. Cassidy and me; in that case I know that some gentlemen in the neighbourhood withdrew their custom from them immediately after the election; I remember that several shopkeepers complained to me, that the little custom they had from Protestant gentlemen had been withdrawn from them, but it was only in a few instances that there was any power of withdrawing it, inasmuch as they had withdrawn it before.

9331. Are the principal part of the tradesmen in the towns in Queen's county Catholics?—Yes, the principal part of them.

9332. But there are in all those towns some Protestant tradesmen?—Yes, in all the towns that I am aware of.

9333. Do you know any instances in which voters declined to come to the poll to vote at all in consequence of feeling themselves uncomfortably placed?—Yes; I believe the generality of them that staid away were from that motive, and I believe that others staid away in consequence of a direct bribe. I have known persons that were bribed and staid away, and I have known others that were offered it that did not stay away; I have a brother-in-law of my own, who was offered 100*l.* if he would vote for the present members, or 50*l.* if he would stay away. When I say I know, I have only a moral certainty, because those are men whose inclinations would have led them to vote against the sitting members,

and who had no direct incentive to vote for them, and who notwithstanding did come forward and vote for the sitting members, and in those cases I am morally certain that they did not do so without some very strong motive, and which I can trace to nothing but the receiving payment in money.

9334. Were you informed by any person that had received those offers?—In many cases I had it from the parties themselves, but in other cases it is only from public report. As to the actual receipt of money it is only public report, but in the cases of the offer of money, I had it from the parties themselves.

9335. Was there any intimidation used at the last election upon the popular side to compel voters to vote in a manner contrary to their own wishes?—Yes, there was this species of intimidation, if such it can be called, that is, the moral influence that the public have the power of using towards a person living in that community: for instance, a man living in a very dense population, and where he feels that they wish him to do a certain thing, and he does not do it, he must naturally conceive that he is to receive a certain share of their ill will. Not that I think the intimidation went to the extent that he was afraid that bodily injury would be inflicted upon him, but that they would not have the same kindly feeling towards him; that they would not deal with him; that they would withhold neighbourhood from him. If that can be called intimidation there was a great deal of it, and that sort of intimidation, if it can be called, was held out to them.

9336. Were there any instances where that intimidation went beyond what you are now stating, where personal violence was used, or threats of personal violence were used?—Not in any case that I have heard of. If that had happened I should have heard it, and I think I should have heard even if the threats had been held out.

9337. Do you know any instances in which after the election violence has been used towards persons that voted against the popular side?—No, except this can be called violence, that I have known persons desired and obliged to leave the Roman Catholic chapels on Sunday, that is, obliging them, so far as desiring them, to go away.

9338. You mean that there were cases in which the congregation in the chapel desired some individual to leave the chapel, in consequence of his having voted against the popular side?—Yes, I have known that to happen in perhaps 20 cases.

9339. Those were persons that had actually voted?—Yes, and in some cases men that had not voted, but were restrained from coming forward, as the public believed, under the influence of a bribe.

9340. Do you know any instances in which tradesmen who voted against the popular side have suffered in their trade, or their property, by loss of custom?—Many by loss of custom, but not by violence.

9341. Are the tradesmen that have so suffered Protestants or Catholics, or both?—Both. I believe the feeling is stronger against a Catholic, because it is conceived that he had a worse motive for so acting.

9342. Did the Catholic priests interfere at the late election?—Some of them interfered so far as canvassing. I do not know that any, except one or two curate priests, acted in the way of canvassing.

9343. Did any of the priests come up with the voters to the poll?—No, I did not see one of them come up to the polling booths, but I know they were in the town and spoke to the freeholders, and encouraged them; but I must say that out of 22 parish priests in our county, and as many curates, I do not remember having seen more than five or six of them at the election. I am sure they did not amount at any rate to ten.

9344. Did any Catholic priests address their congregations from the altar in reference to the election?—I heard some myself; I dare say many others did.

9345. What language did they use?—They of course inculcated upon them the necessity of temperance if going to the election; and in every case the recommendation was for no one to go there, except those that had business, that is those that had votes, and recommending to the people to be temperate, not to drink ardent spirits, and to avoid doing anything that would bring them into collision with the authorities; and also recommending them to beware of perjury, as in those cases there were oaths to be administered, and recommending

them also to vote conscientiously as their opinions directed them, would be for the public good ; and in fact inculcating the moral obligation that was upon them, of not doing anything that would injure the public by voting for persons not the best for the public.

9346. Did they use any language calculated to inflame the feelings of their congregation against voters upon the opposite side?—Never any that I heard, nor do I believe that they did.

9347. Did the Catholic priests attend any public meetings, and harangue the people there?—Not that I am aware of ; and I do not remember that there was any public meeting in the county before the election ; there were some meetings after the election was over. I went to some of the parishes for the purpose of thanking the electors for the support they had given me, and addressed them outside the chapel-yard ; Sunday being the only day when I could meet them altogether ; and at those there were some Catholic priests that lived in the particular parish, and I believe in every case of that nature they were present, but I do not recollect, except upon one occasion, that any of them spoke.

9348. Did they attend any parochial meetings or district meetings before the election?—Yes, I am sure they did.

9349. Did they harangue the people there?—In some cases, but not generally ; not more than about five or six.

9350. You have stated that a very extensive system of persecution was carried on by the landlords of Queen's county, and that a number of tenants were either ejected or distrained for rent, and that great suffering was the consequence?—Yes ; and I must further say, that another species of persecution that was very much carried into effect was what is called "beating fines," that is fining men that had beaten land, that is what is called burning the surface ; the fine is 10*l.* an acre ; and I know one case where a man was obliged by ——— to pay 93*l.* ; and I know another man he, ———, sent to gaol for some months, and he was either liberated by the Insolvent Act or paid the money.

9351. Is not that an offence against the law?—Yes ; but this was an offence that was in general overlooked ; the law appeared in many cases to be a dead letter, and seldom acted upon.

9351. You mean to say that it was so rarely enforced, that the tenant might reasonably infer that he was safe in doing so?—Certainly ; and I am quite sure the man that paid 93*l.* had no idea that it would be enforced, or else he would not have done it, because he had voted against ———.

9393. Do not you think the non-dealing is a very injurious system?—I think so ; but, under the circumstances in which the population are placed, with respect to the aristocracy of the country, they have no other mode of protecting themselves than that, and a very effectual one it is, if it was properly carried into effect, and I think a very legitimate one.

9394. Then you are a defender of that system?—Certainly, under the present circumstances of the country, but not otherwise.

9395. So that you would think yourself justified, as a gentleman of weight and respectability, and lately a candidate for the county, in recommending to the people that system?—Certainly, and I have done so.

9396. Supposing that the system of the interference of the landowners, with the free-will of the voters, could be done away, would you still recommend the non-dealing system?—By no means ; on the contrary, I have always supported the necessity of voting by ballot ; and I conceive that at present it is nonsense to talk of freedom of election without the vote by ballot ; because, from the distresses and the heart-burnings that the country has undergone since the last election, I do not know how it is possible to ask for any man to come forward and give his vote for the public good.

9397. Is there much feeling in favour of the ballot in your county?—Yes ; all those that are in favour of the non-dealing are in favour of the ballot ; and those that are against the non-dealing are against the ballot. The persons that are in favour of the non-dealing are so only as a *dernier ressort*, and as the lesser of two evils.

9464. Have you any thing else you wish to state to the Committee?—Yes.

Besides the other modes of persecution adopted by the landlords of the county, there is a right the people claim to the bogs of Ireland, and, as I think, a right not founded in law but from mere occupancy. But whatever the case be, whether they have a right or not, they have been heretofore generally used as modes of procuring fuel for the people of the country. One of the modes resorted to of persecution now, and perhaps one of the strongest and harshest modes, is the deprivation of the people of the country of fuel. That has been resorted to in almost every case; that is, by refusing to allow them to cut turf. Some years they got it before as an appendage to their lands, and sometimes they got it for payment; but in none of the cases that I refer to can they get it by either mode. As a proof of that, I have copies of some hundreds of notices to tenants of ———, forbidding them to cut turf.

9465. Are the notices all of a similar tenor?—Yes.

9466. Be so good as to read one of them?—"Sir,—Take notice, that any permission, leave or liberty that may have been at any time heretofore given to you, to cut turf or fuel, or otherwise, in or on any bog or bogs on the estates of ———, in the Queen's County, is hereby withdrawn; and you are hereby required, immediately after service of this notice, to desist from so cutting turf in or on the said bog, or committing, or causing or permitting in your name, or on your behalf to be committed, any waste, trespass or injury thereon, or in any manner interfering therewith; and take notice, that should you at any time after the period of the service of this notice, trespass upon said bog, persevere in cutting turf thereon, or otherwise be found in any manner trespassing or committing waste thereon, legal proceedings will be instituted against you in respect to same, and you will otherwise be punished as the law directs. Dated this 30th day of April, 1835. (Signed) ———, of the Estates of the said ———."

9467. Have a great number of such notices been issued both by ——— and other landlords?—I do not know that other landlords have issued notices like this, but I know they have prevented turf being cut. I know that that has been done by ——— and other landlords; and I know that they have refused it, not only to voters, but to all persons who had any brother or relation that was a voter, or took any part in the election.

9468. Is it a great inconvenience to the tenants to be deprived of the power of cutting turf?—It is not only an inconvenience, but if it is carried into effect it will be as bad as being deprived of their existence.

9469. Can they go to any other place for fuel?—No, unless they go to the expense of getting coals from a long distance. There is another species of intimidation and persecution that is resorted to, and which I think shows the necessity of the ballot more than any thing I have known as yet, and that is the persecuting men to such a degree as to make them give up their present leases, or to intimidate them from voting hereafter; I have known many persons that have been induced to do so, and I have known many more that have been sought to be induced to do so.

9470. Are those 10% voters?—Yes.

9471. What inducement is held out to them?—In many cases that I know, those men have been under ejectment for a year's rent. Suppose a year's rent became due upon the 25th of March, ejectments have been served upon them, and the landlord told them if they would give up the lease he would forego the ejectment and give a longer time for the payment of the rent.

9472. Then you conceive that many of the Irish landlords, finding that their tenantry vote contrary to their wishes, are disposed to neutralize the votes of such individuals?—Certainly; I know several of them have refused leases of late to any Catholic tenant, although they give them to Protestant tenants.

9473. Then you imagine that the state of things in that county is such that Protestant landlords will apparently do every thing in their power to place Protestant tenants upon their estates, in order that they may have the support of Protestant voters?—I think they will till they get such a chastisement, in the shape of bad payment and refractory men, that in a short time it will cure itself; but I am sure that great evils will be inflicted upon the country in the mean time.

9475 Do not you think that property should be represented in the House of

Commons?—Yes, and I conceive it must be; because I conceive that the aggregate of every community must have more property than any individual; and besides I think that in no case, if the channel of public opinion was allowed to run in its proper current, would property ever be deprived of its just and legitimate influence, and I think any thing beyond that, landed proprietors ought not to expect.

9476. Do you consider that the two unsuccessful candidates at the last election represented the property of the county in a fairer manner than the Honourable Mr. Vesey and Sir Charles Coote?—Vastly.

9477. You think there was more property upon your side than upon the other?—Yes, twenty to one.

9478. Then how came the election to turn against you?—From intimidation and bribery.

9479. How was the intimidation carried into effect by the minority against the majority?—The minority are the large landed proprietors; they have the power of intimidating and persecuting in every character, as landlords, magistrates and jurors, and in fact the dispensation of the law goes entirely through their hands; and that being coupled with their being possessed of the landed property of the county, the influence they are able to create through terror was able to return the two sitting members.

9480. You were understood to state before that your side in the county were possessed of nineteen-twentieths of the landed property in the county, and now you state that the other side are possessed of almost all the landed property; how do you explain that?—In stating that the greater part of the property was upon our side, I meant not merely the landed property but the aggregate property, commercial and manufacturing and agricultural.

9481. But the landed property was decidedly in the scale of your adversaries?—No, I think there is more landed property in the hands of the tenantry than in the hands of the proprietors; I will take the value of land in our county at 1*l.* an acre; I conceive that to be the landlord's rent, and I conceive there is more than that amount of interest in the community generally; that is, in other words, that the tenantry of the country possess more interest in the country than the landlords, and that they must do so in order to support an existence.

9482. The question relates to the owners of land, not to the occupiers of land?—Then it is quite the other way in as a great a ratio, and perhaps more so.

9483. That is to say, that the land proprietors and owners are more than twenty to one against you, and in favour of those two gentlemen?—Certainly.

9484. As land gives a right to vote for the county, and as landed property has by the Reform Act a right to be represented, do you not consider it natural that a great proportion of the landed proprietors should be interested in returning to Parliament a person who would vote in their landlord's interests, rather than be represented by more liberal candidates?—I think they are influenced by that feeling; but I think it not a legitimate feeling according to the constitution of this country, because if that was the intention of the Legislature, they would have confined the power of voting to the landed proprietors; because if they are to have the power of coercing their tenantry to vote in whatever way they wish, under semblance of having their property represented, it is a mere mockery to give the present constituency the power of voting.

9485. Do not you consider that the relation between landlord and tenant, by mutual acts of reciprocity and kindness, is one of the motives by which persons are actuated in all situations of life, and that it is natural for the landlord to confer favours upon his tenantry, expecting that they in return will meet his wishes in an election?—I do not think it is the practice for landlords to bestow acts of kindness, in order to obtain their tenant's votes; and even if it were, it would be a very vicious one, because I conceive that the obligation of voting conscientiously for Members of the Legislature is a moral obligation upon those men prior to every other obligation; and that no obligation they may be under to a landlord ought to go to the extent of inducing them to commit an act that will be injurious to society; therefore, if the landlord seeks that power, he seeks that which he has not a right to; and every tenant who indulges him in it is committing an injury

upon the public, merely to serve himself; and I consider him just in the same degree responsible, and committing an act of moral turpitude as a man that receives a direct bribe.

9486. Might not a landlord just as well pretend to determine whether his tenant shall be a Roman Catholic or a Protestant, as to determine who he shall vote for?—I think a great deal more rationally, because, if he was able to induce the tenant to change his religion, he would not inflict any injury upon the public, whereas, by inducing him to vote for a person injurious to the public interest, he inflicts a public injury.

9487. Suppose any landlord was to say to his tenant, "you shall quit my land if you do not attend Protestant worship," do not you think he would be pushing the limits of authority much beyond the legitimate bounds?—Yes, and I think it much more injurious that he should insist upon his voting for a particular person whom his conscience does not consider the best person for the public good.

9488. You think a man's political conscience is as much to be protected as his religious conscience?—Yes, and besides that, a species of moral obligation must bind him to vote for the person who he conceives would be most serviceable to the public.

9489. Do not you think that if it were once established as a principle that the landlord ought to control the vote of the tenant, it would be expedient to introduce a covenant in the lease, binding the tenant to vote just as the landlord desired him?—Yes; I think if the Legislature were to recognize that principle at all, they would be doing a charity to the tenantry to deprive them of the power of voting altogether.

9490. Do not you think in the state of the Queen's County, it would be a charitable act to disfranchise the greater portion of the tenantry, who are on the one side stimulated by their priests and by popular clamour to vote for the popular candidate, and on the other, by their landlord to vote according to his interests?—I think it would, unless he was protected by secret voting, or protected in some way that the landlord could not injure him; and I must beg leave to remove the impression that men have been induced by popular clamour and by their clergy to vote contrary to their consciences; I never yet knew an instance of the kind, of men being obliged to vote contrary to their consciences merely by popular or priestly influence; but I have known hundreds of instances where men have been obliged to vote contrary to their consciences through the intimidation and persecution of their landlords.

9491. Have you any thing further that you wish to state to the Committee?—There is another species of intimidation resorted to, and that is where tenants generally sign leases almost without reading them, at least so far as regards clauses that are not likely to be acted upon, and among them is frequently inserted a clause of non-alienation; and in one particular case, in which I have a letter of a man, I will, with the permission of the Committee, read it to show the hardship that this man has been subject to, merely because he voted contrary to the will of his landlord: "Sir,—I am sorry to have to inform you on this day I have been informed by Mr. ———, that my cause under the subletting will be tried at Maryborough on Saturday next; I have a holding in ——— from ——— under indenture of lease, bearing date the fourth or fifth day of October, 1827. I have twice voted for my country. I have let that holding under which I am now sued in order to break my lease; it is coming down, a record from Dublin. I have 13*l.* a-year profit thereout, and if it goes against me, I will be reduced to great distress. I am, &c. &c.—*N. B.* About five years ago, ——— himself gave me a verbal consent to let these lands, and I will find proof as to his giving the consent by his word, and you are well aware that there would be nothing about it, only for my voting the two last elections. You may as well charge ——— of this, as well as the rest of his venomous acts in this country: put it into all public newspapers. I am after paying to Mr. ——— 3*l.* 12*s.* to defend in Dublin—he now says I must get nine guineas for three superior counsel again Friday next." There is also another species of intimidation, with regard to the registration, which must affect the elections; they are just as much persecuted by the landlords for registering, or even attempting to register, as if they actually voted against the landlord; also

our ——— gives every sort of opposition, and in fact, holds out threats to the unfortunate men that come forward to register so much, that he says, "How should you like for your landlord to hear that you are able to afford 10*l.* a-year more rent than you are now paying? and, my poor man, I would recommend you to take care how you come forward, which will perhaps injure yourself hereafter." Our county sent a petition against ——— stating those facts, and praying for some kind of redress, or an alteration in the Reform Act, so as to put it out of the power of the barrister to be able to intimidate, which has been lately laid before the House of Commons.

9512. Have you any thing further to say to the Committee?—Nothing further than to say, that I believe the greatest blessing the Legislature could bestow upon the people, in the present state of the country, would be to give them the vote by ballot; and also to put the question of registration in such a clear point of view that there could be no mistake in it. (pp. 525—541.)

Mr. WALTER ANDREWES.

10413. WHAT is your profession?—I am a writer or solicitor.

10414. Where do you reside?—In Maybole.

10415. Have you taken a part in the elections for the county of Ayr?—Yes, ever since the passing of the Reform Bill, I have.

10455. Is there any prevailing feeling among the tenantry with whom you are acquainted, that they are impeded in the free exercise of their franchise by the interference of their landlords, or the factors of their landlords?—That is decidedly well known to be their opinion, and I have heard them state that they would associate among themselves for their own protection from interference of all kind from either party.

10453. Then they do not confine their dislike of interference to the interference of one party or of another?—Certainly not.

10544. They object generally to be interfered with, do they not?—They object generally to interference. (pp. 603—605.)

Mr. HUGH CAMPBELL.

10593. ARE you a farmer?—Yes.

10594. What is the name of your farm?—Knockgeden.

10626. What is your polling place?—Maybole.

10657. Are you anxious to have the ballot in your part of Scotland?—At one time I was not; but from what I have seen, I consider it would be the only mode now that we can have freedom of election by; and a vast number of people that I know are of the same opinion.

We are aware that much difference of opinion exists among Reformers on the subject of the Ballot. We know that many of those to whom the nation is deeply indebted for the progress which we have recently made, are decidedly opposed to the Ballot; and it is doubtless a question on the practical operation of which much difference of opinion may be fairly entertained. We could not, in justice to all parties, withhold the opinions given to the Committee on this subject. M. de Tocqueville and other witnesses, all entitled to attention, from their talent and experience, estimate the remedial effects of the Ballot very highly. They seem to have estimated with care the value of those improper influences which interfere with the freedom of the elective franchise; and though they may reasonably admit that the Ballot is not necessary for the protection of those who dare, at all hazards, be honest, yet they appear to think that until society shall have so far advanced in civilization as to dispense with a police, the Ballot is essential to freedom.

THE BALLOT.

MONSIEUR A. DE TOCQUEVILLE.

4026. WITH respect to our political condition, there are two circumstances which explain why the French electors entertain little apprehension of the influence of individuals, and do fear the power of the Government; the first is, that the number of electors being very small, and every one of them being in easy circumstances, it is very seldom that any individual is in a situation to exercise any influence over their welfare; if the electoral body was extended, and the poorer classes became a portion of it, perhaps individual influence would become more generally felt; the second is, that in France the Government has collected into its hands not only the power of directing the whole organization of society, but also of directing in a certain degree all the local administrations, by which I mean the communes, the cantons, the arrondissements and the departments. Hence results first, that the Government has in its pay a prodigious number of public functionaries, not less than 180,000; and secondly, by the means of those individual functionaries it exerts also an immense influence over the happiness and the fortunes of those not immediately depending upon it.

4031. Do not you think that if it had been as much the object in France to guard the voter against the influence of other electors, as it has been to guard him against the influence of the president and the Government, precautions might easily have been taken to render it impossible for the other electors to know his vote?—In France, as I have already said, the only party whose influence causes any alarm is the Government; it is particularly from the eye of the agents of Government that they have been desirous to hide themselves; and as soon as that point is accomplished, the object of the law has been effected.

4034. Do you think that in that calculation of running all risks, the changes of being protected even in the event of the success of the Government by the secrecy of their votes, had any influence upon the minds of the electors in determining them to vote against the Government?—I think that a man perfectly master of himself is also master of his secret, but I also think that it is difficult during the period that precedes an election, and during the period of the election itself, and especially after the election, for an elector so to act as not to afford some reason for suspecting in what manner he is voting; he is almost sure to do something that will create suspicion enough to lead to the intervention of an authority so little responsible as the French authorities are in administrative matters; so that the elector in such a case must run great risk of losing his place; and the secret voting, though it is a security which may be employed, is not by itself infallible; it is certainly, however, a very great security.

4072. Suppose a proposition was made in the French chamber to alter the mode of voting now practised in France from what it is at present, to voting *vivâ voce*, would it or not be the general belief in France that the Government would acquire a very great increase of influence by means of that measure?—Up to the present time the public attention in France has never been turned to that question; secrecy of voting is in France what would be called here a matter of course; nobody of any consideration in the political world has hitherto expressed an opinion that the voting ought to be public, but my opinion is, that if the votes were given publicly, the power of the Government would be infinitely increased.

4087. You have visited the United States of America?—I have.

4090. Do you conceive that the secret voting in America is necessary to protect electors against the strong state of popular feeling?—Yes; that is the greatest advantage which I ascribe to the secret suffrage in America. In America, tyranny can only come from the majority. Hitherto this tyranny does not appear to me to have been brought into action on a very large scale. I suppose, however, that the secret voting has afforded, and will afford, an important security against the tyranny of the majority, which I consider as the greatest evil and the most formidable danger that can attend a purely democratical government. (pp. 232, 238, 240.)

Mr. JOSEPH PARKES.

1746. CAN you imagine any law which can reach these indirect modes of influencing votes, whether by threat or promise, as in the case of landlord and tenant, or customer and trader?—I am not aware of any law which can effectually reach this class of influence, except the alteration of the mode of voting. I do not know how far it is consistent with the inquiry of the present Committee to enter into that subject, but I entertain now very strong opinions upon it, and very different from those I once entertained.

1747. What opinions did you once entertain?—I believe one of the greatest prejudices I ever entertained was against the vote by ballot.

1748. The opinion you entertain now is in favour of it?—Yes; experience in Cornwall long since decidedly converted me to the ballot, and I have taken great pains to ascertain facts connected with that mode of voting in different countries and in different periods.

1761. Do you think there is any mode by which secret voting can be effected?—I do; it has been frequently effected, and may be again.

1811. Should you consider it would be difficult to provide a mechanism for giving the votes of persons with perfect secrecy?—Not the least.

1762. Will you state the instances in which it has been frequently effected and may be again?—I think it is effected in many of our own social institutions and effectually, and I believe it is perfectly effectual in other countries; I believe that to a very great extent indeed it is effectual in France; and I am quite certain, from communications and facts known to me in relation to vote by ballot in the states of North America, that it is completely effectual there. The best practical mode of ballot I know is the New York system, as enacted in their recently revised statutes.

1767. Is it a matter of surprise to them, that the expediency of the ballot is questioned in this country, and the mechanical means by which the object can be secured?—I have never spoken to any American who did not express the greatest surprise; I am aware that there has been considerable canvassing in America, and that it is extensively known in what way persons vote in periods of great public excitement, such as the controversy about the presidentship, and the tariff, and the Bank, reprehensible scenes unquestionably took place in some of the States, but none of them occur in consequence of the ballot. I never met with any intelligent American, nor any Virginia man, and I have met two or three very intelligent men lately, who did not express the greatest surprise at the controversy here on the subject of the ballot as a protection to voters against influence; that the ballot is no complete preservative against bribery—but there is little of it in America; for that I have no idea that bribery exists; but it protects from intimidation certain individuals, and is particularly superior as a mode of election. In a letter I had from the Boston gentleman, he states the ballot to be the only mode they could adopt to ensure them against the evil of periodical elections of their successive officers. If that the Americans had not adopted it, there would be no peace.

1768. Is it considered very valuable there as a protection against intimidation?—Yes, and many of the property classes there are the great advocates of it; and I believe the effect of it in this country could not but be of advantage, not exclusively, but particularly to those possessed of property in the country. I will instance the case of Ireland, where the returns would be much more honestly the expression of opinion, in consequence of voting by ballot. I know instances in which the violence of mobs has presented means of intimidation which has destroyed the fair expression of opinion; the effect perhaps has sometimes been in favour of opinions which I entertain myself, but which I am ashamed should be advanced by such means. I believe if we had the ballot in this country there would be a secrecy only on a certain per centage of the franchise; that would be in the instance of those not able to act up to their opinions on the open voting; I believe that three fourths of the constituency who could afford to keep a conscience, would act just as openly as

they do now, and why not? I do not mean to say that the ballot would be at all effective in small constituencies, the law might be evaded as it was in Rome when dividing into small wards.

1772. For the complete protection of the purity of election, you think large constituencies supported by ballot, would be necessary?—Yes, I do, and I think the Reform Bill has produced a more strange anomaly than ever existed before.

1773. In what respect?—By the small number of voters in particular places as compared with that of other boroughs; I have gone through a list of various electoral returns, and I think the average was under 230 voters returning Members, and in schedule (B.) I can hand the lists in to this Committee, a complete analysis of the comparative number of all the constituencies of the kingdom, made up from the last Parliamentary Returns; any thing more politically anomalous does not exist in any country in the world.

1782. Do you mean, in adopting the ballot, to exclude canvass?—I think it would, in a great measure, limit canvass, and that that would be a very great improvement, for canvass at present is only an appeal to grosser passions in treating, and so on; I think that the effect of the ballot would be an appeal to their minds.

1785. Nine-tenths of the parties who vote at counties, for instance, are influenced by a communication with the parties, are they not?—I should think not, I wish it was so; I think they are influenced by very different modes.

1786. Were you understood to say, that in your idea, the ballot is coupled with the prohibition or exclusion of the canvass?—No: I mean that the effect would be to diminish the present modes of canvass.

1787. If the voters voted by ballot, the candidate would have it as much in his power to go on a canvass as he has now?—Yes, just as much; and I think the habit of what is called receiving the compliment would be some time before it passed away, but that gradually there would be a substitution of other appeals to electors, and the abolition of individual canvass would tend to diminish the expense of elections.

1788. But still the candidate might canvass as he has done?—Yes, and he would, if an individual elector was known to entertain the prejudices referred to. The benefit produced by the ballot would far more than counterbalance any evil of neglected explanation to particular voters.

1789. Do you mean to exclude Committees from entering into the merits of an election decided by ballot?—I think I would in a great degree; I think there is great misconstruction of principles in trying particular votes. If the constituencies were sufficiently large, there would be no necessity for it. I have directed my inquiries to the subject of the American contested returns; they have a similar tribunal committee to ours; there is a particular law on that subject, but it is rare indeed that returns are contested.

1790. Virtually, where the constituencies are numerous, as in Middlesex or Westminster, a scrutiny is out of the question, is it not?—Certainly, and I believe, in many cases, a scrutiny is brought forward merely to beat the opposite party by expense; I think there have been such cases this Session.

1791. Might not some improvement of the previous system of registration limit considerably the necessity for scrutinizing votes by the House of Commons, as entirely superfluous?—Yes, I think so; the registry ought to be final; and as to payment of rates, I consider the making the payment essential to the vote extremely objectionable; that it would be much better to take a longer period of rating, leaving payment as a matter between the voter and his parish.

1792. It is a temptation, both to the elector and the candidate, to have recourse to that expedient?—Constantly; I would rather see a man two years rated entitled to vote, than a man who had paid his rates for one year; it would facilitate register, and prevent bribery.

1793. Would you permit him to vote if he had left the place entirely?—I am not quite sure that a quarter per cent. of the franchise is not better legal

ized, though bad, than that after the registry it should be the subject of expensive scrutiny; I think, on the whole, when the List is made up, I would let every one on it vote, whatever might have subsequently disqualified. It is the lesser evil of the two.

1794. You would get rid of the declaration made, as to the parties retaining the same right of voting?—I would; I do not think it is a matter of any importance how we may be qualified between the register and the time of voting, the per centage of disqualification is so trifling.

1795. Is it within your knowledge, that that third question has given rise to a great deal of perjury?—Unquestionably.

1796. To a habit of giving answers not strictly in accordance with truth?—Yes; and that persons have been unjustly prevented exercising their franchise.

1797. The only evil that would result from getting rid of the third declaration would be, that you might have a very small number of out-voters who have not remained inhabitants after the last day of registration?—Yes; if there was not a half per cent. of the whole constituency disqualified, it is a much less evil than to subject the register to a purse scrutiny of the House of Commons.

1798. Has it come to your knowledge, that the corporation of London have lately abandoned the ballot, and resorted to open voting?—Yes, but under circumstances not analogous to the question of the utility of the ballot.

1799. Are you aware what their particular reasons were?—I am not fully, though I know generally.

1800. Are you aware it was not the constituent body of London in which this question of the ballot was agitated, but the Common Council of London?—Certainly; I consider the ballot a great violation of principle there exercised.

1801. The Common Councilmen are, as it were, the representatives of the city?—Yes, they are; on that very account the advocates of the ballot object to protect representatives by the ballot. Ballot by common councils is as unjustifiable as the voting of the French Deputies by ballot, because the representatives are responsible to the constituents. The Committee are aware that in one borough in England, the ballot was in action a century and a half ago, and that there was some remarkable evidence upon it; I allude to the western borough of Lymington, and it was there regarded as a great benefit; it is said that after the ballot ceased, they never had any peace; it was about 180 years ago.

1802. Are you aware that the corporation of Wisbeach some years ago took means for obtaining a mode of secret voting?—Yes, and in other corporations; I think at Portsmouth there is a partial exercise of the ballot.

1803. You were examined some time ago as to the fact of persons concealing their votes under a system of ballot, are you aware that at present any portion of the voters in towns or counties actually conceal up to a very late period of the election what their intentions are?—A very great number; I have known two candidates in a town at a loss to calculate the result of the poll from the number of persons who refused to pledge; it is a large per centage, and I should say it was a class of electors upon whom, in consequence, a great deal of malpractice was brought to bear, because it is the universal practice of experienced agents, after going through the canvass, to make out a list of what are called the "doubtfuls," and every experienced agent exerts his utmost to convert them, or prevent their voting; and the general practice is to divide the doubtfuls into lists, and to bring to bear upon them every possible influence which they can employ—men, women, and children—to turn them, and in many town contests that particular class turn the election.

1804. In spite of all those means, is it within your knowledge that those persons succeed in keeping their intentions profoundly secret until they are disclosed by the day of election?—I know many that do, and who ultimately vote directly contrary to the calculation of the agents.

1805. Do you think that if they were enabled to vote by ballot they would still keep their secret?—I think all that class would keep their secret.

1806. It has been stated as an objection to the ballot that the voters ought to be responsible to non-voters, and that secrecy would destroy their responsibility?—I cannot recognise any responsibility to non-electors; I think the class of politicians who contend for such responsibility ought to advocate the enfranchisement of the non-electoral body; it cannot be said that if a man is not fit to vote himself, he ought to have an influence with the qualified.

1825. Are you aware, that in Upper Canada a resolution has been passed for secret voting?—Yes, and I am quite sure that the question of the ballot is considered in this country in a very different light from what it was formerly. Till lately we could not discuss it in the presence of those opposed to it, without a great deal of warm controversy. I am quite certain, after the next registration, and the impending club system of this country now going on, all parties will cry out for ballot, or there will be a very curious state of things in the country. (pp. 104—108.)

REMEDIAL MEASURES

GENERALLY.

The remainder of M. de Tocqueville's evidence is in pp. 230—241. For other suggestions on remedial measures, see answers to the questions numbered:—
9266, 7, 9276—9283, 9289, 9292. (pp. 521, 4.)

8509—8523, 8525—8561. (pp. 482—7.)

9053, 4, 9056—9062, 9067—9072, 9075—9080, 9110—9118. (pp. 511, 13, 15.)

538—550, 591—614, 705—724. (pp. 33, 34, 38, 43, 44.)

3745—3802, 3805—3828. (pp. 211—219.)

1663, 4, 1686—1718, 1828, 1846—1858. (pp. 95-6-9, 104—8, 110.)

IF the public mind is not aroused, by the Evidence of which a faithful abstract is given in the preceding pages, to a sense of the danger in which the Commonwealth is placed by the corruption and coercion of the Electors and electoral frauds practised in every part of the kingdom, we must look for a regular and rapid growth of the evil, terminating in the entire subversion of our liberties at no distant period. The new Constituency will sell the Reformed Parliament to a new set of Boroughmongers (as greedy as those who were rooted out by the Reform Act), who will speedily find the means of doing away with that degree of popular control which is still preserved at Elections; and the Aristocracy, titled and monied, will again become the Lords paramount controlling the Crown as well as the people, by commanding a great and settled majority in the Parliament.

But if the people who are able to read and reflect will take the trouble to inform themselves of the extent of the danger, it will be averted. For our fellow-countrymen are prompt and steady in removing mischief when they clearly discern it; and the only cause

for anxiety is lest their eyes should not be opened to the existence and extent of the approaching evil, and to its dreadful consequences if allowed to attain maturity.

We are on the eve of a general Election the most important in the History of this Country, and in which the virtue and moral principles of the Electors will be more severely tried than they have ever before been, especially by the desperate efforts of that party who feel that their only remaining chance of getting into power again depends on the degree in which they can corrupt and intimidate the Voters. Let those Candidates then who are opposed to such practices—let all those men, whether Candidates or Electors or Non-Electors, who feel strongly how much of the welfare of the commonwealth depends on the result of this Election—study, themselves, and impress on the minds of others, the statements here published. Let those statements be the text from which they may daily exhort the bribers as well as the bribed, the rich and the poor, landlords and tenants; from which they may denounce the former as the most superlatively guilty if they persevere in such practices, and warn the latter that if they suffer themselves to be bought on this occasion, they will be sold by the same party—before any new occasion can arise,—sold into irredeemable slavery.

Scotland, as we have before stated, has been comparatively free from the disgrace of the open bribery and coercion practised at the English Elections since the passing of the Reform Act. But there is reason to fear much from fraudulent votes and secret influences in that Country. In Ireland, the domineering faction continue their unfeeling warfare against the people with an open and reckless spirit of oppression that has scarcely been surpassed in the History of persecution. If the readers of these pages wish to have further Evidence on this subject, let them read the statement, noticed in p. 129, of the "*Persecutions of certain Tory Landlords, in the County of Carlow*, referred to in a petition of N. A. VIGORS, Esq., "M.P., presented 15th February, 1836." They will read the most heart-rending details, vouched for by affidavits of known witnesses, which have never been impeached; showing how, where, when, and by whom, *nearly 2000 individuals* were driven from the lands which they and their ancestors had occupied for ages and paid in general high rents for, the expulsions being proved to have originated (in nine cases out of ten) in party and political feelings;—they were almost wholly Catholics who had been guilty of voting for what they honestly regarded the cause of their Country and their Religion. There is a small two-penny Pamphlet also well worth perusal at the present crisis, entitled a "*Letter to the coerced Electors of Great Britain*." B. F. KNOWLES. Published by RIDGWAY & SONS.

NOTES.

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S ADDRESS, p. 1.

In the introduction, the reference to Sir Robert Peel's "Address to the Electors of Tamworth" in 1834, is to the sentence as to the necessity that the opinions of the Government of this country be in unison with those of "the constituent body of the united kingdom." This body, prove it sound or prove it corrupt, the registration fixes. Its voice is, a *Majority of the Reformed House of Commons*, that voice against which not Toryism itself entertains the "vain notion" of ever governing the country again. See *Speech at Merchant Tailors' Hall, 1835*.

THE BRISTOL CHARITIES, p. 73.

The following facts relative to the Bristol Charities have transpired since Mr. Visger gave his evidence, and are such as completely elucidate the transactions in question:—

The recipients of Mrs. Peloquin's Gifts of £.6 each for the years 1833, 1834 and 1835 were, Men 152.

Of whom did not vote	24
Voted for one Whig and one Tory	5
„ for two Whigs	3
„ for two Tories	120
	<hr/>
	152
	<hr/>

The recipients of Mrs. Peloquin's Gifts of £.1 10s. each to Freeman's Wives for the year 1835 were 45.

Whose husbands did not vote	5
Voted for one Whig and one Tory	5
„ for two Whigs	3
„ for two Tories	32
	<hr/>
	45
	<hr/>

Recipients of Alderman Whitson's Gift of £.1,—a gift not necessarily bestowed on Freeman—for the year 1835.

Voted for one Whig	1
„ for two Whigs	2
„ for two Tories	32
	<hr/>
	35
	<hr/>

LONDON:

PRINTED BY T. BRETTELL, RUPERT STREET, HAYMARKET.