

THE  
LIFE AND SPEECHES

DANIEL O'CONNELL, M.P.

EDITED BY HIS SON,

JOHN O'CONNELL, M.P.

KILKENNY CITY,

AUTHOR OF "AN ARGUMENT FOR IRELAND," "REFEAL DICTIONARY," ETC.

" Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not,  
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow !"  
BYRON.

VOL. II.

DUBLIN :  
PUBLISHED BY JAMES DUFFY,  
10, WELLINGTON-QUAY.  
LONDON: C. DOLMAN, 61, NEW BOND-STREET.

1846.

V34 = L75

A84.6-2

3241

## P R E F A C E .

---

THE ten years which are embraced in the present volume of this "Sketch of the Life and Collection of the Speeches of Daniel O'Connell" (to give the work its proper, though very awkward title) were among the most important of his entire career, in point of permanent usefulness to Ireland.

This assertion may appear at first sight strange ; considering that the period in question included so small a portion of the workings of that great engine which he devised and put together, and by which he accomplished the great victory of Catholic Emancipation.

And in all probability the reasons advanced in support of the assertion may not seem as convincing, nor by any means as palatable, to some of those who shall chance to read this imperfect record of Mr. O'Connell's career, as I have little doubt they will be found when submitted to the majority of Catholic Ireland.

During the ten years, then, which occupy this volume, the struggle between the enemies and the defenders of the independence of the Catholic Church in Ireland was most severely carried on ; and in effect decided for that, and

until the present, very perilous season. Mr. O'Connell, it will be seen, was the main agent in this, as in other manifestations of the right-mindedness and high-mindedness of the Irish Catholic people.

Ireland's hope is her Catholicity ! Pure she has preserved it for fourteen hundred years ; and pure she must preserve it, so long as she claims to rank among the nations. But all history and all experience tell us, that state contact never can operate otherwise than to contaminate and destroy the purity of religion, and wean from it the reverence and attachment of the people.

That there was a time when state alliance was of benefit, may be readily conceded, without in any degree weakening the argument. That time was in the infancy of civilization, when men had to obtain their lights and a knowledge of the first and leading principles of rational liberty from the teachings of the Church, and when, pending that instruction, it was well that the only institution which the rude license and ignorant passions of the barons at all respected, should have the countenance and support of the secular authority.

Yet even then, even under the peculiar circumstances of those times of violence, evil still resulted from the Church and state connexion—a fearful evil in the number of ecclesiastics who were found ready to support the brutal license and tyrannous rapacity of a William and a Henry, whenever they came in contact with the privileges and rights

which the Church held in guardianship for the humble and the lowly.

Ireland would, indeed, have profited little of the teachings of all history—of those of her own sad history in particular—were she ever to give her consent to the chaining of the ministers of her holy religion to the chariot-wheels of the state. Where would have been her consolations in the afflictions through which she has passed?—where the pure, bright Christian hope which is beaming upon her for the future, if those who administered the consolations, and who encourage that hope, were the *salariéd* or *selected* servants of a reckless and unscrupulous, or *of any*, temporal government?

If the attempted invasions of the independence of the Catholic Church in Ireland by the British government, in the period 1814–1824, were dangerous, from their boldness, and the perseverance with which, for at least a considerable portion of that period, they were urged on, their attempts at the present time are far more dangerous, from the insinuating and deceptive forms under which they are made. With the pretence of benefiting religion, and of favouring and forwarding the extension of education, the real design is, to enmesh the prelacy, and to master and control, and ultimately to pervert to anti-Catholic and anti-national purposes, the moral and intellectual training of the future men of Ireland.

The heart of Ireland was sound in the period 1814–1824 ;

and once aroused to the danger, as it was by Mr. O'Connell's warning voice, it speedily and utterly defeated the fell designs of the enemy. That heart is as sound now ; and catching up his warning once again, it will speedily and entirely defeat them now and for ever more.

The attacks which have in some quarters been made upon the first volume of this work, for what was styled its "sectarian polemics," will, of course, be revived, by the Catholic tenor of these prefatory remarks.

Such attacks, however, are of no account, where there is the consciousness of duty done. The advocates and abettors (open or concealed, conscious or unconscious) of indifference and of religious compromise, render, by those attacks, the duty only the more imperative, to proclaim and to insist upon the vital importance to Ireland's hopes, to all her prospects for the future, of preserving uncontaminated her religion, and all appertaining to it ; and the man of real statesman-like mind, whatever may be his creed, will, if he calmly consider the matter, allow that there is reason in this course.

What is the experience of nations ; and their experience as fully and as minutely tested as it is in the case of individuals ? That where there is not to be found some strong leading and guiding principle—some grand motive of action—some controlling power to appeal to—little that is stable, little that is safe, can be looked for in character and conduct. This principle and motive are not to be looked for in what

is of a political nature ; for political matters are, in their nature, temporary, variable, evanescent. Where, then, are we to look ? To that which, in its nature, is not temporary, not variable, not evanescent ; but ever enduring, ever identical, ever in presence with us—to religion !

Religious feeling, religious attachment, form the only tie by which you can bind together men's souls from generation to generation, for those great designs by which the advancement of real civilization, and, with it, of the happiness of universal man, are to be promoted.

What has made the dangers of France ?—what is it that causes her social and political state to be a source of the greatest solicitude, not merely to the friends of a dynasty in that country herself, nor to foreign potentates, trembling for another European convulsion, while they half hope for it to indulge their rapacity, but really to the friends of peace, of social order, of Christian freedom ? Nothing but the imperfect hold which, after the shock of her hideous Revolution, religion has as yet been able to regain upon the minds of her people.

It is needless to multiply cases. The instinctive tendency of man towards *some* religion ; the impossibility, without regard being had to it, of constituting any society that shall cohere and endure ; the speedy and progressive deterioration of the human character when once religion has been abandoned ;—these are facts requiring no illustration, nor any lengthened comment, to be impressed upon the mind ; and

to cause a due appreciation of the singular Providence to Ireland, that has blessed her with such a sheet-anchor as is her ancient faith amid the wild currents and tempests of the world.

The foul and fell attempts of the assailants of that faith were, as we have said, baffled by Mr. O'Connell; and not once, but several times, during the period of 1814-1824—a period during much of which there was a very perilous stagnation of enterprize and spirit in the popular party. Had the enemy succeeded, none of the steps which Ireland has already made good, in her progress towards freedom, would have been gained—none of the assured good hopes of her onward-march to its entire accomplishment would exist; but the people, demoralized and degraded, deprived of the all-powerful restraint which religion supplies over their outraged feelings and maddening passions, would, in all human probability, have plunged, or be now plunging, into the worst and wildest excesses of anarchical violence and demoniacal crime!

By the success of the *anti-veto* struggle, the foundation was solidly laid, upon which the fair superstructure of rational and constitutional liberty has been since so steadily arising; and no English nor Irish section of latitudinarian ultra-*Liberals* must be permitted to hurl into ruin the glorious edifice, or even to retard its completion.

With regard to the speeches, &c., contained in this volume, the compiler has only to observe, that he experienced



considerable difficulty, from the scarcity of anything like good records of the proceedings of popular meetings, &c., during the period embraced. He is not, however, conscious of any serious omission, nor of any grave defect, in the mode in which he has presented to the public the material he has been enabled to collect.

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
FEELING of the Country with regard to Mr. O'Connell's conduct in the defence of the "Dublin Evening Post," and in the Affair of the "Securities" . . . . .	1-5
Resolutions of the various Meetings in the Autumn of 1813 . . . . .	4-6
Detailed Report of the Cork Meeting; Differences there . . . . .	7-13
Deputation from the Anti-Vetoist part of the Meeting to the "Cork Catholic Board" . . . . .	13
Mr. O'Connell's Report of the result . . . . .	14
Resolutions proposed . . . . .	15, 16
The "Cork Board's" opposition to them; attack on Mr. Magee, of <i>The Evening Post</i> , and objection of thanks to Mr. O'Connell . . . . .	17, 18
Mr. O'Connell's speech on this occasion . . . . .	18, 23
The objectors defeated; Mr. Remiah Sheehan (at present of <i>The Evening Mail</i> ), objects further; similar result; chairing home of Mr. O'Connell . . . . .	23, 24
Publications in the newspapers relative to the occurrences at this Meeting; squibs, resolutions, advertisements, &c., . . . . .	24-31
Second Cork Meeting, four days afterwards (3rd September, 1813); Mr. O'Connell's speech, recommending conciliation and union for the common object of obtaining their rights . . . . .	31-37

## CHAPTER II.

Death, at the storming of Saint Sebastian, of Mr. O'Connell's cousin, Lieutenant John O'Connell, 43rd regiment . . . . .	38
Reflections on the condition of the Irish soldier . . . . .	39

Reflections on the pending Irish Coercion Bill ; and its similarity with a coercion measure of the year 1813 . . . . .	40
Return of Mr. O'Connell to Dublin, in October ; differences with Mr. Sheil, and others in the Board . . . . .	41
Renewed Persecution, by the Government, of Mr. Magee, of <i>The Dublin Evening Post</i> , Michaelmas Term, 1831 ; Attorney-General Saurin and Mr. O'Connell again in argument . . . . .	41-46
Mr. O'Connell's retort ; notice of it by the Bench, who were about to commit him ; how the matter ended between him and them . . . . .	47, 48
His speech in mitigation of Mr. Magee's punishment . . . . .	48-58
<i>Reputation of Mr. O'Connell, by Mr. Magee's other counsel, Mr. Wallace, at his client's desire</i> . . . . .	59
Conclusion ; and sentence of Mr. Magee . . . . .	60
Correspondence between Lord Donoughmore and Henry Grattan, on the one part, and the Catholic Board upon the other—The latter accused of "appearing to dictate" . . . . .	61
Temperate reply of the Board . . . . .	62, 63
Meeting of Board, December 1st ; suggestion of some mark of Catholic feeling towards Mr. O'Connell, to compensate him for the attacks being made on him by the Orange press and Corporation . . . . .	64, 65
Mr. Sheil and Mr. O'Connell in collision at a meeting of the 8th December ; the former opposing an unqualified resolution against all "veto" or "security" plans ; Mr. O'Connell's speech . . . . .	65-76
Testimonial to Mr. O'Connell ; Meeting of the 11th December ; Resolutions respecting it ; Speech of John Finlay, Esq., on the subject . . . . .	76-86
Mr. O'Connell's acknowledgment of these compliments, on the next day of meeting . . . . .	87
Continuation of the Donoughmore and Grattan affair . . . . .	88
Meeting of the Board, December 24th ; Dr. Dromgoole's speech, when proposing the anti-"security" resolution of the 8th of December, attacked by Messrs. O'Gorman, Finn, &c. . . . .	89, 90
Mr. O'Connell's speech in favour of Dr. Dromgoole . . . . .	90-97

### CHAPTER III.

Another act of the " <i>Crown v. Magee</i> " drama ; Motion to set aside the verdict ; Mr. O'Connell's argument with the Court . . . . .	98-100
His speech on the motion . . . . .	100-110

Presentation to him of a Silver Cup, January 18th, 1814, from the Manufacturers of the Liberty of the City of Dublin; Address, and his Reply: Allusion to "Repeal" . . . . .	111, 112
Meeting of the Catholic Board on his notice respecting "illegal associations" in Ireland; his speech; Details respecting the various illegal gatherings of the Peasantry at various times; their causes, designations, objects, &c., &c.; Evil legislation between landlord and tenant, "enabling the former to dispense with any personal confidence in the latter;" Accounts of the riots in the North—the Orangemen in possession of arms, endeavouring to extirpate the unarmed Catholics; Rise of the Orange system of "Lodges;" Progress in organization, fostered by the Richmond Government; Ribbonmen organized in defence; Orange festival then recently held in Derry—Bishops, Magistrates, &c., &c., assisting; Provocations to the Catholics; Impunity to Orange rioters; Certain punishment to Catholics; Folly and criminality of Ribbonism; Warnings and appeals to the people . . . . .	112–122
Address embodying these appeals . . . . .	122, 123
Remarks on the conduct of British governments since the Union, relative to Irish disturbances . . . . .	124
The Donoughmore and Grattan affair again; Lord Donoughmore replies satisfactorily—Mr. Grattan otherwise; Mr. O'Connell's speech	124–130
Incident at this meeting relative to the attendance of policemen and others, sent by Government to witness and note the proceedings of the popular assemblies—Mr. O'Connell's conduct on this and similar occasions . . . . .	131
Allusions to the parties thus sent to the Catholic and to the Repeal Associations—Conclusion of the chapter . . . . .	132

## CHAPTER IV.

The year 1814, eventful as the " <i>Veto</i> " discussion then very hot—Calumnies respecting the dispositions towards the " <i>Veto</i> " of the Catholic Bishops . . . . .	133
Brief account of the circumstances on which these calumnies were sought to be founded . . . . .	134
Re-commencement of the " <i>Magee</i> "-persecution, and sentence on him . . . . .	135
Encounter between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Woulfe (the late Chief Baron Woulfe), on the subject of securities, at a Catholic meeting of the County Clare, March, 1814 . . . . .	135–147

	PAGE.
Disastrous intelligence from Rome—Quarantotti's rescript—General alarm and protest . . . . .	148
Resolutions of the parish priests and other clergymen of the archdiocese of Dublin, May 12, 1814, against the rescript . . . . .	149, 150
Similar declaration from some of the Bishops . . . . .	151
Defeat of an attempted meeting in favour of the rescript . . . . .	152
Opinion regarding the rescript pronounced by the Bishops, at their Maynooth meeting in May—Sudden appearance of a proclamation against the Catholic Board . . . . .	153
Difficult position of the Catholics, thus assailed in their religion and their politics . . . . .	154
Another difficulty arising, in the attempts to prevent the Jesuits establishing themselves in Ireland . . . . .	155, 156
Charge of Baron Fletcher to the Wexford County Grand Jury, at the summer assizes, 1814, exposing the evils and crimes of the internal administration of the country . . . . .	156-165
Address (in July) of the English Catholics to his Holiness the Pope, <i>approving</i> the rescript of Quarantotti—Arrival, nearly at the same time, of the news of the disclaimer of that rescript, by the Pope—Mission of the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, and the Right Rev. Dr. Milner to Rome, to speak the sentiments of the Irish Church . . . . .	166

## CHAPTER V.

Discouragements and difficulties of the Catholics at the close of 1814, and commencement of 1815 . . . . .	167
Exclusive coterie meetings of some of the wealthier Catholics, taking advantage of the suppression of the Board—Mr. O'Connell attends to watch proceedings—His speech, 17th January, at one of these meetings, preparatory to an aggregate meeting . . . . .	167-170
Mr. O'Connell called upon to mitigate his resolution against the " <i>securities</i> "—He refuses—Division and termination of the affair . . . . .	171
Aggregate Meeting of the Catholics, at Clarendon-street Chapel, 24th January—Lord Fingal's objections to the resolutions—Mr. Mahon and Mr. O'Connell reply—Secession of Lord Fingal . . . . .	171-175
Mr. O'Connell's declaration then, against " <i>vetoism</i> " of any description, borne out by all his conduct since ; and particularly on the occasion of the " <i>Infidel Colleges</i> " attempt of the British Government . . . . .	175
Mr. O'Connell's speech after Lord Fingal's secession . . . . .	175-180
First mention of the <i>szme</i> " <i>Catholic Association</i> ," a body got up, tem-	

porarily, in February, 1815—Report of a Committee of the same, appointed to wait on the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, relative to the reports current as to the intentions of Rome, with regard to the veto . . . . .	180-183
Adjourned Meeting of Catholics, 16th June—Lord Donoughmore's letter, expressing his wish to do whatever the Catholics should desire—Mr. Grattan's less friendly—Mr. O'Connell's speech relative to the latter . . . . .	183-187
The O'Connell and D'Esterre Duel—The correspondence and all particulars, as given in the journals of the time . . . . .	187-195
Meeting of the 23rd of February—Mr. O'Connell's speech, advocating petitions throughout the country, for " <i>unqualified</i> " Emancipation, as distinguished from Emancipation to be accompanied with " <i>securities</i> ," or " <i>veto</i> " provisions—Alludes to the CORN LAWS, then in discussion in the British House of Commons—Puts " <i>upon public record his conviction of the inutility, as well as the impropriety of the proposed measure,</i> . . . . and of their not proving any substantial benefit to Ireland," but the contrary, &c., &c., &c.—His belief that the necessary tendency of restrictions upon corn must be to destroy the very market of which it seeks exclusive possession, &c., &c., &c. . . . .	195-205
Declarations of the Bishops in August, 1814, against the " <i>securities</i> " . . . . .	206
Resolutions and speech respecting this declaration, at the Catholic Aggregate Meeting, 20th August, 1815 . . . . .	206-216

## CHAPTER VI.

Mr. O'Connell's affair with Mr. (now Sir Robert) Peel, as given by the public journals . . . . .	217-233
Deputation and remonstrance to Rome agreed upon, respecting " <i>securities</i> " . . . . .	233
Mr. O'Connell draws up the remonstrance . . . . .	234-237
Petty moves of the " <i>seceders</i> " in the beginning of 1816 . . . . .	237
Aggregate Meeting, 5th March, expressing gratitude for, and adhesion to, the declaration of the Bishops against " <i>securities</i> " . . . . .	238, 239
Gloomy state of the Catholic cause—Exultation of the Orange party at the restoration of peace, and the ultra-Tory settlement of Europe—Depression on the popular spirit, and exceeding difficulties of Mr. O'Connell, in endeavouring to keep it alive at all . . . . .	239-243

## CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE.
An abortive attempt at a " <i>Reform</i> " Association in Dublin . . . . .	244
The vetoists continue their cabals—Collision between them and Mr. O'Connell in February, 1817 . . . . .	245-250
Discouraging reports from Rome—Resolutions respecting them adopted at a Catholic Meeting, March 6th—Various minor occurrences on this subject . . . . .	251, 252
Mr. O'Connell's endeavour to procure a discharge of the recognizances imposed on him in consequence of the affair with Mr. Peel . . . . .	253-255
Re-organization of the Catholic Board—Proceedings at their first meeting, against "veto," and various other proceedings . . . . .	255, 256
Meeting of December 4th, 1817—Mr. O'Connell's speech, denouncing the "notes" to the Rhemish Bible, as published by a bookseller of Dublin, but denounced by the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, the Right Rev. Dr. Troy . . . . .	256-259
Mr. O'Connell's denunciation of these "notes" opposed by Eneas Mac Donnell . . . . .	257-259
Short affair between Mr. Leslie Foster and Mr. O'Connell, in the year 1817 . . . . .	260
Remonstrance of the Catholics sent to Rome—Treatment there, and report of their agent, the Rev. Mr. Hayes. (His report in the Appendix) . . . . .	260
Answer from Rome, disapproving of the tone and manner of the remonstrance . . . . .	261
Dinner to "Thomas Moore," at the Rotundo, June 8th, 1818—Mr. O'Connell's remarks returning thanks . . . . .	262
Dinner to himself, in Tralee, October, 1818 . . . . .	262-271
Occurrence between him and the Knight of Kerry, November, 1818 . . . . .	271

## CHAPTER VIII.

Meetings of Catholics in the early part of 1819, to acknowledge Protestant sympathy . . . . .	273-277
Notice of the affair of the Irish South-American Expedition . . . . .	278
Public letter of Mr. O'Connell on the Catholic affairs, October, 1819, . . . . .	279-282
His opinion as to Catholic eligibility to the office of sub-sheriffs . . . . .	283
Speech on the Dublin election, 1820 . . . . .	283-286
Letter relative to Mr. (Lord) Plunket and the Catholic question . . . . .	287, 288

	PAGE
Meeting on the same . . . . .	288-292
Meeting at Kilmainham, December, 1820—Attempt to get up an Address to George IV.—Disturbance of the proceedings, and failure of the object—Subsequent proceedings . . . . .	293-301

## CHAPTER IX.

1821—Mr. O'Connell's annual letter to the Irish Catholics—Mr. Sheil's comment thereupon, and Mr. O'Connell's rejoinder . . . . .	302
Mr. O'Connell's letters on Lord Plunket's bill for the relief of the Catholics . . . . .	320-323
Proceedings of the Catholics on the announcement of George the Fourth's intended visit . . . . .	325
Approaches to conciliation between the Catholics and the Orangemen—Their respective conduct . . . . .	332
Visit and departure of the king—his letter recommending a general reconciliation—How received . . . . .	333-338
Mr. O'Connell's "travelling-cap" made a part of history . . . . .	338

## CHAPTER X.

Lord Wellesley appointed viceroy in 1822—Meeting to address him . . . . .	339-342
Mr. O'Connell's annual address . . . . .	343-350
Stormy meeting of Catholics, February, 1821 . . . . .	350-356
Education—Meeting at the Rotunda . . . . .	358, 359
Distress—Meeting at the Mansion-house—Absenteeism—Repeal . . . . .	360
Mr. O'Connell's defence of a newspaper, May, 1822, in the King's Bench . . . . .	368-372
His letter on Orange processions, to Marquis Wellesley . . . . .	373
Incidents of his success in defence of prisoners . . . . .	375-379
Speech on Repeal—Clondalkin Dinner, November, 1822 . . . . .	380
His letter on a point of professional etiquette . . . . .	383
The bottle-throwing conspiracy, 1822 . . . . .	388
Mr. O'Connell visits his family in France . . . . .	389

## CHAPTER XI.

Mr. O'Connell at the Kilmainham meeting to address Lord Wellesley, January, 1823 . . . . .	390-394
First indication of his intended plan for "THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION" . . . . .	395
Aggregate meeting, 10th May—Requisition and proceedings—Resolution for the appointment of a "Catholic Association" . . . . .	408



	PAGE
Mr. Sheil doubts of success—Mr. O'Connell predicts it . . . . .	409
First meeting of the Association as an organized body, 13th May, 1823,	410
Other meetings—Mr. O'Connell's speech "on the administration of justice" . . . . .	415-419
Case of "O'Connor v. Publishers of <i>Dublin Evening Mail</i> "—Mr. O'Con- nell's speech . . . . .	420-422
His speech in the Association on "church rates" . . . . .	422-427
Admission of Catholic freemen to Corporations—Speech relative to Henry Brougham . . . . .	429-435
Winter-session of the Association commences 1st November, 1823—Va- rious subjects dealt with by Mr. O'Connell—Ditto meeting, 8th November . . . . .	437-448
Catholic affairs—Tithes—Burying grounds—Mr. O'Connell's legal opi- nion on the latter, and other proceedings . . . . .	449-464
Dublin Library Society—Meeting to expel <i>The Evening Mail</i> , Decem- ber 2nd, 1823 . . . . .	465-466
Catholic Association—Motion for an anti-tithe petition . . . . .	466-471

## CHAPTER XII

Association meeting of 24th January, 1824 . . . . .	473
Ditto, 4th February, Mr. O'Connell opens his plan of penny subscrip- tions . . . . .	479-486
Rules referring to it, February 18th . . . . .	490
Preparations for aggregate meeting . . . . .	494
Aggregate meeting, February 27th, 1824—Mr. O'Connell's speech on Catholic affairs—Orange organization, &c., &c., . . . . .	497-507
Meeting of the Association, February 28th—Collection of the Rent— Speech on Kildare-street Association . . . . .	508-513
Notice of other meetings; and concluding remarks of the second vo- lume . . . . .	514-518

## APPENDIX.

Rev. Mr. Hayes' Report of his mission to Rome . . . . .	519
Extracts from letters of Morgan O'Connell, Esq., engaged in the South American Expedition . . . . .	524
Dinner to Mr. O'Connell, in Edinburgh . . . . .	529
Abstract of Mr. O'Connell's genealogy . . . . .	530

# MEMOIR AND SPEECHES

OF

DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ., M.P.

---

## CHAPTER I.

THE speech with which we have concluded the first volume of this collection of Mr. O'Connell's public addresses, political and professional, was, perhaps, the one that made the most startling impression of any during his whole career.

Other speeches of his at various periods have equalled, and may even be considered as having surpassed it in various points and attributes of oratory and argumentation; but as a whole, and as a speech of terrible effectiveness on the momentous occasion that had called it forth, there are not many which suggest themselves in comparison.

It will be observed, that he did not by any means confine himself to the simple defence of Magee, but made a vigorous and sustained assault upon his prosecutor, and on the tyrannous government of the day. This was with the express consent and desire of the defendant, or "traverser," himself—concurring as he did in the opinion of his counsel, that with such a tribunal as that before which he was arraigned, fear and shame might possibly have some effect, but reason and justice none whatever.

Still, the more apparent interests of the client were very far from being foregone, or neglected. The reader will have perceived, that the argument respecting the alleged libel was close, and pointedly put. Not a single ground of legal vantage was given, or neglected, and when he did launch out into his phi-

lippic, it was not before his calmer appeal to the judgment and the conscience had been made upon all the legal points of the case.

There was a singular daring in the speech. Even at the present day, it would be a startling thing to hear counsel assail judge, jury, and official prosecutor, in a political, or any other trial, with the directest and fiercest charges against the two latter; and scarcely less direct or less fierce imputations on the former. Some very powerful moving cause should exist, and its influence be very strongly and generally felt inside as well as outside the court, to ensure entire impunity for the assailant.

If such would be the case even now, when something more moderate notions are prevailing as to the reverence due to personages in authority and high position, than were current in the earlier parts of this century, it can well be imagined, that the effect was astounding at the time of which we write.

The terror inspired into the breasts of all lovers of order, and indeed of all humane and Christian minds, by the horrible atrocities of the French Revolution, had been diligently cultivated and worked upon by the friends and upholders of monarchical and oligarchical despotism in every country, but particularly so in these countries; where advantage was taken of it to the uttermost, to repress the rising and expanding spirit of popular enfranchisement.

Direct invasions of the constitution, serious restrictions and denials of popular rights, even where long admitted, thus received the sanction in England of at least the *quiescence* of public opinion in that country; and as it is in the nature of tyranny to be aggressive, this advantage was pushed to such a point as seriously to threaten the utter extinction of public liberty.

When this was the state of things in England, matters were, of course, far worse in Ireland; where the old antipathies of race and religion, still further inflamed by the heats and furious excitements remaining after the suppressed rebellion, nullified everything like a general expression of political sentiment; and where

the government stood openly committed and identified with the anti-liberal, anti-popular, and anti-national party who were in the ascendant.

From the outset of his career Mr. O'Connell had noted and duly weighed these peculiar impediments in the upward way of the Irish people towards freedom, and had made up his mind to meet them in the spirit of the Virgilian line—

“Tu ne cede malis; sed contra audentior ito!”

He determined not only to resist the enemy, but to brave him—on all occasions where it would not be glaringly impolitic so to do—and to make the feeling of contemptuous hostility, with which everything Catholic was regarded by the ascendancy party, be exchanged for that of hatred, springing from, and intermixed with, a wholesome dread of those whom they had hitherto trampled upon with impunity.

This result was not accomplished alone. Another of greater consequence—one amply compensating for the increased personal *spite* his exertions were every day accumulating against him, in the breasts of his and Ireland's enemies—was also achieved, viz., the restoring to the Irish people that proper self-respect, without which nations, no more than individuals, are rarely seen to arrive at great ends. Some of this proper feeling is even yet wanting in the breasts of the Irish nation; but as compared with the time when Mr. O'Connell began his career, the improvement is most striking and happy; and he has the consolation, of witnessing in each succeeding year, a further ripening of the fruit of this, as of many other of the anxious labours of his life.

It is with regret we record the fact, that Mr. Magee did not persevere in the same high sentiments which had dictated the license he conceded to his counsel. The mention of this circumstance is not made wantonly, or with any wilful invidiousness, but as necessary to this memoir. The instances of human weakness are unfortunately far too common, that this should

excite more than pity; however much justification there would appear for a stronger and more bitter feeling.

Beyond a natural feeling of disappointment at his being guilty of it, this act of Mr. Magee's gave Mr. O'Connell very little concern, although others might not have been quite so easy under what was, in effect, a species of denunciation of a professional man, for imputed sacrifice of his client's cause, to a desire of venting political hostility.

Previous to further notice of this wretched affair, we shall give some proofs that the country appreciated better than Mr. Magee, the extraordinary effort Mr. O'Connell had just made.

They are to be found in resolutions passed at various public meetings throughout Ireland, and are intermingled with expressions of approbation of his conduct; in the affair of the bishops generally.

We take them without any specific order, nor indeed much research; but as they meet the eye in looking over the newspaper records.

The first was at a meeting of the inhabitants of the county of Louth, and commenced with a vote of respectful confidence and gratitude to the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, for their recent declarations and acts.

#### LOUTH

At a meeting of the freeholders and inhabitants of the county of Louth, held at Louth, Monday, 9th August, 1813—James Keiran, Esq., in the chair, it was resolved—[here follows the resolution of thanks to the prelates]—after which it was

“RESOLVED—‘That our most sincere thanks are due to the Catholic Board for their general management of our cause, and particularly to the large majority of that board, for their decided and unequivocal approbation of the conduct of their prelates, on the late important crisis;’

And—

“That the same be communicated to them by our chairman, through that enlightened friend of civil and religious liberty—the strenuous opponent of oppression, and the ornament of his country, for splendid talents, unwearied zeal, and unquestionable integrity—Daniel O'Connell.”

DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ., M. P.

KILKENNY.

At a meeting of the gentry, clergy, &c. &c., and inhabitants of the county of Kilkenny, August 12th, 1813—Captain Bryan in the chair—

“RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY—‘That Daniel O’Connell, Esq., is eminently entitled to our gratitude and applause, for his many and precious services rendered to the Catholic cause, and to his country; his faithful performance of his duty on the Catholic Board; his unshaken constancy in watching over the interests of Ireland; his early opposition to the humiliating bill lately proposed in parliament; his intrepid development of the crimes and treason of Orangeism; and, finally, for the dignified, eloquent, and unparalleled oration which he pronounced, upon the 27th of July last, in defence of the virtuous and patriotic John Magee, the proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*.’

“We hold that oration to be of inestimable value; and singularly calculated to control the partialities of the bench, to shame and stigmatise the bigotry of a selected jury, and to rebuke into native insignificance the vain and vulgar law-officer who shall hereafter, virulently and venally, invade a free press, or vilify an injured nation.”

---

KERRY.

At a meeting held at Tralee, on Thursday, 15th August—Dominick Rice, Esq., in the chair—

“MOVED, AND CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY—‘That Daniel O’Connell is eminently entitled to our warmest and sincerest gratitude for his ever-vigilant, persevering, and most successful efforts in the cause of his suffering country, but in particular for his late bold and splendid oration in defence of John Magee, Esq., in which he exhibited himself against great but petulant oppression, as the firm and independent Irishman, ably discharging a public duty, undeterred by calumny, uninfluenced by interest, and undismayed by power.’

---

WEXFORD.

At a meeting held at Wexford—Henry Lambert, of Carnagh, Esq., in the chair—

“RESOLVED—‘That Daniel O’Connell has, by his late vindication of the Catholics of Ireland, obtained our most grateful confidence.’

“Passed with acclamation.”

---

GALWAY.

At a meeting held at Galway, on the 15th August, Lord Ffrench in the chair—

“RESOLVED—‘That the thanks of this meeting are due, and are hereby given, to Daniel O’Connell, Esq., for his manly and dignified support of Catholic loyalty and Catholic honour, on a late trying occasion.’

“Passed unanimously.”

---

CORK.

At a meeting held at Cork, on Monday, 30th August, John Galway, jun., Esq., in the chair—

“RESOLVED—‘That the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork most gratefully admire the merits and approve the worth of that great and good Irishman, the strong

pillar of our cause and pride of our land, Counsellor O'Connell, who, in the spirit of constitutional independence, often has undauntedly stood foremost in the fight, whenever the interests of Ireland were to be defended, her rights demanded, or her enemies confounded.

"And that we consider him particularly entitled to our most glowing gratitude, as Catholics and as Irishmen, for his virtuous motion in support of the hierarchy, proposed by the General Board of the Catholics of Ireland, on the 29th of May last, and so triumphantly carried by a glorious and patriotic majority."

---

#### LIMERICK CATHOLIC MEETING.

At a meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Limerick, pursuant to requisition held at St. Michael's Chapel, on the 12th August, 1813—William Roche, Esq., in the chair—

"RESOLVED, 1st—'That petition be read.'

"RESOLVED, 13th—'That our warm thanks and gratitude are due to Counsellors O'Connell and O'Gorman, for their invariable zeal and fidelity in our cause, and for the kindness and support of their presence this day.'

"WILLIAM ROCHE, Chairman.

"ALAN F. O'NEILL, Secretary."

---

#### WATERFORD CATHOLIC MEETING.

At a meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Waterford, on Sunday, 15th August, 1813, at St. Patrick's Chapel—Richard Power O'Shee, Esq., in the chair—

"RESOLVED—'That Daniel O'Connell, Esq., has the strongest claim to our applause for his splendid display of talents, on all occasions, in support of the Catholic cause—particularly in his able defence of John Magee, Esq.'

"RICHARD P. O'SHEE, Chairman.

"THOMAS HEARE, Secretary."

---

#### DROGHEDA CATHOLICS.

At a meeting of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the county of the town of Drogheda—Roger Hamill, Esq., in the chair—

"RESOLVED—'That the persevering zeal and convincing powers of mind, so conspicuously displayed by our much admired countrymen, Counsellors O'Connell and Scully, have not only added strength and lustre to our cause, but have essentially contributed to enlighten the Catholic mind of Ireland; and we should feel ourselves deficient in gratitude, were we to omit conveying to those valuable and eloquent men our cordial thanks.'

"PATRICK TERNAN, Secretary."

The circumstances attending the vote of thanks to Mr. O'Connell, in Cork, afford such a view of the difficulties he had to struggle with, that we give them in considerable detail, copied

from the *Dublin Evening Post*, of September 7th, 1813, and subsequent dates:—

#### CORK CATHOLIC MEETING.

[FROM THE CORK MERCHANTILE CHRONICLE.]

“The most numerous and respectable meeting of our Catholic countrymen that has ever been witnessed in this city, was held on last Monday (30th August). Pursuant to the appointment of the Board, the place of meeting was changed from the Patrick-street Theatre to the Lancasterian School; and accordingly, at twelve o'clock, upwards of ten thousand persons attended. At this hour, the members of the Board proceeded to take their station in the School-room. The chair was placed upon a small table, and no hustings raised, which created great inconvenience. There were no seats prepared, except within a paling intended for the accommodation of the Board and their select friends. This total neglect of arrangement, and the evident insufficiency of the room to contain the thousands who crowded to the meeting, gave rise to a general cry of adjournment, which no exertions of the gentlemen near the chair could induce the meeting to suppress. At length, James Roche, Esq., proposed John Galway, of Lota, to fill the chair; and Mr. Galway having immediately complied with this invitation, a general outcry was raised against the propriety of placing that gentleman in the chair. He, however, persisted in holding his place, and the opposition of the meeting continued equally determined. Mr. Roche frequently endeavoured to satisfy the meeting of the fitness of Mr. Galway to fill that station, and recommended them, at least to try him, but the general complaint against the vote given by that gentleman at the General Board in Dublin, in opposition to the motion of thanks to the prelates, was repeated in several charges, as replies to Mr. Roche's request. In the midst of this confusion, Counsellor O'Regan took out from his pocket a sheet of paper with some writing upon it, which, as well as we could collect, contained the resolutions intended to be proposed by the Board for the adoption of the meeting, and was proceeding to read them, when he was interrupted by Counsellor Mac Donnell, who called upon him not to endeavour to pass his resolutions in such a manner, and at such a moment. Mr. O'Regan did not then proceed, but Mr. Roche again renewed his endeavours to reconcile the meeting to Mr. Galway as their chairman, but they would not consent; and the opposition having continued unabated for a very considerable period of time, Mr. Mac Donnell suggested to the Board the prudence of substituting another chairman. No answer being given to this, Mr. Mac Don-



nell addressed the chair, and moved that Mr. Roche should take the chair. This motion was sanctioned by almost the unanimous voice of the meeting, but the question was not put, and consequently the confusion continued. Mr. Mac Donnell then proceeded to the place where the Board were assembled, and after some conversation between Mr. Roche and other members of the Board with that gentleman, Mr. Roche again addressed the meeting, and begged they would allow the Board to consider among themselves for a few minutes, and that he could assure them all their reasonable desires should be complied with. This proposition of Mr. Roche was loudly cheered, and the Board proceeded to deliberate, for about ten minutes, when Richard Barry, of Barry's Lodge, Esq., one of the Board, exclaimed, in a very loud voice, 'Will you suffer the proceedings of the day to go on?' Some persons from the crowd replied, 'No; not until you have another chairman;' upon which the Board retired from the meeting. This secession excited great agitation and disgust. Mr. Mac Donnell entreated the gentlemen present to observe strict temperance, as he assured them they could not more gratify their enemies than by a violation of good order. He suggested the propriety of appointing another chairman at once, as the members of the Board had thought proper to withdraw. He recommended for their choice a gentleman who had done more for their city than any one of those who had then left them—Mr. Timothy Mahony, of Blackpool. This proposition was received with loud plaudits, and in the meantime Counsellor O'Connell made his appearance, and was immediately cheered by the greetings and benedictions of the meeting. He was conducted to the chair, and when the uproar of patriotic exultation which his presence had created had somewhat subsided, he addressed the meeting. He told them that the success of their cause depended on the unanimity of their body; and illustrated, in a most happy strain of eloquence, the advantages of union, and the evils of division. These propositions were cheered by unanimous applause, and Mr. O'Connell then finding the public feeling to be so well disposed, he quitted the room for the purpose of seeing the Board. When Mr. O'Connell had retired, Mr. Mac Donnell again proposed Mr. Mahony as chairman, and the cry for Mr. Mahony became general; but owing to the pressure of the crowd in the room, that respectable gentleman had found it necessary to retire. On this being ascertained, Counsellor O'Leary was proposed by Mr. Mac Donnell, and called to the chair by the unanimous voice of the meeting, and, being conducted thereto, the most perfect order prevailed. By this time the heat and pressure in the room became insupportable, and several thousands, who could not gain admittance, became clamorous for an adjournment, which was agreed to una-

nimously, and the meeting adjourned, accordingly, to an extensive open plain, immediately adjoining the school-room. When Counsellor O'Leary had taken the chair at this adjourned place of meeting, Timothy Mahony, Esq., addressed him and the meeting, stating that in declining the very high honour they were kind enough to offer to him, he was not influenced by any unwillingness to contribute his humble mite to the support of the great cause they were assembled to advance; but, conscious of his own feeble abilities to fill so exalted a station, he willingly and gratefully resigned the chair to the highly-able and respectable gentleman who had so properly been called to it.

“Several most respectable Protestant gentlemen being observed at a distance, there was a general expression of wishes for their accommodation, when

“Counsellor Dennis advanced to the Chair, and addressed the meeting to the following effect:—

“Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—I beg to make one observation: I am at this moment honoured with being the mouth-piece of those good and worthy Protestant gentlemen who have assembled here to sanction by their presence, and assist by their voices, the great, the glorious, and the just cause in which ye and ourselves are embarked. Gentlemen, we are distinctly and deservedly your friends—the friends of justice and of truth, because we are the friends of the Irish people, of Irish Catholics, the best and the most virtuous men upon the face of the earth. But, gentlemen, we lament to behold any thing like a division between you; your great object should be conciliation; it is the desire of your Protestant friends; they have no wish to indulge in any but that of general conciliation, because they know that if you do not draw together, you give the triumph to your bitter and irreconcilable enemies. But when I look round and behold this immense and respectable meeting, there can be no doubt of success. Gentlemen, as your dissenting party were retiring from you, they entreated of us, your Protestant friends, to accompany them, but we refused, because we would not identify ourselves with any party in the Catholic body; you must allow us to act in the same manner towards you. No, those steady and long-tried friends to your cause—Stawell, Beamish, Crawford—will not attach themselves to any party, but go with the unanimous voice of the Irish Catholics. Having stated thus, allow me to mention the resolution we have come to, we will retire for the present in the hope of an arrangement between yourselves. Allow me, for the present, to depart; accept my warm and ardent feeling—be firm, be united, be unanimous amongst yourselves, and your enlightened, liberal, and patriotic friends will be at their post.

“Counsellor Mac Donnell then addressed the meeting:—

“Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—We have heard the statement of Counsellor Dennis—the statement of that good and amiable friend. It is true we have a division, but we have no right to complain of the principle which occasions this division. Gentlemen, under our circumstances, our Protestant friends have taken a high and an exalted stand; they have not descended to connect themselves with that feeble party which have occasioned this internal division; but the very circumstance of their explanation proves the respect they bear to you, as they would not condescend to any explanation with you, if they did not respect you, and they are entitled to our warmest thanks. But, gentlemen, without observing upon the conduct of those persons who have deserted your great cause; yet it is a duty we owe to ourselves pointedly to mark the conduct which brought about this division. We are called unanimously to pronounce upon the conduct of those arrogant men who will not condescend to act with us, unless suffered to lead and drive the people as they may choose; but yet, under all these circumstances, I will call upon you to give up resentment—to forget the injuries they have done you, and I would even still reach out the *olive*, rather than flourish the *laurel*. Would they were now within my hearing, that they might return and discharge the duty—the imperative duty which they owe the great cause they are engaged in, how freely would we forgive and forget our injuries; nay, to the very last moment we will be ready to receive them. But I fear a disappointment; however, we know the principle upon which we act, and we will be firm to our duty. They fancied they could assemble a party in that building, and carry their wishes with a high hand against the general voice of the people. Gentlemen, was that a fit hole to drive this immense assembly into?—(cries of “no, no.”) No, it was not; and even if it had been filled, certain death would have been the consequence to some. Look at the immense concourse of persons in every direction about—Protestant and Catholic—and see if that was a fit place, without air, seats, or any accommodation whatever? Yet this was the place selected in despite of every remonstrance; and what was the precious reason given by those gentlemen to the earnest and repeated solicitations made to them; why, gentlemen, a reason which no Orangeman would have dared to have offered, or dared to have insulted your ear with—“*that they were disinclined to enter a chapel, as they were afraid of the clergy.*” Why, gentlemen, at this day, are we forgetting all duty, forgetting all obligation, forgetting all truth, constancy, and honour? are we to allow ourselves to be the slaves of such coarse and vulgar bigotry, “*that they were afraid of the clergy?*” The Catholic clergy have never yet betrayed or

neglected their duty, they are above the slanders of their calumniators. Gentlemen, under the guidance and direction of several Catholic gentlemen of this great county and city of Cork, I will proceed to submit some few resolutions for your adoption; but before I proceed, give me leave to observe upon some suggestions which were laid before the committee, by their own desire, nearly a fortnight ago, for the purpose of their framing resolutions founded upon those suggestions; and, gentlemen, I read those suggestions now to you, in order to satisfy you that neither I, nor the respectable gentlemen, with whom I had the honour to act, ever interfered until their interference became actually necessary; the following are the suggestions as delivered to them:—

*“Suggested Proceedings for the next Aggregate Meeting.*

“Meeting to be held in the North or South Chapel; the keys to be delivered to James Roche, Esq., previous to the meeting.

“Determination to petition for unconditional Emancipation.

“Direct condemnation of ecclesiastical arrangements in the late bill.

“Approval of, and gratitude to the prelates for their general conduct, and particularly for their late address and resolutions.

“Thanks to Dr. Milner for his opposition to the late bill, and faithful discharge of his duties as agent to the Irish bishops.

“Thanks to the members of the Church of Scotland and Synod of Ulster.

“Approbation of the conduct of the General Board.

“Declaration of the expiration of the term for which the Cork Board was appointed, and appointing persons who shall co-operate in Dublin with the General Board in presenting the petition, &c.; the object being to suspend for the present the sittings of a local Board. No resolution to be proposed of either approval or disapproval of the conduct of the Cork Board.

“Adoption of general petition.

“Thanks to Donoughmore and friends in Lords. Grattan having been thanked at last meeting, *quærs* propriety of repetition of thanks to him, as Donoughmore was not then named?

“Thanks and gratitude to John Magee, Esq., for his undeviating support of Catholic interests.”

“Gentlemen, here is one more which this late committee did not think worthy of being treated even with common politeness; it is a suggestion for a vote of thanks to that best of men, and worthiest of Irishmen, Counsellor O'Connell. This suggestion was scouted with disregard, and flung from them with contempt, thus refusing the empty tribute of a simple vote of thanks to the man who had devoted his life to our service. I will read the suggestion:

“Thanks and gratitude to Counsellor O'Connell, to be expressed in the most animated and affectionate terms.”

“The other suggestions were as follows:—

“Determination not to vote for any candidate who will not pledge himself to be a friend; and a recommendation to the Catholics of county and city to register freeholds.

“Determination to prefer Irish manufacture, and encourage its prosperity.”

“ Now, gentlemen (continued Mr. Mac Donnell), it is my duty to proceed to read the resolutions; in doing so, I have the concurrence of respectable gentlemen of both the city and county.

“ [Here Mr. Mac Donnell was interrupted by the appearance of Counsellor O’Connell, who had returned from the meeting of the Board, who had retired. When he reached the chair, he addressed the meeting to the following effect :]

“ Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—Before my highly and valuable friend, Counsellor Mac Donnell, proceeds to read those resolutions, I have a proposal to make, which, if it meets your sanction, may, under Providence, have the full effect of bringing about a general reconciliation. Gentlemen, nothing can be of more benefit to us than unanimity; and therefore it is I would propose, that before you proceed to establish a new Board, or whatever other mode you may think proper to pursue, that you give the seceders another opportunity of returning to their post and their duty. Do not conceive that I mean to insinuate that their presence is necessary to establish the justness of your proceeding.—No, no, gentlemen, I insinuate no such matter; on the contrary, it is a fact, a strong fact, that the moment the aggregate meeting assembled, their power was dissolved—you have not again elected them, and they are as nothing without your support. But I am induced to this, that I might be the happy means of effecting unanimity in this great county and city; my only hope is that of doing good for my poor country. It is this feeling for the good of old Ireland that is forcing me forward in this instance—and also, because I think we shall be successful. I think those gentlemen have seen their error; they begin to find they are nothing. I saw them a few moments back, a few scattered individuals, in a corner of a yard. I addressed them, because, though small, very small indeed in their numbers, yet, as individuals, they are respectable, and I wished to undeceive them of their errors. I asked them if they were Roman Catholics, and could they talk about securities? I told them to leave securities to the minions of the castle—to the pensioned hirelings of the state—aye, and to the Orange Papists too; but let not them, as honest, honourable, worthy Roman Catholics, insult the public ears with so discordant a sound. I told them, that we had only one security to offer, and that we were willing to surrender our heart’s blood, our lives, our properties, our persons, in the front of the battle. Away, then, with faction, with party and division—give us Emancipation, and we, in return, will give every security in our persons, lives, and properties. Then let faction raise its head, we will put it down, spring from what quarter it may. Then let the foreign foe pollute our shores, and we will prove our sincerity and our

attachment to that constitution, which we are now seeking to receive the benefits of, by driving them before us. At present how are we treated? Something in the nature of mad dogs, which they will not let loose without first tying up one of their legs; so by us, they will give us Emancipation, after we give them security that we will be slaves. Let us then go after those people—let us endeavour to effect, if possible, an understanding between the anti-vetoists and the Board. We will endeavour to find out the sound and the perfect. Send your independent and honourable chairman, Counsellor O'Leary, for one of the deputation—let my esteemed and worthy honest friend, Counsellor Mac Donnell, be another—let the Rev. Mr. England be a third; he is too sincere, upon a good cause, to deny his aid. Fill up the list to the number of ten. I promise you, if we gain no honour in this affair, we shall lose none.

“I do therefore move, sir, that a deputation of ten persons be appointed to wait upon the committee, and commune with them on the present differences; and that they do return in one hour with their reply.”

After some discussion, Mr. O'Connell's motion was acceded to; and he, with the following gentlemen, were deputed to communicate with the Board:—

Counsellor O'Leary.

Counsellor Mac Donnell.

Rev. Mr. England, (the late much esteemed Right Rev. Dr. England, Catholic Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina.)

Francis J. Moloney, Esq.

Timothy Mahony, Esq.

Nicholas Murphy, Esq.

Edmond O'Flaherty, Esq.

James N. Mahon, Esq.

Maurice Hoare, Esq.

Jeremiah Murphy, Esq.

This deputation accordingly proceeded, and were admitted to an interview with the Board in a *bed-chamber!* To this dignified *hall of council* the body in question had to retire, from the hootings of the people, who were becoming exceedingly dissatisfied with their proceedings. After two hours' delay the deputation returned, and

“Counsellor O'Connell addressed the meeting. He informed them that there had been an unanimous agreement come to on resolutions perfectly without qualification of any kind, and unequivocally demand-

ing "*simple repeal*," as it was phrased—that is, the unconditional abrogation of the penal code.

"He further stated, that the same unanimity had prevailed with regard to a vote of thanks to the Catholic bishops—and similar votes to Grattan, Donoghmore, and the Dukes of Kent and Sussex.

"He added that the Board, obedient to the manifestations of popular feeling that day witnessed, would now consider their office at an end; and their body as hitherto constituted, entirely dissolved; but that they offered themselves for re-election as members of a Board to consist of double the number of that to which they had belonged; the latter having been 34, the new Board would therefore, of course, be 68.

"He thus concluded:—

" "These gentlemen are now coming back repentant, and seeking your favour; will you refuse it to persons repenting their errors?"

" "No," said some persons in the crowd; "*we forgive them, and may heaven forgive them!*"

" "Aye, you follow that—the pure feeling of our Irish Catholics! How I love to hear such sentiments—the effusions of honesty bursting from the heart! Oh, that such sentiments pervaded the country—then had we no need of meetings! But *prove your forgiveness*. The Board bring with them the chairman, whom you, this day, would not allow to preside—but he now comes like the prodigal child! Oh, will you not receive him into your bosoms, and prove yourselves Christians?"

" "Is it because he has once done wrong, that you should spurn him through life?"

" "If he *did* vote against the motion of thanks to our bishops, still he is now sorry for it: no doubt it was the error of his judgment; but he sees this error in common with others; receive him and them cordially, then; let Mr. Galwey take the chair, and we shall have unanimity, that most desirable of all objects under heaven."

"As Counsellor O'Connell was speaking (says the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, from which we quote), the Board made its appearance, and Mr. Galwey addressed the meeting.

"He congratulated the meeting on their prospects of unanimity, and announced that a set of resolutions were now to be proposed—twelve certainly, with the full concurrence of those with whom he acted—but that any beyond that number should be dealt with as mere individual suggestions open to discussion and opposition.

"The following resolutions were accordingly read by James Roche, Esq., who acted as secretary upon the occasion:—

"RESOLVED—That having confidently anticipated that the beneficent interposition of the legislature would have, ere now, relieved us from the necessity of a further expression

of our complaints, we cannot but lament the disappointment of our just and reasonable expectations.

“ Yet, however acutely we may feel even the temporary postponement of our success, we consider it a matter of real consolation to have found that an actual majority of the 658 members, who compose the House of Commons, have declared themselves favourable to our relief.”

“ RESOLVED—‘That firmly relying on the immutable justice of our cause, on the wisdom of the legislature, and on the distinguished liberality of our Protestant brethren, we will persevere in every constitutional endeavour to obtain the repeal of those oppressive and impolitic laws by which we are aggrieved.

“ And that we do, therefore, in concert with our fellow-citizens throughout the kingdom, renew our earnest applications for their TOTAL AND UNQUALIFIED REMOVAL.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That we do adopt the petition of the Catholics of Ireland, and that it be referred to the gentlemen now composing the Catholic Board for this county and city (in conjunction with the following names which are added to the Board), to prepare and forward it at such time, and in such manner, as shall seem to them most conducive to their success :—

Thomas Coppinger,  
Counsellor O'Leary,  
Philip Harding,  
Pierce Nagle, jun.,  
Dr. Pigott,  
Jeremiah M'Carthy,  
Daniel Clanchy,  
John Shinnior,  
Anthony O'Connor,  
Counsellor Mackey,  
Garrett Nagle,  
Timothy Donovan,  
Dr. Balwin,  
Michael Callaghan,  
Patrick Russell,  
Maurice O'Connell (of Darrynane),

Luke Shea,  
Edward Reardon,  
Bartholomew Foley,  
John Morrogh,  
Nicholas Murphy,  
Dr. Donegan,  
Denis Richard Mayland,  
Francis Molony,  
Frederick Shanahan,  
Alexander M'Carthy,  
Timothy Mahony,  
Francis Molony,  
Jeremiah O'Leary,  
John Cremin, jun.,  
James Nicholas Mahon,  
Edmond Hore.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That the said Board does not consist of any representatives of the people, or of any part of the people, and that their sittings be open and public.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That reposing the most implicit confidence in our revered prelates, a grateful confidence to which their pastoral and personal virtues so eminently entitle them, we can never accept of any legislative relief, however unlimited in its political operation, encumbered as on a late occasion, with restrictions which they shall declare contrary to the doctrines or discipline of our Church.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That among the many able supporters of our cause in parliament, pre-eminent and unrivalled stands the immortal name of Henry Grattan.—The splendour of his talents, the extent of his services, and the unabated ardour of his zeal, in the advocacy of our cause, have justly exalted this illustrious patriot to the foremost place in our estimation and gratitude.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That their Royal Highnesses the Dukes of Kent and Sussex, by their zealous and honourable exertions in our behalf, have proved themselves the true supporters of those principles which placed the House of Hanover on the throne, and have received our attachment and gratitude.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That the most lively thanks of the Catholics of the county and city of Cork are eminently due, and hereby given to the Right Honourable Earl Donoughmore, and the illustrious family of Hutchinson, for their uniform, manly, and hereditary support of our rightful cause.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That we are deeply indebted to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland as well as to the Synod of Ulster, for the liberality with which they have respectively declared themselves on the subject of our claims.’

“ RESOLVED—‘That the zealous and unwearied exertions of the Earl of Fingal and the General Board of Ireland, in the cause of Catholic liberty, claim our cordial thanks.’



"RESOLVED—'That it is a primary and indispensable duty to obtain for ourselves that constitutional weight which the elective franchise confers, and to acquire for our parliamentary friends, that legislative importance which can best insure the success of our cause.

"And we trust our body will carry this into effect.'

"RESOLVED—'That to relieve the necessities, and increase the industry of a numerous class of our distressed fellow-countrymen, we most earnestly recommend to our countrymen, the exclusive use of IRISH MANUFACTURE.'

"The foregoing resolutions were proposed by the Board. Here follow the resolutions partly objected to :—

"RESOLVED—'That the warmest expression of our gratitude is due, and hereby offered, to that venerable and indefatigable Catholic prelate, the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, as well for those mighty labours which his great mind has suggested, as for that faithful discharge of the high trust reposed in him, as agent for the prelates of Ireland, who have sanctioned his struggles by their public and grateful approval.

"And, that we confidently trust he will proceed in his exertions for our religious preservation and political redemption, unshaken by the hostility of false friends, or false brethren, who have not the good sense to estimate, or the spirit to approve, his generous attachment to our cause and our country.

"And, that we feel particularly indebted to that excellent prelate, for his manly, upright, and conscientious opposition to the ecclesiastical arrangements, submitted to parliament during the last session, in the bill purporting to provide for the further relief of his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects.'

"RESOLVED—'That our most grateful thanks are imperatively due, and cheerfully offered to that invaluable Irishman, John Magee, Esq., proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*, for his undeviating support of our cause, and manly exposure of the bigotry and profligacy of our enemies of every rank and degree.'

"RESOLVED—'That the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork most gratefully admire the merits, and approve the worth of that great and good Irishman, the strong pillar of our cause, and the pride of our land, *Counsellor O'Connell*—who, in the spirit of constitutional independence, often has undauntedly stood foremost in the fight, whenever the interests of Ireland were to be defended, her rights demanded, or her enemies confounded.

"And that we consider him particularly entitled to our most glowing gratitude as Catholic Irishman, for his virtuous motion in support of our hierarchy, proposed in the General Board on the 29th day of May last, and triumphantly carried by a glorious and patriotic majority.'

"RESOLVED—'That Counsellor Mac Donnell, the patriotic editor of the *Mercantile Chronicle*, the vigilant sentinel of our rights, the undaunted and incorruptible advocate of Catholic claims and religious freedom, has well merited, and continues to obtain the entire confidence, sincere gratitude, and cordial thanks of this meeting, and that he be appointed a member of the Board.'

"RESOLVED—'That the cordial thanks of the meeting are eminently due, and hereby given to Messrs. Stawells, Beazish, senior and junior, Crawford, Cuthbert, Blennerhasset, Yates, and many other Protestant gentlemen whose presence, and Major Torrens, Counsellor Denis, and Mr. Jackson Reid, whose eloquence have shed so bright a lustre on the proceedings of this day.'

"JOHN GALWEY, JUN., Chairman.

"WILLIAM J. SHERIDAN, Secretary."

"As chairman and secretary of the meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork, assembled yesterday, we have considered it our duty to authenticate the proceedings by our signatures. But lest it should be thence inferred that they had received

our approbation, we do hereby declare our utter dissent from, and do protest against the proceedings there adopted.

“ J. GALWEY, jun., Chairman.

“ WILLIAM J. SHEEHY, Secretary.”

We have given the resolutions in their advertised form, with the Chairman and Secretary's protest appended; and now revert to the period of the meeting when they were brought forward, to give in detail the proceedings which were had upon them, and which gave rise to this protest, as well as to other occurrences which shall be noticed in due order.

After the Chairman's announcement that the Board had “sanctioned” only the first twelve of these resolutions, and after the three which related to Right Rev. Dr. Milner, to John Magee, and Mr. O'Connell, had been brought forward, read, and proposed by Mr. Mac Donnell,

“ Mr. R. Moylan came forward.

“ He protested against the resolutions just proposed by Mr. Mac Donnell—dealing thus with the three :—

“ My first objection is to Dr. Milner!

“ His *tergiversation* is known. He deceived and disappointed our friends in England, and deceived us all; and his tergiversation is *known* and *acknowledged* by all!—(Loud cries of disapprobation.)

“ And upon the second point I fear not to express my disapprobation of any vote of thanks to Mr. Magee—a man generally known and acknowledged to stand a CONVICTED LIBELLER!!!

“ At this moment, (says the newspaper report,) the shouting against Mr. Moylan became very great; and several Protestant gentlemen, who were near the Chairman, were seen to be withdrawing.

“ Order, however, was restored, with some difficulty; and Mr. Moylan was allowed to proceed.

“ With respect to the third motion, viz., that of thanks to Counsellor O'Connell—no man respects his private worth more than I do—but if I grant him a vote of thanks, it will be approving his public conduct; therefore I cannot give my consent to any vote of thanks to him.

“ As an amendment to Mr. Mac Donnell's motion, I, therefore, move the following, which I am about to read:—

“ Resolved—That no spirit of conciliation has been, or ever shall be, wanting on our part; and that we are ready to make every concession to our Protestant brethren, consistent with the safety, integrity, and essential discipline of our Church.”

“Mr. Eugene M'Sweeney, of Mary-street, seconded Mr. Moylan's amendment.

“Counsellor Dennis remonstrated, as a Protestant, against this proceeding of Mr. Moylan's, in particular against the use of such epithets to such a person as that gentleman had applied to John Magee.

“Is he, for his virtuous consistency, to have his character profaned, and himself termed a convicted libeller!! . . . . Have you never heard of juries been packed, and truth being made a libel? Oh, reflect! beware!—remember the times you live in, and the scenes you have lately passed through! . . . . Feel as Irishmen *should* feel. Love in your hearts the hero who gloriously falls in a great public cause!” . . . . .

After an eloquent address in this strain, he concluded with an exhortation to temper, moderation, &c., and the meeting was then addressed by—

“COUNSELLOR O'CONNELL—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I offer myself to your notice this moment with feelings it is impossible to assume. I offer myself in support of two resolutions, and most decidedly adverse to the third.

“It is wrong of you to think of bestowing thanks to one of yourselves, who, in his exertion in common with yourselves, can do no more than merely his duty—to fight and struggle in a good cause. But besides all this, there is no man worthy of what is said in that resolution—no man alive could deserve the warmth of approbation so expressed; and, therefore, I do entreat of you, as it entirely regards my person, to dismiss it from your notice as one unworthy of occupying your attention. (No, no, pass the resolution).

“But, gentlemen, it is objected to that enlightened prelate, Dr. Milner, that he at one time agreed to the veto, but that after he changed his opinion!

“Oh! would to God that any man who finds himself in error would act thus nobly, and that, believing he might be wrong, would not go about misleading others, but, like the great and good divine, whom they charge with tergiversation, renounce their errors and permit the public mind to repose in peace.

“Who are those men who charge tergiversation? Why, they are persons who change hourly—such among them who have opinions to change; for the majority of them possess no opinion at all. Who are those independents, who have so lately started up amongst you? or what is their title to the character of independent? For my part, I

declare I do not know in what their independence can exist, except it be that no person can depend on them. (Excessive laughter for a long time).

“But yet, these are the persons to come forward and charge upon an high-minded and deeply-respected divine, “tergiversation,” because upon a point of vital and most essential importance, where his great mind was awakened to a sense of the threatening danger by the honest remonstrance of his virtuous brethren, he calmly listens to the dictates of conscience—reconsiders, and finding his error, openly, honestly, and manfully avows it !

“He did not allow his illumined mind to be obscured by the doctrines of this world. No selfish vanity, no worldly pride, prevented him from retracting his errors : he did so ; and like a man, whose kingdom was not of this world, as publicly as he had erred, were his sorrow and his regret. And, gentlemen, what is Dr. Milner after all but a man ? Can you expect more of him than you will allow to all other men ? It is the lot of human nature to err ; but it is only in the greatness of virtue to retract and feel regret. (Cheers).

“But look at the erudite politicians ; it is really surprising how modest, meek, and humble those enlightened independents are ; the population of Ireland declare against *all* vetoism, under *all* and *every* shape and form, and these two youths came forward, the one to propose, the other to second a resolution, for what ? For *provisional* securities ! That is ; you have declared against *vetoism* ; now under the other name of *provisional securities*, grant it ; and thus you become tergiversators !

“They come forward to give one proposition, which they turn into an adjective, and the other into a substantive, and which substantive cannot support the adjective ; and this is the doctrine and precious argument upon which you are called upon to defame the character and wound the feelings of one of the most learned and able men in England ! A prelate who is now opposed in England by a vile faction, more disgraceful, and possessing worse passions, than the infuriated anarchial faction which desolated and laid waste the happiness of society in France. The latter were a faction which have brought their country under a wicked military despotism that has ended in subverting the liberties and privileges of mankind. But the faction in England are still more wicked, because they are the determined enemies of every thing virtuous, liberal, honest, and enlightened ! And this is the vile faction which would seek to bow his grey head in sorrow to the grave. They endeavoured to cast him down ; but Ireland met him in his fall, and upheld him. (Cheers).

“How glad I should be to know those people who are here disposed

to act against reason and good sense! How gladly would I labour to convince them of their error. But why should I lose time? Who are they? What are they? Where are their numbers? Is there another man in these immense meeting to join these two youths? Oh, that they could count our numbers this day! Will they call for a division? Oh, for tellers to enumerate our majority! Oh, what an appearance those dissenters would exhibit! What! a minority of two or four to countless thousands? And what do they dissent from? From the very principle now laid down by the Board itself. Mr. Roche just told us, the simple repeal was the defined intention of the Board; nay, it is one of the resolutions which you have just now carried; yet those dissenters talk of an *amendment of the securities*. Mr. Roche is the identical gentleman who has seconded this motion of thanks introduced by Mr. Mac Donnell, to Dr. Milner, yet, this young gentleman would tell you to reject it. They talk of securities; some of the Board were satisfied with the late bill, and voted against your bishop in Dublin; and upon this it is, perhaps, that those gentlemen dare to talk of security: but your Board have retracted from that conduct, and they have found favour.

We will make no charges of tergiversation, nor will we blame those unreflecting young gentlemen, if they now retract their errors. But I will tell those people that are satisfied with the late bill, that so far as being a bill of relief, it was anything else than a charter for emancipation. Oh! how proud I am of the unanimity I perceive upon this great point; it will be a delightful consolation to the already tortured feelings of the good old prelate! He has broken no faith with you; there has been no breach of contract; he has watched with a guardian's care over our interests; he is too honest, too sincere, too virtuous to deceive Ireland; he possesses a combination of all the qualities, and all the excellencies which should compose the aged prelate, and amongst all these great qualifications and virtues, there is but one thing bad about him, he has for us, perhaps, too much of the Englishman about him.

“But, gentlemen, when I turn my thoughts on the other branch of Mr. Moylan's speech, what are my feelings? Oh! for the pensioned minions of the castle! Oh! for the attorney-general and the prosecutors of Catholics to stand up here to-day and behold a Catholic rise up in a Catholic assembly, and pronounce JOHN MAGEE a convicted libeller!!! If you would reflect upon the thousands of which you are daily deprived, to bestow upon the wretched hireling prints of the day; if you could know the sums lavished upon the dull and stupid *Patriot*—upon the vile and proverbially profligate *Correspondent*, to abuse, re-

vile, and condemn the people—to blazon forth a bigoted ministry—you would soon discover that the enlightened and patriotic writer of the *Dublin Evening Post*, which has the confidence of the people, and a circulation throughout the empire, would have been gladly and eagerly purchased up! How might then such a young gentleman, so educated, so enlightened, be received at the castle! how he might have made his way among the minions of a court, instead of his being calumniated as a convicted libeller! Oh, for a packed jury in some trying case, where Mr. Moylan's feelings or interests were concerned to make him know the effects of courtly influence!

“If this Mr. Moylan had seen the masters of Orange lodges sitting upon the jury of *John Magee*, he could not long have hesitated to decide that John Magee would have been declared a convicted libeller. If Mr. Moylan had been placed under such circumstances, however innocent his conduct, he too would have been declared a convicted libeller. But of what was he convicted? That he truly described the character of the Duke of Richmond's administration. Is it not in all your recollections, that this great duke dined at the mayor's feast in this very city?—that he on that occasion refused to drink the toast proposed of ‘the glorious and immortal memory?’—and yet, is it not a fact, that this great duke did actually pardon Hall, the Orangeman, the murderer of the only son, and only support of a poor aged widow? Did this noble duke bring to punishment the murderers of the Catholics at Curruginsheega? No. And yet this noble duke, with the attorney-general at his elbow, brings a prosecution bravely into a court of law, to defend the purity of his administration in Ireland; a jury of Orangemen are empannelled; they find truth is a libel; and they find that John Magee is the libeller!

“Let this noble duke enjoy the fame he has reaped in this great exploit. I tell him, John Magee is happier in his mind, confined within the dungeon of a prison, than that lord duke is now in his palace, and that when the memory of that lord duke shall be forgotten in our land, or only recollected with disgust and horror, the name of Magee, the independent proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*, shall be hailed as the proud and stern advocate of a nation's rights, and the glorious victim of persecution and proscription. To be sure he is now in Kilmainham prison; but he feels no pain for himself; he only feels for his country—for you, my Catholic countrymen; but yes, he will feel pain when he hears that at a meeting of the Catholics at Cork, a Catholic Irishman rose up and called him a convicted libeller!!!

“But I call on this young man, not to discredit his name and his

family by this transaction ; I call upon him to retract ; it is the only means left him.

[“Mr. Moylan here said he would not, and one person said he could not, as he was pledged to persevere in it].

“Well then, there is no way left but to divide upon it ; but how can it be accomplished ? Well, is it not provoking, that we cannot see what majority they will have against a vote of thanks to John Magee ? There he is in Kilmainham, in the bloom of youth, with a head clear and intelligent, his genius bright and brilliant, his heart virtuous and incorruptible. Yes, my countrymen, his head is as clear as his heart is honest ; he is a true Irishman, and I pride myself in calling him my friend. He is ardently, really, honestly attached to his country ; he has cause to be so ; he is deeply interested in her peace, tranquillity, and glory. He would call out to her aid, and to the aid of the state, an unbought army of Irishmen, and for these virtues he is sentenced to linger out two years in a dungeon !

“When it will be imparted to Mr. Magee, that this vote of thanks passed this meeting, his honest heart will rejoice ; but what will be his pleasure when he is informed, that if there were an objection, he will see that it only called out the greater spirit in the people, he will see that it gave more gravity, more weight, more consequence to the measure. (Cheering).

“My good friends, guard yourselves against division ; be watchful of those that seek to divide you ; these divisions have put down Ireland—a continuance of them will destroy the finest and fairest country in the world. We have no intense heat in summer to dry up the earth ; we have no chilling colds in winter to freeze us ; we are the most light-hearted people upon any shore ; for seven hundred years our spirit has continued unsubdued. We were never beaten in any battle ; on one occasion we submitted to an agreement, a compact, and that compact was broken, not by us, but by those who pledged themselves solemnly to its fulfilment. Why, then, should we be abused ? Why insulted ? Why doubted in our honour, in our integrity ? At all events, why quarrel among ourselves ? (Cheers).

“If it were not for these cursed divisions, Ireland would be the paradise of the world. (Cheers).

“With respect to the third motion before you, I shall be short, particularly as it regards myself. When I direct my attention to the great cause I am engaged in, I could not but anticipate the assaults which would be made against me : yet, I set out with a fixed determination, that though I may be deprived of abilities to serve, yet, I

knew I had a heart to feel, and thus emboldened, I trusted more to the excellence of our good cause, than the talent of the advocate; and if I have in any degree been conducive to the great interests of Catholic Ireland, I rejoice; nor shall the slanders, or the vile malignities of my enemies deter me.

*"I WILL GO ON, and the more I am maligned, the more will I be pleased, and hope for the prospect of success, nor will I ever doubt myself, until I shall hear those wretched hirelings of corruption teem forth odious praise to me! Then doubt me, but not till then.*

"Externally and internally I will fight the enemies of us all; they are sometimes to be found nearer to us than we can suspect, and they are the more dangerous for that. I have continued to labour, and will continue so to do. But, adopt not this exaggerated praise offered to me here to-day; it is not possible I could, or any man could be deserving of it. I give up this point to Mr. Moylan; I make Mr. Moylan a present of his motion, and let him give us the rest. (Loud and persevering cries of no, no! we will not, we will not!)

"Then, beforehand, I thank you, sincerely and honestly I thank you; it encourages, it cheers me on; I here want language to express my feelings; *I will stand by you while I live; I WILL NEVER FORSAKE POOR IRELAND.*"

When the enthusiasm of the auditory, after the foregoing speech, subsided enough to give him a hearing, Mr. James Roche again came forward and seconded Mr. O'Connell's protest against Moylan's amendment.

After some further speaking, Mr. Moylan's amendment to Mr. Mac Donnell's three resolutions was put, with the following result, according to the calculations of the newspapers:—

For the amendment, . . . . .	4
For the votes of thanks to the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, John Magee, and Daniel O'Connell, Esqrs., . . . . .	10,000

This matter being satisfactorily disposed of, the consideration of the remaining resolutions, which we have given from the advertisement, was taken up.

On that expressing thanks to Counsellor Mac Donnell, Mr. Remiah Sheehan (now long known as the chief manager of the *Dublin Evening Mail* newspaper) objected, and attacked Mr.



Mac Donnell's newspaper violently (the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*).

The anger of the meeting was such, that after several attempts to be heard, in which he was aided, to the best of their power, by the chairman and Mr. Mac Donnell himself, Mr. Sheehan gave way, and retired from the room.

Mr. Mac Donnell then entered into an eloquent vindication of himself, and after a brief further discussion, the question was put, and the vote carried triumphantly in his favour.

At the conclusion of the meeting the crowd gathered about Mr. O'Connell, and in spite of his most earnest entreaties, *chaired him* home, "up Hanover-street (says the punctual reporter), part of the South Main-street, along Turkey-street, into the Parade, to his lodgings at Laffan's, the latter, from the window of which he addressed the congregated thousands"—chiefly on the necessity of preparing for the elections, and securing the return of Christopher Hely Hutchinson—and exhorting them to peace, good humour, and unanimity.

Now began a war of *protocols*, in the shape of advertisements, &c., which we insert as nearly in their order as may be :—

"A paragraph having appeared in a newspaper in this city, charging the Catholic clergy with using indecent misrepresentations to inflame the minds of the people, preparatory to the late aggregate Catholic meeting, which meeting is termed one of the most tumultuous and riotous scenes ever witnessed in our city ;

"And further stating that the clergy, from their altars, told the people the Catholic Church was in danger, and ordered them to the meeting to defend their religion ; thereby, as is alleged, encouraging violence, &c. ;

"And further insinuating, that in addition to their exhortations, they were concerned in distributing inflammatory hand-bills, &c. ;

"Now, the Catholic clergymen of the city of Cork, considering the evil tendency of these false and malicious paragraphs (in *Freeman's Journal*, and *Cork Southern Reporter*), and that they are inserted as much to diminish their well-earned and highly beneficial, and religious influence with their flocks, as to discredit the late aggregate and respectable meeting of this great county and city—

"Declare most solemnly that they did not use such expressions in

their exhortations . . . nor hold themselves accountable for the hand-bills (which, however, they do not consider to have been inflammatory) that were distributed on that occasion, &c.

"They add, that although they do not feel called upon to disabuse their fellow-citizens, who are witnesses of their lives, they yet think it incumbent, by this declaration, to prevent the public at large from being influenced by such wilful misrepresentations."

Now for the defeated "*security men*:"

"We, the undersigned, do hereby declare our resignation as members of the newly-appointed board of Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork:—

Edward Morrogh.  
Daniel Leahy.  
Daniel Goold.  
Edmond Morrogh, of Kilworth.  
Thomas Denehy.  
Barry Cotter.  
Rick. Deasy.  
M. O'Sullivan.  
Pierce Nagle, jun.  
John Galway, jun.  
William Coppinger, jun.  
James O'Mullane.  
Robert M'Carthy.  
Charles Connell.

James O'Regan.  
Michael Galway.  
James Redmond.  
William J. Sheehy.  
Richard Barry.  
Denis Moylan.  
George Waters.  
James Roche.  
Stephen Roche.  
James Callanan.  
Daniel Callaghan, jun.  
Philip Stackpole.  
D. R. Moylan.

"Cork, August 31, 1818."

"We, the undersigned Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork, anxious to vindicate ourselves from the imputation of having sanctioned opinions and proceedings which we neither concur in nor approve, do hereby protest against the proceedings of the aggregate meeting held yesterday, convinced as we are that many of the resolutions there adopted are at variance with the good sense of the Roman Catholics of this county and city, and calculated more to injure than to promote the advancement of our cause:—

William Coppinger, jun., Barry's Court.  
John Galway, jun., Cork.  
Richard Barry, Barry's Lodge.  
George Wattara, Cork.  
Daniel Callaghan, jun., Cork.  
Pierce Nagle, jun., Annabessy.  
Stephen Roche, Camden-place.  
Charles Connell, Kilhera.  
Robert Burke, Cork.

Cornelius Donovan, Cork.  
Richard Callaghan, Cork.  
Thomas Sheehan, Cork.  
Remmy H. Sheehan, Cork.  
James Sheehan, Cork.  
S. John D. Aikenhead, Cork.  
John Cahill, Cork.  
John Thompson, Cork.  
Denis Mullins, Cork.

- Michael Galwey, Old Court.  
 James O'Regan, Cork.  
 Edward Morrough, Camden-place.  
 William Beardon, Marybrook.  
 Michael O'Brien, Cork.  
 Daniel Donovan, Middleton.  
 Richard Ronayne, Cork.  
 Edward Ronayne, North-strand.  
 James Barry, Ahousih.  
 John Swiney, South-Mall.  
 William Barry, Rochville.  
 Richard Coppinger, Cork.  
 David Barry, Barry's Lodge.  
 David Barry, jun., ditto.  
 James Barry, Rockville.  
 Jeremiah O'Reilly, Cork.  
 James Fitz Gerald, Garracloyne.  
 John Roche, Ahuda.  
 John Roche, jun., ditto.  
 Michael Leahy, Terrace.  
 P. Stackpole, Russell-place.  
 John Coppinger M'Mahon, Barry's Court.  
 Richard Kenifeck, Reagrave.  
 William Callanan, Mariborough-street.  
 Daniel Leahy, Terrace.  
 Andrew Morrough, Camden-place.  
 Daniel Goold, George's-quay.  
 Francis Goold, ditto.  
 James Redmond Parry, Donoughmore.  
 Stephen Murphy, Cork.  
 Martin J. Farrell, Cork.  
 James Fegan, South Mall.  
 William Sheehy, Merchant's-quay.  
 Charles Herley, Cork.  
 Charles Daly, M.D., Cork.  
 Denis Richard Moylan, N. Abbey.  
 Denis Creagh Moylan, jun., ditto.  
 Thomas Leahy, jun., Terrace.  
 Gerald H. Gibbons, Kinsale.  
 Patrick Kenifeck, Cork.  
 Michael O'Driscoll, Baltimore.  
 Eugene M'Swiny, Cork.  
 Daniel Donegan, Cork.  
 Daniel Meagher, Cork.  
 John J. Finn, Cork.  
 Frederick Honan, Cork.  
 James B. Galwey, Cork.  
 Thomas Coppinger, Cork.  
 Thomas Quill, Cork.  
 Patrick Stokes, Cork.  
 Richard Donovan, Middleton.  
 Pat. Hayes, Cork.  
 Joseph Hayes, Cork.  
 George O'Driscoll, Cork.  
 Robert Honan, Cork.  
 Richard Nugent, Cork.  
 P. W. Callaghan, Lota.  
 Dominick Waters, Cork.  
 Michael Barry, George's-quay.  
 Garrett Barry, Cork.  
 Patrick O'Connor, ditto.  
 James Coppinger, jun., ditto.  
 Stephen Coppinger, ditto.  
 Bart. Verling, Cove.  
 H. A. Goold, Ardmore.  
 Henry Galwey, Old Court.  
 James Punch, Castle-street.  
 Richard Barry, Cork.  
 Edward Barry, Ahanish.  
 James Galwey, Fortrichard.  
 Edward Galwey, ditto.  
 William Galwey, ditto.  
 John Crenagh Moylan, N. Abbey.  
 Daniel Donovan, jun.  
 Timothy O'Regan, Cork.  
 John Conlan, Cork.  
 William Regan, Cork.  
 Denis Murphy, ditto.  
 James Purcell, ditto.  
 M. D. Galwey, ditto.  
 John Fitzpatrick, Parade.  
 John Galwey, Ratland-street.  
 William Trant, South Mall.  
 Edward Hegarty, Cork.  
 John M'Leod, ditto.  
 James O'Brien, Mariboro'-street.  
 Alexander O'Driscoll, Creagh.  
 Bart. Raines, Cork.  
 Mathew Geran, ditto.  
 John Creagh Walters, ditto.  
 Joseph Coppinger, jun., Middleton.  
 Pierce Power, Clonsault.  
 Richard Barry, Cork.  
 John Shee, ditto.  
 J. L. Mulcaby, Cork.  
 E. Hegarty, ditto.  
 James Byrne, ditto.  
 Patrick Hansey, Cork.  
 John Callanan, ditto.  
 Wm. Coppinger, Ballydaniel.\*

“ At a numerous and respectable meeting of the Roman Catholic gentlemen of the city and county of Cork (who dissented from, and protested against, the proceedings of the late Roman Catholic Aggregate Meeting,) held this day, Saturday, September 4th, 1813, at the Bush Tavern—Alexander O'Driscoll, Esq., in the chair—the following resolutions were agreed to :—

“ RESOLVED—‘ That we have seen with regret the success of those artifices which have been employed to deceive a generous and unsuspecting people, and lead them into riot and disorder.’

“ RESOLVED—‘ That adopting the wise principle of the constitution, by which property is made the standard of opinion, we found it impossible, at the late aggregate meeting, amidst the tumult of the lowest populace—ignorant of necessity, and misled by design—to ascertain the sense of the Catholics of this city and county.’

“ RESOLVED—‘ That we are too deeply interested in the success of the Catholic cause to relinquish it for one instant into the hands of persons not possessing our confidence; and that while we make every exertion for the attainment of conciliation, we will continue to prosecute our just claims with undiminished ardour, and in the same steady and constitutional course we have hitherto pursued.’

“ RESOLVED—‘ That justly anxious for the final establishment of a system of government, free from restraint and distrust, on account of religious opinions, we feel assured that our revered prelates, whose personal and pastoral virtues entitle them to the highest confidence and respect, will be ever ready to give their cordial aid to the attainment of any measure which shall obtain our emancipation, without injury to our religion or its doctrines.’

“ ALEXANDER O'DRISCOLL, Chairman.

“ Alexander O'Driscoll, Esq., having left the chair, and William Coppinger, Esq., of Cork, being called thereto, thanks were unanimously voted to Mr. O'Driscoll, for his very proper and dignified conduct therein.

“ WILLIAM COPPINGER, Chairman.

“ FREDERICK HONAN, Secretary.”

#### CORK CATHOLIC BOARD.

At a meeting of the Cork Catholic Board, held in the Bush Tavern, on Friday, the 3rd day of September, 1813—Cornelius O'Leary, Esq., in the chair—the following resolutions were unanimously adopted :—

“ RESOLVED, on motion of Jeremiah Mac Curtie, of Woodview, Esq., seconded by Thomas Coppinger, of Leemount, Esq.—‘ That the source of all the calamities of Ireland has been found in the dissension of her children. By their dissension, she was first subdued and enslaved—by their dissension has her servitude been continued—and in their dissension now consists the last remaining resource of all her enemies.

“ That, engaged as we are in the noblest cause that ever warmed the human heart, or stimulated human action—the cause of religion and our country—we deem it a sacred duty to use our best, our first, and our unremitting exertions to restore unanimity, and to procure the cordial co-operation of all classes, to the advancement of that glorious cause.

“ That, deeply impressed with these sentiments, we pledge ourselves, collectively and individually, to our country, to carry them into immediate and active effect and operation; and we, with confidence, conjure our fellow-Irishman and fellow-sufferers to combine their exertions with ours, and manifest a corresponding spirit of reciprocal conciliation and harmony.

“ That this Board do meet once in three weeks; and that copies of the petition to the legislature, adopted at the last aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county

and city of Cork be made, to be left for signature at such places as shall be appointed at the next meeting.

“That a subscription be opened in all the parishes of this county and city, for defraying the expenses of our petition, and of the general petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland; and that the sum of five hundred pounds be transmitted to the General Board, for the latter purpose.

“That we do solemnly pledge ourselves, individually and collectively, to carry into the most prompt and efficacious execution, the resolution of our last aggregate meeting, respecting the registry of freeholders; and we claim the confidence and esteem of our fellow-countrymen only as we shall redeem this pledge.

“On the motion of Francis J. Molony, Esq.,

“RESOLVED—That Timothy Mahony, Esq., be appointed Secretary, and Nicholas Murphy, Esq., be appointed Treasurer to this Board.

“On motion of Thomas Coppinger, Esq., seconded by Eneas M'Donnell, Esq.,

“RESOLVED—That no gentleman do speak or vote in this Board, unless he be dressed in Irish manufacture.

“That the resolutions adopted at the last aggregate meeting, together with those of this day agreed upon, be transmitted forthwith for insertion in the *Dublin Evening Post*.”

“CORNELIUS O'LEARY, Chairman.

“TIM. MAHONY, Secretary.

“Counsellor O'Leary having left the chair, and Alexander MacCarthy, Esq., being called thereto,

“RESOLVED—That the particular thanks of the Board be given to Counsellor O'Leary, for his very proper conduct in the chair.”

“RESOLVED—That this Board do adjourn to Tuesday, the 28th instant.”

“ALEXANDER M'CARTHY, Chairman.

“TIM. MAHONY, Secretary.”

This last pompously announced *sederunt* of the defeated party excited a good deal of amusement as well as indignation, at the contrast between the consequence assumed, and the little political weight actually enjoyed by the parties.

It drew from Mr. O'Connell the newspaper “squib” we are about to give, addressed to the proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*.

After some severe personal reflections on prominent individuals, the “squib” goes on as follows:—

“Pray, pray, print their resolutions, that the world may see what they are, who accuse us of ignorance. Pray print their resolutions, that it may be seen where the ignorance really and truly is.

“In their first resolution they call us ‘a generous and unsuspecting people’—very much obliged to them for the compliment, but we are not such fools as they take us for; and we will not be sold by the head, nor by the tail, by any contractor or ignorant squireen, or Jacobin miller, or writing clerk, or bankrupt, that ever lived.

"Then look at this second resolution, in which they state two things equally false. First, *'that there is a principle of the constitution by which property is made the standard of opinion.'*"

"Property is a good standard of contractors; but it is no more the standard of opinion than it is the standard of law or of Latin.

"But to return: they say, secondly, *'that we are the lowest of the populace, ignorant of necessity, and misled of design.'* How could you say any such thing, Dan Donovan—you who are a miller, and were—what were you, my dear Dan? You were also, in your day, a 'liberty and equality' boy; and this is not the doctrine you have preached to us at your mill. Indeed, indeed, Dan, it does not become you to be an aristocrat.

"To be sure no great reliance could be placed upon the accuracy of men who have falsified the constitution, for I believe there never was any thing so untrue as that the constitution measures every man's opinion by *the weight of his purse.*

"Was there ever any thing so silly printed? Why, if it were true, no rich man could be, in point of law, a blockhead; there could be no wealthy fool; or, I suppose, a rich man, who talked foolishly, might be indicted before the recorder, for *violating a principle of the constitution.* 'Your property, sir,' the recorder would say to the *convicted dunce*,—'your property is made the standard of opinion, and you have, in contempt of the wisdom which belongs to property, been convicted of having talked nonsense; and, therefore, you are to be imprisoned six months at hard labour, to teach you the great principle of our constitution, that property is the standard of opinion.'

"Dear Mr. Magee, now I should like to see some of the protestors tried at sessions under this statute; it is called, I believe, the statute for regulating the standard of opinion, by the exact scale of the wealth of each individual. I would trouble you, Mr. Magee, to translate this third resolution into English.

"Whether it was fatal necessity or design, I do not know, but I am quite sure they drew it up in a way which cannot be understood. I wish to God some of those standard men would tell us, plain people, what it means.

"The fourth resolution was intended to mean something; it was intended to mean the veto. But the standard protestors quarrelled beautifully amongst themselves, and they agreed to leave the fourth resolution in a shape that might mean any thing or nothing at all.

"Having gone through their resolutions, I came to the signatures. The first thing that struck me was 'Frederick Honan, Secretary.' 'Oh, oh!' said I, 'a clerk to Bob Burk!' Standard of property,

indeed,' said I. 'But,' said my neighbour, 'don't you know, Paddy Shan,' said he, 'that Bob Burk is in London looking for the contract too, and that Master Frederick signs his name to every thing?—sure enough didn't he sign his name to the protest?—and as he manages his property in his absence, he, of course, has in his keeping all the good sense that belongs to the property; for property is the standard of opinion, Pat.'

"I was quite satisfied with Master Frederick Hoann, and then I went to look at the chairman, and the first was Alexander O'Driscoll, Esq. Christ preserve me! from the West with £350 a-year, commonly called 'Sandy Tim,'\* and now become 'a standard of property!' And he charges us with ignorance! Pray, Mr. Sandy Tim, what is the extent of your own 'larning?' You can read, I suppose—and write, I guess; but, further than that, Mr. Sandy Tim, how dare you talk of ignorance? But I forgive you, for you got into bad company; and I know who it is, and I could read him a little of his history, if he does not behave himself better in future, and not join the Orangemen against us.

"But I had like to forget the best joke at all. Why, who do you think these men that declared that property is the standard of opinion took as their second chairman? A friend of mine, poor as I am—Mr. William Coppinger, better known by the name of 'Jamaica!' I was quite sure they picked out the second richest man amongst them as the standard of their opinion, and as their second chairman. You cannot think how pleased I was. Now, thought I, the five pounds he owes me these three years will be paid!

"Off I ran to his assignees; for, sir, I was kept out of my honest earnings by his being made a bankrupt; off I ran to his assignees: 'Gentlemen, said I, pay me five pounds that Mr. Coppinger owes me: he has got some great estate—he has certainly got a great property. "Property is the standard of opinion,"' said I. 'Here it is down in print, in the newspapers, signed "William Coppinger." My debt is a fair debt, and honestly due; and so pay me.'

"You may judge of my surprise, when the assignees told me quietly, that if I went to the expense of employing an attorney, and proving it regularly, they would pay me a dividend as well as the other creditors. I asked what the dividend would be, and when? The assignees solemnly assured me they expected to be able to make a dividend of two pence in the pound, and that I should certainly get a tenpenny bit for my five pounds.

\* The man who was dismissed by Peel's government, in 1844, for misconduct as a magistrate, restored shortly after on account of his Orange politics, but subsequently and finally dismissed for further outrageous conduct.

“ ‘Property is the standard of opinion,’ said I ; and here is a bankrupt, without his certificate, who is to pay ten pence for a hard-earned poor man’s debt of five pounds—thinks fit, with his comrades, to abuse the people of his native city, by calling them ‘the lowest populace;’ and then he says that ‘property is the standard of opinion!’ Oh, for the value of twopence-in-the-pound of an opinion !

“ I wish to God the protestors would make a small collection for the creditors of their chairman, instead of going to the expense of printing foolish and lying advertisements in the newspapers.

“ In my next, I will tell you more about the ‘boys’—about our friend Mellish, and his partner Joe, and modest Pat Hayes, and Mullins, the breeches-maker, who despises the people, and the rest of the pretty youths, that would, if they could, sell every

“ ONE OF THE POPULACE.

“ Blarney-Lane, Cork, September 10th, 1813.”

We come now to the meeting at which these resolutions were passed. It was announced as a meeting of the Cork Catholic Board, and held, as we have seen, on Friday, September 3rd, 1813.

The report, which is from the *Cork Mercantile Chronicle*, states that a mistake having delayed the attendance of the press, they found Mr. O’Connell speaking.

“ He proceeded to say that in whatever point of view he considered the protest, signed by several of the Roman Catholics of the county and city, the resignation of several members of the Board, and the consequent division between them and the body at large, he would say it was to him a source of regret, because he was well assured, and well convinced, that unanimity was strength, and division weakness.

“ Ireland would never have fallen from the pinnacle of grandeur upon which she stood as a nation but for the division of her children ; and it was often said—he hoped, not truly—that if any Irishman were put to the torture, another would be found to turn the wheel. He did not, even upon reviewing these divisions and distractions, and the steps taken by the protestors, yet give up the idea of beholding a spirit of conciliation pervade the Catholics of the county and city of Cork ; he sincerely hoped they would see the necessity of union and harmony, and that every man would discharge his duty by his country ; and if the seceders obstinately refused to return to their post, he knew the gentlemen composing the present Board, having the confidence and support of the people, would transact the affairs of the great body of the Catholics, and dis-



charge the great trust reposed in them, with honour, dignity, and integrity; and the public would not ultimately have to regret either the secession of supposed friends or real enemies.

“ Amongst the signatures to the requisition of the Board, and to those of the protest he was alluding to, he saw those of several of the most respectable and enlightened men of the county and city; and why those characters have seceded from the general wish was yet to be ascertained.

“ Was it because they objected to the 13th resolution, passed at the aggregate meeting? No, it could not be; because this resolution, which was one of thanks to Doctor Milner, was seconded by James Roche, one of the most independent members of the late Board.

“ Was it, then, on account of the 14th resolution, which was one of thanks to Mr. John Magee, the independent proprietor of the *Dublin Evening Post*, and offering himself the consolation of the public sympathy? No! for this resolution met the support of several members of the Board. They could not refuse their sympathy to the sufferings of a man who had, for a series of years, devoted his talents and his fortune in fighting their battles, and supporting their right to freedom—a man who had embarked his fame on the success of their cause, and for which he ultimately brought upon himself the vengeance of the Government. The smallest opposition to such a resolution from one of that body would afford him more real pain than the imprisonment of two years, to which he has been consigned.

“ Was it, then, in consequence of the 15th resolution, adopted at Monday’s meeting? He could not conceive it was. That resolution was seconded by Mr. T. Denehy, one of the Board, and supported by several other members of that body. This vote was one of compliment to himself. He considered that indeed it should be flattering that his poor exertions in the cause of his country met the approbation of the meeting; but much as he valued that sentiment, he would freely forego the pleasure it afforded him, if it tended in the smallest degree to create any division or disunion among the Catholic body.

“ For himself, he wished for freedom much; for his children, he wished for it more; but he sought and wished for that blessing much more for his enslaved and afflicted country. For this grand object he fought unceasingly and unremittingly, and encountered obstacles and difficulties that could, most probably, have dismayed a man of a less ardent or sanguine mind. (Great cheering).

“ He would ask, was it to the 16th resolution the Board and protestors so strongly objected? This certainly was one of the reasons that induced the resignation of the Board; and he would not have presumed

to say so, but that it was publicly avowed by the majority of that body. They declared they would not act with Counsellor Mac Donnell. He, as well as the other members of the Board, was appointed by the only legitimate authority—that is, by the voice of the people, at the aggregate meeting; and they had no right to question that appointment; neither had they the power to resign that authority with which they were invested, until they did so to the people at the next aggregate assembly. Therefore there was no legal resignation of the Board; they were still in existence as members of that body; and he still entertained the fond hope that they would surrender any irritated, disappointed, paltry feeling, at the shrine of conciliation, and as men of honour, give credit to the public voice, and return to the post they would appear to have deserted.

“ He would like to meet the members among the protestors who were security-men, and those who considered themselves *not* security-men, and who might have signed that document from other causes, in fair reasoning and argument. He would wish to give any man credit for the purity and honesty of his motives; and as a diversity of opinion existed among them, it was perfectly natural, among men exercising their own free judgments upon great national and political questions, in which all were equally interested; while he would pay his tribute of respect to their opinions, even though erroneous, he would endeavour to correct, by calm discussion and plain truths, the fallacy of their judgments and opinions.

“ He hoped there was some person present that would convey to those security-men the reasons why those securities cannot be complied with: because it would be entrusting to the hands of men who were no judges of their religion—either of its tenets or discipline—and who could feel no anxiety in its support or preservation, but the contrary, the management of its affairs, and the appointment of its hierarchy; and even though we were disposed to join the Orangemen in giving up our religion into such hands, we would not do so without the previous consent of the Pope. This the Bishops have unanimously declared; and it is out of the nature of things that the Pope could be consulted at present—and when he could, it was impossible to tell.

“ Unfortunately the Pope is under the power of Bonaparte. It is the interest of that military despot that the divisions and animosities existing in the empire should be kept alive and continued. He is proud that the Roman Catholic millions of this country should be kept in slavery, knowing that the power of England is thereby weakened; and though we did offer the securities required, we cannot, from Bonaparte's conduct hitherto, suppose him the dupe of such extreme absur-

dity and folly as to suffer any communication with the Pope which would tend to heal the divisions amongst the people of the empire.

“It was absurd to think of the idea; and it was equally absurd to press those securities (which could not be given, though we were satisfied to do so) as a bar to the freedom of a brave, loyal, and suffering people.

“There are (said Mr. O’Connell) fourteen Roman Catholic dioceses at present vacant in this country; and it is impossible to appoint bishops to them, because there can be no communication had with the Pope. His approbation is absolutely necessary; and will it be contended that those bishoprics would be continued thus vacant, if the Pope’s approbation in the appointment could be dispensed with? It is a part of the discipline of the Catholic Church that cannot be given up; and however those security-men may pant for freedom, the great body of the Catholics would not accept it in barter for their religion.

“But, say those who clamour for those securities—‘If the present Pope died, Bonaparte would undoubtedly raise to the Papal chair his uncle, Cardinal Fesch.’ Be it so. He was willing to meet them upon every fair ground. They say, if Cardinal Fesch was the Pope, he would be the creature of Bonaparte, and subject to his control; and having the nomination of the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, he would only appoint such men to that dignity as would be disaffected to the British government, and who would best suit the views of Bonaparte.

“Cardinal Fesch! who is *in disgrace* with his nephew, and *in exile*, because he opposed, and would not sanction, his marriage with his present wife!

“Was the man who thus opposed Bonaparte, and refused to lend himself to his ambitious or capricious views, likely to degrade and disgrace the Papal chair, by submitting to his will in the appointment of bishops for this country? In time of war, he could not be at all consulted for that purpose; and if peace were brought about previous to Catholic emancipation, who would expect the attainment of that measure from the British ministry?

“There were *thirty-four* bishoprics vacant in France at present, because *that same Cardinal Fesch would not submit that his nephew should have the least control in their appointment.* He would not suffer that one of them should be filled by any of his creatures; and if this be the principle by which the cardinal is governed in the country where Bonaparte rules with despotic sway, is it to be supposed that when this country shall be at peace with France, he will act upon a different principle in the appointment of bishops for this country, in which Bonaparte can have then no interest whatever?

“ Yet the British ministry demand those securities which were attached to the bill almost passed in the house of parliament—and these prepared by men who did not understand our religion; yet they undertook to regulate that which they knew nothing about, without consulting one Roman Catholic prelate, clergyman, or layman. And this was called, in this city, a charter of emancipation!!

“ We cannot surrender our religion into the hands of such men. If we were disposed, we could not do so. We will give them security, however. We will share with them our prosperity and our blood; and if they want a precedent for enacting a charter of emancipation, and for their redeeming their brethren and country from slavery and bondage, we will give them the precedent of the Diet of Hungary, who were exclusively Roman Catholic. That independent body, in 1791, granted, without veto or securities, the privileges of the state to Protestants, and every other religionists, and embraced their countrymen as brethren. This passed only twenty years ago, and it was a noble example set to other nations. Let the British act towards Irishmen with the same spirit of freedom and conciliation, and they would be found to live in the hearts of a proud, brave, and enthusiastic nation.

“ It was remarkable that amidst all the agitation of the Catholic question throughout Ireland—and he felt pride in stating it—no spirit, of disaffection was to be traced amongst its people; that though they called aloud for emancipation, they pursued their legitimate object loyally and constitutionally. At the different assizes throughout the country for the last circuit, not an individual was charged with being disaffected to the government. No; not a single person was even tried upon the Whiteboy Act; and this argued the quiet and undisturbed state of the country; and this fact he would throw in the face of the hirelings who would attempt to charge the agitators of the Catholic question with disaffection. The people of the country caught at the sympathy offered them by their agitators, and in this sympathy was peace and harmony preserved. ◆

“ He would again revert to the protestors. He could not well divine their meaning; and amongst the rest, there was one protestor who stood alone—he meant, Mr. John Boyle. Neither could he well tell what was intended by his protest. All he would say of him was, that he considered him a man endowed with talent; and if he had a little ballast with the sail, he thought he would prove a respectable and useful Irishman.

“ If those protestors succeeded to the utmost, they might form a body of one, or two, or three hundred persons—they were certainly,

in point of prosperity, men of consequence and respectability, but in point of numbers, insignificant indeed ; if they continue their desertion of the popular feeling, they will be opposed to five millions of their fellow-slaves—and they will be spoken of through Ireland with contempt—they will appear as if fighting against their country. At one period, Lord Fingal, and several of the most respectable persons seceded from the general and popular feeling, and in a very short time they found they had a sacred duty to perform, and they returned.

“He did hope that the seceders in Cork would be found to act with the like good sense—that they would return ; the present members of the Board invited them to join in the sacred cause in which all were alike interested, and have pointed out the baneful effects of disunion upon the country, at other periods of her history.

“If, however, they persevered in the desertion, he said he was convinced that the Board would hereafter be governed by the spirit of harmony towards all their brethren, that was breathed throughout the resolutions then passed ; that they would watch the interests of their cause, aided by the voice of the people by whom they were chosen, with firmness and temper, and that the protestors would be found only as flies on the wheel in its motion.

• “Mr. O’Connell then read the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth resolutions, which were put by the chairman, and carried unanimously.

“On the sixth being put, Mr. O’Connell said he hoped he would be excused saying a few words. It was not necessary to arouse the people of Cork to a sense of the obligations they owed, in unison with every Irishman, to the illustrious family of the Hutchinsons ; the last elections called their particular attention to the registry of freeholders, and they have acted upon it ; the resolutions then read would still operate as a further stimulus upon them for exertion. If the late Board had made or adopted proper arrangements previous to the election, and if a spirit of apathy had not seized them, this great and commercial city would not be represented by Dumley Longfield—nor robbed, as it was now, of its true and honest representative, the patriotic Christopher Hely Hutchinson. (Cheers).”

Mr. T. S. Coppinger and Counsellor Mac Donnell spoke strongly on the subject of Irish manufacture ; and the latter suggested that the preference of everything Irish to English should be urged on those parents who sent their sons to *England for education*.

“Counsellor O'Connell thought that would be doing much ; the sure way of doing business was to do a little at a time.

“He did condemn, as much as his learned friend, the absurd practice of sending children to be educated in England. Since the Union he knew, out of fifteen young gentlemen who had got an English education, one only to be a man of talent ; seven broke their fortunes, and others were engaged in every species of dissipation and folly. So much for the advantage of an English education. He would not have this topic form part of the resolution, as in a very short time he was convinced the evil must remedy itself.

“There was another branch of trade that deserved the notice and encouragement of the Board—he meant the cotton trade. At one period it flourished, and it was now as much depressed as any other branch of trade. The English sent over some cords and velveteens, and undersold the Irish manufacturer ; the fact was, that though the Irish goods were sold at a higher price, it was by no means dearer than the English. It was found, at the end, to be more lasting, and give much more wear than the other, yet the people were led away by the appearance of the English article and the smaller price, and therefore gave it the preference : thus this branch of trade was completely ruined.

“It only required a proper spirit amongst the people to put an end to this monopoly ; let them be taught what was of real advantage to their country, and it must flourish. It was the finest country under heaven—indented with the finest harbours, and inhabited by the bravest men in the world—and it only required the cordial co-operation of all her sons to make it the happiest country in the globe. (Cheers).

“He concluded by reminding the Board, that the day-notes would inform them who it was that imported goods from England.”

This was one of the many occasions in Mr. O'Connell's life, when he laboured in the good cause of the deserving, hard-working, and most skilful artizans of Ireland. We shall have, unfortunately, to note the failure of several such efforts—as all such *must* fail, till the vitality of industry be restored with the money and rich consumers of the country, by the repeal of the emaciating act of union.

## CHAPTER II.

As we have been speaking of relatives of Mr. O'Connell, the following brief notice of one towards whom he cherished a strong affection, will find an appropriate place here, from the *Dublin Evening Post* of Saturday, September 25, 1813:—

## " LIEUTENANT O'CONNELL.

"The successful storming of St. Sebastian (31st August), from the nature of the obstacles opposed by a scientific enemy, confessedly ranks first, in point of military achievement on the part of the allies. Many of our countrymen distinguished themselves most conspicuously upon that memorable occasion. The relatives of the fallen heroes, though under the influence of national or Spartan pride, must notwithstanding feel heart-rending grief, 'not loud but deep,' for the irreparable loss sustained in their domestic society.

"In no instance, perhaps, will this adversity be more poignantly felt than in the family of Lieutenant John O'Connell of the forty-third regiment, a near relative of the counsellor of that name, a brave and promising youth, whose talents as a soldier would indubitably, one day or other, do honour to his country, when those disabilities under which the greater part of his Majesty's Irish subjects labour should have been removed.

"He volunteered on the forlorn hope at the ever-memorable siege of Badajoz, where he was severely wounded; and on the attack on St. Sebastian, he sought a post of danger, where he gloriously fell in the arms of victory.

"The meritorious death of this young officer leads the writer of this to take notice of a circumstance well worthy of remark in the Irish character—that although a difference of political principles at home may prevail for a time, yet when their country demands their aid, every sentiment is abandoned but those of loyalty and union. Party is regarded as subordinate, or as the 'reverie of an idle dream;' all prejudice is abandoned, and nothing appears but a desire to defend the king, the country, and the constitution—thus refuting the base calumnies of some, who would say that a difference of religious opinions constitutes a difference of loyalty; and who would cloud the imagination of the young

soldier with mistaken ideas, tending only to mislead his opinions, and throw an insuperable barrier in the path of his military career."

Mr. O'Connell's affection for this gallant young man, which had been manifested in more than words—having extended to the equipping and furnishing him with all necessary matters, when joining the army—was most fervidly and devotedly reciprocated by its object.

What a condition was that of the Irish Catholic soldier at the time in question! He might fight; nay, he *did* fight, bleed, die for England—in England's wars; and the chains of his fellow-Catholics, and of his country, were all the more firmly riveted by his sacrifices!

Nay, at the present day—at *the present day*—how much better is his condition, and that of his country? As we write, our ears are still ringing with the thunder of the guns proclaiming the astonishing victories on the Sutlej—the acquisition of new Britain in India, the lists of slain and wounded are filled with empires for names of the "Papist Irishry"—and at the same moment a tyrannous coercion bill for Ireland is in progress through parliament!

As we have alluded to the pending coercion bill, a few passages in one of the newspapers from which we have been quoting will strike the reader, from their applicability to the present moment:—

"The Irish government applied this year (1813) for their celebrated insurrection bill: the British parliament granted it. They *never* passed such an act before.

"Since William the Norman, no such command had issued from any constituted authority in England. It was exactly the mandate of the Norman conqueror, put into the forms of a British statute, in the year 1813. Let the people be disarmed, and in bed by sun-set. No man shall have the right of being abroad after sun-set; but every agent of every magistracy shall have the right of forcible entry, after the shortest notice that his discretion may suggest. *His* discretion! That is, the discretion of any constable, drunk alike with liquor and loyalty!

"Why! the Norman Conqueror acted with more consideration. He knew that he was promulgating his commands to a people who could not understand his language; he therefore ordered a bell to toll



as notice to the people 'that the time of retiring had arrived.' But in this instance the parliament of England issued its command, requiring the Irish, without any external signal or notice, instantly to conform to an extraordinary and incredible restriction.

"There never was a measure in any civilized country more severe and less necessary. *It invests the Lord Lieutenant with a tyranny the most absolute that man could exercise.*

"The people complain. Either they have cause or they have not. If they have not cause for complaint, why should the government give them cause, by suspending the constitution? If they have cause for complaint, why should you give them greater cause, by suspending the constitution?"

Thirty-three years ago, the foregoing was written; and is not the whole charge of the Repealers against England substantiated by the fact, that these sentences are as directly applicable to-day—are as justified and warranted by the fact at this moment, as when written in 1813? Nay, strictures even more bitter and stronger worded, are due to the present instance of mis-legislation.

Under the measure brought forward this year (1846) by the government, we find a license of tyranny given to the Lord-Lieutenant far exceeding that which drew forth the superlatives of the indignant newspaper writer in 1813. It is now proposed to give the head of the Irish executive power, not only to proclaim a district, but any part of a neighbouring district that he may judge it convenient so to do; *and to levy what fine he likes, by what tools or instruments he chooses, from the wretched occupants of the soil—(landlords, and all owners in possession, being carefully saved exempt)—in the district or districts that he may so have chosen, of his own sovereign will and pleasure, to proclaim!*

How long is this to go on? *For very shame, ought this to be the legislation for Ireland, at the end of forty-five years, that England has had to shew her wisdom, her superior knowledge of managing the affairs of other nations—her greatness of soul—her benevolence!!!*

During the progress of the autumn, Catholic meetings were held in various parts of Ireland besides those already noticed;

and resolutions similar in substance to what had been passed elsewhere, were universally adopted.

Mr. O'Connell's conduct, therefore, in respect of the Veto question, at the trial of Magee, and all other occasions that he had come before the public, was stamped with the seal of general approbation and concurrence.

Late in October, he returned to Dublin, in time to attend the second meeting of the Catholic Board, after its re-assembling for the winter "*campaign*."

Richard Shiel—the present Right Honourable Richard Lalor Shiel, M.P. for Dungarvan, and late Vice-President of the Board of Trade, was now beginning to appear more frequently at these meetings; and at that now in question one instance, though a slight one, occurred, of those temporary differences which for a period were occasionally visible between him and Mr. O'Connell, giving rise to excited feelings, that have long since subsided into the warmest and most permanent feelings of mutual regard and affection.

The trifling instance we allude to was a dispute about the power of the Catholic Board to alter, and, with such alteration, definitively adopt, in the name of the Catholic public, resolutions and a form of petition, which had previously been submitted to an aggregate meeting, and there decided upon.

Mr. Shiel made, however, very little resistance to Mr. O'Connell's proposition on this occasion, and the altered resolutions and petitions were adopted; and means ordered to be taken for giving them circulation, and procuring signatures.

On Saturday, October 30th, 1813, there was an animated discussion of some length respecting a Mr. Kennedy, whose conduct there, and at the Kilkenny Catholic Board, had excited serious animadversion. As usual, Mr. O'Connell contrived to get the Board and the individual out of the unpleasant circumstances in which they were mutually involved, without sacrifice on the part of either.

In this, the highest and most difficult part of the duties of a popular leader, Mr. O'Connell's tact has been confessedly pre-eminent throughout his career.

His efforts have, however, sometimes been neutralized by the obstinacy of one or other of the parties involved in the dispute of the moment; and in the case before us they were rendered nought by Mr. Kennedy's very unwise perseverance in forcing himself and his deeds upon the notice of the Board at their next meeting, 5th November. The result was a complete establishment of the charges made against him by the Kilkenny Board, and an invitation to him to consider himself no longer a member of that of Dublin.

On the next following Saturday, Mr. O'Connell proposed a resolution for general adoption by the Catholics of Ireland, declaring against the introduction of any measure into Parliament, affecting in any way Catholic discipline, without previous examination and approval of it by the Catholic prelates.

His object was to endeavour to smoothen the way to the mistaken "*security*"-men to return to Catholic agitation; and so to effect a restoration of entire harmony in the Catholic body. But a violent opposition having arisen to the resolution, on the ground that it might be interpreted as an indirect approval of some form of "*securities*," Mr. O'Connell, though unconvinced of its having any such tendency, withdrew it, and so had to abandon for a season the hope of restoring unanimity to the popular councils.

On the 19th of November, the unfortunate John Magee was brought up in custody to plead in the King's Bench to an indictment for publishing the resolutions of the Kilkenny Catholics, in which, while complimenting him and his counsel, they assailed the Duke of Richmond.

The Attorney-General strongly opposed Mr. O'Connell's motion to the court, that Mr. Magee, who had entered his plea of "not guilty," should be allowed to "traverse in prox," in the usual way.

Mr. Justice Day ineffectually suggested to the Attorney-General the fitness of acceding, if for no other reason than the advanced state of the term, and pressure of business.

"ATTORNEY-GENERAL (SAURIN)—'My lord, I certainly will not consent. If counsel for the traverser can show, that in point of law, he has the

right, I shall bow with submission; but if not, I consider it most material, as well to the public justice of this country, as to the administration of the law, that the trial be proceeded on as speedily as possible.'

"MR. O'CONNELL—'It is clearly the right of the subject, in cases of misdemeanour, to traverse *in proæ*; and Mr. Justice Day will please to recollect that at the last summer assizes of the county of Monaghan, where he presided as judge, several persons who had been indicted for a riot and assault, availed themselves of the right we now contend for, and had their trials postponed till the next assizes.

"'The case of "the King *v.* M. O'Connor," indicted for a misdemeanour, before the Chief Baron, was another recent instance where the practice was recognized and adopted.

"'It is laid down in the 4th vol. of "Blackstone's Commentaries," that it is usual to try all felons immediately, or soon after their arraignment; but it is not customary, nor agreeable to the general course of proceedings—unless by consent, or where the defendant is actually in gaol—to try persons indicted for smaller misdemeanours at the same court in which they have pleaded not guilty, or traversed the indictment.

"'Mr. Justice Blackstone does not say that it *may* not be done—but he declares that it was not customary nor agreeable to the course of legal proceedings. It is for the counsel for the crown to show that there exists a legal distinction in the practice between the term and the assizes—both being, in contemplation of law, considered only as one day.'

"Mr. Perrin, in support, cited 'the great Anglesea case,' in which one of the witnesses having been indicted for perjury, Baron Mountenay held that though justice required an immediate trial, yet the traverser, being indicted for a misdemeanour, had a *right* to postpone.

"MR. O'CONNELL—'It would be impossible for his client to be prepared. Mr. Townshend had said the court might issue its *precipe*, and order a jury to be returned in five minutes.'

"Mr. Townshend begged the learned gentleman's pardon—he *said no such thing*. What he had said was, that the court might issue its *precipe*, and direct a jury to 'be returned *instantèr*!'

"Mr. O'Connell would not argue the point of distinction between the great space of time of *instantèr* and *five minutes*—but he would contend that the crime of *wilful and corrupt perjury* was more atrocious than that of a supposed libel for publishing resolutions, which he presumed the traverser had never seen until they were in print."

"Mr. Justice Day, and Mr. Justice Osborne considered that the practice applied only to assizes, or quarter sessions; and the Attorney-General then pressed that Wednesday, the 24th of the month, should be fixed.

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘There are no less than eleven counts contained in the indictment—eleven *distinct* offences charged in it. The transaction arising in Kilkenny, at a considerable distance from town, it will be quite impossible for Mr. Magee to be prepared on so short a notice.’”

Remonstrance, however, was useless—the Attorney-General persisting in his appointment.

Mr. Magee’s appearance the day on which the foregoing proceedings took place, was much remarked upon. His confinement had evidently impaired his health; and might have induced some feeling of mercy in the breast even of an ordinarily hard-hearted man. But they were tigers that managed Irish affairs then, and nothing but hunting their victims down to the death could allay their savage appetites.

We postpone Catholic meetings, proceedings, &c., to follow out the history of the hunt.

On Wednesday, the 24th November, the traverser was duly brought up again, for the purpose of taking his trial for the alleged libel on the Duke of Richmond, in the Kilkenny resolutions of the 4th of August: *and also*

“To hear the judgment of the court on the motion made to set aside the verdict in his former prosecution!”

The latter scent was first harked upon; and the leading bloodhound, the Chief Justice, delivered, at considerable length, the opinion of the court—that the verdict ought to stand; and ordered the traverser (who had been in Kilmainham since the preceding term) to be brought up on the next Saturday, to receive sentence.

A conversation then occurred as to affidavits in mitigation, on the one side, and aggravation, on the other, of the impending sentence; and the Attorney-General,

“Still cheering on the prey,”

strongly urged that the very next day should be fixed for bringing his victim up.

Some glimmerings of humanity, or more likely of shame, awoke in the Chief Justice's breast, at the earnest appeal of Mr. O'Connell, against the unfairness of not allowing some little time to the prisoner to answer the affidavit of the prosecution; and the *great* indulgence was conceded of *two days* for that purpose.

Mr. O'Connell then addressed himself to the argument respecting the traverser's right to *traverse in prox* in the matter of the indictment for the Kilkenny resolutions.

“The Court of King's Bench, he said, had, from the earliest period, recognized the practice as the right of the subject—a right never violated but once, during the reign of James II.; and restored again early in the reign of his successor, William III. The instance he alluded to was the celebrated case of the seven bishops.”

The Chief Justice interposed, that if the court had decided the question the previous day, it ought not now to be re-opened.

Mr. Justice Osborne set him right as to the fact of its not having been decided; and said the counsel had then seemed unprepared, and that the motion was fully open to further discussion.

Mr. O'Connell in continuation:—

“In Chief Baron Gilbert's ‘History of the Common Pleas,’ chap. 4, p. 143, your lordships will find it thus laid down.

“This was plainly the ancient practice; because there was no continuance from the appearance day to the time of declaring, there being no precedent of *libertas narrandi*; therefore the declaration must be of the same term. But in the King's Bench, when a defendant comes in on a criminal process, which is supposed to issue on a complaint to, and by examination of, the Chief Justice, the defendant is not discharged till the second term after his appearance; for in the first term, all parties concerned might possibly not have notice.

“When a man comes in on criminal process, he had liberty to *traverse in prox* (it is strange, said Mr. O'Connell, here pausing in his reading—it is strange how Lord Chief Baron Gilbert could have used this phrase, which the Attorney-General lately stigmatised as so *vulgar*!) on all bailable offences, because he might not be prepared for trial with his witnesses; but it was otherwise in capital cases, because there was oath of the crime, &c., &c.

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘There are no less than eleven counts contained in the indictment—eleven *distinct* offences charged in it. The transaction arising in Kilkenny, at a considerable distance from town, it will be quite impossible for Mr. Magee to be prepared on so short a notice.’ ”

Remonstrance, however, was useless—the Attorney-General persisting in his appointment.

Mr. Magee’s appearance the day on which the foregoing proceedings took place, was much remarked upon. His confinement had evidently impaired his health; and might have induced some feeling of mercy in the breast even of an ordinarily hard-hearted man. But they were tigers that managed Irish affairs then, and nothing but hunting their victims down to the death could allay their savage appetites.

We postpone Catholic meetings, proceedings, &c., to follow out the history of the hunt.

On Wednesday, the 24th November, the traverser was duly brought up again, for the purpose of taking his trial for the alleged libel on the Duke of Richmond, in the Kilkenny resolutions of the 4th of August: *and also*

“To hear the judgment of the court on the motion made to set aside the verdict in his former prosecution!”

The latter scent was first harked upon; and the leading bloodhound, the Chief Justice, delivered, at considerable length, the opinion of the court—that the verdict ought to stand; and ordered the traverser (who had been in Kilmainham since the preceding term) to be brought up on the next Saturday, to receive sentence.

A conversation then occurred as to affidavits in mitigation, on the one side, and aggravation, on the other, of the impending sentence; and the Attorney-General,

“Still cheering on the prey,”

strongly urged that the very next day should be fixed for bringing his victim up.

Some glimmerings of humanity, or more likely of shame, awoke in the Chief Justice's breast, at the earnest appeal of Mr. O'Connell, against the unfairness of not allowing some little time to the prisoner to answer the affidavit of the prosecution; and the *great* indulgence was conceded of *two days* for that purpose.

Mr. O'Connell then addressed himself to the argument respecting the traverser's right to *traverse in prox* in the matter of the indictment for the Kilkenny resolutions.

"The Court of King's Bench, he said, had, from the earliest period, recognized the practice as the right of the subject—a right never violated but once, during the reign of James II.; and restored again early in the reign of his successor, William III. The instance he alluded to was the celebrated case of the seven bishops."

The Chief Justice interposed, that if the court had decided the question the previous day, it ought not now to be re-opened.

Mr. Justice Osborne set him right as to the fact of its not having been decided; and said the counsel had then seemed unprepared, and that the motion was fully open to further discussion.

Mr. O'Connell in continuation:—

"In Chief Baron Gilbert's 'History of the Common Pleas,' chap. 4, p. 143, your lordships will find it thus laid down.

"This was plainly the ancient practice; because there was no continuance from the appearance day to the time of declaring, there being no precedent of *libertas narrandi*; therefore the declaration must be of the same term. But in the King's Bench, when a defendant comes in on a criminal process, which is supposed to issue on a complaint to, and by examination of, the Chief Justice, the defendant is not discharged till the second term after his appearance; for in the first term, all parties concerned might possibly not have notice.

"When a man comes in on criminal process, he had liberty to *traverse in prox* (it is strange, said Mr. O'Connell, here pausing in his reading—it is strange how Lord Chief Baron Gilbert could have used this phrase, which the Attorney-General lately stigmatised as so *vulgar*!) on all bailable offences, because he might not be prepared for trial with his witnesses; but it was otherwise in capital cases, because there was oath of the crime, &c., &c.



“ He (Mr. O’Connell) admitted that the case of the seven bishops was contrary to these principles ; but even then one of the judges, Mr. Justice Powel, differed with the rest of the court, and preserved his integrity during that infamous and depraved reign, when every case between the king and the subject was decided by the other three judges against the liberty of the subject.

“ There was another case, in 2nd Salkeld, page 515, to which he would call their lordships’ attention :—‘ King’s Bench, Michaelmas Term, 1st of William and Mary.—If a man be bound by recognizance to appear on the first day of term, and is charged on his appearance with an information, in case the information be laid in Middlesex, the party has time to plead during all that term, so that it cannot come to trial in the term; but in case it be laid in any *other county*, the party shall have time to plead till the next term; for he is as much concerned to defend himself in those cases as in any civil action; and since the law allows him counsel, the law likewise allows him time to consult with them : *for not to allow the means of defence, is to take away the subject’s defence.* Otherwise it is in *capital cases*; but note—in these cases there are no counsel, &c. &c. (Decided *per curiam*, contrary to the case of the seven bishops.’ ”)

Mr. O’Connell then cited the 37th Geo. III. c. 30, to the same point; and concluded by observing that both the common and the statute law “ had recognized the right of the subject, *in vulgar epithets*—according to the Attorney-General—to *traverse in proz.*”

The Attorney-General replied, citing cases in support of his position.

He failed, however, even with that court; and the trial was ordered to stand over to Monday, the 31st day of January, 1814.

But the victim was not to escape. The other matter came on at the appointed time. The following is a brief account :—

The Attorney-General commenced with referring in strong terms to the whole course of the defence of Mr. Magee, since the beginning of the prosecutions—or rather *persecutions*—most particularly Mr. O’Connell’s speeches in defence, which closed our last volume, which he characterised in the most violent terms. He urged in aggravation of sentence Mr. Magee’s publication of the speech in question, and declaration of approval of it.

The Attorney-General did his utmost also to enlist the personal feelings of the Chief Justice, by drawing his attention to Mr. O'Connell's scarcely-indirect charges against him on the occasion mentioned. The following was Mr. O'Connell's reply :—

" COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

" SATURDAY, 27TH NOV. 1813.

" *The Attorney-General's Motion in Aggravation of Sentence on Mr. Magee, for publishing a Report of the Trial of THE KING, at the Prosecution of HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF RICHMOND against JOHN MAGEE, Proprietor of the ' Dublin Evening Post.'*

" MR. O'CONNELL—' I am sure, my lords, that every gentleman present will sympathise in the emotions I now experience. I am sure no gentleman can avoid feeling the deepest interest in a situation in which it is extremely difficult to check the strongest resentment, but quite impossible to give that resentment utterance in the severity of language suited to its cause and provocation. Yet, even here, do I yield in nothing to the Attorney-General. I deny, in the strongest terms, his unfounded and absurd claim to superiority. I am his equal, at least, in birth—his equal in fortune—his equal, certainly, in education; and as to talent, I should not add that, but there is little vanity in claiming equality. And thus meeting him on the firm footing of undoubted equality, I do rejoice, my lords—I do most sincerely rejoice—that the Attorney-General has prudently treasured up his resentment since July last, and ventured to address me in this court in the unhand-some language he has used, because my profound respect for this temple of the law enables me here to overcome the infirmity of my nature, and to listen with patience to an attack which, had it been made elsewhere, would have met merited CHASTISEMENT.

" JUSTICE DALY—' Eh! What is that you say?'

" JUSTICE OSBORNE, with much apparent emotion—' I at once declare, I will not sit here to listen to such a speech as I have seen reported. Take care of what you say, sir.'

" MR. O'CONNELL—' My lord, what I say is, that I am delighted at the prudence of the Attorney-General, in having made that foul assault upon me here, and not elsewhere, because my profound respect for the bench overcomes now those feelings which, elsewhere, would lead me to do what I should regret—to break the peace in chastising him.'

" JUSTICE DALY—' *Chastising!* The Attorney-General! If a criminal information were applied for on that word, we should be bound to grant it.'

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘I meant, my lords, that elsewhere thus assailed, I should be carried away by my feelings to do that which I should regret—to go beyond the law—to inflict corporal punishment for that offence, which I am here ready, out of consideration for the court, to pardon.’

“JUSTICE OSBORNE—‘I will take the opinion of the court whether you shall not be committed.’

“CHIEF JUSTICE—‘If you pursue that line of language, we must call upon some other of the counsel at the same side to proceed.’

“JUSTICE DAY—‘Now, Mr. O’Connell, do not you perceive that, while you talk of suppressing those feelings, you are actually indulging them? The Attorney-General could not mean you offence in the line of argument he pursued to enhance the punishment, in every way, of your client. It is unnecessary for you to throw off, or to repel, aspersions that are not made on you.’

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘My lord, I thank you—I sincerely thank you. It relieves my mind from a load of imputation when I hear such high authority as that of your lordship kindly declaring that it did not apply to me. And yet, my lord, what did the Attorney-General mean when he called a question a senseless and shameless question? What did he mean when he—he, my lord—talked of low and vulgar mind? What did he mean when he imputed to the advocate participation in the crime of the client? This he distinctly charged me with. All I require from the court is the same liberty to reply with which the Attorney-General has been indulged in attack. All I ask is, to be suffered to answer and repel the calumnies with which I have been assailed.’

“JUSTICE DALY—‘You shall have the same liberty that he had; but the Court did not understand him to have made any personal attack upon you.’

“JUSTICE OSBORNE—‘We did not understand that the Attorney-General meant you, when he talked of a participator in the crime of your client.’

“ATTORNEY-GENERAL—‘I did not, my lords. I certainly did not mean the gentleman. To state that I did would be to misrepresent my meaning, which had nothing to do with him.’

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘Well, my lords, be it so; I rejoice, however, that this charge is thus publicly disavowed, and disavowed in the presence of those who heard his words originally, and who have heard me repel any attack made upon me. I rejoice to find that your Lordships have interposed your opinion that no personal attack has been made upon me, and thus have rendered unnecessary any further comment on what had flowed from the Attorney-General. I am, therefore, enabled at once to go into the discussion of the merits of my client’s case. And now let me first solemnly and seriously protest against the manner in which

the Attorney-General seeks to aggravate the punishment. It is by introducing into the affidavit of the attorney for the prosecution, passages from the speech of counsel at the trial. These, perhaps, are times in which it may be desired by him, as it certainly is safe for him, to make bad precedents. But against this precedent I enter my earnest, my honest, my independent protest. My protest may, for the present, be disregarded; but it will accompany the precedent in future times, and if not destroy, perhaps mitigate, its evil effects. I therefore do protest against it, on behalf of the bar, and on behalf of the public. What! is the Bar of Ireland to be thus degraded, that it shall be permitted to the inferior branches of the profession, to every attorney in the hall, to drag into affidavits the names of counsel, and their discourses for their clients? If it be permitted against a defendant in a criminal case, it must be equally, or rather more liberally, allowed to civil suits. There will, in future, be no motion for a new trial without introducing the name of counsel, and his exertions for his client, and perhaps his politics—perchance his religion! We shall be subject to a commentary upon the Oath of Attorneys. The debate on motions will not be what the pleadings state, or what the witnesses swore, or what law was laid down by the judge; but the discussion will turn upon the speech of the counsel, what it was he said, what he thought. A meaning will be affixed, by an attorney's swearing, upon every sentence of the counsel, and he shall not dare to describe crime, or to pourtray criminality, lest the general description of offence may be transmuted by the oath of an attorney into particular and powerful individuals; and whilst he ought to have his mind at complete liberty to look for all the topics to serve the cause of his clients, and to confute the arguments of his adversary, he will in future be fettered and encumbered by the dread of exposing himself to the imputations of the adverse attorney, and the compliments of the bench. I do not think any gentleman ought to condescend to advocate a cause under such circumstances, or that he could continue high-minded and worthy of his rank in society, if he were to submit to such degradation. Against this practice now, for the first time, attempted to be introduced—against the first but mighty stride to lessen the dignity of an honourable profession, I proclaim my distinct, unequivocal, and solemn dissent. But the privileges of the bar, however interesting to a numerous and respectable class of men, sink into insignificance when contrasted with the rights of the public. The public have a right to the free, unbiassed, and unintimidated exertions of the profession. If the bar be controlled—if the bar be subjugated—if the profane hand of the Attorney-General may drag the barrister from the high station of responsibility in which he is at present placed, and call for censure on the

client for the conduct of the barrister, then indeed will it be quite safe for power to oppress and to plunder the inhabitants of the land ; in vain shall the subject look for a manly advocate, if he is to be exposed to the insolent mockery of a trial of himself in the shape of an attack upon his client. How are the powerful to be resisted ? How are the great to be opposed when they menace injustice ? Certainly not by the advocate who fears that whilst he endeavours to serve his client he shall injure himself ; certainly not by the barrister who has reason to apprehend that his language, being distorted in an attorney's affidavit, will expose him to censure from those to whom he cannot reply. It is the first interest of the public that the bar shall be left free. No inconvenience can result from this freedom, because it is always subject to the discretion of the judge who presides at the trial. He has it in his power to stop any proceeding inconsistent with propriety ; but if he does not interfere at the trial when the advocate could defend himself and assert his right, what authority has been found to warrant an appeal to a future court, in order to punish that which ought not to have been prevented ? In short, the public are deeply interested in our independence ; their properties, their lives, their honours, are entrusted to us, and if we, in whom such a guardianship is confided, be degraded, how can we afford protection to others ? Lessened in our own esteem, habituated to insult, we shall dwindle in talent as in character ; and, if the talent may remain, it will be simply useless to the oppressed, greatly serviceable to the oppressor. For the public, therefore, who may easily be enslaved, if the bar be debased, I again enter my solemn protest against this bad precedent. For myself, I have scarce a word to say ; talents I do not possess, but I never will yield the freedom of thought and of language—I never will barter or abandon the independence of the profession. It may injure me ; I know it will injure me, and I care not ; but as long as I belong to the Irish bar, I will be found open, decided, manly, independent. Unawed by the threats or frowns of power, holding in sovereign contempt the vile solicitations of venality, and determined to do my duty in despite of every risk, personal and public—the enemy of every oppression and fraud—the unalterable friend to freedom. I have a fault—I know it well—in the eyes of the attorney-general. The spirit that invented the inquisition exists in human nature ; that there was an inquisition proves the existence in nature of an inquisitorial spirit. Nature is not calumniated when she is charged with all the atrocity of bigotry in design and action ; and towards me that design has an object that is easily understood. To check the Popish advocate may, in the eyes of the attorney-general, be a work equally pious and prudent ; but the proudest feelings of contempt may defeat his intention and place me

above the reach of malevolence. From myself and from this strange precedent, I come to the case of my client. It is my duty to show your Lordship that the matters stated for aggravation ought not to affect my client. It would be unjust—it would be cruel—it would be atrocious to punish him by reason of the controversy into which I have been driven; that, I am sure, the court ought not, and therefore will not do. Neither can you punish him for publishing his trial. It is admitted that his report is a true report of the trial; the truth of the report is not even controverted; and having this fact admitted, that he has given a true report, the law is clear; it is clear no indictment or information, nor any criminal process can be maintained against a person who publishes a true report of our proceedings in our courts, nor does any civil action lie for such report. It is laid down in 2 Hawk. 354, that nothing is a libel, or can become the subject matter of a criminal prosecution as such, which occurs in the course of proceeding in a court of justice; and the case of *Astley v. Young* in 2 Burr. has settled that no civil action will lie for anything that so occurs; there is but one case in the books where a contrary doctrine was held, and that case is just one of those bad precedents which, though triumphantly established at the time, are soon rendered obsolete and unavailing by the abhorrence of every rational man. It is the case of the *King v. Williams* in 2 Show. It was an indictment against Sir William Williams, for having published, by order of the House of Commons, "*Dangerfield's Narrative of the Meal Tub Plot.*" Such was the horror which the wise people of England entertained of the Pope in his proper person; or at least some conspiracy to re-establish his authority had been discovered close concealed in a meal-tub, and the House of Commons catching and propagating the delusion, ordered the narrative of this terrific plot to be printed and circulated throughout the country. It was for this publication that Sir William Williams, the speaker of the commons, was indicted in the first year of King James. If your Lordships take the trouble of looking into the report, you will find that the counsel for the defendant, Mr. Pollexfen, a man who deserves the admiration of posterity, for he, at that despotic period, had the courage to attempt to stem the torrent of unrelenting persecution at the bar, and overbearing and iniquitous intolerance of the bench; he, the counsel for the defendant, was interrupted by the bench, and not suffered to defend his client as his case merited to be defended. I admit that the case of Sir William Williams determined that the high court of parliament itself had no right to sanction the publication of any part of its proceedings which contained matter in itself libellous. But fortunately the authority of that case has been completely exploded, even by the modern Court of King's

Bench in the time of Lord Kenyon, in the case of *The King v. T. Wright*, in 8 Term Reports, 293 : it was a favourable circumstance ; that was an application on behalf of the late Mr. Horne Tooke. Mr. Tooke, in 1794, had been acquitted of high treason, and yet, in 1799, the House of Commons adopted the report of a committee, and ordered it to be printed, stating in substance, that although Mr. Tooke had been acquitted, yet that the evidence adduced at his trial showed him to be guilty. The order of the house, however, was, that the report should be printed for the use of the members. Wright, the defendant, printed it for public circulation, and he therefore had no protection from the order of the house but the general protection which every man has, to publish the written documents laid before that house. For this publication, grossly reflecting on Mr. Tooke, and accusing him of a crime, of which a jury of his country acquitted him, he applied to the King's Bench for a criminal information relying on the case of *The King v. Williams*, as only not in point, because much stronger. The court refused the information, and declared the case of *The King and Williams not to be law*. Judge Grose, upon that occasion, said these words :—"The case of Williams occurred in the worst of times, and is a disgrace to a court of justice ;" and Judge Laurence declared, "that no information could be granted for publishing a true statement of the proceedings in a court of justice, although it may in itself contain a libel—and no matter of law, for," said he, "it is of vast importance to the public that the proceedings of a court of justice should be universally known. The general advantage to the country in having those proceedings made public more than counterbalances the inconvenience to individuals." Such is the law—such is the doctrine laid down by a court which could not be reproached with any overweening propensity to popular rights or popular opinions. Nor is this case shook, or its authority weakened by the case before Lord Ellenborough, reported in 7th East, 493, under the fictitious names of *Nokes v. Styles* ; on the contrary, the principle is distinctly recognized and admitted, and that case was decided as an exception, by being beyond the principle, and not a true report of judicial proceedings. I do, therefore, lay it down as clear law, that no indictment or information, or action could be sustained for publishing this report of the trial ; which report the Attorney-General seeks to convert into an aggravation of punishment, that is, of course, an increase of punishment—that is, a double punishment : punishment for the original libel, for which the defendant has been found guilty, and punishment for this report, of which not only has the defendant not been found guilty, but for which he could not legally be put on any trial. It is no offence, in point of law, yet the defendant is to be punished, in point of

fact, for it. In point of law, the Attorney-General could not prosecute him for this publication. If he indicted him, I would demur to the indictment; and still for this report, upon which he could obtain no conviction or judgment, does he call on the court to inflict a sentence! No jury could convict the defendant of this publication; but the Attorney-General requires a vote of the court to be substituted for the verdict of a jury, and sentence to be pronounced upon that vote, when no verdict could sustain a judgment. It is abhorrent to law, and detestable to common sense, that a man should suffer twice for one crime; but this is a case in which it is sought that Mr. Magee should suffer twice—once for what is in law a crime, and once for what is not a crime in law or in fact—that is, he is to be punished in the second instance, although the law admits his innocence. It is not that detestable thing, double punishment, for one offence—it is this greater atrocity that is sought for by the Attorney-General, a punishment for no offence. This court is bound, by every principle and every feeling, to resist the solicitation of the Attorney-General, and not to punish a man for that which the law has sanctioned. But suppose I am wrong, and that this report is, in itself, a libel: then let the Attorney-General indict for it; and if he can convict, let him call for sentence. If it be indictable, the consequence may be, first, that he procures an increase of punishment for it in this instance; and secondly, that he afterwards, upon an indictment, procures a sentence for the same publication! Out of this dilemma the court cannot be relieved. If this be no offence, you have no right to punish for it; if it be an offence, you ought not to leave it in the power of the Attorney-General to punish twice for it. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to follow the Attorney-General through the matter which the affidavit of the attorney for the prosecution contains; and I do it slightly, and merely to show how little my client has to answer for with regard to those. The affidavit sets out three passages from my speech in the defence of Mr. Magee: the first relates to the Attorney-General directly and by name; the second consists of a passage addressed to the jury, upon their impartiality; and the third, the attorney who made the affidavit swears he believes alluded to one of your lordships. It is said that Mr. Magee ought to have made an affidavit to contradict that of the prosecutor's attorney; how could he contradict that affidavit? The attorney swears he believes the passage has a certain meaning; and how could any person swear that the attorney does not so believe? If he had given us the reasons of his belief, he might be possibly contradicted in fact, or confuted in reasoning. But look unto the passage, and you will find that it expressly states an imaginary case; and wretched indeed must be the state of the bar and the client, if the paint-



ings of the imagination of counsel are to be reduced in shape and form, and embodied into an array against the client. I disdain being a party to any such degradation; I should feel disgraced if I were to offer an explanation upon this topic. Then with respect to the passage relative to the jury: it was my duty, and my client's interest, to speak to them candidly; and the passage in question does not hinge more than merely to state what would be the conduct of an impartial and unbiassed jury upon such an occasion, and to contrast that conduct with what we had to apprehend from a jury of a different complexion. I will not, indeed, condescend to vindicate the passage. The manner of procuring the attention of a jury to the defence of the client, is the privilege as well as the duty of the counsel, and the client was never yet made responsible for the mode in which counsel effectuates that purpose. The remaining passages relate to what was said of the Attorney-General himself. He has read for you that part in which, as counsel for Mr. Magee, I proclaimed (after an apology for the coarseness of the expression), any man who charged the Catholic people of Ireland with treasonable or revolutionary sentiments, to be a *liar*. You will, upon reading the entire of the passage, find that it is a reply to what fell from the Attorney-General—it is a mere answer to his speech. He indulged in extraneous topics, and as, counsel for the defendant, I felt it my duty to follow him.'

“JUSTICE DAY—‘You have no affidavit for the defendant stating that the Attorney-General went into extraneous topics.’

“MR. O'CONNELL—‘We have not, my lord; nor is it necessary we should: for those passages purport of themselves to be a reply to such extraneous topics—to be a reply to the Attorney-General using those topics. If those passages are to be resorted to, they must be taken altogether, and resorted to for what they purport upon the face of them to be. They purport, then, to be a reply to the Attorney-General; and I ask your lordships in what language such charges ought to be refuted? The jury was composed of what are called outrageously loyal men. It was the interest of my client, who had long been the advocate of the Catholics of Ireland, to stand well with that jury; it was his interest that his counsel should stand well with them. Besides, there was a higher and more imperative duty on the advocate—as the Catholics are, by their oaths and their allegiance to the constitution—feeling for myself the pride of disinterested loyalty—that loyalty which is the result of judgment and of principle, not the mean and abject speculation of personal gain—that loyalty which would equally maintain the safety of the throne and the liberty of the people, and not that canting, peculating loyalty which seeks to enrich itself by cringing submission to the power-

ful, and insulting oppression to the weak and humble. With the fire of genuine and constitutional loyalty about me, I did brand with the harsher expressions known to the language, the man who should presume to impeach the allegiance of the Irish Catholic, or mine own; and I will even proclaim as a liar, the man who makes that charge, whether he boldly and directly charges it, or contents himself with mean insinuation of its truth. Thus much I have said rather for myself than for the defendant, for in the extravagant shape of the present proceeding, I have the air of being on my trial and not my client; and I confess there is some justice in this. It was I who spoke the speech—it was I who urged these topics of defence—why should my client be punished for it? It was I who commented freely on the Attorney-General, and addressed the jury as I deemed best—why should Mr. Magee suffer for my acts?—why should he be punished for the boldness of my language? Is it because he sat in silence, and did not interrupt me? Why, his lordship, the Chief Justice, who presided at the trial, saw me there—he heard me, I presume, as well as Mr. Magee; the counsel for the crown heard me, and did not interrupt me; your lordship heard me, and did not interrupt me—I beg pardon, you did interrupt me once, and then I was able easily to satisfy your lordship of my right to reply to the Attorney-General. If there were any objection to what was said—if the line of reasoning or comment I pursued was objectionable or faulty, the trial was the time to have noticed it—it was the time peculiarly and exclusively suited for such notice; and it is due as well to the traverser as to the prosecutor, to take that and no other time for the investigation of the propriety of the defence. It is *then* that the counsel for the defendant can be best prepared to vindicate the line for defence. The assertions of the antagonist, his conduct at the trial, are then fresh in the recollection of the counsel and the court—all the subject is in the possession of the counsel for the traverser. The judge himself can then best determine—the counsel for the traverser can then best maintain his right—a doubtful or ambiguous sentiment can then be easily explained, and made to bear only its precise and proper meaning; in short, every view of the case will clearly show that the trial is the proper, and indeed the only proper place to investigate the rights of the parties, the privileges of the counsel, and, in fact, the duties of the judge. But, suppose it otherwise—suppose there does lie some new appeal to a future court—yet, surely, Mr. Magee is not to blame. There is no appeal to him from the Chief Justice; he is not bound, under peril of punishment, to be a better judge of the propriety of a defence and of the privileges of counsel than his lordship. Was it ever heard of that a private person was required, for his own safety, to avoid

an increase of punishment, demanded to superintend the conduct of the bench, and to become a censor of the judge? Must Mr. Magee be punished because he, fortified by the example of the court, listened in silence to the topics which I urged? The Attorney-General is, therefore, quite unreasonable, when he requires of the court to increase the punishment of Mr. Magee for not interrupting the discourse of his counsel. It has, however, been relied on, that Mr. Magee afterwards, in his newspaper, approved of and applauded the defence set up for him, and avowed it. My lords, I pray you see to what this amounts. In the first place, it can be nothing more than would necessarily be implied from his silence. The client is presumed to avow that defence which is made in his presence; the public avowal of it can, therefore, make no difference. Whether he speaks of it or not, the defence is his; the public avowal is no aggravation. But in the next place, see, I entreat of you, what Mr. Magee has avowed thus publicly; he has avowed the "topics of this defence;" that is the extent of his avowal. Now, the speech of his counsel—my speech, my lords, was distinctly and emphatically divided into two distinct series of topics: the latter, and lesser part, related to the defence of Mr. Magee; the former, and far greater part regarded the extravagant attack made by the Attorney-General on the Catholic population of Ireland. All the passages in the affidavit, taken from those extraneous topics, arose between the Attorney-General and myself personally; none of the passages in the affidavit relate to the series of topics in the defence, properly so called. The avowal and approbation of Mr. Magee are referrible only to the topics of defence, and not to the matters contained in the affidavit to aggravate the punishment. To his *defence* no objection has been stated; and beyond what is purely his defence he ought not, in any view of his case, be made responsible. I recapitulate, for Mr. Magee, his publication of the trial is no crime—no offence cognizable by any public tribunal; it is an act to which the law declares that no punishment is attachable. Besides, here it is sought to make him answer for what could be the fault, if fault at all, only of his counsel. And good God, what a precedent will be established, if you do so!—if you punish him for that which the zeal of his counsel urged perhaps indiscreetly—I would concede, for argument sake, improperly; but not for this ought the client to be punished; and then any approbation given by him is confined expressly to the "topics of defence;" so that upon any view of the subject, he cannot be confounded with his counsel. In short, the object—the plain object of the present proceedings is, under pretence of seeking punishment on the client, to attack the counsel. Your lordships have said that nothing personal to me was meant by the

Attorney-General; but welcome should any attack he may choose to make on me be, so you, my lords, spare the client, innocent, at least, of this default. I put his case, in this respect, on your sense of right and common justice.

“I conclude by conjuring the Court not to make this a precedent that may serve to palliate the acts of future, and, perhaps, bad times. I admit—I freely admit—the Utopian perfection of the present period. We have every thing in the best possible state; I admit the perfection of the bench—I concede that there cannot be better times, and that we have the best of all possible prosecutors. I am one of those who allow, that the things that be could not be better. But there have been heretofore bad times, and bad times may come again—there have been partial, corrupt, intemperate, ignorant, and profligate judges—the bench has been disgraced by a Bilknop, a Tressilian, a Jeffers, a Scroggs, and an Alleybown. For the present there is no danger, but, at some future period, such men may rise again, and if they do, see what an advantage they will derive from the precedent of this day, should it receive your lordships’ sanction. At such a period it will not be difficult to find a suitable attorney-general—some creature—narrow-minded, mean, calumnious, of inveterate bigotry, and dastard disposition, who shall prosecute with virulence and malignity, and delight in punishment. Such a man will, with prudent care of himself, receive merited and contemptuous retort. He will safely treasure up his resentment for four months. His virulence will, for a season, be checked by his prudence until, at some safe opportunity, it will explode by the force of the fermentation of its own putrefaction, and throw forth its filthy and disgusting stores to blacken those whom he would not venture directly to attack. Such a man will, with shameless falsehood, bring sweeping charges against the population of the land, and afterwards meanly retract and deny them; without a particle of manliness or manhood, he will talk of bluster, and bravado, and courage; and he will talk of those falsely, and where a reply would not be permitted. If such times arrive, my lords, the advocate of the accused will be sure not to meet what I should meet from your lordships this day were I so attacked; he will not meet sympathy and equal liberty of speech. No, my lords, the advocate of the accused will then be interrupted and threatened by the bench, lest he should wipe off the disgrace of his adversary—the foul and false calumnies that have been poured in on him! The advocate then will not be listened to with the patience and impartiality with which, in case of a similar attack, your lordships would listen to me. The then attorney-general may indulge the bigoted virulence and the das-

tard malignity of an ancient and irritated female, whose feelings evaporate in words; and such judges as I have described, will give him all the protection he requires; and, although at present such a dereliction of every decency which belongs to gentlemen would not be permitted, and would rouse your indignation, yet in such bad times as I have described, the foul and dastard assailant would be sure, in court and beyond it, to receive the full protection of the bench, whilst the object of his attack would be certain of meeting imprisonment and fine, were he to attempt to reply suitably. My lords, you who would act so differently—you who feel with me the atrocity of such a proceeding—you, my lords, will not sanction the attempt that has been made this day to convert the speech of counsel against the client, lest by doing so, you should afford materials for the success of any future attorney-general, as I have endeavoured to trace to you. Before I sit down, I have only to add, that I know the reply of the Solicitor-General will, as usual, be replete with talent, but I also know it will be conducted with the propriety of a gentleman, for he is a gentleman—an Irish gentleman; but great as his talents are they cannot, upon the present document, injure my client. With respect to his colleague, the Attorney-General, I have only to say that whatever relates to him in my speech, at the trial, was imperatively called for by his conduct there. As to him I have no apology to make. With respect to him I should repeat my former assertions. With respect to him I retract nothing. I repeat nothing. I never will make him any concessions. I do now, as I did then, repel every imputation. I do now, as I did then, despise and treat with perfect contempt every false calumny that malignity could invent, or dastard atrocity utter whilst it considered itself in safety.”

It was after the close of this speech of Mr. O'Connell's that Mr. Magee's repudiation of him was made.

Mr. Wallace, as counsel for the prisoner, requested to be heard before the Solicitor-General's reply; and his request being acceded to, he delivered a long and laboured argument—contending that Mr. Magee was not to be held responsible for his counsel's speech; and that even if he were, his adoption of it by the publication in his paper and as a pamphlet, should be held as a separate offence, separately to be adjudicated upon, and not to be taken without trial, as an aggravation of the former.

In the course of his speech Mr. Wallace having said :—

“ I am solicitous to avoid in any degree implicating the case of my client, Mr. John Magee, with the merit or the demerit of his counsel's speech.

“ If my learned colleague have fallen into any error or impropriety in the speech which he delivered, he has the manliness and candour, I am confident, to avow it, and to take upon himself the responsibility.”

“ MR. O'CONNELL—‘ I do not admit that I have been guilty of any impropriety.’

“ MR. WALLACE—‘ I am misunderstood if it be supposed that I mean to charge any impropriety upon Mr. O'Connell. I say only that if such impropriety *had been* committed,’ ” &c. &c.

Notwithstanding this retraction, Mr. Wallace, in discharge, it is to be supposed, of the duty his client had imposed upon him, suffered himself to be betrayed into rough language afterwards, using such expressions as “ the sins and crimes of counsel”—“ abuse of the forensic robe,” &c., and even calling on the bench to punish Mr. O'Connell for the speech, and not Mr. Magee.

There was no want of will on the part of those he addressed to punish the former as well as the latter. Neither was there, as may well be supposed, any disinclination on the part of counsel for the prosecution to press for such a course.

But prosecutor and judges well knew that Mr. O'Connell was prepared for every emergency ; and that no submission was to be expected from him. In their consciousness of the truth and justice of even the most violent portions of his address, they shrunk from exercising the somewhat doubtful power of the court in such a conflict with a fearless and a determined man. In short, to use a homely proverb, the expressiveness of which will plead its excuse, they were fearful of “ *catching a Tartar.*” “

Mr. Solicitor-General accordingly refused to draw the distinction argued for by Mr. Wallace, between counsel and client ; and solacing himself with some foul language, for

having to forego the direct attack upon Mr. O'Connell, called for the rigour of the court against Mr. Magee, for his original offence and its aggravation—his adoption, by a printed avowal in his own paper, of the philippic of counsel.

The Solicitor-General's example was imitated by the bench. Lord Chief Justice Downes, indeed, went so far as to indulge in a ludicrous expression of penitence for not having himself stopped Mr. O'Connell in mid-career.

Mr. Justice Day, in delivering judgment, had the powers of face to defend, and praise the Lord Chief Justice and the jury!

And he crowned the whole by a eulogium upon the court—as a “sober, *unimpassioned*, and *dignified* tribunal!!!”

It is, indeed, ludicrous at the present day to find such epithets applied to the whole or any portion of the Irish bench for many years after the Union. Men the most notoriously incompetent—the most notoriously partizan, disgraced that bench; placed there by the infamous governments that, under the auspices of Castlereagh and Sidmouth, afflicted poor Ireland.

Reckless hostility to the rights and liberties of the people—the most slavish subserviency to the powers that were—these, combined with just sufficient ability to render them actively mischievous to society, were the requisites for Irish judges during those hideous times.

If the praise we have cited appear now ludicrous, it was a bitter, a cruel, and most insulting mockery then.

The following was the sentence passed on Mr. Magee:—

“THE SENTENCE—BY JUSTICE DAY.

“The sentence of the court is—That you, John Magee, do pay a fine of £500 to his Majesty; that you be imprisoned for the space of two years in Newgate, to be computed from the day of conviction, and that you do find security for your good behaviour for seven years, yourself in the sum of £1,000, and two sureties in the sum of £500 each; and that you be further imprisoned until such fine be paid, and such security given.”

Reverting again to Catholic politics, we must, to avoid too great detail, pass with a brief description a meeting of the 20th of November, when the results were announced of the correspondence between the Board on the one part, and Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan on the other, relative to the course to be pursued the following session as to measures of Catholic relief.

Both Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan distinctly and definitely refused to continue in communication with the Catholic Board in this matter, on the basis proposed by the latter—namely, that no “*securities*” should be embodied in any future “Relief” Bill, without the previous knowledge and approbation of the Catholic prelates.

Both accused the Board of at least the appearance of an intention to invade the privileges of parliament, and to dictate to it by, as Lord Donoughmore worded it, “leaving a naked affirmative or dissent, as their only remaining sphere of action, to the representatives of the people and the hereditary counsellors of the crown.”

Mr. O'Connell remarked that these letters gave the opportunity to explain the *real* views and motives of the Board; and “to show that their conduct was sanctioned by the constitution, and warranted by necessity—that it was temperate and respectful; but always firm and dignified.”

He then referred to the previous meeting to show that the tenor of the resolutions had been mistaken by the noble and right honourable writers of the letters just read—that from a desire to obviate every objection, no matter how little weighty in their eyes, they had given up the intention of submitting a *draft of a bill*, confining themselves to mere suggestions, and that they did not wish in the least to interfere with the dignity, or control the judgment of those whom they addressed.

He thus continued:—

“But I beg, Mr. Chairman, to go one step further, and to contend that there is *no* dictation implied in the drawing up of a bill to be



afterwards submitted to the consideration of a member of parliament.

“Who spoke of dictation when Mr. Charles Butler, last year, prepared the frame of a bill? Lord Castlereagh, who now professes to be our ardent friend, did not call *that* dictation. No; he called for the draft of a bill, and I believe acted upon it. Is the privilege reserved for Mr. Butler, and are the Catholics of Ireland to be excluded?”

“Who spoke of dictation when Mr. Grattan procured the frame of a bill to be prepared by Mr. Burrowes, by Mr. Burton, and by Mr. Wallace? If the frame of a bill carry dictation in its train, why did our illustrious advocate risk our cause by getting that draft prepared in Ireland?”

“Or am I, in sober sadness, to inquire whether it be the Irish Popish touch that pollutes the deed, and renders that which was lauded by the minister in England, and practised by the Protestant patriot in Ireland, an act of dictation and crime in us!”

Mr. O’Connell concluded with a motion for another communication to be addressed to the noble lord and Mr. Grattan, respectfully pointing out to them their mistake as to the intentions of the Board.

Mr. O’Gorman (after two or three speakers had been heard to the same effect as Mr. O’Connell) opposed the motion; and in deference to a point of form, it was withdrawn for the day, notice being given that it would be brought forward again at the next meeting.

On that occasion (27th November) Mr. O’Connell accordingly moved it, in an altered and modified shape—namely, as “for a committee to prepare answers” to the letters in question.

He alluded to some of his former arguments; and cited the cases of Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt’s conduct towards the Catholic delegates on two occasions, to show that there would be nothing derogatory in their being listened to by private members of either house.

“It was not to be expected,” he continued, “that any one should be able so well to unravel the labyrinth, whose intricacy had caused the defects of former bills, as men whose interests and feelings had led them to make it the study of a great part of their lives, and who had been

continually in the habit of answering, as counsel, the applications of persons aggrieved by these complicated laws.

“ In short, a recurrence to the information in the hands of Catholics was the only means to prevent the same unhappy catastrophe which destroyed the fruits of last year's exertions. . . . How lamentable if the Irish people should be deprived of results almost within their grasp, by internal dissension, or by a secession from each other, which, if it were not really dissension, inflicted all the consequences of such a calamity!

“ What! shall an attorney-general be able to boast, as he did to me *this day* (Mr. O'Connell had just come from the scene of Mr. Magee's renewed persecution) that there is a party of the Catholics of Ireland attached to him! To HIM—their continual, their unwearied persecutor!!! And have there been appearances in our behaviour to each other which could give the colour of truth to such an assertion; and shall we continue to authorize it? Shall we not rather sacrifice every difference of opinion, every individual prejudice, and unite at once to spurn away the contumely with which it stains us?

“ For my own part, I have heard that some gentlemen are kept away by a fear that I may recur to the subject of an alleged promise to the Prince Regent. I utterly disclaim such an intention. I never will recur to it. In the name of my esteemed and patriot friend, George Bryan, I can also state, that he never again will mention it. Let every Irishman offer up his sacrifice on the altar of unanimity; her omnipotent spirit will receive our incense with gladness, and will guide us irresistibly through every danger, to the goal of triumph and success!

“ There are but two causes that can retard our success—disunion and distrust among ourselves; and the continuance of that unworthy prejudice among others, which degrades the Catholic to comparative insignificance in the scale of intelligent beings. . . . Is it not thought high insolence in a Popish writer to be talented?—in a Popish mechanic to exercise his profession with ingenuity? And from what other source could it arise were Catholic assistance to be refused in the formation of a bill to relieve us? Did not Mr. Wilberforce consult with the Negroes on the subject of their slavery, receive information from them, and bring the answers of the African to the bar of the House of Commons? And is the Catholic alone to labour under the stigma of mental degradation, without asserting the rights of his nature?”

The motion was carried with some discussion, but no opposition; and Lord Ffrench, who was in the chair, Mr. O'Connell

himself, and Messrs. Dromgoole, Mahon, Bryan, Scully, Finn, Owen O'Connor, Finlay, and Sir T. Esmonde appointed of the committee.

On Wednesday, December 1st, after some general business, Mr. O'Gorman called the attention of the Board to the attacks on Mr. O'Connell, for his conduct as counsel for Mr. Magee.

Nicholas Mahon warmly concurred in the opinion of Mr. O'Gorman, that it was the duty of the Catholics to come forward and repel the attacks made upon Mr. O'Connell, "by some solid and lasting memorial, which he could hand down to his latest posterity." He further styled him the "best and dearest friend of his country."

"MR. PLUNKETT had so imperatively felt that every Catholic in the land was bound to come forward and support the undaunted, incorruptible, and inflexible supporter of the Catholic people; that, although not a member of the board, he had attended that day for the sole purpose of declaring his determination to support him at the hazard of his life and fortune.

"He felt that upon this subject his powers of expression were altogether inadequate to do justice to his feelings; but he would venture to assert, without fear of contradiction, that the man of whom he spoke was the first of Irishmen—that he lives more in the affections of the people than any other who could be named! And it would be wonderful indeed if the fact were otherwise, for it had been his unceasing ambition to expose, at the risk of his person and fortune, the errors and corruptions of the enemies of Ireland, and to rally a genuine spirit, which had long lain dormant in this country, and which he had at length so effectually accomplished, that it would take the minister, with all his power, and the treasury at his back, full fifty years to overcome it, even if the glorious career of its first mover were at this moment to be stopped.

"His object had ever been to rally men of all persuasions, parties, and habits, under one title—that of Irishmen; and Mr. Plunkett thought the board should come to some immediate resolution indicative of their conviction of his merits.

"MR. O'CONNOR (the chairman) regretted that it should be thought necessary to delay such a measure.

"COUNSELLOR O'GORMAN wished to give every member an opportunity of doing justice to transcendent desert.

MR. SCULLY pronounced a speech, in which he dwelt upon the many claims of Mr. O'Connell on the gratitude of his country, the total failure of any attempts to injure him in his profession (if indeed such attempts were made at all), and declared his warm approbation of the notice respecting the testimonial of the feeling of the Board towards him. He said it was a fact notorious, that not even the late Sergeant Ball (before he got a silk gown) had more extensive practice, more general business than Mr. O'Connell enjoys at this moment; and those who visit the courts, and the agents and clients who employ him, know best with what excellence that business is done.

"Yet, with all this, he contrived to devote more time to the public good, and to indulge the native excellence of his disposition in acts of private benevolence, than almost any other man! As to the alleged secession; he did not think it would be becoming the dignity of the Board to entertain any specific measure upon it; and he drew a long picture of the unpleasant situation in which, he presumed, the persons said to have receded must be placed.

"MR. O'CONNELL said it had been suggested to him not to speak; but it was impossible to listen to such language as he had just heard without emotions indescribable, and still more impossible would it be to listen to it and remain silent.

"When first he had volunteered as the advocate of his country's rights, he did conceive that he had embarked in the service of an insolvent ingratitude, but never was man more completely mistaken. He had met rewards equal to the most brilliant services, when, in fact, all he would lay claim to was good intention. No form of words could convey an idea of what he felt, when he heard his name coupled with encomiums so disproportioned to any thing he could effect—he would not attempt an impossibility.

"In returning thanks to his friend, Mr. Plunkett, for the kindness of his expressions towards him, he wished to say, that in any personal controversy in which he might happen to be engaged, he required neither aid nor seconding. If he required assistance other than his own arms could afford him, he would not deserve to receive it. If a miscreant, clad in the robes of an alderman, had dared to introduce a personal quarrel of his into a public transaction, he owed his protection to his cloak and his secrecy.

"Was he (Mr. O'Connell) to meet him in the street, he would proclaim a coward.

"With respect to his profession, he was only surprised at the perseverance with which clients committed their cases to him. The progress he had made had been effected in despite, in contempt of favour-

itism ; and if his professional career were stopped by any conspiracy, he should not be astonished at it! As to an attack that was made upon him, and which came from a quarter that could not be replied to, if emancipation was carried, it should be brought before the proper tribunal. A scene which must surprise the British parliament would, in that case, be unfolded."

On Wednesday, the 8th of December, occurred the collision of opinion before alluded to between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Shiel.

The Board met at the Shakspeare Gallery, in Exchequer now Wicklow-street—a place so named from, and given for the purpose by, strange to say, one of the old corporation, a good humoured, well natured individual, of somewhat eccentric character, named Stephenson. Lord Ffrench was in the Chair.

The proceedings commenced with a notice by Mr. O'Connell, of an intended address to the Northern Catholics, warning them from joining ribbon societies, or suffering themselves in any way to be betrayed into criminality by the provocations of the Orangemen.

Doctor Dromgoole next brought forward a motion, for some time on the books, and postponed from meeting to meeting, for a positive and unqualified declaration on the part of the Catholic body against "*securities*" of any kind, description, or degree ; and against even entertaining any proposition under any circumstances, which could be at all construed into a suggestion of them.

The motion was ably seconded by Dr. Sheridan.

Mr. Shiel then rose in opposition. The *Evening Post* thus treats of his speech :—

"We shall not pronounce upon certainly one of the most brilliant harangues ever delivered in a public assembly. Mr. Shiel has taken a part contrary to that recommended by us, and finally contrary to that adopted by the Catholic Board ; but we feel great satisfaction in giving circulation to a correct and faithful copy of his speech. It is an honour to his country, although we cannot help thinking it directed against his country's dearest interests."

Mr. Shiel concluded amid very warm cheering.

Mr. O'Connell rose immediately in reply :—

“ My lord, whilst the meeting is yet dazzled and warmed with the brilliant and glowing language—‘ the thoughts that breathe, and words that burn’—of my young friend, I rashly offer myself to your consideration.

“ I rashly interpose the cold, dull jargon of the courts—the unanimated and rough dialect of the pleader ; but the cause of freedom and of my country will enable me, even me, to unravel the flimsy web of sophistry which is hid beneath the tinsel glare of meretricious ornament. Unsound reasoning may be so adorned by the flowers of the imagination, and the corruscation of fancy, as to dazzle for a moment and mislead, but it requires only the sober voice of plain sense—it asks only the sacred name of liberty and our native land, to break the spell, to dissolve the enchantment, and to expose the genuine deformity of the unpatriotic advocacy.

“ Let me not be misunderstood ; I admire, no man can more admire, the splendid talents of my young friend : I appreciate them at their full value—I hold them higher than he does himself. They were bestowed on him for the highest purposes—they are suited to the greatest and best purposes—to relieve and adorn his country. He does not do justice to his own genius when he confines it to the advocacy of a sect or party. Let it never be his reproach that—

“ ‘ Born for the universe, he narrowed his mind,  
And to party gave up what was meant for mankind.’

“ Oh, no ! Let him raise his soul to the elevation of his talents, and not take the puny and pigmy ground of party or division. Let him devote himself to his country ! God and nature have been bountiful to him. Let him, in recompense, as bountifully give, by consecrating to the service of liberty and Ireland, all the fascinations of his fancy, and all the brilliant glories of his genius. See how mistaken he must be, when I can exhibit myself his superior. I own I am his inferior in talent, but the cause I advocate sustains me, and my eloquent young friend sinks beneath the cause which he has espoused.

“ I must regret that he has given utterance to sentiments which every sense of duty commands me to condemn. The doctrines of slavery, which he has preached, I must censure. He has told us that the Catholics have nothing to do with questions of freedom or the constitution—that their object should be to place themselves on a level with the Protestants, and he is indifferent whether this equality be obtained

by pulling down the Protestant or elevating the Catholic. In direct terms he has preferred the dead level of despotism to our present situation of comparative inferiority.

“My lord, I object to those assertions, I protest against those principles of action. Many of the topics which have been urged by the eloquent gentleman do not bear on the present subject of debate. It is unnecessary to reply to them. To much more of his discourse it is needless to reply, because he did himself give the most powerful and the best answer to the arguments that might be used against the motion of Dr. Dromgoole. But it is incumbent on every friend to freedom, and to the constitution, to confute the slavish doctrine we have just heard. I am ready to meet him on this topic plainly, directly, and unequivocally.

“The proposed resolution goes to declare that either as Irishmen, or as Catholics, we never will consent to allow to the crown, or the servants of the crown, any interference in the appointment of our bishops! I support this motion upon both grounds:—First, as an Irishman, that this interference would be injurious to public liberty. Secondly, as a Catholic, that it would be destructive of the Catholic religion. The manners of society—the state of the public press, fettered and in chains though it be—the decency and decorum of modern habits, the progress of the human mind, and many other causes, render the constitution secure from open and direct attack. Absolute power is not likely to be obtained, nor even sought after by direct force and plain violence. But who is there so blind as not to see the inroads that have been made upon our rights and liberties by the effect of corroding influence? Who is so sunk in apathy—who is so degraded in stupidity, as not to perceive how unconditional and unlimited the power is that may be obtained indirectly and by corruption? In truth, the only danger that menaces the constitution, the only chance of rendering that constitution a mere name, arises from the spread of influence and corruption, which, like a cancer on a fair face, disfigures and destroys the beautiful fabric of public freedom!

“He is no friend to liberty—he knows not how to appreciate freedom—he is fitted for slavery, who can behold unmoved the progress of this terrific disease in the state—influence! I support the present motion because I dread and detest that influence, and should deem myself unworthy to seek for any liberty, could I consent to increase the influence of the servants of the crown. The young gentleman has argued, that this influence is already so great, that the appointment of our bishops would not add to the evil, and he has underrated much the value, even in a pecuniary point of view, of the

office of Catholic bishops. Let the servants of the crown then be content with the patronage they have. It is sufficient for their purpose, and if this addition be but small, let them leave us this small independence, for this little is our all—and great it is in fact.

“The state is secure already of the allegiance of the Catholic bishop, he is bound to the state by his repeated and solemn oaths; but, not content with this, the ministers want to have him become their political agent—they want to have him in the subservient management of electioneering politics: if they succeed in obtaining the power to appoint a Catholic bishop, they will, without doubt, take good care to stipulate with him for the selection of priests devoted to their patrons; and at the ensuing elections we shall see the courtly sheriff become insignificant—the castle bishop will canvass the diocese, the parish priest will ransack the different districts of the county, and you will have a Vereker, or a Bagwell borne on the shoulders of a duped people, in the room of a Glentworth or a Matthew.

“I do, therefore, meet the eloquent young gentleman upon this ground first, and insist that we should be unworthy of emancipation should we adopt his doctrines. Emancipation! My lord, the word would cease to have its appropriate meaning—the thing would cease to have any value. By emancipation I mean a participation in the free constitution of this country—not a chance of sharing in the public plunder. By emancipation I understand a right as a freeman to constitutional liberty, not a participation in the servitude of slaves—not a share in the authority of a despot.

“Besides, I beg to bring your minds to the second motive for adopting this resolution:—The injury your religion must sustain if the minister of the day appoint our prelates. The minister is and will continue a Protestant as far as a minister of state may be said to have any religion. If he be sincere, as a Protestant his choice of a bishop will be governed by this sincerity, and he will appoint as Catholic bishop the man least likely to serve the Catholic religion—most likely to injure and degrade that religion.

“But suppose him insincere, as a Protestant, there will be no doubt of his attachment to power as a statesman. As a statesman, then, who will he appoint as bishop? The man who can purchase the situation—perhaps for money—certainly for service. And does any man imagine that the Catholic religion will prosper in Ireland, if our prelates, instead of being what they are at present, shall become the servile tools of her administration. They would then lose all respect for themselves; all respectability in the eyes of others; they would be degraded to the station of excisemen and gaugers; and the people, disgusted and dissa-



tified, would be likely to join the first enthusiastic preacher of some new form of Methodism, that might conciliate their ancient prejudices, and court their still living passions.

“The ministerial bishops of Ireland would become like the constitutional bishops of France, one of the means of uncatholicizing the land. I beg to remind the young gentleman of the description he himself has given of the English; he has told us they were sunk in prejudice, and overcome by groundless and irrecoverable antipathy to Irish Catholics. And if this be so, and much of his argument was founded on the assumption of this as a fact—if this be so, who in his senses would think of confiding to these English the government of the Catholic Church in Ireland, and the appointment of her bishops. He who would confide to England this sacred duty, demonstrates that she is unfit for it. Surely he cannot be prepared to sacrifice all religion and country, for the name and shadow of an useless and degrading emancipation.

“I therefore call on this meeting, as they are Catholics, and value the religion which they have inherited and believe; as they are Irishmen, and idolize their native land and her liberties, to reject the splendid fascinations of my youthful friend, and to adopt the proposed motion.

“Let us show that we value freedom, and therefore deserve to be free! Let us prove that we respect the constitution, and therefore merit to partake of its blessings. Let us resist, not increase, an already overgrown influence, which may be so fatal to liberty, to justice, to happiness!

“But I go further; for my part, I hold my Protestant fellow-countrymen in no animosity; I view them with no jealousy: I wish—I sincerely wish to elevate, not to degrade them. They are Irishmen, as I am, and I am anxious for their liberties; even should I not increase my own, I should be delighted to promote theirs. My desire is directly the reverse of that of Mr. Shiel; he prefers the equality of slavery, to the having one class depressed and the other elevated. For my part, if I could not elevate the Catholic, I wish not to depress the Protestant. I would advance both if I could; I would depress neither; and if the Catholic be still a slave, it is some comfort to my mind, that the Irish Protestant has some share of freedom: and here I answer the question of my young friend. He asks am I content to be a slave, that others may be free? The question relates to myself personally; I answer it at once. If I can procure freedom for my country, I am content with torture—death—with what is worse than either, with slavery!

“He then asks, if I consent that my children should be slaves for the sake of my country? I readily answer—no. For myself, I can submit

to slavery, but not for them. It is, indeed, to confer the blessings of liberty on *the nestlings of my heart (my children)*, that I struggle against obloquy, conspiracy, and calumny—I can sacrifice myself, but not them; but it is my dearest duty so to educate them in the love of Ireland, that each for himself will be ready to make the sacrifice of his all for Ireland.

Let me in my turn put a question or two to the eloquent young gentleman. Knows he not how delightful it must be to suffer for our country? Does he not feel how sweet pain, and reproach, and death would be for Ireland! Has he not a monitor within that tells him it requires no heroism to prefer his native land to self, and that the first transport of existence must be to contribute, by any sacrifice, to his country's liberties? If he have any, why did he question me? if he have not, let me assure him, compassion must give way to admiration; and I must pity even whilst I admire his poetic strains.

“I stop here for one moment, to protest against one sentence of the learned doctor, on which, I trust, I mistook him. He spoke of the thousand sects that nestle under the wing of Protestantism, and he spoke in terms that appeared to me to imply disrespect. For my part, I shall never, in silence, listen to any language trenching on the freedom of religious opinion, or implying disrespect to any man who follows the dictates of his own conscience; if, instead of a thousand sects of Protestants, they have the same right to choose for themselves that the learned doctor has; and it would little become him, struggling for freedom of conscience for himself, to reproach the effort of that liberty in others. Any man who worships the Deity in the form which his unbiassed conscience prescribes, is worthy of respect; he may be in error, but his error can only deserve compassion, not reproach.

[Doctor Dromgoole here interposed by disavowing any disrespect to any sect of Christians.]

“From this digression, my lord, I come back to the arguments of the eloquent young gentleman, Mr. Shiel.

“He intimates, that he has at length found out the grand secret for obtaining emancipation; and he insinuates that we have hitherto mis-conducted the cause, and postponed freedom. I shall follow him upon both topics—first, his secret for obtaining emancipation; and, secondly, his discovery of our mistakes in that pursuit. His secret to emancipate is thus disclosed: the English, he said, are prejudiced against us, vilely prejudiced—their prejudice is inveterate, and cannot by any means be cured; it must therefore be yielded to, and gratified, if you would be emancipated; but the only method of gratifying their proud prejudice,

is by sacrificing to it some share of the discipline at least, if not of the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

“My lord, nothing can be more clear or distinct than this reasoning ; but I contend for it, that it is built on untrue premises ; and even if it were true in all its terms, it should be rejected from higher considerations. But I deny the premises ; admitting, however, that the English are ignorant—grossly ignorant of us, and therefore blindly prejudiced against us. I admit this fact, and the causes of that prejudice have been given by Mr. Shiel. The genius of misrepresentation has presided over their historians, from the splendid romance of the unbelieving Hume, to the stupid and malignant fictions of the credulous Musgrave. It is by misrepresentation that the English have become prejudiced ; facts have been distorted and falsified ; truth has been violated ; individuals have been calumniated ; tenets abhorrent from our judgment, our reason, and our religion have been imputed to us, and continue to be imputed to us !

“Hence this prejudice—hence this evil ; and here also is the remedy to be found. It is by constant and unwearied application to the causes of disease. It is by explaining away misrepresentation ; by vindicating the truth of history ; by demonstrating the falsehood of calumnies ; by the public rejection of the abominable tenets imputed to us, and the plain and manly exposition of our real and genuine opinions. It is not sufficient once, or twice, or ten, or fifty times to meet this enemy of falsehood, or vindicate our friend, truth. The English have become prejudiced by the force of repetition of calumny. We shall set them right, by means of the repetition of the vindication.

“Will the gentleman contend, that falsehood and delusion are all-powerful—candour and truth vain and impotent ? In the first encounter, they may be defeated by proud and overbearing and stupid prejudice, I admit ; but candour and truth have in them a reviving principle ; and returning again and again to the contest, they must ultimately prevail. I do therefore rely on the force of the truth—on the repetition of our vindication, as the means of overcoming English prejudice.

“He says you should sacrifice some of the discipline of your Church to this English Dagon. I deny that the idol is worthy of such a sacrifice. I deny that you could conciliate the monster by any sacrifice short of your entire religion, discipline, doctrine and all. If you offer to prejudice this sacrifice you, by your actions, though, perhaps, not in words, admit the justice of the prejudice. When you offer to English prejudice part of the discipline of your Church, you admit, at least in the opinions of the prejudiced, the truth of their suspicions and their

fear. But it is in the nature of suspicion and fear never to be satisfied; and the first sacrifice will justify and stimulate them to demand more.

“You come before the legislature, admitting the propriety of their taking away something from you; and they, acting upon your admission, will be ready enough to take away all. You cannot bribe their prejudices with a share of your religion: it will not—it cannot—indeed, it ought not to be satisfied with the part you offer. But thus, admitted by yourself into your camp, prejudice would not be consistent, unless it insisted upon converting all your property into spoil, and rendering itself for ever secure, by extinguishing for ever its enemy. Away, then, with this base and vile traffic—this bribing of a prejudice, which Mr. Shiel has so powerfully proved to be absurd. Away with this bartering with absurd prejudice—this traffic of so much of your religion for so much of their privileges—this exchange of certain lots of your discipline or doctrine, for a specific quantity of emancipation. We never can succeed in this peddling and huxtering speculation. They are ready to take all and give none. We are entitled gratuitously to our freedom, or rather we have already purchased it by our allegiance, our treasure, and our young blood. We are entitled to it as a right. Reason, justice, and nature are at our side. Let us preserve our integrity and our honour, as well as our religion; and be emancipated as our forefathers desired—as Catholics, or not at all.

“I now come to the discovery which my talented friend obscurely intimated that he has made, namely, that we, agitators, have retarded the progress of emancipation.

“I have heard this charge made repeatedly out of this Board; I have heard it said that by our violence, our intemperance, and what not, we have put back emancipation for fifty years. Against these calumnies, too, I appeal to the fact: the fact furnishes me with an answer—a triumphant answer—I could scarcely desire any reply more complete, more decisive.

The agitation of the Catholic question commenced in 1805, and nothing could be weaker or of less effect than our commencement. In 1807, the Grenville administration attempted to do something for us—they attempted to pass a law to enable Catholics to be officers in England as they are in Ireland. That was all they could attempt—but did they succeed? No; the attempt cost them their places; and Mr. Perceval, seated on the shoulders of the “no-popery” mob, was borne into power in triumph; the “no-popery” cry was raised, and all England was shook from the centre to the extremities. The war-whoop of religious bigotry resounded throughout the land, and in the pride and folly of its prejudices, it deemed the Catholic claims extinguished for ever.

“ Well, what has followed? We continued our agitation—our *violence* as it has been called—our *intemperance*. We passed our strong, our “*witchery*” resolutions. We exposed the vices and the secret motives of the insolent and venal beings who opposed our emancipation. I myself was in the habit of painting, in their native colours, the creatures who, for pay, insulted my native land, a practice which I have given up rather from lassitude and disgust than from any opinion of its being injurious to our cause. Amidst all this violence and intemperance, what was the consequence? Why, that in 1813, a bill was near to pass, intending and purporting to give us all. Our enemies themselves consented to give us everything except seats in parliament. They consented to give us situations and command in the army and navy, places at the bar and on the bench, corporate offices and dignities, places in the excise and customs; all, all except parliament—they consented to all. Mr. Abbott, our leading adversary, consented to everything except parliament.

Now, place the two undoubted and indisputable facts together: in 1807 our friends could not procure for us even so much as the military rank in England; in 1813 our enemies offered us the station of sheriffs, mayors, admirals, generals, judges, and chancellors. Compare the two periods—contrast the two situations, and then let me see the man who will say that the Catholic cause has receded, or been driven back during that period! I demand of the candour of my young friend to admit that the Catholic cause has advanced during the last seven years of agitation; I do not ask of him the sacrifice of admitting that it has advanced by that agitation; but it comforts my own mind, and cheers my secret soul to see the natural effect result from the plain, manly, uncompromising course we have steered.

“ I return one moment to English prejudice, so happily described by Mr. Shiel; and I ask him whether this very alteration between the opinions of the English in 1807 and in 1813 does not prove to demonstration that prejudice is best met by reason and argument. During the last seven years we made no degrading sacrifice; and yet the repetition of our arguments, and the display of truth have advanced our cause. Let my young friend meditate on these facts, before he again envelopes in poetry the cause of despotism, and the triumph of prejudice!

“ My lord, I have combated this eloquence advocating the influence of the crown—I have ventured to oppose it supporting the prejudices of England; I will now briefly allude to another argument, or rather assertion, of his: he says the present resolution implies a censure on our prelates!

“What, my lord, can it be censure to declare that we are so pleased and proud of our prelates, who have been appointed without any interference of the crown, that we never will consent to any such interference? The Board censure the bishops! The Board, my lord, has always expressed its respect, its veneration for the bishops. Our enemies, indeed, would be delighted, if they could establish any division between the Board and the Catholic hierarchy. But, no; that is impossible. Instead of the present resolution implying censure, it directly and justly speaks praise and approbation. We approve and applaud—and it would be difficult, indeed, not to approve and applaud our prelates, as they are. We seek no change—nor will we consent to any change that would be likely to place different men in high offices. The prelates, too, I may venture to add, approve of the course pursued by the Board: they see, they easily see that however anxious we are for freedom, we are still more anxious for the purity of our religion—they know that, though we are desirous not to remain slaves, we are determined to continue Catholics; and that ardently as we love liberty, we will not purchase it as the price of schism.

“It is, therefore, impossible, to separate the prelates from the Board, or the Board from the prelates. We interfere only upon subjects belonging to our province. Any connexion between the crown and the Catholic hierarchy in Ireland must, of course, be of a political nature; and against such, we have a right to protest, and do protest; but if the revered and venerable prelates of our Church, exercising their discretion as to that which belongs to them exclusively—the details of discipline—shall deem it right to establish a system of domestic nomination, purely and exclusively Irish; if, I repeat, our prelates deem it right to establish a system of domestic nomination—of a nomination purely and exclusively Irish; if our prelates deem it right, in their wisdom and piety, to establish any such arrangement, the Board, my lord, will not interfere with such arrangement, because it has no right whatsoever to interfere with it; but it will certainly applaud, and gratefully receive any such decision.

“Before I conclude, let me avow the pleasure I feel that my resolution on this subject was negatived—not because I think it was an improper resolution in the sense I meant it—but because it was, I find, so capable of being misunderstood. I never complained of its being rejected—all I complained of was, that it was not understood. I attributed the fault to others, I now see it was my own; for the sense which Mr. Shiel has put on that resolution convinces me that there was an ambiguity in it which alone merited condemnation. I do, therefore, myself condemn it as mischievous, because equivocal, and cheerfully

submit myself to the censure that may follow the man who uses, on a delicate subject, ambiguous language.

“This great question is now fairly before the Board. We, who support the resolution, call for emancipation, without making our bishops the slaves or the instruments of the ministry—and require our liberties, to which we are entitled as our birthright, without any sacrifice of the doctrine or discipline of our Church. We humbly petition parliament to assure us freedom, but we ask it as Catholics—we respectfully require of them liberty, but we wish for it with perfect safety to our religion. We have given them the security of our allegiance—we have sealed their sincerity with our oaths, and confirmed it in our blood; all we require in return is the privilege of worshipping God as our forefathers worshipped him. We are ready to insure, with our dearest interests, the integrity of the state—all we ask in return is, the integrity of our religion!

“Those who agree with me, that we are entitled to emancipation, without compromise, will support this resolution; all who agree with my eloquent friend, that our emancipation should be purchased by some undefined concessions of doctrine, or, at least, of discipline, to absurd prejudice—for so he proved it; all those who think they can bargain with absurd prejudice, upon the capital of their faith, will reject the present resolution with Mr. Shiel.

“He has, indeed, been unfortunate in the side he has selected; he has not been lucky in his allusion. It was not the Catholic barons of the reign of John that crouched beneath papal usurpation. It was a profligate, faithless, unprincipled prince, who used the pope’s then authority to enable him to enslave a Catholic people.

“I am of the faith of the Catholic barons, who, with their swords, extorted the great charter of liberty; I am of the religion of the Catholic parliament that passed the statute of provisors; firm in my attachment to her ancient faith, ardent in the pursuit of liberty. Let my young friend join this standard, and soon shall he become a leader. To the superiority of his talent we shall easily cheerfully yield, and give him that station in his country’s cause to which his high genius entitles him. Let him devote himself to the uncompromising advocacy of Ireland—glory will await him, and the sweeter satisfaction of serving his country! Let him reject party and adopt Ireland, who, in her widowhood, wants him; and in her service let his motto be—‘God, and our native land.’”

The tone of the meeting was taken from this speech, and Dr. Dromgoole’s motion carried with acclamation.

On the 11th December a meeting of the Board occurred, at

which, *for once*, Mr. O'Connell was *not* present, though in town.

The kindness of his friends caused his absence. They had determined to devote that day to their grateful recognition of his labours for Ireland, and their generous and high-spirited support of him against the felon attempt in the King's Bench to put him down and crush him, and with him, may we say it, the hopes of Ireland.

Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman, Esq., came readily forward, at the repeated calls of the meeting, to redeem his notice of motion, relative to a mark of Catholic attachment to Mr. O'Connell.

He concluded a kind and spirited speech as follows:—

“Wherever Catholic rights were to be asserted, Catholic wrongs redressed, or Catholic character vindicated, there, in the front rank of your supporters, and often *alone*—as on a recent occasion—there was to be found Daniel O'Connell, the intrepid and incorruptible defender of his country's rights!”

Mr. O'Gorman concluded with the resolution in the following advertisement, which appeared in the *Post*, Dec. 16th, 1813:—

“At a meeting of the General Board of the Catholics of Ireland, held at the Shakspeare Gallery, Exchequer-street, Dublin, on Saturday, the 11th December, 1813—Owen O'Connor, Esq., in the chair—

“RESOLVED—That a service of plate, of the value of one thousand guineas, be presented to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the part of the Catholic people of Ireland, as a small tribute of their gratitude for the unshaken intrepidity, matchless ability, and unwearied perseverance, with which, in despite of power and intolerance, he has uniformly asserted the rights, and vindicated the calumniated character of his Catholic countrymen.”

“RESOLVED—That the following noblemen and gentlemen do compose a committee for the purpose of carrying the above resolution into effect:—The Viscount Netterville, the Lord Ffrench, Purcell O'Gorman, Owen O'Connor, George Bryan, Henry Edmond Taaffe, Nicholas Mahon, Randal M'Donnell, Esqrs.”

“OWEN O'CONNOR, *Chairman*.  
“EDWARD HAY, *Secretary*.”

We cannot, though it be deemed going out of our limits, refrain from giving the speech of John Finlay, on this occasion.

Between him and Mr. O'Connell an old and fast friendship is still most warmly subsisting. A congeniality of mind first produced it, and acquaintance has, from the first moment, been



continually adding to its strength. No sincerer friend Mr. O'Connell has ever had; and of none has he more sincerely recognized and endeavoured to repay the attachment.

Mr. Finlay's speech bears strong evidence of that talent and power of intellect which, if nature had given him the same taste for the agitator's life of unceasing activity and toil that animated his friend, would have rendered him "*facile princeps*" at least of far the greater number of those who have been prominent in the struggle for Irish rights.

The following was his address on this occasion:—

"When a man steps forth from the ranks of tranquil life, and devotes his time to public interests, he avows that he employs himself in that which is equally the business of all. Thus the public, in whose service he starts a volunteer, are placed in censorship over his words and actions; and the members of the community protect themselves from self-reproach of civic in exertion, by scrutinizing his motives with all possible doubt, and accounting for his acts with the least possible charity.

"This caution, though sometimes unfair, is seldom unreasonable; it is frequently justified by the event, and always allowable, under the principle that no class of men should be more suspected than patriots, because no class has produced more impostors.

"But this suspicion, like every thing else, should have its limits; and there is a length of time—a quantity of fidelity beyond which jealousy or suspicion cannot exist without injustice to its object. Time is the ordeal of patriotism. To preserve a patriot's purity, it is not expected that he should be always *right*, because he cannot be always *wise*; but it is necessary that his acts should be always well-intended, because he may be always honest.

"Therefore when time has assayed and established the fairness, not of his acts, but of his intentions, his exertions, his talents, and his purpose, it then becomes the duty of the people to repay, by an increased portion of their gratitude, for those doubts which their caution compelled them to entertain.

"Ten years have tried the fidelity of O'Connell; and you stand now indebted to him in the article of gratitude, not only for the quantity of service conferred, but the time during which the trial has been protracted, and the expression of your collective gratitude deferred.

"This line of reasoning applies to every free country, but it applies

in a more particular manner to Ireland. In Ireland there is one simple division of its inhabitants—Catholic and Protestant; religion, in truth, makes no part in the political results which flow from this distinction. Protestant is another word for the possessor or expectant of place; Catholic, another word designating whom the law excludes. Thus power, place, patronage, and a large portion of franchise being, in fact, denied to the great majority, and confined to a few, they become real property in the hands of their possessors; and, unless their possessors be endowed with no common portion of disinterestedness, they have every motive derivable from self to examine with severity, and interpret without charity, the motives and conduct of those men who would destroy that property, by the generality of its diffusion.

“Therefore the advocate of Catholic emancipation appears in greater or less degree of hostility to every Protestant in this country who has not the virtue to dismiss the calculations of self; therefore, the advocate most efficient, prominent, and persevering presents an aspect of political hostility, varying its phases exactly in proportion to the degree of self-love which sways the motives of those Protestants to whom he is an object of observation; and for this reason Daniel O'Connell is hated by some, disliked by many, and cannot, in the nature of things, depend for approbation on any Protestant not purely disinterested; therefore, he must suffer from calumny exactly as long as you must suffer from injustice, and the amount of injury in this way inflicted is the exact measure of reparation which mere justice should prompt you to compensate.

“The permanency of his country's affection is the only species of remuneration to which he ever looked forward. The vulgar value of the certifying instrument is a matter of indifference to him, and should not be a subject of deliberating economy with you.

“Such are the disadvantages, moral and political, which, *for a time*, must always operate to obstruct the actions and obscure the motives of him who struggles for the public good. The moral disadvantage applies to all countries; but the moral and political units in Ireland.

“There is a third disadvantage, if the patriot be a lawyer, which I shall call a professional disadvantage. The bar is an educated, enlightened community. It has been truly said that the pursuit of the law exercises, in its study, the noblest faculties of the mind, and engages, in its practice, the cardinal virtues of the heart. Ambition is a passion suitable, perhaps essential, to a barrister; but, in the mind of all who are not great or good, envy is the inseparable handmaid of ambition. In the barrister's career to professional success, the course is so narrow, the competition so violent, and the prize so important,

that all praise is rigorously denied except when extorted by unquestionable desert. Thus, then, where a man happens to unite the characters of a patriot, an Irishman, and a barrister, there is a threefold censorship imposed o'er his conduct, which nothing but eminent virtue can sustain, and which, if sustained, cannot well be over-rated.

*" EMINENT AND PROMINENT IN THESE THREE RELATIONS, history will describe DANIEL O'CONNELL spotless in the relations of private life, matchless in the duties of private friendship, beloved by every man who knows him, esteemed by all who have not a prejudice or an interest in disliking him; with manners that instantly disarm hostility, there never yet was a man introduced to him for the first time, under prepossessions to his disadvantage, that did not feel his dislikes hastily evaporating, and depart from the conference a convert to esteem !*

" At five in the morning you will find him in his study ; at five in the evening you will probably find him still labouring in the public service ; if you cannot find him thus employed, you may be almost certain of finding him at home. I never knew any man of equal industry ; I never thought that any man could be so industrious. No man at the bar *labours more* in his profession, and no man at the Board labours *so much* in politics ; but to labour *as much*, and to labour *so well*, far exceeds the common notions of human capability.

*" Social and sober—polite and unceremonious—cheerful, affable, candid, and sincere—proud with the haughty, and meek with the humble ; his frown rebukes arrogance to inferiority, and his smile lifts humility to his own level. His virtues cannot be indifferent to you ; they should be objects of your care, for they have been agents of your interest.*

" Such a man, in difficult times, volunteered as the advocate of press and people. The apathy that followed the measure of the Union had depressed the nation to political indifference. Lord Clare had declared, in the British House of Peers, that the Catholic people felt uninterested in the question of emancipation. It became necessary to correct the error or the fact. The two great pillars on which emancipation could be raised were, the exercise of a free press, and the exercise of the right of petition. *O'Connell* started the advocate of both ; and here commenced the political hostility between the interested advocate for the governor, and the disinterested advocate for the governed ; that is, between Mr. Saurin and Mr. O'Connell.

" Those two pillars of emancipation were assaulted alternately by the Attorney-General. A new and severe tax was imposed on the press, in the expectation that men would be discouraged from embarking their property in a speculation in an enterprise so unprofitable as an inde-

pendent journal. The experiment failed; the press was not weakened—it was strengthened; and those who had been the friends became the enemies of the Irish government.

“ This attempt against the press was made during the ministry of Mr. Foster; the next attempt was against the people, and made in the ministry of Mr. Pole. A proclamation was issued against the manner in which the people exercised the right of petition. A circular was issued, which every magistrate in Ireland felt it his duty to disobey. It appears, by the declaration of Mr. Pole, that this circular was the suggestion of Mr. Saurin. It appears, by the highest law authorities in England, that it was a composition of which a lawyer should be ashamed. *Ex officio* informations were poured in abundance against the Catholic peers and gentlemen who presided at the Catholic meetings. The convention act, enacted many years before, was called into action against the people.

“ The next attempt was against the press. The press was attacked by every mode of attachment, information, and indictment. The most objectionable mode was first resorted to—*attachment*. The cry became loud; and the less objectionable mode of information was next resorted to; and as the cry became louder still, this usual and more constitutional mode of indictment was finally fixed upon.

“ Mr. Saurin, ambitious of a character for lenity, has lately declared, in his motion for an aggravation of punishment, that he had not prosecuted more than *three*. Of his Majesty's Attorney-General I should not wish to speak *without deliberation*. It might be unbecoming—it might be unsafe. I am not inclined to speak disrespectfully, or *otherwise*. I must not, in politeness or in prudence, contradict; but when he states as a fact, that of the press he never yet prosecuted but *three*, I may be permitted to say, without offence, that this is an assertion which, consistently with a good conscience, I dare not to affirm.

“ It is certainly true that he did prosecute the *Irish Magazine* for the article called ‘*The Painter Cut*,’ secondly, Mr. Fitzpatrick, for the ‘*Statement of the Penal Laws*,’ and, thirdly, Mr. Magee, for the article against the Duke of Richmond: these are *three*. But it is equally true that he did prosecute the proprietor of the *Freeman's Journal*, by that most objectionable mode of prosecution, an attachment, and that he did obtain that attachment; and that Mr. Harvey, under the apprehension of its execution, was for a year confined to his own house. I can say this is true, for I was present at these motions. This reckons *four*.

“ It is equally true that he moved for another attachment against each of two proprietors of the *Evening Herald*, and although the Court of

King's Bench unanimously pronounced the libel to be **NONSENSE**, they, however, granted him the attachment, with their opinion that he ought not to execute it. This I know, for I was counsel in the cause. Then reckoning this prosecution against two as but one prosecution, I say this makes *five* prosecutions.

“ It is equally true that he at the same time filed an *ex-officio* against the *Herald*. This I know, for I was counsel in the cause. This reckons *six*. It will not be denied that he also issued *ex-officio* informations against the *Correspondent* and *Freeman*. These make *eight*. He also issued, of late, two *ex-officio* informations against two Kilkenny papers for publishing the resolutions of public bodies. These make *ten*. He says *three*—I say *ten*. Does he mean to say that he only prosecuted three to conviction? The fewer he prosecuted to conviction compared with the number that he did prosecute, shows his want of ability rather than of will, and gives no claim to the character of lenity; but even reckoning those that he prosecuted to conviction, he does not reckon fairly. He only reckons, even in this sense of prosecuting, Cox for one. I say he prosecuted Cox for **THREE**, and obtained conviction for **TWO**. Thus, taking prosecutions for **CONVICTIONS**, he is not right, and taking prosecutions in its proper sense, he should have said **TWELVE** instead of **THREE**.

“ In addition to this, I am informed that he issued *ex-officio* informations against almost all of the publishers of Dublin, on the subject of the ‘Statement of the Penal Laws.’ Then where is the ground of his boast of lenity? Finally, the Irish Attorney-General, after having produced one sleeping statute against the press, brought forth another against the people—the Convention Act against the people—the Stamp Act against the press—both enacted in bad times: neither of them were enacted in England—neither of them before used in Ireland. The operation of this Stamp Act was to extinguish the property itself, or at least wrest it from the owner's hand. Mr. Magee was obliged to part with his property; but though an unprecedented act of power tore his property from him, he took care that it should not be torn from the service of the country.

“ Mr. Saurin having so far succeeded, by every usual and unusual mode of prosecution against press and people, finally *attached the advocate of both*. His speech for his client was the ground of complaint. An attempt was made, by the partizans of power, to injure his professional character, by insinuating that *he had* injured his client by his defence; and the unbecoming rumour was spread abroad, that the manner of the counsel should be the measure of mercy—that had Mr. O'Connell been more merciful to Mr. Saurin, Mr. Saurin would have been

more merciful to Mr. Magee ; but this insinuation lost its force—it was very well known to every one, and to no one better than to Mr. Magee, that tenderness was not among the weaknesses of his prosecutor.

“The object of the *motion in aggravation* was, in truth, to punish the advocate for the defence. Mr. Saurin insinuated ulterior proceedings, and the benchers were sounded on the subject of stripping the *advocate of his gown!* Many severe philippics had been pronounced at the bar before. Such a measure was never attempted. Lord Clare has been compelled to look at a portraiture of his own vices, presented to his eye by an immortal advocate, but he never dreamt of punishing the advocate by law. He has spoken in the severest terms in the House of Lords respecting the philippic on the trial of Finnerty ; but he never thought of any proceeding of this description. The Solicitor-General admitted it was a most extraordinary proceeding ; and his apology for this most extraordinary proceeding was, that it was an extraordinary speech ; but what was the amount of blame imputable to the speech ? I omit the appeal to the passions of the Chief Justice—an appeal which in decency should not have been made, and which never could be made with decency. This being omitted, what is the amount ? The composition of that jury, and the distribution of justice in this country. As to the distribution of justice, I shall be very cautious in speaking on that subject : it appears to give particular offence. I do not wish to lose my gown : I cannot afford it as well as O'Connell ; but I hope I may say this much without losing my gown—that a considerable prejudice exists on the subject.

“I lately heard a peasant say—‘*Oh, Sir, it requires a great deal of INTEREST in this country for a poor man to get a LITTLE JUSTICE!*’ This prejudice is very widely spread. I do not boast of a particular strength of mind, and, therefore, plead guilty to the infirmity of being occasionally affected by this prejudice myself.

“As to the business of selected juries, the fact cannot be denied, that the religion of a Catholic operates as a challenge to exclude him from juries in every criminal case of importance. The juries, without one exception, have had no Catholic in any crown prosecution in which the Attorney-General has been engaged. These two topics were the objectionable parts, for I cannot suppose that extracts from history constitute crime. These two topics were the ground of offence ; so that, in future, it will be safe, perhaps necessary, to *believe* that the juries are selected equally and indiscriminately, and that every judge and every juror is beyond all exception. ‘Tis unsafe to blame them,’ says one public accuser ; ‘And it is more unsafe to praise them,’ said the other. ‘They have a right to be angry with their libeller,’ said Mr. Saurin ; ‘And they

have a greater right to be angry with their panegyrist,' said Mr. Bushe. God help us! How are we to speak of them? Act upon both opinions: say nothing at all upon the subject.

"I lament that this discussion has arisen here; for notwithstanding Mr. Saurin's reliance on the respectable Catholics, I don't see any Catholic, respectable or otherwise, who appears here disposed to defend him, although some are of opinion that he requires some defence. Therefore I am sorry that his conduct is discussed, but he challenged you to it. He sent you an issue, and it becomes necessary for you to return him his verdict. Why should he rely on the Catholics? He has used against the press and the people every species of prosecution, legal and severe, common and uncommon. He has brought forth two statutes—one against the press, the other against petition—both unused before—both strangers to the law of England; he has issued circulars and summonses to his own house, both rebuked by high law authorities in England, and he is the first Attorney-General who ever made a motion in aggravation in Ireland. Was it just that his Stamp Act should tear from John Magee the property of a paper which he had convicted?—and if it was, is it just that it should also deprive him of the property of another paper, which *was not convicted*? Are these the grounds of his reliance? Why, then, he rests upon a broken reed.

"As he asks, give him a verdict, and express your condemnation of his conduct, by the honours which you pay to the object of his persecution.

"It is your duty to hold up O'CONNELL. It has been said with some truth that no man ever yet yoked his fortunes to the fate of Ireland, who was not ruined by the connexion. The Catholic cause is of considerable weight, but it is said its weight has often operated rather to sink than float its adherents. Contradict those imputations. Give me now, in the instance of O'Connell, a practical proof that this rumour is untrue, and in doing so I make not this an occasion to express your respect for the virtue of economy; parsimony at best is amongst the minor virtues; it is a personal attribute, it should make no part of a people's character when developing their affections to a great man for great services in a great cause. If you do exercise it upon this occasion, it may be said in fact, as it must be said in law, you do not represent the benevolent purposes of my generous countrymen.

"Power has attempted to put down O'Connell; it is the people's interest to hold him up. *What would you do without him? Who would you get like him?*

“ In his political and forensic capacities, his enemies allow he possesses two qualities always essential, not always combined—an *intrepid Advocate*, an *HONEST Patriot*, a clear head, an honest heart, and a manly purpose, are seldom united—are united in him, and necessary for you. He resembles Mr. Whitbread in that every-day working talent, which does the business of practical usefulness, and which in both, curious to say, is compatible with eminence of talent—a sort of talent that does not work itself down—that, like the memory, gathers vigour from its toil—and, like the Bridge of Cæsar, acquires strength and solidity from the very weight of its burden. Therefore Whitbread, in real usefulness, is worth half of the opposition—he is, in fact, an opposition in himself; and so it is with O'Connell.

“ Compared with such a man, what are the dozens of periodic orators who, like myself, occasionally come forth with a holiday speech, decked in the finest trappings of our eloquence. Give me the man who is not afraid to lose character by every-day work—who will speak well to-day and ill to-morrow. Every man who speaks often, must sometimes speak ill. Health, indisposition, constitution, fits of dulness, many things may cause it; but give me the man who will not avoid speaking when necessary, because he may speak with less effect; who will not deem it necessary to let the soil lie fallow in order to give value to the future production; who in truth is more anxious for the public service than his own fame, and who, in public attention, rests upon facts and not upon phrases!

“ This power of continual exertion falls to the lot of very few; for my own part, in my humble exertions, I have found occasional periodic exertion more than enough; and I have often been surprised and astonished at the powers of uninterrupted and successful exertion which exist in Whitbread and O'Connell, and do not at all exist in the same degree in two other men in these countries.

“ These talents are now yours; you should prize the highly gifted *honest* owner, fighting the battles of his country, he stands exposed to the shafts of angry power. Let Hibernia, in whose cause he acts and suffers, cover her patriot with her ample shield—

“ ‘ Let him but stand in spite of power,  
A watchman on the lonely tower;  
His thrilling trump will rouse the land,  
When fraud or danger is at hand,  
By him as by the beacon light,  
The pilot must keep course aright.’

“ But if he, like many others, should be fated to endure the ingratitude of the country—if he should be placed in the midst of useless



friends, and implacable enemies—if his enemies should gratify their purpose against him—

“ ‘Then is the stately column broke,  
The beacon light is quenched in smoke,  
The trumpet’s silver sound is still,  
The warden silent on the hill!!!’ ”

(Great cheering).

The motion was then put and carried unanimously, amidst the warmest demonstrations of concurrence.

Mr. O’Connell’s answer to it was made upon Saturday December 18th—

“OWEN O’CONNOR, Esq., in the Chair.

“The Chairman informed the meeting that he had communicated, in his capacity of chairman, the resolution of the Board respecting a mark of gratitude to Mr. O’Connell, passed on Saturday last, to that gentleman.

“MR. O’CONNELL rose—He was loudly cheered, and spoke to the following effect:—To you personally, sir, I trust I need not apologise for not having answered your communication. I have the honour (and a very proud honour I consider it) of calling you my friend; and I hope the high value which you know I entertain for your public and private worth, will convince you, that I could not have intended anything disrespectful to you, personally, by not replying to your letter.

“With respect to the public, my reason for not answering the communication is either the best or the worst in the world; it is literally this—I was unable to do it! I did frequently attempt to commit to paper the expression of my feelings, but my powers of language sunk beneath the effort. I was utterly unacquainted with any form of words that could give utterance to the sensations which throbbed at my heart. I could guess at no terms which could even impart an idea of the gratitude which swelled in my bosom for so unmerited an honour, conferred by such a people and upon so humble an individual!

“The feelings to which this unexampled kindness gave rise, were not to be expressed in any form of words. My gratitude is too big for language, and I leave it to kindred spirits to recognize and appreciate sentiments too ecstatic, and too refined for utterance.

“But should I not have seized this opportunity to make professions of attachment, of zeal, of affection, for the ill-starred land of my birth? Should I not endeavour to repay your kindness by declaring that your

approbation would increase that attachment—enliven that zeal, animate that affection? No, sir, I will not make any such professions. They would be untrue, and I scorn them. No, sir, even your applause—and who can describe how much I value your applause—even your applause will not, because it cannot, increase the devotion with which I have consecrated my existence to Ireland. I have already devoted all the faculties of my soul to the pursuit of the liberties of my country; and humble as my capabilities are, I had already given them all to my native land.

“Alas! the gift was small, but it included certainly purity of design, sincerity of intention, perseverance of exertion, contempt of personal danger, neglect of personal advantage, and finally, incorruptible integrity and truth.

“You cannot increase my zeal—my devotion, but you have recompensed them beyond measure, and beyond reason. I have been unable to serve my country—I am a zealous but a useless servant; and you have thrown away upon mere zeal that high recompense of your approbation which ought to be reserved for actual services. However flattering to myself, still I cannot but blame the prodigality of your kindness. I know I owe much of it to private friendship, and I avow I have been delighted and gratified beyond measure by the proofs of friendship which your resolution has been the means of calling forth. It has satisfied me that I may rank amongst my friends those persons whose virtues and patriotism must render their favourable opinion an object of the highest consideration to every man, and whose friendship must reflect honour upon any individual whom they shall distinguish by it!

“I am glad that it was introduced, because it elicited those proofs of friendship; and I am grateful to my enemies, who gave occasion for an exhibition of the feeling which was that day witnessed here. I am glad that the enemies of my country, who are my enemies because they are her's, have so completely identified me with the Catholic cause, and have proved that they attack me only when they commit still greater attacks upon Ireland.

“But there is another and a higher consideration—a consideration which gives me pure and unmixed pleasure—it is that afforded by the stimulus you hold out to the patriotism of others, when you bestow honours thus liberally upon plain and unserviceable honesty. The man who dedicatèd himself to the cause of his country must calculate on meeting the hostility and calumny of her enemies—the envy and false-heartedness even of her friends. He must reckon on the hatred and active malignity of every idolator of bigotry—of every minion of power—of every agent of corruption. But that is little; he will have to en-

counter the hollow and treacherous support of pretended friends—of those interested friends respecting whom he will in vain exclaim—‘God protect me from my friends, I can guard myself from mine enemies!’

“What is to cheer and to recompense him in his exertions? The richest and best of rewards—your applause!

“You have, then, done wisely to grant that precious recompense to one so little deserving as myself, because you have thereby held out a prospect to higher minds of what they may expect from you. You have fanned the flame of pure patriotism, and I trust enlisted in your service the juvenile patriots of the land with talents superior—oh! beyond comparison—to my pretensions. (Mr. O’Connell here turned to Mr. Shiel who sat near him.) [Hear, hear.]

“And he and others will be roused to serve and adorn their widowed country.

“Of your traducer I shall say nothing. You have refuted his calumnies. For myself I need not tell you that, in the struggle for the liberties of Ireland, every peril, personal or political, is to me a source of pleasure and gratification. For myself I can only once more repeat that any language I am acquainted with sinks beneath the sensations with which a reward so disproportioned to the only merit I can lay claim to (that of good intention) inspires me.

“I have heretofore loved my country for herself—I am now her bribed servant, and no other master can possibly tempt me to neglect, forsake, or betray her interests!”

Let Ireland say whether, in the thirty-three years that have elapsed since this protestation, he has ever falsified his words.

At the meeting of the 18th, at which Mr. O’Connell thus spoke, there were read, preliminary to the business of the day, communications from the Earl of Donoughmore and Henry Grattan, in answer to the explanatory address of the Board, passed some meetings previous.

The tone of these letters was not improved, continuing to savour very much of captious superciliousness; but the ground which the writers took at the beginning of the correspondence was so far lowered, that they consented to receive, *as suggestions*, the statement of Catholic opinion which they had before so stiffly refused, and endeavoured to stigmatise as an attempt at dictation.

After a few words from Mr. O'Connell and others, the consideration of them was postponed to a future day; and the meeting proceeded with the more agreeable business of the day.

We close the record of Catholic proceedings in the eventful year 1813, with their meeting of Saturday, December 24th, on a matter that had given rise to considerable excitement and discussion—it was the speech of Dr. Dromgoole, when proposing his motion of entire repudiation of securities; and the whole affair can be best explained by a brief account of some of the occurrences at it.

“CATHOLIC BOARD.

“SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24TH, 1813.

“EDWARD BLAKE, of Frenchfort, in the Chair.

“On the chair being taken, DR. DROMGOOLE rose and said he had, on the last day of meeting, intimated that it was his intention to take an early opportunity of replying to the animadversions made on his speech. It had borrowed its importance, not so much from anything to be found in the speech, as from the mutilation of the paragraphs. As he meant to have it printed in a correct form, accompanied with a vindication of his statements and opinions, he trusted the Catholic Board would, until then, give him a short respite of opinion.

“MR. O'GORMAN immediately got up, with the *Dublin Evening Post* in his hand, containing Dr. Dromgoole's speech, and a sheet of paper, containing the heads of the objections which he (Mr. O'G.) intended to urge.

“MR. O'CONNELL and others urged the propriety of granting the delay desired.”

After some discussion, MR. O'GORMAN being called upon, proceeded:—

“Sir, this is a question of too vital and important a nature to be stifled or suppressed. It resolves itself, in fact, to this point: whether the Catholics of Ireland shall silently submit to have themselves considered as participators in the folly and guilt of a speech which amounts to a complete verification of all the calumnies imputed to us by Dr. Duigenan, Mr. Giffard, or Sir Richard Musgrave—for silence is, in this instance, acquiescence.

“The objectionable passages of that speech which were heard, were

rebuked on the spot both by my learned friend (Mr. O'Connell) and myself: those were the passages in which he described different descriptions of sectaries, as nestling under the wings of Protestantism; and in which he alluded to the improbable, nay, almost impossible case of a Catholic becoming the king of those realms."

MR. O'GORMAN then went on to review the speech, *seriatim*, and concluded thus:—

"I have felt it a paramount duty to disclaim, both on my own part, and that of the body, doctrines so unwise, so injurious, so dangerous, so unjust, and so unchristianlike—and I trust the disclaimer will be adopted by this meeting."

"MR. FINN followed, and entered his solemn protest against the doctrines contained in the speech imputed to Dr. Dromgoole."

"MR. O'CONNELL said, that before the question was put, he, too, was anxious to deliver his sentiments; and although he concurred with the resolution, and was desirous to redeem the Catholic Board from the novel charge of bigotry, yet he was still more anxious to rescue his excellent friend, Dr. Dromgoole, from the load of much unmerited calumny.

"In despite of that calumny, he would call and consider Dr. Dromgoole his excellent friend; he had qualities meriting that name, both as a public and a private man. As a public man, he was zealous, talented, honest, incorruptible, persevering, indefatigable; as a private man, he was kindly, sincere, unaffected—with as little of the oppressive bigot disposition about him—with a disposition as contrary to bigotry and oppression as any human being.

"In public, you all know him—in private, I know him well: and a man more abhorrent of any violence or constraint upon any religious opinion whatsoever, however repugnant to his own, cannot exist. I have, therefore, to complain, that so much clamour has been raised against him upon the report of a speech which, he tells you, is not correctly reported—and which we, who were present when he spoke, all know cannot possibly be correctly reported. I do but justice to my friend in this description; and although there is no calumny I fear so little as a charge against me of bigotry—because even my enemies know that I am the devoted advocate of the principle of religious liberty—yet I must do myself the justice to say, that no man can reject and condemn, more distinctly or emphatically than I do, whatever of intolerance, or of harshness, or of bigotry, may be found in the speech published as that of Dr. Dromgoole.

"But I do not condemn that publication upon any ground of impo-

licy ; policy does not seem to me to be the ground upon which our censure should be placed ; I know of no policy that could justify, or ought to palliate the suppression of every man's real opinions ; for my part I have no desire to enter into the pale of the constitution under any disguise—I have no wish to filch away any part of the constitution. My sentiments are frank and avowed : I am a Roman Catholic from conviction, as well as in consequence of my birth and education—I am firmly attached to the Catholic persuasion, because it appears to my mind the best ; and whilst I admit, cheerfully, to others a similar right of selection and preference, I disclaim and reject any emancipation but that which shall be granted to me as a Catholic.

“ If this declaration be displeasing to our enemies—if it have not sufficient of accommodation and conciliation for our kind and condescending friends, let them reject my claim, for I never will condescend to offer that claim otherwise than as a Catholic.

“ Speaking, therefore, of the speech, not as spoken here by Dr. Dromgoole, but as published for him, I have no hesitation in saying, that it is not because of its impolicy I find any fault with it, but upon that principle of mutual toleration and respectful courtesy towards each other, which ought to govern the speeches and publications of all sects of Christians.

“ Perhaps we are justified in treating the bigotry of a Catholic with more harshness than the same quality in a Protestant, just as the injury one suffers from a friend is more unpardonable than the extreme of outrage from an enemy ; yet I am grieved to see that those very persons who behold, with perfect indifference, the Catholic religion and Catholic people of Ireland outraged and insulted in the most scandalous and infamous manner, exhibit all the violent and frantic irritation of a diseased and morbid sensibility at the lesser offences comprised in the speech published by Dr. Dromgoole. I do complain that this morbid sensibility should exhaust its violence upon the speech attributed to the learned doctor ; and whilst I do not justify, but reprobate every harsh and narrow-minded passage in that publication, I do not, I cannot forget the beastly and brutal bigotry towards us which is daily exhibited in the newspapers in the pay of the government, and which is sanctioned by the laws themselves.

“ This clamour, which has been excited respecting the learned doctor's speech, brings with it one source of gratification. I am pleased to find our Protestant friends and enemies so alive to the evils of bigotry. It seems to me as if they had made a new discovery, and they show a zeal and freedom which does honour to their feelings, and is proportionate to the goodness of the cause in which they are engaged—that of

hostility to bigotry. I have ran before them—in this hostility to bigotry I now most heartily join them, friends and enemies—I most cheerfully join them in their hatred of bigotry ; all I require of them is to allow this holy animosity to be impartial and just—to suffer it to be applicable and applied to all parties and religious persuasions.

“ Let it not be exhausted and spent upon Dr. Dromgoole's speech ; but let, at least, a little of it be reserved for the bigotry of those who attack the Catholics of Ireland.

“ I have had lately occasion to refer to Dr. Duigenan's pamphlets ; and I thought to select some passages to show how much bigotry may be borne by modern liberality, provided it were bigotry directed against the Catholics. But it was vain to endeavour to select—there is but one idea in the entire of his works, that Irish Catholics are perjurers in principle, traitors from choice, and murderers by religion.

“ During the Richmond administration in Ireland, this man was made a privy councillor, for no other reason but his calumnies against us, and yet these detestators of bigotry—these men who are now in such a ferment against illiberality—these accusers of Dr. Dromgoole were silent, or applauded the promotion of Duigenan ! If, however, I have not been able to make any selection from amongst the calumnious rhapsodies of Duigenan, I have collected a few flowers from the government newspapers of the last six weeks—I will not disgust you with the reading of more than two of them.

“ Under the date of the 18th of last November, a newspaper in the pay of the castle has the following tirade, upon the occasion of the seat called Castle-Brown, in Kildare, having been, as it asserts, purchased by Jesuits :—

“ ‘ Ireland stands in imminent danger. If Popery succeeds, her fairest plains will once more witness days worthy of bloody Mary ! and the walls of Derry shall again become the lamentable bulwarks against Popish treachery and massacre !’

“ Well, this from men who hate the expression of any kind of bigotry ! who are in a rage at Dr. Dromgoole for using the word ‘ novelty’ in a disrespectful sense ; it is, one would think, rather uncivil. ‘ Papist treachery and massacre’ are perhaps nearly as bad as ‘ Protestant novelty.’

“ But this is a mere jest, compared with a paragraph which I found in a government newspaper of the second of this present December. Hear it with patience :—

“ ‘ The letter of Cranmer (alluding to a letter inserted in that paper), shows that times respectively, when each of the fundamental tenets of Popery were invented, viz., the power of the Pope to dispense with oaths,

and depose sovereign princes, by absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance, the nullity of oaths to heretics, their extirpation as a religious duty!

“Recollect that it is not a mere isolated individual—it is a man patronised and salaried by the administration—a man paid with our money that has the effrontery to traduce us thus. To attribute to us, as fundamental tenets, doctrines of perjury, murder, and treason—doctrines which, if they were those of the Church of Rome, I would not belong to her communion for an hour—doctrines which shock humanity, and would make religion the most cruel and the most absurd mockery!

“Where is now that fever of zeal and fever of liberality that induced the public press to strain all its energies on the attack of Dr. Dromgoole? Whom did his published speech accuse of perjury, of murder, and treason? What! shall it be said that, like the eels in the story, we Catholics are so accustomed to be skinned alive, that we do not feel it, but that the sensibility of every other sect deserves the highest protection—that of the Catholic people none? Are, then, the Catholics, in the opinion of their friends, in such a state of moral degradation, that it is quite unimportant how they are treated? Alas! I much fear there are too many who think so; and, miserable slaves that we are, our own dissensions encourage and justify the opinion.

“But that opinion has a higher source still. The law—the barbarous and calumniating spirit of legislation—has consecrated the contempt in which we are held. No Protestant can hold office in Ireland without being obliged to swear:—

“‘That the invocation of the saints, and the sacrifice of the mass, *as they are now used in the Church of Rome*, are superstitious and idolatrous!’

“Take notice, it is not any abstract notion that may be formed of these practices, but the practices themselves, ‘*as they are actually used*,’ are idolatrous.

“Thus our Protestant relatives, kinsmen, friends, are to swear solemnly, to attest to the ETERNAL BEING, that we are IDOLATORS! Hence, then, with the partial and corrupt irritability that seeks for causes of censure in the language of an unavowed individual Catholic, and forgets the paid, the salaried, the authorized, alas! the sworn calumnies, the bigotry of our adversaries.

“But do I justify the speech given to the learned doctor? Oh, no; certainly not. I do not think calumny and bigotry can or ought to be set off, the one against the other; or that the Catholic could or ought to compensate himself for the intolerance of his enemies by being himself intolerant. No; I condemn both—I condemn equally—I condemn



the paid bigot and his employer, as well as the volunteer bigot and his approvers. I would if I could silence both, and establish in the place of hatred, bigotry, and recrimination, a heart-cheering system of affection, toleration, and mutual cordiality ; and I would call upon all the liberal press of Ireland—a press which has such a paper as the *Dublin Evening Post* at its head—not to exhaust all the thunders on my friend Doctor Dromgoole, but to reserve enough of its fire and fury to blast and destroy all the enemies of perfect freedom of conscience.

“ Let me not be for one moment mistaken. Much as I regard Doctor Dromgoole, I never shall conceal my decided disapprobation of some of the topics contained in his printed speech. I heard one of them here ; and, respecting my friend as I sincerely do, I distinctly reprobated that topic, and insisted that reproachful language should not be used of any sect or persuasion. Doctor Dromgoole will also give me credit to believe, that if I had heard any where other topics of the printed speech, I would equally have disclaimed them at the moment.

“ But there is much exaggeration in the censure I heard this day—the meaning is shamefully mistaken—I had almost said, distorted ; but there is one thing quite clear, that this Board is the most unfit theatre in the world for polemical divinity. It is bad enough any where—here it is abominable. The Protestant divines assert that their system commenced with the Christian era, and was disfigured by the idolatrous errors of Popery for centuries. The Catholic divines assert, that our system commenced with the apostles, and has been continued since, in uninterrupted and unbroken succession, and that our adversaries have embraced human inventions in the stead of truth. The infidel will be apt to exclaim ‘ *Sottise des deux parts* ’—and the sober layman will leave the discussion to the divines at both sides.

“ Doctor Dromgoole seems to think that the word Protestant, which has been in use near three hundred years, is a novelty. The word seems to have caused great anger and violent indignation. I really am not aware of its insulting quality. If it be true, why not use it? If it be untrue, what harm can this unimportant falsehood do? But the fact is that those subjects, one and all, are unfit for our discussion here. The mutual assertions of polemics cause irritation and enmity, and never can induce conciliation or conviction. No man is ever converted from his opinions by persecution or abuse. Let all those subjects be for ever banished from amongst us, and let us set the glorious example of preaching and practising the doctrines of that Christianity which is founded in fraternal affection, and best evinced by fraternal charity.

“ Eight years have now elapsed since our agitation commenced.

During that period we have had meetings of every class; we have had speakers of every age, of every occupation, of every profession; we have spoken in the hour of hope; we have talked in disappointment; we have been heard in the long intervals of doubt—almost of despair; during this period our active, zealous, and indefatigable enemies have watched us well. The secret spy, the avowed hireling, the treacherous friend, have attended to all our discourses, and yet they have been unable to detect one single phrase of bigotry, a single expression of illiberality, a single idea of harshness to other sects, or a single indication of that mind which would retaliate oppression upon the oppressors.

“We could not have kept a secret so long. We could not have suppressed our real sentiments. Why has there, to the present period, been no bigotry discovered? For one reason only—because it did not exist; and those who boast that they have at length discovered it in Doctor Dromgoole’s speech—those who exhibit such joy at the discovery, do, in spite of themselves, by their very triumph at the discovery of bigotry in one individual, pay the Catholics at large the compliment of admitting that the discovery was unexpected—that bigotry was rare amongst us, and the finding of it, therefore, a triumph to our enemies. In this very triumph is found the finest eulogium that could be paid to the long-oppressed and mildly-suffering people of Ireland. It is the voice of a bitter enemy in its joy proclaiming its astonishment that a cause of reproach could be found to exist in any one individual of the Catholic body.

“I conclude by giving my concurrence to the motion. For my own part I have devoted much of my time to the Catholic cause—a time of little value, alas! to my country, but of great value to myself; but I would not give up one hour of that time, or a single exertion of my mind, to procure the mere victory of any one sect or persuasion over the others! No, my object is of a loftier and different nature. **I AM AN AGITATOR WITH ULTERIOR VIEWS!**—I wish for liberty—real liberty!

“But there can be no freedom any where without perfect liberty of conscience. That is of the essence of freedom in every place. In Ireland, it is eminently, almost exclusively, the hope of liberty.

“*The emancipation* I look for is one which would establish the rights of conscience upon a general principle to which every class of Christians could equally resort—a principle which would serve and liberate the Catholics in Ireland, but would be equally useful to the Protestant in Spain—a principle, in short, which would destroy the Inquisition and the Orange Lodges together, and have no sacrilegious intruder between man and his Creator! I esteem the Roman Catholic religion as the

most eligible. All I require is that the Protestant, the Presbyterian, the Dissenter, the Methodist, should pay the same compliment to his own persuasion, and leave its success to its own persuasive powers, without calling in the profane assistance of temporal terrors, or the corrupt influence of temporal rewards."

"With these views, with these sentiments, I concur in the resolution proposed, and, I am encouraged to concur in it because it does not appear to me that my friend, Doctor Dromgoole, thinks it ought, in its present shape, to be opposed, or if I find any difficulty in acceding to it, that difficulty arises from my great contempt for that hireling clamour, excited by the vilest bigots, against a very feeble imitation of their own practice, and to which clamour you appear to me to offer a tribute which it does not deserve to obtain.

"This senseless and magpie accusation of bigotry is raised against us by the very creatures who are daily trafficking themselves in bigotry. The Orangemen arraiguing religious prejudices! Oh, for a sermon in favour of chastity, to be preached by the venerable keeper of a brothel! Yet to this goddess is the tribute of this vote offered. Think you that you will conciliate those who raised this uproar? Do you imagine that light from heaven would convince them? No, no; they have an immediate interest in traducing you, and, right or wrong, they must give their allotted portion of bigotry.

"I do dislike this motion on that account, and it does require the knowledge that Dr. Dromgoole himself will not oppose the motion, to bring me over to his support.

"There is another principle of opposition, too, which I meant to take, and if I did, it would, I imagine, be irresistible—it is the precedent which this vote will leave. I solemnly protest against it as a precedent. I would not have the Board made responsible for the speeches of any individual. I protest against such responsibility. I would not have the Board deemed answerable for the speeches of my learned friend, Mr. O'Gorman, nor for my nearer friend, Mr. Finn; still less would I have you held responsible for my discourses. And yet if we disavow Doctor Dromgoole's speech, what will be the obvious consequences? Why, that the hirelings will exclaim at every sentence that sounds harsh to their servile ears, 'Why, this is the sentiment of the Catholic Board.' It will be in vain to answer, 'No, it is the sentiment but of an insignificant individual'—I allude to my own case—the reply will in future be decisive. It must be the opinion of the entire Board, otherwise they would disavow it, as they disavowed Doctor Dromgoole.

"Thus the present motion, originating as it has done with men whose errors can be attributed only to mistaken patriotism, will for ever

afford our enemies an argument and a proof that the opinions of each individual are authorized by the Board, because not disavowed.

“ Yet I will not divide the Board, but vote for this motion, because it gives me another opportunity of reprobating bigotry and religious rancour in general, and of pouring my execrations on the causes of that feud which changed the inhabitants of this land from countrymen and brothers, and made them aliens to each other, and mortal enemies; that feud which has struck down the ancient kingdom of Ireland from her rank as a nation, leaving her nothing but the name of the paltry and pitiful province, in which we vegetate rather than live !”

After Mr. O'Connell, Dr. Dromgoole spoke, and the resolution passed.

## CHAPTER III.

WE revert once more to the year 1813, to give another act of the Magee melo-drama.

## "COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

"THE KING *at the Prosecution of the DUKE OF RICHMOND v. MAGEE.*

"MR. O'CONNELL said he was instructed to move the court to set aside the verdict of conviction obtained by the prosecutor against Mr. Magee. These were the reasons assigned by the defendant, upon which the verdict ought to be set aside:—

"First—'That the jury was not regularly impanelled, balloted, and sworn.

"Second—'That the jury was unduly returned upon a second *venire*, after a former *venire* had been issued and returned.

"Third—'That there was not evidence to go to the jury of a publication of the alleged libel in the county of the city of Dublin, and for the misdirection, in that particular, of the learned judge.'

"To raise these objections in law, it would be necessary to examine the facts, and these facts were brought before the court by the affidavit of Mr. Magee, which stated, that notice of trial had been served on him on the 17th of May last; that a writ of *venire facias* had issued, tested the 5th of May, and returnable on the Monday next after the Morrow of the Ascension, which had been returned with a panel annexed; that he heard and believed that a writ of *distringas* had issued, grounded on that *venire*.

"The affidavit further stated, that the trial having been postponed, it did not take place till the 26th of July; that a new writ of *venire facias*, bearing test the 31st of May, and returnable in three weeks from the Holy Trinity, had issued and was returned with a panel annexed; and that in the panel annexed to the second *venire*, there were some names different from those in the panel annexed to the first *venire*.

"Such were the facts disclosed by Mr. Magee's affidavit. There had been abundant time given to the crown-solicitor to answer this affidavit, and to rectify any mistake or misapprehension; no answer had been given, and, therefore, for the purposes of the present motion, it must be taken for granted that the facts were as Mr. Magee stated them to be; in other words, the defendant's affidavit must be taken to be true.

“CHIEF JUSTICE—We will not look to any affidavit—these are matters of record. We will consult the officer of the court upon them; this is the time to have the facts ascertained by him. Mr. Bourne, how is the fact?”

“MR. BOURNE, the clerk of the crown, said that on the 5th of May a *venire* issued returnable on the 31st, being the last day of term, on which day the court had postponed the trial. The *venire*, however, had been returned in the usual way, with the panel annexed by the sheriff, on the 30th of May, but no *distringas* issued on that *venire*. On the 31st of May, a second *venire* issued, returnable on the morrow of three weeks of the Holy Trinity, and on this *venire* a *distringas* issued, and the trial was had.

“MR. O'CONNELL asked if the names inserted in the second panel were not different from those inserted in the first?”

“MR. BOURNE said that there were *some* of them different.

“MR. O'CONNELL—Now, my lords, we are agreed as to all the facts, except one. We are agreed that two *venires* issued, and were returned with a panel annexed to each, and that those panels were different from each other. The only fact we can dispute about is the issuing of the *distringas* on the first *venire*. Now, the affidavit states that such *distringas* issued. The crown-solicitor, who must know the fact positively, as it belonged to him alone to issue it, is silent. The fact being uncontradicted by him, who alone could positively contradict it, must be taken for admitted, because not denied. I am, therefore, at liberty to assume, for the purposes of my argument, that there were two writs of *distringas* as well as two writs of *venire*.

“CHIEF JUSTICE—No such thing. The officer declares that there was but one *distringas*, and we will take his certificate as conclusive.

“MR. O'CONNELL—My lord, the officer cannot certify any such thing. He does, I admit, declare it, but he cannot certify it, because a negative certificate to that effect would be in the nature of an *alibi*, lasting from the 5th to the 31st of May. If the officer was for one moment out of the office during that period, the *distringas* might have issued without his knowing anything about the matter; for it is not to be supposed that he can possibly recollect all the writs he signs for a month. Now the practice is to issue the *venire* and *distringas* together. You will find it so laid down in Tidd's Book of Practice, 5th edition, page 795. The assertion of the officer is therefore of no weight in the matter. The only way to contradict our affidavit would be by the affidavit of the crown-solicitor, who must know the fact, or a negative certificate out of the seal book.

“JUSTICE DAY—If the *distringas* had issued, it would have been re-

turned to the office, and we should find it with the officer along with the *venire*.

“MR. O’CONNELL—No, my lord, you could not find it with the officer; it is never returned to the office; it cannot be returned to the office, because it is not a returnable writ; nor is it ever brought in, unless there be a trial, and then it comes to the officer, together with the *postea*.

“JUSTICE DAY—Why, it is impossible that *distringas* could have issued. The *venire* was returnable on the 31st May; the *distringas* could not issue until the next day, and upon the 31st the court postponed the trial.

“MR. O’CONNELL—Is it your lordship’s opinion that the *venire* being returnable the 31st of May, the *distringas* could not be tested or issue until the 1st of June?

“JUSTICE DAY—Certainly; that is my opinion. I am quite clear that the *venire* being returned on the 31st of May, the *distringas* must bear test next day.

“MR. O’CONNELL—Then, my lord, that would be error; that precisely would make the Record erroneous. The identical point was determined in Tutchin’s case, 2nd Lord Raym. 1061, and 14th Cobbett’s State Trials, 1095. There the *venire* was returnable the 23rd of October—the *distringas* bore test the 24th, and it was held to be a discontinuance, and the judgment was arrested.

“CHIEF JUSTICE—Well, sir, we are all of opinion that the report of the officer must be taken as conclusive; and you are bound to argue the case as if no *distringas* had issued. We will not hear the matter debated after the declaration of the officer.

“MR. O’CONNELL—Well, my lords, I must take it so; and really it does not weaken the case of my client. The law is as clearly in his favour as if it was admitted that the *distringas* had issued; although, until controlled by the court, I did not feel at liberty to give up even a point of no great importance.

“Let me, before I go into the argument of the case, take the precaution (probably a superfluous precaution) of showing that the court can, and may set aside verdicts had against any person charged with a crime. When the party accused is acquitted, then, indeed, the court cannot set aside the verdict; but it is otherwise when a verdict of conviction was given. In 2 Hawkins, 628, it is said to be settled, that ‘the court cannot set aside a verdict which acquits a prisoner, but they may a verdict that convicts, as contrary to evidence, or the directions of the learned judge, or any other verdict whatsoever for a mis-trial.’ This authority is express, that a verdict of conviction may be set aside; so

it seems may any verdict, which I understand to mean even a verdict of acquittal in the case of a mis-trial.

“ Now, my lords, this is an application to set aside a verdict of conviction, and in the strongest possible case—a case of a mis-trial. There was, I contend, a mis-trial for two reasons :—

“ First, because the jury was not regularly impanelled and balloted for according to the provisions of the act, called the Balloting Act ; and

“ Secondly, by reason of the second *venire*.

“ The third point—the want of legal evidence—belongs rather to the class of cases upon improper verdicts, than as a ground of mis-trial.

“ Upon the first point, the fact appears on the record that there were but twenty-four jurors returned. If the case be within the Balloting Act there should have been at least thirty-six. The fact also is, that the jury were sworn as they appeared ; but if the case be within the Balloting Act, they should have been drawn by lot. Now I contend for it that this case is within the Balloting Act. That act is the 20 Geo. II. c. 6. It is entitled ‘ An Act for the better regulating Juries.’ The recital of this act is general, that many evil practices had been used in corrupting of jurors returned to try issues before justices of assize, or at nisi prius, and expressly to prevent the like practice the remedy is applied by the legislature.

“ The first section prescribes the amount of property which shall be a necessary qualification for jurors, for the trial of issues between party and party before justices of assize or nisi prius, save upon trials *per medietatem* linguæ. I entreat of the court to carry the exception in its recollection, as trials *per medietatem* can occur only in criminal cases. The 3rd and 4th sections of the statute are those the construction of which is now in controversy ; they enact that, after the 1st of May, 1756, every sheriff or other officer, to whom the return of the venire, or other process, for trial of causes before the justices of assize or Nisi Prius, doth belong, shall annex a panel thereto containing not less than thirty-six, nor above sixty names of jurors, and that those names need not be entered in the distringas, but the panel referred to ; and the statute then enacts, that those names shall be written on separate slips of paper or parchment, and put into a box or glass, and drawn out by some person appointed by the court for that purpose ; and that the first twelve names so drawn shall constitute the jury, unless in case any person be set aside on a challenge, when another name is to be drawn, and so on in every case of challenge until the jury is complete.

“ My lord, if the case of Mr. Magee come within this statute, there



has been a mis-trial, because the proper number thirty-six were not returned, and because there was no ballot, or drawing of the names. But it will be contended for, on the other side, that this act of parliament is applicable solely to civil causes, and does not extend to criminal causes; and this position is sustained upon the legal rule that the king is bound by no act of parliament, unless specially named or necessarily implied. I admit, my lords, the fact, that the king is not expressly named in this act. I admit also the rule, as a general rule, but it has exceptions, and I think I shall be able to demonstrate that this act binds the king and extends to criminal cases. I shall establish that this act includes criminal as well as civil causes, upon three grounds:—

“First—Upon the ground that this is one of those acts of parliament which, upon general principles, bind the king without his being specially named.

“Secondly—Upon the construction of the act itself taken separately.

“Thirdly—Upon the construction of this act, as induced and forfeited by a comparison with other statutes made in *pari materia*.

“I have admitted the rule, that the king is not bound by any statute unless specially named. I insist there are exceptions to that rule. The very first authorities in the law prove those exceptions. The words of Lord Coke, in the 2nd Inst. 681, are these—‘Whenever a statute is intended to remedy a wrong, as the statute 32 Henry VIII., to prevent a discontinuance by the husband of his wife’s estate, the king is bound by it, though not specially named.’ I beg also to refer the court to 5th Co. 14—letters A and B, called the ‘Case of Ecclesiastical Persons.’ It is expressly laid down ‘that all statutes to suppress wrong—to take away fraud—to prevent the decay of religion—bind the king, though not named in them.’ And in the case of the king against the Archbishop of Armagh, reported in 1st Stra. 516, it is decided, that the king is bound, without being named, by all statutes for the advancement of religion or of learning. Thus, then, we have exceptions to the rule, that the king is not bound by a statute unless expressly named. The king is bound, though not named by all the statutes made to remedy wrong, to suppress wrong, to take away fraud, to prevent the decay of religion, to advance religion, to advance learning.

“Does the statute in question come within any of those exceptions, is the only remaining question. It is ‘an act expressly to prevent the evil practices of corrupting jurors, and to procure a fair and impartial trial.’ Is not that to remedy wrong? *Is not the suppression*

of the corrupting of jurors a suppression of a wrong? Is it not a fraud to corrupt jurors, and does not this act take away a fraud? I may go further and say, that it is an act to prevent the decay of religion, because in the corruption of jurors perjury is necessarily implied, and surely, where perjury prevails religion must decay. But this may be a forced construction, and I need not rely on it. It is quite plain, that this is a statute which remedies a wrong, suppresses a wrong, and takes away a fraud; it suppresses and gives a remedy for a wrong of the most grievous, scandalous, and abominable kind, the corrupting of jurors; it takes away a fraud of the most mischievous and dangerous description, the corrupting of jurors.

“Is the court prepared solemnly to determine that to corrupt jurors is no wrong, nor any fraud? Look at the instance put by Lord Coke of a wrong, for the suppression of which the king is bound without being named. A discontinuance by the husband of the wife's estate—a mere inquiry to individual property, and can it be imagined that the corrupting of jurors, which renders all property, life, and honour insecure—the corrupting of jurors, which destroys the very foundation of our laws, and renders civilised society worse than barbarism—the corruption of jurors, including judicial robbery and murder; that all this is so light and trivial a nature as to be no wrong, no fraud, and not to be compared in importance with the invasion by a husband of the rights of his wife to her freehold estates.

I feel that I consume time unnecessarily when I press this point. It is impossible that this evil should not be admitted to be a wrong and a fraud; as the authorities which I have cited cannot be overturned, I look with confidence to your decision, that this statute of the 29th of George II. is one which binds the crown, although not specially named, but the case is still stronger, because even if the court decided the question against me on the general principle, yet this particular statute is so framed as to bind the king. He is bound by the first section. That section enacts, that in the trial of all issues joined between party and party in the courts above or at Nisi Prius, no person shall be a juror unless he have a certain property, except on trials *per medietatem lingue*, and also except in counties of cities and towns. Now, if ever the exception proved the rule, this is a case where it does so. The exception is of a trial *per medietatem*; but that trial can be had in criminal cases only. It can be had in the one case alone where the king is a party. The legislature have excepted this species of trial. If they had not expressly excepted it, it would have been included, or this absurdity must follow, that the legislature, by express words, excepted that which was not included at all in the enactment.

“To this dilemma is the court reduced, it must decide either that the general enactment of the first section includes criminal cases, and then this exception is sensible and rational, or that the first section does not include criminal cases, and then this exception, introduced by the legislature, is absurd and nonsensical. Either my construction of the statute is the right one, or the legislature has enacted gross and childish nonsense.

“Which construction will the court adopt? Assuredly that construction which I put on the statute, and which gives to the entire of it good sense and plain meaning, and the court will at once reject that interpretation which converts the act into a jumble of absurdities and contradictions.

“Having thus established upon the constitution of the first section of the statute that criminal cases are included in it as well as civil, I come to the third and fourth sections; and here the matters appear quite plain: those sections speak of any sheriff or other officer having the return of the venire or other process, for the trial of causes (those are the words of the act), before justices of assize or *Nisi Prius* in any county. The words are general, they apply to all sheriffs and officers, to all jury process, to all causes, and to all counties. There is no exception here as in the first section of trials *per medietatem*. There is no exception here as in the first section of counties, and cities, and towns. Let it be recollected that I have established that the first section applies to criminal as well as civil cases, and then I have only to contend for it, that the other sections, which are more extensive in the words of enactment, are at least equally extensive in meaning.

“The state of the argument is this: I have proved that the first section, though more limited in phrase and language, extends to criminal as well as civil cases, and all that remains is to show that the third and fourth sections, which are more extensive in phrase and language, are equally extensive in meaning. But the very terms of the proposition are self-evident, otherwise this absurdity would follow, that when the legislature said *less* it meant *more*, and when it said *more* it meant *less*. And now, my lords, to decide the construction of the statute against my client will be to introduce inextricable confusion and absurdity into our statute law, and render language of no avail but to confound all meaning and understanding. It may, perhaps, be answered, as I have before heard the assertion made, that the king is never included under the description of a party to a cause. My answer will be the words of the 10th Charles I. c. 13, an act which I will have again to refer to. It enacts:—

““That in all cases where a full jury does not appear, then either

party may pray *a tales*, as well where the *king is a party* as otherwise.'

"I cite this act to show that the legislature, under the description of party to a cause, has included the king, thus giving a legislative meaning to the word which precludes the necessity of any argument to show its legal meaning. I have thus obviated the only objection that I conceive can be raised to my construction of this statute. I have thus I hope successfully contended, that this statute should be construed to extend to criminal as well as civil cases, but I deem it right to confirm this construction, by pointing the attention of the court to statutes made for the same purposes—the procuring of fair and impartial jurors. Statutes made in aid of the *same purpose* have been always used to aid the construction of each. The courts consider the entire as one system of law, each part of which should serve to support and illustrate the rest.

"Let us see then how the present statute can be best considered to form part of the same system, with the 10th Charles I.; it is the 13th chapter of the 2nd session of that year. The section I would particularly call the attention of the court to is the third; it is entitled:—

“An Act concerning the Appearance of Jurors at Nisi Prius.’

“The first section relates to the qualification of jurors and regulates the *venire*; the second regulates the *distringas*; and the third provides for the appointment of *a tales*, for default of the jurors named in the panel ‘in all actions as well where the king is a party as where he is not.’

“Now take those two statutes together, you will find the king included in the first, which purports to regulate the jurors at Nisi Prius; you will find him included as a party, and you will find criminal cases (for none other can be meant) comprised in the words ‘all actions.’ See, then, whether it be possible to exclude the king from the second statute. That statute is part of the same system with the first, and are made with the same object; the intention of the legislature is the same in both—to procure a fair and impartial trial. As in the third section of the statute of the 10th of Charles I., so in the first section of the 29th of George II., criminal cases are plainly included.

“Can the court perceive all this, and not feel the monstrous absurdity of attempting to disjoint the two statutes—to break up the system of law into fragments, by giving to one statute a different construction from the other? And why should this be done? Why should the court make the legislature thus capricious and contradictory? Why should it make the first statute differ from the second? Why should

the court make the first section of the second statute contradict the third and fourth sections of the very same statute? Surely the mischief which the legislature desired to remedy is as great in criminal as in civil cases. It is as easy to corrupt jurors in criminal as in civil causes. Nay it is more likely to be done. The temptation to corrupt—the temptations to be corrupted are much stronger in criminal than in civil causes. The evil consequences are as great, really much greater, in the criminal causes. Why then shall the court adopt a construction of the statute, which, against the words and plain intention of the legislature, must confine the remedy and relief intended by parliament to crimes of minor mischief and more difficult perpetration, and exclude the cases of greater evil and more easy commission?

“My lords, I confess I am anxious to succeed upon this part of the case. If the court will give my construction to the act, they will go far to prevent any odious and atrocious attempt to pack a jury. The subjects of the land will have the same chance of fair and impartial juries in criminal cases tried at Nisi Prius, as they have in civil suits, and the law upon this subject will be consistent with itself, and conducive to justice.

“Let it not be said that the practice of returning but twenty-four jurors has fixed a judicial construction upon this act. I deny that any practice can alter the law, and besides practice in civil cases (and the practice has been confined merely to civil cases) cannot have been considered as of any importance. It is a practice that could not be controlled by the parties, because, under the statutes of Isofailes, the error is cured by verdict, and, therefore, there has been no person interested in civil cases to bring this practice in review before the court. It would be of no avail to a party in a civil suit to go to the expense of calling on the court to decide upon the construction of this act after verdict, when he was stopped from taking any advantage of the error.

“I do, therefore, firmly rely on it, that the practice in civil cases cannot afford any assistance in construing this statute. *The statute itself must decide the question*, and to that I with confidence appeal.

“If this statute, the 29th George II., be held to extend to criminal cases, there is an end to all question, and the verdict must be set aside. If, on the contrary, the court shall decide that this statute does not extend to criminal cases, then our second objection must prevail—that of the two *venires*; because it is only that statute which allows a second *venire* after the first is returned. The prosecutor is reduced to this dilemma—either the 29th of George II. c. 6, extends to criminal cases (and then there has been a mis-trial for want of sufficient return of

jurors, and of a ballot), or that act does not extend to criminal cases, and then there has been a mis-trial, because of the second *venire*.

“My lords, neither at common law, nor under any other statute, could a second *venire* issue after the return of the first; even in civil cases no second *venire* could issue at common law. The case of *Pretious v. Robinson*, 2 Vent. 173, proves that there could be no second *venire* at common law. It was an action in which issue was joined in Hilary Term, in the second year of William and Mary; the *venire* was awarded and issued in that term. In Easter Term a second *venire* issued, upon which a trial and verdict were had; the jury returned *was precisely the same upon both venires*, yet the verdict was set aside upon the grounds of its being a mis-trial. The court said all the proceedings were void, there being no authority for the second *venire*. This, my lords, is a case in point, though a weaker case than ours; for the jury in that was the same—in ours, different. The case of *Pretious v. Robinson* appears, however, to have been the cause of the interference of the legislature. The inconvenience of continuing the same jurors from term to term, until it should suit the convenience of the parties to go to trial; to continue the jury for years in attendance, was felt, in civil cases, to be a great inconvenience to suitors as well as to jurors themselves, and therefore the legislature interfered. But you see from the case I have cited, that at common law there could have been but one *venire*, even in civil cases; and the practice was to continue the jury by issuing a *distringas*, then an *alias*, and then a *pluries distringas*, and so on until the cause was tried, see Tidd's Prac. 789. The first statute in England that altered the law in this respect was the 7th and 8th of Will. III. c. 32, which was amended and extended by the 3rd Geo. II. c. 25. In Ireland, the statutes that relate to the *venire* are, first, the act of the 10th Chas. I., st. 2, c. 12; it enacts, that any mis-awarding of a *venire*, or defect in its return, shall be cured by verdict; but in this act there is an express exception of criminal cases.

• “Second—The act of 7 Will. III. c. 25; it enacts, that want of fifteen days between the test and the return of the writ of *venire* shall not be deemed error; but in this act there is also an express exception of criminal cases.

“Third—The act of the 6th of Anne, c. 10; it enacts, that a *venire* may be directed to the body of the county, and not to any particular ville, but criminal cases are excepted.

“These, my lords, are the only statutes in Ireland which altered the common law, with respect to the writs of *venire facias*, before the act of the 29th Geo. II. c. 6. But in the three former acts criminal cases were excepted, so that unless the last act, the 29th of Geo. II. applies

to criminal cases, the writ of *venire* in those cases must be regulated by the common law, and then the authority of *Pretious v. Robinson* is in point to show that there could not have been a second *venire*.

"But this doctrine does not rest upon the authority of that solitary case. The law is distinctly laid down in the case of the *King v. Franklin*—a case which occurred in the 5th of Geo. II., the year 1731, and of which a full report is given in 5th T. Rep. 453, in the case of the *King v. Perry*. In *Franklin's* case it was material for his counsel to shew that there *ought* to have been a second jury under the English Special Jury Act; but they failed upon the construction of that act, and they were compelled to admit that at common law there could not have been a *venire de novo*. Lord Raymond, then Chief Justice, is indeed express upon the point. 'The statute of William and Mary,' said he, 'does not extend to criminal cases; and, therefore, in criminal cases there cannot be a second *venire*.' Such is the express decision of the court in *Franklin's* case, in 1731; and that case is adopted as clear law in 1793, by the unanimous opinion of the Court of King's Bench, in the *King v. Perry*. The same law that, after one *venire* returned, there could not issue at common law a second *venire*, is expressly laid down by all the books of practice; you will find it in Tidd, 5th Ed. 1792, in *Gilb. Comm. Pleas*, 92, and laid down very distinctly in the case of the *King v. Haire and Mann*, in 1st Stra. 267.

"In that case there was a *scire facias*, at the suit of the crown, to repeal letters patent. One of the defendants pleaded to the facts—the other demurred in law. The Attorney-General applied for a trial at bar. It was resisted until after the argument of the demurrer; because if that were determined against the crown, any trial of the fact would be superfluous. The Attorney-General, however, said that the *venire* was returned and filed, so that if the trial was put off, there would be a discontinuance. But the court said, 'there is no danger of a discontinuance if the *venire* be filed, the proper entry is that the jury *ponitur in respectu*; if it be not filed, you may enter a *vice comes*, not *misit breve*, and either will prevent a discontinuance.'

"So that upon all these authorities—*Pretious v. Robinson*, *The King v. Franklin*, *The King v. Perry*, *The King v. Haire and Mann*, and from all the books of practice, I draw this undeniable conclusion, that after one *venire* is returned and filed, there cannot be a second *venire* without a discontinuance and a mis-trial, unless under the authority of the statute of the 39th of Geo. II. But the prosecutor, in the present case, cannot rely on that act, because if this case be within its provisions, then there was a mis-trial for the other reasons adduced.

"Perhaps some flimsy attempts may be made to distinguish this case

from those I have cited, upon the idle allegation that the first *venire* was not filed. My lord, this distinction would be so very senseless, that I conjecture it will be resorted to only because there is no other possible mode of escaping from the dilemma to which the prosecution is reduced. But I disdain to argue upon so unfounded a distinction. The *venire* is produced in court from amongst your records; it is produced, together with the rest of the record, and as part of the entire. Nothing is filed unless this *venire* be filed; and I believe it would be impossible to show any authority to distinguish between records that are filed and records that are not. I dismiss the objection with the perfect conviction that it cannot be seriously attended to, and does not deserve a serious reply.

“Thus, then, stands the case; there are two *venires*, both returned and filed. The first is totally abandoned, and, although in the office, yet a false suggestion entered of *vice comes not misit breve*. There was, therefore, a discontinuance, there was, therefore, a mis-trial.

“There was a discontinuance because the first *venire* was not followed up in regular course. The entry should have been a respite of the jury—*ponitur in respectu*—*respectus* being the law Latin for a respite; but instead of that entry a new *venire* is awarded, and upon that the trial is had. The first *venire* is abandoned, and completely discontinued; any, the slightest interruption in the progress of the process is a discontinuance. In Tutchin's case, which I have already cited to the court, the *venire* was returnable the 23rd of October; to continue the process regularly, the *distringas* should have borne test on that day; it bore test the next day, the 24th, and this was held to be a discontinuance or interruption of the process; yet, as the law knows no fraction of a day, the process was well continued by the *venire* until the last moment of the 23rd of October, and the *distringas* carried it on from the first moment of the 24th. There was, therefore, no discontinuance, no interruption of the process, save for the ideal instant that may be supposed to separate the last moment of the 23rd, from the first moment of the 24th of the same month; but the law recognizing the existence of that ideal instant, as making a separation between the *venire* and *distringas*; and the *venire* being completely run out *before* the *distringas* commenced, the court decided that there was a want of connexion between them, which prevented a regular continuance of process, and the judgment was arrested, and Tutchin escaped punishment, although he had been convicted by a jury.

“But see how much—how infinitely stronger Mr. MAGEE's case is; the first *venire* was returned the 30th of May last; on the 31st its return was out; from that day to this there have been no further pro



ceedings on it; it has been abandoned, not for an ideal instant, but for many months and altogether; there is no man who can contend but, under those circumstances, a discontinuance has occurred in the cause.

"I may, my lords, be greatly mistaken, but I confess it seems to me to be impossible to get over these objections. The prosecutor has discontinued his first *venire*, and therefore the subsequent proceedings are void. He has tried Mr. MAGEE upon a second *venire* and a new panel, and therefore the proceedings are void; or if he shall resort to the statute, which enables parties in civil cases to abandon the first and issue a second *venire*, then, my lords, his proceedings are equally void for want of the ballot, and the proper number of jurors which that statute requires.

"The third point relates to the evidence. I feel the case so strong upon the two views of it, that I am disposed to abandon the third to the exertions of my learned colleagues. In fact, the only evidence given of a publication in Dublin of the matter alleged to be libellous was the paper left at the stamp office. Now, the purpose of its being left there was merely to have the stamp duties calculated and paid. It was not left there for any other purpose of information—not that the columns should be read or communicated to others. Can this be called a publication? I admit it proves proprietorship; but suppose—and upon the present evidence you are bound to suppose—that only the one paper which was sent to the stamp office to have the duties ascertained, was printed, could you call that a publication of a libel in Dublin? I submit that would be carrying the doctrine of constructive publication farther than it has yet been; and the court will not, I trust, make, in a criminal case, any decision so unfavourable to the liberty of the subject.

"I conclude with conjuring the court not to sanction the proceedings of the Attorney-General in this case; for, supposing and admitting that it did not originate in improper motives, it may lead to improper conduct in future law officers. I mean not to make an unnecessary charge upon the present law officers of the crown; but if the court determines this case against my client, they will enable a future attorney-general to change his jury as often as he pleases, until he shall procure one suited to his purposes; whilst, by the same construction, the subject will be deprived of all chance of a fair and impartial trial, by being deprived of the large number to select from—the knowledge of their character and situations in life in time to prepare his challenges, and the fair chance of having the best men in the panel on the jury; all precious advantages, to which every subject who has property to the amount of £10 at stake is clearly entitled."

While on the subject of these compliments to Mr. O'Connell, it will save time to insert here the following publication from the *Dublin Evening Post* of January 18, 1814:—

“Daniel O'Connell, Esq., at his house in Merrion-square, was this day, January 14, 1814, presented with a silver cup, accompanied with the following

“ ADDRESS.

“ SIR—Please to accept from the manufacturers of the Liberty of the City of Dublin, a silver cup, as a token of their confidence and esteem. It is but the widow's mite;—yet they hope not less acceptable, as it overflows with their affections.

“ They value equally your private worth, and public transcendent abilities, evinced on all occasions for the good of our common country.

“ May your days be long and happy in your honourable professional pursuits—so as your children's children may unite in greeting you with ours, for having handed down to posterity, unswilled, those virtues and talents which we all so much admire.

“ We are, with respect, your faithful humble Servants,

“ J. TALBOLT.

“ C. DOWDALL.

“ ANSWER.

“ FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—You make me very proud; you make me very vain. You call this the token of your esteem and your confidence; you offer it as the pledge of your affections! My Irish heart swells with grateful acknowledgments. It prizes your gift beyond all that princes or powers could bestow.

“ How fondly do you overrate me! I have not talents—I have not services—but I have a heart devoted to the civil and religious liberties of our common country. Your kindness confirms and exalts that devotion; and sooner shall my heart cease to vibrate than forsake the cause of conciliation and cordiality, or abandon the wish and the hope for the re-establishment of the independence of Ireland.

“ You compare the situation of your manufactures to the widow's state. Alas! your country is widowed too! Manufactures and freedom equally require a resident and national legislature. Before 1782 Ireland had neither manufactures nor freedom. Legislative independence gave her both; and as they were created by the genius of the Irish constitution, so they can revive only under the same powerful influence.

“ My gratitude to the manufacturers will be best evinced if I can awake the people of Ireland to hope for a REPEAL OF THE UNION! If they once entertain hope, success will be neither remote nor difficult. The nations of Europe are bursting their bondage. Shall Ireland alone remain accursed? Yes! she is accursed in the insane dimensions of her inhabitants. But she may become a nation again, if we all sacrifice our parricidal passions, prejudices, and resentments on the altar of our country. Then shall your manufactures flourish, and Ireland be free!

“ To hold a place in your esteem, confidence, and affection, and to merit it by the honesty of my wishes for the welfare of our country, is the first ambition, fellow-countryman, of your devoted and grateful Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

The cup in question (still in Mr. O'Connell's possession, of course) is a very handsome one, and reflects great credit upon the taste and skill of the Irish artist and fabricators.

On the occasion of receiving it, Mr. O'Connell, in allusion to





the then subsisting custom of toast giving, declared that no toast should ever be drunk out of it save

“THE REPEAL OF THE UNION!”

It is a melancholy thing to reflect upon, that low and poverty-stricken as was the condition of that extensive district entitled “The Liberty” of Dublin City, it has long since fallen much lower, and, indeed, declined into utter ruin. The time is years ago gone by, when such a presentation could be repeated as that which we record; and “The Liberty” which, during the Irish Parliament, was the focus of active and most remunerative manufacturing employment of various descriptions, is now, and has for a long time been known, only as the focus of the last and uttermost wretchedness and helpless destitution!

For this amongst the rest was the legislative union ordained, and this amongst the rest of the appalling miseries now afflicting this unhappy country, the legislative union has most fatally and notably accomplished.

\* We had nearly omitted an interesting speech of Mr. O’Connell’s, delivered on the very last day of the year 1813:—

“At a meeting of the Catholic Board, at the Shakspeare Gallery, Friday, 31st Dec., MR. O’GORMAN in the chair,

“MR. O’CONNELL rose to make his promised motion on the subject of illegal associations. He said that the importance of the subject he had to introduce should serve as an excuse for want of method. The miseries of Ireland pressed too heavily on the heart not to exclude every other consideration.

“It required no authority to prove that Ireland had been wretched almost beyond the lot of humanity. Her sufferings were known where they were not felt—in England. The present Lord Sidmouth, then Mr. Addington, in one of the Union debates, had said, ‘that in the six hundred years since the reign of Henry II., there had been more unhappiness in Ireland than in any other civilized nation not actually under the visitation of pestilence or internal war. There was neither prosperity, nor tranquillity, nor safety.’ Such was the representation made before the Union, and it was now confessed by every body, that the Union had not diminished our calamities.

“It was beyond the present question to consider the causes of the miseries of Ireland. They were either too remote, or too obvious, to

justify any lengthened commentary. But the effects of her wretchedness were daily exhibited in various wild and frightful forms.

“Amongst these effects stood prominent the tendency of the people to form combinations and secret associations. The law of nature which, during evaporation, gave a form to the crystal, was not more powerful than the moral influence that tended to connect in bonds almost indissoluble the children of misfortune. Under various fantastic denominations, the Irish people classed themselves together in societies, some of which still exist, but many had left little trace, save their names, their crimes, and the graves of their victims.

“There had been, or were, ‘White Boys’ and ‘Right Boys’—‘Caravats’ and ‘Shanavests’—‘Thrashers’ and ‘Carders’—‘Hearts of Steel’—‘Peep-o’-Day Boys’—‘Defenders’—‘Orangemen’ and ‘Ribbonmen’—and, above and different from all, ‘United Irishmen.’

“The immediate causes that had produced those associations were of two different kinds. The associations had two distinct characters. The first cause and character were to be traced to the oppressions of tithe-jobbers and land-jobbers; and to this class belonged the ‘White Boys,’ ‘Right Boys,’ ‘Caravats,’ ‘Shanavests,’ ‘Thrashers,’ and ‘Carders.’ The second cause and character were easily discerned in religious animosity and rancour, and to this class belonged the ‘Hearts of Steel,’ ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys,’ ‘Defenders,’ ‘Orangemen,’ and ‘Ribbonmen.’ The last, and the ‘Defenders,’ were exclusively Catholic—the other three exclusively of the different Protestant persuasions.

“As to the United Irishmen, they were not peculiar to either sect, but endeavoured to embrace all sects, and to include the partizans of all classes, and amongst the United Irishmen there had been found men, led away by the vain desire of republican institutions—men who, however mistaken, may be admitted, now that the storm has long since ceased, to have been actuated by pure, though erroneous, love for Ireland.

“The evils which created the first class belong not to any of the objects for which this Board assembles. They, however, deserve and require the greatest attention from the legislature and government: they exist in the actual state of society in Ireland—in the exactions of the tithe-farmers and tithe-proctors—in *the natural rapacity of land-owners, excited by a liquited market, and a multitude of bidders.*

“These evils are aggravated, too, by the laws which enable the landlord to dispense with any personal confidence in the tenant. *The statute law has done much to aggravate the evil; the laws were made by landlords; they have improved the proceedings in replevin and eject-*

*ment, until the landlord may, with perfect ease, first strip the tenant, who has assumed too high a rent, of all his property, and then evict him from the land.*

To restore the common law in these particulars would much tend to quiet the country ; but no efficient remedy will ever be adopted by a distant, and ill-informed and mis-informed legislature ; and these evils will continue until Ireland shall have a resident parliament, instructed in the facts, and interested in the results. Perhaps the period of such a parliament is remote, but in it are centred all my hopes of permanent tranquillity for Ireland.

“The class of combinators on the score or under the pretence of religion is that which should engage our attention at present : these religious animosities are terrible and degrading, but they bring with them this consolation, that they are easy of remedy. They exist only at the pleasure of the administration : the government, when it pleases, can terminate their course, and it will remain at the discretion of the ministry to put a period to religious dissensions, unless, indeed, the Orange faction shall be so long fostered as to grow too strong for the persons who have nourished it, and to become too powerful for the legitimate authorities of the state. That period is still distant ; and now, by the expression of a single wish, the government could extinguish religious factions in Ireland for ever. The Orange system exists only because it has the countenance of the administration, and if that system ceased, religious animosities would vanish.

“To understand the nature of the associations on the score of religious differences, it is necessary to recur briefly to their history.

“The ‘Hearts of Steel’ and ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys’ were Protestant associations for the oppression of the Roman Catholics. They existed only in the northern province. The ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys’ associated principally in the county of Armagh ; their first object was to prevent the Roman Catholics from having arms. They attacked the houses of Roman Catholics early in the morning—taking name from this circumstance—and deprived the Catholics of arms. When the arms were quietly surrendered, the assailants usually did no further injury, but any resistance provoked vengeance ; and resistance was natural, and, being sometimes successful, became frequent ; thence bloodshed, and the repetition of attacks and outrages.

“The Roman Catholics, assailed by the ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys,’ without the slightest colour of law, and without any original provocation on their parts, formed themselves into counter associations, under the descriptive name of ‘Defenders ;’ and from the year 1791 to the year 1795, a village warfare, a feud of unmitigated barbarity, pervaded a great part of

Ulster, between the two rival and illegal parties—the ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys’ and the ‘Defenders.’

“In the year 1795 a material alteration took place in one of the parties. Several battles had taken place in that year, in which the ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys,’ though inferior in numbers, were infinitely superior in discipline and arms, and were consequently successful. Their views enlarged: the total extirpation of the Catholics from Armagh, if not from Ulster, became a probable expectation; and the name of ‘Peep-o’-Day Boys’ yielded its place to the system, regularity, and superior station of ‘Orangemen.’ A regular organization was planned and effectuated by bigots of a superior rank and order. A feeble imitation of freemasonry lent something of mysticism, and much of regularity, to the Orange lodges.

“I had from a militia officer, a friend of mine, the detail of the initiation of an Orangeman. The gentleman I allude to was allowed, by mistake, to be present in an Orange Lodge, in the county of Wexford, when two Orangemen were *made*. The ceremony contained an analogy to the facts related in the seventh and eighth chapters of Judges, and the password was, ‘The sword of the Lord and of Gideon!’

“The Orangemen were the 300 selected by Divine inspiration from the immense multitude—the 32,000 who originally formed the camp of the Israelites; and as those 300 were composed by the directions of the Most High, of the men who lapped water out of their hands, without kneeling to drink at the running stream, so this chosen few of the Orangemen were designated as, ‘the men who lap and do not kneel!’ And distinct allusions were made to a different liquor for Orangemen than water—a liquor to be furnished by the kneeling and superstitious Papists! The oaths were administered with much solemnity, and the secret signs communicated: and the newly-initiated were reminded that, with so small a number, Gideon had brought confusion and destruction on the numerous host of the Midianites! The Orangemen became thus the chosen of the Lord, and the Papists were the Midianites doomed to destruction.

“I have, I confess, sometimes been amused at the happy aptitude of the hideous allegory. The chosen few, with Gideon, were successful, not by force or bravery, but because they introduced discord and dissension in the camp of their enemies. The Midianites turned against each other their own swords, and thus the Orangemen excite strife and dissension amongst the Catholics, *and place their best hopes of success in our wretched differences and squabbles!*

“And there are some Catholics, perhaps, who would co-operate in the hateful purpose; but the number is few, and the Orangemen must be



disappointed, because there never was a period in Irish history when so much congeniality of sentiment prevailed amongst the Irish Catholics.

“The first design of the Orangemen was the extirpation of the Catholics from Ulster: nor was this design confined to mere speculation. Out of the county of Armagh alone, more than seven hundred families were banished by the Orangemen;—their properties were destroyed; their houses levelled or burned; the lives of all endangered; some of them murdered, and the survivors driven from their farms, and compelled to quit the province. Had they committed any crime? Had they been guilty of any offence? Yes, they had: they were Roman Catholics. Nothing more; but that was sufficient: they were Roman Catholics.

“This is the first grand fact in the history of the Orangemen. In the audacity of falsehood, this fact may be denied, and the person who asserts it may be treated as a calumniator. But this is a fact of which there is, fortunately, the most unquestionable evidence. There is the testimony of Lord Gosford, the governor of the county of Armagh—testimony given publicly at a meeting of the magistrates of that county convened by him on the 28th of December, 1795. He there stated, ‘that this banditti,’ as he called them, ‘had commenced and carried on a persecution of atrocious cruelty; that they spared neither age, nor sex, nor innocence; that neither ancient nor modern history could supply an example of the ruin and misery inflicted by the Orangemen; and he added—let this, I pray, be marked well—’ that the only crime of the wretched objects of this ruthless persecution was, a profession of the Roman Catholic faith, or an intimate connexion with a person of that faith!’

“Such was the testimony of a Protestant nobleman, resident on the spot, an eye-witness of what he described; and he, too, a man of strong anti-Catholic feelings. The evidence of Mr. Grattan, also, at the same period, may be adduced. In parliament, he painted the origin of Orangeism—he detailed the first persecution of the Catholics by the Orangemen:—‘Those insurgents, said Mr. Grattan, ‘call themselves Orangemen, or Protestant Boys—that is, a banditti of murderers, committing massacre in the name of God!’ Such was the language of Mr. Grattan—such was the evidence of Lord Gosford; and thus is the cardinal fact of the commencement of Orangeism, and its mischievous and murderous origin, placed beyond a doubt.

“From such a beginning the spirit of the Orange institution may be easily collected. Its history in Ireland is written in letters of blood, from its first murders in Armagh to its innocent and almost praiseworthy manslaughter of the present year in the streets of Belfast.

“It is said that the original plan of extermination was soon abandoned—that it was softened down to perpetual slavery and degradation; that Catholics are to be allowed to live, provided they are quiet and tractable slaves. The rebellion in which the United Irishmen had engaged drove some men of a milder tone and temper into the Orange associations, and they are said to have assumed something less of persecution; but the living principle of exclusion and reproach still remains, and cannot but bring forth fruits of bitterness and oppression.

“In 1800, a new organization of the Orange Lodges took place, and, with more regularity, less zeal was exhibited. The system languished after the Union, and was decaying fast, and strong hopes were entertained that it would sink into oblivion, when, in an ill-starred hour, Ireland was handed over to the legal advisers of the secretaries to the Duke of Richmond, and in the year 1808, Orangeism, patronised and revived again, displayed its horrid front, to affright and desolate the land. The great patron of this revival was made a privy councillor—the Orange processions, insults, tumults, and murders ensued. I need not remind you of the unpunished massacre of Caharnashegagh; I need not recall to recollection the introduction of this system into the county of Donegal, where it had been theretofore unknown. But I am compelled to lead you to that fact, because it is there that the origin of the Ribbonmen is to be found.

“The county of Donegal is one of the most Catholic counties in Ireland: almost all the peasantry in that county are Catholics. Like the other two greatest Catholic counties, Galway and Kerry, neither disaffection nor disturbance were found there during the rebellion; and, as in the latter counties, so in Donegal, the Orange institution was unknown until the year 1809, when, in the Richmond Administration, it was introduced into that county, one scarcely knows why, unless as part of a general plan. Orange processions were established; the people, insulted and outraged, were easily induced to apprehend greater evils: they saw no reason why, during a profound and long-continued tranquillity, their religion should be vilified and insulted, and their persons exposed to danger and outrage. They imagined that the Orange Society was sanctioned by the law, as they saw it remain unrestrained and unpunished. They resolved to form a counter-association, similar in plan and form to the Orange Association, to be exclusively of Roman Catholics, and to be confined merely to the purposes of defence against the attacks of the Orangemen. The Roman Catholics of the county of Donegal did therefore associate under the denomination of Ribbonmen; and several anti-Orange or Ribbon Societies were soon formed.

“The Ribbonmen, like the Orangemen, were bound together by oaths

of secrecy and co-operation. Like the Orangemen, they had their secret articles annexed to their oaths; like the Orangemen, they were organized in lodges, having a master and a deputy-master, a secretary, and three committee men to each lodge. The Orangemen, have, indeed, five committee men to each regular lodge—the Ribbonmen were content with three. As the Orange violences in the counties neighbouring to Donegal became more frequent, the Ribbon Societies extended. About two years ago they formed a regular Grand Lodge, still imitating the Orangemen, which was composed of nine grand officers, and held its sittings in Derry. From this Grand Lodge there were, I am told, more than ninety lodges affiliated; and it is said that in the space of six months upwards of twenty thousand men, between the ages of eighteen and forty, had been sworn in as members of this association! Such was, as I am informed, the state of the Ribbon Society in the month of June, and it was then rapidly extending itself into the more southern counties of Ulster.

“I have great pleasure in adding, that the address published by the Catholic Board, in June last, had the most powerful effect in putting a stop to the meeting, and, I am assured, it induced the Grand Lodge of the Ribbonmen to resign its functions. Those who were before the most active partisans of the system have since exerted themselves with energy and success to suppress its lodges. The system has been broken up, and unless the renovated activity of Orangeism shall give it new life (of which there is much reason to be apprehensive), the Ribbon Society will shortly be at an end for ever.

“I have not stated the oaths by which this society was bound. Those oaths were, I understand, three times uttered. At first the Ribbonmen’s oath commenced with a direct, positive, and unconditional oath of allegiance. They also swore to assist in the defence of the Catholic clergy and laity against the attacks of Orangemen, and an oath of secrecy as to what was to be privately communicated to them was added. This oath was soon altered; and in its place was substituted an oath resembling almost exactly the Orange oath. It began with an oath of allegiance to the king, his heirs and successors, so long as he and they should protect the Catholic clergy and laity of Ireland from the illegal violence of schismatics, heretics, and Orangemen; and it then continued and concluded as the former oath. The third oath and that latterly adopted, was different from the former in nothing else, as I am informed, than in omitting altogether the part that related to allegiance to the king.

“Such, according to my information, is the short history of the Society of Ribbonmen. This society owed its origin to the Orangemen. Its decay was the work of the Board. But the Orangemen are again on

the alert. The resemblance in colour and name, for in nothing else are they like to the patriots in Holland, has filled the Irish bigots with fresh hopes and renovated fury. In the north, they indulge in excesses almost as ridiculous as they are illegal. A festival of three days, an Orange boven of half a week, has been lately celebrated in Derry. Under the ludicrous pretence that it was necessary to bless, with the Orange flag, the first stone of a new court-house, a three-days' festival was celebrated, sufficient to remind the poor Catholics of Derry of the Spartan solemnities, during which it was permitted to inflict every cruelty on the wretched helots.

“The consequences of this most absurd carnival, at which baronets and bishops, sheriffs and clergymen, magistrates and mobs, joined in revelry, may be a revival of the Ribbon Lodges. Attempts have been made, I am told, to revive them, even before this festival; and unless a strong impression be now made of the illegality and impolicy of those lodges, there is reason to apprehend that they will once more multiply.

“The people will readily listen, however, to us, as they have done before. They know we are actuated by no motive but the pure and disinterested desire to obtain for them relief, in the only way that relief can or ought to be obtained—according to the constitution. We who are honoured with popular confidence, only because we have deserved it—we will easily persuade the people to avoid violating the law, or exposing themselves, as they must do, if they continue in those associations, to the treachery of their pretended friends and to the persecutions of their open enemies. We will point out to the people that these illegal societies expose them to certain punishment; that no useful result can possibly arise from them; that the individuals who belong to them will be prosecuted, and the Catholic body disgraced by their continuance, whilst the very existence of those societies will serve as a pretext and excuse for the Orangemen to continue their outrages. It will gratify their appetite for vengeance, and disappoint the hopes and wishes of the individuals of this Board, who are looking for Emancipation through the legitimate channels of the constitution. In short, the Orangemen will be gratified and delighted by the continuance of those associations; whilst the real friends of Ireland, who, amidst danger and calumny, have continued to advocate the Catholic cause, must retire in disgust and despair, if the people will not abandon all illegal societies.

“That the Ribbon Society is illegal is easily proved by a reference to the statute book. The statute of the 50th of the King, chapter 102, includes almost every possible case of an association bound together by any solemn oath or engagement. The oath is illegal, if the person taking it be bound to any association, brotherhood, committee, society, or con-

federacy whatsoever, formed, or to be formed, for any seditious purpose, or to disturb the peace, or to injure persons or property, or to obey any commander, officer, or leader, or to obey any committee, or the orders, rules, or commands of any committee, or other body of men, or to assemble at the desire or command of any such person or persons, or not to give evidence against any brother associate, or for various other purposes mentioned in the statute.

“Now, it is very clear that an organized association, such as the Ribbonmen, must be bound, by the import of its engagement, to assemble at the command of some superior, and to obey some rules or orders. The Ribbonmen are, therefore, liable to punishment under this statute. The Orangemen, by the sixth rule in their secret articles, are bound to assemble at any time when summoned by the master, getting ten hours’ notice, or, if possible, at any other time. They are also bound to obey all the rules contained in the ten secret articles. It is, therefore, equally clear that the Orangemen are within the statute of the 50th of the King. And upon an indictment, properly framed under that statute, if the evidence of the facts that really exist could be given, there is no doubt that for every Ribbonman and Orangeman sworn since the year 1810, the person who administered the oath could be transported for life, and the Orangeman or Ribbonman who took it could be transported for seven years.

“I am aware that the Orangemen run no great risk of being prosecuted. But the impunity of the Orangeman affords no great protection to the unfortunate Ribbonman. The Ribbonman will be only the more certainly prosecuted because of the indulgence held out to the Orangemen. Would to God I could see an administration in Ireland that would equally and impartially hold out protection and punishment, according to law and not otherwise, to both parties.

“I am very ready to believe; nay, it is the conviction of my soul, and I loudly proclaim it, that if Lord Whitworth was apprised of the real state of those facts, he would fulfil the pledge he has so distinctly given—of an equal and impartial administration of justice. But Lord Whitworth is surrounded by men who are deeply interested in deceiving him. The facts are concealed from him. The truth is disguised. The Catholics are represented as desiring the overthrow of the constitution—the Orangemen as its supporters. But the truth is, that the Catholics most anxiously wish to see the constitution placed beyond the possibility of danger; they are, to a man, ready to die for the integrity of the empire and of the constitution. The Orangemen, on the other hand, seek to control the legislature, and to oppress their fellow-subjects, and perpetuate their slavery; they would continue Irishmen as

slaves, in the name of a constitution that gave us freedom as a birth-right.

“To return to the illegality of these associations. The Ribbonmen are liable to be indicted under another statute, by the 15th and 16th of the King, chap. 21, it is declared to be a high misdemeanor, punishable by fine, by imprisonment, by whipping, for any persons to assemble, by day or night, with any unusual badge, or to assume any particular name or denomination. The Ribbonmen are liable to punishment under this statute; they assemble with a badge—a green ribbon; they assume the denomination of Ribbonmen. For either offence they may be indicted and punished. It is true that the Orangemen come expressly within the provisions of the same statute—they assemble with badges of orange—they assume a particular denomination—Orangemen. Under this statute they may and ought to be indicted; nay, I can answer for it they will be indicted, if the Catholics enable us, as I am sure they will enable us, to put together the funds necessary for carrying on those prosecutions. But even the impunity of the Orangemen affords no prospect of safety for the Ribbonmen. The Ribbonmen of the North, like the White Boys of the South, will experience the rigour of the statute, although the Orangemen may be allowed to escape without punishment, notwithstanding the plain violation of the law!

“The duty of the Board, under those circumstances, is to expose to the Catholics of Ulster the criminality and the folly of engaging in any secret association. It may be suggested that the people are driven, in their own defence and by persecution, into those combinations. The answer is ready—the people need not be driven to any such extremity, because for the outrages of the Orangemen legal redress may be obtained; and if the individuals attacked be too poor to procure that redress for themselves, the Board will readily enable them to bring their cases before the public and the courts of justice. We will enable them to seek for and obtain all the redress that the law can give in such case; but no man shall partake of our assistance who will continue any longer a member of any illegal confederacy whatsoever.

“Let what will become of the Ribbonmen, from us they can never expect countenance or support. But the poor Catholics who have the good sense to avoid any such association shall be certain of meeting pecuniary and professional assistance. We will not go to war with the Orangemen, however able and willing we may be to do so; but we will go to law with them, and expose their absurd pretensions and atrocious cruelties to contempt and punishment.

“By adopting my motion for another address to the people, you will have an opportunity of again cautioning them against being the dupes

of their own passions, or of the artifices of their enemies. You will call upon them to confide in the laws, and you will enable them to secure all the protection that law can give.

“Mr. O’Connell concluded by moving—‘That a committee should be appointed to prepare an address to the people, cautioning them against illegal associations.’

“Motion agreed to and the meeting adjourned.”

#### “ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE.

“FELLOW COUNTRYMEN AND FELLOW SUFFERERS!—The General Board of the Catholics of Ireland, to whom you have confided your petitions to the legislature, once more address you. They claim the continuance of your confidence only because they feel that they deserve it by the zeal and purity of their intentions and exertions in the cause of your religion and your country.

“Fellow-Countrymen, the object of your petitions is sanctioned by justice; it is enforced by wisdom; it *must* be attained, unless the artifices of your enemies shall triumph over justice and wisdom! We say their artifices, because their arguments have failed, and their calumnies are forgotten or despised.

“Amongst their artifices we dread but one—it is that which has been tried with success on former occasions—it is one to which you are exposed by your situation, your sufferings, and your feelings. *Your enemies wish to betray you into illegal associations and combinations!* They wish to bring upon you punishment, aggravated by its being merited; and they still more earnestly desire to ruin your cause and that of Ireland!

“Their emissaries, become more cautious from former detection, are likely to assume deeper disguise. It is our duty to expose to you the evils which must ensue to yourselves and the Catholic cause if you enter into any illegal or secret combination.

“Repeated acts of parliament have pronounced associations and combinations, for almost any imaginable purpose, to be *illegal*. A recent statute, called the 50th of Geo. III. chap. 102, besides more associations which are plainly criminal, as for seditious purposes, or to disturb the public peace, has declared every association, brotherhood, committee, or society whatsoever, to be unlawful, if formed to injure any person, or the property of any person—or to *compel any person to do, or omit, or refuse to do, any act whatsoever*. That statute has also declared any oath or engagement to be *illegal*, which imports to bind any person to obey the rules, or orders, or commands of any committee or body of men not lawfully constituted; or of any captain, leader, or commander not appointed by the king; or binding any persons to assemble at the command of any such captain, leader, commander, or committee, or of any person not having lawful authority; or binding any person not to inform nor give evidence; or not to reveal nor discover having taken any illegal oath, or having done any illegal act, or to conceal any illegal oath thereafter to be taken.

“For inducing or procuring, by any means, the taking of any such oath or engagement, the punishment is transportation for life. He who takes any such oath is liable to transportation for seven years; and it will not be received as an excuse that the party has been compelled, by force or menace, to take such oath, unless he make full discovery to a magistrate within seven days.

“By another act of parliament, called the 15th and 16th of the King, chapter 21, it is made a high misdemeanour, punishable by pillory or whipping, to wear any particular badge or dress, or to assume any particular name or denomination of party.

“Recollect, too, we entreat of you, that not only is it unlawful and punishable to assume the name, or wear the colours or badge of such an association, or to take or induce any person to enter into engagement or oath to belong thereto; but that almost every act, in pursuance of such oath or engagement, is made by various acts felony of death. Even to assault a dwelling-house (strangely as the phrase may sound), is a capital felony in Ireland. And to raise the arm, even without a blow, is an assault in law.

“So that he who, in pursuance of the plans of any such association, raises his un-

armed hand against a dwelling house, may, for that offence, be capitally convicted and suffer death!

"We select this instance to show you the extent to which capital punishments are applicable by law to the consequences of illegal associations.

"Transportation for seven years is the doom of him who enters into any illegal association.

"Transportation for life is visited upon him who induces another to enter into an illegal association.

"And finally—death is the punishment of him who does any one act in pursuance of the designs of an illegal association.

"Such, fellow-countrymen, are the punishments which the law denounces against illegal associations—whether they be called White Boys or Right Boys, Trashers or Carders, Ribbonmen or Orangemen, they *all are liable to punishment*, and all deserve condemnation.

"It is quite true that some delinquents may escape; but do not flatter yourselves that you can be of the fortunate number. If you transgress the law, you will meet, as you will deserve, all the zeal and activity of prosecution.

"Reflect upon these serious subjects for your consideration. If you offend against the laws, what favour can you hope for?—what favour have you any grounds for expecting?

"Reflect, also, upon the *utility* of these associations. What utility—what advantage of any description has ever been derived from them? None—none whatsoever! No redress has ever been obtained by their means. They have been quite useless! Nay, worse, they have always produced crimes!—robbery, outrage, murder!!!

"And they have uniformly been followed by numerous executions, in which the innocent have been often taken for and confounded with the guilty!

"Do you require any other arguments to induce you to refrain from these associations? Perhaps you are careless of your own lives? You cannot be insensible to the blood of the innocent!

"There is, however, another inducement to refrain: your enemies—the men who would deny you the poor privilege of worshipping your God as your forefathers have worshipped—these men, all these men, anxiously desire that you should form criminal combinations and confederations; they want but a pretext for framing laws still stronger and more sanguinary; they want but a pretext to lay the heavy hand of power upon your country and your religion!

"Your enemies seek to seduce or to drive you into illegal associations. Your friends, the Catholic Board, ardently desire to prevent your forming any such association. They conjure you, if you confide in them, to hearken to advice which can be dictated only by their affectionate attachment to you. They conjure you to respect the laws—to live in peace—to offer no outrage nor injury to any man—to seek legal redress alone for every injury and outrage inflicted on you.

"*That redress is and shall be, within your reach.*

"They beseech you to look for relief from your grievances only through the lawful channel of petitioning parliament.

"And they confidently promise you, that the wisdom of parliament will speedily extend that relief, if you continue, by peaceable and dutiful conduct, to deserve it; to gratify your friends, and disappoint your enemies.

"So will you afford us the happiness of seeing your religion rescued from the calumnies and inflictions of centuries of persecution, and your countrymen of all classes and persuasions reconciled, coherent and finally free!"

In all but the assurance of the "*wisdom* of parliament," the address just recited would be applicable to existing circumstances.

In truth in this point such an assurance was inapplicable and vain, even when given, politic as it then was, and almost *necessary*, to appear to be under the delusion thus implied.



That this country, during the forty-six years since the Union, has been kept in the connexion with Great Britain, or at least that a most bloody and most ruinous civil war has not raged between the two kingdoms, has been in no way owing to the "*wisdom*" of the imperial parliament. In fact, peace has been preserved, as it were, in despite of the conduct of that body.

Laws of cruel and wanton coercion have ever been freely and cheerfully passed by them; measures even of the most moderate benefit have been received with hesitation, delayed, objected to, mutilated, or entirely rejected.

The local government in Ireland has had a perfect impunity in its petty but most grinding tyrannies. Its flagrant partisanship—its pollution of the bench of justice—its subornation of perjury and murder, when desirous of striking terror into the people—its frauds, lyings, and all its enormities, have ever been screened, commended, and encouraged by the body that has usurped the power of legislation for Ireland.

The connexion has been so preserved; or, at the least, the sanguinary and internecine civil struggle we have spoken of, has been averted, solely by the admirable *patience* of the Irish people; by that most virtuous, religious patience, which has induced them to bear with aggravated and increasing sufferings and wrongs in the Christian desire to avoid the guilt of blood; and in the Christian hope that Providence may at length see fit to remove its chastening hand!

But even *their* patience—like all other human attributes—*is finite*.

"CATHOLIC BOARD.

"SATURDAY, JANUARY 8,

"SHAKESPEARE GALLERY, KILCHUGHER-STREET.

"MR. SHERLOCK in the Chair.

"Secretary read proceedings of former meeting.

"MR. O'CONNELL, from the committee appointed to prepare an address to the northern Catholics concerning *illegal societies*, stated the address was not ready, and, on motion, got leave to sit again till the next Saturday.

“MR. LAWLESS asked the secretary if the resolution for printing Mr. Lidwell's speech had been acted on.

“Secretary replied it had not.

“MR. LAWLESS having said he would move for the printing,

“MR. MAHON saw no necessity for the motion.

“MR. O'CONNELL suggested to Mr. Lawless the appointment of a committee to have the speech printed. It was the best speech he had ever heard, and a copy ought to be in the hands of every member of parliament before the end of the long adjournment.

“Suggestion adopted, and a committee of five named.

“Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan's letters having, on Mr. O'Connell's motion, been read:—

“MR. O'CONNELL said, he trusted those letters had made, and would continue to make, a deep impression on the minds of the Catholics of Ireland.

“He should judge of the moral fitness of the Catholic population of the land for freedom, by the sensation those letters had created, and should continue to create. Deep, but not loud, should be the feelings of men deserving liberty. It belonged to the spirit of philosophic inquiry to trace out the causes of which the temper and tone of those letters were the natural results: but it belonged to the dignity of philosophic patriotism to bear with this temper and tone in patient, and, he may add, unrelenting calmness.

“For my part (said he) I may, perhaps with the greatest justice, be denied the praise of either philosophy or patriotism; but in treating of the subject of those letters, and especially of that of the Earl of Donoughmore, I have another guide; it consists in perfect respect for the purity of his intentions, and great gratitude for his manly, uncompromising, unconditional, unqualified advocacy of emancipation. He did not talk of entering into any traffic between a portion of the liberty of the constitution and a fragment of the discipline of our Church. He did not insult his enslaved countrymen by supposing or admitting, that though we were quiet whilst we were kept in thralldom, we should become riotous, and ought to be put upon '*our securities*' the moment we were liberated. No, sir; the advocacy of Lord Donoughmore was precisely that which the great people whose cause he was to support, wished and wanted. It took right and justice for its lofty ground, and scorned traffick, and barter, and compromise.

“I repeat, therefore, that Lord Donoughmore so entirely commands my respect and gratitude, that I am in no danger of suggesting any course respecting his letter inconsistent with those feelings.

“As to the other letter—that of Mr. Grattan—it is not my intention

to introduce, with respect to it, any proceeding for the present ; and I am the more inclined to refrain, lest what I have said of Lord Donoughmore should suggest any unpleasant contrast. If such contrast arises, let me not be accused for it—I make no comparisons ; and if, in the nature of the facts, any contrast arise, let the blame be flung in the facts, and not on me, who am bound by every argument supplied by my judgment, and by every affection of my soul, to prefer—greatly to prefer, and to praise—indeed to praise exclusively, the unconditional, unqualified, uncompromising advocacy of our rights.

“ Such has been the support given to the Irish people by the Earl of Donoughmore, and for that he deserves and possesses our warmest hearts.

“ With these sentiments towards our advocates we are not to forget ourselves. Indeed those letters not only make it impossible to forget, but they open a new view of the state of the Catholics of Ireland ; they have led me to a discovery of some magnitude—they have shown me distinctly the cause of many appearances that I reckoned most monstrous and unnatural ; they have reconciled me to Duigenan, to Musgrave, and to Giffard ; they have disclosed to me the source and secret of their abuse. Vulgar it is, and coarse ; but then vulgarity and coarseness are scarcely the fault of the individuals ; it is to be attributed to their education, and habits, and tempers. Had they the education and temper of gentlemen they would treat us differently ; we should have a better style and more courtly condescension in their reproach, and even in the calumny of their advice ; but the principle would not be different from that which they act on at present.

“ It is a principle discoverable and discovered by me, for the first time, in those letters. It consists simply in the natural and moral superiority which the law imposes upon the Protestant over the Irish Catholic. It is to be found in the natural and moral inferiority to the Protestant, which the law inflicts on the Irish Catholic. A century of persecution commenced by the grossest violation of the faith of treaties that ever disgraced the page of history, authentic or fictitious. A century of legal degradation has so lessened and brought down the Irish Catholics in the eyes of their Protestant neighbours, that we are in the scale of humanity but dwarfs compared with those social giants.

“ I was long aware that such was the estimate of us in which our enemies indulged ; but this correspondence was necessary in order to convince me that the same prejudice lurked in the minds of our friends. I flattered myself that we had risen in their estimation ; I did imagine we had ceased to be whitewashed negroes, and had thrown off for them all traces of the colour of servitude ; but this correspondence has, I confess, done away the delusion.

“Perhaps they are themselves unconscious of this claimed superiority—indeed I believe that they perceive it not—being a matter of habit, and having arisen before reflection, and unaided by reasoning, it may well happen, and I believe it does happen, that our friends are themselves unaware of the judgment of inferiority which has been tacitly passed upon us; and that when they announce, as those letters announce, a plain superiority—a superiority not as of any assumption but as of clear right, our friends are themselves ignorant of the assertion of any such superiority. In short, my conviction now is, that the inferiority of the Irish Catholic resembles a species of innate idea in the minds of our Protestant friends, which remains there unaccompanied by any distinct consciousness of its existence.

“Do the Catholics really deserve this opinion of inferiority? I think not—I think both their enemies and their friends will soon acknowledge their just claims to equality, if the Catholics continue to look to themselves and to their own exertions, for their first and best claim of success.

“Conceding this superiority for the present, and cautiously avoiding to hurt its national pride, or to provoke any other exhibition of its inherent dignity, there is yet one passage in the letter of the Earl of Donoughmore which requires a reply from the Board, and one passage only. It is that which relates to representation—it is that in which the noble lord seems to charge upon us having assumed or exercised a representative capacity. I feel at once that this charge could have originated simply and singly in the mistake or misapprehension of the noble lord. It cannot have any other source whatsoever than from some misrepresentation of the mode of our association, or of our conduct when associated.

“But, admitting and proclaiming the purity of the motive of making this charge; it is, however, even upon that account, the more imperative upon us to set his lordship right upon the subject. We owe it to him to afford him accurate information on this interesting subject. We owe it to ourselves to prevent the possibility of the continuance of mistake or misapprehension on this important subject.

“I am confident I need use no other argument to induce the Board to adopt my motion for giving the noble lord precise information with respect to our association, than the manifest propriety of giving our advocate a true view of our situation. We have too much respect for him to allow him to remain in error.

“But there is another and a pressing motive for disclaiming the imputed representation. It is to be found in the construction put on the Convention Act by our adversaries. They have procured, by their ar-

guments, the decision that 'pretence' and 'purpose' are synonymous, and that any persons who meet, no matter under what 'pretence'—no matter for what 'purpose'—commit a crime if they really be, or assume to be, representatives. This decision establishes that the crime prohibited by the statute, consists in 'representation,' but in 'representation' alone. The pretence or purpose is immaterial. The only thing, said the Attorney-General, and say the judges of the King's Bench, to be inquired into is, representative or not. This decision suited the purposes of the prosecutor at the time it was pronounced, but it has now become inconvenient to him, and is certainly at this moment the protection of the Board from his attacks. Our construction of the statute would have limited the Catholic committee to the exclusive consideration of a petition. The only *purpose* should, according to our construction, have been petition, leaving us, perhaps, the empty honour of claiming an useless and almost ridiculous title to a representative capacity; and then, upon our own showing, and with our own assent, the Attorney-General would have a right to put down the committee the moment it departed from the strict line of mere petitioners.

"But our construction was overruled; the Attorney-General was too wise to adopt it, though it was manifestly the most convenient, as well as the most constitutional view of the subject. He did not foresee that we would divest the select meeting of the Catholics of all representative capacity, and that getting rid of representation, we should, upon the Attorney-General's own showing, and upon the authority of the Court of King's Bench, be entitled to discuss other subjects with as full and strong a right as that of petition.

"The result of the prosecution of Doctor Sheridan and Mr. Kirwan has, therefore, been highly beneficial to us. It has been infinitely more useful to the Catholic body than if we had succeeded in obtaining a judgment of the court. Then our committee must have been confined within the narrowest limits of preparing and forwarding petitions, but now we run no risk of any indictment on the Convention Act, whatever extent our deliberations may have.

"There is, however, one precaution—it is simply this, that we are not to be, nor pretend to be, representatives.

"Allow me here to protest against being understood to say that, as a lawyer, I conceive the construction put on the statute by the Court of King's Bench right. No; I certainly think the court was mistaken; and I hope the first possible opportunity of bringing that construction in review before a superior tribunal will be taken; but, until it is reviewed, until it is altered, it is our duty to submit to it, and to acquiesce in it. I do, therefore, cheerfully submit to the decision, although not convinced

of its accuracy : as the court has no claim to infallibility, it is liable to error.

“ But, submitting to its present opinion, it became necessary to avoid not only the reality, but all appearance of representation. We are not constituted upon any scheme of representation. We never claimed any representative capacity ; on the contrary, we always disclaimed it ; and having it now charged upon us by the Earl of Donoughmore, we are bound again to disclaim it, because our silence, under such a charge, might be construed into an admission of its justice. Yes, upon legal principles, silence would now be an admission of this legal crime ; and it is scarcely necessary to remind the meeting that the same law officer who plunged the Richmond administration into a warfare of litigation—nor a very wise one, I imagine, with the Catholic people—has every motive of resentment, of passion, of prejudice, and even of interest to induce him, if he can, to involve the present administration in a similar silly contest.

“ The historian of human nature has admirably described his state physician as presenting similar remedies for all diseases. He prescribed bleeding and warm water for all his patients, with uniform success. They all died. The Sangrado of the law is as uniform in his prescription : it is simply a state prosecution, as a remedy for all evils. Prosecute, prosecute, is ever on his lips.

“ He has not, indeed, been uniformly successful ; nor has the learned and grave doctor effected any great political cures. But he is as sanguine as ever in his opinion of the efficacy of his prescriptions ; and if this letter of Lord Donoughmore remain unanswered, it will afford the attorney-general a fair pretext for what he delights in—a new prosecution.

“ He will be able to read, as part of his speech, two paragraphs from the letter ; and we should have the mortification of finding the language of our friend and advocate rendered useful to the most bitter and unrelenting of our enemies—the only one of our enemies, indeed, who actively, and zealously, and from his heart opposes us—the single individual whose passions and whose conscience—such is the force of early and hereditary prejudice—drive him to seek for any prosecutions that may impede our progress. It would be melancholy—it would be deplorable, that such a man should be furnished with arguments against us by the Earl of Donoughmore ! The authority of that noble lord ought to have great weight with any jury ; and it is possible—recollect that I only say it is possible—that the attorney-general may find in the city of Dublin a jury sufficiently disposed to convict us on the authority of Lord Donoughmore.

“I speak with great reverence of Dublin juries. It is boasted that they do their duty gratuitously; but duty is done as well and as zealously for love as for money; and we ought to avoid giving them gratuitous trouble. For the ease of these juries, and for our own protection, let us respectfully, but distinctly, disclaim the imputation of representation which the noble lord has, by mistake, cast upon us.

“I conclude by again referring this correspondence to the serious consideration of the people of Ireland. Let them weigh it well. If it meet disapprobation amongst us, it has had more than enough of praise from our enemies. There is not a public writer enlisted against the Catholics, that has not been decided in his approbation of it. It is certainly our duty to reply to this paragraph. There our epistolary intercourse will end, for our suggestions ought to be so framed as not to require any reply.

“Would to God that I could revive in the mind of Mr. Grattan his former feelings for the Catholics of Ireland!—that I could rouse him to that energy with which he formerly advocated our cause!

“What securities did he ever speak of in the Irish parliament? What apprehension was about him for the Established Church, in the year 1793, when he obtained so much for us? Where were his alarms then? and yet that, if ever, was the period in which the Established Church might have been in danger. What is there in the English air to alter the mental vision, so that it shall behold gorgons, and hydras, and chimeras dire, where before it saw nothing but the pleasant prospect of amity, strength, and social security?

“Would I could conjure up the ghosts of the illustrious dead who so often aided him in his battle for his then own Ireland; and amid the group, I would call up the phantom of departed Ireland herself to remind him of what he was, and what he ought to be, unsophisticated by the delusions of English politics!

“In the sacred names of the mighty dead, I would conjure him to return to the grand and simple principle of the right to perfect liberty of conscience! Whether he succeed or fail in that pursuit, his ancient glories will brighten in the rays of these his later honours; and he will singly sustain, in degenerate days, the consistency, as well as the splendour of the first models of Grecian and Roman virtue!”

An incident occurred just after the termination of this speech that, trifling in itself, would yet supply the key, were such wanting, to the policy that has pervaded and marked the public life of the subject of this work.

One of the members of the Board present, Mr. B. Coyle, drew Mr. O'Connell's attention to a person who was taking notes of the proceedings, at a place different from the usual seats of the reporters; being below the kind of "bar" formed by a railing at the end of the room. This person Mr. Coyle said he believed to belong to the police-office.

The individual thus made the object of general attention, admitted that he was employed by the police authorities, and said "that he acted solely by the command of his superiors, and sincerely hoped he should not be held to have thereby forfeited the regard of others."

"Mr. O'Connell," continues the report; "said that was all perfectly fair, and that he expected by the next meeting to have a desk or table, at which two or three, or as many more as the police should think fit, might be accommodated comfortably."

Thirty or forty times at least, during the course of his agitation, similar occasions have arisen for similar steps upon his part—greatly to the disappointment and discomfiture of the authorities, he showed such readiness to oblige.

It would have been the most agreeable news at the castle, during any period of that long course of agitation, to have word brought that Mr. O'Connell had caused to be turned out, or obstructed, or even shown a disinclination to the attendance of the police-reporters, at any of his thousand-fold meetings.

When in a few years after the period at which our sketch has arrived, the Catholic Association arose, and almost from its birth began to give symptoms of how far it would surpass all former popular gatherings in its giant maturity, two reporters, and of a class much superior to the police news-carriers who had hitherto been usually employed in the duties of watching and communicating all proceedings of the Catholics at their meetings, were delegated to attend. Both acknowledged subsequently that they had come to Ireland (they were English by birth) with the most rueful and despondent feelings, fully impressed with the conviction that they were doomed men, in



being selected not only to go to that turbulent and throat-cutting country, Ireland, but to attend the consultations of the terrible confederacy acting under the orders of the arch-rebel, O'Connell!

Being fair-minded and well-disposed men, they very soon learned to laugh at their fancied terrors, and freely acknowledged the highly favourable impressions they received from the general tone of the proceedings at the association. One of them, indeed, became quite fiery in his partisanship in favour of Mr. O'Connell and his association.

Mr. O'Connell was ever careful, as his words already quoted indicate, to provide the fullest and the amplest accommodation to parties thus sent; and their generally inoffensive and highly creditable conduct made him the more anxious to convenience and oblige them. There have been but two or three instances in which his attention has been at all badly repaid; and these are scarcely of moment sufficient to be mentioned at all.

Of the gentleman who at present attends the Conciliation Hall and other popular meetings in Ireland, on the part of the government, it is impossible to speak too highly. It would seem that the reckless parties who mismanage the Irish part of that government, feared that his high and gentlemanly feelings would indispose him to do all that they wished, since they have taken the further *precaution* of causing the attendance of two note-taking police-inspectors!

We have now to address ourselves to the task of abbreviating our collection of Mr. O'Connell's speeches.

To do so, necessitates the leaving out of very much interesting matter, strikingly illustrative of the current of events, and of men's minds and feelings, during the troublous period of the Catholic agitation. But this work should, were any other course adopted, so inevitably swell into the most extravagant proportions, that it is inevitable to *do as we propose*.

## CHAPTER IV.

THE year 1814, with which we have now to occupy ourselves, was one of a very eventful nature. "The *"veto,"* or *"securities"* discussion was hottest in that year, and the opposition to it the most earnest, and in its results the most effective.

Some vantage-ground had been given to the advocates of base compromise and miserable surrender—as those who supported the veto might truly be described—some vantage-ground had been given them (and by them had been unsparingly used) by the general promulgation of the fact that, in 1799, a portion—but a very small one, being not one-third—of the Irish Catholic hierarchy had, under the extreme pressure of the sad and difficult circumstances of that time of terror, and with great limitations and reservations, in some degree entertained the proposition of *"securities."*

Making the most, however, of the concessions which they were at all inclined to consider, they amounted to no more than an expression of readiness to allow of some species of guarantee being held out against the possible appointment to high ecclesiastical office in Ireland of persons who might be known to be inimical to the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland.

This was the entire effect and purport of the document which was said, and with truth, to have been drawn up in 1799.

This document (according to the account afterwards given of it by the celebrated Dr. Milner, the distinguished and most learned vicar apostolic of the Midland District in England, and for several years the agent of the Irish Catholic bishops) was signed by the small proportion mentioned of the Irish hierarchy, while under a delusion as to the fair intentions of the government, but was soon after attempted to be suppressed by them—

selves, as far as possible, when they began to see through their delusion.

Such a document, however, was far too precious to the enemies of the Catholics, and of their religious independence, not to be preserved; and indeed undue pains were taken to preserve it by the parties to whom it would have appeared strange to apply that designation. The English Catholics procured copies of it to be printed and privately circulated; and when, in 1808, the question of veto was first distinctly taken up by the government, some of these copies were found in the ministers' hands.

Catholics on this side of the water were also found to involve themselves in this terrible mistake. The honoured name of Lord Fingal was unfortunately to be reckoned amongst them; and the part he took was sufficiently active. It procured for him the distinction, such as it was, of a special letter from Lord Grenville, explaining the views of the British cabinet in proposing the "SECURITIES."

"Ministers," said the letter, "must have an effectual control over the appointment of Catholic priests, for the security of the religious establishments of this country."

That was to say, that in order to preserve the temporalities of the Protestant Church in England (and of course in Ireland), it was necessary that Catholic priests should, if possible, be made the creatures and tools of the government.

A strange inducement and recommendation to Catholics of the proposed measures!

Dr. Milner was summoned to an interview with Mr. Ponsoby, on Saturday, 21st of May, 1808; when, being introduced by Lord Fingal, he was questioned as to what likelihood there was of inducing "his constituents," the Irish bishops, to favour the "veto," or some equivalent security.

His reply (as stated by himself in a letter of February 13th, 1811, to the *Freeman's Journal*, answering and commenting on some statements with regard to his conduct in the matter, made

in an article in the thirty-third number of the *Edinburgh Review*, was to the following effect :—

“ That he had *no instructions* from the Irish prelates relative to their admitting of a regal interference, in the appointment of their future colleagues ; and that, therefore, he *could give no pledge whatever on their behalf* : that he well knew they could not admit of *any positive interference* in this business on the part of the *uncatholic government* ;—nevertheless, that he himself was persuaded there was a disposition in them to admit of such a limited negative interference as might give the proposed additional pledge with respect to the loyalty of episcopal candidates. Finally, that in consequence of his undecisive answer, he was directed by the right honourable gentleman to write to Ireland for instructions, which he did, in letters to five different prelates.”

The answers which he received to these communications were, however, of such a nature, in the majority of instances, as to make evident to him his mistake ; and he accordingly took immediate steps to make it known equally to all whom it concerned.

The rest of the discussion, so far as our sketch has to do with it, will be noticed as we proceed.

On the 3rd of February, the *persecution* of Magee recommenced in the Queen's Bench, with the indictment against him for the Kilkenny resolutions of August last.

It is quite enough to say that the Attorney-General had, in this case as in all others he pleased, his own pet picked jurymen in the box ; and the fact of the traverser having been found guilty follows as an inference of course.

The sentence was, a fine of £1000, with imprisonment for six months from expiration of his former sentence. Subsequent securities for the peace to be given, in £1000 for himself, and two sureties in £500 each.

However desirous to avoid, henceforward, delays of any length upon particular years, we cannot omit a speech of Mr. O'Connell's, towards the end of March, at a Catholic meeting in the county Clare, on the noted subject of the “ securities,” as mixed

up with the differences between the Catholic Board, and Lord Donoughmore, and Mr. Grattan.

Mr. Woulfe, the late Chief Baron, a man of singular intellect and ability, made a splendid oratorical effort on this occasion, to induce the Catholics to falter and hesitate in their hitherto decided course of open opposition to the fraudulent and ruinous schemes of the government, relative to Catholic matters. His talents enabled him to make a powerful impression upon the meeting, and it was necessary for Mr. O'Connell to leave no stone unturned to remove that impression.

For this purpose he made use, at the beginning of his speech, of the fair party weapon of ridicule, protesting that the proceedings of the day had strongly brought to his memory one of the old fables he had learned in childhood—that of the sheep consulting whether they should not manifest their faith in the good words of their ancient enemies, by getting rid of the guardianship of the dogs, who usually attended them.

After amusing his auditory for some time by his description of the sage counsels of an old patriarch of the flock, who warned them against the course they were about to adopt, Mr. O'Connell, perceiving that he had tuned the meeting up to the proper pitch, suddenly raised his eyes to the gallery, from which part of the chapel in which they were assembled the previous speaker had addressed them, and said

“At this critical moment, when the voice of prudence was beginning to be heard, a WOLF (Woulfe) came forward to the front of the gallery,” &c.

As he spoke the words, he pointed to Mr. Woulfe, and an uproarious and universal shout of laughter did more than fifty long speeches could have done to destroy the effect of that gentleman's eloquent harangue.

The rest of Mr. O'Connell's address was in a graver spirit, and effectually carried with it the meeting.

“Mr. O'Connell said that he did not rise to oppose the motion, as it

was now modified by Mr. Woulfe. He did not, and never should, resist any tribute of Catholic respect and Catholic gratitude to the Earl of Donoughmore. He should never forget how much the Catholics owed to that noble lord. In his illustrious family they had found their best supporters. The Hutchinsons of the present day had their fathers' and their own claims upon our gratitude. At a time when liberality to Papists was little short of crime, their revered father broke the bondage of bigotry, and stood forth, single and alone, the advocate of his enslaved country. The cause which he espoused was zealously and faithfully pursued by his sons. The Earl of Donoughmore has unremittingly pursued it upon every occasion; in every discussion he stood prominent in our cause. No enemy of religious liberty was too humble to escape his contempt; no profligate deserter of religious freedom would be too exalted to escape his dignified reprobation. (Loud applause for many minutes.) And then he had a brother, too—the very first of patriots—the most disinterested, the bravest, the truest Irishman living;—a man who could be described, in the language of truth, only by adopting a familiar phrase, but certainly not a disrespectful one, and calling him the finest fellow that breathes—CHRISTOPHER HELY HUTCHINSON. (Shouts of applause.) To his family more was due than ever could be repaid; but alas for poor fallen Ireland!—when, instead of combining in the expression of those sentiments, attempts were made to use the name of one of that house as an instrument of dissension. But Mr. Woulfe is mistaken; there cannot be any dissensions conjured up under the auspices of that name.

“The learned gentleman, Mr. Woulfe, has indeed endeavoured to excuse himself from an attempt to convert his motion into a tocsin of discord. He says that he has been unfairly dealt with—that your resolution to confine the business of this day to the petition itself has unjustly deprived him of other opportunities of dissension, and that he is, therefore, driven to this effort, in order to disturb, [if he can, your unanimity.

“What, sir, will the gentleman then avow that discord and dissension are of themselves such mighty blessings that their absence is to be regretted? Is he in love with disorder and disunion? Does he think unanimity an evil, and cordial combination a curse? If such be his opinions—if those be the sentiments of the gentlemen with whom he says he acts, and who have taken the names of seceders—oh! long may they secede from Catholic counsels, and never may they return!

“But what is the justice of Mr. Woulfe's complaint? A select meeting, held before we came here, consisting of a large number of that respectable class of Catholic gentry in your county, who have hitherto

been most active in your cause, concurred in this sentiment, that irritation and division amongst the Catholics ought now particularly to be avoided, and, therefore, they agreed to submit to this assembly that resolution which Mr. Mahon has moved, and you have adopted.

“ At the select meeting, division had at length but one supporter: with the exception of one, the meeting agreed to forbear from all discordant topics. Here, indeed, Mr. Woulfe has had two persons to vote with him against Mr. Mahon’s motion.

[Here a gentleman exclaimed that there were three besides Mr. Woulfe, for he, too, had voted with him.]

“ Well,” said Mr. O’Connell, “ there were three—mighty minority!—there were just three in this assembly—three against the hundreds here met; and if the twenties and thirties of thousands of Catholics whom your country contains were all here assembled, the minority would not be increased by a single individual. (Applause.) Well, with this glorious minority of three, the learned gentleman proceeds. He first moves that the name of the Earl of Donoughmore be substituted for that of Earl Conyngham. Sir, however we respect the former, that was a motion which could not be acceded to. Earl Conyngham, even if he did not support your claims, possesses a species of affectionate popularity in this country which would protect his name from any slight. The best reward of that rare character in Ireland—an excellent landlord and a steady friend—Earl Conyngham deservedly possesses in the respectful affections of his countrymen. There never was a more vain attempt than that to displace him amongst the Catholics of the county of Clare. (Applause.)

“ This difficulty was felt by Mr. Woulfe. He felt that he could not succeed in erasing the name of Lord Conyngham from your resolution. He, therefore, substituted a motion confined to a compliment to Lord Donoughmore. This motion was instantly acceded to. Every individual present cheerfully, readily, cordially agreed to it. The resolution must pass unanimously.

“ Was Mr. Woulfe satisfied? His motion met unanimous support. Was he content? No, sir, he was not satisfied—he was discontented. Unanimity even upon his own proposition displeased him. The motion was a *pretence*; his purpose was disunion and discord; and accordingly, without an assignable motive, or rational cause—quite *apropos des bottles* as the French say—he pronounced a long harangue against the Catholic Board, full of sound and fury, but in plain truth signifying little if anything. In good set terms he railed at the Board. I regret that the points of accusation were so indistinct that it is difficult to follow or un-

derstand them. But, as far as I could comprehend them, this volunteer harangue of accusation shall not pass without reply.

“Yet I first must proclaim my delight at the manner in which this attack was received. I am glad he made it. I am glad that a ‘seceder’ should thus have had ocular demonstration of the unpopularity of his own opinions. You first heard him in silence. The disapprobation which soon followed marked your sentiments, and, amidst the expressions of your decided disapprobation, which accompanied the close of his speech, he has learned how justly you prize the honest exertions of your General Board. (Loud and continued applause.)

“Yet an object has been attained. One purpose is effectuated. The philippic you have heard will appear in print: it will grace the columns of the hireling press—the vile, the scandalous corruption, the base-born slaves of venality will rejoice to publish it, and some shallow and false friends will give it double circulation.’ It will appear uncontradicted and unaccompanied by that indignant reproof which you have poured upon it; and the seceders, joined in an holy alliance with the Orange Bovens of Derry, and with the paltry persecutors of Wicklow, with the Wingfields and Stratfords, conscientious supporters of religion! God bless the mark! Yes, the ‘seceders’ and the persecutors will rejoice in chorus, for the Catholic Board has been attacked by both; and the speech you have heard this day will be quoted with equal delight by Protestant and Papist Orangemen. (Applause.)

“Let me, however, here, where I can be heard, proudly vindicate the Catholic Board from the aspersions of the learned gentleman. I am, indeed, proud to be the advocate of the Board—doubly proud, because such advocacy requires nothing but the simple statement of facts to make it triumphant. For of what does he accuse us?—of what do his four charges consist? I shall separate the four counts in his indictment, to speak technically, and you will soon perceive how idle and absurd is the accusation. It charges the Board—

“First—With acting in such a manner as enables our enemies to misrepresent our actions.

“Secondly—With this, that the Earl of Fingal and Sir Edward Bellew, by name, and the learned gentleman himself, and several other important persons, calling themselves ‘seceders,’ have separated from the Board.

“Thirdly—With having made an unnecessary and virulent attack on Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan; and—

“Fourthly—With having been guilty of a——pun. (Laughter).

“Such, Mr. Chairman, are the grave and portentous charges brought by Mr. Woulfe against the Board. I shall plead to them, but reversing



the order and continuing the phrase of my profession, I shall plead not guilty to the two latter counts, and tender a justification to the two former.

“The last charge is that with which I begin, namely, that the Board has committed a pun. This has the merit of comicality and of novelty. It has been gravely stated by Mr. Woulfe; but I am unable to attempt, with gravity, to refute the charge, otherwise than by denying the fact, and regretting that some worthy seceder has not furnished the Board with a collection of approved jests and moderate witticisms, that could suggest nothing bold or dangerous. A public body accused of a joke! a public body charged with being miserably witty! Oh! most wise, most sapient accusers! But, let the fact be known. One gentleman of the Board, Mr. Lawless, used the unfortunate witticism now reprobated. He, Mr. Lawless, talked of the ‘*knockloftiness*’ of the style of a certain letter; but, besides, that the Board is scarcely responsible for the jests of an individual, the fact is, that the one in question did not originate with him; he found it in ‘*The Belfast Magazine*,’ and retailed it to the Board, at second hand.

“Let ‘*The Belfast Magazine*,’ and not the Board, bear the blame; and there never was a work that could better sustain an attack; it is a work that does honour to Irish genius, taste, and talent; it is a work consecrated to Irish liberty; it glows with every noble sentiment of religious and civil freedom; and dull must be the understanding, and cold must be the heart it could fail to enlighten and to warm in the cause of Ireland. The conductors of it are Protestants and Presbyterians; would to God the Catholic Board contained many—would that it contained any such men.

“To return from the digression which a very silly charge against the Board bid me indulge, I now take up the next proposition to which I have, for the Board, pleaded not guilty. It is, sir, the solemn accusation, ‘that the Board has made an unnecessary and violent attack on Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan!’

“This charge I totally and entirely deny. The gentleman has not supported it with a single proof; but as it involves us in the base sin of ingratitude, I shall reply to an improved charge; and by merely stating the facts, demonstrate the plain injustice of the accusation. The facts are these; attend to them I pray you: they are of importance to every Irishman, no matter what may be his mode or form of faith.

“Last year a bill was brought into Parliament, purporting to be for the relief of the Roman Catholic body. There was no deliberation on that bill. Lord Donoughmore was scarcely consulted with at all; but it was prepared principally under the auspices of Mr. Canning, one of

the foremost in that class of statesmen who raise their own interests whilst they despise public liberty and political principle, and laugh in private at the dupes, by whose confidence they rise to wealth and power. Mr. Canning was the chief framer of the bill, and it was quite suited to a patriot of his description.

“It was the duty of the members of the Catholic Board diligently and carefully to examine the principle and contents of a proposed law, in which, as Catholics and as Irishmen, we were all so deeply interested. We found it to be erroneous in principle; defective, and almost entirely useless in its details respecting our religion; indeed, it might have been said to contain no principle at all; or, rather, it contained a direct negative of the great object of our pursuit—the principle that would declare conscience free, and religion a question between man and his Creator. (Applause).

“Then, with respect to our religion, it went to place our Church, the appointment of our bishops, and the consequent control over our clergy, in the hands of three privy councillors, to consist, perhaps, of Dr. Duigenan, Sir Richard Musgrave, and the acting clerk or secretary at the Castle, generally some conceited and ignorant English coxcomb. Such were the men who were to preside over our Church; to whose fostering care our religion was to have been confided; to whose tender mercies the holiness of our faith was to be entrusted. Is there in the Catholic body any man so stupid as to imagine, that the Catholic religion could exist fifty years under such control?

“It has survived persecution; built upon a rock, it has defied the storms of force and violence. But this Emancipation Bill would have undermined the Church, and the rock on which it is founded; and in the fall of both, the credulous people would be crushed to death and destruction.

“This to you is enough. Canning's Emancipation Bill would have destroyed your religion. No man could expect to be appointed a bishop after it passed, for any other reason than because he did not deserve that sacred office. Piety, and learning, and holy zeal, and blessed charity, which we now see so often combined in our venerated prelates, would all be passed over and carefully rejected; and in their room the men would be selected, who were subservient, and subtle, and flattering; the men who could sacrifice their consciences to the interest of their patrons. A good electioneering agent would deserve a mitre by arduity in the bribery and corruption of a contested election; and the patronage of the Catholic Church would become a constant, as it would be a valuable article of ministerial traffic and barter.

“Add to this the hereditary hatred which so many cherish against

the Irish Catholics; and when you have placed the Irish Catholic Church under the combined controul of bigotry and interested profligacy, I would fain learn whether there be any seceder so confident as to assert, that the Catholic religion in Ireland could survive under that domination?

“But this is not all: the last ray, the remaining spark of liberty in Ireland would have been extinguished by the same process which had put out your religion. The quantity of influence which the minister would have procured by means of Mr. Canning’s bill is obvious: there would be placed in every diocese, and then in every parish in Ireland, a ministerial dependant, obliged to support the minister by the tenure of his ecclesiastical office; and then the expectants of the offices would, as is usual, be under the necessity of using double diligence in the service of the friends of the ministry. Thus Canning’s bill would have given a more extensive and formidable patronage and support to every succeeding administration; it would have brought more numerous, better disciplined, and more effective recruits into the ranks of corruption than any one political measure ever yet invented, or even imagined.

“I repeat it, that then, public liberty would be a shadow, and the simple and the unpretending despotism of a Turkish province would be a subject for admiration and regret. (Applause).

“See what has already occurred in the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. The Irish Presbyterians were remarked and admired for their love of liberty; their hatred of oppression; their manly and noble spirit of independence. The republican portion of our mixed constitution; that part of our constitution which is essentially necessary for the preservation of the liberties of the people, had, in the Irish Presbyterians, vigilant guardians, active, zealous, informed, and enlightened supporters. The Presbyterians first felt that the true interests of Ireland required a cordial co-operation of all the Irish people; and demanded the extinction of religious animosities, and the glow of mutual benevolence. The Irish Presbyterians, accordingly, sacrificed their prejudices on the altar of Ireland; they made the first advances to conciliation; and met even the half-way advances of the Catholics, to a cordial combination of effort in the cause of freedom. They were always the friends of civil liberty; and, for the sake of that darling object, they became the friends of religious liberty also.

“But in an evil hour, when the clergy accepted salaries from the state, the ‘*Regium Donum*’ was introduced; their clergy became familiar with the Castle; the natural consequences followed: their leading gentry fell off, and joined the more courtly and fashionable worship of the Established Church; their lower classes deserted, and joined the ranks

of the Methodists, and sought untried preachers amongst other sectarians; and there remains now to remind us of the ancient glories and worth of the Irish Presbyterians, only just such a residue as must convince us what they would have been, and what she would have done for Ireland, if the Church had not been corroded and almost annihilated by the blighting breath of ministerial influence and corruption.

“With this example before us of a religion almost destroyed, and a watchfire of liberty almost extinguished, could we feel otherwise than indignant at Canning’s attempt to destroy the Irish Catholic Church? We are attached to the Catholic Church firmly and conscientiously; we are attached to liberty ardently and devotedly; and we could not behold with indifference our religion and our liberties devoted, under the name of relief, to decay and ruin. We had not, we confess, sufficient coldness and discretion to see those prospects, and remain unmoved. Our venerable prelates joined in our fears; they condemned Canning’s clauses; we expressed our gratitude; and here secession began. The ‘seceders’ thought the bill right, and the bishops wrong; and from the day on which we thanked our prelates for their care of the Catholic Church—from that day the great era of secession is dated, and the party of whom, for the first time, a boast is made at a public meeting, commenced its history; but of this party I shall say more presently.

“The relief bill, I have told you, was defective in its details. After having pointed out its natural and necessary tendency to destroy religion and liberty, it may be deemed quite superfluous, or worse, to notice its details; but I cannot avoid pointing out a few of its most prominent defects. At present it is said that the Catholics of Ireland cannot found any school, nor establish any charity for Catholics. Catholic schools and Catholic charities are, they say, forbidden by law; nay, the law is much worse; for there is a commission, consisting principally of Protestant bishops, with Dr. Duigenan at their head, whose duty it is to look for illegal—that is, Catholic—charities; then to employ an attorney, who, *in all events*, is to be paid out of the charitable fund attacked. Whether they succeed or not, their attorney is entitled to his plunder—his full costs from the defendants; and it is the duty of those commissioners, thus amused with litigation, at the expense of their adversaries, to lay hold of all property destined for Catholic schools and charities, and to convert it to the purposes of Protestant charities and schools!

“All charitable bequests for Catholic purposes, the executors are bound to divulge, under severe penalties. Besides, concealment is impossible; for the wills must remain in the Ecclesiastical Court, and thus a complete inquisition is established over every source of charitable

relief, and every fund for the education of Catholics. Besides, the very collections of your charity sermons may be swept away by any common informer, but that such species of profligacy is restrained and controlled, in despite of the law, by the execration of mankind.

“ Perhaps you imagine that the late relief bill would have reduced those evils, and rescued your schools and charities from the Protestant inquisition. You are mistaken if you think so. The bill would have left the inquisition precisely as it found it.

“ I shall particularise but one more defect. A Catholic priest is at present subjected by law to capital punishment if he happens to marry a Catholic to a Protestant, or to a person who was a Protestant at any time within twelve months before the marriage. It is immaterial whether the priest know the fact, or be ignorant of it. Let it be so studiously concealed from him that he cannot possibly discover it, still he is guilty of a capital felony; and I will venture to assert that there is not a single priest in any of the large towns in Ireland who has not repeatedly been rendered liable to the punishment of that offence. But the law is not content with directing the priest to be hanged, even for a mistake; the cruel folly of the penal code went further; and lest the priest should be unreasonable enough not to be contented with hanging, another statute has, in addition, imposed a penalty of £500. Thus, a priest may, by law, be first hanged, and secondly fined £500 for one and the same offence; and the construction was, in the year 1802, expressly admitted, in my hearing, by the late Lord Kilwarden, pronouncing the unanimous opinion of the Court of King’s Bench.

“ The relief bill would have left the law, in this particular also, as it found it; and if the charter of emancipation, as it was ludicrously called in Cork, had passed, the priests of that city would have continued liable, for a mere mistake, to death, with a superadded fine.

“ I will not delay you to particularise many other defects in the relief bill; I will not point out to you the omission to give votes to Catholic peers at the election of Irish representative peers; of the insertion of civil and military officers, without adding naval and judicial, although the distinction between naval and military officers is pointedly recognized by the statute law, and the difference between naval and military officers has already been effectually relied on to exclude the Catholic from the latter. Neither shall I detain you with pointing out the insufficiency of the relief bill to procure the Catholics their rights in corporations. You well know the advantages derived from the freedom of corporate cities; you know by experience what vexations freemen of cities escape. Corporate rights are now become of inestimable value in the neighbouring city of Limerick; and if there be spirit and indepen-

dence amongst you, they may also soon become valuable in the town of Ennis.

“ All these, and many more wants were in the relief bill of last year. The Catholic Board would have ill-deserved the confidence of their oppressed countrymen, if they had not sagacity to discover, and manliness to expose those defects. The course to be pursued appeared plain and simple. Lord Donoughmore was certainly in no manner responsible for the relief bill; and Mr. Grattan, who had supported its civil enactments, was, we are convinced, unacquainted with the particulars in which that bill was defective. Under these circumstances, the Board solicited respectfully a communication with those illustrious personages. Something like offence appears to have been taken at our solicitation; we were replied to in a style of superiority, better suited, perhaps, to periods when the Catholics were more depressed, the Protestants more elevated. What was the cause or reason of the error—for so I must pronounce it—into which these, our great advocates, fell? The Board treated it with perfect respect, and replied to it in terms of perfect civility. The rejoinder was, perhaps, more unbending than the first answer. Lord Donoughmore did not think it right to descend from his lofty attitude. Mr. Grattan took the same ground, and even condescended to lecture the Board. But the Board never swerved from its determined respect. It was the prototype of humility personified; and it did not, for one instant, forget what it owed to the former services of the noble lord and right honourable gentleman. It did not even enter into any expostulation, much less into any reproof. But it submitted in silence to a claim of superiority which the law conferred, and, perhaps, nature had confirmed; nor was that silence the less meritorious for the thousand heart-breaking recollections which legal superiority rouses and perpetuates. (Loud and continued applause.)

“ Such are the facts; I defy Mr. Woulfe, or any other gentleman to contradict any one of them. Where, then, is the attack on Lord Donoughmore? Where, then, is the violence or intemperance of the Board? For my part, I felt and found blame, for another and a very different reason. I apprehended that the Board would have met censure and reprobation for the excess of its tameness and submission. ‘ Bold measure men,’ as the hirelings of the administration call us, would have acted otherwise. ‘ Bold measure men,’ if such there really were, would have put an earlier period to the correspondence, by respectfully, but firmly, declining future support. But we thought and judged differently; and therefore can securely laugh to scorn those who would accuse us of intemperance, or disrespect to Lord Donoughmore or Mr. Grattan. (Much applause.)

“ Little must be said on the other topics of accusation. It is rather ludicrous to charge us with the course that Lord Fingal, and Sir Edward Bellew, and the learned gentlemen have seceded, or that our enemies misrepresent us. I cheerfully admit the private worth and high rank of the noble lord ; I readily concede the great wealth and respectability of the worthy baronet ; but after all, what are they when put in contact with the people of Ireland ? Lord Fingal is not the Catholic cause, nor is Sir Edward Bellew the Catholic strength. That cause may proceed in its native and inherent strength without them. Whilst I lament their absence, and should rejoice at their exertions, I cannot consent to think that the liberty of the people depends on their presence or secession. The seceders of 1792 were as high in rank, and were sixty-eight in number ; yet the people pressed on their cause, and were eminently successful. I say this to show you, that even if Mr. Woulfe be right, and that this secession has taken place, yet the people may, if they please, again triumph. Let Mr. Woulfe, too, recollect, that the Board contains other noble lords and honourable baronets, who have not seceded ; and that the families of those who remain are as free from the intercourse of placemen and pensioners as those who are alleged to have seceded.

“ One word, then, as to the charge that we give room for misrepresentation. My answer is ready :—If our actions were mischievous or improper, our enemies would have no occasion to misrepresent. They pay a compliment to our integrity when they resort to misrepresentation ; they tacitly admit that the fact would not serve their purposes, when they distort it, in order to injure us.

“ And, after all, who can stay the progress of misrepresentation ? We have open and avowed enemies. We have equally tried enemies, who pretend to be our friends ; for their daily pay they must calumniate and misrepresent ; and for my own part, I should as soon be angry with the winds for shifting to an unpleasant point, as I would with any of those pitiful creatures, whose rancour is paid by the day, and who, perhaps, for smaller pay, certainly for greater, would calumniate the subjects of their present eulogies. But while the people of Ireland listen to the dissemination of discord and dissension, does Mr. Woulfe and his ‘ seceders’ imagine that the people will never learn the wisdom of union and concord ? Have seven centuries of misery and misfortune not taught Ireland the source of her woes ?—is she now to learn that it was by division she was first conquered ?—that it was by the dissension of her sons she was often plundered—and that it was by their discord she was finally erased from the rank of nations, and reduced to the form of a province ?

“ Yes, Mr. Chairman ; our enemies did, our enemies can at all times succeed in Ireland. The curse of the country is in that spirit, which leads Irishmen to prefer a contest with one and the other, to the attack of the foes of their religion and liberty. It is quite characteristic of this ill-fated land to have Mr. Woulfe exhaust that eloquence in a sally against the Catholic Board, which might be better employed upon the opponents of his faith and country. Why does he play the Roman fool, and turn his sword upon his fellow-slaves, whilst oppressors are allowed by him to escape with impunity ? Let him expose one bigot—let him desert and reprobate one prejudice, and then, perhaps, he may be entitled to war with his fellow-labourers ; but if he prefer to take the same side with the persecutors, and to strike at those who strike at them, let him not wonder if he be mentioned amongst the enemies of his country.

“ How often has Ireland been taken to the market, and sold by the corruption of her own children !—how often has she been betrayed by the folly of her own sons ! But a better day opens, I trust, to her view. Her Catholic Board will remain firm at its post until religious liberty is attained. It is cheered and rewarded by your confidence ; and the ‘ seceders’ themselves will, I trust, soon learn, that unqualified emancipation is our undoubted right, as the active pursuit of it is our first duty ; and in that sacred cause let the watchword be—**UNANIMITY FOR OLD IRELAND !**”

Well was it that the Catholic mind was thus again excited against the detestable “ securities ;” as in a very few weeks after, the afflicting intelligence was announced, that the prelates appointed to administer ecclesiastical affairs at Rome, during the captivity of the Pope, had not only assented to, but approved of the “ securities” in the parliamentary bill of the preceding year.

The document itself which conveyed this disastrous assent, and which bore the signature “ Monsignor Quarantotti, Vice-Prefect of Rome,” was immediately published, *in extenso*, by all the journals of the united kingdom ; and exceeding was the jubilee of the enemies of the religion of the Catholics—*friends* of their political claims, as many of them were. Corresponding was the grief and dismay of every Catholic of sound judgment and sound heart ; but in an equal measure was their determina-



tion not even yet to abandon their opposition to the ruin of their religious independence.

A very few brief extracts from the letter of "An Irish Priest," which appeared in the *Dublin Evening Post* the day after Quarantotti's document had been given, will show the spirit in which the latter was met at once:—

"The ferment spread like wild fire through every gradation of society; and the very lowest order of people felt its influence. Some cursed—others moaned—all complained. Early this morning my old servant maid, without waiting for any commands of mine, accosted me abruptly with these words:—'Oh, sir! what shall we do? Is it—can it be true, that the Pope has turned Orangeman?!'"

"I must beg to correct two material mistakes of yours. . . . The document is *not* from his Holiness Pius VII. . . . Nor is there a word to indicate any sort of consent or approbation from him, or any one of his cardinals. Quarantotti refers to no authority but his own. . . . A clerk to the Congregation of Propaganda presumes to decide on a subject of the greatest magnitude, and which would require the deliberation not only of the whole Congregation and of the Pope himself, with his whole College of Cardinals, but of an entire Œcumenical Council. Nay, as it appertains to local discipline, that Œcumenical Council itself could not compel us to submit—much less an understrapper of Propaganda!"

After severe criticism on the *Latinity* of the document, the writer thus proceeded to another point of attack—the channel through which an announcement of such importance to Ireland was made: through an English Vicar Apostolic! instead of, at least, being addressed to the Irish regularly constituted Hierarchy. We pass over this and other points strongly and warmly put and expressed, to give the concluding sentence, applicable to the circumstances of the present day, with the single alteration of substituting the words "self-styled *liberal Catholics*" for the last word here given:—

"Every attempt to weaken the Catholic Church in Ireland shall, in the end, prove fruitless; and as long as the shamrock shall adorn our

island, so long shall the faith delivered to us by St. Patrick prevail; in despite of kings, parliaments, Orangemen, and *Quarantotti*."

Almost the next newspaper contained a stirring protest and address of clergymen against this rescript by Quarantotti (or "*Mister Forty-Eight*," as the irrepressible tendency to jesting, in the Irish Catholic, had already christened him, in allusion to a wild story about the derivation of his patronymic, said to have been from the number of a lucky lottery-ticket that had made his father's fortunes). As the first clerical move we give it in full, with the names annexed; foremost among them, as our readers will gladly recognize, the honoured name of the revered and admirable present Bishop of Dromore, the Right Rev. Dr. Blake.

Others too, names of dearly loved and respected members of the priesthood of Dublin at the present day, will also be gladly and warmly recognized—and affectionate regrets will be again awakened at seeing the names of others who have, at various periods of the long interval since this act of true-hearted patriotism and unerring religious fidelity, gone to receive the reward of their virtues.

#### "RESOLUTIONS

"OF THE PARISH PRIESTS AND CLERGYMEN OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF DUBLIN,

"BRIDGE-STREET CHAPEL, THURSDAY, MAY 12.

"We, the undersigned parish priests and clergymen of the archdiocese of Dublin, feel it as a duty that we owe to God, and to our flocks, to make the following public declaration:—

"RESOLVED.—That we consider the document or rescript, signed "*Quarantotti*," as *non-obligatory* upon the CATHOLIC CHURCH IN IRELAND, particularly as it wants those authoritative marks, whereby the mandates of the HOLY SEE are known and recognized, and ESPECIALLY THE SIGNATURE OF THE POPE.

"That we consider the granting to an anti-Catholic government any power, either direct or indirect, with regard to the appointment and nomination of the Catholic bishops in Ireland, as at all times inexpedient.

"That, circumstanced as we are in this country, we consider the granting of such a power not only inexpedient, but highly detrimental to the best and dearest interests of religion, and pregnant with incalculable mischief to the cause of Catholicity in Ireland.

"That such arrangements of domestic nomination can be made among the clergy of Ireland, as will preclude that foreign influence against which those securities, so destructive to religion, are called for by the parliament.

"We, therefore, most humbly and respectfully do hereby supplicate our venerable archbishop, and we do hope that the Catholic clergy and laity of all Ireland will join us in praying, that he and the other Irish prelates will, without delay, remonstrate against this document, and represent to his holiness and the sacred college of cardinals, now happily re-instated at Rome, the peculiar situation of the Catholic Church in Ireland, and the tremendous evils which we apprehend would inevitably flow from the adoption of the principles laid down in the said document.

" Michael Blake, P.P., and President of the Meeting.	Stephen Dowdall, O.S.E.
Miles Mac Pharian, P.P.	Francis Joseph L'Estrange, O.D.C. Clarendon-street Chapel.
Andrew Lube, P.P.	Joseph O'Hanlon, do. do.
Morgan D'Arcy, P.P.	Charles Boyle, Curate, Clontarf.
John Joseph Smyth, P.P.	Joseph Sheridan, Church-street Chapel.
Joseph Ham, P.P.	Michael Nowlan, John's-lane Chapel.
Barusby Murphy, Economy of Townsend-street Parish.	Nicholas Malone, Church-street Chapel.
John Fitz Harris, Townsend-street.	Walter Myler, Curate of Liffey-st. Chapel.
John Barret, Francis-street Chapel.	Hugh Daly, 88, Michael and John's.
Patrick Corcoran, Superior of Church-street Chapel.	James Campbell, Meath-street Chapel.
C. G. O'Beilly, Provincial O.D.C.	Richard Fennin, John's-lane Chapel.
Patrick Doyle, Liffey-street Chapel.	Daniel Costigan, Liffey-street Chapel.
G. Stanton, Ex-Provincial O.S.A., S.T.M.	John Martin O'Donovan, Chaplain to the House of Industry.
Edward Armstrong, Liffey-street Chapel.	Michael F. Kincaid, O.S.F.
Denis Farrell, O.S.D.	Peter Wade, Mary's-lane Chapel.
L. S. Phelan, Curate of St. James'.	John Madden, John's-lane Chapel.
Patrick Brady, Meath-street Chapel.	John Devereux, Church-street Chapel.
— Prendergast, Curate of St. Andrew's.	Andrew Ennis, Liffey-street Chapel.
J. Pearson, Curate of 88, Michael & John's.	John Francis Roche, Clarendon-st. Chapel.
J. J. Callan, Curate of St. James'.	John Murray, Swords.
Miles O'Connor, Curate of St. Andrew's.	Anthony Gullifoye, O.S.A. Adam and Eva.
Joseph Joy Dean, Principal of Blanchers-town Academy.	L. Flunkett, O.S.D.
William Yore, Curate of St. James'.	James Carey, P.P., Swords.
J. Kavanagh, Curate of Francis-st. Chapel.	James F. Kenny, Church-street.
James Reynolds, O.S.F.	J. Leonard, O.C.E., Church-street.
Patrick Furell, Curate of St. Andrew's.	John Grace, Townsend-street Chapel.
M. Doyle, Curate of 88, Michael & John's.	Simon M'Carthy, French-street Chapel.
Alexander Roche, do. do.	Denis M'Foley, Fortmarnock.
Thomas Coleman, do. do.	Patrick Caffrey, Church-street Chapel.
M. Keogh, Curate of Meath-st. Chapel.	Patrick Callaghan, do. do.
Patrick Corr, Mary's-lane.	E. J. M'Dermott, B. Ord. Frsadm. Curate of Francis-street Chapel.
M. B. Corr, do.	Joseph Gilan, Liffey-street Chapel.
John C. Kearney, Francis-street Chapel.	James M'Keon, P.P., Finsch.
	Denis Gaban, O.S.A. Curate St. Catherine's."

The *Evening Post* announced that the names thus appended included all the clergymen at that moment in the city of Dublin, and ends its remarks upon the address with

"DEO IN EXCELSIS!"

Meantime the Catholic and liberal newspapers, with but one exception, were blazing out in indignation against the scheme, and all connected with it; and their own articles were accompanied, and, as it were, sanctioned by letters from clergymen, &c. full of the same denunciations and protests.

The venerable Dr. Coppinger, Catholic Bishop of Cloyne, was first in the field, of his order, at this crisis. In a letter of his that appears in the *Dublin Evening Post*, of May 14, he styled "*Mr. Quarantotti's decree*" a "*very mischievous document*," and added:—

"In common with every real friend to the integrity of the Catholic religion in Ireland, I read it with feelings of disgust and indignation!"

In similar strong terms the Catholic Bishop of Dromore, the Right Rev. Dr. Derry, followed a few days later.

Right Rev. Dr. O'Shaughnessy:—

"The result of this pernicious document, if acted upon, would be fatal to the Catholic religion; therefore I hasten to protest against it, and while I have breath in my body will continue to do so."

What we have given were the first—almost instantaneous demonstrations. It would be utterly impossible to give even a summary of those which rapidly and in overwhelming numbers and increasing strength followed them.

On Thursday, May 19th, an aggregate meeting took place at the Farming Repository, Stephen's-green, Thomas Wyse, jun., Esq., in the Chair (the present member for Waterford city), to consider the rescript of Quarantotti, and other Catholic business.

At this meeting occurred much that was the prototype of the species of support that has by some parties been given to the schemes which Sir Robert Peel's ministry are now attempting to carry out against the Catholic religion.

There was the same suggestion of "moderation," "prudence," &c. &c.; the same eloquent deprecating of "introducing polemics," &c.; the same affected humility in declining to argue matters connected with discipline, &c., of the Catholic Church, and the same terrible danger to pure Catholicity, had these specious reasoners succeeded with the assembled Catholics.

But they—and the wicked government whose base and execrable designs, several of them unthinkingly, but, alas! a few, it is to be feared, with deliberate intent, were seeking to abet—received a signal defeat; the happy forerunner of entire and final overthrow a few months later.

The following were the pith and marrow of the resolutions which were unanimously passed on this occasion:—

“RESOLVED—‘That we deem it a duty to ourselves and to our country, solemnly and distinctly to declare, that any DECREE, MANDATE, RESCRIPT, OR DECISION WHATSOEVER OF ANY FOREIGN POWER OR AUTHORITY, RELIGIOUS OR CIVIL, ought not, and cannot of right, assume any dominion or control over the political concerns of the Catholics of Ireland.’

“RESOLVED—‘That the venerable and venerated the Catholic PRIESTS of the archdiocese of Dublin have deserved our most marked and cordial gratitude, as well for the uniform tenor of their sanctified lives, as in particular for the HOLY ZEAL AND ALACRITY with which, at the present period of general alarm and consternation, they have consoled the people of Ireland, by the public declaration of their sentiments respecting the *mischievous document*, signed B. QUARANTOTTI, and dispose them to await with confidence the decision of our revered prelates at the approaching synod.’

“RESOLVED—‘That we do most earnestly and respectfully beseech our revered prelates to take into consideration, at the approaching synod, the propriety of for ever precluding any public danger either of MINISTERIAL or FOREIGN influence in the appointment of our prelates.’”

Mr. O’Connell’s speech at the aggregate meeting is given in evidently a very imperfect shape indeed. It had three chief points:—first, a protest against the recent steps taken in favour of the veto; next a vindication of the conduct of the clergy of the archdiocese of Dublin, who had so nobly come forward against that measure, and an expression of confidence that the hierarchy would soon fulminate against it; and finally, a contemptuous and indignant comment upon some peculiarly bigoted and peculiarly absurd anti-Catholic resolutions of several county grand juries.

The bishops’ protest was as follows, agreed to on the 27th of May, after two days’ conference at Maynooth:—

“RESOLVED—‘That a congratulatory letter be addressed to his Holiness, Pius VII., on his happy liberation from captivity.’

“RESOLVED—‘That having taken into our mature consideration the late RESCRIPT of the VICE-PREFECT of the PROPAGANDA, we are fully convinced that it is *not mandatory*.’

“RESOLVED—‘That we do now open a communication with the HOLY SEE on the subject of this document; and that, for this purpose, two PRELATES be forthwith deputed to convey our unanimous and well-known sentiments to the CHIEF PASTOR, from whose wisdom, zeal, and tried magnanimity, we have reason to expect such decision as will give general satisfaction.’

“RESOLVED—‘That the two last resolutions be respectfully communicated to the Right Honourable the EARL of DOWNGOMORE, and to the Right Honourable HENRY GRATTAN, with an earnest entreaty, that when the question of Catholic emancipation shall be discussed in parliament, they will exert their powerful talent in excluding from the bill intended for our relief, those clauses which we have already deprecated as severely penal to us, and highly injurious to our religion.’”

We must hurry on our summary of the fast-crowding events

of this stirring year, with as little of comment as is possible, consistent with preserving the slender thread of our narrative.

The unsatisfactory correspondence between the Catholic Board and Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan continued in the same mixed style of compliment and remonstrance until early in June, when, without warning to those who had entrusted him with the Catholic petition to the lower House, and without consultation with any one, Mr. Grattan, when presenting the petition, announced that it was *not* his intention to bring forward the Catholic claims that session.

The Catholic Board was instantly summoned to consider this unexpected event, and decide on what steps it might be proper to take under the circumstances, when suddenly the following proclamation made its appearance.

“WHITWORTH.

“Whereas an assembly, under the denomination of the Catholic Board, has, for a considerable time, existed in this part of the United Kingdom, under pretence of preparing petitions to parliament on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland.

“And whereas, under the provisions of an act made in the parliament of Ireland, in the thirty-third year of the reign of his present Majesty, intituled—‘An Act to prevent the Election or Appointment of Unlawful Assemblies, under the pretence of preparing public petitions, or other addresses to his Majesty, or to the parliament’—The said assembly is an unlawful assembly.

“And whereas, great artifices has been employed in order to persuade the public generally and his Majesty’s Roman Catholic subjects in Ireland in particular, that such an assembly is lawful and necessary to the exercise of the right of petitioning.

“And whereas, the law hath hitherto not been enforced against the said assembly, in the expectation that those who had been misled by such artifices would become sensible of their error; and in the hope that the said assembly would be discontinued without the necessity of legal interposition.

“Now we, the Lord Lieutenant, by and with the advice and consent of his Majesty’s Privy Council, being satisfied that the permanence, or the further continuance of the said assembly can only tend to serve the ends of factious and seditious persons, and to the violation of the public peace,

“Do hereby strictly caution and forewarn all such of his Majesty’s subjects as are members of the said assembly, that they do henceforward abstain from any further attendance at or in the said assembly.

“And do hereby give notice:

“That if, in defiance of this our proclamation, the said assembly shall again meet after the date hereof, the said assembly, and all persons acting as members of the same, shall be proceeded against according to law.

“Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin, this third day of June, 1814.

“CHARLES MANNERS, (Lord Chancellor).

CHARLES CASHEL.

DROGHEDA.

WESTMEATH.

MAYO.

ERNK.

CHARLES KILDARE.

CASTLE COOTE.

FRANKFORT.

J. M’MAHON.

G. HEWETT.

G. KNOX.

J. ORMSBY VANDELEUR.

WILLIAM SAURIN.

S. HAMILTON.”

It will thus be seen that the Catholics had their hands pretty full! The unauthorized *capitulation* with the British government as to Irish ecclesiastical independence, by Quarantotti; the folly and treachery that were backing him in Ireland; the extraordinary abandonment (as, at least for the current session of parliament, it was) of their cause by its old parliamentary advocates; and now the renewed activity of hostility on the part of the government—all this might well have been expected to dismay the fainthearted, and chill the hopes of the brave.

But the cause was *not under the* guidance of a faint heart; or of one whose bolder conceptions needed fair skies and summer weather to ripen them into action. A meeting was immediately held in Mr. O'Connell's house, in Merrion-square, at which it was resolved, of course, to submit to the government, in so far as the abstaining from assembling at that moment the Catholic Board; but at the same time to summon at once another aggregate Catholic meeting, to consider the most advisable course to be pursued at so important and difficult a juncture.

How can one for a moment entertain a feeling of doubt as to Ireland's success in her present efforts, when the mind reverts to these and other times we have been describing?—division and treachery in the popular ranks—seduction, terror, and violence on the part of the government.

But the popular cause came safely through all its former emergencies, as it will through the present and those which may be yet before us, by their peaceful and invincible perseverance in that course which Mr. O'Connell has epitomised in one of those short, pithy, pregnant sentences, that have been, as it were, the texts of his most powerful political addresses, and the exponents of the policy of his whole life :—

“ THERE IS BUT ONE MAGIC IN POLITICS, AND THAT IS—ALWAYS  
TO BE IN THE RIGHT!”

Thus have the people sedulously acted throughout, keeping themselves in the right, and putting the enemy, with all his vio-

lence and all his power, ever in the wrong; and hence the secret of their steady progress towards ultimate success.

As if any thing were wanting to embarrass affairs in Ireland, the government now threw in another ingredient of dissatisfaction and discontent. The admirable order of Jesuits were for some time applying for leave to form an establishment for the education of the youth of the higher and middle classes of Catholics—the same which has now existed with such beneficial fruits to society in general, since 1814, at Clongowes Wood College, near Clane, in the county of Kildare. Little peddling difficulties, suggestions of the most narrow-minded, most miserable bigotry, were raised by the government. Even *open threats* of what would be nothing more nor less than plain, undisguised rapine and robbery were held out by Mr., now Sir Robert Peel, the Irish Secretary, in answer to the personal solicitations of the Very Rev. Dr. Kenny, who was conducting the negotiations on the part of the society.

To those who knew that most learned, most pious, and admirable man, any eulogy of ours would appear faint and vain indeed; and to those who had not that happiness, it would be impossible to convey any thing like an adequate idea of his extraordinary mental powers, his profound learning, and the saintliness of his life.

Mr. Peel communicated to the House of Commons, on being questioned by some alarmed no-Popery member, who had not slept quietly in his bed since the first news of the *invasion* of Ireland by the dreadful Jesuits, the threats of plunder of their property, which, in an interview with Dr. Kenny, he had held out to deter the society from their purpose. But he took care not to communicate the quiet and sufficient answer with which the unworthy and disgraceful menace was rebutted.

“Mr. Peel,” replied Dr. Kenny, with great calmness and good-humour, “it may be so: your government *may* attempt, and have the power to effect such a violation of the rights of property, but in doing so they will also violate the maxim of Lord Chatham, whose statesman-



ship you profess to hold in reverence. As you may not recollect the circumstance at this moment, suffer me to recall it to you. It having been suggested to him to lay hold of the monies lying in the English funds, in the names of natives of France, with whom war was then waging, 'No, no,' said he; 'if *the Devil* had money in the English funds, it should be held safe for him!'

What Lord Chatham would have conceded to his Satanic Majesty, Mr. Peel thought he could not well withhold from the Jesuits, small as he may have considered the difference between those parties; and so the funded investments of the order were respected, and themselves at last allowed to proceed with their beneficent and admirable project.

On Saturday the 11th June, the contemplated aggregate meeting took place in the present church of St. Teresa, Clarendon-street—the Hon. Martin Ffrench in the chair.

The following were the chief resolutions:—

"2. RESOLVED—'That the Catholic Board was not elected, or in any manner constituted or appointed, to represent the people of this realm, or any number or description of people; neither did it, nor does it, assume or exercise authority of representing of the people, or of any description of the people.'

"3. RESOLVED—'That we, therefore, utterly deny that the Catholic Board is an unlawful assembly, either within the provisions of the Convention Act or otherwise; and especially as the Convention Act contains a saving provision in the words following, viz. :—"Provided, also, that nothing herein contained shall be construed, in any manner, to prevent or impede the undoubted RIGHT of his Majesty's subjects, of this realm, to petition his Majesty, or both Houses, or either House of Parliament, for redress of any public or private grievance."

"4. RESOLVED—'That in the acts of the Catholic Board we recognize unwearied diligence, distinguished talent, and inviolate fidelity in the performance of its arduous duties. The Catholic people have found in it a firm, legitimate organ of their opinions and feelings. Their RIGHTS have been advocated, and their wrongs proclaimed with truth and earnestness. The results have proved eminently beneficial; for, whilst the friends of religious freedom have augmented in numbers, and triumphed in argument, the votaries of intolerance have been humbled, abashed, and nearly silenced. General calumnies against our moral principles have been exploded, and our opponents are now compelled to resort to the despicable substitute of personal defamation. Much has been done by the Catholic Board towards cheering and cementing the Catholic people; guiding them by constitutional principles; protecting them, in many instances, from local oppression; checking magisterial delinquency in others; warning them seasonably against the snares of insidious foes; and, with a prevailing spirit of benevolent patriotism, the wants of the native artisan and neglected manufacturer have been affectionately consulted, and their interests cherished with parental solicitude. The very existence of such a board has frustrated the intrigues and crushed the profane speculations of such as would traffic upon a venal misrepresentation of Catholic sentiments.'

"6. RESOLVED—'That for these and many other valuable services rendered to Ireland, and to religious freedom, we sincerely thank the members of the Catholic Board, and recommend them to the respect and gratitude of their country.'

"7. RESOLVED—'That his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant having thought proper to forbid the meetings of said Board, at a moment when the discussion of our claims in parliament is immediately to be expected, and when, of course, the important and most necessary communications with our noble and honourable advocates in both Houses may, from day to day, be indispensably called for, such a prohibition is, by its nature and unavoidable consequences (whatever be the motives that dictated it), calculated to embarrass and obstruct, in various ways, the success of our humble application to the legislature, and to surround it with difficulties, not warranted by any circumstance that we can discover, and altogether adverse to the spirit of the British Constitution—difficulties which seem too likely to render the right and act of petitioning for a season inefficient, and, of consequence, and in effect, nugatory and of no value.'"

Brief as it is necessary to be, it were a heavy omission, indeed, did we not insert here the following *extracts* from a charge delivered by Mr. Justice Fletcher, to the grand jury of the county of Wexford, at the summer assizes, 1814.

So searching a review of the causes which distracted and convulsed the social state in Ireland at that time, *and which prevail at the present day*, augmented instead of being diminished or mitigated, so much, at least, as relates to the conduct of landlords, and of the magistracy, should have made a deep and effective impression on the men who wielded the powers of government, and induced them to apply vigorous remedies to the old and lasting evils here enumerated.

But those men were as fully informed upon the subject as Baron Fletcher himself. They neglected to apply remedies, because all their sympathies, and the sympathies of their successors in the present day, were, and are, entirely and solely with the faction that derived profit from Ireland's wretchedness.

"In my circuits through other parts of the kingdom, I have seen the lower orders of the people disturbed by many causes, not peculiar to any particular counties; operating with more effect in some, but to a greater or less extent in all. I have seen them operating with extended effect in the north-west circuit—in the counties of Mayo, Donegal, Derry, Roscommon, &c. &c.

"These effects have made a deep impression on my mind. My observations, certainly, have been those of an individual; but of an individual seeing the same facts coming before him, judicially, time after time; and I do now publicly state that never, during the entire period of my judicial experience (comprising sixteen circuits), have I discovered or observed any serious purpose, or settled scheme, of assailing

“ Superadded to these mischiefs are the permanent and occasional absentee landlords, residing in another country, not known to their tenantry but by their agents, who extract the uttermost penny of the value of the lands. *If a lease happens to fall in, they set the farm by public auction to the highest bidder. No gratitude for past services; no preference of the fair offer; no predilection for the ancient tenantry, be they ever so deserving; but if the highest price be not acceded to, the depopulation of an entire tract of country ensues.*

“ *What, then, is the wretched peasant to do? Chased from the spot where he had first drawn his breath, where he had first seen the light of heaven, incapable of procuring any other means of existence, vexed with those exactions I have enumerated, and harassed by the payment of tithes, can we be surprised that a peasant of unenlightened mind, of uneducated habits, should rush upon the perpetration of crimes, followed by the punishment of the rope and the gibbet.*

“ Nothing, as the peasantry imagine, remains for them, thus harassed and thus destitute, but with strong hand to deter the stranger from intruding upon their farms; and to extort from the weakness and terror of their landlords (*from whose gratitude or good feelings they have failed to win it*) a kind of preference for their ancient tenantry.”

\* \* \* \* \*

The learned judge next turned to an evil only too rife even now—the jury laws. It is to be recollected that the grand juries were entirely (and are still, in many instances) in the hands of the ascendancy faction.

“ Gentlemen, another deep-rooted cause of immorality has been the operation of the *county presentment code* of Ireland—abused as it has been for the *purpose of fraud and peculation*, will you not be astonished when I assure you that I have had information judicially from an upright country gentleman and grand juror, of unquestionable veracity, in a western county, that in the general practice, not one in ten of the accounting affidavits was actually sworn at all! Magistrates have signed and given away printed forms of such affidavits *in blank*, to be filled up at the pleasure of the party. This abuse produced a strong representation from me to the grand jury; and had I known the fact in time, I would have made an example of those magistrates who were guilty of so scandalous a dereliction of duty. Another source of immorality may be traced in the registry of freeholders. The tenantry are driven to the hustings, and there, collected like sheep in a

pen, they must poll for the great undertaker, who has purchased them by his jobs, and this is frequently done with little regard to conscience or duty, or real value of the alleged freehold.

“Another source of immorality lay in the hasty mode of pronouncing decrees upon civil bills, which was common before assistant barristers were nominated for the several counties. All these concurring causes, however, created such a contempt for oaths, that I have often lamented it to be my painful lot to preside in a court of justice, and to be obliged to listen to such abominable profanation.”

\* \* \* \* \*

The next matters touched upon in this admirable address come upon us like an echo from the recent debates on Ireland, instead of as the recital of words uttered in a time barely within the memory of the present generation.

“But, gentlemen, is there no method of allaying those discontents of the people, and preventing them from flying in the face of the laws? Is there no remedy but act of parliament after act of parliament, in quick succession, framed for coercing and punishing? Is there no corrective but the rope and the gibbet? Yes, gentlemen; the removal of those causes of disturbance which I have mentioned to you will operate as the remedy!

“I should imagine that the permanent absentees ought to see the *policy* (if no better motive can influence them) of appropriating liberally some part of those splendid revenues which they draw from this country—which pay no land-tax or poor’s rate, and of which not a shilling is expended in this country! Is it not high time for those permanent absentees to offer some assistance, originating from themselves, out of their own private purses, towards improving and ameliorating the condition of the lower orders of the peasantry upon their great domains, and rendering their lives more comfortable. Indeed, I believe that some of them do not set up their lands to auction. I know that the Earl Fitzwilliam, in one county (Wicklow), and the Marquis of Hertford, in another (Antrim), act upon enlightened and liberal principles; for although their leases generally are only leases for one life, and twenty-one years, the tenant in possession well knows that, upon a reasonable advance, merely proportionate to the general rise of the times, he will get his farm without rack-rent or extortion. But I say that the permanent absentees ought to know that it is their interest to contribute every thing in their power, and within the sphere of their extensive in-

fluence, towards the improvement of a country from whence they derive such ample revenue and solid benefits. Instead of being so, how do many of them act? They often depute their manager upon the grand jury of the county. This manager gets his jobs done without question or interruption; his roads, and his bridges, and his park walls—all are conceded.

“For my part, I am wholly at a loss to conceive how those permanent absentees can reconcile it to their feelings or their interests to remain silent spectators of such a state of things, or how they can forbear to raise their voices in behalf of their unhappy country, and ATTEMPT TO OPEN THE EYES OF OUR ENGLISH NEIGHBOURS, WHO, GENERALLY SPEAKING, KNOW ABOUT AS MUCH OF THE IRISH AS THEY DO OF THE HINDOOS. *Does a visitor come to Ireland to compile a book of travels? What is his course? He is handed about from one country gentleman to another, all interested in concealing from him the true state of the country; he passes from squire to squire, each rivalling the other in entertaining their guest—ALL BUSY IN POURING FALSEHOODS INTO HIS EARS TOUCHING THE DISTURBED STATE OF THE COUNTRY AND THE VICIOUS HABITS OF THE PEOPLE.*

“Such is the crusade of information which the English traveller sets forward, and he returns to his country with all his unfortunate prejudices doubled and confirmed, in a kind of moral despair of the welfare of such a wicked race, having made up his mind that nothing ought to be done for this lawless and degraded country. And, indeed, such an extravagant excess have those intolerant opinions of the state of Ireland attained, that I shall not be surprised to hear of some political projector coming forward, and renovating the obsolete ignorance and the prejudices of a Harrington, who, in his ‘Oceana,’ calls the people of Ireland an untameable race, declaring that they ought to be exterminated, and the country colonized by Jews; that thus the state of this island would be bettered, and the commerce of England extended and improved.

“Gentlemen, I will tell you what these absentees ought particularly to do. They ought to promote the establishment of houses of refuge, houses of industry, and schoolhouses, and set the example, upon their own estates, of building decent cottages, so that the Irish peasant may have at least the comfort of an ‘English sow;’ for an English farmer would refuse to eat the flesh of a hog so lodged and fed as an Irish peasant is.

“Are the farms of an English landholder out of lease, or his cottages in a state of dilapidation? He rebuilds every one of them for his tenants, or he covenants to supply them with materials for the purpose. But how are matters conducted in this country? Why, if there is a

house likely to fall into ruins upon an expiring lease, the new rack-rent tenant must rebuild it himself; and can you wonder if your plantations are visited for the purpose, or if your young trees are turned into plough handles, spade handles, or roofs for their cabins? They are more than Egyptian taskmasters, who call for bricks without furnishing a supply of straw. Again, I say, that those occasional absentees ought to come home, and not remain abroad, resting upon the local manager, a species of *'locum tenens'* upon the grand jury. They should reside upon their own estates, and come forward with every possible improvement for the country.

"I do not suppose that you should expect any immediate amendment or public benefit from the plans suggested for the education of the poor. It is in vain to flatter yourselves that you can improve their minds if you neglect their bodies. Where have you ever heard of a people desirous of education, who had not clothes to cover them, or bread to eat? I have never known that any people, under such circumstances, had any appetite for moral instruction.

"So much, gentlemen, for landlords, permanent and occasional absentees. You should begin the necessary reformation. You now enjoy comforts and tranquillity, after seasons of storm, and fever, and disturbance. The comparative blessings of this contrast should make you anxious to keep your county tranquil. If your farms fall out of lease, set them not up to be let by public auction—encourage your tenantry to build comfortable dwellings for themselves—give them a property in their farms, and an interest in the peace of the county. These are the remedies for the discontents of the people; they will be found much better than the cord and the gibbet.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Gentlemen, this subject brings me to a consideration of the magistracy of the country. Of these I must say that some are over-zealous; others too supine. Distracted into parties, they are too often governed by their private passions, to the disgrace of public justice, and the frequent disturbance of the country.

"Here let me solicit your particular attention to some of the *grievous mischiefs flowing from the misconduct of certain magistrates: one is occasioned by an excessive eagerness to crowd the jails with prisoners, and to swell the calendars with crimes.* Hence, the amazing disproportion between the number of the committals and of the convictions—between accusation and evidence—between hasty suspicion and actual guilt. Committals have been too frequently made out, in other counties, upon light and trivial grounds, without reflecting upon the evil consequences of wresting a peasant (probably innocent) from the

bosom of his family—immuring him for weeks or months in a noisome jail, amongst vicious companions. He is afterwards acquitted, or not prosecuted, and returns a lost man in health and morals, to his ruined and beggared family. This is a hideous but common picture.

“Again, fines and forfeited recognizances are multiplied, through the misconduct of a magistrate. He binds over a prosecutor, under a heavy recognizance, to attend at a distant assizes, where it is probable that the man's poverty or private necessities must prevent his attending. The man makes default; his recognizance is forfeited; he is committed to the county jail upon a green-wax process; and, after long confinement, he is finally discharged at the assizes, pursuant to the statute; and from an industrious cottier, he is degraded, from thenceforth, into a beggar and a vagrant.

“Other magistrates presume to make out vague committals, without specifying the day of the offence charged, the place, or any other particular, from which the unfortunate prisoner could have notice to prepare his defence. This suppression is highly indecorous, unfeeling, and unjust; and it deserves, upon every occasion, a severe reprobation of the magistrate, who thus deprives his fellow-subject of his rightful opportunity of defence.

“There are parts of Ireland, where, from the absence of the gentlemen of the county, a race of magistrates has sprung up, who ought never have borne the king's commission. The vast powers entrusted to those officers call for an upright, zealous, and conscientious discharge of their duty.

\* \* \* \* \*

“Gentlemen, the judge whose duty it is to pass the presentments can be of little service towards detecting a ‘job.’ He has no local knowledge; he knows not the distances, the rates, the state of repairs, or the views of the parties. He may, indeed, suspect the job, and tear the suspected presentment; but he may tear inadvertently that which is useful, and let the job pass. Therefore, for the sake of the county, do as Mr. Bagwell did at Clonmel. Begin the reformation, and discountenance firmly all parcelling of ‘jobs.’

“Gentlemen, when I visited the House of Industry at Clonmel, which is liberally and conscientiously conducted by an association, consisting of persons of every religious persuasion, with the Protestant parson and the Catholic priest at their head, never did my eyes witness a more blessed sight. I immediately asked: ‘What do you pay to the matron and to the manager?’ The sum was mentioned: it was small. ‘I suppose,’ said I, ‘it is no object of a county job?’ Mr. Grubb—the bene-

volent Mr. Grubb—smiled, and said, ‘ You have hit it, my lord—that is the fact!’

“ BUT THERE IS ONE REMEDY THAT WOULD, IN MY ESTIMATION, MORE THAN ANY OTHER, ESPECIALLY CONTRIBUTE TO SOOTHE THE MINDS OF THE DISCONTENTED PEASANTRY, AND THEREBY TO ENABLE THEM PATIENTLY TO SUFFER *the pressure of those burthens which cannot, under existing circumstances, be effectually removed*—I mean the EQUAL AND IMPARTIAL ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—of that justice which the rich can pursue until it be attained, but which, that it may benefit the cottager, should be brought home to his door. Such an ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE WOULD GREATLY RECONCILE THE LOWER ORDERS OF THE PEOPLE WITH THE GOVERNMENT UNDER WHICH THEY LIVE; AND AT NO VERY DISTANT PERIOD, I HOPE, ATTACH THEM TO THE LAW, BY IMPARTING ITS BENEFITS AND EXTENDING ITS PROTECTION TO THEM IN ACTUAL AND UNIFORM EXPERIENCE.

“ Gentlemen, if you ask me, ‘ How may this be accomplished?’ I answer, ‘ By a *vigilant superintendence of the administration of justice at quarter sessions, and an anxious observance of the conduct of all justices of peace.* Perhaps the commission of the peace in every county in the kingdom should be examined. In seasons of popular commotion, under chief governors, all acting, unquestionably, with good intentions, but upon various principles and different views, it is not improbable that *many men have crept into the commission, who, HOWEVER USEFUL THEY MIGHT OCCASIONALLY HAVE BEEN, ought not to remain.* THE NEEDY ADVENTURER; THE HUNTER FOR PREFERMENT; THE INTEMPERATE ZEALOT; THE TRADER IN FALSE LOYALTY; THE JOBBERS OF ABSENTEES;—if any of these various descriptions of individuals are now to be found, their names should be expunged from the commission; and if such a mode of proceeding should thin the Commission, vacancies might be supplied, by soliciting every gentleman of property and consideration to discharge some part of that debt of duty, which he owes to himself and the country, by accepting the office of justice of peace. Should their number be inadequate to supply the deficiency, clergymen long resident on their benefices—more inclined to follow the precepts of their divine Master, by feeding the hungry and clothing the naked Catholic (although, adhering to the communion of his fathers, he should conscientiously decline to receive from him spiritual consolation); not harassing and vexing him by a new mode of tithing, and an increase of tithes; not seeking to compensate the dissentients from the communion for the income he derives from their labour by showing a regard for their temporal welfare; attached to their Protestant flocks by



a mutual interchange of good offices, by affection, and by habit. Such a man, anxiously endeavouring not to distract and divide, but to conciliate and reconcile all sects and parties, would, from his education, his leisure, his local knowledge, be a splendid acquisition to the magistracy, and a public blessing to the district committed to his care. Men of this description are retired and unobtrusive; but I trust, if sought after, many such may be found.

*“ Persons there have been of a sort differing widely from those I have described. These men identify their preferment with the welfare of the Church; and if you had believed them, whatever advanced the one, necessarily promoted the other. Some clergymen there may have been, who, in a period of distraction, perusing the Old Testament with more attention than the New; and, admiring the glories of Joshua, the son of Nun, fancied they perceived in the Catholics the Canaanites of old; and, at the head of militia and armed yeomanry, wished to conquer from them the promised glebe. Such men, I hope, are not now to be found in that most respectable order; and if they are, I need scarcely add, they should no longer remain in the commission.”*

\* \* \* \* \*

The necessity of hastening with our task compels the omission of several details of the anti-veto agitation, and reduces us to the summary statement of the proceedings on this subject.

In July, an address, pompously announced as from the Catholics of England, to His Holiness the Pope, made its appearance in the public papers. Its tenor was of the same miserable description as former documents put forward as from the same body, on the Catholic question; containing, as it did, unequivocal manifestations of the spirit of compromise and surrender, and lauding, in unmeasured rescripts, the spirit of Quarantotti.

Almost at the same moment came the intelligence of the disclaimer of the rescript by the authorities in Rome. Cardinal Gonsalvi, deputed by the Pope, drew up and published this disclaimer, denying the authority of Monsignor Quarantotti to issue it; and announcing his dismissal, and that of his colleagues in the act.

The present venerable and much-beloved Archbishop of Dublin, Doctor Murray—then coadjutor to his predecessor in the see, the Most Reverend Doctor Troy—was at the time upon a

mission in Rome, on matters relative to this subject, in company with the Right Reverend Doctor Milner.

The latter justly-eminant prelate had, as we have seen, both by word and deed, long before made the most ample and abundant *amende* for the temporary mistake into which he had been led by the surreptitiously-published resolves of the terrified little coterie of Irish prelates, in 1799. He had, as we have also seen, carried his anxiety to make reparation so far as to have brought upon himself the bitter and scandalously-irreverent hostility of the English vetoists, but did not consider he had yet done enough. Accordingly, he had joyfully assented to the joint mission to Rome; and, when there, laboured indefatigably to undo the miserable intrigues of which some of the high ecclesiastical dignitaries in that city had become the victims.

Meantime, whatever differences had at first existed among the prelates at home, as to the terms in which their rejection of Quarantotti's rescript, and the "*arrangements*" it involved, should be finally made known, were fast disappearing, as the Catholic body, led by the second order of the clergy, protested more and more energetically against the observance of any measure in dealing with the obnoxious and detestable propositions. The year 1815, on which we are now entering, saw an end to the matter; and thus an end—at least, until the present time—to the base hopes entertained by the bitter enemies of Irish ecclesiastical independence.

## CHAPTER V.

THE year 1814 closed amid considerable gloom, in so far as related to the political prospects of the Catholics. The Board had been put down; and though some rash heads had suggested resistance to the illegal and unconstitutional act of the Lord Lieutenant in proclaiming against it, the wiser leaders declined entering into what could be at best only a bootless struggle with an unscrupulous and powerful government, and might easily become one of sad disaster and bloodshed. Nothing, however, was farther from their minds than to desist from all exertion; and the autumn and winter were passed by them in attending meetings in the provinces, and half-private consultations on Catholic affairs in Dublin.

Their firmness was, however, sorely tested by the faint-heartedness of many, the false-heartedness of some, amongst the men who had hitherto been prominent with them in Catholic affairs. Nor did the conduct of those who had taken on themselves to be the patrons of the Catholics in parliament by any means tend to lighten the heavy pressure of impending difficulties. The unworthy quibblings and cavillings of these parties—the undeserved and somewhat arrogant taunts and reproaches in which they indulged—and, finally, their miserable coquetting for popular applause, after first wantonly affronting popular opinion, made the Catholics consider any assistance derived from them as dearly and sorely purchased indeed.

The Dublin meetings were but of a few persons in a drawing-room of Lord Fingal's residence in Dublin. The press not being admitted, nor, indeed, anything like general access given, they speedily received a *nickname*, being designated as the “*Catholic Divan*.” Mr. O'Connell, however, succeeded in procuring a mitigation of the rule of exclusion, during the brief period that the “*Divan*” survived his return to town for the winter season.

On the 10th January, 1815, at one of these little snug meetings Mr. Shiel brought forward a long, and, so far as language went, a well-written form of petition to be adopted by the Catholics. Mr. O'Connell, however, took several objections to it, and an animated and somewhat sharp discussion ensued.

Mr. O'Connell's objections began with the very first paragraph, in which there was much laudation of the "*generosity and liberality*" of the British parliament. The exhibition, or existence of these attributes, he totally and entirely denied; and would oppose the petition, if on this ground alone.

But far weightier reasons for objection remained behind. In a subsequent paragraph, Mr. Shiel would have made the Catholics declare that, "in seeking capabilities for constitutional distinctions, they must proportionally come within the sphere of constitutional influence and control," and when pressed for explanation of his exact meaning, admitted that he meant to allude to the power the government might acquire by distribution of patronage among the Catholics.

This paragraph was indignantly scouted at by Mr. O'Connell and others present.

Another, equally objectionable, met the same fate. Its tenor was confessed by Mr. Shiel to have been directed towards the leaving of a loophole open; for the proposal, at some future time, of "*security*" measures of one kind or another.

A statement that Pitt had been favourable to Catholic claims, was flatly contradicted; and, finally, the petition as a whole being put to the vote, was negatived, and Mr. O'Connell and some others requested to act on a committee to provide a substitute fit for general adoption.

"On the 17th there was another meeting at Lord Fingal's.

"MR. O'CONNELL said that it was his duty to report to the sub-committee, to whom the various petitions had been submitted. It was easy matter to make the report, as it consisted in the simple statement, that they had rejected all the petitions, and were unable to agree on any other. Indeed, there appeared to be a radical and decisive difference of sentiment between the members of the sub-committee, which evinced

itself upon a point of vital importance. It was one upon which, for his part, he never could make any concession.

"Having failed in coming to any agreement on the subject of a petition, the sub-committee directed its attention to the other part of their duty—the preparing resolutions to be submitted to the aggregate meeting; but here, in the very first step, dissension was introduced; although, for my part," said Mr. O'Connell, "I have taken every possible precaution to obviate the cause of any difference of opinion.

"The first resolution which I have to propose is one that has been already four times adopted; it is—

"That we do renew our earnest petitions to the legislature for the total and unqualified repeal of the penal statutes, which aggrieve and degrade the Catholics of Ireland."

"I now offer this resolution to this meeting, and I should merely state, that it is one in which every individual present, including you, my lord, has publicly and repeatedly concurred—that it has been the preface to all our petitions since 1808. I should content myself with this statement, but that my friend, Mr. Shiel, has already announced his intention of opposing this resolution, unless the word 'unqualified' be omitted, and has announced, as if with effectual authority, that a new secession will take place, unless we agree to alter the language of our petition and resolutions. This object is plain and undisguised. It is by changing our language we evince to the legislature that our sentiments are altered, and thus most significantly call on them to enact for our religion, I know not what vetoistical arrangements. If we refuse, and refuse we certainly shall, he has pronounced our punishment, a new secession.

"Allow me, therefore, to justify the gentlemen with whom I have acted, and let me show that, if this resolution creates a new secession, it will only betray the inconsistency of those who secede. In our endeavour to promote conciliation, and procure unanimity, it became necessary to ascertain the causes of the secession. I found, my lord, that the Catholics had acted together until the summer of 1813. It was then the secession commenced. The cause of that secession was alleged to be the introduction of extraneous topics—topics unconnected with our petition. I have your express authority, my lord, in stating *this* to be the cause of secession. We had all gone together to a certain point;—that point was the introduction of extraneous topics in 1813.

"Taking, then, this open and only avowed cause of secession, it seemed easy to produce unanimity. The seceders had agreed with us upon certain subjects. We readily consented to confine all our present proceedings to those subjects on which all parties had before agreed. To this we have pledged our faith: let us see whether a similar fidelity will be observed towards us.

“ The resolution which I propose was adopted in substance in 1809. In 1810 we unanimously agreed—all parties agreed, and published the resolution—

“ That, as Irishmen and as Catholics, we never would consent to any interference on the part of the Crown, or the servants of the Crown, with the nomination of our bishops.’

You, my lord, and all the seceders, went with us in 1809 and in 1810. In 1811, the identical resolution which I now propose was passed at an aggregate meeting. You, my lord, were in the chair. It has the sanction of your approbation. You and the seceders continued to act with us. In 1812 this resolution was again passed. You, my lord, and the seceders, continued to act with us. This resolution passed again in 1813. You, my lord, and the seceders continued to act with us for many months afterwards; and until the memorable vote of thanks to the bishops. At all those times this resolution passed unanimously; and now, because we wish to repeat the usual form; because we repeat a resolution so often unanimously adopted; there is to be a secession again;—that is, you will all secede because we use your own language for the fifth time—you having already used it four times!

“ It is better be manly at once. Let the truth be told: the seceders were not candid when they resolved on unqualified emancipation. They then desired the veto: they still desire it. Let the pretences of extraneous topics and of intemperance of language be laid aside; let the fact be avowed: we will meet it boldly. We are ready to give up every matter of form; we are ready to sacrifice every thing except principle. We most ardently desire unanimity; but if the late seceders will retract their words for the sake of the veto, and claim only a qualified emancipation, the sooner they secede again the better, and the division must be perpetual; for we, at least, will be consistent; **AND NOW, AND FOR EVER, SHALL REJECT ANY PARLIAMENTARY BOON FOR THE SACRIFICE OF OUR RELIGION AND LIBERTY!**

“ I do, therefore, move the resolution as unanimously adopted—the Earl of Fingal in the chair—on the 9th of July, 1811.”

“ MR. POWER, of county Waterford—‘ Do you mean to say that you will not accede to any ecclesiastical arrangements?’ ”

“ MR. O’CONNELL—‘ Certainly. I mean to ask for our emancipation without any qualification of our religious opinions.’ ”

“ MR. POWER—‘ Then I will not agree with your resolution.’ ”

“ EARL FINGAL—‘ I agreed to these meetings on the supposition of an honourable understanding between us, that no religious subjects should be introduced, but that we should confine ourselves solely to a petition for our civil immunities.’ ”

“ MR. O’CONNELL—‘ My lord, that is exactly what I wish. I desire that we shall receive emancipation without reference to our religious

opinions, and without subjecting our religion to the control of a Protestant parliament.' ”

“ After some general observations from several gentlemen on this part of the subject,

“ MR. SHIEL addressed the meeting at considerable length against the introduction of the words ‘ unqualified emancipation.’ ”

His views, which may be gathered from the statement we have given of the nature of the leading paragraphs in the petition he had seen rejected at the preceding meeting, were supported eagerly by some, and as warmly opposed by others.

Some of those who agreed with Mr. O'Connell having repeated his exhortations to end these unpleasant and irritating discussions by some steps towards that union of sentiment, the want of which would paralyse their efforts in the cause,

“ MR. SHIEL said it rested with Mr. O'Connell and his friends to procure that union. Would they give up that solitary word, ‘ unqualified,’ and then there would be a certainty of union.

“ MR. O'CONNELL—‘ So, then, the only chance the gentlemen would give us for obtaining union rests upon our abandoning a word which has been used at every Catholic meeting in Ireland.’ ”

He accordingly entirely refused to omit the word so obnoxious to Mr. Shiel, and, soon after, the meeting came to a division, when there appeared nine for Mr. O'Connell's view of the case—Messrs. Segrave, N. Mahon, M'Manus, O'Brien, O'Hara, Blake, and Lyons, with himself; and three against it, viz., Messrs. Shiel, R. M'Donnell, and Lube.

Another committee was then named, and the meeting adjourned.

On the 21st of January, Mr. O'Connell reported to a meeting at Fitzpatrick's, in Capel-street, that all that had been done was to pass a resolution, that a petition should be presented, leaving it open to discussion what that petition should be, and also the point as to who should be called upon to present it to parliament.

Considerable discussion ensued upon the latter point, some being for again entrusting it to Lord Donoughmore in the Peers, and Mr. Grattan in the Commons, while others agreed that the Duke of Sussex should be chosen in the Lords, and that in the

credit to his head and his heart, he conjured the noble lord to alter his opinion, and concede to the unanimous wishes of the whole assembly.

"He could not be persuaded that there was anything in the resolutions which could clash with his lordship's sentiments. It was true that he opposed an intermeddling with spiritual matters. 'But, Good God,' said Mr. Mahon, 'what has a simple demand of unqualified emancipation to do with theological controversy?'

"**LORD FINGAL** protested that his mind was made up upon this matter, and begged that he may not be pressed further. He was not wedded to any particular mode of emancipation—he was not pledged one way or the other—but he thought it was agreed that nothing should be said on questions of Church discipline, until some official communication was had from Rome; and as he conceived that gentlemen did not recognize this arrangement by the measures they proposed, he thought he was called upon to remain neutral.

"**MR. O'CONNELL** said, that so much had fallen from Lord Fingal, both now and on a former occasion, respecting a contract or compact, that as a party to the late proceedings, he felt himself bound to make a few observations on that subject.

"And first he must distinctly and emphatically deny that he ever was a party to any compact which could directly or indirectly tend to sanction any alteration by parliament in our ecclesiastical concerns. He never heard that any such compact existed.

"For my part," said he, "the understanding which I conceived to exist was, that we should so petition parliament, that we should not, neither should the legislature, if we could prevent them, enter into any arrangements respecting the discipline of our Church; but that we should either be emancipated, just such Catholics as we are, or continue in our present state, as in both religion and rights.

"For this purpose, and to exclude discussion, I took up a resolution which prefaced all our petitions for seven years; a resolution adopted, sanctioned, and confirmed repeatedly by the noble lord himself. It was a resolution to ask for *unqualified* emancipation. The noble lord and his friends immediately dissented; they said that resolution meant a rejection of the veto, and they insisted it should be so altered, and so modelled as to strike out the word 'unqualified,' and let in 'vetoism;' and then, mark what must appear a strange mistake, they *most consistently* accused us of having started a discussion upon this forbidden subject!

"First, they objected to the usual language of our petitions; and then they accused us of creating the discussion which their own objection produced!!

"This dilemma was immediately produced. We asked for unquali-



fied emancipation, as we had always hitherto done. By doing so, said Lord Fingal, you introduce ecclesiastical subjects, and break the compact. Next, his lordship would alter the usual course, and ask for emancipation, leaving to, and thereby inviting, the parliament to qualify it; that is a direct introduction of ecclesiastical subjects, and the alleged compact is thereby plainly broken. So that this alleged compact amounts to this—that, in either cases, it must be violated. There are but two courses, and, in either of those courses, this compact, as understood by Lord Fingal, must be broken. That is infallible. If we use the old words, with the old meaning, his compact is broken; if he uses new words, he must clearly have a new meaning, and then his compact is equally broken. There is but one way of avoiding the violation of his lordship's contract, that is, either by finding out words to use in our petition, which have no meaning, or to petition without using any words at all.

“Having then shown how impossible it was for us men, having some small share of that acuteness so necessary for our profession, to understand the implied compact on which we met, as his lordship understood it, I will state to the public what I conceived was our agreement.

“We agreed to abandon all intemperance, though, God knows, it is not easy for those who feel for Ireland's wrongs to keep their temper. We agreed, first, to substitute mildness for any intemperance; secondly, to forget the wanton attacks of our enemies, and not to retort by any personal abuse; thirdly, to confine ourselves to our petition, to the exclusion of all other topics; and fourthly, not to agitate religious subjects.

“The last point was the only one difficult to be managed. We were sure we had overcome the difficulty, for we adopted the noble lord's own words, his often repeated words:—‘My God! how can we have differed with him!’ Here are his own words! Yes, he objects, he dissents, and he threatens to secede. Why? because we use his own words. By what ingenuity—by what magic could we procure unanimity? We sacrifice every thing. We submit to imputations which I cannot but say are unfounded, and adopt the language of the noble lord himself, and our return is a new dissension.

“He who runs may read the truth—a *purchase of emancipation*, AS THE PRICE OF RELIGION, is the plain object.

“It may be disguised, but it now obtrudes itself too forcibly not to be visible to the dullest eye. I *desire unanimity*; I have endeavoured to obtain it, but I now disclaim it for ever, IF IT BE NOT TO BE HAD WITHOUT THIS CONCESSION.

“I will for ever divide with the men who, directly or indirectly, consent to VETOISM OF ANY DESCRIPTION.

“After this distinct avowal, will the noble lord be pleased to accept

the chair? Let him only recollect, that he is most important, most valuable, whilst he remains at his natural post—the head of the Catholics. But, if he choose to give our enemies this triumph, let him refuse, and, although we know his value, and shall regret his refusal, the Irish Catholic people are too great to feel the loss.”

“LORD FINGAL declared himself distressed at being obliged to declare that he would outrage his own feelings if he consented to take the chair, under all the circumstances of the case. He did not presume to say he was right, but he could not surmount the difficulties which his opinions had thrown in his way.” \* \* \* \* \*

Before finishing our account of this debate, we cannot help remarking, that Mr. O'Connell must be confessed to have redeemed his pledges just recorded by us. He *has* opposed “vetoism of every and any description.” He *has* refused to make concession where religion was involved. The “Infidel Colleges” Act of last session has proved his consistency, and his firm adherence to the pledges he gave on the occasion we have been citing.

Lord Fingal departed from the assembly, and the O'Conor Don remained, therefore, in the chair. A letter was read from Lord Donoughmore, the tone and sentiments of which met high approbation.

Some other gentlemen having spoken, Mr. Lidwill (before-mentioned) rose and delivered a very able speech, entirely acquiescing in Mr. O'Connell's views. When he had concluded, the latter came forward to speak again :—

“He began by declaring, that he never addressed any auditory with so much depression of heart. He felt chilled to the very soul at the mournful contrast this day exhibited between the Protestant and the Catholic. The Protestant gentleman who had just spoken, the Protestant nobleman whose letter had been read, were both deeply anxious for the character and liberty of the Catholics—whilst the Catholic nobleman coldly departed from the cause of his children and his country, because his fellow-labourers would not consent to that which Lord Donoughmore so gently called a *degrading stipulation!*

“But the mental inferiority of the Catholics was easily accounted for—they are slaves. The Protestant superiority was easily traced to the share which he had in the British constitution. Whilst the Catholic crouched in thralldom, the Protestant tasted the air of freedom, and

his mind acquired the energy and elevation which liberty alone can bestow !

“This was a source of many a bitter reflection ; the scene that had taken place there that day, the new dissension announced and carried into effect, the war proclaimed against Ireland and her people—all conspired to weigh him down with sorrow. Yet, there does (said he) exist some consolation ; I derive some comfort from these melancholy events. One of the two great objects I had in view has completely succeeded ; the cause of Catholic division is now manifest. My first object was to procure unanimity ; that indeed has failed, after I had made every effort to attain it, except the sacrifice of principles. My second great object was, that if we were to remain divided, the cause of our division should be plain, clear, and simple.

“The division, the secession has been attributed to our violence, our personal sarcasms, our introduction of extraneous topics. I myself believed, that these were, at least, partly the real causes ; but all these were cheerfully, readily, and at once abandoned by us ; and the cause of secession is now, as I anxiously desired it should be, plain, clear, and simple.

“That cause is our seeking UNQUALIFIED EMANCIPATION. Here, now, is the single cause. If we expunged the unqualified, if we consented to take qualified emancipation, we should have no secession, no division ; my Lord Fingal would preside in that chair ; there would be unanimity. The quarrel is reduced to a single word—but, certainly, a word pregnant with meaning—*unqualified*.

“Now, I rejoice that all the pretences upon which division was justified, have thus vanished. The truth is at length told. When the seceders recommended to us *moderation*, the English of moderation was *the veto* ; when they accused us of *violence*, they meant that we *scorned a barter of our religion* ! And when they charged us with ‘*agitating extrinsic topics*,’ they meant that we had too strongly resolved *never to allow a hostile interference with our Church*. The seceders have now thrown off all disguise, and though some of them may deceive themselves, no other honest man can longer be the dupe of their artifices. We have now parted with the seceders on principle, and unless they return to that principle, may their secession be perpetual.

“I must blame the want of candour of those gentlemen. They are for qualified emancipation. To *qualify*, is a technical word of familiar meaning. In Mr. Shaw Mason’s book, one worthy divine boasts he was so powerful a theologian in his youth, that no less than 136 Papists *qualified* under his auspices in five years ; but that since 1778, he lost his talent for controversy, and not one Papist could, since the statute of

that year, be prevailed on to qualify. This reverend gentleman is still living, and ready to give *qualified* emancipation to all our seceders. Let them betake themselves to him, and leave us to seek the only emancipation to which, as Catholics, or as Irishmen, we will ever consent—UNRESTRICTED, UNQUALIFIED, UNCONDITIONAL.

“ If the veto, if the interference of the Crown with our religion, were a question exclusively religious, I should leave it at once to the bishops. But it is infinitely interesting as a political measure. It is an attempt to acquire without expense, an influence greater than any the minister could purchase for millions. Who is there that does not feel the vital, the pressing danger to liberty that results from ministerial influence? We owe it to ourselves, and to the Protestants equally, to resist this contagious interference; and every duty that can urge a man to a public disclosure of facts, interesting to every class in the state, calls on me to declare that there exists a conspiracy against the religion of the Irish Catholics, and in its efforts, against the liberties of all the Irish people!

“ I state it as a fact, which I have from such authority as leaves no doubt in my mind, that a negotiation is going on between Lord William Bentinck, Lord Castlereagh, and Cardinal Gonsalvi, one result of which is intended by the two former to be, the concession to the minister of the British crown of an effectual supremacy over the Catholic Church in Ireland; and there is every reason to dread that the cardinal waits only to get what he considers an *adequate compensation*, before he accedes to the measure.

“ The restoration of part of the Pope's territories, still withheld, is said to be the price offered by Lord Castlereagh; but it is not so clear that he has it in his power to make the payment. Besides, I do not think so unworthily of the Pope, as to believe easily that he who resisted the favour of Napoleon will yield to the seductions of Lord Castlereagh.

“ The danger, however, appears much increased, when we recollect the exaggerated praises of England contained in the letter from our prelates to the Pope. Can his holiness doubt the sincerity of our prelates? I know they regarded that passage as the unmeaning language of compliment; and if they had considered it as a serious assertion of fact, they would have died before they signed it. But, indeed, the lightness, with which such language was used by them increases much our peril; as it must inspire the Pope with that confidence in the English government which he ought *not* to have. This danger, too, is still augmented when we see the plain proof of the existence of this conspiracy amongst ourselves. It can be defeated only by vigilance,

activity, and the anigated and loud expression of our abhorrence of the proposed measure.

“ Let our determination never to assent reach Rome. It can easily be transmitted there ; but even should it fail, I am still determined to resist. I am sincerely a Catholic, but I am not a *Papist*. I deny the doctrine that the Pope has any temporal authority, directly or indirectly, in Ireland ; we have all denied that authority on oath, and we would die to resist it. He cannot, therefore, be any party to the act of parliament we solicit, *nor shall any act of parliament regulate our faith or conscience.*

“ In spiritual matters, too, the authority of the Pope is limited ; he cannot, although his conclave of Cardinals were to join him, vary our religion, either in doctrine or in essential discipline, in any respect. Even in non-essential discipline the Pope cannot vary it without the assent of the Irish Catholic bishops. Why, to this hour, the discipline of the general Council of Trent is not received in this diocese. I do, therefore, totally deny that Gonsalvi, or Quarantotti, or even the Pope himself, can claim the submission which the seceders proclaim that they are ready to show to their mandates ; and my confidence is great in the venerated prelates of Ireland. They fill their sees in a succession unbroken for an hour since the days of St. Patrick and his companions ; they have resisted for more than a thousand years fraud and force ; and they will preserve in its native purity, in contempt of persecution and in despite of treachery, that religion committed to their care, which commenced with the first, and is destined to continue immutable, to the second coming of our blessed Redeemer !

“ Yes ; as our former prelates met persecution and death without faltering, the bishops of the present day will triumph over the treachery of base-minded Catholics, and insidious ministers of government !

“ Even should any of our prelates fail, which I do not and cannot believe, there is still resource. It is to be found in the unalterable constancy of the Catholic people of Ireland. If the present clergy shall descend from the high station they hold, to become the vile slaves of the clerks of the Castle—a thing I believe impossible—but should it occur, I warn them in time to look to their masters for their support ; for the people will despise them too much to contribute. (Great applause followed this sentiment.)

“ The people would imitate their forefathers ; they would communicate only with some holy priest who never bowed to the Dagon of power ; and the Castle clergy would preach to still thinner numbers than attend in Munster or in Connaught the reverend gentlemen of the *present* Established Church.

“ Those are evils which we shall never witness. It would be preposterous folly in any statesman to grant an emancipation, which, instead of conciliating and quieting, would only alienate and disgust still more the minds of the people. Indeed, such an emancipation could be thought of only in this age of deliverance. At present there was a rage for delivery; every thing and every body, except poor Johanna Southcote, was delivered. Spain was delivered to the beloved Ferdinand and the odious inquisition; Saxony was delivered to the King of Prussia; the faithful Poles were delivered to the magnanimous Alexander; and Catholic Ireland is to be delivered to Duigenan, Saurin, and Peel!!!

“ The process by which this last deliverance is to be effectuated is various, according to the temper of the deliverers. There is a Scotch plan—an English plan—and *the old Irish plan*. The Scotch plan has been announced by the Earl of Selkirk, and some other worthies of Edinburgh, in advertisements containing the most insulting calumnies. That earl and his associates proposed to deliver the ‘wild Irish’ by a plan of ‘education;’ and in order that such plan should infallibly succeed, the earl magnanimously subscribed half-a-guinea to carry it into effect. (Laughter.)

“ The English plan was still a wiser one; they formed missionary societies; they had a mission to the islands of the South Sea; they had, as the perfection of human absurdity, a mission to convert the Jews; and they have lately established a mission to convert the idolaters in Ireland!

“ But, notwithstanding the prudence of the Scotch, and the boasted wisdom of the English, their plans have totally failed. The only efficient plan was the old Irish one! It was simple as it was effectual; it consisted merely in *dissension*; its only operation was to *divide* the people, and success was the certain result. It had been successful for more than seven hundred years in Ireland. Irish dissension had hurled your ancestors, sir, from a throne; it had reduced the chieftains and lords of the soil to the state of vassals and slaves, and it continued their descendants the inferiors, in this, their own—their native land, of every foreigner that would perform the only condition required—the swearing that the religion of Ireland was idolatry. This fatal dissension was never to end—nay, it was proclaimed anew; and this very day the Earl of Fingal commenced a new secession!

“ (Here the Chairman interrupted by saying, that he was quite convinced, that whatever Lord Fingal's conduct might be, his motives were pure.)

“ MR. O'CONNELL resumed—I attributed no motives at all to the noble lord. I merely stated a fact; and in his absence, as I could not

discover any thing in his motives to praise, I should think it quite unfair to censure. I stated the fact that my Lord Fingal has again seceded from us. It is a melancholy thing to see those wretched divisions perpetuated; it is melancholy that the few will not submit their judgment, upon matters of form at least, to the many—for it is a matter of form that has taken from us the noble lord; because he, too, could accept, without violating any principle, unqualified emancipation.

“I know we are threatened with a renewal of the scenes of 1792; but the men who would now contend against unqualified liberty will never again muster sixty-eight; they may muster some solitary dozen, but, perhaps, not so many. The noble lord, respected as he is in private life, when he retired from this meeting, took with him just the number of Falstaff's recruits—only three and a-half—(laughter)—and what are three and a-half in contrast with five millions?

“Apathy and indifference can alone injure a cause sustained by the wants and wishes of a people. Indifference in this case is a crime—apathy is sacrilege. There exists abroad a conspiracy against your religion and liberties; at home, beware of treachery. Let us recollect that our pursuit is a real, not a fictitious freedom—that our objects are not the paltry and personal emoluments of place and power, but liberty for our country and our posterity!

“Let us ask this blessing as Catholics; and spurn it, if offered in any other form. Dissension, which weakens our strength, should increase our zeal and exertions. I now confidently call on every man who refuses to enter into a base traffic of his religion for place or power, to come forward in this cause; and I feel and know, that throughout the land the voice of the people will be heard—the compromisers will sink into insignificance—and **WE SHALL HAVE THE GLORY OF ACHIEVING OUR LIBERTIES, WITHOUT FORSAKING THE WORSHIP OF OUR FATHERS!**”

As upon this occasion, so throughout the many similar junctures of his eventful career, Mr. O'Connell has shown that he, however anxiously, earnestly, and unwearingly he could and did labour to put an end to dissensions, and bring conflicting parties in the popular body to at least an outward unanimity, sufficient to prevent interruption or damage to the common cause, he never allowed his anxiety for this end to carry him too far; but boldly met the difficulty in front, and quelled it with a firm hand, when milder measures had not been successful.

We now come to the formation of a "*Catholic Association*," thus announced in the journals of the day:—

"There was a meeting in Capel-street on Saturday, and some of the most distinguished and opulent members of the Catholic community proceeded to act upon the resolution passed at the aggregate meeting, which declares the necessity of forming some association to undertake the management of such petitions or appeals to the legislature as may be demanded by the continuance of the disqualifications which still so grievously harass the body at large.

"The ceremony of organization was very simple, and we trust fully consistent with every real or imaginary provision of the Convention Act. No chair was taken—no proposition submitted—no instructions offered—no *speechification* even indulged in; but every gentleman who chose entered his name in a book, which Mr. Secretary Hay held open (and will continue to keep open from eleven till three each day,) and the rites and solemnities of installation were then complete and ended.

The first meeting of the Association will, we understand, take place on Saturday.

One of the first acts of this new body was to appoint a committee to take certain steps relative to the "*Veto*" question, which will be best described in the following report, presented by them to the Association, at its meeting on Thursday, 16th February, 1815:—

## "REPORT

OF THE

### COMMITTEE OF THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION,

"Appointed February 14th, 1815, to wait upon the Most Rev. Doctor Murray, in order to ascertain from him the Facts respecting any Negotiation that has existed, or does exist, respecting any Arrangement of Catholic Discipline in Ireland, as connected with the Crown, or the Ministers of the Crown.

"The Most Reverend Doctor MURRAY having appointed the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, 15th February, as the most convenient hour for meeting the deputation of the Catholic Association, your committee waited upon his grace accordingly at the appointed hour.

"His grace was pleased to open the interview by stating that he had received the letter of the chairman, Owen O'Connor, Esq., intimating the objects of the deputation; that he felt every disposition to give any information in his power; at the same time that he felt it necessary to observe, that he could not admit that the Catholic Association could claim his compliance with their desire as a matter of right, or that they possessed any authority to demand from him any account of his conduct.



" He proceeded to Rome as the delegate of the Catholic bishops, not of the Catholic Association; and he felt himself accountable only to the prelates for his conduct on that mission, to which they deputed him. He thought it necessary to state thus much, to prevent the present case being made a precedent on any future occasion. He, however, felt that in the present times all matters of form and ceremony should be waived, and that all classes of Irish Catholics should co-operate together in support of the great cause in which they were engaged.

" Your committee most distinctly informed his grace, that there did not exist in their minds, or in the minds of those who had deputed them, the most distant disposition to press upon his grace's consideration any subject which he did not feel himself perfectly disposed to entertain.

" They did not, by any means, desire or intend to ask of his grace that he should enter into any account of his conduct, as they felt fully sensible of the justice of his grace's observations; they merely desired to receive from his grace any information which he should consider worthy or fitting to be communicated to the Catholic body, and would feel indebted to his grace if he should please to grant such information, which they would receive as a favour, without pretending to demand it as a right.

" His grace was pleased to express himself perfectly satisfied with this explanation, and proceeded to say, that he did not consider himself called upon to refer to any negotiations which may have existed prior to his having been deputed to proceed to Rome, such as the negotiations in 1799.

" To this your committee assented.

" His grace then stated, that he proceeded to Rome as delegate from the Irish prelates, for the sole purpose of remonstrating against the rescript of Quarantotti; that that rescript had been recalled by the Pope, on the principle that it was issued without due deliberation, in the absence of his holiness and the sacred college; that the matters contained in that rescript had been referred by his holiness to a special congregation, composed of the most exalted and incorruptible characters in Rome. His grace further expressed his complete conviction that the opinions of that council would be formed upon principles purely of a spiritual character; and he was also satisfied that when the opinion of the council should be referred to his holiness, who had reserved to himself the right to pronounce definitively on the subject, the sovereign pontiff would be influenced in his determination solely by a regard for the spiritual welfare of the Catholics of Ireland, for whom he felt strong affections; and his grace felt satisfied that neither the interference of the British ministry, nor any other temporal consideration whatever, would affect that determination of his holiness.

" His grace could not anticipate when the determination of his holiness could be expected.

" In answer to a question from your committee, his grace further stated, that, exclusive of the objections to the rescript for informality and want of authority, the see of Rome felt other and most serious objections to the subject matter of the rescript; and that *affairs stood now exactly in the same state as if that rescript had never existed*—the whole matter being referred, *ab integro*, to the congregation appointed by his holiness, and their report to be subject to his revision and determination. The last accounts received by his grace from Rome, came down to the 24th December, at which time no decision had been formed.

" In answer to your committee, his grace stated that his holiness had been put in full possession of the feelings of the Catholic clergy and laity of Ireland relative to the rescript; and that copies of all the documents considered well calculated to communicate information of those proceedings, were laid before his holiness and the congregation, to whom the whole matters were referred.

" Your committee inquired whether any deputation from the English Catholic Board, or any other portion of the English Catholics had reached Rome? To which his grace was pleased to reply, that *Dr. Macpherson had presented a memorial to the Pope, from some portion of the English Catholic body, which he inclined to believe was the English Catholic Board. This memorial prayed his holiness to confirm the rescript of Quarantotti; it reached Rome some time in November last, and after the rescript had been recalled.*

" Dr. Milner protested against Mr. Macpherson being the English agent; and also against the English Board being considered as the English Catholics. In answer to another question from your committee, whether or not the memorial of the English Ca-

thelics was supported by the British cabinet, his grace replied, that he could not speak positively on this subject; he had heard it mentioned. He was pleased, however, to repeat the assurance of his conviction, that the decision of his holiness would be influenced solely by spiritual considerations.

"Your committee further prayed his grace to inform them, whether Cardinal Gonsalvi had been authorised by his holiness to confer or negotiate with Lord Castlereagh on the subject of the rescript. His grace observed, that he could not answer for the truth or falsehood of every rumour; he felt certain, however, that if any such instructions were given to Cardinal Gonsalvi, he must have been limited by certain defined principles, which he could not violate or trespass upon; and that any measures resolved on between him and any English minister would be ultimately submitted to the decision of his holiness, who would be influenced in that decision solely by spiritual considerations, which would not be affected by any opinions or desires of the British minister, or by any other temporal influence.

"Your committee expressed unaffected reluctance in intruding so long upon his grace who was pleased to assure your committee, in the most gracious and confidential terms, that he felt sincere pleasure in communicating any information in his power to the Catholic body; and the more particularly as it was not probable that there would be a meeting of the prelates at an early period. His grace concluded by assuring your committee that he would be always ready to communicate such information as he may possess on any other subject upon which the Catholic body would please to consult him.

"Your committee cannot conclude their report without recording their testimony of the very kind and courteous language and deportment of his grace during the whole of their interview; and further, they deem it their duty humbly to suggest, that his grace is pre-eminently entitled to the thanks and gratitude of his Catholic countrymen, for the readiness which he evinced in meeting the desires of this Association."

"Thursday, 16th June, there was an adjourned meeting of the Catholics of Ireland held at Clarendon-street chapel. At one o'clock the chair was taken, at the universal call of the meeting, by OWEN O'CONNOR, Esq. The Chairman opened the proceedings of the day, by stating, that in consequence of the resolution to that effect passed at the late aggregate meeting, he had solicited an answer from Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan, to the question accompanying the petition of the Catholics of Ireland."

The letter of Lord Donoughmore was couched in terms that demonstrated a great anxiety to meet the wishes and forward the views of the Catholics.

Mr. Grattan's letter was, unfortunately, not of the same tenor, as will be gathered from the speech we are about to give. No circumstance could have given Mr. O'Connell more severe pain than to find himself compelled to speak with censure of such a man as Henry Grattan. But the Catholic body should be vindicated at all hazards and all cost.

"MR. O'CONNELL rose, and begged leave to read to the meeting, a second time, the letter from the chairman to Mr. Grattan, and the

reply of Mr. Grattan. He then spoke to the following effect:—I have, said he, a painful duty to perform; but it is my duty, and I shall not shrink from the performance of it, however painful. The course to be pursued is sufficiently obvious; and it is necessary to recapitulate the facts, merely to place beyond any cavil the propriety of those measures which the honour as well as the interests of the Catholic body demand.

“ Mr. Grattan took charge of our petition last year; he presented it to the house, but he refused to discuss its merits. No reason was given for this refusal, other than the reason that silences, though it cannot satisfy, the slaves of despots. It consisted singly of the phrase, ‘*Stet pro ratione voluntas.*’ We were deeply impressed with the conviction that the discussion of our grievances and claims in the last session—indeed, every session, could produce nothing but advantages. Our cause is founded on eternal justice and plain right; therefore, so long as there remains one particle of common sense amongst men, discussion must advance that cause. The Catholic Board called on Mr. Grattan to bring forward our question; he again refused. The Board a second time entreated of him to do so; he once more refused. We then called another aggregate meeting, and that meeting requested from Mr. Grattan a discussion. Strange to say, he still persevered in his refusal—a perseverance unexampled in the history of parliament.

“ It must be recollected that this unrelenting refusal on the part of Mr. Grattan to move on our petition, was one adopted without any consultation or concert with our best friends. Lord Donoughmore was in London, and yet he was not consulted. It was determined by Mr. Grattan to postpone, as long as he could, for one session, any chance of relief; and he came to this resolution without the advice, or even the knowledge, of our other chosen advocate, Lord Donoughmore. Thus, without concert, without co-operation, we were doomed by Mr. Grattan to another year of slavery, and also without the poor pleasure of rattling our chains in the hearing of our oppressors. Allow me here, as an humble freeholder of the city of Dublin, solemnly to protest against this refusal. I do not dispute nor question the integrity of Mr. Grattan nor his high honour; but I dispute his judgment; and, humble as I am in talents and in station when compared with him, yet I am ready to demonstrate that he is mistaken.

“ I am ready to show that a member of the House of Commons is, by the constitution, bound to receive and attend to the instructions of his constituents. I can show precedents where this duty has been recognized even by the bitterest enemies, as it has been always hitherto asserted by the best friends of liberty. I mean not to dispute the right of the representative to exercise his judgment respecting the instructions

of his constituents; but I can prove that those instructions have been hitherto received, and attended to as their acknowledged duty, by the members of the House of Commons.

“ Thus, then, has Mr. Grattan finally rejected you. You offered him your petition upon this condition, that he would agree to discuss your grievances this session. He refuses to enter into any such agreement. He therefore rejects your petition. You may, indeed, cringe and fall before him. The Catholic people may submit and, with Christian meekness, seek another blow. The thousands who hear me, and who were right in demanding this condition, may retract and degrade themselves; but there is no other course, if you would have Mr. Grattan to present your petition. He has taken his high station; he will neither descend nor bend.

“ It remains for us to seek another advocate—an advocate less brilliant in eloquence, but more suited to our views and wishes. At this period it is doubly incumbent on us to make a prudent choice. Mr. Grattan differs from us on the veto. He assented to Canning's clauses, though he did not introduce them. If he had accepted our petition, it would have been necessary to give him information of the disgust and abhorrence produced by those clauses. We should owe to ourselves and our religion, emphatically to announce the detestation in which we hold any intermeddling with our Church. This and more would be necessary, had Grattan been our advocate; but if this meeting were now to retract, and to abandon their own judgment, and to select Mr. Grattan, notwithstanding his letter, the consequences are obvious. He would refuse to receive any suggestions whatsoever; and then you who desire unqualified emancipation, would have your advocate calling, in your name, for an emancipation which, in your judgment, would only increase your slavery.

“ Good God! can any man imagine that Mr. Grattan would find it possible to listen to us upon these matters of importance, when he declares it impossible to answer us upon a mere question of time? The question we put to him was as simple as, ‘What is it o'clock?’—his reply, ‘It is impossible for me to answer!’ Well, if he cannot condescend to answer as to the hour of the day, what prospect is there of his being able to reply to more weighty questions? In short, he has taken his stand; he will answer no questions; he will receive no instructions; he rejects all stipulations; and he disclaims the condition upon which you offered, and the Earl of Donoughmore accepted, your petition.

“ There cannot, therefore, be found in this crowded assembly any Catholic sufficiently hardy to propose that we should retract, and again offer our petition without a condition. (A general cry of ‘No, no!’ for

many minutes.) I know that no person would hazard such a proposition, whatever powers of effrontery he may possess; nor do I accuse any man of entertaining such an idea.

“ You must have a new selection made; you must have a man selected who *will* consent to lay your grievances before parliament this session; who will consent to receive your instructions; who, in short, will seek to obtain for the Catholics of Ireland that which the Catholics of Ireland deserve, and not get up a plan of his own, in which he may be the principal figure, and the Catholics secondary objects.

“ The advocate we want is a man who will require from parliament an emancipation that would quiet and content the people of Ireland, and extinguish the heart-burnings and animosities which at present rage in this country—not an emancipation which would create more jealousy and disaffection, and embitter our feuds, and increase our rancorous hostility to each other;—an advocate, in fine, who would, from his heart prefer the emancipation of Ireland to the emancipation of Mr. Grattan and Mr. Canning. Such is the advocate we want; and such an advocate may, I know, be found; but alas! we must, I much fear, go to England to seek for him. We must seek for an Englishman, for I know of no Irish member to whom you can now commit your petition.

“ Let me not be taunted with this preference. I do not prefer an Englishman as such. Oh, no! My preference and my prejudices are altogether Irish. My heart, my soul, my feelings, are all—all Irish. My patriotism is almost exclusively Irish; and I remember the wrongs England has inflicted on my wretched country, with a hatred doomed to be immortal and unrelenting.

“ But there is now no choice. Ireland was, in the last session, abandoned by all the Irish members. She was flung at the feet of Peel, to insult and to trample upon her as he, in his majestic forbearance and wisdom, should think fit; and, lastly, our Irish patriots have found out that he is an Alfred—nothing less! (Much laughing.)

“ Oh, it is sorrowful mirth; but this is true: Ireland was defended only by Englishmen. There remained amongst them the still unextinguishable flame of liberty, and they made a generous effort to protect Ireland. May the best blessings of heaven be poured upon them. Whitbread, and Horner, and Bomilly, and Grant, and others, fought for Ireland. We will find amongst them an advocate suited to our purpose; the cause and the principle of civil and religious liberty will never be scorned by them.

“ I cannot conclude without deprecating any declamation on the merits of Mr. Grattan. No man can be more sensible of those merits than I am.

*" I recall to mind his early and his glorious struggles for Ireland. I know he raised her from degradation, and exalted her to her rank as a nation. I recollect, too, that if she be now a pitiful province, Grattan struggled and fought for her whilst life or hope remained. I know all this, and more ; and my gratitude and enthusiasm for those services will never be extinguished.*

" But I know, too, that, to use his own phrase of another, ' he was an oak of the forest, too old to be transplanted.'

" I see with regret, that except his services in our cause, he has, since the Union, made no exertions worthy of his name and of his strength. Since he has inhaled the foul and corrupt atmosphere that fills some of the avenues to Westminster, there have not been the same health and vigour about him. He seems to have forgotten his ancient adorations. He supported the Insurrection Bill, and every future Peel has the authority of his name to aid in outlawing Ireland. He accused his fallen countrymen of cherishing a French party. Alas! he ought to have distinguished between the strong anti-Anglican spirit which centuries of oppressive government created and fostered, and any attachment to the enemy of freedom. The very party whom he was induced to traduce, hated despotism as much in France as in Russia or in England ; and it assuredly had nothing French about it.

" But above all, Mr. Grattan has mingled the support of our cause with the procuring for a Protestant ministry the patronage of our Church. These recollections mitigate the sorrow I feel at his having now disclaimed our petition. I feel for him unfeigned respect ; but he has refused to accept the petition upon our terms. I shall, therefore, move—

" ' That the Catholic Association be requested to send a delegation to London, in order to procure a member of the House of Commons to present our petition, and apply for unqualified Emancipation.' "

Some members having interfered to request a postponement of the resolution, on various grounds, but chiefly in order to have more time for considering it, Mr. O'Connell withdrew his resolution, on the grounds of an unwillingness to create a difference of opinion, and the sincere wish that he had for unanimity ; but he would wish that if it should be given into the hands of the Association, that they should report to an aggregate meeting, to be held on Thursday, the 23rd instant.

A resolution was then put and carried to that effect.

Our task in recording the main events of Mr. O'Connell's life has hitherto been one of unmixed pleasurable interest. The awakening of a people from their deep moral entrancement, after the bloody terrors and ruinous disasters of a period of defeated insurrection, and of utter violation and up-rooting of their constitutional rights and privileges; the arousing of that fallen people, and cheering of them up again to hopeful exertion, for noble purposes and objects: these were deeds, whose recital needed not the additional impulses of natural affection for their author, to render it a *labour of love*.

But we have now come to an incident of the deepest and saddest tragedy; the remembrance of which has embittered Mr. O'Connell's life, interweaving itself with every joy and pleasure, and only mitigated by the consoling assurances which religion holds out to the truly penitent heart.

Over and over again has he declared that he willingly accepted every taunt, every insult from his enemies at his subsequent refusal to engage in the criminality of a duel, in his anxiety to offer up some atonement to an offended God!

We proceed to give, as matter of history, the newspaper accounts of this most afflicting occurrence, without further preface or delay, upon so painful a subject:—

#### “ DUEL BETWEEN MR. O'CONNELL AND MR. D'ESTERRE.

##### PARTICULARS.

“The deadly hostility with which the councils of intolerance have latterly encountered the Catholic petitioners, threatens to produce a corresponding but tremendous reaction. We have long seen that individuals have been proscribed by the scurrility of the Castle prints, and with cowardly baseness pointed out as objects of sanguinary aggression. To this source every observant person must ascribe the duel of yesterday, between Counsellor O'Connell and Mr. J. N. D'Esterre, of the Bachelor's-walk, a member of the Corporation of the Guild of Merchants.

“Some time ago, Mr. D'Esterre announced himself as a candidate for the office of city sheriff; his friends in the corporation had remarked instances of castle favour bestowed upon men, whose sole merit consisted in an opposition, or show of opposition, to Counsellor O'Connell or his friends. This experience probably suggested the

idea of promoting Mr. D'Esterre's civic objects by a repetition of the practice. The experiment, however, has nearly\* proved fatal in the present instance.

"Mr. D'Esterre was unfortunately advised to select Mr. O'Connell as his adversary. Accordingly, on Thursday last, the 26th ultimo, he addressed a letter to Mr. O'Connell in the following words :

"11, Bachelor's-walk, 26th January, 1815.

"SIR—Carrick's paper of the 23rd instant (in its report of the debates of a meeting of Catholic gentlemen, on the subject of a petition) states, that you have applied the appellation of *beggarly* to the corporation of this city, *calling it a beggarly corporation*; and, therefore, as a member of that body, and feeling how painful such is, I beg leave to inquire whether you really used or expressed yourself in any such language?

"I feel the more justified in calling on you on this occasion, as such language was not warranted or provoked by anything on the part of the corporation; neither was it consistent with the subject of your debate, or the deportment of the other Catholic gentlemen who were present; and, though I view it so inconsistent in every respect, I am in hopes the editor is under error, and not you.

"I have further to request your reply in the course of the evening; and remain, sir, your obedient servant,

"J. N. D'ESTERRE.

"To Counsellor O'Connell, Merrion-square."

"Mr. O'Connell's answer was as follows:—

"Merrion-square, January 27th, 1815.

"SIR—In reply to your letter of yesterday, and without either admitting or disclaiming the expression respecting the corporation of Dublin, in the print to which you allude, I deem it right to inform you, that, from the calumnious manner in which the religion and character of the Catholics of Ireland are treated in that body, no terms attributed to me, however reproachful, can exceed the contemptuous feelings I entertain for that body, in its corporate capacity; although, doubtless, it contains many valuable persons, whose conduct, as individuals (I lament), must necessarily be confounded in the acts of a general body.

"I have only to add, that *this letter must close our correspondence on this subject.*

"I am, &c., &c.,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL.

"To J. N. D'Esterre, Esq., 11, Bachelor's-walk."

"Mr. D'Esterre was advised to persist in the correspondence, and addressed another letter (but directed in a different hand-writing) to Mr. O'Connell. It was returned to him by Mr. James O'Connell, enclosed in a letter of the following tenor:—

"Merrion-square, Friday Evening.

"SIR—"From the tenor of your letter of yesterday, my brother did not expect that your next communication would have been made *in writing*. He directed me to open his letters in his absence. Your last letter, bearing a different address from the former one, was opened by me; but, upon perceiving the name subscribed, I have declined to read it, and, by his directions, I return it to you enclosed, and *unread*.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES O'CONNELL.

"To J. N. D'Esterre, Esq., 11, Bachelor's-walk."

\* Written the day before Mr. D'Esterre's unfortunate death.



“ Things remained in this condition until Sunday last. On this day, Mr. James O’Connell received a note from Mr. D’Esterre, containing disrespectful observations on himself and his brother. Immediately after the receipt of it, he sent his friend Captain O’Mullane, to Mr. D’Esterre to say, that after he adjusted his affair with his brother, he would bring him to account for his conduct to himself peculiarly.

“ Captain O’Mullane at the same time intimated, that Counsellor O’Connell was astonished at his not hearing in what he conceived *the proper way* from Mr. D’Esterre.

“ Nothing further happened on Sunday, and on Monday morning, Mr. Lidwell, who remained here several days, to be the friend of Mr. O’Connell, though some members of his family were seriously indisposed, left town for home, despairing of any issue being put to the controversy.

“ Monday passed on, and on Tuesday considerable sensation was created by a rumour, that Mr. D’Esterre was advised to go to the Four Courts, to offer Mr. O’Connell personal violence. Neither of the parties came in contact, but it seems that Mr. D’Esterre was met on one of the quays by Mr. Richard O’Gorman, who remonstrated with him by stating, that he conceived he was pursuing a very unusual sort of conduct. ‘ You conceive,’ said he, ‘ that you received an offence from Mr. O’Connell ; if so, your course is to demand satisfaction. This, I understand, you have not as yet done, but if you are now resolved to do it, I undertake, on forfeiture of having a riddle made of my body, to have Mr. O’Connell on his ground in half an hour. This occurred about three o’clock, but no challenge followed.

“ About four it was understood that Mr. D’Esterre was on the streets, and Mr. O’Connell paraded about with one or two friends, but did not come across his antagonist. A multitude soon collected about him, and he used several expedients to avoid them. He went into Tuthill’s, in Dawson-street, at one time, and came out through the stable yard. Still, however, a crowd pressed on, among whom there could not be less than 500 gentlemen, all of whom seemed carried away with a singular enthusiasm in favour of ‘ the man of the people.’ Mr. O’Connell then had no other resource left, than to take refuge in a house in Exchequer-street. In a short time, however, he was assailed by the most formidable interruption which he had yet encountered. Judge Day entered in his magisterial capacity to put him under arrest. The honourable justice said he would be satisfied if he had the guarantee of Mr. O’Connell’s honour that he would proceed no further in the business. ‘ It is not my duty, Mr. Justice,’ said Mr. O’Connell, ‘ to be the aggressor ; I will, therefore, pledge my honour, that I will not be the aggressor ;

further, however, I must tell you, that no human consideration will induce me to go.' The honourable judge then retired, and Mr. O'Connell shortly after repaired to Merrion-square.

"In the meantime it was observed that Mr. D'Esterre was in a shop in Grafton-street, surrounded by a number of friends. We have heard that Mr. James O'Connell noticed a leer on the countenance of one of them, which provoked him to use an insulting expression. Nothing, however, in the way of a demand of explanation followed. Tuesday, then, ended without a challenge. Some of Mr. O'Connell's friends were at the play in the evening, and they brought many persons to account for expressions unfavourable to Mr. O'Connell, which they conceived they overheard. There was a clergyman taxed, who defended himself by mentioning his profession; as to the others, they all, *una voce* declared, that they meant nothing offensive to Mr. O'Connell. No challenge of any kind, then, grew out of Tuesday's proceedings.

"On Wednesday (yesterday) morning, however, it was at length intimated to Mr. O'Connell, that Mr. D'Esterre intended to call upon him for a meeting. Twelve o'clock was fixed upon for the nomination of hour and place.

"There was some overture made to enlarge the time, but, Mr. O'Connell's friend would not consent. We should mention that this friend was Major M'Namara,\* of Doolen, in the county Clare, a Protestant gentleman attached to no party, and of the highest respectability. He is the descendant of some of the most distinguished of our Irish chieftains, and the connexion of many titled families of England. Of the extent of his property we need not give a better description than that he is able to poll six hundred freeholders. The friend of Mr. D'Esterre was Sir Edward Stanley. After some discussion, the parties fixed upon the ground, which we have already intimated. It is about twelve miles from the city, and constitutes part of Lord Ponsonby's demesne. The hour appointed was half-past three o'clock.

"At three precisely—we can speak confidently, for we now speak from personal knowledge—Mr. O'Connell, attended by his second, Surgeon Macklin, and a number of friends, was on the ground. About four, Mr. D'Esterre, attended only by Surgeon Peele, Sir Edward Stanley (his second), Mr. Piers, and a Mr. D'Esterre of Limerick, appeared.

"There was some conversation between the seconds as to position, mode of fire, &c., which, added to other sources of delay, occupied forty minutes. During this interval, Mr. D'Esterre took occasion to say,

\* At present, (1846), member for the county Clare, and for several years,

that his quarrel with Mr. O'Connell was not of a religious nature ;—to the Catholics or their leaders, he said, he had no animosity whatsoever. At forty minutes past four o'clock the combatants were on the ground. They both displayed the greatest coolness and courage.

“ As to Mr. O'Connell, we never saw him in better spirits, or more composed ; indeed, his cheerfulness was the astonishment of every spectator. It would be injustice to Mr. D'Esterre, whatever opinion we may have of the part he espoused (or rather of the party who stimulated him to this act), to deny that he appeared perfectly self-possessed.

“ We understand, when it had been agreed by the seconds that the opponents were to take their ground with a case of pistols each, to use as they might think proper, Sir Edward Stanley, Mr. D'Esterre's friend, addressed Major M'Namara, Mr. O'Connell's friend, as follows :—

“ SIR EDWARD—‘ Well, sir, when each has discharged his case of pistols, I hope the affair will be considered as terminated, and that we leave the ground.’

“ MAJOR M'NAMARA—‘ Sir, you may, of course, take your friend from the ground when you please. You, sir, are the challenger, and you may retire from the ground whenever you think proper ; but I shall not enter into any such condition as you propose.’ However, it is probable there may be no occasion to discharge the whole of a case of pistols.’ ”

[Of Mr. O'Connell's demeanour on the ground, the late Jeremiah M'Carthy, of Dawson-street, used to relate the following little anecdote :—Being recognized by him upon the ground, during the moments that elapsed ere the preliminaries were arranged, he was saluted with the cheerful address : “ Well, Jerry, I never missed you at an aggregate meeting yet !”]

“ The friends of both parties retired, and the combatants, having a pistol in each hand, with directions to discharge them at their discretion, prepared to fire. They levelled, and before the lapse of a second both shots were heard. Mr. D'Esterre's was first, and missed ; Mr. O'Connell's followed instantaneously, and took effect in the thigh of his antagonist, about an inch below the hip. Mr. D'Esterre, of course, fell ; and both the surgeons hastened to him. They found that the ball had traversed the hip, and could not be found. There was an immense effusion of blood. All parties prepared to move towards home, and arrived in town before eight o'clock.

“We were extremely glad to perceive that Major M'Namara and many respectable gentlemen assisted in procuring the best accommodation for the wounded man. They sympathised in his sufferings, and expressed themselves to Sir Edward Stanley extremely well pleased that a transaction, which they considered most uncalled for, had not terminated in the death of his friend.

“We need not describe the emotions which burst forth along the road, and through town, when it was ascertained that Mr. O'Connell was safe.”

The foregoing was, of course, written before the unfortunate death of Mr. D'Esterre. “From the first little hopes were entertained,” say the newspaper accounts, “of the ill-fated gentleman's life, and on Thursday, the 2nd February, he expired, after much suffering.” He was, indeed, as the *Freeman's Journal* styled him, “the dauntless and unsuspecting victim of the scoundrel policy” of the bigots who put him forward to fight their battles, and shelter their cowardly selves.

He was in the corporation as representative of the guild of merchants, and had acted a spirited part there in the advocacy of the right of Ireland to an unrestricted trade. It is even said—and, we believe, with perfect truth—that he had actually opposed a resolution, of anti-Catholic tendency, proposed by the notorious Jack Giffard—the very resolution against which Mr. O'Connell directed the speech in which he used the expression towards the corporation, which was made the groundwork of the unhappy affair. It added much to the general sorrow, that Mr. D'Esterre should, by allowing himself to be made the tool of others, have himself expiated the very offence of which those others had been so basely guilty, and which he had so creditably opposed.

Mr. D'Esterre had, in his earlier life, been in the marines, and, during one of the great naval mutinies that occurred in or about the year 1799, had distinguished himself much in his efforts to suppress it, on board the ship to which he belonged. We now resume the newspaper accounts.

“No inquest has been yet (Saturday, February 4th) held on the body

of the unfortunate Mr. D'Esterre; and it appears by the following letter, which was received by Mr. O'Connell on Saturday evening, from Sir Edward Stanley, that there is to be no prosecution:—

“ Royal Barracks, 4th February, 1813.

“ SIR—Lest your professional avocations should be interrupted by an apprehension of any proceeding being in contemplation in consequence of the late melancholy event, I have the honour to inform you that there is not the most distant intention of any prosecution whatever on the part of the family or friends of the late Mr. D'Esterre.

“ I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient, humble Servant,

“ EDWARD STANLEY.

“ Daniel O'Connell, Esq., Merriam-square.”

“ To the above, which evinces a very commendable spirit of accommodation, Mr. O'Connell returned the following answer:—

“ Merriam-square, 6th February, 1813.

“ SIR—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday, and I beg of you to accept my sincere thanks for your very polite and considerate attention.

“ It is to me a mournful consolation to meet such generous sentiments from those who must be afflicted at the late unhappy event. But believe me, my regret at that event is most sincere and unaffected; and if I know my own heart, I can with the strictest truth assert, that no person can feel for the loss society has sustained in the death of Mr. D'Esterre with more deep and lasting sorrow than I do.

“ Allow me again to thank you, sir, for the courtesy of your letter; a courtesy quite consistent with the gentlemanly demeanour of your entire conduct on this melancholy transaction.

“ I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient, humble Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“ Sir Edward Stanley.”

The following is the last notice we shall extract relative to this sad affair:—

#### “ THE LATE MR. D'ESTERRE.

“ Mr. D'Esterre, a few minutes before he had taken his ground, declared, that whatever might be the result of the unpleasant business between Mr. O'Connell and him, that it had not originated, on his part, from any religious animosities or party feeling. He declared from the bottom of his heart, and called God to witness to the truth of his words, and said that if they were to be his last words, and he in his dying moments, he would make the same declaration: That he had never harboured a bigoted feeling, or any religious animosity against the Roman Catholics of Ireland, their Board, or their leaders; that he had always been the friend of liberality and toleration, and referred for his sentiments on religious liberty to his speeches and declarations at the meetings of the

Common Council and Corporation; that, in the midst of that body, where a spirit had prevailed decidedly hostile to Catholic claims, he had candidly and openly espoused the Catholic cause. Thus much he wished to say, in order that his motives might not be either misunderstood or misrepresented."

The character of the unfortunate gentleman, given in the latter part of our quotations from the newspaper accounts, is said to have rather fallen short, in its favourable points, of his merits, than to have exceeded them. By friend and by opponent alike, his allowing himself to be put forward as the champion of the bigots who had the corporation under their control, was matter of lamentation. Had one of these creatures been struck down, very different, indeed, would have been the feelings excited; and few would have looked upon the event as other than one of retributive justice.

In civil strife, however, it is the commonest chance that the lot of sacrifice falls otherwise than where it has been most deserved, or than man's presumptuous judgment would have decreed it;—so may Divine Providence have chosen to baffle the counsels of men; and at the same time to hold out to them a saving warning from the facile resort of violence in the settlement of their contentions.

We most gladly leave this painful subject, and turn at once to Mr. O'Connell's next public appearance, which was at a Catholic meeting of the 23rd of February.

"MR. O'CONNELL said that he wished to submit to the meeting a resolution, calling on the different counties and cities in Ireland to petition for unqualified emancipation. It was a resolution which had been already and frequently adopted; when we had persevered in our petitions, even at periods when we despaired of success; and it became a pleasing duty to present them, now that the symptoms of the times seemed so powerfully to promise an approaching relief.

"Indeed, as long as truth or justice could be supposed to influence man; as long as man was admitted to be under the control of reason; so long must it be prudent and wise to procure discussions on the sufferings and the rights of the people of Ireland. Truth proclaimed the

treacherous iniquity which had deprived us of our chartered liberty ; truth destroyed the flimsy pretext under which this iniquity is continued ; truth exposed our merits and our sufferings ; whilst reason and justice combined to demonstrate our right—the right of every human being to freedom of conscience—a right without which every honest man must feel that to him, individually, the protection of government is a mockery, and the restriction of penal law a sacrilege.

“ Truth, reason, and justice are our advocates ; and even in England, let me tell you that those powerful advocates have some authority. They are, it is true, more frequently resisted there than in most other countries : but yet they have some sway among the English at all times. Passion may confound, and prejudice darken the English understanding ; and interested passion and hired prejudice have been successfully employed against us at former periods ; but the present season appears singularly well calculated to aid the progress of our cause, and to advance the attainment of our important objects.

“ I do not make the assertion lightly. I speak after deliberate investigation, and from solemn conviction, my clear opinion, that we shall, during the present session of parliament, obtain a portion at least, if not the entire, of our emancipation. We cannot fail, unless we are disturbed in our course by those who graciously style themselves our friends, or are betrayed by the treacherous machinations of part of our own body.

“ Yes, every thing, except false friendship and domestic treachery, forebodes success. The cause of man is in its great advance. Humanity has been rescued from much of its thralldom. In the states of Europe, where the iron despotism of the feudal system so long classed men into two species—the hereditary masters and the perpetual slaves ; when rank supplied the place of merit, and to be humbly born operated as a perpetual exclusion ;—in many parts of Europe man is reassuming his natural station, and artificial distinctions have vanished before the force of truth and the necessities of governors.

“ France has a representative government ; and as the unjust privileges of the clergy and nobility are abolished ; as she is blessed with a most wise, clear, and simple code of laws ; as she is almost free from debt, and emancipated from odious prejudices, she is likely to prove an example and a light to the world.

“ In Germany, the sovereigns who formerly ruled at their free will and caprice, are actually bribing the people to the support of their thrones, by giving them the blessings of liberty. It is a wise and a glorious policy. The Prince Regent has emancipated his Catholic subjects of Hanover, and traced for them the grand outlines of a free con-

stitution. The other states of Germany are rapidly following the example. The people, no longer destined to bear the burdens only of society, are called up to take their share in the management of their own concerns, and in the sustentation of the public dignity and happiness. In short, representative government, the only rational or just government, is proclaimed by princes as a boon to their people, and Germany is about to afford many an example of the advantages of rational liberty. Anxious as some kings appear to be in the great work of plunder and robbery, others of them are now the first heralds of freedom.

“ It is a moment of glorious triumph to humanity ; and even one instance of liberality, freely conceded, makes compensation for a thousand repetitions of the ordinary crimes of military monarchs. The crime is followed by its own punishment ; but the great principle of the rights of man establishes itself now on the broadest basis, and France and Germany now set forth an example for England to imitate.

“ Italy, too, is in the paroxysms of the fever of independence. Oh, may she have strength to go through the disease, and may she rise like a giant refreshed with wine ! One thing is certain, that the human mind is set afloat in Italy. The flame of freedom burns ; it may be smothered for a season ; but all the whiskered Croats and the fierce Pandours of Austria will not be able to extinguish the sacred fire. Spain, to be sure, chills the heart, and disgusts the understanding. The combined tyranny of the Inquisition and the court—the kindred despotism of church and state—press upon one, and tantalize the mind, whilst they bind the body in fetters of adamant. But this despotism is, thank God, as unrelentingly absurd as it is cruel, and there arises a darling hope out of the very excess of the evil. The Spaniards must be walking corpses—they must be living ghosts, and not human beings, unless a sublime reaction be in rapid preparation. But let us turn to our own prospects.

“ The cause of liberty has made, and is making, great progress in states heretofore despotic. In all the countries in Europe, in which any portion of freedom prevails, the liberty of conscience is complete. England alone, of all the states pretending to be free, leaves shackles upon the human mind ; England alone, amongst free states, exhibits the absurd claim of regulating belief by law, and forcing opinion by statute. Is it possible to conceive that this gross, this glaring, this iniquitous absurdity can continue ? Is it possible, too, to conceive that it can continue to operate, not against a small and powerless sect, but against the millions, comprising the best strength the most affluent energy of the empire ?—a strength and an energy daily increasing, and hourly appreciating their own importance. The present system, disavowed by libe-



ralized Europe, disclaimed by sound reason, abhorred by genuine religion, must soon and for ever be abolished.

“ Let it not be said that the princes of the Continent were forced by necessity to give privileges to their subjects, and that England has escaped from a similar fate. I admit that the necessity of procuring the support of the people was the mainspring of royal patriotism on the Continent ; but I totally deny that the ministers of England can dispense with a similar support. The burdens of the war are permanent ; the distresses occasioned by the peace are pressing ; the financial system tottering, and to be supported in profound peace only by a war taxation. In the meantime, the resources of corruption are mightily diminished. Ministerial influence is necessarily diminished by one-half of the effective force of indirect bribery ; full two-thirds must be disbanded. Peculation and corruption must be put upon half-pay, and no allowances. The ministry lose not only all those active partizans ; those outrageous loyalists, who fattened on the public plunder during the seasons of immense expenditure ; but those very men will themselves swell the ranks of the malcontents, and probably be the most violent in their opposition. They have no sweet consciousness to reward them in their present privations ; and therefore they are likely to exhaust the bitterness of their souls on their late employers. Every cause conspires to render this the period in which the ministry should have least inclination, least interest, least power, to oppose the restoration of our rights and liberties.

“ I speak not from mere theory. There exist at this moment practical illustrations of the truth of my assertions. Instances have occurred which demonstrate, as well the inability of the ministry to resist the popular voice, as the utility of re-echoing that voice, until it is heard and understood in all its strength and force. The ministers had determined to continue the property tax ; they announced that determination to their partizans at Liverpool and in Bristol. Well, the people of England met ; they petitioned ; they repeated—they reiterated their petitions, until the ministry felt they could no longer resist ; and they ungraciously, but totally, abandoned their determination ; and the property tax now expires.

“ Another instance is also now before us. It relates to the Corn Laws. The success of the repetition of petitions in that instance is the more remarkable, because such success has been obtained in defiance of the first principles of political economy, and in violation of the plainest rules of political justice.

“ This is not the place to discuss the *merits of the Corn Laws* ; but I cannot avoid, as the subject lies in my way, to put upon public record

*my conviction of THE INUTILITY, AS WELL AS THE IMPROPRIETY, OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE RESPECTING THOSE LAWS. I expect that it will be believed in Ireland that I would not volunteer thus an opposition of sentiment to any measure, if I was not most disinterestedly, and in my conscience, convinced that SUCH MEASURE WOULD NOT BE OF ANY SUBSTANTIAL OR PERMANENT UTILITY TO IRELAND.*

“As far as I am personally concerned, my interest plainly is to keep up the price of lands ; but I am quite convinced that the measure in question will have an effect PERMANENTLY AND FATALLY INJURIOUS TO IRELAND. *The clamour respecting the Corn Laws has been fomented by parsons who were afraid that they would not get money enough for their tithes, and absentee landlords, who apprehended a diminution of their rack rents ; and if you observed the names of those who have taken an active part in favour of the measure, you will find amongst them many, if not all, the persons who have most distinguished themselves against the liberty and religion of the people. There have been, I know, many good men misled, and many clever men deceived, on this subject ; but the great majority are of the class of oppressors.*

“There was formed, some time ago, an association of a singular nature in Dublin and the adjacent counties. Mr. Luke White was, as I remember, at the head of it. It contained some of our stoutest and most stubborn seceders : it published the causes of its institution ; it recited that, whereas butcher's meat was dearer in Cork, and in Limerick, and in Belfast than in Dublin, it was therefore expedient to associate, in order that the people of Dublin should not eat meat too cheap. Large sums were subscribed to carry the patriotic design into effect, but public indignation broke up the ostensible confederacy ; it was too plain and too glaring to bear public inspection. The indignant sense of the people of Dublin forced them to dissolve their open association ; and if the present enormous increase of the price of meat in Dublin beyond the rest of Ireland be the result of secret combination of any individuals, there is at least this comfort, that they do not presume to beard the public with the open avowal of their design to increase the difficulties of the poor in procuring food.

“Such a scheme as that, with respect to meat in Dublin—such a scheme, precisely, is the sought-for corn law. The only difference consists in the extent of the operation of both plans. The *corn plan* is only more extensive, not more unjust in principle, but it is more *unreasonable in its operation*, because its *necessary tendency must be to destroy that very market of which it seeks the exclusive possession.* The *corn law men want, they say, to have the exclusive feeding of the manu-*

*facturers ; but at present, our manufacturers, loaded as they are with taxation, are scarcely able to meet the goods of foreigners in the markets of the world. The English are already undersold in foreign markets ; but, if to this dearness, produced by taxation, there shall be added the dearness produced by dear food, is it not plain that it will be impossible to enter into a competition with foreign manufacturers, who have no taxes, and cheap bread ? Thus the corn laws will destroy our manufactures, and compel our manufacturers to emigrate, in spite of penalties ; and the corn law supporters will have injured themselves, and destroyed others.*

“ I beg pardon for dwelling on this subject. If I were at liberty to pursue it here, I would not leave it until I had satisfied every dispassionate man, that the *proposed measure* is both **USELESS AND UNJUST** ; but this is not the place for doing so, and I only beg to record at least the honest dictates of my judgment on this interesting topic. My argument, of the efficacy of petitioning, is strengthened by the impolicy of the measure in question ; because, if petitions, by their number and perseverance, succeed in establishing a proposition impolitic in principle, and oppressive to thousands in operation, what encouragement does it not afford to us to repeat our petitions for that which has justice for its basis, and policy as its support !

“ The great advantages of discussion being thus apparent, the efficacy of repeating, and repeating, and repeating again our petitions, being thus demonstrated by notorious facts, the Catholics of Ireland must be sunk in criminal apathy, if they neglect the use of an instrument so efficacious for their emancipation.

“ There is further encouragement at this particular crisis. Dissension has ceased in the Catholic body. Those who paralysed our efforts, and gave our conduct the appearance and reality of weakness, and wavering, and inconsistency, have all retired. Those who were ready to place the entire of the Catholic feelings and dignity, and some of the Catholic religion too, under the feet of every man who pleased to call himself our friend, and to prove himself our friend, by praising on every occasion, and upon no occasion, the oppressors of the Catholics, and by abusing the Catholics themselves ; the men who would link the Catholic cause to this patron and to that, and sacrifice it at one time to the minister, and at another to the opposition, and make it this day the tool of one party, and the next the instrument of another party ; the men, in fine, who hoped to traffic upon our country and our religion—who would buy honours, and titles, and places, and pensions, at the price of the purity, and dignity, and safety of the Catholic Church in Ireland ; all those men have, thank God, quitted us, I hope for ever. They have

returned into silence and secession, or have frankly or covertly gone over to our enemies. I regret deeply and bitterly that they have carried with them some few, who, like my Lord Fingal, entertain no other motives than those of purity and integrity, and who, like that noble lord, are merely mistaken.

“But I rejoice at this separation—I rejoice that they have left the single-hearted, and the disinterested, and the indefatigable, and the independent, and the numerous, and the sincere Catholics to work out their emancipation unclogged, unshackled, and undismayed. They have bestowed on us another bounty also—they have proclaimed the causes of their secession—they have placed out of doubt the cause of the divisions. It is not intemperance, for that we abandoned; it is not the introduction of extraneous topics, for those we disclaimed; it is simply and purely, veto or no veto—restriction or no restriction—no other words; it is religion and principle that have divided us; thanks, many thanks to the tardy and remote candour of the seceders, that has at length written in large letters *the cause of their secession—it is the Catholic Church of Ireland—it is whether that Church shall continue independent of a Protestant ministry or not. We are for its independence—the seceders are for its dependence.*

“Whatever shall be the fate of our emancipation question, thank God we are divided for ever from those who would wish that our Church should crouch to the partizans of the Orange system. Thank God, secession has displayed its cloven foot, and avowed itself to be synonymous with vetoism.

“Those are our present prospects of success. First, man is elevated from slavery almost every where, and human nature has become more dignified, and, I may say, more valuable. Secondly, England wants our cordial support, and knows that she has only to concede to us justice, in order to obtain our affectionate assistance. Thirdly, this is the season of successful petition, and the very fashion of the times entitles our petition to succeed. Fourthly, the Catholic cause is disencumbered of hollow friends, and interested speculators. Add to all these the native and inherent strength of the principle of religious freedom, and the inert and accumulating weight of our wealth, our religion, and our numbers, and where is the sluggard that shall dare to doubt our approaching success.

“Besides, even our enemies must concede to us, that we act from principle, and from principle only. We prove our sincerity when we refuse to make our emancipation a subject of traffic and barter, and ask for relief only upon those grounds which, if once established, would give to every other sect the right to the same political immunity. All

we ask is 'a clear stage and no favour.' We think the Catholic religion the most rationally consistent with the divine scheme of Christianity, and, therefore, all we ask is, that everybody should be left to his unbiassed reason and judgment. If Protestants are equally sincere, why do they call the law, and the bribe, and the place, and the pension, in support of their doctrines? Why do they fortify themselves behind pains, penalties, and exclusions, and forfeitures? Ought not our opponents to feel that they degrade the sanctity of their religion, when they call in the profane aid of temporal rewards and punishments, and that they proclaim the superiority of our creed, when they thus admit themselves unable to contend against it upon terms of equality, and by the weapons of reason and argument, and persevere in refusing us, all we ask—'a clear stage and no favour.'

"Yes, Mr. Chairman, our enemies, in words and by actions, admit and proclaim our superiority. It remains to our friends alone, and to that misguided and ill-advised portion of the Catholics who have shrunk into secession—it remains for those friends and seceders alone to undervalue our exertions, and underrate our conscientious opinions.

"Great and good God, in what a cruel situation are the Catholics of Ireland placed! If they have the manliness to talk of their oppressors as the paltry bigots deserve—if they have the honesty to express, even in measured language, a small portion of the sentiments of abhorrence which peculating bigotry ought naturally to inspire—if they condemn the principle which established the inquisition in Spain, and Orange lodges in Ireland, they are assailed by the combined clamour of those parliamentary friends, and title-seeking, place-hunting seceders. The war-whoop of '*intemperance*' is sounded, and a persecution is instituted by our advocates and our seceders—against the Catholic who dares to be honest, and fearless, and independent!

"But I tell you what they easily forgive—nay, what our friends, sweet souls, would vindicate tomorrow in parliament, if the subject arose there. Here it is—here is *The Dublin Journal* of the 21st of February, printed just two days ago. In the administration of Lord Whitworth, and the secretaryship of Mr. Peel, there is a government newspaper—a paper supported solely by the money of the people; for its circulation is little, and its private advertisements less. Here is a paper continued in existence like a wounded reptile, only whilst in the rays of the sun, by the heat and warmth communicated to it by the Irish administration. Let me read two passages for you. "The first calls '*Popery the deadly enemy of pure religion and rational liberty.*' Such is the temperate description the writer gives of the Catholic faith. With respect to purity of religion, I shall not quarrel with him. I only

differ with him in point of taste; but I should be glad to know what this creature calls rational liberty. I suppose such as existed at Lacedæmon—the dominion of Spartans over Helots—the despotism of masters over slaves, that is his rational liberty. We will readily pass so much by. But attend to this:—

“‘I will,’ says this moderate and temperate gentleman, ‘lay before the reader such specimens of the **POPISSH SUPERSTITION** as will convince him that the treasonable combinations cemented by oaths, and the **NOCTURNAL ROBBERY AND ASSASSINATION** which have prevailed for many years past in Ireland, and still exist in many parts of it, are produced as a necessary consequence by its intolerant and sanguinary principles.’

“Let our seceders—let our gentle friends who are shocked at our intemperance, and are alive to the mild and conciliating virtues of Mr. Peel, read this passage, sanctioned, I may almost say certainly countenanced by those who do the work of governing Ireland. Would to God we had but one genuine, unsophisticated friend, one real advocate in the House of Commons! how such a man would pour down indignation on the clerks of the Castle, who pay for this base and vile defamation of our religion—of the religion of nine-tenths of the population of Ireland!

“But, perhaps, I accuse falsely; perhaps the administration of Ireland are guiltless of patronizing these calumnies; look at the paper and determine; it contains nearly five columns of advertisements—only one from a private person—and even that is a notice of an Anti-Popery pamphlet, by a Mr. Cousins, a curate of the Established Church. Dean Swift has some where observed, that the poorest of all possible rats was a curate—(*much laughing*); and if this rat be so, if he have, as usual, a large family, a great appetite, and little to eat, I sincerely hope that he may get what he wants—a fat living. Indeed, for the sake of consistency, and to keep up the succession of bad pamphlets, he ought to get a living.

“Well, what, think you, are the rest of the advertisements? First, there are three from the worthy Commissioners of Wide Streets; one dated the 6th of August, 1813, announcing that they would, the ensuing Wednesday, receive certain proposals. Secondly, the Barony of Middlethird is proclaimed, as of the 6th of September last, for fear the inhabitants of that barony should not as yet know they were proclaimed. Thirdly, the proclamation against the Catholic Board, dated only the 3rd day of June last, is printed, lest any person should forget the history of last year. Fourthly, there is a proclamation stating that gunpowder was not to be carried *coastwise* for six months, and this is dated the 5th of October last. But why should I detain you with the details of state

proclamations, printed for no other purpose than as an excuse for putting so much of the public money into the pocket of a calumniator of the Catholics. The abstract of the rest is, that there is one other proclamation, stating that Liverpool is a port fit for importation from the East Indies; another forbidding British subjects from serving in the American forces during the present, that is, the past war; and another stating, that although we had made peace with France, we are still at war with America, and that, therefore, no marine is to desert; and, to finish the climax, there is a column and a half of extracts from several statutes; all this printed at the expense of government, that is, at the expense of the people.

“Look now at the species of services for which so enormous a sum of our money is thus wantonly lavished! It consists simply of calumnies against the Catholic religion—calumnies so virulently atrocious, as, in despite of the intention of the authors, to render themselves ridiculous. This hireling accuses our religion of being an enemy to liberty, of being an encourager of treason, of instigating to robbery, and producing a system of assassination. Here are libels for which no prosecution is instituted. Here are libels which are considered worthy of encouragement, and which are rewarded by the Irish treasury. And is it for this—is it to supply this waste, this abuse of public money—is it to pay for those false and foul calumnies, that we are, in a season of universal peace, to be borne down with a war taxation? Are we to have two or three additional millions of taxes imposed upon us in peace, in order that this intestine war of atrocious calumny may be carried on against the religion of the people of Ireland, with all the vigour of full pay, and great plunder? Let us, agitators, be now taunted by jobbers in parliament, with our violence, our intemperance. Why, if we were not rendered patient by the aid of a dignified contempt, is there not matter enough to disgust, and to irritate almost beyond endurance?

“Thus are we treated by our friends, and our enemies, and our seceders; the first abandon, the second oppress, the third betray us, and they all join in calumniating us; in the last they are all combined. See how naturally they associate;—this libeller in *The Dublin Journal*, who calls the Catholic religion a system of assassination, actually praises, in the same paper, some individual Catholics; he praises, by name, Quarantotti, and my Lord Fingal (*much laughing*); and the respectable party (those are his words) who join with that noble lord.

“Of Lord Fingal I shall always speak with respect, because I entertain the opinion that his motives are pure and honourable; but can anything, or at least ought anything place his secession in so strong a point of view to the noble lord himself, as to find that he and his party

are praised by the very man who, in the next breath, treats his religion as a system of assassination. Let that party have all the enjoyment which such praises can confer; but if a spark of love for their religion or their country remains with them, let them recollect that they could have earned those praises only by having, in the opinion of this writer, betrayed the one, and degraded the other.

"This writer, too, attempts to traduce Lord Donoughmore. He attacks his lordship in bad English, and worse Latin, for having, as he says, cried *peccavi* to Popish thralldom. But the ignorant trader in virulence knew not how to spell that single Latin word, because they do not teach Latin at the charter schools.

"I close, with conjuring the Catholics to persevere in their present course.

"*Let us never tolerate the slightest inroad on the discipline of our ancient, our holy Church. Let us never consent that she should be made the hireling of the ministry. Our forefathers would have died, nay, they perished in hopeless slavery, rather than consent to such degradation!*

"Let us rest upon the barrier where they expired, *or go back into slavery, rather than forward into irreligion and disgrace!* Let us also advocate our cause on the two great principles—first, that of an eternal separation in spirituals between our Church and the state; secondly, that of *the eternal right to freedom of conscience*—a right which, I repeat it with pride and pleasure, would exterminate the Inquisition in Spain, and bury in oblivion the bloody orange flag of dissension in Ireland!"

Mr. O'Connell concluded by moving his resolution, calling on the several counties to petition.

This pregnant speech will meet our reader's eyes at a singularly appropriate moment; when the iniquitous taxation of food, against which he thus early protested, is being abandoned, under the pressure of a popular movement, to the success of which his depriving the bread-taxers of the assistance they expected from Ireland, has not a little contributed. It will be seen that *his* convictions are not to be placed in the category of those recent enlightenments on this subject; which, while undoubtedly to be respected and credited, do at the same time confess a previous blindness and narrowness of judgment, scarcely compatible with real statesmanlike genius.

The allusions to Irish ecclesiastical matters have also their ap-



propriateness now; when the encroachments already made by our anti-Catholic government make us tremblingly alive to their further projects; especially with the unhappy defection that, on the occasion of those encroachments, made itself visible in our ranks, to a small but a deeply-afflicting extent.

At the time we write of, such defections were fortunately rendered harmless by the energy and steadfastness of the people, led on by their clergy and the majority of their hierarchy. The spring and summer of 1815 witnessed many proofs that the heart of Ireland was sound; and in August of the same year the public mind was cheered by the following declaration of the bishops:

“At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, held in Dublin, on the 23rd and 24th of August, 1815, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to—the Most Rev. Dr. Kelly, president:—

“RESOLVED—‘That it is our decided and conscientious conviction, that any power granted to the crown of Great Britain, of interfering, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of Bishops for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, must essentially injure, and may eventually subvert, the Roman Catholic religion in this country.

“RESOLVED—‘That, with this conviction deeply and unalterably impressed on our minds, we should consider ourselves as betraying the dearest interests of that portion of the Church which the Holy Ghost has confided to our care, did we not declare, most unequivocally, that we will at all times, and under all circumstances, deprecate and oppose, in every canonical and constitutional way, any such interference.

“RESOLVED—‘Though we sincerely venerate the supreme pontiff as visible head of the Church, we do not conceive that our apprehensions for the safety of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland can or ought to be removed by any determination of his Holiness, adopted, or intended to be adopted, not only without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to our repeated resolutions, and the very energetic memorial presented on our behalf, and so ably supported by our deputy, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray; who, in that quality, was more competent to inform his Holiness of the real state and interests of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, than any other with whom he is said to have consulted.

“RESOLVED—‘That a declaration of these our sentiments, respectful, firm, and decided, be transmitted to the Holy See, which, we trust, will engage his Holiness to feel and acknowledge the justice and propriety of this our determination.

“RESOLVED—‘That our grateful thanks are due, and hereby given, to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, and the Right Rev. Dr. Milner, our late deputies to Rome, for their zealous and able discharge of the trust reposed in them.

“OLIVER KELLY, President.

Richard O'Reilly.  
J. T. Troy.  
Thomas Bray, Cashel, (proxy).  
F. Everard, Coad. Cashel.  
D. Murray, Coad. Dublin.  
Pat. Jos. Fitzhett, Meath.  
William Coppinger, Cloyne.  
Thomas Connelley, Clonsilla.  
Charles Sagarua, Kerry.  
John Power, Waterford.  
Charles O'Donnell, Derry.  
John O'Flinn, Arboury.  
Peter Waldron, Killala.  
James O'Shaughnessy, Killalee.

Farrell O'Reilly, Kilmara.  
P. Ryan, Ferns.  
Charles Tusk, Limerick.  
O. Fitzhett, Elphin.  
John Murphy, Cork.  
Patrick M'Mullen, Down and Connor.  
Kyrus Marcus, Omory.  
Peter M'Loughlin, Raphoe.  
James Murphy, Clougher.  
Edmund Derry, Dromore.  
Nich. Corcoran, Elect. Kildare and Leighlin.  
James M'Gouran, Elect. Ardagh.  
Edmund Fitzhett, Warden of Galway.”

This document drew from the Catholic laity the following expressions of gratitude and delight :—

“CATHOLIC AGGREGATE MEETING.

“TUESDAY, 29TH AUGUST, 1815.

“RESOLVED—‘That we deem it our first and most pleasing duty to express, in the strongest terms which our language can afford, our perfect confidence in, and esteem and veneration for, and gratitude to the most reverend and right reverend the Catholic prelates of Ireland; and these our unanimous sentiments are deeply and everlastingly impressed on our minds, by their firm, manly, and decided condemnation of any measure, giving to the crown, or the servants of the crown, any control whatsoever over the appointment of our bishops, inasmuch as any such measure must necessarily tend to destroy our religion, and also materially injure the civil rights and liberties of the people of Ireland, of all classes and denominations.’

“RESOLVED—‘That our chairman be requested to transmit, in terms of the most affectionate respect, our most cordial gratitude to those learned, exemplary, and pious clergymen, Archdeacon Blake, Doctors Lube and Darcy, and to the other reverend and estimable clergymen of the second order of the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy, who have concurred with them in constant and unqualified opposition to the abhorred veto in all its shapes and forms.’

“RESOLVED—‘That we cannot omit this occasion to publish to the world the fervent tribute of our lively gratitude and most profound reverence for the officiating Catholic priests of Ireland; a class of men uniformly distinguished by the most unremitting zeal and activity, and by the most incessant charity and disinterested purity, in discharge of their sacred duties;—men whom no dangers have terrified, no persecution has ever deterred, no seduction has ever led astray, and no temptation could ever bribe, from the faithful discharge of their duties; and who have obtained, as they have well deserved, the heartfelt admiration of all the persons of their own persuasion, and the decided approbation of the liberal and enlightened of every other religion.’

“RESOLVED—‘That the Catholics of Ireland having, on their solemn oath, declared that the Pope has not, and ought not to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm; we cannot, without exposing ourselves and our religion to just derision and reproach, and also without incurring the dreadful guilt of perjury, consent to any arrangement by which the British minister may derive from the Court of Rome any jurisdiction or power over the transactions in civil life, and conduct in temporal affairs, of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, and that our resistance to any such arrangements, instead of operating in our disfavour in the mind of any just and rational statesman, ought, on the contrary, to convince him that we deserve liberty, as well because such conduct furnishes one more powerful instance of their conscientious adherence to the obligation of an oath, as because it proves that we practically distinguish the spiritual authority of his Holiness the Pope, which we always fully recognise, from any civil or temporal power or authority in him, or derived from him, which we disclaim, and would, if necessary, resist at the peril of our lives.’ ”

When the fourth resolution was put, Mr. O'Connell came forward and spoke at considerable length. The following is the best extract we can give of his speech :—

“This, said he, is a day of gratulation and triumph. The sentiments of delight which we experience are pure and unmixed. Our great cause is at length placed on its proper basis. Win or lose, we are

sure our religion cannot suffer. Our question is now stripped of all the intricacies and details in which it was involved by false friends and perfidious co-operators. It reduces itself simply and singly to this—shall we be emancipated as Catholics, or as Catholics, continue slaves?

“Every attempt to barter religion for liberty—every scheme to traffic upon our faith, for civil benefits, is destroyed for ever, and this additional advantage results among ourselves, that the unanimity of the Irish Catholics is now secure from all danger. As one great mass of weight and consistency, we should now proceed towards the attainment of liberty. The seceders are deprived of every excuse, of every colour or pretext for division. No man who continues to secede, can pretend to sincerity as a Catholic, or purity as an Irishman.

“The secession originated in the concealed desire to facilitate the ministerial arrangements with the Pope and the bishops. Secession was afterwards justified on the avowed grounds of permitting such arrangements to take place unimpeded by the laity; but now that those arrangements are impossible—now that the bishops have declared their irrevocable opposition—now that they have declared that ministerial interference **MUST ESSENTIALLY INJURE, AND MAY DESTROY** the Catholic religion in Ireland; where is the man who can get credit for his pretence of being a Catholic, who still continues his secession, to favour that which the highest and most revered authority has told him must essentially injure, and may destroy his religion? Oh no, if the seceders be sincere, and some, at least, amongst them, I am at present convinced are so—if they be honest, they will now send in their adhesion, and rejoin the ranks of their struggling countrymen.

“It is unnecessary, I am sure, to prove that no seceder can now lay claim to pure devotion to his country. They cannot require us to believe that they are honest as politicians, or faithful as Irishmen, whilst they endeavour to add to the corrupt influence of Lord Castlereagh, and strive to increase the power in Ireland of the worthy champion of Orangeism—Mr. Peel. (At the mention of Mr. Peel’s name there was much laughing).

“You mistake me, said Mr. O’Connell. I do not—indeed, I do not intend this day to enter into the merits of that celebrated statesman. All I shall say of him, by way of parenthesis, is, that I am told he has in my absence, and in a place where he was privileged from any account, grossly traduced me. I said, at the last meeting, in the presence of the note-takers of the police, who are, paid by him, that he was too prudent to attack me in my presence. I see the same police informers here now, and I authorize them carefully to report these my words, that Mr. Peel would not **DARE**, in my presence, or in any place where

he was liable to personal account, use a single expression derogatory to my interest, or my honour. And now I have done with the man, who is just fit to be nothing but the champion of Orangeism. I have done with him, perhaps for ever.

“ I return to our proper topic of joy and exultation !

“ Our prelates have amply justified the veneration in which they are held. Never were there men more respected and revered. No men ever deserved so much respect and reverence. But the gratitude they have merited, and the triumph they have won, is rendered doubly delightful by its being exclusively Irish. It belongs to Irishmen alone ; not a foreigner has any claim to it.

“ Gonsalvi, the Italian, either betrayed or sold our Church to the British minister at Vienna ; indeed, the exact amount of his price is stated to be eleven thousand guineas. Though a cardinal, this man is not a priest. He is a secular cardinal, just fit for any bargain and sale ; right glad, I presume, to have so good a thing to sell as the religion of Ireland. Quarantotti—the odious, the stupid Quarantotti—and Cardinal Litta, and the Pope himself, are all, of course, foreigners. Then the next class in the arrangement of the veto are the English Catholic bishops. First of all, I must mention a name that ought not, perhaps, though it will surprise you—Doctor Milner. Yes ; Doctor Milner has performed another truly English revolution. He was the first to broach the veto. He came to Ireland on a vetoistical mission ; the Irish rejected the mission and the missionary. He then recanted his errors—renounced his first opinions—abjured them—nay, he even denied them, and brought no small discredit on himself by the flat contradictions under which he laboured. We, however, thought his repentance too sincere ; and leaving him to decide his personal quarrel as he could, sustained him for his anti-vetoistical principle.

“ Well, what has occurred now ? Why, this identical Doctor Milner has gone round again, and has actually written to the bishops to accede to Litta's plan of veto. Milner's letter was read at the synod ; it was, I understand, an official document ; of its contents I can give you certainly an abstract, because its contents have been communicated to me by one of our prelates, whose name, if necessary, I am at full liberty to use. His letter requested of the bishops to accede to the new plan of veto. It stated that the government would not be satisfied with so little ; that it would require more ; and, therefore, concluded the candid prelate, you may with safety accede to his plan ; it will never be brought into operation, and you will have the grace of showing your acquiescence, without any danger to the Church. (Loud laughter.) Such was the

fimsy and unmanly sophistry by which he attempted to conciliate the Irish bishops.

“ But well knowing that there was something in the Irish understanding that would scorn such advice, he proceeded to state and to solve the following ingenious dilemma :—‘ Either (says his letter) the candidate for episcopacy in Ireland will be disloyal, or he will not be disloyal. If he be disloyal, we would all (continues Doctor Milner) be rejoiced that he lost the bishoprick.’ Now, I beg just to inquire the meaning of the word disloyalty. In this country it generally means disinterested attachment to the rights and liberty of Ireland. The more honest, zealous and pure is the love of any man for his native land, the more certain he is of being charged with disloyalty; whilst on the other hand, we see plunder, and torture, and murder called loyalty. But mark, I pray you, how Doctor Milner treats the other horn of the dilemma. ‘ If (says he) the candidate be a loyal man, and that the British ministry shall strike out his name, on a suspicion of his disloyalty, he will have an excellent action at law against the British minister.’ Yes; an action at law by an Irish parish priest or friar against the prime minister of England, for exercising a discretionary power vested in him! Admirable and sublime remedy! who does not at once see its efficacy? Yes; I trust that it is the intellect, not the integrity, of this prelate, that has been thus affected.

“ The most zealous apostle of the veto is another English prelate (Doctor Poynter). Poor man! his principal means of support depended on the uncertain gratuity of a few of the upper class (as they are called) of English Papists; he would prefer the more solid engagement of a permanent pension from government. He exerted every nerve to carry this ruinous measure. One of our northern prelates, who is advanced in life, and a good deal deaf, was in the habit, at the present synod, of mistaking Poynter’s name; he constantly called him Doctor Spaniel. On being corrected two or three times, in the heat of the debate, he exclaimed—‘ Poynter by name, but spaniel by nature! I am right in his designation, though I may mistake his denomination.’ Indeed, the English Catholic bishops are proverbial for their vacillation. At a former period of history, they changed their religion no less than four times in the short space of thirty-six years. Hence the proverb so common in Ireland—‘ You may trust an English bishop as far only as you could throw him;’ and the Catholic bishops in England, at this day, fully justify the saying. The only scholar amongst them is Doctor Milner; and he appears arrived at dotage. The rest of them, by their servility, their pliability, their eagerness to conciliate the favour of their

lay patrons, and their anxiety for pensions from government, have become the ridicule of the country. The Protestants laugh at them—the Quakers shrug at them—the Methodists sneer with secret joy at them—and we, Irish, whilst we reverence their office, hold their conduct in unqualified abhorrence.

“ You owe all your safety and success to the Catholic bishops of Ireland. They have defeated every argument ; they have withstood every seduction ; they have disappointed every unhallowed expectation. What an idle pretext is this anxiety to ascertain their loyalty ! I challenge the calumniators of every class—calumny prospers in Ireland—it is the best trade going. Well, I challenge the host of calumniators to point out a single instance in which, since the Revolution, an Irish Catholic bishop was charged with disloyalty.

“ Away with this vile pretence ; it is political power the minister wants. He desires, too, to get rid of your religion, because it is troublesome ; but his great object is to increase his influence—to enlarge the number of his retainers—to give corruption a more extended sphere of action, that the very name of liberty may be blotted out, and ministerial management take the place of constitutional control. We have opposed the veto as Catholics ; our worst fears have been confirmed by the decisive authorities of the bishops. Their words contain such a justification of our resistance that I must repeat them. They say—‘ It must essentially injure, and may subvert, the Catholic religion in Ireland.’ As Catholics, then, do I say to all the subjects of the empire, we are bound to resist this measure. This is our vindication—our full justification.

“ But it has always been odious to me on another account. If I were a Protestant by education and from conviction, as I am a Catholic by education and from conviction, I declare to God I should equally oppose and resist the veto. Every enlightened and liberal Protestant ought to thank us for our opposition ; for what enlightened man is there who does not see the frightful progress of corrupt influence, where direct dominion would be resisted and overthrown ? Corruption eats its silent way ; it devours the vitals of the state, whilst it allows the outward forms and shapes to retain the appearances of pristine strength and vigour. The parliament, more than thirty years ago, declared that ‘ the influence of the crown had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished.’ Alas ! from that day to this, the evil has only accumulated ; no attempt at a remedy has been entertained. Who is the honest man that could put his hand to his heart, and say, that this influence has not swept away the most valuable part of that for which the English of old fought, and bled, and died—constitutional liberty ? And

can such a man, thus convinced, allow the minister to take, at one sweep, all the influence of another Church? No man who values the safety of what remains to us of the constitution, can assent to the gratuitous bestowing of more energy on the disease which undermines the constitution.

“There is, however, a more pressing view of this danger, which arises when we behold the present state of Ireland. She has no parliament of her own; there is little of interest, and less of sympathy for the complaints of Ireland in that of England. What grievance has the imperial parliament redressed?—what inconvenience has it remedied? Let those who can, inform us when have our prayers been listened to. *The very remoteness of that parliament renders the sound of our complaints weak and inefficient.*

“This is a topic which I would fain dwell upon; but, alas! to bewail our misfortunes in the language of truth may be crime; and to speak historically of the practical evils that have flowed from the union, would probably be punished by the very men who themselves loudly foretold the very calamities which we endure, and which they sometimes now inflict. *But this very apprehension of talking the truth serves only to prove how dismal would the prospect of liberty be, if in every Catholic diocese in Ireland there were an active partisan of the minister, and in every Catholic parish an active informer.* Who is it that is ignorant of the present plan of patronage in Ireland? Why, have I not myself been the means of promoting many and many an adventurer? I have actually promoted more than one clergyman of the Established Church, and our cause has promoted many of them. To instance only one, there is the rectory of Clane, in the county of Kildare, which ought to be placed to my credit. A reverend parson, of the name of Thorpe, wrote as ill-constructed a pamphlet as it is possible to imagine, to abuse me. The subject ought, I think, to have enlivened the man; it was dull, indeed—but it was virulent, and he was immediately rewarded with the living of Clane. There is Elrington, the provost, too; how many a man of genius, taste, and learning in College was overlooked when he was promoted from his retirement! The public were astonished. Who could account for this promotion, when there were so many in College and about College more suited to the dignity? But it was recollected that he had written a pamphlet or book against the Papists, and either dedicated or sent it to the Duke of Cumberland, who is one of the greatest patrons of the Established Church, in Ireland, and Chancellor of our University. Oh! a pamphlet against Popery! The provostship was little enough for him. But did any body ever read the pamphlet through? If I had to sentence one of our worst enemies, I should not

desire a more malignant sentence than to condemn him to the reading, distinctly and without omission, the entire of that pamphlet. Human nature, I fear, could not bear it.

“ Need I point out to you the regular plan of county patronage in Ireland? Shall I trouble you with the well-known details? The Catholic bishop would become one of the appendages of the county patron; and, if he should, against all expectation, prove ungrateful or refractory, means would easily be found to get rid of him. If we allow the minister to appoint our bishop, it would follow that the minister would soon procure a law to authorize him to cashier the bishop, when necessary, as well as to make him. It would, indeed, follow, from the principle, that the minister was to regulate the loyalty of the bishop.

“ If he was to prevent a disloyal priest from being a bishop, surely he ought to have the power to turn off a man who had obtained a mitre by pretending to be loyal, and who afterwards proved disloyal. Every person who granted the first, must admit the fair and obvious necessity of the second. And if, in addition to all his other influence, this authority were given to the minister and his dependents, where would the torrent of corruption be stayed, or where could resistance against any future plan for the establishment of arbitrary power he hoped for?

“ I do, therefore, deprecate the veto, as an Irishman. As an ardent, an enthusiastic lover of liberty, I detest it, and would oppose it at every peril. In both capacities, as Catholics and as Irishmen, we will ever resist it; and, placing on our banners the sacred words ‘religion’ and ‘liberty,’ wage an eternal war against the open enemies and insidious foes of both. (Hear, hear, hear!—great applause.)

“ The veto is defeated, and for ever; but the question then arises, whether we shall ever be emancipated without it? I have been asked this question; my reply has been: we shall not, perhaps—probably we shall. But if we are not, we shall, at all events, have preserved our religion and our honour. If we continue in an unjust inferiority of political station, we shall, at least, remain sincere Catholics, and faithful Irishmen. We may not be able ‘to command success;’ but we will have done more—‘we will have deserved it.’

“ We have refuted every calumny; we have practically disproved every objection; we have shown how powerless the Pope is to alter, without the assent of our bishops, the discipline of the Church. And we now exhibit the determination, which we have always avowed, to resist any measures originating in Rome, of a political tendency or aspect. I know of no foreign prince whom, in temporal matters, the Catholics of Ireland would more decidedly resist, than the Pope; and



this whilst they respected and recognized his spiritual authority. (Hear, hear, hear.)

“ But we will—we must succeed. If there be an over-ruling Providence in heaven—if there be justice or wisdom on earth, we ought to expect success. Our liberties were not lost in any disastrous battle. Our rights were not won from us in any field of fight. No; our ancestors surrendered upon capitulation. A large army—many fortresses—a country devoted to them—foreign assistance at hand; all these our ancestors surrendered, on the faith of a solemn treaty, which stipulated, in return, for Ireland, ‘liberty of conscience.’ The treaty was ratified—it passed the great seal of England; it was observed—yes, it was observed by English fidelity—just seven weeks. Our claim of contract has not been worn out by time. The obligation on England is not barred by a century of injustice and oppression.

“ It has been attributed to the bigotry of the Catholics of Brabant and Flanders, that they have rejected the new constitution of the Netherlands, because it favoured religious liberty. Absurd calumny! They were, it is known, attached to the government of Napoleon, who established universal liberty of conscience; but there were many and many Irish colleges and convents in Brabant and Flanders. The inhabitants had been practically informed of the breach of faith—of the violation of solemn treaty by the first Prince of Orange who reigned over Catholic Ireland. What was so natural as that they should entertain fears lest a breach of faith, a violation of treaty should signalize the first prince of that same House of Orange that was to reign over Catholic Brabant.

“ We are not, I repeat it, overthrown in battle. Our oppression originated in injustice. It has not been justified by any subsequent crime or delinquency on our parts. For a century and a half of sufferings, we have exhibited a fidelity unaltered and unalterable. Our allegiance to the state has been equalled only by our attachment to the faith of our fathers. But we now present the extraordinary spectacle of men at one and the same time the reproach of the justice, and the refuge and succour in danger, of the British empire. Let the hardiest of our opponents say what that empire would now be but for the Catholics of Ireland.

“ Thus do the Catholics urge their claims. They complain of original injustice; they insist on present merits; they require the aid of, and they place their emancipation on, the great principle of the universal right of liberty of conscience; they call on England to behold *a prelacy promoted from their superior merits, and rendering illustrious their superior station by the unobtrusive but continued exertion of all*

*the labours and all the virtues that could ornament and dignify episcopacy.* (Great and long-continued applause.)

“ They call on England to behold a priesthood having no other motives but their sense of religion ; *seeking no other reward but the approbation of their consciences ; learned, pious, and humble ;* always active in the discharge of their duties ; *teaching the young, comforting the old, instructing the ignorant, restraining the vicious, encouraging the good, discountenancing and terrifying the criminal—visiting the hovel of poverty, soothing the pangs of sickness and of sorrow, showing the path to heaven, and themselves leading the way.* (Repeated bursts of applause.)

“ They call on England to behold a *people faithful even under persecution—grateful for a pittance of justice—cheerful under oppressive taxation—foremost in every battle,* and giving an earnest of their allegiance and attachment to a government which they could love, by their attachment to the religion which they revere—proving, by their exclusion and sufferings, their practical reverence for the obligation of an oath ; and by their anxiety to be admitted into the full enjoyment of the constitution, how powerfully they appreciate the enjoyment of civil liberty. Such a people as this—distinguishing at one and the same time spiritual authority, which is not of this world, from temporal power, which belongs to it—giving to GOD the things which are GOD'S, but preserving to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar'S—such a nation as this, prelates, priests, and people, demand, with manly firmness, but with decent respect, their birthright—LIBERTY, their honest earning : that which they maintain with their money, and sustain with their blood—the CONSTITUTION.

“ Such are the persons who require emancipation ; such is the nature of their claim. Shall I be told, then, by interested bigotry, that the people of England cannot, in conscience, grant our demands ? Conscience, indeed ! Oh, let the English conscience consult justice, and we shall soon be free. But the objection is futile and ridiculous. Why, there are now upwards of five hundred different sects in England, and our demands favour every one, except the Established Church ; for all we ask is liberty and conscience. We do not ask—we would not take peculiar privileges or individual advantages ; we ask that religion should be left between man and his Creator, and that conscience should be free.

“ Let me, however, read for you the extract of English conscience and liberality, where Ireland is unconcerned. The other day the British forces conquered the King of Candy. A treaty was, on the 2nd of March last, signed between the British officers, the representatives of our King, on the one part, and the principal Candians, on the other. It is the charter by which the sovereignty of the state is vested in the crown ; it has been accepted and confirmed by the Prince Regent, and

is now law in the island of Ceylon. The fifth article of this treaty is in these words:—

“ The religion of BOODHO, which is professed by the chiefs and by the inhabitants of these provinces, IS DECLARED INVIOLEABLE; and its rites, ministers, and places of worship are to be MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED.”

“ There are inviolability, maintenance, and protection, for the state religion of Boodho, and English conscience is not shocked. Here is the Mirth Avater, or incarnation of Vishnou, protected by the British government, maintained in all its attributes, and declared inviolable; we shall have learned dissertations, printed at the British expense, showing his powers and glory; proving him to be the Godanna of our district, and the Fohi of the Chinese; and perhaps a controversy may arise again, whether he be not the identical Woden whom one class of the mongrel ancestry of England worshipped.

“ Mark, too, that there is here no veto—no nomination by the crown talked of. The emancipation of the Candians is full and unqualified; and then we are told that conscience will prevent the full and unqualified emancipation of Catholic and unchristian Irishmen.

“ Believe me, however, that your emancipation is not remote or uncertain. The history of the world is not over. A fortnight might place an Alexander on the throne of Napoleon; and as his power is already overwhelming, I rejoice that he is of the Greek Church, lest we should be put on our securities as to him.

“ No; the history of the world is not over. It is true that legitimacy and autocracy, and all other invasions on popular rights and free choice, are for a season triumphant. The title of deliverer has become synonymous with a partitioner and plunderer. Royal declarations are only public demonstrations of the pretences which cover purposes of guile of another description.

“ But the spirit, the genius of liberty survives. Man cannot, with the knowledge he has acquired, and the examples he beholds, continue in slavery. The people cannot, even in despotic states, be despised; but in a free state, like that of England, five millions cannot continue in thralldom. Who does not perceive how fast our multitudes increase—how rapidly our strength accumulates? See within the last twenty years how we have risen from a horde of helots to a nation. Even the union, which destroyed our country, increased our importance and our numbers. England wants us, and may easily gain us. Let her act as she has done by the Candians; let her leave inviolate the religion which the chiefs and the people of Ireland possess; and we will, in return, support her by our unbroken strength, and sustain her with our young blood, in every distress, and through every peril!

“ Mr. O’Connell sat down cheered by most rapturous applause.”

## CHAPTER VI.

THE eloquent words in which Mr. O'Connell, in the foregoing speech, depicted the prelacy, clergy, and people of Ireland, are—thank God for it—if possible, even more applicable to the same classes in the present day!

His allusion to Mr. Peel led to the following affair, which, as a matter of history, we here record, as we find it in the journals of the time:—

## “ AFFAIR OF HONOUR.

“ We stated on Saturday, that an affair of honour was on the *tapis*, the circumstances of which were singularly complicated. The reader will judge with what justice the phrase was applied, by the following transcript of a correspondence which has grown out of the subject:—

“ No. I.

(FROM THE CORRESPONDENT.)

“ We are authorized to give insertion to the following letter and statement, arising, as we conceive the matter, out of a passage in a speech reported in some of the Dublin papers to have been spoken by Mr. O'Connell, in the aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics, on Tuesday last. The passage alluded to is in the following words:—

“ All I shall say of him (Mr. Peel), by way of parenthesis, is, that I am told he has, in my absence, and in a place where he was privileged from any account, grossly traduced me. I said, at the last meeting, in presence of the note-takers of the police, who are paid by him, that he was too prudent to attack me in my presence. I see the same police informers here now; and I authorize them carefully to report these my words—that Mr. Peel would not DARE, in my presence, or in any place where he was liable to personal account, use a single expression derogatory to my interest or my honour.’

## “ SIR C. SAXTON'S STATEMENT.

“ SIR—As I feel anxious that an early statement of a recent transaction, in which I have borne a part, should be before the public, I enclose a memorandum, to which I have to beg you will give insertion in your paper.

“ I am, sir, your obedient and humble Servant,

“ CHARLES SAXTON.

## " MEMORANDUM.

" On the morning of Thursday, the 31st of August, I called upon Mr. O'Connell, and informed him, that Mr. Peel having understood that he had expressed a wish, at a public meeting, on Tuesday last, that some communication should be made as from him to Mr. Peel, was desirous of learning the purport and terms of that communication, and that I had waited on him, from Mr. Peel, for the purpose of obtaining them.

" To this application, after ascertaining that what he should say would not subject him to any consequences, either of law or parliamentary privilege, Mr. O'Connell stated the expressions used by him on the occasion referred to, in terms so substantially the same as those contained in the report of his speech at the public meeting before mentioned, in the *Dublin Chronicle*, that I was induced to take that paper from my pocket, and read from it that passage which related to Mr. Peel, remarking to him its similarity with what he had just stated. To this remark he assented, admitting that it was what he had said.

" Upon this I observed to him, that as it was clear his speech alluded to something that had fallen from Mr. Peel in parliament, I was empowered by Mr. Peel to say to him, that there was nothing he had ever said, or that he had seen reported as said by him, with respect to Mr. O'Connell, that he did not unequivocally avow, and for which he would not hold himself responsible.

" As Mr. O'Connell did not offer any thing directly in answer to this communication, but was proceeding to comment on Mr. Peel's conduct on this occasion as handsome and gentlemanlike (which he subsequently repeated, with a desire that his opinion to that effect might be conveyed to Mr. Peel), I took occasion to say, that I presumed Mr. Peel might expect to hear from him, in consequence of the communication he had just received.

" His answer was, that it certainly was his feeling that a communication from him to Mr. Peel ought to follow, but that he must advise with his friends; for that, indeed, the nature of the communication with which I was charged seemed to make that course necessary. To this observation I replied, that, putting together the expressions he had then acknowledged, and the communication then made to him from Mr. Peel, the conclusion was easily drawn.

" On parting, it was settled that whatever communication Mr. O'Connell should have to make in consequence of what had passed, I might expect to receive at the house of Mr. Otley.

" Mr. Lidwill having called there, in my absence, to inquire for me, stating that he came from Mr. O'Connell, and leaving word where he was to be met with, I went to his hotel, as soon as I received notice of his visit; and, on being introduced to him, began the conversation by acquainting him that I had called, having heard that he had some communication to make to me from Mr. O'Connell, in consequence of a communication I had made to the latter by Mr. Peel's desire, the particulars of which I began to state in the terms I had conveyed them to Mr. O'Connell, and had proceeded so far as to repeat the words in which Mr. Peel avowed whatever expressions had been used by him in parliament, when I was immediately interrupted by Mr. Lidwill desiring, in the first instance, to speak, as he came from Mr. O'Connell, and to inform me, that, having been made acquainted by Mr. O'Connell (who, he subsequently added, had placed himself in his hands) with what had passed between him and myself that morning, he had called on me, not from a conviction that any communication from Mr. O'Connell to Mr. Peel was necessary, but lest my conversation with Mr. O'Connell should have led me to expect a hostile message, which it was Mr. Lidwill's opinion that Mr. O'Connell was not called upon by the circumstances to make.

" Mr. Lidwill followed up this statement with a good deal of his own reasoning on the matter, which I do not consider it necessary to relate, as it did not go in the least degree to remove the conclusion that Mr. Peel was to expect no communication from Mr. O'Connell.

" CHARLES SAKTON.

## " No. II.

## " MR. O'CONNELL'S LETTER.

" ' Merrion-square, Sept. 3rd, 1815.

" ' SIR—The very novel and extraordinary course pursued by Mr. Peel and Sir Chas. Saxton having terminated in a newspaper publication, I beg of you to publish for me the enclosed letter, which I received from my friend, Mr. Lidwill.

" ' The dexterity of my adversary in publishing on Saturday evening, has given him, what I suppose he estimates highly—one day's *talking at me*. This paltry trick he resorts to; and yet he declares that he "feels anxious for an *early statement of a transaction*" which occurred two days before!!!

" ' The conversation between Sir Charles Saxton and me is very inaccurately stated by that gentleman, in the *Correspondent*. I will only notice two particulars—first, his omitting to mention, that on my expressing *my own opinion* on the fitness of my sending to Mr. Peel, I added, "any friend would disappoint my hopes and wishes who should advise me not to call on Mr. Peel;" and secondly, his inserting the last reply which he has attributed to himself—not *one word of which did he utter in my presence*.

" ' For the rest, I leave the case to the Irish public. I have disavowed nothing; I have retracted nothing; I have refused the gentlemen nothing. I have only to regret that they have ultimately preferred a paper war.

" ' I am, sir, your obedient and humble Servant,

" ' DANIEL O'CONNELL.' "

## " No. III.

## " MR. LIDWILL'S LETTER.

" ' Kearns' Hotel, Kildare-street,  
Saturday, Sept. 2nd, 1815.

" ' MY DEAR O'CONNELL—The statement relative to your affair with Mr. Peel, made by Sir Charles Saxton in the *Correspondent* of this night, in which he says so little, and suppresses so much of what passed between himself and me on the subject, renders it necessary that I should communicate to you, in regular order, the whole of what occurred between us on both the days he waited on me here, leaving you at liberty to make what use you please of the information. When the public shall be informed that he spent twenty minutes with me on Thursday, and forty-two minutes on Friday (the visit of which day, and the object of it, he studiously conceals) in discussing the transactions which caused both interviews, and shall contrast it with the little he reports of what must have passed in such a space of time, it will naturally draw a conclusion differently from the object he had in view in making that statement.

" ' After hearing from you Sir Charles Saxton's communication from Mr. Peel, and resisting the view you took on the subject, I went to Mr. Otley's, where, not finding Sir Charles, I mentioned to Mr. Otley I came for the purpose of letting Sir Charles know (had he been there) that I did not conceive any thing which had passed between you and him on that day altered the relative position in which you and Mr. Peel heretofore stood, or rendered it in any way necessary that *you* should make, through me, any hostile communication to Mr. Peel; but that if Sir Charles should wish to see me on the subject, I would wait at home until six o'clock, leaving him my address. He came to me nearly at that hour, and was proceeding to detail what passed between you and himself, until I interrupted him, by mentioning what I said as above, to Mr. Otley, and giving it as my fixed opinion, that it was not you who should commence any hostile proceeding. He then resumed his narrative of what passed between himself and you, and added, that you thought differently from me on the subject—for that, though you said you would act under the control of your friends, yet that any friend who would advise you not to send to Mr. Peel would be, in your opinion, much mistaken, and disappoint your wishes, or words to that effect. This was the only point in which your report and Sir Chas. Saxton's, of your interview in the morning, did not exactly agree; but this, and some observations on his part, tending to alter my opinion, compelled me to assign the reasons which de-

terminated me to decide for you as I had done. I then told him, that the asperity of the language you had used respecting Mr. Peel, while under the impression of receiving ill treatment from him, had been so grossly offensive, that I considered you to be the aggressor; that the English language did not admit of an expression more galling and debasing than to say of any man, he would not dare to do, in the presence of another, what he did in his absence; that it was a broad and unqualified charge of cowardice, which a denial, or even an offer to prove unfounded, was not sufficient to repel; that though it may tend, in some respect, to set up the individual so abused, yet it did not go to punish the insult; that this impression was so strongly fixed in my mind that I told you, that if you persisted in wishing to send a hostile communication to Mr. Peel, I must decline any further interference on your part; for that it would be an unjustifiable prodigality of your own life, and a wanton aggression on that of another. After some little pause, Sir Charles Saxton asked me, if I knew what were the observations of Mr. Peel in parliament, of which you complained? I candidly acknowledged I had not seen any report which could justify your charge on him; but that you mentioned to me, he had said, in quoting some passage of a speech of yours, that in quoting you, it was not an ordinary individual, but one who could lead the Catholics of Ireland to his own purposes, and broadly insinuating that these purposes were dishonest. Sir Charles instantly replied—"Mr. Peel never said any such thing, nor any thing which justified personality to him; that he got every report he could, and that no one bore any such feature; that he would avow every one he saw, or any thing he had said." I agreed with him as far as those I had seen, and mentioned my regret at the observations you have made respecting Mr. Peel. He then apologized for trespassing so long on my time; and as he was going, I again repeated, to avoid any misconception, as I then observed, my opinion, that it was not from you any hostile proceeding should come, for the reasons I before stated. Thus ended the business of Thursday.

"On Friday, I waited at home until one o'clock, thinking it probable that, on consideration, he might judge it necessary to come to me again. Between that hour and half after two, he called twice; and the last time, he left the note I herewith enclose.—(See No. 1.) In consequence of my acquainting him I was then at my hotel, he immediately came there. I must here observe, that at the moment I sent to inform him I was at home, I also wrote a note to you (which I suppose you have), desiring that the horses might be in waiting, as I would appoint an immediate hour, and the nearest field in the county Kildare to the town of Cellbridge, for the meeting, which I conceived Sir Charles was coming to require.—(See Nos. 2 and 3.) You may judge my surprise when, on his entering my room, I saw him hold out some papers, which he said he wished to show me, as containing the substance of what passed between us the day preceding. Before he read two paragraphs of the first paper, I observed I could not agree with him. He attempted to alter them to my view; he did not succeed. I offered to meet him with my notes, and to agree on a mutual statement, if we could. He declined it. He told me, while altering, he intended to publish, but very briefly. I answered, I could neither agree to the correctness of a partial publication, nor admit the correctness of such part as he had read. He then said, for the first time, that when I told him, the day before, that I did not judge the communication he (Sir Charles) had made to you, rendered a call on Mr. Peel necessary, on your part, he considered his mission as at an end, and that every thing I said afterwards was reasoning. I told him I could not agree with him, for there was no other subject common between us, and that I considered he was even *then* on that mission. He asked, were not there some things said by me which I would not wish to have published? I replied not; for every word which I had used would only more strongly prove how firm my conviction was, that it was not from you anything hostile should proceed. Then rising to depart, he said—"I have shown you this paper." I answered—"I will not admit what I have seen of it to be correct, and I shall make my observations on whatever you publish, and add those reasons I have given for the opinion I entertain." He then left me about four o'clock. While he was altering what he had brought with him, I wrote out the paragraph, in which I mentioned my opinion, that you would not be justified by any thing which had passed, in calling on Mr. Peel; he said it was substantially correct, and, I must say, it was nearly what he has published on that head.

"This is the substance of what had passed, committed to paper on each day, as soon as Sir Charles Saxton had left me. You know how tenacious my memory is, and how perfectly this agrees with what I related to you after each interview. If I delivered a

message under these circumstances, to what reproaches would I have exposed myself! Should I do so because his friend had said he would avow a report, which would prove you had been unjustifiably severe on Mr. Peel? Did he say he would avow any thing which was either insulting to, or untrue of you? Did he tell you, you were either a calumniator or liar? No; he simply said, he would avow any paper which he himself had seen, or any thing which he himself had said, neither producing the one, nor re-asserting the other. Did his simply denying your reflection on his want of spirit was neither just nor well-founded, inflict any punishment on you for so mortifying an insult? Reason by analogy. If a man tell me I am a liar, in a certain assertion, will my denying it, and even adducing circumstances to prove I was correct, set me right under such a charge? I will thereby show I did not deserve the imputation; but must not I, to ease my own feelings, and satisfy the public opinion, seek other reparation for my wounded honour?

"If I had delivered a message, and was called on to state the grounds for it, would it be deemed a sufficient excuse, that Mr. Peel had said he was responsible for what he had said, or what he had seen reported of him to have been said, without knowing, or his avowing, what that was, or that either was offensive? No; there was but one plain and obvious course to be pursued by me. That was (in case you had been approached in a different manner,) to call on you either to produce some document to justify your asperity, or if you could not do so, to advise you to admit you had acted under an erroneous impression, and to express your regret.

"I am not inclined to doubt the courage of any man. If I was, the character of Mr. Peel, in that way, would not be raised in my estimation by his conduct on the present occasion. Labouring under a charge, which he has given ample evidence he deeply feels, he might have led you to the field; but in place of that, he has compelled you to follow him to the printing-office. In a transaction in which I know I was not only accountable to the public, but eventually might be awfully responsible to my Maker, I acted with the most mature deliberation. Whether I am as competent to form as just a conclusion on such a subject as Sir Charles Saxton, our countrymen must judge; but whatever that judgment shall be, I should be unjust, if I did not take the entire responsibility on myself, for I acted throughout without once respecting your feeling on the occasion.

"Yours, &c.

"GEORGE LIDWILL.

"Daniel O'Connell, Esq., Merrion-square."

("1.)

"Sir Charles Saxton did himself the honour of calling on Mr. Lidwill this morning, for the purpose of asking a few minutes' conversation with him, on the subject of their conference of yesterday; but, unfortunately, finding him from home, is under the necessity of troubling him with this note, to request he may be informed as soon as Mr. Lidwill returns to his hotel, by a line addressed to him at Mr. Otley's, No. 4, in Ely-place, where Sir Charles Saxton will remain, in expectation of Mr. Lidwill's answer.

"4, Ely-place, September 1st, 1815.

"George Lidwill, Esq., Kearn's Hotel, Kildare-street."

("2.)

"MY DEAR O'CONNELL—Sir Charles Saxton called on me twice while I was absent from this. The last time, he left a note to say when he would hear I was at home, he would again call on me. I expect him every moment; and therefore write this to you, to have horses ready, as I will appoint the first field adjoining Calbridge, in the county Kildare, and an immediate hour, for meeting, which I must naturally think he is now coming to require.

"Yours,

"G. L.

"Friday.

"Daniel O'Connell, Esq."

("3.)

"MY DEAR FRIEND—Do just as you please; I only think the county of Kildare ought to be the place—I care not where there. Every thing will be ready EXPEDITIOUSLY.



" My family would be less alarmed if we postpone it till morning ; but do just as you please. I will remain HERE.

" Yours,

" D. O'CONNELL.

" Harcourt-street, Friday.

" To G. Lidwill, Esq."

" Since the preceding lines were written, we understand that Mr. O'Connell received a message from Mr. Peel, in consequence of the expression used by the former—namely, that Mr. Peel chose to bring him into the printing-office, instead of the field. The message, we understand, was delivered by Colonel Browne ; but fortunately, in consequence of a communication to the Lord Chief Justice, Mr. O'Connell was put under arrest, and held to bail by his lordship. We have not heard whether Mr. Peel has been put under arrest. He had left his Lodge at the Park, at a late hour last night. We also hear that Mr. Lidwill had received a message from Sir Charles Saxton, in consequence of his statement. But we trust that both these gentlemen have been put under arrest."

The following is the account of the subsequent proceedings in this affair, as given in the same paper from which the preceding portion has been taken :—

#### " AFFAIR OF HONOUR.

" This affair of honour has, as might ensily have been seen, lengthened out to another statement. The following has been published since our last :—

" No. IV.

" At one o'clock on Tuesday morning, Sheriff Fleming got information that Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Lidwill had received hostile messages from Mr. Peel and Sir Charles Saxton, on the evening preceding, and that time and place for a meeting had been fixed. He instantly went to Mr. O'Connell's house ; and finding him in bed, gave him in charge to two peace officers, with an engagement that he would return at nine o'clock, to accompany him to the Chief Justice's. He went to Mr. Lidwill's with equal promptitude ; and having found him also in bed, took the same course which he had adopted with regard to Mr. O'Connell. He lost no time in repairing to Mr. Peel's house, in the Park, and subsequently to his residence in the Castle ; but could learn no other tidings of the object of his pursuit than that he and Sir Charles Saxton had left town the morning preceding. He made the strictest searches, but no trace of the retreat of either of the gentlemen could be found. Next morning, at the appointed hour, he appeared, with the gentlemen he succeeded in putting under arrest, before the Chief Justice ; and they were bound over to keep the peace, in large penalties. " The authority of his lordship," says a cotemporary, " in cases of this kind, is said to extend over his Majesty's dominions."

" No. V.

#### " SIR CHARLES SAXTON'S LETTER.

" Dublin, September 5, 1815.

" SIR—For the sole purpose of vindicating the accuracy of my statement, inserted in the *Correspondent* of Saturday last, and in consideration of the period which must elapse

before I could make known the following particulars in the ordinary course I have to request you will give them an early insertion in your paper.

"Mr. Dickenson, who waited on Mr. Lidwill, at my request, obtained an interview with him early this morning, and received from him the admissions annexed to the requisition, which are contained in the following paper, subscribed by Mr. Dickenson:—

"First—His admission that after he had delivered the sentence contained in my report, viz.: 'that he came from Mr. O'Connell, &c., and ending, 'Mr. O'Connell was not called upon by the circumstances to make.'

"Whatever conversation passed between us, was prefaced with an observation from me, 'that, as between ourselves, I might then be permitted to remark to him,' &c. (my remarks going to my view of the turn the affair in question had taken).

"Secondly—That in using the term 'suppresses so much,' and again, 'studiously conceals,' Mr. Lidwill does not mean to impute intentional misrepresentation.

"Thirdly—That, as well in the relation which, in my first interview with Mr. Lidwill, I gave him of what had passed between me and Mr. O'Connell, as in the written statement I read to Mr. Lidwill, on the following day, he more than once repeated that there was no disagreement between Mr. O'Connell's statement and mine, except in the very passage which I subsequently erased, and for the insertion of which Mr. O'Connell has since contended, viz., 'that he thought the office of a friend would be ill-discharged by any one who should dissuade him from a hostile step.'

"Fourthly—That the phrase I assert to have been used by me, viz., 'putting together the expressions Mr. O'Connell had then acknowledged, and the communication then made to him from Mr. Peel, the conclusion was easily drawn,' made part of my statements to Mr. Lidwill, both oral and written; and that in my second interview with him on Friday, when stating the variance between my account and Mr. O'Connell's, although he informed me that he had noticed that variance (as it appeared to him to be) to Mr. O'Connell, he did not give me to understand that Mr. O'Connell himself had made any objection, either to my accuracy in this respect, nor in respect of the passage last above quoted.

"Fifthly—That the mention of Mr. Lidwill's regret at the observations uttered by Mr. O'Connell, preceded any question of mine, or any conversation respecting the import of the words attributed to Mr. Peel, and that on hearing them from Mr. Lidwill, my observation was, 'that I did not know, but that I did not believe they were ever

"Although I do not remember to have heard this expression on Thursday from Sir C. Saxton, I believe it to have been then the impression on his mind, that he was speaking from himself, and not from Mr. Peel.

"I did not intend to charge Sir Charles Saxton with misrepresentation in using those words.

"I admit this in substance, but there may have been some variation in the words of the quoted passage. This is admitted in my statement.

"I do not recollect those words, but Sir Charles Saxton expressed himself to me as having more strongly intimated to Mr. O'Connell his expectation of a communication to Mr. Peel; and finding no variance between Mr. O'Connell's report and Sir Charles Saxton's statement to me, of what had passed between them (Sir Charles Saxton and Mr. O'Connell) except that Mr. O'Connell had not mentioned to me his remark, in respect of his being dissuaded by any friend. Of course, I did not, at my second interview, or at any other time, give Sir Charles Saxton or Mr. O'Connell to understand that any variance existed between their statements.

"I admit that I frequently expressed my regret, but at what periods I cannot say; and that Sir Charles Saxton's remark concerning the use of the words attributed to Mr. Peel, was his own answer to my quotation of the supposed words.

used by Mr. Peel, and that I had searched for them as far as lay in my power,' but that the words 'personal hostility' were never introduced by me.

"Sixthly—That his objections to my written statement were not offered until I had finished reading that part which recited my conversation with Mr. O'Connell, and that Mr. Lidwill's objection then was, that the paragraph referring to words used by Mr. Lidwill, viz., 'that Mr. O'Connell did not feel himself called upon to take any step in consequence of Mr. Peel's communication,' should have been as it is now, printed, viz., 'that he, Mr. Lidwill, did not think Mr. O'Connell called upon by the circumstances to send any hostile message.'

"Seventhly—That it was not until I insisted that it was unnecessary for me to insert Mr. Lidwill's reasoning on the subject, that he declared he could not admit any part of the proposed statement.

"(Signed)

J. P. DICKENSON."

"From the sixth article Mr. Lidwill dissented; and also required that the declaration subjoined hereto should be considered preliminary to any publication of his admissions, viz. :—

"I make this explanation in answer to Sir Charles Saxton's minute, under the stipulation that my declaration,—That I entered more freely into an explanation, because I was in the custody of the magistrate, and my arms tied up; therefore, I could not be supposed to be under any other influence on earth, but a sense of what was right—shall accompany any publication or statement made of any explanation.

"I am, sir, your obedient Servant,

"CHARLES SAXTON."

#### "TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

"Sir Charles Saxton again precedes me in publication. That which I have read in the *Correspondent* of last night surprises me not a little, for these reasons:—

"First—That he should resort to any publication at all under the circumstances in which he and I now stand mutually pledged.

"Secondly—That he should have published, as explanations given, those which were only admitted *would* be given by me, under a condition, which his friend refused to comply with, and which he was told by me, if he quitted my apartment without complying with, the whole was at an end.

"Thirdly—Sir Charles, in his publication, has complied with the very condition demanded by me, and objected to by his friend, namely, that the admission required of me, which I rejected, should be inserted, together with my rejection of it, in any statement to be published. His friend had offered to withdraw this proposal, and then to take the other explanations, as I was satisfied that I could give them.

"For these reasons, his publication has surprised me.

"Now, a word as to the explanations.

"First—that I admitted my belief of an impression upon his mind, "that in the instance referred to, he was speaking from himself, and not from Mr. Peel."

"This I could not have doubted; not only because he subsequently said so, but because he took the trouble to impress such a belief upon my mind, by an extraordinary species of argument, namely, by distinguishing his personal from his representative capacity, and observing that he could hear some of my arguments in the former capacity, though not in the latter. To the validity of this distinction I did object.

"Secondly—The English language will not admit the expressions of "suppressing and concealing," under any circumstances, to be "misrepresentation," but certainly not in the instance before us relative to Sir Charles Saxton; for he admits, in his own statement, that a great deal was said by me, which he calls "reasoning," and forbore to relate, because it did not go to remove the impression then upon his mind. This does not appear to be "misrepresentation," though certainly a material "suppression."

"The third explanation is exactly what is stated by myself, in my letter of last-Saturday to Mr. O'Connell.

"The fourth is as stated.

"The fifth, "That I expressed my regret at observations originally made by Mr. O'Connell, relative to Mr. Peel."

"This will be deemed most natural, when it is recollected that, it being my object to prove that the first hostile message should come from Mr. Peel, it was my argument to make Mr. O'Connell appear as much in the wrong originally as my sense of his error would admit; and I have already stated, in my letter to Mr. O'Connell, that I did express that regret.

"As to the latter part of that explanation, relative to the remark made by Sir Charles Saxton, as to the words attributed to Mr. Peel, I must consider the remark to have been Sir Charles's own, inasmuch as Mr. Peel could not have foreseen what answer I could make to Sir Charles's question.

"*Personality* was the term which I asserted, in my letter to Mr. O'Connell, to have been used by Sir Charles; and to the use of that term by him I adhered in my explanation.

"The sixth admission required was the only one which, in my opinion, militated against any part of the statement in my letter to Mr. O'Connell; and I rejected it at once, and demanded that it should be inserted as having been required by him, and rejected by me; and thus prove to the public that I would be as firm in refusing what I ought to resist, as willing to explain what I ought to explain.

"Sir Charles Saxton's friend refused to consent to this demand; but said that he would withdraw it entirely, as if it had not been proposed, and let the explanation number seven stand in its place, as number six.

"The seventh explanation is as stated.

"Whilst Sir Charles Saxton was altering his notes to meet my objection, and whilst I was transcribing that passage, which he said was substantially correct, as reported in my letter to Mr. O'Connell, and which I admitted was correctly published by him, Sir Charles observed that his publication would be brief, for that he would not publish my reasoning. I then rose and said that I would not consent to a partial report, or agree to the correctness of his notes as read to me, inasmuch as I did not then know whether he would publish that of mine, which he said was substantially correct, or that of his own, which he read to me before he began to alter.

"Guarding against any possible future event, I wished to give you every information relative to this part of my conduct, which has been prematurely brought before you by Sir Charles Saxton. I boldly call upon the people of Ireland to compare these explanations, as given by him, with the statements contained in my letter to Mr. O'Connell; to look at the declaration which I stipulated should accompany any publication of these explanations, and then to decide whether my honour is or is not unsullied.

"I go to the Continent in your quarrel, for I have none of my own.

"I go under the heart-rending circumstances of being obliged to put to the test the fortune of a dearly-beloved and affectionate child, in a delicate state of health, and whose only surviving parent I am, by confiding to her the truth, to save her from the torture of doubt; but I go on behalf of a country in which I have drawn my first breath. I go for a people the more endeared to me by their misfortunes, and for a cause to which my last words shall bear evidence of my fidelity.

"I feel no uneasiness for my character in my absence. Wherever I may be present, yours shall never be tarnished in my person.

"GEORGE LIDWILL.

"September 7th, 1815."

"The circumstance to which reference is made in Mr. Lidwill's letter, is very curious, and one which puts the publication of Sir Charles Sax-

ton's statement in a new and singular point of view. The reader will be of this opinion, when he is informed, that on the day previous to the publication of Sir Charles Saxton's letter, it was expressly stipulated between the friends of the parties, that Sir Charles and Mr. Lidwill should meet in Calais at some day of the present month.

"Mr. Peel, Colonel Brown, Sir Charles Saxton, and Mr. Dickinson, sailed for England last night."

It is a curious instance of the spirit of the time, that the newspapers were in violent conflict with each other, as to the manner in which each had treated of this affair, bandying about various accusations—but all evidently of opinion, that they were bound in honour not to render themselves accessory to obstructing a fight!

In our more civilized days, a higher and more Christian tone of feeling prevails, and few are the journalists, no matter how reckless, who will give even a tacit sanction or encouragement to a custom condemned alike by the laws of heaven and of man.

We continue our newspaper extracts, giving the correspondence as well as the narratives they record:—

"Dublin Castle, September 4th, 1816—6 o'clock.

"SIR—Having seen in a newspaper of this evening, a letter, bearing your signature, connected with a communication which I have recently made to you, imputing to me a "paltry trick;" and concluding with the expression of your regret that I had "ultimately preferred a paper war," I have to require that you will appoint a friend, who may, with Colonel Brown (the bearer of this letter), make such arrangements as the case requires.

"I am, sir, &c., &c.,

"ROBERT PEEL.

"Daniel O'Connell, Esq."

"A delay occurred, which is explained by Mr. O'Connell to Colonel Brown, as follows:—

"Mr. O'Connell presents his compliments to Colonel Brown, and with the utmost concern begs to inform him that the delay has been caused by a circumstance of the most painful nature—his having been put under arrest by the sheriff, which is still aggravated by his feelings, from having been done by Mrs. O'Connell, who, agitated by the publications in the newspapers, sent privately, and after he had gone to bed, to the sheriff."

"An interview subsequently took place between Colonel Brown and Mr. Richard Newton Bennett, when the following occurred:—

"Mr. Bennett waited on Colonel Brown from Mr. O'Connell, to answer the call from Mr. Peel, and stated that inasmuch as he (Mr. O'Connell) is prevented by his recogni-

zance, just entered into, from giving him a meeting within the reach of it (the United Kingdom), that he is ready to give such a meeting at the most convenient part of Europe; that Mr. O'Connell is now ready to go, but will make the time of meeting convenient to Mr. Peel, at any reasonable distance.

"Colonel Brown, being fully authorized by Mr. Peel, accepts the arrangement for the meeting of the parties, as suggested by Mr. Bennett; and proposes that Ostend should be the place of rendezvous, at which place the parties, as they arrive, should leave their address at the post-office.

"Colonel Brown suggests, that as it is impossible to fix a day for meeting, where the seas are to be crossed, that it be left to the discretion of the parties to use all convenient speed in reaching Ostend.

"Colonel Brown suggests, that the parties should engage and bind themselves to keep this arrangement in secrecy as much as possible, consistent with their convenience.

"If either party should find it convenient to delay the journey for two or three days, it is at their option, giving notice.

"Ostend is named as the place of rendezvous, but on the arrival of the parties, they may fix any place on the Continent more convenient.

"S. BROWN.

"R. N. BENNETT.

"Dublin, September 6th, 1815."

"On the evening of the 5th, Mr. Bennett informed Colonel Brown that he found more delay necessary in leaving Ireland than he had first expected, and added, that he would write to Colonel Brown on the subject.

"On the next day, September 6th, Colonel Brown, having early in the morning, intimated to Mr. Bennett, Mr. Peel's intention of leaving Ireland, addressed the following note to him:—

"Colonel Brown presents his compliments to Mr. Bennett, not having received the letter which he has expected from Mr. Bennett, he has only now to inquire if Mr. Bennett has anything further to communicate to Colonel Brown before he leaves Ireland, and to say that he feels assured that their arrangements are so fully understood that a misunderstanding is not possible.

"20, Stephen's-green, 6th September—Three o'clock."

"After this note had been dispatched, the following letter was received from Mr. Bennett, and the answer annexed returned by Colonel Brown:—

"Harcourt-street, September 6th.

"SIR—I received from you this morning an intimation that Mr. Peel intended sailing for England this night. I beg to remark that the right of appointing the time was originally vested in me exclusively, and I did not conceive that there would have been any difficulty in my adding a few days to the time at first proposed for my personal accommodation, when I had conceded to the fixing of the time, as it now stands, in courtesy to Mr. Peel's public situation.

"This surely was not unreasonable on my part, having had no idea, on leaving my country-house, that the business would not have terminated here yesterday.

"But being disappointed in this hope, it now only remains for me to apprise you that Mr. O'Connell will leave town to-morrow morning for the south of Ireland, and will embark at Cork or Waterford, and use all convenient speed in proceeding to the Continent. If a vessel can be had, and the weather answers, he intends to go all the way by sea. He prefers going by the south, from reasons suggested by the circumstances in which he now stands, all mainly tending to ensure the certainty of the intended meeting, and for the

same reason he elects to proceed by water to trusting himself in England, where the officiousness of ill-judging friends might obstruct him.

“ ‘ It is my wish to change the rendezvous to Calais, in order to accelerate the meeting, and as more consistent with the original intention, i. e., appointing the most convenient part of the Continent (which I consider the nearest), and Ostend being fixed upon under an erroneous impression.

“ ‘ I have, &c.,

“ ‘ R. N. BENNETT.

“ ‘ P.S.—I am just leaving town: my address in the country is *Newberry, Edenderry*, where I shall be happy to receive any further communication you may deem necessary; and shall be happy to co-operate with you in rendering the detail of this unpleasant business as little burdensome as possible to yourself.’ ”

“ ‘ Dublin, September 6, 1815.

“ ‘ SIR—At three o'clock this day my servant left a note at your house in Harcourt-street, since which hour I have received your letter, dated two o'clock.

“ ‘ Upon its contents I must observe that Ostend was fixed upon by us to be the place of rendezvous, upon various grounds, most of them suggested by yourself, which made it appear to be the most eligible place; Calais and Hamburgh having both been under our consideration. I shall, therefore, proceed with Mr. Peel to Ostend, in fulfilment of the agreement.

“ ‘ I presume I am to consider your letter as notice of the intended delay of your journey, as specified in our agreement.

“ ‘ I cannot pass by your desire to render the detail as little burdensome as possible, without acknowledgment; and with this view I mention, that should any communication occur to you as necessary to be made, previous to your leaving Ireland, it may be addressed to me, “ No. 20, Stephen's-green,” and it will be forwarded.

“ ‘ To obviate, as far as possible, all obstructions to arrival at Ostend, we leave this to-night.

“ ‘ I scarce need remind you of our agreement, that, though Ostend is named as the place of rendezvous, “ on the arrival of the parties they may fix on any place of the Continent more convenient.”

“ ‘ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ ‘ Your most obedient Servant,

“ ‘ S. BROWN.’ ”

“ ‘ The same day Colonel Brown received the following letter from the same party, forwarded to him from Dublin, whither it had first been directed :—

“ ‘ SIR—I had the honour of your letter of the 6th instant, by the post of yesterday, and hasten to reply to the only part of it that appears to me material to notice, until we meet, viz :—“ Whether you are to consider my letter as notice of the intended delay of Mr. O'Connell's journey?” I do not entirely agree with some of your impressions on the transactions between us.

“ ‘ With respect to that part to which I allude, I have to say that I told you I required a few days to prepare myself, having come to Dublin unprepared to go further, and I proposed to specify the time, but as you declined to enlarge our agreement, and as Dublin is not the place of embarkation, whatever time the agreement allows will be taken by Mr. O'Connell in the south, exclusive of the time occupied in travelling. On his arrival at Cork, if a vessel can be procured direct for the place of rendezvous immediately, or in a few days, he will embark; but if not, he will proceed to Waterford, and if a vessel can be got there for that place, he intends to go by it. If any considerable delay be likely to arise from such conveyance, he proposes to go in the packet to Bristol, avoiding a journey through England at all, or as little as possible, for reasons before stated. Mr. O'Connell is to write to me promptly, in ascertaining whether it would be probable that he can proceed from Cork by sea. If the opportunity be immediate, he will go on without

me, and I will follow, without a moment's delay, as well as I can. I am here nearer Cork or Waterford than at Dublin.

“As there is uncertainty whenever seas are to be passed, and especially in a long voyage, in order to save you and Mr. Peel inconvenience, I beg to suggest that it would be better not to pass to the Continent until you are apprized whether a vessel can be had direct to Ostend, from Cork or Waterford, as I shall not be here to receive an answer. I am at present at a loss how to convey this intelligence to you, as a letter to your house in Dublin, the only address you have favoured me with, would be too tedious; I shall, however, try to discover some way of doing so, if possible. Under the circumstances I have stated, I will lose no time in relieving you and your friend from the suspense which circumstances create in this unpleasant affair.”

The rest of the story can be gathered from the disjointed newspaper paragraphs, which we add to those already given—continuing our preference of their statements of the affair, to the risk of incurring the slightest suspicion of being influenced in our own narration:—

[FROM THE DUBLIN CHRONICLE.]

“After the arrest of Mr. Lidwill on Sunday, Sir Nicholas Conant, who is at the head of the police, stated that orders had been issued to officers at all the western ports, to transmit the names of the passengers on board the packets from Ireland, to the office of the Secretary for the Foreign Department. He added, that the object of this regulation was, to prevent the possible escape of Mr. Lidwill or Mr. O'Connell, that they were watched at every stage since their arrival, and orders sent down to all the ports on the coast opposite France and Holland, to prevent their embarkation.

“Mr. Lidwill, however, succeeded, as he supposed, in avoiding a discovery, and concealed himself from the moment of his arrival, until his arrest in London, being about fifteen or sixteen hours. His retreat was discovered by a Bow-street officer, who, having made out Mr. Prittie, followed him closely, and traced him to the apartments of Mr. Lidwill. Mr. Lidwill being put under an arrest on Sunday, remained in custody until Monday, when he was brought before Lord Ellenborough, Chief Justice of the King's Bench in England, when he was bound over, under a penalty of £3000, not to leave the kingdom, for the purpose of fighting a duel with Mr. Peel, or Sir Charles Saxton, until the first day of next term. What the ultimate control is, to which Lord Ellenborough looks forward, we cannot say, particularly as the entire of the proceeding, on the part of his lordship, seems altogether of a novel character, and must raise a legal question for consideration.

“Mr. O'Connell having been informed of the arrest of Mr. Lidwill, changed his lodgings, and used every means to avoid detection. It was



necessary, however, to obtain passports from the Dutch ambassador ; and accordingly, the friends of Mr. O'Connell proceeded for that purpose to the house of his excellency, but could not see him during that day, although they remained there from an early hour. Several of the officers from Bow-street, and the other police offices, were at that time dispatched to the different hotels, and their vicinity, in search of Mr. O'Connell, while others were stationed at the different roads, to prevent his escape.

“ At a late hour in the night the friends of Mr. O'Connell succeeded in obtaining the passports from the Dutch ambassador, without which they could not travel to Ostend, or in any other part of the dominions of the king of the Netherlands. Arrangements were then made for departure before daylight ; Mr. O'Connell was to have taken the route by Brighton, and his friends to have proceeded by Calais ; but the officers continued on the watch, and succeeded in arresting Mr. O'Connell as he was in the act of starting, about four o'clock in the morning.

“ Mr. Prittie and Counsellor Bennett left London on Tuesday to proceed to Calais, to notify the interruptions which prevented the attendance of Mr. Lidwill and Mr. O'Connell.

“ Private communications from London, of Tuesday evening, state that Mr. O'Connell had not, at that hour, provided bail.”

#### “AFFAIR OF HONOUR.”

[FROM THE GLOBE OF WEDNESDAY.]

“ At a late hour on Sunday evening, Mr. Lidwill and Mr. O'Connell, with their respective friends, arrived in town, on their way to the Continent, according to a previous arrangement with Mr. Peel and Sir Charles Saxton. Early on Monday, Mr. Lidwill was taken into custody at his hotel, and, after entering into the necessary arrangements, was bound over to keep the peace both here and elsewhere.

“ Immediately on being apprized of this fact, Mr. O'Connell made the necessary arrangements for pursuing his journey to the Continent, and in furtherance of this purpose, in the course of Monday, he removed from the British Hotel, to Holyland's Coffee House, Strand, with the view of leaving town without further delay. He was, however, pursued by the magistracy, and, while in the act of leaving town yesterday morning, at six o'clock, he was taken into custody by the Bow-street officers, who, as it subsequently appeared, were stationed in the vicinity of the hotel for that purpose, so early as three o'clock in the morning. They had beset Mr. O'Connell's servant in the carriage, and at the same moment, one of the party entered the hotel, and took him into custody.

“The officer felt it necessary to be so particular as to accompany Mr. O'Connell from the coffee-room to his dressing-chamber. Soon after ten o'clock, Sir R. Conant arrived, and after a conversation with Mr. O'Connell, which was at different intervals repeated in the course of the day, but which it would be premature to relate, the magistrate whose name we have mentioned, consented, at five o'clock in the evening, to release Mr. O'Connell, on his own personal responsibility, from the custody in which he was placed, until this morning.

“The parties, whose progress to the Continent has been intercepted late last night, sent forward to the gentlemen expecting their arrival at Calais, a statement of what has occurred. The gentlemen who bear this communication, are said to be furnished with a *carte blanche* for the definitive arrangement of this very protracted and most unpleasant affair.

“Mr. Lidwill and the Honourable F. Prittie visited Mr. O'Connell repeatedly in the course of yesterday.

“Lavender was the officer who arrested Mr. O'Connell, by virtue of a warrant from the Lord Chief Justice. So completely was Mr. O'Connell pursued by the *winged* messengers of the law, that the officer had information of the time when the post-chaise was ordered. He was also furnished with an accurate description of Mr. O'Connell's person, which he showed that gentleman, after he took him into custody. At eleven o'clock this morning, Sir N. Conant waited on Mr. O'Connell by appointment, at his hotel, and conducted him to Sir Simon Le Blanc's chambers, for the purpose of his entering into the necessary recognizance.

“The recognizance was taken before Sir Simon Le Blanc. The terms of it are as follows :—That Mr. O'Connell shall keep the peace, himself in a bond of £1000, and two sureties in £500 each. He is also required to remain in London until the first day of next term. To the latter part of the recognizance Mr. O'Connell strongly objected, in consequence of the professional inconvenience to which he would be exposed by an absence from Ireland at such a period. Sir Simon Le Blanc replied, that if the other conditions of the bond were fulfilled, the objectionable part might possibly, on application to a judge in chambers, be revoked.

“Mr. O'Connell required the affidavit to be read, on which the warrant for his arrest was grounded ; this request was, of course, complied with, and it appeared that the person who had sworn to the fact of Mr. O'Connell's intention to proceed to the Continent to fight the Right Honourable Robert Peel, was Mr. James Becket. The learned judge took occasion to say, that as a question had elsewhere been started rela-

tive to the legality of the binding over beyond the limits of the kingdom, he felt it right to express his decided opinion as to the validity of the present course of proceeding. Mr. O'Connell's sureties were Mr. O'Neill and Mr. Patterson.

"Connected with this transaction, we think it right to state that Mr. O'Connell, who did not arrive in town until late on Sunday night, lost not a moment on Monday in procuring the necessary passports, which, in consequence of a delay to receive the counter-signature of the Dutch ambassador, in the event of the parties proceeding to Flanders, where Mr. Peel was said to be waiting, were not ready until late on Monday night. Our readers are aware that he was arrested early on Tuesday morning, although he had taken every pains, by a concealment, and even a change of his address, to elude discovery.

"Mr. O'Connell's recognizance in Ireland is £10,000."

An obscure morning paper states, that Mr. Ponsonby, one of Mr. Lidwill's bail, is the Right Honourable George Ponsonby, leader of the opposition in the House of Commons. The print is as ignorant as it is obscure. The Mr. Ponsonby alluded to, is the Honourable George Ponsonby, brother of Lord Ponsonby.

[FROM THE COURIER OF WEDNESDAY.]

"We yesterday copied from a morning paper, a paragraph relative to Mr. Lidwill, in which it was stated, that 'Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Butler, who appeared as Mr. Lidwill's bail, endeavoured to shew that Lord Ellenborough exceeded his powers in requiring security to such an extent of place; but Lord Ellenborough justified the measure.' We can now declare, on the most unquestionable authority, that not a syllable passed of the nature here alluded to."

[FROM THE COURIER OF THURSDAY.]

"An incorrect statement having appeared in another paper, we publish the following, which will be found to be correct:—

"Mr. Prittie and Mr. Lidwill came direct from Holyhead. Mr. Lidwill was arrested by Sir N. Conant, whilst at dinner, at the Clarendon Hotel, Bond-street, not many hours after he had risen from his bed, on Saturday last, and as Sunday was not a day on which the

Right Honourable the Chief Justice (Lord Ellenborough) transacted business, he could not be bailed until Monday.

“Mr. Lidwill and his friend came to town in a direction contrary to Mr. O'Connell, who arrived from the South of Ireland. Mr. Lidwill was discharged by Lord Ellenborough on Monday morning. Mr. O'Connell was not arrested until Tuesday morning. Mr. Prittie left town for Calais on Monday, in the carriage which was to take him and Mr. Lidwill to that place, if the recognizance had been in the usual way. Of course, therefore, he could not wait on Mr. O'Connell several times on Tuesday. Indeed, he left town without knowing that that gentleman had been in it.

“Yesterday, Mr. O'Connell was conducted to Mr. Justice Le Blanc's chambers, where he entered into recognizances to keep the peace, himself in £1000, and his two sureties, Messrs. Patterson and O'Neill, in £500 each.”

The affair being thus arrested, immediate notice was sent, by letter, to Mr. Peel at Ostend, and all parties returned to their respective avocations in Ireland.

We now gladly revert to the general business of Mr. O'Connell's career.

On Wednesday, the 8th of September, he moved—at a meeting of the “*Catholic Association*,” as it was called—for a committee of seven to go round the different parishes to collect subscriptions towards defraying the expenses of the deputation about to proceed to Rome on the “*securities*” question.

Mr. O'Connell himself, with Messrs. Mahon, M'Donnell, Evans, and Lyons, were appointed to draw up a remonstrance to his Holiness the Pope.

The clerical deputation consisted of His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, the Right Rev. Dr. Murphy (at present Bishop of Cork), and Archdeacon Blake, all three revered personages still happily adorning the Irish Church, the last named being now the much respected and beloved Bishop of Dromore.

On the 14th September appeared a letter from the Right Rev. Dr. Milner (in answer to Mr. O'Connell's allusions to him in a speech we have given some pages back), repeating his disclaimers of vetoistical inclinations.

The following remonstrance to the Pope was drawn up by Mr. O'Connell, and adopted by the Catholic body :—

“TO HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS VII.

“THE HUMBLE ADDRESS AND REMONSTRANCE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

“MOST HOLY FATHER—We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, most humbly approach your Holiness, imploring for five millions of faithful children, the apostolical benediction.

“We desire, Most Holy Father, to address your Holiness in respectful and unreserved terms; that so your Holiness may be perfectly informed of our fears, our desires, and our determinations.

“We deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to remind the Sovereign Pontiff of our Church, of our peculiar claims to his protection and support; for we cannot, for a moment, imagine that your Holiness is unmindful of the constancy and devotion manifested towards the Holy See, by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in despite of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people.

“We cannot, however, abstain from reminding our Most Holy Father, that although the persecution which we and our ancestors endured, was notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon us, on account of our adherence to, and connexion with, the Holy See; nevertheless, the Roman Catholics of Ireland never solicited the predecessors of your Holiness, at any period of that persecution, to alter, in the slightest degree, that connexion, or make any modification of the existing discipline of our holy Church, to obtain, for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the repeal or mitigation of those cruel laws which proscribed them.

“With sentiments of most sincere sorrow, we have heard that, notwithstanding the uniform manifestations of our spiritual attachment to the Holy See, it has pleased your Holiness to favour a measure which would enable a Protestant government to control the appointment of our prelates; against which the Catholic voice of Ireland has protested, and ever will protest with one accord. No spiritual grounds are alleged for the proposed alteration in our ecclesiastical system; it is not pretended that it would advance the interests of religion, or improve the morality of the Catholic people of Ireland; on the contrary, it is proposed in opposition to the well known and declared opinions of our spiritual guides, and is offered as an exchange or barter for some temporal aid or concession; it therefore becomes our duty, as Catholics and as subjects, to state, in most explicit terms, our sentiments upon it.

“It is considered right to assure your Holiness, in the first instance, that although the penal laws, which were framed for the oppression of the Catholics of Ireland, have been considerably relaxed during the reign of our present most gracious sovereign; nevertheless, the hostility to our holy religion continues to exist in full force; and every artifice is practised, and every inducement held out, to seduce the Irish Catholic from the practice and profession of his religion. Rewards are given to every Catholic clergyman who apostatizes from his faith; public schools and hospitals are maintained, at great expense, in which hostility to the creed and character of Roman Catholics constitutes the first principle of instruction; commissioners are appointed to prevent Catholic institutions receiving any benefit from the donations of pious persons; societies are established, under the favour of our rulers, for proselytizing the Catholic poor; and bribes offered and given to Catholic parents, for the purchase of their children's faith; at the same time, that every effort of bribery and corruption is exerted to influence Roman Catholic schoolmasters to seduce the Roman Catholic children entrusted to their care, from an attachment to their creed. Every member of the legislature, every minister of the government, every judge of the land, every superior naval, military, or civil officer, and almost every individual in official station, is obliged to swear, and has actually sworn, in the following words, viz. :— I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe, that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in

the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose, by the Pope, or any authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void from the beginning.'

"It is to persons who have taken these offensive oaths of hostility against our holy religion, that we are now required, Most Holy Father, to confide the selection and appointment of the prelates of our Church; and thus, the efforts of persecution having been found unsuccessful, it is now sought to accomplish, by intrigue, the destruction of that Church, whose pre-eminence has excited the jealousy and the hatred of our religious opponents.

"We cannot suffer ourselves to suppose that your Holiness would knowingly sanction so pernicious a measure; for, it is our decided conviction, that any such concession to our Protestant Prince, or to his Protestant ministers, of a right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of our prelates, would inevitably destroy the Catholic religion in Ireland. Its first consequence would be, a general indignant revolt against the framers or favourers of the detested system, without regard to rank or station; and it is not difficult to imagine that so lamentable a breach would lead to such a state of distrust and dissatisfaction, as might end in the dissolution of that confidential connexion, in spiritual concerns, which at present so happily subsists between the Holy See and the Roman Catholics of Ireland. The prelates and priesthood would be shunned and despised; the altars and confessionals would be deserted; a state of irreligion and immorality would succeed in the place of the religious and moral conduct which at present distinguishes the people of Ireland; public disorders and private misfortunes would follow, and our neglected Church would become an easy prey to those who now labour for the extirpation of the Roman Catholic faith from this nation.

"We desire to assure your Holiness that the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland feel, towards their prelates and their priests, the most enthusiastic esteem and attachment; they look up to them not merely as spiritual guides, but also as confidential friends and faithful advisers. The trials of persecution created a system of mutual affection and support, which enabled each to bear up against the severities of sanguinary laws. These mutual services are not forgotten; the sentiments which they generated remain unchanged; and, therefore, we never can consent, that our pure and pious hierarchy should be contaminated by such a connexion, as must endanger their just influence, and render them objects of dislike and distrust among their faithful flocks.

"These are some of the results expected by the favourers of the proposed measure, to follow its enactment; but there are other objects also in their contemplation. They seek, and ardently desire, to destroy the spiritual authority of the Holy See in this country; and we are confident that their expectations would be ultimately fulfilled, if they could establish the desired revolution in our ecclesiastical system; because experience has taught us, that wherever any interference of the ministers of the British crown has been allowed, they have ultimately succeeded in obtaining absolute and exclusive control.

"Your Holiness must be sensible of the injustice of the imputations directed against our venerable hierarchy, by those persons who express a desire to provide further securities for their peaceable and loyal conduct. Their correspondence with the Holy See is, of course, open to the inspection of your Holiness; and we entertain no doubt but they may, with perfect safety to their political characters, challenge the most scrutinizing and jealous reference to the communications which constitute that correspondence. Again, their conduct at home is watched with more than common vigilance; the most trifling instance of disaffection would be gladly exposed, and yet their characters not only remain unimpeached, but the highest officers of the crown, resident in this island, have borne testimony to their loyalty, and to their laudable exercise of that influence which their station and conduct had obtained for them, over their respective flocks. The ministers of the crown are already invested with ample powers to correct any subject or stranger who may disobey the laws; and no instance has occurred in this country, of any man, of any sta-

tion, having escaped punishment, in consequence of the insufficiency of the existing laws to provide for his correction.

"Neither should it be forgotten that our venerable prelates are bound, by most solemn oaths, to observe strictly loyal and peaceable conduct; of which oaths we annex copies hereunto, and humbly submit them to the inspection and consideration of your Holiness. And we are, therefore, confident that this demand for further securities is not founded upon any apprehension of the existence of a necessity for them; but that it has originated solely from a desire to enable the enemies of our holy religion, by the admission of such interference and encroachments, to accomplish the destruction of a Church which they have so long, ineffectually, assailed.

"We feel that we should be wanting in the practice of that candour, which it is our pride to profess, were we not further to inform your Holiness that we have ever considered our claims for political emancipation to be founded upon principles of civil policy. We seek to obtain from our government nothing more than the restoration of temporal rights; and must, most humbly, but most firmly, protest against the interference of your Holiness, or any other foreign prelate, state, or potentate, in the control of our temporal conduct, or in the arrangement of our political concerns.

"We, therefore, deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to state to your Holiness the manifold objections of a political nature which we feel towards the proposed measure. We have confined ourselves, in this memorial, to the recapitulation of objections, founded upon spiritual considerations; because, as on the one hand we refuse to submit our religious concerns to the control of our temporal chief; so, on the other hand, we cannot admit any right, on the part of the Holy See, to investigate our political principles, or to direct our political conduct; it being our earnest desire and fixed determination to conform, at all times, and under all circumstances, to the injunctions of that sacred ordinance which teaches us to distinguish between spiritual and temporal authority, giving unto Cæsar those things which belong to Cæsar, and unto God those things which belong to God.

"Thus, then, Most Holy Father, it appears—while this obnoxious measure is opposed by every order of our hierarchy, that we, for whose relief it purports to provide, feel equally ardent and determined in our resistance to it; solemnly declaring, as we now do, that we would prefer the perpetuation of our present degraded state in the empire, to any such barter, or exchange, or compromise of our religious fidelity and perseverance.

"We, therefore, implore your Holiness not to sanction a measure so obnoxious to the most faithful and disinterestedly attached portion of the universal flock. Our hostility is founded on experience and observation; whereas, the remote situation of your Holiness renders it necessary that the Holy See should rely upon the representations of others, who may have been interested in the practice of delusion or deceit; for the Roman Catholics of Ireland never can believe, that their revered pontiff, who had endured so much of suffering in maintenance of his spiritual station, would, knowingly and intentionally, invade or oppress the conscientious feelings of a Catholic people, who had endured nearly three centuries of persecution, in consequence of their devotion to the same religious system.

"If this our determination be erroneous, we should regret that we and our ancestors had not long since discovered the error; as the Catholics of Ireland could, by making such sacrifices, have already obtained relief from the penal code which oppressed them. But, we do not lament our perseverance; on the contrary, we are confirmed in our conviction, that a conscientious adherence to the same course will ultimately obtain the approval of the Holy See, and ensure the admiration of every faithful member of the Christian Church.

"If it shall please our temporal rulers to impose this obnoxious regulation upon us, we must bow down our heads before the ordinance of the All-Seeing Providence; and, humbly confiding in his merciful protection, meet this new trial with the same religious spirit as has enabled us to survive every similar persecuting provision. Grievously, indeed, would we lament, if our enemies should succeed in alienating the mind of your Holiness from so many millions of faithful children. Should it, however, unhappily appear that the influence of our opponents is more powerful than the prayers of such a people, we would still proceed in the course which practice and persecution have tried and proved.

"We will not, however, anticipate so calamitous and so portentous a determination on the part of your Holiness; we will rather cherish our accustomed confidence in the Holy See, and, resting on the benign Providence of the Divine Founder of our faith, we will look forward to such a determination on the part of your Holiness, as will ally our reli-

gious anxieties; preserve, undisturbed, the peace of a Church enthusiastically devoted to its spiritual chief; and thereby perpetuate, by indissoluble bonds, the spiritual connexion which has been so long maintained between the See of Rome and the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

"For these purposes, and with these views, we lay this our humble address and remonstrance at the feet of your Holiness, praying a favourable consideration; and again imploring the apostolical benediction.

"THOMAS ESMONDE, Chairman.

"EDWARD HAY, Secretary.

"I certify that the above address and remonstrance was framed by the Association of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, pursuant to the directions of the aggregate meeting, held on Tuesday, the 29th day of August last.

"NICHOLAS MAHON,

"Chairman of the Association.

"Dublin, September 16th, 1815."

The foregoing address was duly forwarded to Rome; but after a period of vexatious delays and inconclusive negotiations, the fact came to be known that it would not be received there officially; as that would be taken to be a formal recognition of the right of lay interference in a matter held by many authorities to be exclusively of an ecclesiastical nature.

There is nothing that need delay us in the records of the popular struggle during the remainder of 1815, or the early part of the succeeding year.

In January, indeed, of that year, the "seceders," as the *soi-disant* aristocratic party of the Catholics were generally designated, showed some activity in giving trouble; and in that and the following month, the strange and discouraging spectacle was more than once presented to the Irish public, of *two distinct* meetings of Catholics in the metropolis; the seceders at Lord Trimleston's house; and the "Catholic Association," at Fitzpatrick's, in Capel-street; the first resolving to entrust their "*emancipation-with-securities*" petition to Mr. Grattan in the Commons; the other equally resolving to entrust their "*unconditional emancipation*" petition to Sir H. Parnell. Both chose the same person in the Lords—Lord Donoughmore—to present their respective petitions in the upper house.

On Tuesday, 5th March, 1816, an aggregate meeting of the Catholics took place in the present Church of St. Teresa, Clarendon-street. The following resolutions passed.

"RESOLVED—That the Most Rev. and Right Rev. the Catholic prelates of Ireland, at



a meeting held by them in the city of Dublin, on the 23rd and 24th of August, 1816, did unanimately enter into a resolution in the following words;—

“That it is our decided and conscientious conviction that any power granted to the government of Great Britain, of interfering, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of Bishops for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, must essentially injure, and may eventually subvert the Roman Catholic religion in this country.”

“RESOLVED.—‘That with the conviction deeply and unalterably impressed upon our minds of the purity and sincerity of the venerated prelates who adopted the foregoing resolution, and of the plain truth and certainty of the conclusion which they have thus announced, we should consider ourselves as betraying the dearest interests of our religion, and of our country, did we not most unequivocally declare, that we will, AT ALL TIMES, AND UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, deprecate and oppose, by every means that the laws have left us, any such interference as the Catholic prelates and people have so often and so emphatically condemned.

“RESOLVED.—‘That the sole pursuit of the Catholic people of Ireland being liberty—civil as well as religious—we should deem ourselves base and degraded, were we to purchase any advantages for ourselves, by consenting to any arrangement, which, by increasing the undue influence of his majesty’s ministers, must injure the civil liberty of our fellow-subjects, of every religious denomination.

“RESOLVED.—‘That we re-adopt the resolution of the 13th March, 1806, that the holdings of meetings at any private house, for the general concerns of the Catholic body, is unfavourable to the freedom of discussion, and inadequate to the collection of public sentiment.

“‘That any meeting convened for the consideration of Catholic affairs, and involving the interests of the body at large, brought about by private invitation and partial selection, must be injurious to the interests of the Catholics of Ireland.’”

“The Chairman opened the proceedings by lamenting the conduct of the seceders, and condemning the vetoistical tendency of the petition which emanated from them. He expressed a hope that they would see the error of their ways, and that the division among the Catholics being healed, all would once more unite their efforts in the cause. He also recommended immediate endeavours to conciliate the Protestants.

“MR. O’CONNELL said that he was prepared to do everything for conciliation, except surrendering the venerable religion of his fathers and of his country.

“It was not his wish to attack the private feelings of the seceders, nor his desire to say anything of them as individuals. But he would denounce them as a body, and would prove them the enemies of their religion, their country, and their God!

“He then read several resolutions of the Catholic Board, and of various aggregate Catholic meetings, at which the Earl of Fingal and several others of the ‘seceders’ had presided and attended—resolutions strongly declaring their hostility to the measure of the veto. He drew attention to one in particular, moved by Lord Killeen, and seconded by Lord Trimleston (then Mr. Barnewall), which declared that they could not offer in sincerity, any species whatsoever of ‘security,’ nor admit any arrangement or interference of the Crown in matters touching their religion, such interference being, in their opinions, only an exchange of one species of servitude for another.

"Yet (said he), these noble lords now tender the veto to the legislature!

"What is the meaning or interpretation to be put upon this resolution, other than that given by the plain and obvious signification of the words? Were these noble lords then sincere, or are they sincere now? Do they mean to gladden the hearts of our enemies and persecutors, by fostering, in their shameful inconsistency, the belief that there is mental reservation in the minds of Catholics!

"So far as to the people—but how do they stand with regard to the prelates?

"The prelates have declared, that any interference of the Crown must injure, and might subvert their religion. This is their solemn and emphatic declaration. And now the seceders presume to assert that our venerated prelates are insincere! and that, in the name of the HOLY GHOST, they have published a FALSEHOOD to the world!!!

"I restrain my feelings, my natural feelings at this most daring presumption of theirs, and I limit myself to the tame and measured phrase that they, these seceders, are thus clearly acting inconsistently with the declaration of the hierarchy, and what is of infinitely less importance, with their own conduct!

"I oppose the measures of the seceders, because they are pregnant with the worst mischief. I would wish to hear any man explain their conduct, and justify, if it *can* be justified, the disgraceful and slavish sentiment which they have avowed."

The speaker then proceeded to comment, in considerable detail, upon all the circumstances connected with the getting up of the petition of the seceding party, and upon various other matters having relation to the subject of his preceding observations.

Before concluding, he further took occasion to withdraw, with many terms of respect and compliment, all the *expressions* which had fallen from him at a former meeting, with reference to the Right Rev. Doctor Milner, declaring that he had since learned that his lordship was steadily adverse to the veto, and had lately opposed it at the Court of Rome, with all his well-known energy and ability."

The year 1816 closed, without any formal condemnation of the veto by the head of the Catholic Church, and indeed, with not a few indications of a disposition at the Court of Rome, to

treat the proposition with more tolerance than had been dreamed of. The friendship and support of England were then (as it has been whispered, that in some degree they recently were) held to be matters of too great value, not to have every possible effort and sacrifice made to retain them. Like the high irregular waves of the sea, prevailing after the tempest has subsided, the surface of European society yet upheaved ominously and wildly upon every side, distracting the timid mind with a thousand fears and gloomy imaginings, and impelling it to any expedient that gave a chance of temporary safety.

At home, the voice of Ireland had, indeed, spoken out by the mouths of the majority of her hierarchy, and the entire of the second order of clergy; with the unanimous concurrence of the people. So far the question might have been considered closed and determined. But the resolves of a nation, ruled and legislated for by strangers, have their strength and effect only in the momentary strength and concentration of the popular mind; and any of the thousand influences that can be brought to bear on the latter for the purpose of division and distraction, will, if successful, neutralize and destroy the value of what has been previously accomplished.

And there were sadly depressing causes at work in Ireland! The miserable policy of England (policy, alas! little departed from to this present hour) had long before established the conviction that any concession, any grace from her, was only to be won under the pressure of adverse circumstances. Hope of any spontaneous justice, or free-will "*benevolence*" on her part, there was none. The vicissitudes of the sanguinary war, which had been for so many years waging, appeared to offer the only substantial chance for a real alleviation of Irish miseries, a real attention to Irish claims. So long, then, as war existed, so long there appeared some chance for Ireland.

The Irish were not to blame for this state of things. It was not their fault that the interests and mutual feelings of two islands, neighbouring each other, forming parts of the same empire,

and apparently designed by nature to be in friendly alliance, were in antagonism. Supplications without number, crouched in the most pacific, most calmly reasoning, most conciliatory language, had gone forth from them, to the controllers of their destinies in England. The answers had been in insulting words of refusal, and act of flagitious tyranny. Little wonder then, that England's difficulties should have been looked to with a gloomy hope.

But the Irish looked for nothing more than the inevitable concessions of just claims by England in her difficulty. In the sound heart of the nation, there was no desire for French alliance, France, still reeking with the filthy mire of her infidelity, and darkly crimsoned with the stale and unexpiated blood of her revolutionary massacres, was not the companion to whom enfranchised Ireland would have held out the hand. Religion and morality—the only sure groundwork for social order and national prosperity—must have suffered from the connexion, and therefore, Ireland would have none of it.

Where the Catholic party hoped, the Orange party feared and trembled. They were, of course, equally aware of the unfailing coincidence of English difficulty and concession, and had alternated between extravagant joy, and extravagant trepidation, according as the arms of the allies, or those of the French emperor, had prospered in the progress of the struggle. Their exultation at Napoleon's fall, in 1814, had been violent, but speedily dashed and reversed by his sudden astounding recovery of his throne and power, in the beginning of the succeeding year. Where they exulted, the Catholics grieved; where they desponded, the Catholics began to hope.

At length the final reversal came to the hopes of the Catholics, as to the fortunes of Napoleon. Waterloo was fought, Napoleon a prisoner, France subdued, and the alliance most blasphemously styled "Holy!" was let loose upon civilization, and mankind's rights, to work its devilish will. England was in her palmiest hour of triumph, and, as a necessary consequence, her heart was harder than ever towards poor Ireland!

The delight and triumph of the Irish Orangemen may be imagined, but could scarcely be described in words. All dangers seemed over—all hope, all chance shut to the Catholics. Toryism—cruel, strong-hearted, insolent toryism, was rampant, not only in those countries, but all over prostrate Europe. Their ascendancy they believed to have got a new lease—a lease most likely for another century—full license to plunder, oppress, and trample upon their unhappy fellow-Christians, and fellow-countrymen.

As their scale went up, that of the Catholics, of course, went down—down to the very ground. Spirit, hope, life—all seemed quenched—gone out for ever among the so lately well organized and energetic Catholic body.

Mr. O'Connell speaks of this period as one of the most trying of his eventful life. By no kind of means, by no manner of exertion, and he *did* look about for means, and *did* use a thousand exertions, could he arouse the Catholics to action, or even to a defensive position. For more than two years a moral lethargy, a faint-hearted and hopeless apathy hung over the country, and, with the exception of himself, scarce any one was in the field for Ireland.

To such an extent did this helplessness and inactivity prevail, that even the rent of the rooms in Capel-street, tenanted by the Catholics for the purposes of their meetings, was unpaid, until Mr. O'Connell put his hand in his own pocket for the purpose. Resigning them as too expensive, he took smaller rooms in Crow-street, and for a long time discharged all expenses connected with them, and with all that remained of the "*working*" of the Catholic cause.

During this period of depression, had the fell designs of the British minister against the independence of the Catholic Church in Ireland, been actively pushed, there is much reason to believe they would have been successful. But where human help failed, Divine Providence interposed to save us. In the high-flushed pride of her extraordinary successes, England, as it were, for-

got Ireland, and the schemes for corrupting the Irish mind and heart, which had seemed so important, while a chance remained of foreign interference. Or, if she remembered these matters, the idea appeared ridiculous of going to any trouble to delude and seduce a people absolutely, and as she thought hopelessly and irremediably beneath her feet.

The "veto" was therefore abandoned—abandoned at the moment when the chances of forcing it on Ireland were strongest—abandoned when the Catholicism for which our fathers suffered and died, seemed past human help, and "the gates of hell" for a moment seemed about to "prevail."

Why should we then despond in this our present crisis of Catholicism?

We have not alluded to Mr. O'Connell's professional career as yet in this volume, as no reports, except of the most meagre and scanty description, are to be found of his bar speeches, during the interval it embraces. His advance in the profession was great, and his income, term after term, and circuit after circuit, greatly increasing, with a rapidity entirely unprecedented. In order to accelerate the progress of this work, we omit here (reserving them for a more advanced stage), anecdotes connected with, and illustrative of his uninterrupted success in *this* branch of his engrossing avocations.

## CHAPTER VII.

IN January, 1817, Mr. O'Connell gave every assistance in his power to an abortive attempt made in Dublin to get up a society of "Friends of Reform in Parliament." It was composed of Protestants and Catholics, and, though its numbers were very limited, and its duration did not extend beyond a few meetings and dinners, it was so far valuable as being the first occasion since the Union, when Irishmen of differing creeds had associated on something like terms of equality in one body.

Early in February occurred a collision with the vetoists, or "seceders." Profiting by the general apathy we have mentioned as prevailing in the popular mind, this miserable little coterie had been busy in their small way, meeting, speechifying to each other, resolving and labouring with infinite pains to show the minister how anxious they were to subserve his hostility to Irish ecclesiastical independence, if he would only renew and carry on his attacks with his pristine activity.

The following notification from them appeared in the Dublin papers, at the end of January :—

"It is the intention of the gentlemen who have called the meeting of the 4th of February next, while they adhere strictly to the principles contained in their petition of last year, (*i. e.* the seceders' petition entrusted to Mr. Grattan), to evince, by the measure which they intend to propose to the meeting, a desire that the general feeling of the Roman Catholic body may, as far as possible, be attended to! in any 'arrangements that may eventually accompany a bill of relief to the Catholics of Ireland.'"

It is amusing to note the coolness with which this little knot of trimmers announce their gracious desire to have *some* consideration for the opinions of the rest of Ireland.

The meeting was advertised for the day above stated, and to be held at No. 50, *Eccles-street*. Mr. O'Connell and the leading gentlemen of the popular movement determined that it should not be one of a hole and corner description; and accordingly he, with several of his colleagues, attended at the time and place named. They were stopped in the hall by a servant boy, who showed them a resolution signed by Lord Southwell and Sir Edward Bellew, to the effect that the meeting was confined to those who had been parties to sending a Catholic petition to Mr. Grattan in the preceding year. But, as the public advertisement had announced no such reservation, they refused to be bound by this private arrangement, and accordingly proceeded up stairs.

NICHOLAS MAHON opened the battery on the astounded vetoists assembled in scanty numbers up stairs. He said he attended in the assertion of his right as a Catholic, to attend to what was his individual concern, as well as that of the body at large, and therefore would remain.

LORD SOUTHWELL referred to the terms of the notice in the hall, and "hoped gentlemen would withdraw."

MR. O'CONNELL said, he for one would certainly not do so. He entirely denied the right of any portion of the Catholic body to form themselves into a privileged class, or an Orange lodge, out of which they could exclude any other Catholic looking for emancipation.

Besides, he said, he had come there that day in the perfect spirit of conciliation, and to make propositions that might tend to combine the entire Catholic body in one great exertion. The propositions were so reasonable that nothing could resist them, but a determination to dissension, or for the veto.

There was a long consultation between Lord Southwell, Sir E. Bellew, and his brother, Counsellor Bellew. At last Lord Southwell being moved to the chair,

SIR EDWARD BELLEW, disclaiming personal disrespect, moved to adjourn, as persons not summoned were present. Mr. O'Con-



nell opposed the motion, and after some time, succeeded in getting the motion withdrawn.

SIR EDWARD next moved two resolutions drawn up by his brother: the one calling on Mr. Grattan to move on their petition of the last year, and the other expressly recognizing the right of the legislature to make a law *controlling the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church, but praying of them not to infringe either.*

These resolutions were seconded by RANDAL M'DONNELL, Esq., and opposed in strong terms.

MR. O'CONNELL next spoke. The following is the newspaper extract, given by authority:—

“ He first pointed out the weakness and imbecility of the Catholic cause last year, which he traced to division and dissension in the Catholic body. This was freely and fully admitted.

“ He then adverted to the ‘*reasons*’ by which the ‘*seceders*’ had last year justified their division. First, ‘*intemperance.*’ He asserted that there was now not a shadow of intemperance. This, too, was admitted on all hands.

“ Secondly—‘*the introduction of extraneous topics.*’ He asserted, that all extraneous topics had then been abandoned; and this also was admitted.

“ Thirdly—‘*taking away the petition from Mr. Grattan.*’ This point he offered to concede. It could easily be done without interfering with the petition in Sir Henry Parnell’s hands. Another petition may be instantly prepared to be given to Mr. Grattan, and that petition Mr. O’Connell offered to sign, if it excluded the veto.

“ Fourthly—‘*the want of any offer of conciliation, or arrangement in the petitions of the people.*’ Even this had been obviated. The people this year had adopted a petition already signed by Lord Fingal and Lord Southwell, Sir Edward Bellew, and others. And they had actually given up the point of simple Repeal, by acceding to the arrangement, which was short of the veto—domestic nomination.

“ These were all the alleged causes of dissension and division. The popular party had conceded all, or were ready to concede all of them—and Mr. O’Connell further offered to make any other concession which could produce unanimity—anything connected with an expressed or implied assent to any vetoistical measure always excepted.

“ He then called on the seceders to say, whether they would do anything, or take any one step for unanimity ; and to this question, though put repeatedly, he could get no reply.

“ He lastly shewed, that before this meeting, there was perfect unanimity ; and if the seceders did not, by now coming forward, take away from the Catholic cause the strength which unanimity would otherwise give it, there was, in the present state of affairs, the greatest likelihood of success, unless the cause was retarded and embarrassed by conflicting petitions, and discordant petitioners.

“ He concluded by entreating, at all events, further deliberation, and an adjournment for three or four days, with the appointment of a committee, to consist of Sir E. Bellew, Randal M'Donnell, James Connolly, and Nicholas Mahon, Esqrs., who could meet in the meantime from day to day, and consider whether there were any means of reconciling all parties in the Catholic body, and procuring unanimity.

“ Mr. James Connolly proposed, and Counsellor Howley seconded an adjournment accordingly, and Mr. R. M'Donnell assented to it, saying that the meeting would certainly be inexcusable with the country, if it did not, at least, make an attempt at conciliation.

“ The proposition, however, was *rejected* by fourteen to four. Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Mahon, Mr. M'Laughlin (Cornelius), Mr. O'Kelly, and the other *popular* Catholics, were excluded from the vote by the Chairman, on the ground of their not being parties summoned. The minority were Messrs. M'Donnell, Connolly, Howley, and Phelan. The majority are described as seven barristers, (or ‘counsellors’), of whom two were pensioners, viz. Bellew and Lynch (Sir Edward Bellew), two persons totally unknown, and three very young men equally unknown ; ‘and thus (continues the report we have extracted from) was totally rejected all affectation of wishing to strengthen the Catholic cause by unanimity, or of concealing any longer the ardent desire for a veto.’

“ MR. O'CONNELL then rose and said, that he had done his duty. He had exerted every faculty of his mind, and every good feeling of his heart, to promote unanimity. He had taken away all pretext—all colour or shadow of excuse from the few who had set themselves up in opposition to the Catholic body, and had made them, by their own act, demonstrate that they only sought for dissension and distraction, and that they had no other ultimate object but to increase the corrupt influence of the ministry, at the expense of the religion and liberty of Ireland !

“ He would no longer consent to remain among them ; but he would announce to them this undoubted truth, that their puny efforts for a veto were poor and impotent, and would be blasted by the voice of the Catholic clergy and people of Ireland, whose zealous, honest, and con-

scientious opposition to that measure, only accumulated as the attempt to betray them appeared more manifest. It was ridiculous to expect success for that measure, from such miserable support, against the universal voice of Ireland.

“Mr. O’Connell and the other gentlemen of the popular party then withdrew.”

A separate statement of this affair was, a few days afterwards, put forward by Mr. Bellew, chiefly giving his own speeches on the occasion in fuller detail, and varying in some unimportant particulars from the preceding. There was, however, no impeachment of the main facts as already given.

Notwithstanding the refusal of the “seceders” to do their part in the work of conciliation, a “conciliating committee” of Catholics was formed, to endeavour to keep matters in the right channel, and at the same time suggest any concessions compatible with preserving Catholic independence.

This body issued a circular, inviting the co-operation of every Catholic. It was drawn up in the spirit of Mr. O’Connell’s remarks to the Eccles-street coterie; repudiating the veto, securities, &c., &c., as matters against which the nation had pronounced; and suggesting as follows:—

“There is an arrangement which would take away all pretext of argument for our enemies, and which has already been sanctioned by our prelates, and received the full approbation of the people—it is that of domestic nomination.”

Under this title was meant the system prevailing at the present day, when the Catholic bishops of Ireland are only *selected* by the Pope out of a list or lists forwarded to him from the prelates of the province and the clergy of the vacant diocese. It had come practically into operation in the recent election of as excellent a bishop, and as true a patriot as ever lived—the late Right Rev. Dr. Kernan, Bishop of Clogher.

A short speech of Mr. O’Connell’s, at one of the first meetings of the “Conciliating Committee,” gives a striking view of the difficulties and perils besetting the Catholics at this time:—

“MR. O’CONNELL said he rose for the purpose of moving to post-

pone the aggregate meeting from Friday next (the 28th February, 1817), to a future day.

“There were many reasons which rendered this postponement expedient, perhaps necessary; the principal one was the threatened suspension of the habeas corpus act. It was not yet known whether Ireland was or was not included, or to be included within the effect of such suspension; if it were, then it appeared to him that the best course to pursue would be to withdraw the Catholic petition altogether, and to abandon all claims for legislative relief, until the constitutional protection from unjust imprisonment should again be available. There was no pusillanimity in this advice, and the only credit he claimed with his oppressed countrymen was, that of being capable of giving them advice of such a tendency. If it were deemed right to offer up a victim to that rancorous and malignant hatred which the bigots in Ireland, cherished against those who had exerted themselves for Catholic freedom, he for one was perfectly ready to be that victim; but at present it struck him, that one example of unjust suffering by a Catholic, would only encourage the bigots amongst their enemies, and the venal amongst themselves, and, perhaps, prevent many honest but more cautious persons from ever coming forward.

“Besides the suspension of the habeas corpus act, which would leave the personal liberty of every individual in the land at the mercy of the minister of the day, whoever he may be, appeared to him an evil of such tremendous magnitude that all lesser evils should give place to it; and, in the contemplation of so monstrous a calamity, they should forget their individual grievances. As long, therefore, as that vital part of the constitution should remain suspended, he, for one, would most earnestly recommend the suspension of all meetings, petitions, and applications to the legislature.

“There was another point of view in which he deemed this relaxation from petition necessary. When the habeas corpus act shall be suspended, the minister might take up his threatened veto bill, under the name of an emancipation bill. He might seek to enlarge his own influence upon the ruins of the Catholic Church in Ireland, under the name of emancipation. If any man dared to call the people together to remonstrate against the veto—if any attempt were made to resist it by the expression of public indignation, would it not be competent for persons in power to interrupt the organs of the public sentiment, and to immure them in prison for as long as they might think fit. Thus, while the opponents of the veto were silenced by the hand of authority, and sent, perhaps, into solitary confinement, to expiate in the long and heavy hours of seclusion, their criminal fidelity to the ancient faith of

Ireland, the veto might be enacted; *as if in pursuance of their own petition.* To obviate those fearful possibilities, it would be best to withdraw the petition, and officially to inform the legislature that all we desired for the present was, to be left in a state of oblivion!

“ He concluded by saying he would move a postponement until Tuesday next; by which day it would be known whether the present protection of the law would remain, or be taken away. That result would enable the Catholics to determine on their course of proceedings.”

What a state of things! A whole people likely to have to petition, not for a positive boon—not for an act of relief—but *to be let alone!* And yet the only thing at all novel in the circumstances would have been, that any attention should be given to their humble supplications!

The next post relieved the Catholics of this fear; Lord Sidmouth expressly declaring in the House of Lords, when moving the first reading of the habeas corpus suspension act, that there were no circumstances requiring that its operation should be extended to Ireland.

But, out of one trouble or difficulty, the Catholics were a long way from being at ease or in safety. The Irish vetoists were as hard at work, or harder than ever. Both Mr. Grattan and Sir Henry Parnell declared openly and unreservedly for the veto; and at the same moment an alarming letter from the Rev. Richard Hayes, agent for the *anti-vetoists* at Rome, was received, detailing intrigues in support of the measure which threatened to be successful with the authorities there.

The following is an abstract of this long and deeply-interesting letter:—

It commences with stating that the hopes of the vetoistical party at Rome, with Cardinal Gonsalvi at their head, had been revived by the coming of “ young Wyse, late of Waterford, and a Counsellor Ball;” that “ these youths had repeated to the cardinal, to the pope, to Cardinal Litta, and other officials, that ‘ all the property, education, and respectability of the Catholics of Ireland were favourable to the veto; that the clergy were secretly inclined to it; but were overruled by the mob,’ &c., &c.

. . . . . It is true that Cardinal Litta now abhors the veto more, if possible, than any Catholic in Ireland; and the pope is resolved to take no step without his advice; yet you may judge of the intrigue, when the miserable farce of these silly boys is given the importance of a regular diplomatic mission."

The letter then went on to complain of the stoppage and interruption of his correspondence with Ireland, in its passage through different countries:—"What a combination of misfortunes—Italian villainy, French tyranny, British corruption, vetoistical calumny, and, more than all, apparent Irish neglect, have conspired to throw your affairs into the utmost difficulty and danger. Now or never a more powerful effort should be made in Ireland; or the infernal veto, with all its tribe of evils, religious and political, will sink the wretched country of our birth and dearest affections, lower than she has been even in the periods of bloody persecution!"

The writer concluded by requesting to have two coadjutors sent to him: Dr. Dromgoole and the Rev. Mr. M'Auley.

Mr. O'Connell postponed the consideration of this important document until after the approaching aggregate meeting.

On Thursday, March the 6th, this meeting took place. The following were the resolutions adopted:—

"RESOLVED—'That we duly appreciate the value of unanimity amongst the Catholics, and approve of the measures lately resorted to, in order to produce that desirable result. But we cannot recognize any basis for such unanimity, save such as shall exclude any species of vetoistical arrangement whatever.'

"RESOLVED—'That the people of Ireland, in former times, sustained the loss not only of civil liberty, but of their properties, and many of them their lives, rather than relinquish the faith and discipline of the ancient Catholic Church of Ireland; and that we, their descendants, are equally attached to that faith and discipline, and equally determined to adhere thereto, notwithstanding any temporal disadvantages, penalties, pains, or privations.'

"RESOLVED—'That the Catholic prelates of Ireland, assembled in solemn synod, did unanimously enter into the following resolution—"That it is our decided and conscientious conviction, that any power granted to the Crown of Great Britain, of interfering, directly or indirectly, in the appointment of bishops for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, must essentially injure, and may eventually subvert, the Roman Catholic religion in this country."

Upon the following resolution being read—

"RESOLVED—'That we should not receive, as a boon, any portion of civil liberty, accompanied by that which the Catholic prelates and people of Ireland have condemned as

essentially injurious, and probably destructive to our religion ; and we do solemnly declare, that we infinitely prefer our present situation in the state, to any emancipation which may be, directly or indirectly, coupled with the veto :”

MR. Woulfe (late Chief Baron), rose and made a very honourable retractation of his own opinions in favour of the veto ; and commented sharply upon the conduct of the seceders.

On the fifth resolution, viz. :—

“ That the concurrence of all classes of Catholics in the measure of *domestic nomination*, ought to prevail unanimously amongst ourselves, and to obviate the alarms, however unfounded, of the enemies of our emancipation :”

MR. O’CONNELL requested, before it was put, that Mr. Grattan’s late letter should be read ; which being done, he addressed the meeting, recommending that an answer should be returned, distinct, emphatic, and unmistakeable ; repudiating all species of veto. He then proceeded to explain away a mistake of Mr. Woulfe’s. Domestic nomination was not a new suggestion, but a return to the ancient practice of the Catholic Church. He concluded with an earnest appeal to the Catholics to imitate their enemies in unanimity, and ultimate success would be theirs.

Letters were accordingly addressed, not only to Mr. Grattan, but to the other chief parliamentary advocates of the Catholic cause, conveying the spirit of these resolutions. Mr. Grattan returned a simple acknowledgment of receipt. Lord Donoughmore, on the contrary, expressed his warm concurrence with the sentiments of the majority of the Irish nation ; and his entire abhorrence of any arrangement that would give the British minister more power of corruption than he already had. Equally satisfactory was the letter of Sir Henry Parnell.

A motion was subsequently made in the House of Commons, to take into consideration the Catholic claims ; and in the discussion upon it, the views of the Catholics with regard to the veto and its *substitute*—“ domestic nomination,” were explained. But Catholic and Irish affairs were, now that the war was long done, and England busy settling her accounts after it, matters of very secondary importance ; and so the motion was hastily negatived.

The affair between Sir R. Peel and Mr. O'Connell, two years before, was again brought to men's memories by the following occurrence. The account which we give, from a London newspaper, will explain itself without further preface :—

“MR. O'CONNELL AND SIR N. CONANT.

“We understand that on Thursday, the 5th instant, Sir N. Conant called at the Holyland's Hotel, in the absence of Mr. O'Connell, and requested to know at what hour Mr. O'Connell would be at home. He called again on Friday morning, and was shown into Mr. O'Connell's private apartments.

“SIR N. CONANT began by stating that he called on Mr. O'Connell, in his official capacity as a magistrate, having received information from the Irish government, that Mr. O'Connell was in London to procure the discharge of his recognizance, and then to proceed to the Continent, in order that Mr. Peel might follow him there to fight a duel; that it therefore became necessary that the recognizance should be renewed.

“MR. O'CONNELL inquired whether Sir Nathaniel had stated the full extent of his information? and being answered in the affirmative, he declared that it was not correct; that it was now Term time, when his absence from Ireland was extremely inconvenient, and that his intention was, the moment his recognizance was satisfied, to return to Ireland as speedily as possible.

“SIR NATHANIEL said, that this declaration, so far as it went, was quite satisfactory, but that it was requisite Mr. O'Connell should promise *not to go to the Continent at any future period, and invite Mr. Peel to follow him there to fight*, or otherwise the discharge of the recognizance should be opposed, and a further security required.

“MR. O'CONNELL replied, that it was never pretended that he was the challenger; that for his part he had no kind of claim on Mr. Peel. The demand had never lain with him, and it was, therefore, absurd to suppose he would send any message to Mr. Peel; but that as to any promise, he would certainly make none.

“SIR NATHANIEL then said, that in such case, the Court of King's Bench would be applied to, and would continue to keep Mr. O'Connell bound by a recognizance.

“MR. O'CONNELL answered, that from the gross partiality which had pervaded the entire conduct towards him in this transaction, he could well believe that such an application would be made. But he had too much respect for the Court of King's Bench, to believe that it would render itself accessory to any such vexatious and partial disposition—no



matter in what quarter it might exist. He reminded Sir Nathaniel, that the warrant upon which he had acted, was issued upon the affidavit of Mr. Becket, Under-Secretary of State; and purported to include four persons—Sir Charles Saxton, Mr. Peel, Mr. Lidwill, and Mr. O'Connell himself. That it had been executed against the two latter only—while the execution of it against the two former was *carefully avoided*; yet that his recognizance had been kept in force for nearly two years. He did not complain that Mr. Peel was not under a similar obligation; but he expressed his intention to use that fact in resisting any application against him to the King's Bench, as affording decisive proof that in the opinion of those who sought to keep him bound in recognizances, there was no real necessity for any such precaution.

“SIR NATHANIEL CONANT observed, that in whatever part of the world Mr. Peel and Mr. O'Connell should fight, if the event were fatal, the government were determined to prosecute the survivor, and, if convicted, to execute him.

“MR. O'CONNELL answered, that Sir N. Conant had once before used the same language to him; but that the proposition was then, as well as now, stated too largely.

“If he (Mr. O'Connell) should happen to be the survivor, he could hardly doubt, after the partial manner in which he had been treated in this transaction, but that such proceedings would take place against him; while he was certain that if Mr. Peel was the survivor, such proceedings would not take place at all.

“SIR NATHANIEL CONANT said that Mr. O'Connell *could not blame public men for being favourable to each other.*

“He then used many arguments to induce Mr. O'Connell to promise not to invite Mr. Peel to follow him to the Continent; but Mr. O'Connell totally rejected any discussion on that point; and utterly refused to bind himself by any species of promise—the more particularly as the nature of the transaction could never require any such promise from him; and thus, we understand, the conversation terminated.

“SIR NATHANIEL, it is said, in the course of the conversation, expressed a wish for the amicable settlement of the dispute between Mr. Peel and Mr. O'Connell; stating that when he had Mr. Beresford taken into custody in 1796, for sending a challenge to Lord Fitzwilliam, upon his lordship's return from the government of Ireland, the noble lord and Mr. Beresford shook hands, and the dispute terminated.

“Upon this Mr. O'Connell made no remark, nor do we think it necessary to offer any.”

This statement produced a letter from Sir N. Conant, denying

or varying some of the expressions attributed to him, but not impeaching the substance of it. (Mr. O'Connell, however, replied by positively re-asserting his statement.) He concluded by saying, that, under all the circumstances, he felt he would but do his duty in binding over both parties afresh.

This was not done. On application, in due form, Mr. O'Connell's English recognizance was discharged. A motion to discharge his Irish recognizance was made in the Irish Court of King's Bench: the Chief Justice, however, insisted on its being postponed till Michaelmas Term, and Mr. O'Connell's counsel (Mr. Bennett) had to give way, protesting against being compelled so to do.

Upon the 3rd of July, an aggregate meeting was held, to pass resolutions confirmatory of the previous sentiments of the Catholic body, against all arrangements of a vetoistical character, and in favour of "domestic nomination; also, pledging the Catholics to petition early in the ensuing session; and, finally, returning warm thanks to Lord Donoughmore, Sir H. Parnell, and their other *real* parliamentary friends.

It was at this meeting that the public were first made acquainted, by a speech of Mr. O'Connell's, with the circumstances (detailed in our first volume) respecting Counsellor Bellew's three pensions from Government.\*

The Catholic Board was re-organized by a resolution of this meeting; the members of the former body, and of the old Catholic Committee, the short-lived Catholic Association, &c., &c., to be original members, with power of addition, &c. Resolutions were passed at their first meeting, July 12th, for greater activity against the veto, and in favour of "*domestic nomination*," as also for

"A letter of complaint and remonstrance to the See of Rome, upon the indignities offered by the temporal authorities to the very respect-

\* With respect to Mr. Bellew's third pension, Mr. O'Connell quoted Parliamentary Paper No. 806, of 1817, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on the 8rd of June. At page 2, the eighteenth name is that of Mr. Bellew, for £150 per annum, date 16th of June—he having, on the preceding 29th of May, done service for it in attacking the bishops.

able delegate of the Catholics of Ireland—the Rev. Mr. Hayes, and demanding that he should be immediately recalled.”

The reverend gentleman had been ordered to quit Rome, his zeal against the veto intrigue having raised a host of enemies against him.

On the subject of this letter, an opposition arose in the Catholic Board, on the 19th July, when Messrs. Mahon, O’Gorman, &c. &c., denied the Rev. Mr. Hayes’ character of delegate, but after some debate their objections were refuted, and the opposition withdrawn.

The following was the main part of an address to the second order of the Catholic clergy of Ireland, unanimously adopted.

After referring to the treatment of the Rev. Mr. Hayes, it thus went on :—

“ This expulsion has been produced by the intrigues of the unrelenting enemies of our religion and country. Their emissaries remain at present in the uncontrolled and unchecked possession of those mercenary statesmen of the Court of Rome, who are ready to sell the inheritance of the Lord for a mess of pottage.

“ To increase the alarm felt by the Catholic people of Ireland, it has been announced that those emissaries are about to be reinforced by Sir John Cox Hippeley, whose active exertions to procure the servitude and degradation of the Catholic Church of Ireland are too well known to require description.

“ The active exertions of the enemies of our faith are public and notorious. The guardians of that faith will not slumber, nor will they despise dangers which may overwhelm them in ruin.

“ The revered prelates of our Church have publicly and solemnly declared, that any interference on the part of the Crown with the nomination of our bishops, must essentially injure, and may eventually subvert, the Catholic religion in Ireland.

“ Our enemies are using the most strenuous exertions to procure this nomination for the Crown? Shall the Catholic clergy of Ireland behold the threatened peril, and look on in silence?

“ For our parts, we are determined never to submit to that interference. Our ancestors forfeited property, and were prodigal in the submissive effusion of their blood, rather than acquiesce in the infringement of the spiritual supremacy of the venerated head of our Church.

“ We, their descendants, would, we trust, cheerfully follow their example. We have learned too well the lessons you have taught us, not to know the distinction between that allegiance which we owe, and have always paid, exclusively to the government of these countries, in temporal affairs, and that fidelity which is due to the head of our Church, in spiritual concerns.

“ We feel that language is inadequate to express the gratitude and respect of the Catholic people of Ireland towards their esteemed pastors and clergy of the second order. They do not presume to suggest any mode of proceeding to them at the present crisis, confiding, as they implicitly do, in their zeal and piety to adopt such course in support of their bishops, as shall be most conducive to the purity and safety of the religion committed to their care. We deem it also our duty, at this alarming crisis, to declare that upon every occasion, on every event, in persecution or in toleration, you shall ever meet the respectful and cordial support of the Catholic laity of Ireland, who esteem your learning, revere your piety, and reverence the holy and unabated zeal with which you have ever fulfilled the sacred duties of your profession.

“ EDWARD HAY, Secretary.”

A most respectful address, of the same tendency, was also forwarded to the bishops, and by them generally well received, and responded to with renewed pledges against the veto.

The next meeting of the Catholic Board was occupied with a matter, which had already drawn forth the strong condemnation of the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and his coadjutor.

“CATHOLIC BOARD.—‘RHEMISH BIBLE’

“THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1817.

“MR. O'CONNELL said that on the last day of meeting, he gave notice that he would move for a committee to draw up a disavowal of the very dangerous and uncharitable doctrines contained in certain notes to the Rhemish Testament. He now rose to submit that motion to the consideration of the Board. The late edition of the Rhemish Testament in this country gave rise to much observation. That work was denounced by Doctor Troy. An action is now depending between him and a respectable bookseller in this city, and it would be the duty of the Board not to interfere, in the remotest degree, with the subject of that action, but on the other hand, the Board could not let the present opportunity pass by of recording their sentiments of disapprobation, and even of abhorrence, of the bigoted and intolerant doctrines promulgated in that work. Their feelings of what was wise, consistent, and liberal, would suggest such a proceeding, even though the indecent calumnies of their enemies had not rendered it indispensable. A work called the *British Critic* had, no doubt, been read by some gentleman who heard him. The circulation of the last number has been very extensive, and succeeded, almost beyond calculation, the circulation of any former number, in consequence of an article which appeared in it on the late edition of the Rhemish Testament. He (Mr. O'Connell) said he read that article. It is extremely unfair and uncandid; it gives, with audacious falsehood, passages as if from the notes to the Rhemish Testament, which cannot be found in that work; and, with mean cunning, it seeks to avoid detection by quoting without giving either text or page. Throughout, it is written in the true spirit of the Inquisition: it is violent, vindictive, and uncharitable. He was sorry to understand that it was written by ministers of the Established Church; but he trusted that when the charge of intemperance should be again brought forward against the Catholics, their accusers would cast their eyes on this coarse and illiberal attack. Here they may find a specimen of real intemperance. But the very acceptable work of imputing principles to the Irish people

which they never held, and which they abhor, was not confined to the *British Critic*. The *Courier*, a newspaper whose circulation is immense, lent its hand; and the provincial newspapers throughout England—those papers which are ever silent when any thing might be said favourable to Ireland, but are ever active to disseminate whatever may tend to her disgrace or dishonour—they have not hesitated to impute to the Catholics of this country the doctrines contained in those offensive notes, and it was their duty to disclaim them. Nothing was more remote from the true sentiments of the Irish people. These notes were of English growth; they were written in agitated times, when the title of Elizabeth was questioned on the grounds of legitimacy. Party spirit was then extremely violent. Politics mixed with religion, and of course disgraced it. Queen Mary, of Scotland, had active partizans, who thought it would forward their purposes to translate the Bible, and add to it those obnoxious notes. But very shortly after the establishment of the college at Douay, this Rhemish edition was condemned by all the doctors of that institution, who, at the same time, called for, and received, the aid of the Scotch and Irish colleges. The book was thus suppressed, and an edition of the Bible, with notes, was published at Douay, which has been ever since adopted by the Catholic Church; so that they not only condemned and suppressed the Rhemish edition, but they published an edition, with notes, to which no objection has been, or could be urged. From that period there have been but two editions of the Rhemish Testament: the first had very little circulation; the late one was published by a very ignorant printer in Cork, a man of the name of M'Namara, a person who was not capable of distinguishing between the Rhemish and other edition of the Bible. He took up the matter merely as a speculation in trade. He meant to publish a Catholic Bible, and having put his hand upon the Rhemish edition, he commenced to print it in numbers. He subsequently became a bankrupt, and his property in this transaction vested in Mr. Cumming, a respectable bookseller in this city, who is either a Protestant or a Presbyterian, but he carried on the work like M'Namara, merely to make money of it as a commercial speculation.

“And yet,” continued Mr. O'Connell, “our enemies have taken it up with avidity. They have asserted that the sentiments contained in those notes are cherished by the Catholics in this country. He would not be surprised to hear of speeches in the next parliament on this subject. It was a hundred to one but that some of our briefless barristers have already commenced composing their dull calumnies, and that we shall have speeches from them for the edification of the legislature and the protection of the Church.

“ There was not a moment to be lost. The Catholics, with one voice, should disclaim these very odious, these execrable doctrines. He was convinced that there was not a single Catholic of any description in Ireland that did not feel with him, the uttermost abhorrence of such principles. Illiberality has been imputed to the Irish people; but they are most grossly, most cruelly wronged. It had been his fortune often to address the Catholic people of Ireland, and he knew them well. He had ever found them prompt to applaud every sentiment of liberality, and the doctrine of perfect freedom of conscience—the right of every human being to have his religious creed, whatever that creed might be, unpolluted by the impious interference of bigoted and oppressive laws. These sacred rights were never advocated—these enlarged and generous sentiments were never uttered at a Catholic meeting, whether aggregate or otherwise, without receiving, at the instant, the loud and unanimous applause of the assembly.

“ It might, to be sure, be said, and doubtless would be, that those meetings were composed of mere rabble. Be it so. For one, he would concede that, for the sake of argument. But what followed? Why, just this: that the Catholic *rabble*, without the advantages of education, or of the influence of polished society, were so well acquainted with the genuine principles of Christian charity, that they, the rabble, adopted and applauded the sentiments of liberality and of religious freedom, which, unfortunately, met but little encouragement from the polished and educated of other sects.

“ He owed it to his religion, as a Catholic and a Christian—to his country, as an Irishman—to his feelings, as a human being, to utterly denounce the abominable doctrines contained in the notes of this edition of the Rhemish Testament.

“ He was a Catholic upon principle; a steadfast and sincere Catholic, from the conviction that it was the best form of religion; but he would not remain a Catholic one hour longer, if he thought it essential to the profession of the Catholic faith, to believe that it was lawful to murder Protestants, or that faith might be innocently broken with heretics;—yet such were the doctrines to be deduced from the notes to this Rhemish Testament.

“ His motion, in conclusion, was for a sub-committee, to whom the matter should, in the first instance, be referred. The strongest form of disavowal should be drawn up, and might be very properly submitted for the sanction of an aggregate meeting. Copies should then be immediately circulated everywhere, and in particular be sent to every member of both Houses of Parliament, to the dignitaries of the Protestant Church, and the Synod of Ulster,” &c. &c.

MR. ENEAS MACDONNELL *opposed* the motion ! but his opposition was speedily scouted, and the motion carried ; the sub-committee to be, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Scully, Mr. O'Kelly, Mr. Mahon, and " Pius Æneas" himself.

It is unnecessary to give here the details of a personal affair which arose about this time between Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Leslie Foster. The latter, through a friend of his, demanded an explanation of some words reflecting on him, in a speech of Mr. O'Connell's. Mr. Bennett, Mr. O'Connell's friend, reminded the other parties that the Irish Chief Justice had refused to discharge Mr. O'Connell's recognizance, in the sum of £10,000, to keep the peace towards *all his Majesty's subjects* ; that the words being the fair public comment upon the character of a public man, could not be withdrawn nor apologized for ; and that if, under all these circumstances, Mr. Foster persevered in demanding a meeting, Mr. O'Connell, though denying his right to do so, would go abroad to give it to him. Mr. Foster very properly declared that he was satisfied the affair should terminate.

The last acts of the Catholics, in the year 1817, were to send forward their " Remonstrance" to the Court of Rome, and to receive the report of their agent at that court, the Rev. Richard Hayes. His report, abstracted and abbreviated, will be found in the Appendix.

The year 1818 passed over without much of interest occurring on which we need delay the reader. The apathy over the popular mind was at its height ; and where any effort was attempted, dissension and division were sure to interfere to stop all progress. It would be difficult accurately to convey an idea of what Mr. O'Connell justly styled, upon one of the few public occasions then occurring, " the depression of those miserable times."

In June, 1818, an answer was at last received from the Court of Rome, and read at a meeting of the Catholic Board, on Saturday, the 6th of that month.

It commenced with stating, that the reason an earlier answer had not been made, was twofold ; first, that the sentiments of the

Court of Rome had been made known to the bishops of Ireland, who were considered the more proper channel for the communication ; and, second, that however sincere the assurances of respect, &c., on the part of the lay Catholics, there were some phrases used by them, with regard to the extent of the papal authority, which did not give satisfaction.

It went on to state that the intended concession to the British government was proposed in what appeared the interest of the Catholic religion in these countries ; as emancipation, if thereby purchased, would give relief to the suffering Catholic body, remove temptations to apostacy, and also impediments to conversion from the dissenting sects.

But that the arrangement was entirely meant to be conditional, and only conditional upon the *previous* passing of the Emancipation Act.

It concluded with a justification of the proceedings against the Rev. Richard Hayes.

That reverend gentleman, before the document was read, protested that, while yet ignorant of its contents, he did, in any point in which it might blame him, express his entire submission and contrition, and would supplicate pardon from his Holiness.

A committee, consisting of Messrs. O'Connell, Lanigan, Mac Donnell, Scully, Howley, and Woulfe, were appointed to consider what steps should be taken in this matter.

A public dinner, given upon a very handsome scale, to Thomas Moore (and of which Mr. O'Connell was the chief promoter), on the 8th of June, afforded an opportunity for the following renewed expression of truly liberal and truly Irish feelings.

The chairman (Earl of Charlemont), after the leading toasts had been given, proposed

"The Managing Committee, and many thanks to them for their exertions."

"There was a general cry for MR. O'CONNELL.

"He came forward with some reluctance, and declared that he had no affectation at all upon the subject, but could not recognise any claim he had to any peculiar notice on such an occasion as the present.

"When gentlemen met to express the national sentiment towards the



most delightful of the bards of Old Erin, it was quite refreshing, he said, to see the cordial alacrity with which men of every party combined in that testimony to his talents and his worth. The Irish legend celebrated the fame of the Saint of Ireland, at whose command every venomous reptile quitted the land, but it would remain for history to celebrate the more glorious and useful triumph of the Poet of Ireland, at whose presence all that was rancorous and malignant in the angry passions of absurd partizanship, ceased, and violent and virulent disputation became converted into a scene of peace, harmony, and affection.

“ It was a pleasing, a delicious change, and might be perpetual, if Irishmen of all parties would recollect that there were generous, kindly, brave, and good men of every party ; and that, however in the zeal of contention, those good qualities might be denied, yet they did, in fact, live and reside, as in a chosen home, in the bosoms of Irishmen of every faction, sect, and persuasion. (Loud cheers.)

“ This work of conciliation and natural affection was most suited to the man who combined in himself the most splendid and the most endearing qualities—who was alone and at the same time the sweetest poet, the best of sons, and the most exquisite Irishman living. (Loud applause.)

“ For himself, all he should say was, that nothing could give him greater pleasure than to be able to extinguish party zeal for ever, and to join in a national exertion for the benefit of all the inhabitants of his native land. He was a party man, to be sure ; but it was his misfortune, not his fault, to be so. He, however, belonged to the party of the oppressed and excluded ; and if he had been born in Madrid or in Constantinople, he vowed to God he would in either place be more intemperate and violent for the protection of the persecuted Protestant in the one, and of the trampled-down Christian in the other.” (Continued applause.)

From this public dinner to Tom Moore, our hasty narrative must jump to a dinner given to Mr. O'Connell himself, in October, at Tralee, the chief town of his native county.

“ On Monday last, October 24th, 1817, a public dinner was given, at the Mail-coach Hotel, in this town, to Counsellor O'Connell, in testimony of the approbation of the gentry of his native county, of his public and private character. The concourse of gentlemen at this dinner was greater than had ever before been seen in Kerry. The entire first floor of the hotel was thrown into one ; but the room was still not large

enough to contain the entire company. Near thirty were under the necessity of dining in one of the parlours.

“ JOHN BERNARD, of Ballynaguard, Esq., was in the chair. The vice-president was JOHN STACK, of Ballyconry, Esq. The dinner was excellent, and consisted of every delicacy in season, and was served in a very superior style. After the cloth was removed, the following toasts were given :—

“ ‘ THE KING.’

“ ‘ His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, and the Principles which placed his Illustrious Family upon the Throne.’

“ ‘ Prosperity to Old Ireland.’

“ ‘ The Lord-Lieutenant and the Agricultural Interests of Ireland.’

“ ‘ Mr. Secretary Grant and Universal Toleration.’ Three times three—much cheering.

“ ‘ The Lord Mayor of Dublin, and the Liberal part of the Corporation.’

“ ‘ Civil and Religious Liberty to all Mankind.’

“ The Chairman then called the attention of the company to the immediate cause of their meeting. He said, that being totally unaccustomed to speaking in public, he was unable to do justice to the worth and talent which they were met to celebrate. But in that company, where they were known, they needed no encomium. He would, therefore, simply propose

“ ‘ OUR Guest—DANIEL O'CONNELL.’

“ This toast was enthusiastically greeted by the entire company. The cheering and applause continued for several minutes. When silence was restored, Mr. O'Connell rose and addressed the company in a speech of which we can give only an outline. He rose under the manifest oppression of strong feelings, and those feelings more than once overpowered him.

“ MR. O'CONNELL said that his kind friends would at least give him credit for this—that he wanted words to express his gratitude. Where, indeed, could words be found to express the big gratitude that swelled his heart? Language was inadequate to this purpose; and he could only rely on the electricity of Irish cordiality to convey the impulses of his affections to the kindred spirits of his kind friends and countrymen.

“ When, said he, I see myself surrounded by so much of the rank, the wealth, and the independence of my native county, I am naturally driven to ask, How have I deserved this proud and flattering honour? It is not by my talents; for, if I possess any, they are of the lower order: it is not by my services; for, alas! whatever exertions I may have made for our unhappy country have hitherto proved abortive and fruitless. No! I have neither talents nor services; but you have recognized, per-

haps, in me a congenial disinterestedness and honesty of intention. If you have seen in me a singleness of heart and a purity of motive; if you have given me credit for the absence of every sordid and selfish feeling; if you have considered that I loved my country for her own sake alone, your kindness and generosity have supplied the rest: you have taken the will for the deed; you have given to intentions the merit of actions, and have made motives supply the place of services.

“ This is the result of your enthusiastic generosity; but, perhaps, it is also prudent. It may be prudent and wise; and, indeed, I think it is both prudent and wise to read the lesson you do this night to your brothers and your children—to teach them this, that mere honesty and integrity can procure for the public man the greatest and most heart-binding reward, in the kindness and affectionate approbation of his countrymen.

“ Oh, but you afford another and a better example! Where are intolerance, and bigotry, and religious rancour now? Let them behold this sight; let them see here the Protestant rank and wealth of Kerry paying a tribute to an humble individual, only because he has been the zealous advocate of their Catholic brethren. Would to God that the honest men in England, who have been led to oppose Emancipation, by the belief that in Ireland the Protestant feared the Catholic, and the Catholic hated the Protestant, could behold this spectacle, and see how kindly the Protestant cheers the Catholic advocate, and how affectionately the Catholic repays the kindness of his Protestant friends. (Loud and long-continued applause followed these sentiments.)

“ Mr. O'Connell continued—

“ My political creed is short and simple. It consists in believing that all men are entitled, as of right and justice, to religious and civil liberty. I deserve no credit for being the advocate of religious liberty, as my wants alone require such advocacy; but I have taken care to require it only on that principle which would equally grant it to all sects and persuasions, which, while it emancipated the Catholics in Ireland, would protect the Protestant in France and Italy, and destroy the Inquisition, together with the inquisitors, in Spain. Religion is debased and degraded by human interference; and surely the worship of the Deity cannot but be contaminated by the admixture of worldly ambition or human force. Such are my sentiments—such are yours.

“ Civil liberty is equally dear to us all; and we can now see, with heartfelt satisfaction, that it is making a sure and steady progress. The history of the world has taught us to abhor despotism—the story of modern revolutions has taught us to avoid and detest the evils of anarchy. In these countries, all that is requisite is to restore the constitution to

its original purity, to bring its genuine principle into activity, and to sweep away the fictions which have taken the place of realities;—in short, to limit the duration of parliament, and to abolish nominal representation of the people. For those useful and practical purposes all good men should combine, and from their combination success must ensue.

“ But the progress of rational liberty is manifest and cheering. Even the Autocrat of Russia emancipated the slaves of Courland; France already possesses the principle of representation; in the states of Prussia and Germany the iron vassalage of the feudal system has been abolished, and the people are vigorously struggling for representative government; Spain is, I trust in God, on the verge of a powerful revolution, which will vindicate her from the misery and reproach of her present ecclesiastical and civil tyranny; South America has already burst her bondage, and the banners of liberty already float over her plains and on her majestic mountains; and in North America the experiment of popular liberty has been made with pre-eminent success, and the people and the government have become identified.

“ These facts suggest pleasing prospects, and gladden the heart of every man who, whilst he abhors the guilt of irregular ambition, equally detests the servility of that more sordid ambition, whose object is to turn the public service into a source of private emolument. If I have any claim as a public man, it is that I equally reject the one and the other.

“ Such, my friends, is my political creed—such are my principles. That they have met your approbation constitutes the proudest moment of my life, and shall be remembered with exquisite satisfaction to the latest moment of my existence. Your approbation has confirmed that genuine loyalty that binds us to the British Constitution in its purity, and has given a more decided character to that love of liberty which attaches us to all mankind. We will, if you please, set our seal on those sentiments by drinking—

“ ‘ The Cause of Rational Liberty all over the Globe.’

“ The applauses continued for a considerable time after the learned gentleman had sat down. The following toasts succeeded:—

“ ‘ The Army and Navy of the United Empire; may they be as happy in peace as they have been glorious in war.’

“ ‘ The Knight of Kerry, and the Friends of Retrenchment and Reform in the House of Commons.’

“ ‘ Colonel Croesbie, and the Resident Gentry of the County of Kerry.’

“ ‘ Edward Denny, Esq., M.P.; and may we soon see restored the hereditary hospitality of the Denny family in their native county.’

“ ‘ Earl Donoughmore and the Friends of the Constitution in the House of Lords.’

“ ‘ Judge Day; an excellent Landlord, an affectionate Friend, and a good Man.’

“ This toast having been drunk with more than usual demonstrations of regard, MR. O’CONNELL rose and begged permission to say a few words. He gladly seized that opportunity to concur in the testimony borne by his countrymen to Judge Day. On political subjects he had the misfortune to differ from that respected gentleman ; but whilst he continued to maintain the independence of his own political opinions, he could not cease to regret that such a difference had existed. It was now at an end : the learned judge had now retired into private life, and there the most unmixed and heartfelt approbation followed his conduct as a landlord, a friend, and a gentleman.

“ Do you require testimony of his worth as a landlord—go and ask his happy tenantry, and they will tell you he is not an excellent, but the very best of landlords. They will tell you how he fostered and cherished them during the bad times, out of which I hope we are escaping, and their present prosperity speaks his praise with an eloquence that no eulogium can equal. He is an affectionate, active, zealous friend. What Kerryman ever yet asked him for a kindness, within his reach, and was refused ? No ; he never refused to act kindly ; on the contrary, whatever his active exertions could do to promote the interests of his friends was unremittingly bestowed, and that with a cheerfulness and affection which produced gratitude, even where he could not succeed. With these social virtues he retires from public life into the bosom of a society, which will, I trust, render the remainder of his life happy, by bestowing on him that respectful kindness which he deserves as an excellent landlord, a kind friend, and a good man. (Loud and general applause.)

“ These toasts succeeded :—

“ ‘ The Constitution ; may it be restored to its purity, and preserved for ever.’

“ ‘ The Hon. Christopher Hely Hutchinson, and the Friends of freedom in Cork.’

“ ‘ Thomas Spring Rice, and the Friends of Independence in Limerick.’

“ The entertainment was at this time interrupted by three distinct cheers from the street. It was discovered, that the two parties who have so often disturbed the peace of the town by their internal riots, had, for this night, coalesced, and arranged themselves into something like regimental order. They had got up a kind of band of musicians ; and, arrayed with torches, and under four banners, they traversed the town. On two of the banners were painted emblems of Peace and Union ; the third displayed the Knight of Kerry’s, and the fourth, the O’Connell arms. Their band struck up ‘ Patrick’s Day,’ and Mr. O’Connell was called on by the company to address them from the window, which he did. The stewards ordered out two hogsheads of porter ; but

they were immediately rolled back, the people declaring that they did not come to get drink, nor would they accept of any—that they came merely to pay a compliment to a man who was the sincere friend of Irishmen of all ranks and classes.

MR. O'CONNELL then asked leave to propose a bumper to the health of the proprietor of the town. He was the descendant of one of the most ancient families in the British dominions; his ancestors had been settled in Kerry since the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and they had not come here needy and obscure adventurers, but gentlemen even at that time of ancient and high descent. The present baronet was a gentleman of retired and unobtrusive manners; but he possessed a liberality of sentiment on the topics which most agitate and interest Ireland, which do equal credit to his head and his heart. He then proposed—

“ ‘Sir Edward Denny, Bart., and the good People of Tralee.’ (Loud applause.)

“ Maynard Denny, Esq., then rose and said, that he could not sit silent when his brother's health was drank in so flattering a manner. He begged to assure the company, that it was the first wish of his brother, and, indeed, of his entire family, to merit the approbation and kindness of the gentry of this great and ever loyal county. (Hear, hear, hear, much applause.)

“ The Chairman next proposed—

“ ‘The Rev. Stephen Creagh Sandes, and the Protestants of Kerry.’ (Three times three, cheering.)

The REV. MR. CHUTE returned thanks for the honour conferred on his respected friend, Mr. Sandes, and the Protestants of this county.

“ ‘The Right Rev. Dr. Sughrue and the Roman Catholic Clergy of Kerry.’

“ The worthy Prelate then rose, and returned thanks, in a short, but very impressive speech, which we regret to say, we can but feebly convey to our readers. Every word of it breathed the true spirit of Christian charity and conciliation. The substance of what fell from him, as well as we could collect, was, that the doctrines of perfect liberality and mutual affection had been those which he ever entertained and asserted, and which he had always instructed his clergy, of every rank, to inculcate on the minds of the people; and he confidently appealed to his Protestant friends, whether those doctrines of liberality and charity towards all men had not been uniformly inculcated by the Roman Catholic clergy in Kerry.

“ These doctrines were met, as he verily believed they always are, by a reciprocal liberality on the part of the other persuasions, and hence it was by the good sense and the good feelings of all parties that an unin-

errupted cordiality and harmony prevailed in Kerry—and that, even in the worst periods of the rebellion, the county of Kerry had been pre-eminently distinguished by its loyalty, and had obtained the honour of being, in the fatal year 1798, styled by the then government of Ireland, ‘The unstained county.’ The excitement of religious dissension being taken away, there had been no difficulty in preserving the people in their allegiance; not a single soldier was quartered in Kerry during the worst periods of the year 1798; and the poor peasants of this county thus read a lesson to their rulers which ought to teach the inestimable value of religious concord and Christian liberality.

“For his own part, he claimed but a share of this merit—he had been countenanced and assisted by the highly respectable personages, the lord bishops of Limerick. He would boast of calling them his kind friends, and had often exchanged with them the endearing expression of brother bishop. The late lord bishop, Dr. Bernard, was an ornament to his age and country. As a classical scholar, as a polished wit, and as an accomplished gentleman, as well as a divine, he stood unrivalled. The present lord bishop, Dr. Warburton, whom he was proud to call his friend, possessed as liberal and as large a mind as he had ever met with, and was a very sincere friend to religious concord, and inculcated by his precept as well as by his example, that harmony and Christian charity amongst men of all persuasions which did honour to his rank and station. Thus fortified, he said, that he trusted there never would be found any change in the sentiments of all Christians in Kerry towards one another, and that they would ever maintain towards each other, their present liberality, harmony, and affection. The worthy prelate concluded amongst the cheers of the entire company.

“‘Stephen Henry Rice, Esq., and the pure and Impartial Administration of Justice.’  
Three times three—great applause.

“Mr. Rice returned thanks in an animated and pointed strain. He expressed his great pleasure that the gentlemen of Kerry should approve of his conduct. It was, he said, no merit to administer justice with impartiality amongst such men. He claimed no praise on that account. It was simply his duty, and those who knew him would easily believe, that he could have no inducement but the performance of that duty, to the best of his understanding, and according to his conscience. He begged leave to propose the health of

“‘Colonel Barry and the Gentlemen of Killarney.’

“Colonel Barry returned thanks.

“The Chairman then announced as the next toast—

“‘Sir Samuel Romilly and the persecuted Protestants in France.’

“Then followed—

“‘The Patriots of South America, and a speedy and eternal Extinction to the Inquisition.’

“Both these toasts were drank with acclamations.

“‘The Bard of Erin—Thomas Moore.’

“We cannot describe the enthusiasm with which this toast was received.

“Amongst the remaining toasts were—

“‘The Duke of Leinster, and the Resident Nobility of Ireland.’

“‘The Earl of Charlemont, the Hereditary Patriot of the Irish Nobility.’

“‘The Glorious and Immortal Memory of John Philpot Curran.’

“‘Our distinguished Countryman, Charles Phillips, and the Independence of the Irish Bar.’

“‘Sir Francis Burdett, and the Free Electors of Westminster.’

“‘The Hon. Douglas Kinnaird, and the Reformers of Scotland.’

“‘Beecher Wrixon, Esq., and the Friends of Freedom in Mallow.’

“‘Messrs. Carew and Colclough, and the Popular Interest in the County of Wexford.’

“‘Alderman Waithman, and the Independent Livery of London.’

“‘Sir Robert Wilson, and the Friends of Reform in Southwark.’

“‘The President and Free People of North America—may they be bound in Bonds of Eternal Unity with these Countries.’

“‘Universal Benevolence.’

“During the evening there were also the healths drank of several of the nobility and gentry connected with Kerry. On that of the Earl of Kenmare being drank, Mr. Gallway returned thanks.

“Thomas Day, Esq., took occasion to propose the health, he said, of one of the most respectable gentleman of the county,

“‘Maurice O’Connell, of Darrinana, Esq.’

“This toast having been received with distinguished applause, Mr. O’Connell returned thanks in a short and animated speech. He said he could answer for it, that his aged and venerated relative would be pleased and proud of the honour conferred that night on him and his family; delicacy restrained him from indulging his feelings in speaking of that venerable gentleman; but he might be permitted to say, that he afforded an admirable specimen of the ancient Milesian gentleman—courteous and polite, without either flattery or familiarity, dignified, yet affectionate, with the strongest judgment and kindest heart he had passed through a long life of happiness and prosperity, and was now reaching his ninetieth year, with his faculties and reason as distinct and clear as ever—with what was more remarkable, his cheerfulness as unclouded, and his natural gaiety as undiminished as in his early life—and what almost exceeded belief, but yet was literally true, with the affec-



tions of the kindly heart as warm, as animated, and as tender as if he were still a youth. From his precepts and example his family could derive no lessons but those of integrity and honour; and his family, notwithstanding his advanced age, might look forward to enjoy many years of those precepts and that example, and when his career should draw to its close, there never lived a human being over whose grave would be poured such sincere tears of filial piety, reverence, and love.

“Amongst the other toasts given were those of the high sheriff, Charles Herbert, Esq., which the chairman prefaced by some pertinent remarks on the independent manner in which he had called the county meeting, to petition against the window tax.

“On the health of John Collis, of Barrow, Esq., being given, that gentleman returned thanks in a short speech.

“JOHN O’CONNELL, of Grenagh, Esq., begged leave to propose the health of a gallant young gentleman who had fought and bled in the service of his country, and who was likely to be at the head of a splendid fortune in Kerry, which, he was certain, he would do honour to by his liberality and independence.

“ ‘Captain Mullins’

was then drank with three times three.

The CHAIRMAN having proposed the health of the Vice-President, John Stack, Esq., the latter returned thanks, and said, he availed himself of that opportunity to propose the health of an officer of high rank in foreign service, of whom Kerry had the honour to boast,

“ ‘Lieut.-General Daniel Count O’Connell.’

MR. O’CONNELL said, he again felt himself called on to express his sense of the honour done to his respected relative.

“General O’Connell had left his native land at an early age, and had, before the revolution in France, risen from the rank of second lieutenant, to that of a general officer. In his progress he was not aided by influence or patronage, and even his nephew may, without delicacy, be permitted to say, that he had risen by the mere force of his talents and his virtues. He did, indeed, afford a bright but melancholy instance of the miserable impolicy of the penal code, which forced into the service of foreign and adverse states, the genius and the virtue of Irishmen. Never did any man more bitterly regret than General O’Connell the necessity which drove him from the service of his legitimate king, and his beloved country. He always speaks of that necessity in the language of sincere sorrow; and Ireland and Irishmen are only made more dear to his heart by absence. Never, indeed, did any man possess a more genuine Irish heart. His countrymen who met him in

France would readily testify, that no human being ever possessed a more generous heart or ready hand. There was a benevolence around him which exceeded all his other brilliant qualities; and he rejoiced in his elevation, first, and principally, because it enabled him to be useful to numbers of his relatives and of his countrymen. This is not a picture drawn by the exaggerating hand of friendship. It is a mitigated sketch of a man who lives in the hearts of his friends, and is the most endearing of relatives. His country has, at length, reclaimed him, and he has at least this consolation, that he will die in the service of his native land, and that the good sense and the good feeling of the present day have for ever opened that service to Irishmen of every class and persuasion. Yes, my friends, we have this consolation, that whatever of genius or virtue arises in Kerry in future, they will no longer devote themselves to France or to Spain, but be consecrated to the service of Old Ireland."

At the general elections which occurred in this year, Mr. O'Connell exerted himself strenuously in Kerry to procure the return of the Right Honourable Maurice Fitzgerald, the Knight of Kerry, and an incident of the election is thus alluded to by the latter gentleman, in a letter dated 6th November, 1818, published in the papers. We quote an extract from it as the testimony of a "*Union member*," and one yet living, to the broken promises, and evil operation of the act for which he unfortunately voted:—

"Mr. O'Connell having expressed an opinion much too flattering of my conduct, with the exception of my vote on the Union, I am made to say, 'that I thanked Mr. O'Connell for *explaining my conduct on the Union*, that Lord Cornwallis had shewn me a distinct promise, written and signed by Mr. Pitt, by which the Union was to be followed by a total and unqualified Emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland.'

"I *did* say that I thanked my friend Mr. O'Connell (not for explaining), but for giving me an opportunity of explaining the motives which induced me, to vote for the Union. I did not say that Lord Cornwallis had shewn me the paper, nor did I mention the name of Lord Cornwallis or of Mr. Pitt, or of any other person whatever, as connected with that measure. Neither did Mr. O'Connell say that he knew I longed anxiously to repeal the Union. None of these things were said, and therefore, though I may not respect more than you do the reason-

ing powers of the writer, and must allow that he may have been misled, as to his facts, it is necessary to destroy the foundation of his calumnious insinuations.

“Mr. O’Connell stated, and so did I, that I regretted my vote on the Union. I regret it, because all the predicted evils, and none of the promised benefits have resulted from it. I stated at the same time, that I had never given a vote with more honest intentions. That gross delusion had been practised to carry the measure, as the event proved. These delusions were more formally and authoritatively embodied in the speech of Mr. Pitt on that occasion. All this I have repeatedly stated in parliament, and in much stronger language than I ever used at a public meeting.

“If Lord Cornwallis had shown me a paper signed by Mr. Pitt, it must have been of a private nature, and it would have been a breach (not of a privy councillor’s oath, as insinuated, for I was not then a privy councillor, but) of the honour of a gentleman, to have betrayed it.

“Lord Cornwallis did give to me, not in confidence or secrecy, but expressly for circulation, a document which has been since frequently published and quoted, as containing the declaration of the then retiring cabinet. This also I have stated in parliament, but did not mention it at my election.

“I shall never shrink from avowing the motives, which, under the circumstances in which Ireland was, induced me to vote for the Union. I voted for the Union, to guard against the possible re-enactment of the penal laws, *which was contemplated*. To procure the extinction of mischievous political and religious distinctions among my countrymen, and to obtain a safer support and more dignified character to the Protestant Church, than is compatible with the present tithe system, more injurious to its clergy than even to the Catholic farmer.”

## CHAPTER VIII.

WE come to the year 1819. The first occurrence of note in which Mr. O'Connell's name appears, was at a meeting of Catholics to express their gratitude, for a very well got up demonstration by the liberal Protestants of Ireland, at the Rotunda.

## "CATHOLIC MEETING.

"The Catholic inhabitants of the parishes of St. Andrew's, St. Anne's, and St. Mark's, assembled yesterday (Wednesday, 27th January), pursuant to public notice, in the committee-room of Townsend-street Chapel. P. CURTIS, Esq., in the Chair. It was found necessary to adjourn to the body of the chapel.

"After the preliminary forms had been gone through,

"MR. O'CONNELL offered himself to the attention of the meeting, and in a temperate, eloquent, and sensible speech, proposed the following resolutions, introducing each by remarks appropriate to itself:—

"RESOLVED—'That we deem it our first duty to offer the tributes of our most grateful thanks to our esteemed and respected brethren, the Protestants of Ireland, who have come forward with such distinguished liberality and cordiality to petition for our Emancipation.'

"RESOLVED—'That encouraged by their example and support, we do renew our application to the legislature, for the total repeal of the penal laws still affecting our body.'

"RESOLVED—'That a committee consisting of the following gentlemen be appointed to prepare the draft of a petition to the legislature, to be submitted to the meeting, namely—

"Mr. P. Curtis, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. J. Weldon, Mr. T. Fynn, Mr. Kernan, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Thomas Hay, Mr. James M'Anley, Mr. Terence Hughes, Mr. Nugent, Mr. William Ryder, Mr. Edward O'Reilly, Mr. Donelan, Mr. Michael Hughes, and Mr. Gordon.'

"The draft of a petition having been prepared and read \* \* \*

"The following is the draft of the petition:—

## "PETITION.

"That your petitioners have repeatedly and respectfully, in their humble petitions, solicited the attention of this honourable house, to the multitudinous exclusions and disabilities by which his majesty's faithful subjects, the Roman Catholics of Ireland, are afflicted in this their native land.





“That in our present application to the wisdom of the legislature, we are equally encouraged and delighted by the cordial co-operation of great numbers of our beloved countrymen, the Protestants of Ireland.

“That may it please this honourable house to understand those Protestants, in seeking for relief on our behalf, do thereby on their parts tender a sacrifice of the monopoly of the emoluments, powers, and honours of the state; a sacrifice that must be attributed to the purest motives of such Christian charity and exalted benevolence, as entitle those Protestants (so we most humbly and respectfully submit) to great attention and consideration from this honourable house.

“That it is the anxious and earnest desire of your petitioners to live on terms of reciprocal charity and benevolence with our respected Protestant fellow-countrymen, and we desire the repeal of the excluding and restricting laws still in force against us, first, and principally, because those laws have a direct tendency to create and continue a spirit of irritation and ill-will, and to prevent that combination in affection and interest of all classes of his majesty's subjects, which must, upon every emergency, afford the most sure defence to the throne, and most durable and stable support to the constitution.

“May it, therefore, please this honourable house, to take into consideration the unmerited privations and sufferings of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and the benevolent petitions of the Protestants of the land; and, by granting the prayer of the Protestants of Ireland, to restore the Roman Catholics of Ireland to the full and equal participation of all the privileges and franchises of the constitution.’

“MR. KIRWAN seconded the resolutions, and they were all passed with perfect unanimity.

“MR. O'CONNELL spoke in the most animated and enthusiastic terms of the liberality and beneficence of those estimable Irish Protestants, who are at present preparing applications to parliament on behalf of their suffering Catholic brethren. He hailed, in glowing language, the dawn of friendship and affection which has, at length, broken in upon Irishmen. He gave Earl Talbot's administration the praise of NEUTRALITY, at least upon the present momentous and memorable occasion: the slightest interference upon the part of his Excellency's government to check the course of generous feeling now so happily flowing through the country, was not, he said, to be traced; the propriety of petitioning he conceived to be unquestionable; much benefit always resulted from discussion—it assisted to enlighten the English people upon the subject of the belief, and morality, and condition of the Irish Catholics, and this was all that was necessary to the success of Emancipation.

“It would long since have been granted, but that many well-meaning persons in England still believed that the Catholics hold those monstrous and abominable doctrines which have been so perseveringly and so falsely attributed to them—doctrines which he detested and disclaimed from the bottom of his soul. He spoke of the expediency of trying to procure the co-operation of the Catholic peers, peers' eldest sons, and baronets, in the application to the legislature; mentioned the Earl of Fingal, in the most respectful terms; and said it was the

strongly expressed desire of the committee of gentlemen (above-named) who had revised the petition, that no topics should be introduced, no words made use of, which could by possibility give offence, or create division.

“An application could not be made to parliament without expense. But a subscription of half a crown from each householder able to pay it, and none other should be applied to, would be amply sufficient to create a necessary fund. The account to be open for inspection in the committee room of Townsend-street Chapel, every Sunday.”

A few weeks after, Catholic gratitude was expressed at an aggregate meeting of the body.

#### “GREAT CATHOLIC MEETING.

“The largest and most respectable meeting of Catholics which ever took place in Ireland, was held yesterday (Monday, March 1st, 1819), in the old chapel in Mary's-lane—the Right Hon. the EARL of FINGAL in the chair—for the purpose of *expressing, in the most marked manner, the gratitude of the Catholic body to the Protestants who have lately come forward to petition parliament in their behalf.*

\* \* \* \* \*

“The following were the chief resolutions adopted:—

“RESOLVED—‘That impressed with a deep sense of the obligations which the Protestants of Ireland have conferred on us, their Catholic countrymen and brethren, we beg leave to return them our most sincere and heartfelt thanks for advancing the great objects of our petition to the legislature, by their wealth, their numbers, their talents, and their religion.’

“RESOLVED—‘That while we express our gratitude to the general body of our Protestant friends and advocates, we consider ourselves particularly indebted to the justice and liberality of the Right Hon. Thomas M'Kenny, Lord Mayor, for giving them an opportunity to express their sense of the grievances, we, their Catholic countrymen and brethren, labour under, by which act of justice and liberality he has not only conferred an indelible obligation on us, but added a lasting splendour to the dignity of his office.’

“MR. O'CONNELL, who came late in the meeting, spoke to the following effect:—

“It would be believed, without difficulty, that he knew no language which could adequately convey his thanks for the reception which he had experienced. It would be a rich reward for a life devoted to his country's service. He owned he had come there desirous to mingle his feeble sentiments with the general voice of his country.

“When he contemplated the elevated character of the noble chairman, and those of the other gentlemen surrounding him, who gave dignity to the meeting that had assembled for the purpose of expressing their thanks to their Protestant friends and brethren, he was at a loss



how to express himself. He was not sorry that the sense of feeling should shame the language, rather than the language should shame the sense of feeling. He was gratified beyond all expression in seeing the noble lord and the gentlemen in their proper places—the friends, the patrons, and the advocates of Catholic Ireland. It augured well to their cause, that the union of their Protestant brethren should have brought about so happy a union amongst Catholics themselves.

“ When he looked back upon the state of his country ; when he looked back upon what she was, and the wretched figure she made, for whom God had done so much—sunk in indescribable misery, though possessing every natural advantage that could make her great and prosperous—with harbours and ports central to the whole world, and sufficiently capacious to receive the trade of that world, were it doubled—he was led to inquire, how could all this be ? It was by Catholics being opposed to Protestants and Dissenters—Protestants to Dissenters and Catholics—and Dissenters, on the other hand, to both Catholics and Protestants.

“ But the happy, the glorious era, which must be immortal in the history of Ireland, had arrived ;—yes, *had arrived*, and is no longer to be wished for, when these odious and devastating distinctions were removed. Protestants have assembled and expressed their honourable feeling on the claims of their Catholic friends and brethren. The first Protestant nobleman of the country, the Duke of Leinster, one of whose ancestors was brought to the bar of the House of Lords, on the broad plea of being ‘ more Irish than the Irish themselves,’ whose diffidence became his youthful years—it was delightful to see him shaking off that diffidence, which, if it continued, must impede his political career, and leading on that glorious array of Protestant benevolence : the Earl of Meath, always a friend and patron of Ireland ; Charlemont, whose name was music to Irish ears ; Grattan, whose eloquence and virtue raised Ireland into independence and liberty—the old patriot Grattan, who had given Ireland all she had, and would have made her all she ought to be.

“ To these he may add a long list of distinguished and patriotic friends in the government of the country. He would not dispraise even the corporation, much as he had been in the practice of censuring their contracted policy. That corporation which could boast of such a man as Alderman M’Kenny at its head, could not be destitute of virtue—could not be destitute of liberality. It had been usually understood that the office of chief magistrate conferred dignity on the man. In respect to Alderman M’Kenny, the man has conferred dignity on the office.

“ There were other worthy aldermen and members in the corporation, and for their sakes he would respect the whole body. Many had good and substantial motives for opposing their claims : they had sinecure places ; they had active places ; they had places in expectance ; they had pensions for opposing them ; they had patents for loyalty ; and these, surely, were substantial reasons. But the liberal and disinterested Protestants, who joined in their petition, were above such selfish considerations, and their generous and ardent collision of sentiment, with the warm gratitude of their Catholic friends and admirers, will raise a holy flame that shall warm and enliven the whole island. It was rumoured that a larger standing army than that for England would be necessary in Ireland, to maintain those exclusively loyal gentlemen in their sinecure places, posts, and pensions. But he was extremely proud that they had applied to the army to obtain signatures to their petition. It displayed them in their true colours to government, and awakened that government to a sense of its danger. He was not in the habit of praising the government of Ireland, but he could not withhold his best praise from its present rulers. Their conduct was such as conciliated the love and approbation of the Catholic people, and the liberal of all persuasions.

“ He would read the orders issued to the army for their conduct ; they mark the disposition of the present government in fair and legible characters, and show at the same instant the paltry means that were made use of to promote the ends of intolerant faction. [Here Mr. O'Connell read a passage or two respecting the Orange Lodges, and swelling the list by apparent signatures.] Such have been the unconstitutional, but abortive efforts of the enemies to Ireland's prosperity, efforts which, for more than a century, had sunk her in misery and ruin. But Irishmen, Protestants as well as Catholics, have at length awakened from their lethargy, and a new era of happiness, peace, and prosperity opens on the union. No longer shall crowds of adventurers, disheartened by the gloomy prospects held out to them in this country, be found emigrating to the inhospitable wilds of America, in search of that independence and happiness which they should find more perfectly and securely at home. The co-operation of our Protestant brethren may not give us emancipation, but they have given us something better—a union of sentiment, love, admiration, and interests.

“ Let Catholics continue to deserve, and Protestants to reward with their good wishes and confidence, and the motto of Ireland in future be—

“‘ GOD, AND OUR NATIVE LAND!’

“ The question was then put on the resolution, and it was carried by acclamation.”

In 1819, the "Irish Legion," for the service of the "patriot" cause in South America, against the Spaniards, was formed, Mr. O'Connell taking an active part in assisting General D'Evereux, who had been deputed to this country for that purpose.

It is not necessary for us to intrude here upon the province of general history, to recall to our readers' recollection the circumstances under which the Irish South-American Legion was formed and went out; the permission and encouragement given by the minister, who sought to "create a new world," to avenge himself for the enmities his policy encountered in the old; the glow of enthusiasm which prevailed in these countries on the subject; and the fair but ill-kept promises under which men were led to embark in the adventure.

Mr. O'Connell showed his earnestness and sincerity by risking his son in it—Morgan O'Connell, then a young boy, who accepted a commission in one of the hussar regiments of the Legion, and went out under the care, and attached to the personal staff, of General D'Evereux, in the following year, 1820.

Gaily-attended military levees were held at Morrison's, and public dinners were given to celebrate the affair, and compliment the parties engaged in it; and in the latter Mr. O'Connell was prominently concerned, although we have not met with any report of his speeches on those occasions, sufficiently well-given to be inserted here.

Hurrying onward through the years of Catholic prostration that intervened between 1815 and the first dawns of the real "*Catholic Association*," we shall interpose as few comments as can at all be dispensed with, in the matters we have yet to lay before our readers, before approaching the interesting and important era above alluded to.

The following letter appeared, as the date tells, in October of the year 1819:—

" TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

" FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—I hope I shall not be deemed presumptuous in addressing you. The part I have taken in Catholic affairs induces me to expect that you will believe me to be actuated by no other motives than those of an honest and an ardent zeal to promote your interests and to attain your freedom.

"The period is at length arrived when we may ascertain, and place beyond any doubt, whether it be determined that we are for ever to remain a degraded and inferior class in our native land, and so to remain, without any one rational cause, or even any one avowable pretext. We may now reduce the enemies of liberty of conscience to this dilemma: either now to grant us emancipation, or to proclaim to us, and to the world, that as long as the parliament shall be constituted as it is at present, so long all hope of emancipation is to be totally extinguished.

"To this dilemma our enemies may be reduced; and it is a precious advantage to be able, for the first time in the history of Catholic affairs, to place them in a situation in which emancipation cannot be refused without an avowal of stern, unrelenting, and inexorable bigotry; or of worse—of a disposition to make use of bigotry as an instrument to perpetuate the divisions, dissensions, and consequent degradation and oppression of Ireland.

"Our enemies must now be frank and candid. They have not at present—and they will not have unless we furnish it to them—any, the slightest pretence for resisting emancipation. The pretences which they hitherto used are all refuted and exploded. Where could the man now be found sufficiently audacious as to resist our claims on the stale pretexts of Catholic illiberality, English hostility, or Irish turbulence?

"Catholic illiberality! Why, the man who should use that argument would now be laughed to scorn. He would be told that the first, last, and best examples of religious freedom have been given by Catholic states—Maryland, Hungary, and Bavaria would be triumphantly cited. In short, in every Catholic country in the world, possessing any share of popular government, liberty of conscience is already established.

"Even in Spain the Cortes, of whom two-thirds were priests, proclaimed the liberty of the press, and abolished the Inquisition. We therefore can well afford to make a present to the bigots, of the petticoat-making tyrant of Spain, and of our other worthy ally of Portugal or Brazil; but we can proudly and confidently claim for Catholics the palm of liberality.

"No man can now state as a reason for rejecting our claims, the hostility of the people of England. It was a favourite topic with the bigoted part of the present administration. They admitted that emancipation would conciliate Ireland, but then they said that any advantages to be derived from such conciliation would be more than counterbalanced by the irritation and permanent discontent which, they alleged, any concession to the Catholics would create in England.

"Oh, how egregiously they calumniated the intelligent, rational, and honest people of England! What a powerful refutation have the English people given to this calumny! In the voice of assembled myriads, they have proclaimed the utter falsehood of the base imputation. Seven centuries of oppression are already forgiven; and the English name, which we seldom pronounced with complacency, begins to sound sweetly in the ears of our children. May their rulers imitate the good sense of the English people, and speak to the heart of the Irish nation a language which she has never yet heard from an imperial legislature! But whether this useful lesson shall be thrown away on the English parliament or not, this much at least is certain—that no apprehension can be entertained of irritating the people of England by conceding to us our rights. It will gratify their generosity as much as it will propitiate our affections and ensure our gratitude.

"There remained one other pretext to colour the resistance to our claims—it was Irish turbulence; and where no facts of aggression would be adduced, we were then accused of being turbulent in words. And this was an argument to resist emancipation! Oh, most sapient legislators! Oh, most profound and enlightened statesmen of England! A nation was to continue in slavery because some half-dozen of demagogues or agitators, as you were pleased to call us, spoke with bitterness of their oppressions, and taunted with ridicule their oppressors!

"But even this poor and paltry pretence is gone by. Not a word, not a breath has escaped us for the last three years which could be found fault with by the most fastidious delicacy; and as to the conduct of the Irish people, it has been and it is exemplary—the most perfect calm reigns around—

*For leaf is stirred, nor wave is driven.*

Not one sound disturbs our

*Death-like silence and our dreamy repose.*

All is tranquillity, quietness, and peace. The enemies of every liberty, civil as well as

religious, say that the English people are seeking a revolution. For my part, I utterly disbelieve the assertion; but I have the right to beg of our enemies to be consistent, and to admit that the people of Ireland show not the least symptom of a revolutionary tendency.

"No! all we desire—and, indeed, in common candour, it ought now to be acknowledged—is to be admitted into the pale of the constitution, and, by pouring in fresh strength and young blood, to invigorate and to perpetuate genuine constitutional liberty, and to secure that constitution, and the throne on which it rests, as its surest and best basis from all attacks whatsoever.

"In order duly to appreciate the recent and present tranquillity of Ireland, its causes should be calmly and dispassionately investigated. He knows nothing of Ireland who imagines that ours is the quiet of content or of happiness. Alas! the sun does not shine on so wretched a country as Ireland. It is not my present purpose to discuss the causes of such misery, and still less to excite any angry passions against the authors of our present afflictions. I merely state a fact which he who ventures to deny does not need refutation. He would deny the daylight at noon. I am quite safe in not attributing our tranquillity to the absence of wretchedness, poverty, and misery. To what, then, is it to be attributed? I believe the answer is easy.

"The Irish have been so long disciplined in the school of misfortune, that they have acquired an experience which may in time instruct their teachers. There is an instinctive sensibility about them which almost by intuition leads them into the path of gratitude and of prudence. In the present instance they have demonstrated to the world that they possess those qualities to a degree which their enemies could not have believed, and their friends did not perhaps expect. They have hitherto pursued the strict line of gratitude and of prudence; and if we do but continue in the same track, we shall either obtain emancipation, or learn a new lesson, and adopt, with equal kindness of feeling, a more decided, and, I think, a more salutary course.

"There are three distinct causes for the existence of that gratitude in the minds of the Irish Catholics.

"The first is the manner in which our claims were received in the last session by the parliament, and especially by the House of Commons. The majority against us was merely nominal, and were the appearance of accident. When any measure is supported by such a minority as voted for emancipation, it ought not to be difficult to foresee its approaching success. Accordingly, the postponement of our hopes was received by us with some disappointment, but without any irritation; and to those who brought us so near success our feelings of thankfulness were lively and powerful. We are still under the impression of these feelings.

"The second source of our gratitude is to be found in the conduct of the present government of Ireland, especially that of the secretary. We are all aware that the Irish governors are the mere servants of their lords and masters in the cabinet of England. They have but little in their power of active service. They cannot do much *active* good, but they can do, and the present governors have done, much *passive* service. They have maintained an honourable and just neutrality; they have carefully abstained from fanning the flame of bigotry; they have given no countenance, no protection to the excitors of discord—to the promoters of religious rancour. In truth, bigotry is an exotic in Ireland, and requires the hot-bed of Castle corruption and Castle influence in order to rear it into poisonous maturity. Take from it that corrupt influence, and it withers at once, as it has now done, before the native and unadulterated breath of Irish kindness. The neutrality of the Castle has accordingly put an end to a fertile source of dissension and irritation, and for that neutrality the members of the Irish government deserve, and have obtained, our sincere thanks.

"But the third and best cause of our gratitude remains to be told. It is to be found in the conduct of the Protestants of Ireland; all that Ireland can boast of Protestant rank, fortune, talent and independence, came forward to assert on our behalf the great principle of religious liberty. Amongst the glorious constellation of names, friends to liberality, stands pre-eminent that of the late lord mayor of Dublin, Alderman M'Kewey. For the first time in Irish history, a lord mayor of Dublin presided at a meeting intended and calculated to promote genuine loyalty and cordial conciliation.

"I confess the recollection of the efforts made by the highest Protestant worth in Ireland, to procure our emancipation, fill my mind with the most powerful sensations of gratitude; but there is, after all, something more exquisitely soothing in the exertions of

a more humble class—I mean, the Protestant inhabitants of Dublin, many of them in the lowest situations in life, who, at their parish meetings, either followed or helped to lead the efforts of the superior ranks of society. It is to those parish meetings—it is to this domestic exhibition of Protestant kindness and genuine liberality of sentiment, that I look with the fondest affection. Here were found my Protestant countrymen, in the gratification of their unadulterated hearts, showing the true spirit of Christianity, by doing to others what they would desire to have done to themselves. I honestly believe that the extinction of religious feuds throughout nine-tenths of the land, which we have witnessed for the last nine or ten months, has been principally owing to the certainty of reconciliation which the Protestant parish meetings held out.

“I do not mean to detract from the merits of the Duke of Leinster and the lord mayor, and the other noblemen and gentlemen who evinced their patriotic liberality. Their conduct was above all praise; but the good feeling exhibited itself still in a more useful channel amongst those classes of life who know not how to disguise, and who cannot mitigate their sentiments. It was, indeed, the first blossom of Irish unanimity, and it has borne good fruit, in the extinction of ancient animosities, and in the production of a disposition towards tranquillity, peace, and good will.

“The Irish people have hitherto acted from these impulses. Whilst England has been agitated to her centre, Ireland has remained perfectly tranquil. Let our conduct not be mistaken. Let it not be imagined that we are insensible to the blessings of universal liberty, or careless of the unjust state of parliamentary representation—quite the reverse; but we deemed it right in gratitude to our Protestant neighbours—in duty to ourselves and our children, to abstain from any conduct which might endanger the advantages of our present situation. We have taken away all pretexts from our enemies. Let us continue the same line of conduct until *our fate* is decided in this session. I say, *our fate*—because if we are now rejected, who can ever hope again?

“Now we have the Protestants of Ireland for us; now we have the people of England for us; now we have the multitudinous examples of Catholic liberality for us; now we are, in our conduct, without reproach—in our tranquillity, exemplary. In what way can our petition be rejected? It can be rejected *only* by reason of *future* misconduct; it can be rejected only by our own fault, or our own folly. This is my firm and decided opinion; perhaps I am mistaken; but it surely is worth while to try the experiment.

“The session of parliament commences in one short month. There is not one moment to be lost. Perhaps it would be wise *immediately* to address the Prince Regent; that I submit to your consideration. At all events, it is obviously our policy to press forward our question at the earliest possible period in the session.

“Let us, then, my countrymen, meet; let us prepare our petitions; let those petitions be numerous; let them be unanimous, and confined to the single object of emancipation. We shall, probably, succeed; but if we do not, at least we shall have deserved to succeed; and we shall have the farther advantage, that of ascertaining the hopelessness of again petitioning for emancipation.

“You will be told that you should despise emancipation as a minor and unworthy consideration, and join the almost universal cry of reform. Do not be carried away by any such incitement. No man is more decidedly a friend to reform than I am. In theory I admit the right to universal suffrage; and I admit that curtailing the duration of parliament would be likely to add to its honesty. Nay, I am ready to go to the fullest possible practical length to obtain parliamentary reform. But we have a previous duty to perform; a favourable opportunity now presents itself to add to the general stock of liberty, by obtaining our emancipation; and the man would, in my judgment, be a false patriot, who, for the chance of an uncertain reform, would fling away the present most propitious moment to realize a most important and almost certain advantage.

“Such, my countrymen, are the honest opinions—such is the conscientious advice of one of yourselves. I may be mistaken; but I feel certain that you will admit the purity of the motives which actuate me.

“Should, indeed, our present petition be rejected—should we be again causelessly and capriciously scouted by the present parliament, why, then, I, for one, shall certainly be the last to advise you further to pursue what will then be demonstrated to be a helpless and a hopeless course, and although I shall not advise you to throw the sword or the pike into the scale of reform, I will be ever ready to exert all that I may possibly possess of influence—if any I do possess—to induce you to join in a peaceable and constitutional

pursuit of that reform without which we must, if we are now rejected, ever despair of emancipation.

"In the meantime, let us make one last effort—let it be universal, unanimous, single. And let us hope that the prayer of our respectful and dutiful petition will be attended to, and that the British legislature will see the wisdom of conciliating the people of Ireland, of gratifying the people of England, and reciprocating the sentiments and examples of Christian charity held out to them by Catholic legislators and Catholic nations.

"I am, fellow-countrymen, your faithful and obedient servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL.

"Marion-square, October 22nd, 1819."

## "CATHOLIC SUB-SHERIFFS.

(FREEMAN, 24TH FEBRUARY, 1820.)

"We have been favoured with the following opinion, given on a subject of such importance, that we deem no apology necessary for its publication:—

### "OPINION OF DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ.

"This is a subject which I have considered attentively; and my own opinion is distinctly formed on it. But that opinion must be taken subject to what I call the *practical* qualification after mentioned.

"The quere put to me has a double aspect; and, in truth, involves two questions. The first is, whether a Catholic is incapable of being sub-sheriff? The second is, whether there be any penalty attached to his acting as such?

"I shall begin with the latter, because that may be disposed of at once. There is not any penalty whatsoever imposed on a Catholic for acting as, or being sub-sheriff.

"This is a point on which no lawyers can differ, and it is highly important in deciding the other question.

"With regard to the first, I am of opinion that a Catholic is capable of being sub-sheriff.

"This, however, being a point upon which difference of opinion does subsist, and, in truth, one in which the contrary opinion to mine has been generally entertained, I deem it right to give the reasons which induce me to form my judgment on the subject.

"It is very important to observe that the general principle on which the *penal laws* against Catholics created exclusion was, by interposing oaths as qualifications, which no Catholic could, with a safe conscience, take. It was not an exclusion to the Catholic directly, and as such it was a *consequential* exclusion which those statutes created—an exclusion in consequence of not taking those oaths.

"The Catholic, therefore, would not have been excluded any more than the Protestant, by the direct operation of the general penal laws. Both were liable to the same penalty for not qualifying; and both were rendered equally secure from the effect of incurring such penalty by the annual indemnity act.

"Thus far the matter is plain under the general *penal statutes*, and if the question rested on the general law alone, there could be no doubt.

"But there is a particular statute on this subject—namely, the 1st of Geo. I. c. 20; the section is the 4th.

"I admit that such section does, at first sight, appear decisive against a Catholic being sub-sheriff; and it is the apparent force of that enactment, and the general spirit of bigotry in which the *penal code* was administered, which have caused the idea to be universally received that a Catholic cannot be sub-sheriff. It remains to be seen whether the idea be well-founded. The statute in question was passed to compel convert Protestants to educate their children in the Protestant religion, *considering none other as legal Protestants*. Such is the effect of the 2nd and 3rd sections of the act. Then the 4th section commences with a proviso and enactment, that no person shall be capable of being sub-sheriff, or sheriff's clerk, who shall not have been for five years before a Pro-

testant according to *that act*. Now, the meaning of such enactment appears clearly to point out a particular class of Protestants, who are excluded; and this is placed, in my humble opinion, beyond cavil by the remaining part of the sentence, for the entire section is but *one sentence*, which says—“*And that all and every person or persons offending herein shall be subject*”—to what punishment? Why, to be considered *as a Papist*.

“It seems, therefore, to my mind, quite plain that the act cannot create that as a crime is a *Papist*, as to which *every person* who should commit it was to be punished by being constituted by law a *Papist*.

“The construction of the section, therefore, is, that it created an incapacity in, and inflicted a penalty on, a particular description of Protestants; but that it was not meant or intended to operate against, and has provided no kind of punishment for *Papists offending therein*.

“The truth is, that abominable code was dictated by a virulent, but a *muddy spirit* of bigotry; its enactments were, in very many instances, excessively slovenly; and there exist not a few instances in which the legislature, in its contemptuous hatred for Catholics, took for granted that they were *incapable* of employments, although no such incapacity really existed. The case of Catholic schools is a familiar instance.

“The statute of 1798 does not alter, or affect to alter, the law as against the Catholics. Indeed, it would operate decidedly in their favour in this particular, according to the grammatical construction of the premissal in that statute. See the 9th section of the 38rd Geo. III. c. 21. That section uses the disjunctive, OR, as to all the excluded offices, until it comes to the office of second AND third sergeants. It then takes up the *or* again, till it comes to generals on the staff, and it uses AND as to sheriffs and sub-sheriffs. Now, if grammar be preserved; it is the *cumulation* of those offices which is prohibited, and the *individual* office is not within the exclusion, unless in a penal and disabling section, AND shall be read precisely as if it were OR, and that, too, where there is good sense in leaving it in its conjunctive meaning, and where the legislature, in the same sentence, has repeatedly used the disjunctive, OR, in its natural and appropriate meaning. But in forming my opinion on the general topic, I think it right at present not to lay any stress on the statute of 1798.

“I have already said that I gave this opinion, subject to a *practical* qualification. It is this—The spirit of the penal laws has survived the existence of the greater part of them; and although that spirit is much mitigated, it still exists in body and in pressure. The penal statutes are, therefore, less likely to be fairly canvassed than any other; and without insinuating individual reproach, I must say, that in *practice* I should feel less confidence in a favourable construction upon this than upon any other subject.

“There can be no doubt that a Catholic can be sheriff's clerk, and can assist the sheriff in every particular, as such; leaving between such sheriff's clerk and a regular sub-sheriff little distinction, save in name.

“DANIEL O'CONNELL.

“23rd February, 1830, Merrion-square.”

MR. O'CONNELL'S SPEECH AT THE ROYAL EXCHANGE MEETING,  
RELATIVE TO THE DUBLIN ELECTION,

TUESDAY, JUNE 18TH, 1820.

“We are met on this melancholy occasion to celebrate the obsequies of the greatest man Ireland ever knew. The widowed land of his birth, in mourning over his remains, feels it is a nation's sorrow, and turns with the anxiety of a parent to alleviate the grief of the orphan he has left. The virtues of that great patriot shone brilliant, pure, unsullied, ardent, unremitting, glowing. Oh! I should exhaust the dictionary three times told, ere I could enumerate the virtues of Grattan.

“In 1778, when Ireland was shackled, he reared the standard of independence; and in 1782 he stood forward as the champion of his



country, achieving gloriously her independence? Earnestly, unremittingly did he labour for her—bitterly did he deplore her wrongs—and if man could have prevented her ruin—if man could have saved her, Grattan would have done it!

“After the disastrous act of Union, which met his most resolute and most determined opposition, he did not suffer despair to creep over his heart, and induce him to abandon her, as was the case with too many others. No; he remained firm to his duty in the darkest adversity—he continued his unwearied advocacy of his country’s rights. Of him it may be truly said in his own words—

“‘He watched by the cradle of his country’s freedom—he followed her hearse!’

“His life, to the very period of his latest breath, has been spent in her service—and he died, I may even say, a martyr in her cause.

“Who shall *now* prate to me of religious animosity? To any such I will answer, by pointing to the honoured tomb of Grattan, and, I will say—‘There sleeps a man, a member of the Protestant community, who died in the cause of his Catholic fellow-countrymen!’

“I have been told that they would even rob us of his remains—that the bones of Grattan are to rest in a foreign soil! Rest? No! the bones of Grattan would not rest any where but in their kindred earth. Gentlemen, I trust that we shall yet meet to interchange our sentiments of mixed affliction and admiration over a monument of brass and marble, erected to the memory of the man whose epitaph is written in the hearts of his countrymen!

“Gentlemen, I do not come here with a womanly feeling, merely to weep over our misfortune—though heaven is my witness, that my heart is heavy. I come not here to pay a vain tribute to the dead. To do justice to the name of Grattan, would require an eloquence equal to his own; but I ask myself, I ask you, how we can best atone and compensate our country for the loss she has sustained? It is by uniting as brothers and as Irishmen, in returning a representative for our city, not unworthy of filling the place of him who raised the standard of universal charity and Christian benevolence. Yet, in this hallowed moment of sorrow, ere yet his sacred remains have been consigned to earth, the spirit of discord would light the torch of fanaticism, and set up the wild halloo of bigotry and persecution. ‘May God in heaven forgive them, they know not what they do.’

“Gentlemen, will they call this religion—will they profane the sacred name of religion—the religion of Grattan—by such a presumptuous assertion, such an invidious distinction? They will not, they cannot.

“No; gentlemen, I trust for the sake of human nature, that filthy lucre is their object—personal pelf their motive.

“Mr. Chairman, we have a duty to perform; two candidates offer themselves to our consideration—of one, perhaps, it is sufficient to say, that he is the son of Grattan. Of the other—who is he? His name is Thomas Ellis!!

“Well, gentlemen, where are the credentials of this man, who would presumptuously fill the greatest niche ever left vacant in the history of our country? Of course, he is a man of eloquence, talent, and knowledge, and has unremittingly attended to the wants and wishes of Ireland. He has, I believe, practised at the bar, but we have never seen a volume of his speeches, like the eloquent Phillips, nor have we ever heard of his talents, and I suppose it was in his room, two-pair of stairs backwards, in the Four Courts, that he has studied the prosperity of Ireland!

“Well, gentlemen, has he knowledge? Alas! here we find him equally deficient. Oh! but we require too much. If, then, he has neither eloquence, talent, patriotism, nor knowledge, perhaps he has leisure? No! the duties of his situation, for which he gave **TEN THOUSAND POUNDS**, require his constant and unremitting attention, and really it is but fair, that he should receive some interest for his money. But, gentlemen, what does he say for himself? I shall read his own words for you. [Here Counsellor O'Connell read a part of Mr. Ellis's address from a newspaper]. So, gentlemen, he tells you himself, that ‘professions are always suspicious, and, in general, insincere;’ and he proceeds in the next sentence to make professions! He first tells you that they are suspicious and insincere, and he then offers them to you!!! Gentlemen, Cæsar's wife should not only be pure, but she should be above suspicion. Is Ireland so fallen, that this man, thrust forward by a faction, is to be forced upon a people. Can so savage a faction be found, that at the shrine of Grattan, would seek to foment the bloody strife of Christian animosity?

“Gentlemen, I have seen my country a nation, with her peers in the land, and her senators about us; we have lived to see her a province. Our petitions are forwarded through the post-office, and even now bigotry and persecution would bow before their filthy idol. Yet, in speaking of the present state of my country, perhaps I may be permitted to pay the humble tribute of my praise to Earl Talbot, and the Chief Secretary, Mr. Charles Grant, for their impartial conduct as connected with its government. I speak not this as seeking any place for my cousin, or any other relative—I leave that to those police officers who had better adhere to their stations, than interfere in the election

of a candidate to represent this city. I would not see the representation of this city made the property of a stationer, or paper manufacturer, to give to whom he pleases.

“Gentlemen, young Mr. Grattan has always acted an open, upright, honest, candid IRISH part; he bears a name that can never be forgotten or neglected in Ireland; he is the only legacy his father has left to his country, and where is the Irishman who will refuse to act as executor?”

“Gentlemen, it may be asked, why is not young Mr. Grattan here? Oh! let no man reproach him that he is not here. Alas! he is paying the last sad duties to his lamented father.

“An anonymous letter has just been put into my hands, gentlemen, convening a meeting of the friends of Mr. Ellis, and calling upon them to support him as the most loyal and constitutional candidate. I ask you who is the most loyal man? Is it not him who would support the dignity, and strengthen the security of the throne, by encircling it with the affections of the people? I ask you now, who is the least loyal man? Is it not him who would weaken the resources of the constitution, by shutting out a great portion of the subjects of the realm from a just and equal enjoyment of its advantages? But, gentlemen, this letter is even misspelled, and that in the very first sentence. [Here Mr. O’Connell noticed, in the letter, the spelling of one word ‘CANDIDATE.’] The letter concludes, by requesting the friends of Mr. Ellis to wear Orange ribbons in their breasts. I conjure my countrymen to wear no party emblems, but let the name of Ireland be engraven on their hearts. I ask all those around me, do they love their country? Let every man that hears me carry my question home with him. I entreat you all, by one great effort, to save your country even now, whilst the children of her manufacturers are starving, whilst her shopkeepers are without business, her merchants shuddering, and her banks breaking. Still, still, she is worth saving—worth! Oh! what is she not worth, possessing the greenest land, the finest harbours, and the richest verdure? Celebrated even in song, for the beauty of her vales, possessing a people brave, generous, and hospitable, is she not worth saving? Gentlemen, we have a duty to perform, let no man shrink from it—it is not mine alone, but yours (looking round to different gentlemen), and your’s, and your’s, and your’s. Let us unite to put down bigotry—it is the cause of our country that is at stake; let us rally round that cause, and let our motto be ‘*Grattan and Ireland!*’”

Mr. O’Connell sat down amidst the warmest applause of the meeting.

## "CATHOLIC AFFAIRS.

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN EVENING POST.

"Merrion-square, 17th June, 1820.

"SIR—The short report of the proceedings of the Catholics, who met at D'Arcy's, on Wednesday last, which you gave in your last paper, is quite correct as far as it goes; but it does not contain the *whole* truth. It is, I think, my duty to give the public some further information on the subject. This duty seems to me imperative—because I think we are upon the eve of another struggle—to preserve from all encroachment the discipline of the Catholic Church in Ireland.

"I may be much mistaken, but it is my firm and decided belief, that the greatest peril which that Church has in these latter years encountered now awaits her. I may also be laughed at for raising the cry of 'the Church in danger;' but I am quite content to endure any portion of ridicule, provided I am of any utility in rousing the Catholic people of Ireland from the destructive apathy in which they are now sunk.

"My present design is to give a few facts to the public; I shall, in another letter, with your permission, go into further details.

"The gentlemen who have been in the habit of meeting at D'Arcy's, in Essex-street; and many who have *not* been in the habit of meeting there, have, on the death of Mr. Grattan, resolved to give him a successor. We have, I believe, no kind of authority for doing so, save our wish to avoid the difficulty of another aggregate meeting. A committee was accordingly appointed to consider of and report a fit person to present our petition to parliament. The Committee met on Monday last, and, after a good deal of discussion, these three resolutions were *unanimously* passed:—

"1st—That a delegation from the Committee should wait on Mr. Plunket, respectfully to inquire if he would support the prayer of our petition for relief, unconnected with, and unqualified by, any ecclesiastical restrictions or regulations.

"2nd—That such delegation should report, *in writing*, to the Committee the answer of Mr. Plunket.

"3rd—That in case Mr. Plunket should not think fit to give a distinct answer *in the affirmative*—the Committee would report the Knight of Kerry, as a fit person to present our petition."

"Such were, in substance, and, as I recollect, in words the resolutions of Monday last; I give them from memory, but, I believe, with a good deal of accuracy.

"The delegation was appointed; they had the honour of an interview with Mr. Plunket; they were received by him with great courtesy, and they obtained from him a written reply.

"Of that reply I have a copy; it was read repeatedly at the last meeting, but it cannot be published; it is impossible we should publish it, and I deeply and bitterly regret that it is so, because it contains matter, in my humble judgment, of vital importance. But it is impossible to publish it, for this reason, that in answer to a question from one of the delegation on the subject of publishing, Mr. Plunket expressed an opinion that it ought not to be published, and the delegation expressly agreed not to publish it. This is a compact which cannot be violated.

"I am, therefore, constrained from giving any of its contents. But I may say what it does *not* contain—and it certainly does not contain an affirmative reply to the question in the foregoing first resolution—or anything at all like an *affirmative* reply to that question. The duty, consequently, of the Committee was at an end—they were bound by their own unanimous resolution to have reported the Knight of Kerry, as the person to be applied to, in order to present our petition. That was their plain duty under these circumstances—'*Sed Diis aliter visum.*' Without rescinding the former resolution, a motion was made to report Mr. Plunket—a division took place—there were seven for the motion—seven against it—and it was decided in the affirmative by the casting vote of the chairman (Lord Fingal). Upon this contradictory proceeding, some other gentlemen, with me, seceded from the Committee, and repaired to the general meeting, where I moved an adjournment until Wednesday next, the 21st instant, which, after a long and most desultory debate, was carried in the affirmative, as already mentioned in your paper.

"There cannot be a more efficient advocate than Mr. Plunket—I have no difficulty in saying that he is beyond any comparison the most powerful advocate in either country—England or Ireland. The only possible objection to him can arise from his opinions on the subject of legislating, not for the civil rights, but for the religious doctrine or dis-

cipline of the Catholic Church in Ireland—no man in existence more fit for the one, and there cannot, in my judgment, be any person more unfit for the other; and the reason why I think him thoroughly unfit to legislate for the religion or discipline of the Catholic Church is one which does him no discredit. It is because he entertains conscientious objections to the allowing our ecclesiastical discipline to remain in its present state; I respect his conscience, but I will preserve my own.

“To my judgment, no emancipation can be of any avail, but such as shall be satisfactory to all parties. It should not participate in any, even the slightest degree of a victory by the Catholics over the Protestants. On the contrary, it should come as a kind concession from the Protestants, and be received in the spirit of affectionate gratitude by the Catholics. It should, in short, be precisely similar to the relief granted in 1778—to that conceded in 1782—to that bestowed in 1792—and, finally, to that of 1798. In these years there was no mention of any interference with the discipline of the Catholic Church. The Irish parliament felt that, as Protestants, they were incompetent to form a just notion of the details of our religion, and as legislators, that the best and only security for the state was in our affections and allegiance.

“The experience of upwards of forty years has shown that the Irish course of emancipation was as *secure* as it was *beneficent*. Why should it be *now* departed from?

“For the present, I shall only add—that our first duty seems to be to procure emancipation *as Catholics*, if we can—and if we cannot, then, *as Catholics*, to remain unemancipated. In either event, to remain *Catholics* in discipline as well as in doctrine.

“I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,

“DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

#### “CATHOLIC MEETING.

“THURSDAY, JUNE 22ND, 1820.

“The adjourned Catholic meeting was held at D'Arcy's, in Essex-street, on Thursday. It was so numerously attended that there was scarcely accommodation in the house; the rooms, lobbies, stair-head, &c., were all crowded.

“JOHN O'CONNELL, Esq., having been called to the chair—

“COUNSELLOR O'CONNELL rose and addressed the meeting nearly to the following effect:—

“Gentlemen, I hold in my hand some resolutions, which I beg leave to preface by a few observations. I deem it necessary to submit these resolutions to the sense of the meeting, previous to the question on Mr. Plunket's being entrusted with our petition being put; and should these resolutions be carried, I shall move that a copy of them be forwarded to the Right Hon. the Earl of Donoughmore, and also to whoever shall be selected to present our petition to the House of Commons. Gentlemen, the Catholic prelates and the Catholic people have already declared that they will not accept of Emancipation interfering in the slightest degree with the discipline of the Catholic Church. It is now for this meeting to say whether it will act in direct opposition to the Catholic prelates and the Catholic people, their objections to the veto being unaltered and unalterable.

“I trust, gentlemen, that this question may be fairly discussed, and without any warmth or recrimination; and I protest, for myself, that I

do not mean in anything that may fall from me, the slightest disrespect to any man. (Hear, hear.) And I may be permitted to say, that if offence *be* taken, when completely unintentional on my part, it must arise from some consciousness of impropriety.

“ For myself, I seek neither place, pension, nor power; and I protest against any vetoistical arrangements, which we cannot accede to without violating our express engagement with the Catholic people, and going in direct opposition to the Catholic bishops. Gentlemen, it is my wish to avoid topics of irritation, but the time has arrived when it is the paramount duty of every Catholic to preserve the purity of his religion from that most obnoxious of all measures—the veto.

“ Gentlemen, you have been told—Mr. Plunket has told you—that ‘conditions and securities are just and necessary.’ For the first time, gentlemen, you have been told this by any person advocating your cause. Mr. Plunket has, in this, gone farther than any of your former advocates. They only said that they would agree to conditions to obtain Emancipation, but Mr. Plunket tells you that it is his own fixed opinion that ‘conditions and securities are just and necessary.’ Is not this plain? Does any gentleman wink so strongly that he cannot see this meant an infringement on the doctrine of the Catholic Church? Mr. Plunket requires conditions and securities. Mr. Woulfe said, on the last day we met, that he would tell us what these conditions and securities were, or to what they related, but he sat down, gentleman, without giving that most desired explanation.

“ Some gentlemen have mentioned ‘domestic nomination;’ but Mr. Chairman, the Catholic bishops have already declared that *any* interference of the British parliament in the nomination of the Catholic clergy would lead to schism. It has been said that Mr. Plunket does not mean the veto. Can any man in solitude and silence consider on it, and have a second idea upon the subject? Gentlemen, he does mean it. Much has been said of Mr. Plunket’s private opinions. Anything of this kind falls upon me like the idle wind. I stand here upon his own express words, ‘that conditions and securities are just and necessary.’ I repeat it, What can this mean, except veto? The Catholic people have already given their allegiance; they have given, through taxation, their property; they have also given their blood and their oaths. What is there in addition—what else remains—except their religion? I will not be led away by the declamation of any gentleman, but meet them fairly on this question foot to foot. You have given your allegiance, your property, your lives, and your oaths; and I now ask you, and I ask them, what else remains? Nothing, gentlemen, but your religion.

“ On the 26th of May, 1814, the Catholic prelates met; they then

denied, as their ancestors had done, the authority of parliament to legislate for their religion. That opinion was confirmed by the public document of a synod held on the 24th August, 1841, which declared—

“ That any power vested in the Crown of Great Britain relating to the spiritual or ecclesiastical regulations of the Catholic religion must essentially injure, and would eventually subvert, the principles of that religion.”

If, as has been said, we are on the eve of Emancipation, can any Catholic be found so eager for his mess of pottage, that he would greedily swallow the poison with the food. The aggregate meetings, over and over, have condemned the veto—the Catholic prelates have condemned it; and now, when Mr. Plunket differs with them, it is for you to say whether you will adopt his opinion or theirs.

“ The depression of the country has caused a change within the last three years, that it might have taken a century, under a different state of circumstances, to bring about. Many from their own wants, and from the general distress, have been obliged to quit their country, and seek in distant lands that subsistence which their exertions at home have proved ineffectual to procure. We are now acting with a new class of men, and it is necessary to arouse them from the state of apathy in which they appear to be sunk.

“ Now, while Spain is free—France, Germany, and other countries on the Continent in a state of alarm and inquietude, portending, perchance, their deliverance also—it is impossible that the people of these kingdoms can be retained in abject and unconstitutional subjection and prostration. In this country, the bigots at last are compelled to confess among themselves the impossibility of long withholding Emancipation; and so they would fain *discount* it. They would fritter away its value as much as they could; force failing them, they are resorting to every expedient of miserable and odious fraud. Look to the Kildare-street Society, established for the education of Irish children—necessarily of *Catholic* children. Watch their efforts and manœuvres! See how insidiously they go to work!—how active and persevering in their efforts to pervert the youthful mind of Ireland! Look to the tract distributions, and the proselytizing societies of every name and shape, in every quarter, and say, do I allude to things of imagination? Are not these facts, realities, most necessary to be duly appreciated, attended to, and counteracted? How necessary, then, that we should show at least an equal vigilance with our enemies!

“ I trust that we have still sufficient allies in our own camp to put down, by their resistance this day, any and every attempt, under whatever form or colour, that is being made to interfere, in the slightest de-

gree, with the established regulations of the religion to which we are ever inviolably attached.

"Gentlemen, I shall now read the resolutions. They are as follows :—

"RESOLVED—That the Catholic people of Ireland adhere strictly to the sentiments contained in the resolutions of the Catholic prelates in 1818 and 1814, against any interference by the Crown, or by the Legislature, in the regulations of the Catholic religion."

[The resolutions in question were quoted. They have been given already in this work.]

"That this meeting concurring therein, do hereby declare that, as Catholics, they cannot accept of any measure of relief as a boon, which may be accompanied by conditions having a tendency to destroy, or even to injure, their religion.

"2. RESOLVED—That the Protestant parliament of Ireland, in the years 1778, 1782, 1792, and 1798, conceded to their Catholic fellow-subjects various important privileges and rights, and that they did so without requiring any other security than the oaths and affectings of the Catholics of Ireland.

"And that experience has fully justified the benevolent policy of the Irish Protestant parliament in that respect; and that we do seek for, and desire to obtain, the remaining liberties and rights still withheld from us by the penal code, upon no other terms than such as were deemed sufficient by, and satisfactory to, the Irish parliament."

Two more resolutions followed, but, having given the principal, we resume Mr. O'Connell's speech.

"Such are the resolutions, gentlemen, which I mean to submit to the present meeting, and I beg of you to consider the urgent importance of their receiving your sanction.

"It has been asserted of me that my objecting to Mr. Plunket is the mere fruit and consequence of private animosity. Of him I am bound and happy to say, that although upon politics we unhappily differ, I have ever received from that gentleman—and trust I have endeavoured, so far as lay in my power, to return them—the most marked civility, kindness, and courtesy. But even if I had received a slight, they know little indeed of me who could for a moment suppose that I would ever hesitate to sacrifice any private feeling of resentment or annoyance to the permanent interest of either my country or my religion.

"But, gentlemen, the tribunal before which your advocate lays your petition, has not the means of understanding the religion on which it has to decide. They have sworn that our religion is impious and idolatrous. That oath still continues, harrowing up our inmost feelings. I will not, I cannot trust myself to dilate on this subject. The *Edinburgh Review*, gentlemen, the *liberal Edinburgh Review*, speaks of the 'harlot embraces' of the Catholic Church, in terms fit only for some prurient tale of prostitution! Pamphlets, magazines, histories, newspapers, no-



vels, tales, &c. &c.—they are *all* at work—all assailing—all endeavouring to misrepresent and blacken the character of our holy religion. Will you go to the men who have taken the oaths I speak of—who profess the hostile principles and opinions that perverted literature thus labours to spread and confirm?—will you go to *them* to decide upon a question of such vital importance?

\* \* \* \* \*

["Here (says the newspaper report) a gentleman in the body of the meeting asked, 'Why go to them at all?']

"Mr. O'Connell proceeded—

"Some gentleman has asked, 'Why go to them at all?' I answer, Certainly not at all, certainly never, for any interference in the sacred concerns of our religion. We address them as the highest authority recognized by the laws of those countries, for a full and unqualified restoration of our rights."

A discussion of some length ensued after this speech, but resulted in the adoption of Mr. O'Connell's resolutions.

The following appears in the newspapers of the month of July, 1820 :—

**"TO THE MAYOR, SHERIFFS, AND CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF LIMERICK.**

*"Merriem-square, Dublin, 14th July, 1820.*

"GENTLEMEN—I beg leave respectfully to announce my intention to offer myself, at the next vacancy, as a candidate for the office of recorder of your ancient and loyal corporation.

"To maintain the privileges and franchises of that corporation; to identify the common council with the resident citizens, according to right and ancient usage; to administer justice without delay, and at the smallest possible expense; and to exercise all the functions of the office of recorder with the most pure impartiality. Such are the duties of the office to which I aspire.

"To discharge these duties diligently and conscientiously, if I shall be elected to that office, is my fixed and unalterable determination.

"To make an individual canvass, appears to me inconsistent with that feeling of delicacy which ought to belong to the judicial character. I therefore content myself with thus soliciting support. I do not desire that any man should vote for me unless he is in his conscience convinced that I am competent, in professional skill and experience, and, above all, that I should act as your recorder with perfect impartiality and disinterestedness.

"I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, your most obedient Servant,

**"DANIEL O'CONNELL."**

About the time of the foregoing address, Mr. O'Connell had occasion, at a public dinner at "D'Arcy's Great Room, Corn-Exchange," (subsequently the assembly-room of the Catholic Association, and of the popular bodies that succeeded it, down

to the opening of Conciliation Hall in 1844, since which latter event the "Great Room" has become the chief office of the Repeal Association, to express his opinion of Curran.

"The toast it had fallen to his lot to propose was, the memory of one of the greatest of the Irish patriots. His patriotism was undeviating, his eloquence unequalled—uniting at the same time the very soul of wit and humour, with the most touching pathos, in language at once classical, sublime, and irresistible.

"The love of country was impressed upon his heart, and his superior talents shed a lustre on the profession to which he belonged. He sought no personal advantage or emolument, but, by his conduct, gained the respect even of his enemies; and when, late in life, he succeeded to that situation to which his talents so justly entitled him, it was but the honourable reward of genius, perseverance, and industry. In this city, in the worst of times, he was seen fearlessly marching through the ranks of blood, with the bayonet to his breast, true to humanity and to his clients, and advocating the cause of those victims he could not save.

"Yet now—oh, disgrace to Ireland!—his remains are consigned to an obscure churchyard in England, with not a stone to mark the spot where sleeps John Philpot Curran; and even in the country that he loved, there is nothing, as yet, to record his name!

"THE MEMORY OF JOHN PHILPOT CURRAN!"

On the 30th December of this year, a meeting took place at the Kilmainham Court-House, at the requisition of the government party, who were desirous of getting up an address to the King, George the Fourth, approving of the recent infamous persecution of his queen.

The following is an account of it, abbreviated from the newspapers:—

"The most strenuous exertions were made by the requisitionists, amongst whom were a great number of office-holders in the law, police, revenue, corporation, &c., &c.

"A large party of police were in attendance. . . . The first act of the sheriff indicated his bias. He ordered the police to clear away a large number of most respectable freeholders, *and to admit only such persons as he should point out.* In a short time, however, the pressure of the crowd nullified his orders in a great measure.

“Disappointed in this move, he adopted another and a ludicrous device to admit his chosen few. A chair was procured, on which Lord Howth was placed, and raised by four able-bodied policemen, to a *back window*, through which his lordship obtained ingress. A similar operation was performed on Lord Frankfort, and several others, to the no small merriment of the spectators.

“The proceedings were opened amid the utmost order on the part of the people. Lord Howth and Lord Frankfort each said a few words, but they were perfectly inaudible to the bulk of the meeting. It was then perceived that the sheriff was making some nomination or selection.

“MR. O’CONNELL wished to know the nature of the proceedings going on about the chair. He inquired whether any motion had been made, or question proposed.

“THE HIGH SHERIFF, at the suggestion of some person near him, asked if Mr. O’Connell was a freeholder of the county of Dublin?

“MR. O’CONNELL (speaking with great emphasis)—‘I am a freeholder of this county. I have a hereditary property which, probably, may stand a comparison with the person who interrogates me; and I have a profession which gives me an annual income greater than any of the personages who surround the chair are able to wring from the taxes.’ (Loud Applause.)

“THE SHERIFF then said, that he was nominating a committee to prepare an address.

“LORD CLONCURRY objected strongly to this irregularity. ‘The meeting should nominate.’

“THE SHERIFF, however, persevered, and was heard to nominate ‘Lord Frankfort.’

“LORD CLONCURRY again objected, and would take the sense of the meeting.

“THE SHERIFF refused him the opportunity, and repeated Lord Frankfort’s name. The ‘noes’ were in an immense majority against it. The sheriff, however, declared him selected.

“MR. J. D. MULLEN protested, and being threatened by the sheriff to be put out of the court as no freeholder, declared that he was such, and defied the sheriff to put his threat into execution.

“LORDS HOWTH and FRANKFORT, and some gentlemen with them, now produced a prepared address, which, when read, appeared a very poor composition. On the question for its adoption—

“MR. BURNES, K. C., rose to oppose it. He did not see, in the first place, the necessity of making a boast of ‘loyalty.’ There had been no instances of disloyalty for a long time.

"MR. COBBE (from Swords)—'yes, yes!'

"Several voices—'name one, name one!'

"MR. BURNE also called upon him to name it.

"MR. COBBE, 'I will, *the opposition to the present address!*'

"After a shout of laughter which this occasioned, had subsided, Mr. Burne resumed, and argued ably against the calling of the meeting, the sheriff's conduct, and his preconcerted arrangements, &c.

"The SHERIFF—'Mr. Burne, *your party met as well as ours.*'

"After this second interruption, the speaker was at last allowed to proceed, and conclude his protest in peace. But when, after concluding, he again rose to announce that he would move an amended and *really* loyal address, the sheriff declared he would not hear him further; and in spite of remonstrances from Mr. O'Connell and others, put the question on the original address. To this there were a hundred noes for every one aye. He then proclaimed the meeting dissolved.

"MR. O'CONNELL declared that the chairman, though he might abdicate the chair, could not dissolve the meeting until they should have completed the business for which they were convened. He moved Lord Cloncurry to the chair. ♪

"The SHERIFF said he would oppose his lordship's taking the chair.

"LORD CLONCUREY (who was greatly cheered)—'The freeholders of the county Dublin have done me the honour to call me to the chair, and I will certainly obey their commands.' (Great cheering.)

"'I most solemnly protest against the illegal and unconstitutional conduct of the sheriff this day . . . it is inconsistent with every notion of law or liberty, and I am happy to obey the call which directs me to give all the resistance in my power to proceedings so arbitrary and unconstitutional!' (Enthusiastic applause.)

"Here the sheriff was understood to threaten to commit Lord Cloncurry, if he persisted in keeping the chair.

"MR. O'CONNELL—'Prepare your prison, then! If it be large enough to contain us all, we will all accompany him there. (Loud cheering for several minutes.)

"'More freeholders will accompany him there than were found to vote at the last election; nor will they regret the absence of their representatives, though they may have an opportunity of reminding them of that absence.'

"The SHERIFF, then, with great violence of tone and manner, declared that he would call in the military. (Much disapprobation.) He called upon Lord Cloncurry to withdraw. (Loud disapprobation.)

"LORD CLONCUREY—'I will not withdraw! This is the freeholders' house—built with the freeholders' money. At their call I have taken

the chair. I am a magistrate of this county; no man shall use illegal violence in my presence, unless he have a force superior to the law. In support of the law I am ready to perish in this chair, and nothing but force shall tear me from it.' (Enthusiastic cheers.)

"The SHERIFF said that the meeting was an illegal meeting, and that as such he would disperse it.

"MR. O'CONNELL—'The meeting is a perfectly legal meeting. Let every freeholder who values his rights, remain, and if any man be prosecuted for remaining here, let me be that man; for I have, and shall everywhere avow that I have advised, and counselled you to continue the meeting.'

"The sheriff here withdrew.

"The most perfect order and decorum still prevailed, and the court house exhibited one of the most respectable and crowded meetings we have ever witnessed.

"MR. BURNE addressed the chair, but had not uttered many sentences, when a side-door was thrown open with a violent crash, and an officer and some soldiers rushed in. They commanded the freeholders, in the most peremptory manner, to withdraw. Some violence was offered to individuals, but certainly not much, as the privates conducted themselves with good temper, and the freeholders quietly dispersed.

"LORD CLONCURREY kept his seat. Mr. Curran placed himself by his side. Two soldiers, bayonet in hand, ascended the bench close to Mr. Curran, who good humouredly, but firmly, put the weapons aside. The officer, standing on the table, ordered Lord Cloncurry to withdraw.

"LORD CLONCURREY replied, that he was a magistrate, presiding over a legal meeting of his majesty's subjects; that he would remain until the proceedings were regularly brought to a close, unless removed by actual force.

"The officer said he must use force, and drew, or was in the act of drawing his sword, and force *was* applied to Lord Cloncurry before he left the chair.

"The freeholders assembled in immense numbers at the opposite side of the road. A chair was procured for Lord Cloncurry in the passage of a house, and the amended address was read by Mr. Burne, seconded by Mr. O'Connell, and carried with acclamation.

"The following was its substance:—

"That our dutiful attachment and allegiance deserve the greater consideration, inasmuch as those sentiments are not diminished by the multiplied distress and aggravated miseries of your faithful people of Ireland, since the measure of the Union. . . .

"Deeply interested as we are in every event connected with the stability of the throne,

we have felt inexpressible satisfaction at the termination of the late proceedings in the House of Lords: sincerely hoping that proceedings so dangerous and unconstitutional, never will be revived in any shape.

“MR. O'CONNELL moved that a committee be appointed to lay before the Lord Lieutenant, the outrageous and illegal conduct of the sheriff on that day.

“He said that he felt happy in the hope, that all that was honest, and manly, and constitutional in England, would be found in sympathy with the inhabitants of this trampled land. The people of England would now see, that the Irish, however attached to liberty, could not attend a meeting convened by the sheriff, without peril to their lives. Let the people of England learn from the events of this day, the fate that is most assuredly in reserve for themselves, if they do not, while yet there is time, while yet the opportunity remains open, come forward, one and all, to resist the machinations of a ministry, the leading personage of which is the very man who extinguished the liberties of his native land, and laid her prostrate before her oppressors, and helpless against any and every illegal violence!!

“MR. BURNE was then moved to the chair, and thanks being voted, with the warmest acclamations, to Lord Cloncurry, the meeting quietly separated.”

Upon the 2nd of January, 1821, a most numerous meeting, “to consider the best steps to be taken as to the outrage on Saturday at Kilmainham,” was held at the Corn Exchange Rooms (then D'Arcy's Tavern), Hamilton Rowan, Esq., in the chair, and John Finlay, Esq., acting as secretary.

“MR. O'CONNELL considered it incumbent upon him to address the meeting at the earliest possible moment, having been one of the first of those persons who had been instrumental in convening it.

“The gentlemen to whom he alluded, and with whom he had the honour of being associated in recommending this step, did not come to any definite conclusion as to the particular resolutions to be proposed for adoption on this occasion, but had unanimously agreed that they and the general body of the freeholders of the county of Dublin would well deserve the treatment which they had received—would well merit to be branded as the SLAVES they were supposed to be, did they remain

\* Against George the Fourth's most unfortunate queen.

quiescent under the outrage which was, on Saturday last, committed against their rights and persons. (Much cheering.)

“It was a thing unheard of, that at a meeting convened by the high sheriff of a county, to prepare a loyal and dutiful address to his majesty, the freeholders should not have been permitted to give expression to sentiments of loyalty, and freely pronounce their opinion upon the topics with which that address ought to deal. It was monstrous that they should have been driven, at the point of the bayonet, from under the roof of the court-house, where the meeting was legal, into the open air, where, under the existing law, it was illegal to assemble. The very law which made it so, was enacted by the ministry whose counsels this county had been called upon to approve, and constituted a part of the system of the present administration.

“This law was enacted in England to restrain the free expression of opinion in that country. It was enacted under cover of the pretext that large meetings were necessarily dangerous, that they were inevitably inflammatory and tumultuous when held in the open air. But no such meetings had been held in the open air, in Ireland. He (Mr. O’Connell) had attended and spoken at most of the Irish meetings. They were all held under some roof. They were peaceable, and not a shadow of excuse could be alleged for extending those laws to Ireland.

“There was, however, an object in extending them to this country—the object of preserving the consistency of the existing ministry’s system in the government of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Ireland should be struck at! Whether England was hit or no, it was a settled thing that Ireland should be struck at. She was too upright, too inviting for a blow, to allow the opportunity to slip. Like the man at a country fair, who, carrying his head erect and stately, suddenly found himself knocked down, and on asking the reason why, was answered, ‘Oh your head was in the way, and invited the blow!’ (Loud laughter.) So, too, thought the English minister, as he struck the blow, which he felt invited to, at unoffending Ireland! However, *she is not too fallen to rise again*, she is not too *prostrate* to be deterred, or disenabled from making a re-imperative effort for her independence, and the free exercise of the inalienable rights of the people! (Much cheering.)

“The brand has entered your souls, and you deserve to be branded and to be enthralled for ever, if you do not exert your energies to justify yourselves, and vindicate your characters. The voice and the sentiments which went forth at Kilmainham, have thrilled through every heart in the country. They have spoken, trumpet-tongued, the feelings of independence which beats in every Irish bosom, and I hope they will be re-echoed throughout every part of Ireland! (Loud applause.) Oh!

my friends, a glorious opportunity has burst upon you! Avail yourselves of it, and prove to the inhabitants of England, that you do not yield to them in the love of constitutional liberty! That you will struggle to vindicate with them, and restore again in its pristine brightness and purity, constitutional liberty! (Loud cheering.)

“Whatever redress we may seek for the grievances which we have suffered and so patiently endured, let it be sought for only through the constitutional channel. It is, therefore, that I move, in the spirit of the constitution under which we live, and for which we would die—

“That a committee of fifteen be appointed to consider of the best method of demanding redress for the outrage committed on the freeholders, at Kilmainham, on Saturday last.”

“This motion, to which Mr. Finlay and some other gentleman spoke, being about to be put, Mr. M'Donnell suggested a deputation to the secretary at the Castle, Mr. Grant.

“MR. O'CONNELL said he had ever had the highest respect for Mr. Grant, but did not approve of the deputation proposed, as, without it, there was a satisfactory test by which to try the sentiments and disposition of the administration of the country.

“If the government with which Mr. Grant was connected should, by that day week, suspend the public officer who had committed the atrocious outrage on the people's rights, against which they had now met to protest, he (Mr. O'Connell) would be ready to admit, that the Irish government were disposed to consider the just rights of the people. But in the uncertainty, or, perhaps, he should say the very great doubt he was in upon that subject, he could not by any means consent to allow himself to be sent about from the office of one deputy at the castle, to the office of another under-secretary's under-deputy, and to come away without redress, if even he were accorded any reply at all.

“He was of opinion that it would be the more proper method to bring the question before parliament, and to expose the whole proceedings to the public eye of England, that England might see that there existed abundant spirit and manliness in Ireland to co-operate with her in the cause of freedom. (Applause.)

“Great as was indeed the outrage, yet he was clearly of opinion, that the sheriff had served the cause, of which it was evident he was no very warm friend. His conduct was a deathblow to many addresses intended to be got up for the same vile purposes, and by the same underhand management. It had awakened the spirit of the land. Whatever remnant of public spirit still lingered in this country would, by the events of that day, acquire renewed and augmented force and



energy. He sincerely hoped, that one and all, forgetting past dissensions, and sinking every petty dispute about sect or party, in the general weal, would obey the universal call to exertion which the late unparalleled outrage so imperiously demanded.

“He did not think that he was too sanguine in hailing the occurrence at Kilmainham as the harbinger of better days for Ireland. He never would despair—he believed that that liberty for which the patriot long prayed, and which the poet had promised to them, would one day come. Her voice had been lately heard among other nations of the earth. It spoke in Spain—and as it spoke, the nation rejoiced, wealth increased, prosperity was secured, despotism was suddenly struck with blight, and the people became free! (Loud cheering.)

“In Naples, too, her voice had been heard. But Naples stands not secure in her freedom, not because there is danger of invasion into her territory by the Austrian despot, but because Naples treated Sicily, as one nation which might easily be named, uniformly treated another which shall be nameless! (Loud cheering).

“But on no nation, perhaps, were her blessings—the blessings of constitutional liberty—more abundantly showered than on Portugal—Portugal, whose people an English writer, but a short time ago, had ventured to denominate “human vermin” Portugal, whose inhabitants Lord Byron, the poet of the age, and the friend of humanity, had in 1818 pronounced to be

“‘Base Lusian slaves—the lowest of the low!’

That same Portugal is now a great nation among the highest of the high, and her people are the ‘freest of the free.’ Had his friend Mr. M'Donnell been of the patriots of Oporto, he might probably have suggested the propriety of sending an address to the court of the Brazils, at Rio de Janeiro, petitioning for liberty; and, after waiting a year and a-half for an answer, returning with a very plain and unmistakable refusal. (Laughter.)

“With such a prospect before him, why should he despair for his country. He never would subscribe to the belief, that Ireland was reserved for exclusive degradation—but rather espouse the sentiments of the ‘Bard of Erin,’ who united the spirit of prophecy to the genius of poetry—

“‘The nations have fallen, but thou art still young,  
Thy sun is but rising, whilst others are set—  
And tho' slavery's cloud o'er thy morning hath hung,  
The full noon of freedom shall beam round thee yet!  
Erin, O Erin, tho' long in the shade,  
Thy star will shine out when the proudest shall fade!’”

At an adjourned meeting, a few days after, held at the same place, Mr. O'Connell spoke again on the same topics, and to the same effect. A very large number of gentlemen, Protestants and others, who did not usually attend public meetings, were present, and a vote of thanks and compliment to Mr. O'Connell was carried with unanimous acclamations.

No redress was obtained, as from the usual current of events at that time, might have been, and was expected to be the result.

## CHAPTER IX.

WE now come to some letters of Mr. O'Connell, the first of them being one of the earliest of the stirring annual appeals which, during his career he so frequently made to the Irish people, calling on them to arouse themselves to renewed and increased exertion for their suffering country, to count all by-gone efforts as nothing, while yet there was before them anything which they might do to advance her cause.

"Nil actum *reputare*, dumquid *superesset* agendum."

Such, in truth, has been one of the maxims of his agitation most frequently enforced, and most perseveringly acted upon by himself.

The differences with Mr. Shiel, which this letter gave rise to, and to which the others refer, have happily long since lost all their bitterness, and their very recollection has long ago given way to the most enduring mutual regard and friendship.

## "TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

"Can piety the discord heal,  
Or stanch the death-foed's enmity?  
Can Christian love, can patriot zeal,  
Can love of blessed charity?"

"Merion-square, Dublin, 1st January, 1821.

"FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—After another year of unjust degradation and oppression, I again address you. We have lived, another year, the victims of causeless injustice. Our lives wear away, and we still continue aliens in our native land. Every thing changes around us. Our servitude alone is unaltered and permanent.

"The blood runs cold, and the heart withers when we reflect on the wanton prolongation of our sufferings. The iron sinks into our very souls at the helpless and hopeless nature of our lot. To the severest of injuries is added the most cruel of insults, and we are deprived of the miserable consolation of thinking, that our enemies deem themselves justified by any necessity or any excuse for continuing our degradation.

"No, my fellow-countrymen, no, there is no excuse for the injustice that is done us. There is no palliation for the iniquitous system under which we suffer. It contradicts the first right of men and Christians—the right of worshipping our God according to the dictates of our conscience. Nay, this odious system goes farther; it converts the exercise

of that right into a crime, and it inflicts punishment for that which is our first and most sacred duty—to worship our Creator in the sincerity of conscience.

“For this crime, and for this crime alone, we are punished and degraded—converted into an inferior class in our native land, and doomed to perpetual exclusion. Our enemies cannot accuse us of any other offence—other crime we have committed none. Even the foolish charge of intemperance—a charge which was only a symptom of that contempt in which our enemies hold us—even the absurd accusation of intemperance is now abandoned, and our degradation continues without necessity, without excuse, without pretence, without palliation.

“Some honest men might have been heretofore deluded into an hostility towards us by their being made to believe, that there was something in the tenets of our religion inconsistent with civil, or at least with religious liberty. But this delusion can no longer continue. To prove that the Catholic religion is consistent with civil liberty, I appeal to Catholic Spain, where a Catholic soldiery joined a Catholic people to restore representative government; and succeeded in a glorious revolution, unstained on their part by a tear or a drop of blood. To prove that the Catholic religion is consistent with civil liberty, I appeal to Catholic Portugal, where again a Catholic soldiery joined a Catholic people, to enforce the justice of universal suffrage and representative government; and where, also, a bloodless and tearless revolution has been effectuated, of which all that we know is good, is excellent. I might appeal likewise to Catholic Naples, but that the Ireland of her connexion reminds me of my own trampled and heart-broken land, and makes me abandon an example honourable to my religion, because it excites feelings rendered too painfully familiar by the miseries of my native country.

“I need not recur to more ancient instances. I need not cite the first republics of modern Europe. The Catholic republics of Venice, of Genoa, of Lucca. I need not refer to the Catholic Cantons of Switzerland, which were all democratic, while the Protestant Cantons were all aristocratic. Nor need I recall to mind the present struggle for liberty and national independence through the wide spread regions of South America. But when I contemplate ancient and modern days, I can proudly, but cordially and affectionately enter into a rivalry with Protestant lovers of freedom; and contend, as I do contend, that Catholics deserve the palm in the cheering struggles which nations have made, and which, thank God, the nations of the earth are now making for civil liberty.

“With respect to religious liberty, the case of the Catholics is, if possible, still stronger. It was a Catholic state that first proclaimed and established liberty of conscience for all persuasions—the Catholic state of Maryland. It was a Catholic parliament that alone has granted full, free, unrestricted, and equalized emancipation to their Protestant fellow-countrymen—the Catholic Diet of Hungary. It was a Catholic king that afforded the last instance of a similar emancipation—the Catholic King of Bavaria. These instances of Catholic liberality cannot be made too familiar to the minds of honest Protestants, whose ambition it ought to be to give reciprocal proofs of liberality and Christian charity. I would also remind such Protestants that the odious and execrable inquisition so long charished by despotic monarchs, has been crumbled into dust by the Catholic people of Spain the moment they had the power to crush it. I would remind them that in France, a Catholic monarch, whose sincerity in the Catholic faith cannot be doubted, and who punctually hears mass every day, has for one of his ministers of state a Protestant gentleman, although that Protestant, if he were in England, could not fill the office of parish constable, without swearing that the Mass was impious, and he who heard it an idolator. Finally, let every Protestant recollect, that even in Rome itself, a Protestant Church has been erected, and that the Protestant worship is performed in Rome, as it were under the eye, and certainly by the permission of his Holiness the Pope himself.

“I will not, and I need not pursue this subject farther. Every unprejudiced man who will consider the subject dispassionately, must with me arrive at the conclusion, that the tenets of the Catholic religion are perfectly consistent with complete freedom of conscience, and that they assert kindly and well with the best forms of civil liberty.

“I do not dwell upon these topics because of the melancholy pleasure I feel in contrasting our merits with our sufferings. I do not dwell upon them because of the honest pride I experience at the superiority in religious liberality and love of rational liberty, which belongs to the religion of your fathers and mine. I advert to them merely to show, that as Catholic degradation in Ireland is without a cause, so it also is without a remedy. Could that degradation be attributed to intemperance, we might hope for a mitigation of

it by changing our manner, and becoming as gentle as sucking doves. Could that degradation be justified by offence or crime on our part—then, indeed, we might hope for relief by repentance, by atonement, by amendment. Had not ancient and modern instances of the enthusiastic devotion of liberty to Catholics proved our fitness for freedom, we might still expect to win our way by declaring our attachment to the genuine principles of the constitution. Had not Catholics given not only the best and brightest, but almost all the examples of religious liberality hitherto known, we might flatter ourselves to succeed by solemn protestations, that the real doctrine of our Apostolic Church disclaims all force or compulsion, and seeks for votaries, as the apostles did, by mere persuasion. But, alas! every hope, every expectation of this kind is now useless. Our degradation is, I repeat it, without a remedy, because it is without a rational cause, or any reasonable pretence.

“From our exertions we can expect no relief; can we hope for any redress from parliament? In my conscience I think not whilst the parliament remains in its present most anomalous state. Indeed, I have arrived at the most perfect conviction, that it is the extreme of folly and absurdity, to imagine that an unreformed parliament *would* or *could* consent to give us relief.

“Upon principle, the present parliament cannot give us relief—for two reasons, first, because by emancipating the Catholics of Ireland, they would destroy the system by which the present ministry govern Ireland—the system of dissension and division, the weakening of all by preventing any constitutional combination or rational cohesion, for the purposes of opposing misrule. Secondly, because to grant us emancipation, would be to extend the sphere of civil liberty, and the alchemists who expected to extract the most precious metals from the dross of the lowest minerals, were asipient beings when compared with the drivellers who could believe that they were to receive the fine gold of liberty from the dregs of the existing administration.

“Let us, however, quit all theoretic views, and come to a closer examination of our prospects. If we do so, the first object that presents itself to us, is the causeless rejection, so often repeated, of our petitions—all the arguments—all the talent was with us—a few often refuted assertions—a few stale calumnies, exploded everywhere else, and a majority of each house was against us.

“This is the first fact to prove that it is hopeless to continue our petitions to an unreformed parliament. The next is, that such rejections took place, although our advocates in the House of Commons did latterly tender the ministers the veto, as a valuable consideration for a relief bill. Now, that tender was made not only without our consent, but amidst our recorded and repeated disapprobation—and such tender cannot, I will add, shall not, be renewed. Neither Mr. Plunket, nor Mr. anything else, shall again offer a veto without a prompt and unequivocal disavowal—a disavowal which will be followed by a Catholic petition against receiving emancipation upon any such terms. On this point I will not, I cannot, enter into any compromise. Being a Catholic in the most perfect sincerity of belief, I do, in my conscience, and in the presence of my God, believe, that any species of vetoistical interference would be equally injurious to my religion, as destructive of civil liberty in Ireland. With this conviction on my mind, all my most strenuous exertions shall be used to disavow, to complain of, I must say, to denounce every person who may seek to obtain for us civil privileges, by a sacrifice of the safety of our religion. But, my fellow-countrymen, if the parliament rejected our petitions, even whilst our advocates offered to extend ministerial influence and courtly patronage over another Church, what prospect or possibility is there that a parliament, composed of the same unconstitutional materials, will grant us redress, when we disdain and utterly reject that influence and that patronage? Certainly none.

“The third fact to prove that an unreformed parliament will not grant us relief, is to be found in the history of the last sessions. A period had arrived most suspicious to our interests. The ministers had resolved to commit themselves with the British people, by the prosecution of her majesty the queen. They could not but be conscious of the perfect injustice of that proceeding—they could not but know the odium which must be excited amongst such a people as the English, at the palpable iniquity of any men, combining the inconsistent characters of prosecutors and judges. It required but little intellect to perceive how revolting to common sense, to common reason, to common honesty, such a combination must be. A man has only to place himself in the situation of being prosecuted, with a certainty that his prosecutors shall also be his judges. Can any thing be more frightful? The ministers knew it well—they also felt what little reliance was to be

placed on the discarded servants, the prostitutes, and all the vulgar rabble of Italian witanesses, which the Milan inquisition had raked together. The ministers knew their danger, and yet, with a desperate tenacity of place, persevered.

"At such a moment as this, the Catholics resolved to renew their petition. It was a golden, although not a glorious opportunity. I acknowledge that their conduct was not generous, but it was very natural. They did, accordingly, prepare petitions, and Lord Donoughmore, as a matter of course—and Mr. Plunket, by a strange combination of accidents, were requested to present these petitions.

"It is true these petitions were not rejected, but they were worse—they were not received. The House of Lords was not in a temper to hear us. That noble assembly which could listen for weeks with a gloating satisfaction to the obscene details of a Del-pont or a Majocchi, had not one leisure hour to throw away on the claims and rights of five millions of Catholics. Lord Donoughmore, and his sincerity to the Catholics cannot be doubted, therefore, declined presenting our petition to the Lords. Thus, in that house, has the best opportunity I have ever known of pressing emancipation on the ministry, been thrown away and lost for ever.

"The House of Commons was ready enough to adjourn from week to week at the convenience of the ministry; but they could not, it seems, spare any one of their idle days to hear the prayers of an injured people. Mr. Plunket, accordingly, refused to present our petition at that period to the House of Commons, and thus again was lost the most favourable opportunity for our claims which has appeared in modern times.

"Thus have the last sessions passed away, and it only remains for us to consider what course is now to be taken. I have heard it said, that our last petition not having been presented, still remains, and should be brought before parliament in the next sessions; that I totally deny. Of the numerous persons who signed that petition, some must be dead. Is it the petition of the dead men? Many have left Ireland—is it the petition of the absent and uninterested? Very many have changed their minds on the subject, and would not now concur in that petition. I am one of the number. Is it now my petition or the petition of those who think with me? We totally disclaim it. Besides, our resolution, when that petition was prepared, was, that it should be *forthwith*, or *immediately* presented, I forget which was the word. It was prepared for a particular occasion; that occasion has gone by, and, with the petition of last sessions, has passed for ever.

"At the time we prepared that petition, there were six of the cabinet ministers in our favour against seven. The resignation of Mr. Canning has reduced the number of our side to five, and if his substitute, as is likely, be from the No-popey faction, then the numbers of the cabinet will be eight to five against giving us any relief upon any terms.

"The advice which I do, therefore, submit to you, my countrymen, with respectful deference, is this, to petition an unreformed parliament no more for those rights which it has refused so often and so causelessly, and which it will not, it cannot, it, I may say, dare not grant. The time is arrived when we should be weary of being amongst those

" Who yearly kneel before their masters' doors,  
And hawk their wrongs as beggars do their sores."

It is useless, it is worse than useless, to petition a parliament of *virtual* representatives for liberty; we should be again rejected and mocked by the trickery of a debate—and insulted by an unreasoning majority.

"But shall I be asked if I advise you to lie down beneath your grievances in sullen silence and despair. No, my countrymen—no, we will not, we ought not despair. There is a restless spirit of liberty abroad, which, if it will submit to just, necessary, and temperate regulation, must lead to good. Let us not disturb its course, or retard its progress.

"If we continue our Catholic petitions, we shall continue the dissensions and divisions of our country—we shall perpetuate those distractions which alone have weakened Ireland and laid her prostrate. By continuing our separate and exclusive labours, we do the work of our worst enemies, and keep up a perpetual line of distinction—a constant wall of separation between sects and parties in Ireland. Let us rather endeavour to amalgamate the Catholic, the Protestant, the Presbyterian, the Dissenter, the Methodist, the Quaker, into the IRISHMAN—and, forgetting our own individual wrongs, let us call upon Irishmen of every description to combine in a noble struggle for the natural and inherent rights of our now wretched country.







"Let that struggle be confined within the most peaceable and constitutional limits. Let it have for its object the restoration of the constitution—and for its sole guide, the principles of the constitution; let us, in a word, join heart and hand in the pursuit of constitutional reform.

"Believe me, my countrymen, they calumniate the reformers, who tell you that the reformers are enemies of the monarch or of the throne. The direct contrary is the fact. The reformers are the best guards of the monarchy. They know that an hereditary monarchy gives a principle of fixity to executive power, which affords the best and most secure protection against those convulsions which endanger life, and confound property. The reformers are, therefore, on principle, the firm supporters of the throne, and one of their greatest and dearest objects is to rescue the Crown from the thralldom in which it is now held by that borough-mongering faction, which, by domineering over both houses of parliament, holds the ministry in vassalage, and the king in chains.

"Let our future purpose be the abolition of that faction which has plunged these countries in war, in debt, in distress, and involved Ireland in all the miseries of the Union. Let us not enter into any quarrels as to the particular mode of reform; but let us be always governed by that principle of the constitution which justifies taxation upon the grounds of consent; every man being supposed to consent to a tax by his representative. So that without a solecism in constitutional law, no man should be taxed who is not represented. This principle is plain and simple; it accords with justice and common sense, and will never be forgotten by men who deserve to be free.

"Such, my fellow-countrymen, is the advice of one of yourselves for the benefit of us all. It may be mistaken—it certainly is honest and disinterested—and flows from a heart warm with the love of its country and its kind, and devoted to the rights and liberties of Ireland—old Ireland.

"I have the honour to be, Fellow-Countrymen,

"Your faithful Servant and Fellow-Sufferer,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

Upon this letter, Mr. Shiel published, a few days after, the following

"ANSWER TO MR. O'CONNELL'S ADDRESS,

"BY MR. SHIEL.

"TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

"Mr. O'Connell has published his accustomed annual invocation at the commencement of the New Year. To demonstrate the fallacy of his reasoning, and to point out the pernicious tendency of his advice, is my object in addressing you. The concern of every Roman Catholic in our national cause supersedes the sensitiveness with which, upon ordinary occasions, an individual ought to shrink from the public contact. To Mr. O'Connell's address is annexed the authority of his name. I trust that I shall be able to supply any absence of comparative personal importance upon my part by the weight of argument and of fact; and from the high sense which I entertain of Mr. O'Connell's authority, I cannot refrain from making use of it against himself—

• NI aequal homini facti est.

I shall state to you the substance of his letter, as well as it can be reduced to coherence and shape. This annual eruption, in which he has flung out such a flaming fragment of declamation, is accompanied with a considerable obscuration, arising from the shower of volatile opinion with which it is attended, nor is it easy to analyse the lava which is compounded out of such a variety of heterogeneous materials.

"Upon his preliminary observations on our grievances, no comment is necessary; suffice it to say, that they are written with feeling and force. Did he confine himself to such exertions he would be as wise as he is impassioned. I have to do with the practical part of his letter. He advises for the adoption of parliamentary reform, the abandonment of our petition for relief—he dwells upon Mr. Canning's resignation—insists that Mr. Plunket shall make no tender of what, by a piece of professional dexterity, he calls the veto—insinuates that the petition already entrusted to Lord Donoughmore and Mr.

Plunket ought not to be presented, as some of the petitioners are dead, and because he, forsooth, has changed his mind; and concludes with the singular project of amalgamating (as he terms it) a Quaker into an Irishman. Such are the fashions of January, 1821. Well, then, does Mr. O'Connell really think that you are to be so blinded with all the vapour which he has raised, as to imagine that there exists any connexion whatever between Roman Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform? Whatever may be the sentiment of a Roman Catholic, in his individual capacity, upon that topic, what has his creed to do with it? If we cannot obtain relief for ourselves, what shall we procure for others? If the Roman Catholic question cannot pass through the prejudices, will reform overcome the interests of the House of Commons? Mr. O'Connell's reasoning goes to show the weakness of the Catholics—why then ally their imbecility to the cause of reform? What will that cause gain by Mr. O'Connell's casting a peacock's feather into the scale? Where, too, is the certainty of a reformed parliament passing emancipation? The penal code was enacted by a parliament which set at defiance the authority of the crown. It is notorious that many of the opponents of reform are the advocates of our cause, and it is strange, that even while Mr. O'Connell expatiates upon its necessity, he sets such a high value upon the support of Mr. Canning, who is a zealous enemy to that measure. He even admits that there was lately a mere majority of one against us in the Cabinet, and yet he bids us despair unless his new nostrum be employed. How different was his language, when scarcely one minister was favourable to our views, and when the late king's opposition operated as an insurmountable barrier for a time! How did Mr. O'Connell speak, when our hopes hung like wet osiers, and it was needful to employ a strong and commanding spirit to lift them from the stagnant despondency over which they drooped? If we identify our question with reform, will not the opponents of the latter become our foes? Why accumulate new obstacles in our way? If our question, simplified as it is by plain right and obvious expediency, cannot pass through the needle's eye, will Mr. O'Connell, mounted upon a camel, loaded with the union and parliamentary reform, spur the slow and unwieldy animal through the narrow orifice? The Roman Catholics of Ireland do not feel the least inclination to connect themselves with the reformers. The latter are well aware that we could render them no benefit, and must deserve ourselves. Besides, has it ever occurred to Mr. O'Connell that Catholic Emancipation is to pass the House of Lords as well as the Commons? And what has the purification of one branch of the legislature to do with the success of the Catholic question in another. Perhaps, however, both houses of parliament may fall within the comprehensiveness of his projects, and his next address is to blow the mitres of thirty bishops into the paradise of fools. Enough, however, upon this new speculation, upon which it was scarcely worth my while to insist at so much length.

“Let us now examine Mr. O'Connell's assertion, that there is no likelihood—nay, that there is no possibility of success. It must have been since the month of July last that he made this discovery; nor has he condescended to state by what process he has arrived at this grand political result. The only fact on which he relies is, the resignation of Mr. Canning. He builds upon this single circumstance his ill-constructed fabric of despair. Even if we did lose a vote in the cabinet, as our question is not made a cabinet measure, the loss would not be of much importance. But how has Mr. O'Connell ascertained that the vacancy is to be filled by an opponent of our claims? He conjectures it indeed, and it is upon his guess-work that the measures of a nation are to be founded? Where are the evidences of hopelessness? Are they to be found in the opening of the army? If this most valuable concession had been wrenched from the ministry—if it had been ushered in with the sound of trumpets, it would be regarded as a great victory—and so it was to those brave men whose laurels had, till then, been blighted by their creed. This was the measure which removed the Whigs from office; and there was, perhaps, a time when it would have been wise to postpone our petition, nor press upon our earnest friends so perplexing a subject. Did Mr. O'Connell, at that time, advise the Roman Catholics to forbear. No! he reserves this novel doctrine for the present period, and spares this ministry the embarrassment of a question which distracts them, and is the only topic on which they differ. But how does Mr. O'Connell act at this juncture? The very moment that he bids you be silent, he is himself most loud. Does he intend to reserve all expatiation upon our grievances to his own oracular self, and are you to forbear petitioning, that he may continue to address? Upon the remainder of Mr. O'Connell's letter, I need not occupy you long. From the subject of reform he suddenly wheels round to Mr. Plunket; men are not always conscious of their own motives, nor does the mind see itself. The patriotism of Mr. O'Connell may be as pure as amber, but even in amber we may find a straw;

Mr. O'Connell could not allow any personal feeling to influence him, where his country is at stake; yet in speaking of Mr. Plunket, he says, 'neither Mr. Plunket, nor Mr. Anything else, shall.' The phrase is a transparent one, and the rushlight, with its feeble and fretful fire is seen behind. It is as clear as glass; it covers, but it does not hide. Mr. O'Connell does not deal very candidly when he says that Mr. Plunket shall not offer the veto. Mr. Plunket has already distinctly stated, that as the Catholics disapprove of the veto, it should be abandoned; as to the particular form in which the question may be brought forward, let me remind Mr. O'Connell, that upon his proposing, at a very numerous meeting, a resolution, expressive of the unwillingness of the Roman Catholic body to accede to any ecclesiastical arrangements, that resolution was carried by a majority of only six, and when it was communicated to Mr. Plunket, he answered, that he should act as he deemed it meet; let him remember that several of the parishes of Dublin confided their petitions to Mr. Plunket, without the annexation of any resolution whatsoever to control him in the exercise of his discretion. Upon that occasion, when Mr. O'Connell revived the unhappy question of the veto, I read several passages from his address of January, 1819, in which, after dwelling upon the value of a silk gown, he advises that the subject of the veto should be buried in utter silence, says that it is not in the power of the Roman Catholics to prevent its real operation, and intimates that it is already in force.

"One would have hoped that after these opinions, deliberately set down in all the permanence of ink, Mr. O'Connell would hardly have adventured upon a resuscitation of the topic. But inconsistency has no terror for him. In his present address, indeed, he states that he firmly believes in the Roman Catholic religion—I presume he also believed in it in 1819—I hope, too, he does not enjoy a monopoly of faith; nor will the public be inclined to think that such a man as Lord Fingal affords less practical evidence of his creed than any of its more clamorous professors.

"Mr O'Connell (and that I take to be the gist of his address) intimates that the petition, which has been entrusted to Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Plunket, ought not to be presented by them. He says, 'of the numerous persons who signed that petition, some must be dead—is it the petition of the dead men?' Really when we read arguments of this sort, knowing the ability of the advocate, we must think lamentably of the cause. It is the drowning grasp of a sophist in the agonies of confutation. Even in an ordinary action, the death of one of several parties shall not abate a suit; and shall the imperial cause of Ireland perish in the death of John Stiles? He also says that some of the petitioners are abroad, and therefore have no interest. What has become of Mr. O'Connell's patriotism? He gives in this opinion a bad sample of the Irishman into which he wishes to transmute every sect. Does he mean to say that an absence from this country would wash all its sufferings from his memory? It is said that an orator of antiquity had a flute-player always beside him to sound the key by which his voice was to be pitched. It were well if Mr. O'Connell would, before he pens his next address, renovate his languid love of country, with the 'Exile of Erin.' Mr. O'Connell also says that he has changed his mind. If, in the midst of a debate upon a petition of thousands, a single individual was so rash before the House of Commons, and exclaim, 'I have changed my mind—I disclaim the petition though I have signed it;' should this person, by throwing a pebble into the stream, stop the whole current of a great proceeding. Let Mr. O'Connell remember that all these arguments of his are as applicable to every former petition as to the present. Our petitions were generally submitted to Mr. Grattan, seven or eight months before they were presented. Did Mr. O'Connell ever allege that some of the petitioners were dead, or absent, or had changed their minds? Mr. O'Connell insists that the resolution entrusting our petitions to Lord Donoughmore and Mr. Grattan, contained a clause that they would be presented 'forthwith, or immediately, he forgets which.' A person who builds an argument upon a word, and does not remember it, shows what sort of validity he sets upon it. Does Mr. O'Connell really mean to non-suit the Catholics of Ireland; and is it with a 'forthwith' that he is to upset the cause of his country? But neither Mr. O'Connell, nor 'Mr. anything else,' to borrow his own phraseology, shall dictate to the Catholic body; and I must inform him, that he wants the power to do ill. The petition was given to Lord Donoughmore and to Mr. Plunket, that it might be presented as soon as possible, and it was not possible to present it during the last session, when the queen's case blocked up all the avenues of the State. To this Mr. O'Connell, however, pays no attention, nor does he affect to know that the question at that time before the legislature was of so aborting a character as to render every other topic, for the moment, of comparative insignificance. It is not in the shocks of an earthquake that a

house is to be repaired. But to oppose arguments of this sort is to combat with shadows. Neither Lord Donoughmore, our faithful advocate, nor Mr. Plunket, the legitimate successor of Mr. Grattan, will be swayed by such futilities. The latter gentleman knows the value of all the points of law made by Mr. O'Connell. He will not be much disturbed by any splenetic pleading. He is placed upon an eminence which Mr. O'Connell's addresses and harangues cannot reach.

‘ The murmuring surge,  
That on the unnumbered idle pebbles chafes,  
Cannot be heard so high.’

“ Mr. Plunket well knows that Mr. O'Connell does not speak the sentiments of the Roman Catholic body; once, indeed, by following he appeared to guide. By a flexible accordance between his sense of public duty, with his love of popular praise, he served for some time to indicate the varieties of popular excitation. I should be loth to compare him to a sort of political vane by which all the veerings of the breeze might be determined, but it were as idle to imagine that the currents of air on which the balloon is borne, are regulated by the painted machine that floats upon them, as to suppose that a person swelled out with the very inflammable patriotism of Mr. O'Connell, and raised by the very levity of his opinions, should create the vicissitudes of passion on which he ascends. That gentleman was certainly elevated in a very gaudy vehicle, embellished with every diversity of hue. He had risen with the shout of the multitude, and after throwing out all his ballast, and waving his green flag, he very skilfully adapted his course in this aerial voyage to all the mutations of impulse, which agitated the stormy medium through which he passed, until at last, in attempting to rise into a still more lofty region, he has allowed the thin and combustible materials of his buoyancy to take fire, and comes tumbling in a volume of fiery vapour, composed of the Veto, the Union, and Parliamentary Reform.

“ RICHARD SHIEL.”

---

“ TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

“ ‘ But alas for his country—her pride is gone by,  
And that spirit is broken which never would bend;  
O'er the ruin her children in secret must sigh  
For 'tis treason to love her, and death to defend.’

“ Merrion-square, 12th January, 1821.

“ FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—I think it may be useful that I should offer you a few remarks upon a rhapsody which Mr. Shiel has published, under the title of a reply to my late address.

“ I will not do him the injustice to suppose, that he imagines he has given any answer to my arguments. He knows he has not; neither is it important to inquire under what ‘ mutation of impulse’ he wrote. To ascertain whether he found himself ‘ filled with fury—rapt—inspired,’ or acted on some colder and more considerate calculation, would be quite an uninteresting discovery.

“ But I am really at a loss to know how I have provoked the tragic wrath and noble ire of this iambic rhapsodist. It seems to me, that anything so unprovoked, never appeared in the annals of causeless incivility. He set out in a passion, and preserves the consistency of his rage to the end. And yet, after all, I would venture to wager that like the rabid animal in the fable, Mr. Shiel is not half so mad as he pretends to be.

“ There was lately in this country—and I fancy Mr. Shiel knew him—a gentleman who was so very angry an Atheist, that it was not safe for a believer to be in his company. His friends were obliged to preface thus:—‘ Mr. ———, I do not mean you any personal offence—but I really believe in the existence of a Deity.’ So I find it is necessary to say to Mr. Shiel—‘ Sir, I do not mean you any insult—indeed I do not—but yet I am fervently, ay, and disinterestedly attached to my religion, to my country, and to liberty.’

“ This, however, my countrymen, is the crime for which he has bestowed on me a great variety of hard names. He begins by calling me ‘ a flaming fragment,’ next I am ‘ lava,’ and thirdly, ‘ heterogeneous materials.’

“ Again he denominates me ‘ a straw in amber,’ then ‘ a rushlight with fretful fire,’

then, how terrific! '*a sophist drowning in confusion,*' and lastly, and which is quite sublime, '*a volcano of fiery vapour.*'

"From all these plain premises, Mr. Shiel would have you draw the following inevitable conclusion, that the Catholics should continue, year after year, and century after century (for he puts no limit to it), to petition a parliament which knows how to refuse, though it has no reason to give for that refusal.

"But this is trifling—Mr. Shiel is perfectly aware that the great question which the Catholics of Ireland must decide is this, whether they ought to continue to petition an unreformed parliament after repeated and causeless rejections, or join at once the increasing friends of liberty who desire to restore the constitution by reforming that parliament. That is the question.

"Now it is plain, that no rational man conceives that a decision on so momentous a question as this, involving as well the rights as the interests of millions, could be aided either by vituperation, however rancorous, or by the tawdry and tinsel decorations of melo-dramatic oratory; such oratory is fit for nothing else but to gratify that species of vanity which might in a school-boy be allowed to exclaim, 'see what a very clever little gentleman I am! Wha wants me!'

"The public can gain nothing from the mere admiration of Mr. Shiel's talents, if talents they be; neither would my arguments be weakened of their force, even were Mr. Shiel to prove beyond a doubt that I am one of those odious, but alas, too common creatures, who use the name of patriotism, only to serve private purposes, and pretend to take an interest in religion, merely to forward their views, on the speculation of place, or the sordid emolument of pension. Such persons certainly deserve execration; I only say they may reason well notwithstanding.

"The question between us is not to be decided by character, and I therefore, and for many other reasons, commit mine into the hands of you, my countrymen. But I feel myself bound to notice two topics which Mr. Shiel has put forward in his letter, because if I was to leave them unrefuted, their effect might be to divert your attention from the force of my reasoning to motives of mere personal consideration.

"The first of these topics is an empty boast—the second is an unfounded insinuation.

"The boast is, that he (Mr. Shiel) convicted me of inconsistency on the subject of the veto, by shewing, that in January, 1819, I was favourable to a veto, for which, he says, 'he cited several passages from my address of that month.'

"Now mark me, my countrymen, I pray you—in that very address I commenced the discussion of the veto with this passage:—'*With respect to the veto, my sentiments are unchanged and unalterable—my opposition to the veto is founded on principles which I can never yield. AS AN IRISHMAN, I DETEST IT—AS A CATHOLIC, I DEPRECATE IT.*'

"Such were my words; Mr. Shiel, of course, omitted this passage in his garbled extract from the address. He well knows there is high authority for saying that it requires but little intellect to vary the best meaning, merely by omitting part of the subject matter. Even a fool can do it; I do not accuse Mr. Shiel of being a fool—very far indeed from it. I only point out how admirable is the candour of a rhapsodist. Pray admire that candour!

"With this single observation I take leave of Mr. Shiel's boast. If it be not an empty boast, I consent to be called a balloon, and a vane and a fiery vapour for the rest of my life.

"Mr. Shiel's insinuation deserves a more ample discussion. It is this—he distinctly insinuates that I am actuated by motives of *private* hostility or personal resentment to Mr. Plunket, or, in the words of the rhapsodist, 'that the ranslight with feeble and fretful fire is seen behind.'

"I do, my fellow-countrymen, most solemnly assure you, that there is not the slightest foundation whatsoever for this insinuation; that the direct contrary is the fact; in plain truth, it is not my disposition to entertain resentment even against those who injure me; and nothing can be more repugnant to my habits, than to feel ill-will without cause. Now, in point of fact, Mr. Plunket never did me any unkindness whatsoever, or shewed me any incivility or inattention; on the contrary, he has been, in all my intercourse with him, uniformly courteous, attentive, and even kind. I am deeply sensible of that attention and kindness in all the cases in which I have been concerned with him as counsel; and no man living is more ready to give Mr. Plunket credit for the virtues which adorn his private life.

"As a professional man, also, I am perfectly sensible of his merits. I have known the powers of the first advocates of modern times, Erskine and Curran, Romilly and Ball, and I have no kind of hesitation in saying, that Mr. Plunket is more useful than any one of them; he combines a strength of mind and clearness of intellect, with a perpetual and unceasing readiness, in a degree which probably very few men, perhaps no man, ever before possessed. Others may exceed him in the higher orders of eloquence; but in practical utility as an advocate, there is no living man, at either bar in England or Ireland to compare with him.

"Such are my sentiments of Mr. Plunket. I admire his amiable and exemplary deportment in private life—and I cheerfully acknowledge his professional superiority and excellence.

"It is true that I am decidedly hostile to his political opinions on general as well as on local subjects. But is it fair to stigmatize, as the rhapsodist has done, this open and constitutional opposition with the odium of private malignity. My opposition to Mr. Plunket is founded on public principle, and is limited by that public principle, and is accompanied by sincere regret.

"My opposition is not the less decided on that account; I own I cannot relish the public man who advocated the *dispersion* at Manchester; and the killing of the men, women, and children there. I look upon that *dispersion*—I speak gently—as the most portentous event of modern times. If there shall be a military despotism established in England, that *dispersion* will be considered as the first step to its establishment. If we are fated to fall into the horrors of revolution, that *dispersion* will be considered as the accelerator of its progress. I therefore, as a public man, cannot relish its advocacy, neither can I forgive the inclusive advocacy of the six bills of the last sessions of the late reign. These are only some of my objections to Mr. Plunket, as a public man.

"If it be said that, as a Catholic, I have no right to regulate my conduct by those considerations, I will not condescend to reply to the slavish observation.

"Perhaps some Catholics may be inclined to overlook such topics as do not belong to our own cause. But no sincere Catholic will avoid considering Mr. Plunket's opinions respecting our particular question. If Mr. Plunket maintains opinions on the subject of the veto, inconsistent with the purity and safety of that religion, he ought not to be entrusted with any petition from the Catholics. That is a proposition which I hope Mr. Shiel will not deny.

"By the word veto I mean all such measures as would give the crown, or the ministers of the crown, a control over appointments in the Catholic Church in Ireland. Those measures have had different names. Sometimes they have been called 'the royal negative,' sometimes 'conditions,' sometimes 'securities.' But the object of them all was in one mode or the other to control the nomination to Catholic Sees in Ireland.

"Allow me here to observe, that the Catholic prelates have, in public resolutions, repeatedly condemned all such measures. These resolutions declared, that any such measure '*must essentially injure, and may eventually subvert the Catholic religion in Ireland.*'

"Yet, Mr. Plunket is a decided advocate for such measures; so decided, indeed, that he will not consent to emancipation without them. I admit that he has consented to abandon the word veto, and probably may give up the direct royal negative, though I am by no means sure that he will. But it is quite certain that he rigidly adheres to 'condition' and 'securities' as indispensable accompaniments of our relief. To the veto, under these disguises, he is devotedly attached.

"I prove the truth of this assertion thus: On the 14th of June last, Mr. Plunket met a delegation of the Catholic Board sent to make inquiries of him on this very point. He gave in a written reply, in which he insisted on 'terms,' 'conditions,' and 'securities,' as necessarily connected with emancipation.

"Mr. Plunket was, notwithstanding, by the accidents alluded to in my last publication, intrusted with the late petition. All I could do was to have that petition accompanied by resolutions, declaratory of the destructive tendency to our religion, of any vetoistical measure, and also expressive of our hostility to any such measure.

"What was Mr. Plunket's reply? His reply is in print, and cannot be mistaken; and it avowed with all the emphasis of italics, '*that his opinions on that subject were VERY DIFFERENT from those we communicated to him; and further, that the adoption of such conditions was not only UNOBJECTIONABLE, but JUST and NECESSARY.*'

"Here is my decisive objection to Mr. Plunket. Here is that which will make me ever disavow him as my parliamentary advocate. I cannot defer to him on a matter of

importance to my religion; above all, I cannot concur, and I will never again concur in giving him an opportunity, as the selected organ of the Catholics, to enforce measures which the prelates and people of Ireland have so repeatedly condemned as in their nature essentially injurious, and possibly subversive of our religion.

"This it is which makes me extremely rejoice that the petition for last sessions is defunct. I rejoice that it has ceased to exist, and I confidently hope it never will be revived.

"I only smile at Mr. Shiel's special pleading—he considers a petition to be in his nature irrevocable, and that he who once signs it is bound for ever; and this assertion of his he runs through all the mazes of metaphor, as if to escape common sense.

"I am so certain that Mr. Plunket will not adopt Mr. Shiel's fancies, and convert me into a petitioner against my consent, and make himself my advocate without my leave, that I shall not add another word on this topic.

"I have neither leisure nor inclination to follow Mr. Shiel through any more of the affectations, the *peacock's feathers* and the *volcanos*, which glitter in laboured and puny conceits. I am now certain that to keep us *petitioning*, is the game of the ministry. It was said long since in the French army, that if a gentleman conducted himself well as a cadet, he would remain a cadet for life. The reason was obvious; he thus gave useful services at the cheapest possible rate; and thus it will be with us. We have only to behave ourselves well as petitioners; to be very temperate, and mild, and forbearing; to avoid all agitation, and to be most respectful and submissive, and we shall be allowed the mighty privilege of continuing petitioners and cadets during our existence.

"I may now dismiss Mr. Shiel in perfect cheerfulness. I may dismiss him to the association of his fellow-labourers in the *Correspondent* and *Dublin Journal*. For my part, I think it better policy, as I am sure it is better principle, to join the British reformers, and to convince them that the Irish Catholics are not as they have been often represented by Mr. Shiel's new allies—a faction brawling for individual advantages—but men who anxiously and earnestly desire to advance general liberty, and who understand in what constitutional and rational liberty should consist.

"It ought not, however, to be forgotten, that he has not disturbed any one of the propositions which I sought to establish. I will sketch them again briefly.

"1st. 'That an unreformed parliament has repeatedly rejected our petitions without any rational cause, or even any plausible pretence for such rejection.'

"2nd. 'That we have nothing to amend in our political or moral conduct, or to alter in our religious principles, and as we cannot improve our merits, we must endeavour to improve the parliament, that it may do justice to those merits.'

"3rd. 'That an unreformed parliament cannot emancipate us, because it cannot destroy dissension among the Irish; the instrument by which the Irish are at present weakened and ruled.'

"4th. 'That the present administration is not one from which any accession to public liberty can be expected.'

"It is curious to see how Mr. Shiel has met the next topic in my address. Condensed, it amounted to this—

"5th. 'That the House of Lords, in the last sessions, devoted months of attention to foreign prostitutes and varlets, and refused an hour to the rights of five millions of fellow-subjects.'

"Does Mr. Shiel deny this? No; but he justifies it. He says that the cause of the queen was of 'so absorbing a character,' that it 'blocked up all the avenues of the state,' and he adds in the happiest vein of the bathos, 'that in the shocks of an earthquake a house is not to be repaired.'

"That is, the contemptible and scandalous prosecution of the queen is, in Mr. Shiel's poetic language, 'shocks of an earthquake,' whilst the rights and the liberties of five millions of men are 'the repairs of a house!'

"Thus it is that we are undervalued and despised by our enemies, whilst Catholics of some cleverness abuse that cleverness by degrading our cause, and make our unjust sufferings an inferior and minor consideration. According to Mr. Shiel, the House of Lords was dignified by its attention to Dumont and Majorchi. These were shocks of the earthquake; but the liberties of the Catholics of Ireland were mere carpenter's work, too mechanical and base for high and noble minds.

"This, however, is only an instance of bad and vitiated taste. There is bad feeling as well as bad poetry in Mr. Shiel's describing the Catholic people as '*unnumbered idle pebbles*.' This bad compliment, too, he has given in italics, lest any of our insulting

defamers should miss the pleasure of the application. Mr. Shiel is, no doubt, in his own opinion, a diamond of the first water—he is heartily welcome to sparkle at my expense; but let me implore of him with all the earnestness of the plainest prose, to refrain from his sneering sarcasms, directed against, after all, the finest as well as the most faithful—the long-suffering and very wretched people of Ireland.

“ I have the honour to be, Fellow-Countrymen,

“ Your ever faithful and devoted Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

A couple of months subsequent to Mr. O'Connell's controversy with Mr. Shiel, the two following letters were drawn from him, by what seems to have been a very insidious attempt to carry some kind of “*securities*” measure, without giving Ireland time to remonstrate. The bills these letters refer to were suddenly, and without other notice than the indispensable forms of parliament required, brought in and urged forward by Mr. Plunket; at a time when most of the Catholic leaders being absent from Dublin, on the Spring Circuit, anything like a public demonstration against them appeared impossible:—

“ TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

“ Yes; he would rather houseless roam,  
Where freedom and his GOD may lead,  
Than be the sleekest slave at home  
That crouches to the conqueror's creed.”

“ Limerick (on Circuit), 17th March, 1821.

“ FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—Mr. Plunket's two bills are at length before you. They demand your most serious attention. They involve matters of vital importance to your liberties and to your religion. The interest they have excited is intense. No man can love freedom—no man can cherish the Catholic faith in its purity, without feeling the deepest anxiety and alarm.

“ The crisis has at length arrived when *delusion being no longer practicable*, every sincere Catholic must take a part. Apathy upon such subjects as these, and at such a period, is, perhaps, impossible, and would certainly be a crime of great magnitude. But to render activity and zeal useful and salutary, it is necessary that you should be well informed and instructed as to the nature and effects of the intended statutes.

“ You shall have all the information in my power to give. I will state to you simply and plainly the details and object of the proposed laws, and make them understood by every body. For this purpose it is necessary to strip them of that redundant verbiage which belongs to acts of parliament.

“ The first act is really an emancipation or relief bill. It purports to give us much—very much; I believe Mr. Plunket thinks it would give us every thing we have asked for—namely, general eligibility. But he is mistaken. It in some material points would not operate to the extent he imagines. However, it would be a great—a very great boon; and if it stood alone, it would be received with delight by every rational Catholic; and it would go farther to conciliate the affections and to strengthen and secure the fidelity of the people of Ireland, than any law that has been enacted from the reign of Henry II. to the present period. If it stood alone, it would also give *unqualified* relief; and such *unqualified* relief, even without being half so extensive as the present bill, would justly be a source of lively and permanent gratitude.

“ The objections which may be made to this relief bill appear to be principally these.



First—It does not repeal any of the penal statutes; and although it purports to destroy the effects of those statutes, it leaves them on the statute book, and thereby subjects Catholics to *adverse constructions* of the law on future occasions. The simple way would be to repeal whatever is intended to be destroyed, and thereby to take away future controversy and litigation. Secondly—It provides no mode of remedy or redress for the assertion or vindication of the new rights which it confers; for example, it opens to Catholics all the corporations, but it affords no facilities to enable Catholics to effectuate their corporate rights. Thirdly—It announces no principle; it declares no right; it avoids all assertion of the maxims of political economy, and all notice of the impulses of Christian charity. It is dry, meagre, and jejune in its style, and is a composition totally unworthy of being the great social bond of affection and gratitude between nations and people.

“But, my countrymen, the bill itself is so very useful and beneficial a bill that we may and ought to overlook objections of this nature. We should recollect that so much of the above objections as are really important may hereafter be obviated. It may be possible, though it is not probable, that some occasion may hereafter arise to obviate all the unpleasant results of the causes I have alluded to. The bill, if it stood alone, would be an excellent bill, and a source of unmixed and enthusiastic congratulation amongst the lovers of liberty of conscience and the true friends of Ireland.

“Yet I acknowledge that there is a blemish in the bill which gives me some disgust. It is the equivocal language of the new oath. When we are called on to attest any proposition, in the name and in the awful presence of the Deity, the words of such proposition ought to be made as free from ambiguity as possible. It is not so in the new oath. Ambiguous language is used, and used intentionally, and as it were by choice. In truth, the words are so doubtful, and the natural meaning is so repugnant to our religion, that we would reject the new oath at once, but for the legislative declaration which accompanies it, and gives to the words a sense and meaning apparently consistent with Catholic principles.

“I know that the doctrine of our Church respecting oaths is, that an oath is to be taken according to the meaning given to the words by the propounder of such oath. The person who takes the oath is not at liberty to affix another meaning to those words. He must either refuse to take the oath altogether, or oblige his conscience according to the intention of the propounder. Equivocation and mental reservation in oaths have been imputed to our Church, but have been most falsely imputed. Our doctrine is directly the reverse; and the only reason why I would think of taking the oath specified in the new bill, is because the legislature which propounds the oath declares, by the same law, that it has, and ought to have, a meaning, which I conceive is not inconsistent with the Catholic religion.

“I quit the first act for the present. It is, after all, a *relief* bill. The second act gives no *relief*, and is simply a *penal* and *restrictive* law of the worst description.

“Before I proceed to speak of this second act in the terms it merits, I will give a brief and accurate statement of its contents; and I begin with the title. It is called an act ‘*To regulate the intercourse between persons in holy orders professing the Roman Catholic religion, with the see of Rome.*’ This title is broken English and bad grammar. But it is infinitely worse. It has all the characteristics of complete falsehood—the ‘*suppressio veri*,’ the ‘*suggestio falsi*.’ *TACTUM* is suppressed, because the principal object of the bill does not relate to such intercourse at all; but is to give to the secretary of the Lord Lieutenant the absolute appointment of all the bishops and all the deans of the Catholic Church in Ireland. *FALSEHOOD* is suggested—because this is not a bill to regulate the intercourse (for *regulate* means, ‘to order by rule:’) but it is a bill to control, according to caprice, that intercourse, and to control it according to the caprice of a Protestant secretary of state. It is in this respect a bill to suppress the necessary intercourse upon matters of faith and discipline between that part of the Catholic or universal Church of Christ which is in Ireland, and the Pope or visible head upon earth of that Church.

“From the falsehood of the title I proceed to the mischiefs of the proposed enactments.

“The act contains two recitals, and twenty-two sections. Any person desirous of ascertaining with accuracy the minutest details of this most important act, would do well to procure a copy of it, and to follow me whilst I point out its various details.

“I begin with the recitals. They are to be found—first, at the commencement of the act; secondly, in the sixth section.

“The first recital is in substance this—‘Whereas it is expedient that such precautions should be taken with respect to persons to be appointed to exercise the functions of bishop or dean in the Catholic Church in Ireland, as that no person shall assume any part of such

functions *whose loyalty and peaceable conduct shall not have been previously ascertained to the satisfaction of his Majesty, his heirs and successors.*' The second recital—a thing very unusual—repeats the first as above, with the addition of saying that it is fit as well as expedient to ascertain *the loyalty and peaceable conduct* of our bishops as well as deans. But what is the fitness—what is the expediency of such ascertainment? Let me most earnestly, and I will add, most humbly ask, what is the necessity, or where is the occasion, for any such ascertainment? *Loyalty!* Are our bishops disloyal? Is there a disloyal man amongst them? I will go farther; has there ever—aye, include the worst of times—has there ever, even in the worst of times, been a single one of the Irish Catholic bishops disloyal? NEVER—NO, NEVER. I defy a single one to be named as even suspected of disloyalty, and you may take the dead as well as the living.

"There certainly was one Irish bishop tried and executed for treason; and he bore the inauspicious name of Plunket. But his case forms no exception. He was certainly innocent. The accusation against him was ridiculous. He fell beneath the oaths of the infamous comrades of the infamous Titus Oates. His trial and his death only reflect disgrace on the more infamous judges and juries of his day. His fate casts no shade on the loyalty of the Irish Catholic bishops.

"The next thing to be ascertained after the loyalty, is 'THE PEACEABLE CONDUCT.' Sacred God! *the peaceable conduct* of our deans and bishops! Are our clergy, then, such brawlers and rioters?—are our clergy such ruffians and bravoos that there is danger lest they should select for their dignitaries, their deans and bishops, men who are so likely to break the peace that the Protestant Church and the Protestant succession are in danger unless the Crown shall be enabled to exclude the turbulent from rank in the Catholic hierarchy? There are upwards of three thousand priests in Ireland; and yet who ever hears or has heard of any of them engaging in riots or fights, or showing any thing but *peaceable conduct*? Come forward, Mr. Plunket—you who presume, with your double recital, to impute to at least some, if not to all, the priests of Ireland, a tendency to break the peace. Come forward and state whether you ever knew, or have heard of any other than *peaceable conduct*. You cannot allege that you have; and therefore allow me, in the sorrow of my heart, to ask you, how you could have the heart to put upon perpetual record these horrid imputations on a priesthood who never offended you. It was scarcely decent in you, the apparent advocate of Catholics, to inflict ridicule and even ribaldry, on our doctrine of the real presence—more especially when you appear not to understand that doctrine. But what excuse can you give for suggesting any danger of the disloyalty or turbulence of the Catholic priesthood of Ireland.

"I will restrain the honest indignation I feel at this part of the proposed penal law, and return to its enactments. But I must first notice the remainder of the second recital.

"It is in substance this:—FIRST, *that it is reasonable and necessary that government should be informed of the nature and extent of ANY intercourse which may take place with a foreign power.* SECONDLY—I will give this curious secondly in its very words; attend to them, Catholics of Ireland, as a specimen of the species of dexterity with which your religion is assailed. *'And whereas the laws made in former times against intercourse between the subjects of this realm and the see of Rome are of extreme and undistinguishing rigour and severity.'*

"Now, Catholics of Ireland—honest and sincere Catholics of Ireland, you who, in spite of the ribaldry of Mr. Plunket, believe in the real presence—in that tenet of the sweetest and tenderest charity—in that consolatory tenet which, thank God, is sanctioned, not only by the most clear and unequivocal texts, and repeated and repeated passages of the written Word, as well as by the authority of that Church which, being founded on a rock, defies force as well as fraud, Mr. Plunket; you, I say, honest and sincere Catholics, *mark me*: my reputation as a lawyer is of some value to me; your enemies and mine will admit that it is worth me some thousand of pounds by the year. I repeat, *mark me*:—

"I forego that reputation, and consent to pass, for all future days, as utterly ignorant of my profession, unless what I say to you now be true. And at this peril, and under this sanction, and as a lawyer and a man, I tell you that **THE RECITAL WHICH IMPORTS THAT THERE IS RIGOUR OR SEVERITY IN ANY EXISTING LAW UPON THE SUBJECT OF SUCH INTERCOURSE IS TOTALLY FALSE IN POINT OF LAW AND OF FACT.** It is a mistake of the most gross and palpable kind to the mind of a lawyer.

"The statutes to which it chiefly alludes, if it alludes to any thing in particular, and is not meant for mere deception—the statutes to which it *might* allude were statutes chiefly

passed by Catholic parliaments, and sanctioned by all the *native* Catholic priests and bishops in England. Believe me, however, that there is no law of *extreme* or of *undistinguishing* severity against that intercourse which the Catholic clergy of Ireland have always had with the see of Rome. If there were any such law, the Orangemen of Ireland, in their various branches, would long since have inflicted the penalties of it on the Catholic clergy. We owe nothing to either their forbearance, or that of Mr. Plunket. Our clergy owe their safety to the happy fact of the non-existence of such laws.

"Now, I ask you, fellow-countrymen, why this false recital was inserted? The reason is obvious—to make you believe that this new penal law was a relaxation of some ancient and more vexatious statutes, and was a mitigation of some pre-existing evil; instead of being, as it really is, the most powerful and dangerous attack that has as yet been made upon the Catholic Church in Ireland.

"Let us now quit the recitals in this bill, and see whether the enactments do not also more than justify my description of this new species of assault on our religion.

"The enactments are of two kinds. *FIRST*—those that purport to relate to the intercourse between our clergy and the spiritual head of our Church. *SECONDLY*—those that relate to the appointment of deans and bishops in Ireland.

"The intercourse with the Pope is to be controlled in two ways:—*first*, by a new oath; *secondly*, by a Board of Control.

"The appointment of our bishops is much more simple. The new Board has, in fact, nothing to do with it. There is, to be sure, a new oath; but that goes for nothing. The plan simply is, to give the absolute appointment of both deans and bishops to the secretary of the Castle. He is, in future, to be Catholic diocesan—Catholic chapter—and Pope in Ireland!!!

"I will take up the two subjects in their order. In the first instance, **THE INTER-COURSE WITH ROME**; in the next, **THE APPOINTMENT OF DEANS AND BISHOPS IN IRELAND**.

"With respect to such intercourse, the bill provides, in the first section, a new oath; in the second section, a punishment for not taking the oath; in the third section it names the courts in which that oath is to be taken and recorded. It then, according to the usual contempt of distinctness and order with which statutes are drawn up, introduces other matter in two sections. And to return to *the intercourse* in the sixth section.

"The sixth section provides for the creation of a new Board, to control the intercourse with Rome. The seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth sections contain regulations as to the proceedings of that Board; and which I shall detail hereafter. This matter is passed over from the fifteenth to the nineteenth sections—is taken up again in the nineteenth, and continued to the end of the act. I shall have occasion to notice almost every one of those sections.

"But let me, in the first place, call your attention to the new oath, as specified in the first section. It is an oath to be taken by all the Catholic clergy, present and future. It embraces both the objects of this bill. I pass over for the present the part that relates to the appointment of deans and bishops. As far as relates to the intercourse with Rome, it requires every priest to swear, '*that he will not have any correspondence or COMMUNICATION with the see of Rome, or with any authority under that see, tending directly or indirectly to overthrow or disturb the Protestant government or the Protestant Church of Great Britain and Ireland, or the Protestant Church of Scotland, as by law established*;' and further, that he will hold no communication which may interfere with or affect the civil duty and allegiance which is due to the crown.

"The last clause is quite innocent, and, in truth, is included in stronger terms in our present oaths. It is to the clause in Italics that I would particularly direct the attention of every conscientious Catholic layman, as well as of every priest in Ireland.

"The first question I ask is—will the priests—can the priests take this oath, without incurring a direct breach of their duty, and the immediate guilt of perjury? I submit this question to their consciences. If they decide in the affirmative, I shall submit; but at present it strikes my mind very strongly that they cannot take this oath at all.

"As far as relates to the Protestant government, this oath is, of course, safe, and is, in substance, taken already. But as far as relates to the Protestant Church, it appears to interpose frightful difficulties. The Protestant Church is composed of individuals. It is an aggregate of single persons. We conscientiously believe that the Protestant Church is in error. We distinctly believe and are convinced, that its doctrines are erroneous—that is, that the doctrine of each individual in it is erroneous. It is, there-

fore, the duty of every priest, and indeed of every layman, patiently and charitably to convince, by reasoning and argument, each Protestant of his error. Now, by persuading a single Protestant of his error, you do that which at least *indirectly tends to disturb* the Protestant Church. If you were to convince them all, you would at once overthrow, or rather annihilate, the Protestant Church: and every step in the process towards such overthrow must be a disturbance; or, at the very least, must have either a direct or INDIRECT TENDENCY to *disturb*.

"Men may be converted by the efficacy of prayer, by the force of preaching, by the strength of good example, by the nature and the administration of our sacraments; in short, by each and every of the functions of a Catholic priest. But with respect to these functions, he must be in constant communication with the see of Rome. He must hold perpetual intercourse with persons acting under her authority. If he takes this oath, he must disclaim all communion with that see; and he will thereby cease to belong to the religion which has been clung to with affectionate tenacity through many an age of darkness and storm by the people of Ireland. Their priests never deserted the people; and the people will never forsake their priesthood. The present attempt will be as abortive as all the former assaults; and Mr. Plunket's new-fangled oath will be treated with quiet contempt by a patient, long-suffering, and insulted people.

"Yes, both people and priesthood are insulted by this disgusting oath. Insulted, not only because of its being unnecessary, so far as relates to government and civil allegiance, and because of its direct violation of the charitable duties of the priesthood; but more especially and pointedly insulted, because, even if taken by our priests, they are to get no credit for their swearing. It is on this bill a mere superfluous swearing. The priests are not to be believed after they swear. Not the least attention is paid to their oath. They are to be watched as closely and as severely controlled by the new Board, as if no such oath were required.

"The object, therefore, of this oath is no other than to degrade the Catholic priesthood in the eyes of their flocks; to exhibit them in the attitude of swearers at the Custom-house—sworn to in every thing, and confided to in nothing.

"From this degrading oath we will proceed to the Board which is to disbelieve and to control the swearers.

"By the sixth section that board is to be constituted as follows:—The King is to appoint, by commission under the great seal, certain persons to be commissioners—five of whom shall constitute a quorum; but the number of the commissioners is unlimited. They are to form the Board of Control.

"The persons eligible to be commissioners are given in this order:—1st. Catholic bishops; and secondly, Protestant privy councillors. Such are the component parts of the Board of Control, according to the text or body of the bill. The margin, as if for the purpose of delusion, throws in Catholic laymen as also eligible, but the body of the bill is silent with respect to laymen.

"By the seventh section it is that we are given to understand that five are to form a quorum for business. The eighth section provides that one member shall be the secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, being a Protestant, OR! some other Protestant privy councillor; and also one Catholic bishop. The margin, again going beyond the text, adds one Catholic layman. The ninth section provides that the secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, or, in his absence, the commissioners first named in the commission, shall be the president of the Board. The tenth empowers the crown to revoke the commission when and as often as it shall think fit. The eleventh provides that on the revocation of one commission a new one shall issue. The twelfth section specifies the oath to be taken by the commissioners. I shall have occasion to call your attention to *that* oath. The thirteenth section enables the Board to make rules to regulate its own proceedings, and to appoint *secretaries* and *clerks*—aye, in the plural—*secretaries* and *clerks*; and, by way of a hint to such officers, the fourteenth section provides that *the commissioners* shall take no fee or salary. The fifteenth section sets out an oath to be taken by the secretaries and clerks.

"Such is the constitution of this new Board. Before I speak of its duties, allow me to say a few words respecting such its formation. You have too much sense and shrewdness, my countrymen, not to see that it is a mere form—a mere delusion—or, what is vulgarly called in Ireland, a *humbug*. It is essentially Protestant; indeed, for all working purposes, it is exclusively Protestant. For the crown, though it *must* nominate one or perhaps two Catholics, *may* nominate five hundred Protestants. Then if either Catholic or Protestant commissioner displeases the minister, such commissioner can be cashiered and

turned off with quite as little civility and less ceremony than you could dismiss a foot-boy.

"This, therefore, is a mere *humbug* board. Its complicated details are introduced merely to delude. Such a board must be merely the echo of the will of the secretary of the Castle. If they dared to dissent from him, they would be dismissed at the instant, and more pliant commissioners found without difficulty.

"To continue the delusion, it will be said that the Catholic commissioners would form a check on the Protestants, and on the minister, and prevent any injury from being inflicted on the Catholic religion. Consider this matter for one moment, and you will see how impossible it would be for the Catholic commissioners to check any adverse measure. They could do so only by one of three ways:—*first*, by outvoting the Protestants; *secondly*, by an appeal to a court of law; *thirdly*, by an appeal to public opinion, and to the sense of public decency. As to the first, it is absurd to suppose that the Catholic commissioners will ever equal in number the Protestants. That is quite absurd. I need not waste time in proving that they never could out-vote the Protestants. You may have Doctor Troy and the Earl of Fingal at one side of the table; but you would have the Chancellor, the Attorney-General, Sir George Hill, Lord Frankfort, and probably Sir Harcourt Lee, at the other. But I only waste time in proving what no man can doubt.

"The next resource would be an appeal to a court of law. But alas! there would be no kind of legal remedy for any mischief this board may cause. We should only be scouted out of a court of law.

"The remaining resource would be an appeal to public opinion and to public decency. This at best would be but a poor remedy in Ireland, especially after the specimen Mr. Plunket has given us in traducing our religion, whilst he appeared to be our advocate. But even this poor resource is not left, because the oath of the commissioners, as given in the twelfth section, precludes that, for it is an oath of secrecy. It is an oath that the commissioners will not publish or disclose any matter coming to his knowledge as such, save to his majesty or by his majesty's command.

"Mark that oath well. It precludes the Catholic commissioner from disclosing any conspiracy which may be arranged in the Board to injure the Catholic religion. But if there should be any thing the disclosure of which could hurt us, it leaves every commissioner at liberty to disclose *that*, by his majesty's command!

"I have long known that Mr. Plunket was a man of great and powerful ingenuity; but I did not think he had acuteness enough to frame so complete a snare for the Catholic religion. I still cannot give Mr. Plunket credit for the extreme fitness of his 'infernal machine,' as the French would call it. I think he must have been aided by some personage still more ingenious than himself, and one possessed of deep malignity.

"I shall now proceed to point out the functions of this *humbug* Board, as I have already traced its constitution. These functions are declared by the statute from the nineteenth section to the end. They relate to all bulls, rescripts, and instruments coming to any Catholic—lay or ecclesiastical—from, first, the *See of Rome*; or, secondly, from any foreign body; or, thirdly, from any foreign individual whatsoever; or, fourthly, from any person or body in foreign parts acting under the authority of the *See of Rome*; or, fifthly, from any person or body in foreign parts acting under any other spiritual superior; all such instruments—and the word instrument includes letters of all kinds—must be laid before the Board. Yes, as the bill is printed, without any reference to the contents or subject matter. Yes, this bill is printed in a way so general as to affect all his majesty's subjects upon all topics whatsoever. A Committee of the House may, and I think must, confine the operation of the law to matters of doctrine or discipline, or to ecclesiastical affairs. At present the matter is left at large; and this extreme extent proves at least the voraciousness with which it is sought to swallow up all our religious concerns.

"Within a given time after the receipt of every such instrument, it is, under severe penalties, to be laid before the *Humbug* Board—that is, in fact, before the secretary or clerks at the Castle. And if they find anything in it which appears to them in any way injurious to the safety or tranquillity of the state, or of the Established Church, they are to suppress it;—otherwise they are, at their good leisure, to return it, with a certificate of innocency.

"There is by the twentieth section, a species of exception in favour of instruments confined solely and exclusively to the spiritual concerns of an individual or individuals, with this addition, that they must be of such a nature as cannot, according to the disci-

*pline of our Church be submitted to lay inspection.* With this minute qualification surcharged upon the instrument, being *solely and exclusively* relative to the *spiritual* concerns of an individual, the commissioners are to decide; and if they, 'in the exercise of their judgment and discretion,' think fit, they may refer the instrument to the senior Catholic commissioner, and upon his certificate, and upon his oath, the instrument is to be returned to the person sending it in. But it is quite clear that the Commissioners are at full liberty to *exercise their judgment and discretion*, and to read it and retain it if they please. Ay, and to publish its contents by *his Majesty's command!*

"The distinction is just this: All instruments relative to doctrine, discipline, ecclesiastical and spiritual affairs, save those that relate solely to the spiritual concerns of an individual, *must* be read by the Board. They may read those which relate solely and exclusively to the spiritual concerns of an individual. The difference is only in words.

"Such is the intended operation of the new bill; such is the thralldom under which Mr. Plunket would place all communications between the Irish Catholics and the See of Rome. It was rightly prophesied by a Catholic vetoist, in my presence, that if even a modified veto were given to the Crown, the Catholic religion could not survive it fifty years in Ireland. If this bill passes, the Catholic religion cannot subsist one hour, except by means of disobeying its provisions, and submitting to the martyrdom of its penalties. Our fathers would have done so. Are we less faithful, or less interested in the purity of the Catholic faith? Our eternal salvation is involved in the question, and the trifles of this world vanish as empty baubles during the contemplation of the awful results.

"There are two questions which any statesman, not carried away by an overweening anxiety to injure and degrade our religion, would have asked before he brought in such a bill. The first is, whether those provisions are at all necessary for the government?—the second, whether they be practicable? Both these questions should be answered by every fair man in the negative.

"Those provisions are not necessary for the safety of the state, for the following among other reasons:—First, the correspondence with the See of Rome is carried on upon subjects of an ecclesiastical and spiritual nature solely, and, therefore, upon matters which do not concern the State, as the State has no connexion with our Church; secondly, that correspondence is carried on by persons (namely, our clergy) of unsuspected and unimpeachable loyalty; and, thirdly, if those persons were disloyal, the existing laws are already quite sufficient to protect the State against them.

"The existing law inflicts a punishment upon any person, whether layman or clergyman, who corresponds with any foreign power to the prejudice of our government, and the punishment for that offence is no less than hanging by the neck, but not until the party be dead; for before death the party is to be cut down, and his bowels ript open and flung in his face; and his head is then to be cut off, and his four quarters are to be at the King's disposal. I am quite serious. This punishment is that which the law prescribes against any correspondence with a foreign state, contrary to the duty of our allegiance.

"I humbly think such punishment quite sufficient to deter persons from committing the offence, to guard against which all the machinery of the new Board is got up. It is, therefore, ridiculous to talk of the new Board being necessary as an adjunct to our law of treason. The truth is plain, and stares every man in the face. The new Board is not intended to guard against the idle and imaginary dangers of a traitorous correspondence—a species of correspondence, which, it is clear, would never be exposed to the Board. No! The real object of the Board is different. It is simply to place all the details of the Irish Catholic Church in the hands of Protestants, and then to control and crush that Church in all her branches.

"Having thus shown that the provisions of the new act are unnecessary, I proceed to show that they are impracticable. They are impracticable, because, in the first place, the assent of the Pope would at all events be necessary before the Catholic clergy could accede to them. But that assent will not be given. Cardinal Litta, in the celebrated Genoese Letter, although he gives, on the part of the Pope, some assent to vetoistical arrangements—yet he goes on to declare that *the exposing the correspondence with the See of Rome cannot be listened to even for the purpose of discussion.* We are therefore in possession of the express rejection by the Pope of this very measure which Mr. Plunket vainly wishes the parliament to force on us.

"In the next place the Catholic clergy cannot dispose to 'the discretion and judgment' of the Board the correspondence which relates to the spiritual concerns of individuals. Such correspondence has, of its nature, a connexion with sacramental confession, and can-

not, therefore, be disclosed. The Catholic priests of Ireland, whatever their traducers may say to the contrary, would suffer to be torn limb from limb rather than make any disclosure having a tendency, either directly or indirectly, to reveal matters known to them by confession. It will, therefore, be impossible to submit the private spiritual concerns of individuals to any Board, and there must be a very malignant spirit of hostility to Catholics in the mind of the man, or men, who could think of requiring a disclosure of that nature. And yet, my countrymen, the present penal bill would directly subject such private and spiritual concerns to 'the judgment and discretion' of a Protestant tribunal; and that, too, after requiring an oath from a Catholic priest, that the particular letter or instrument related *solely* and *exclusively* to the private spiritual concerns of an individual. It is quite in the spirit of this act, first, to require an oath from the Catholic priest, and then to go on with its precautions, just as if that oath did not deserve any the slightest credit.

"Another reason why the Catholic clergy cannot submit the inspection of all the correspondence on faith and discipline to a Board essentially Protestant, is this: They cannot, without violating their consciences, make such a Board the arbiter of our faith or our discipline. They cannot suffer matters of such high importance to the eternal welfare of their flocks, to be impeded and interrupted by either the false zeal, the malevolent hatred, or the contemptuous caprice of the clerks of the Castle. They cannot submit to those clerks the details of crime or of accusation, which must be referred to, for example, in an appeal by a clergyman suspended or silenced for alleged immorality. A single case of that kind, published at the instance of the Attorney-General, commanding the *publication in the name of his Majesty*, and published in the hostile newspapers of Dublin, would inflict perpetual ridicule and disgrace on the Catholic religion.

"I need not follow this subject farther. The object of the present bill is plainly to cover our religion with disgrace and obloquy: to control it at the caprices of its bitterest enemies; to stop the course of its discipline; to expose our clergy to contempt; and, in fine, to give active operation to all those concealed causes and motives which, in the constitution of human nature, must have the most powerful tendency to annihilate and extinguish our religion.

"I do therefore say, that the Catholic clergy cannot possibly submit to the proposed Board. Mr. Plunket may, it is true, make martyrs of them; but let him rest assured that he will not be able to make them traitors to their religion and to their God.

"There remains much of this abominable bill still to be considered. There remain all its details of the new veto. We never before heard, or had any the slightest intimation, of a design to extend the veto to our deans. The merit of this extension is the exclusive property of Mr. Plunket. This out-Heroding of Herod belongs to Mr. Plunket. Let him have the sole and exclusive honour of it, especially as he has invented it in his capacity of our advocate.

"There also remain the various and complicated penalties and punishments introduced by this bill to be inflicted on clergy and laity for the free exercise of the Catholic religion. I must, I find, reserve the veto and the penalties for another letter.

"For the present, I close with an earnest entreaty to every sincere and honest Catholic to procure a copy of this bill, and to read it attentively. It is the more necessary for individuals to make themselves masters of the subjects, because in the present state of the press of Dublin, little aid and less support can be obtained. The Catholicity of Ireland is at stake, and no man can value his religion who does not at least make himself acquainted with this most important subject.

"I pledge myself not to close my next letter without demonstrating, if it be not already done, that the present bill is, beyond comparison, more *strictly*, *literally*, and *emphatically* a *penal* and *persecuting bill* than any or all the statutes passed in the darkest and most bigoted periods of the reigns of Queen Anne, or of the two first Georges. Its title should be: An act to 'deatholicise' Ireland; for that is certainly its object.

"Fellow-countrymen, I write to you in sorrow as well as the sincerity of my heart. I place great confidence in your good sense. I place great confidence in the sincerity of your attachment to the faith of the uninterrupted Church of Christ; but my greatest and most firm reliance is upon that God, who protected our fathers amidst the flames of persecution, and may in his mercy guard their children from the pestilence of pretended friendship.

"I am, my beloved countrymen,

"Your ever faithful and devoted Servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

## "LETTER III.

## "TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

" Yes, he would rather houseless roam,  
Where freedom and his God may lead,  
Than be the sleekest slave at home  
That crouches to the conqueror's creed."

" Limerick, 20th March, 1821.

" FELLOW COUNTRYMEN—I have endeavoured in my first letter to point out the mischiefs of Mr. Plunket's bill, so far as it relates to that object to which alone its title alludes—the intercourse with Rome. I will now, in the name of God, proceed to show you all the abominations of the double veto which that bill contains. This veto is the principal and leading purport of the bill, although it is studiously suppressed in the title.

" The vetoistical matter is confined to a part of the oath in the first section, and to the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth sections.

" I have already stated the parts of the oath which relate to the correspondence with Rome. There is, in addition to this passage: The priest must swear he will not concur in the appointment of any bishop, save of a person of *unimpeachable loyalty and peaceable conduct*.

" I object to this oath, because it presupposes a necessity for such swearing. It presupposes that which is a foul, and, thank God, an unfounded calumny—namely, that there have been Irish Bishops of doubtful loyalty and of disorderly conduct. Besides this, swearing is quite thrown away. The priest gets no kind of credit for his swearing—the law proceeds with as much rigour as if the priest had not been sworn.

" The veto itself comes next. It comes in the blackest and most undisguised colours. Listen, Catholics of Ireland, to the simple and efficacious plan which Mr. Plunket has devised, in order to give the Secretary of the Castle the appointment of our bishops and deans, and to convert our priests into sycophants, and expectants on the bounty of the Castle.

" The sixteenth section enacts, THAT EVERY PERSON WHO SHALL HEREAFTER BE nominated to the OFFICE OF BISHOP OR DEAN, in the Catholic Church in Ireland, shall, BEFORE his consecration or acting as such, give notice to the Secretary of the Lord-Lieutenant, and that he shall not be consecrated or exercise any functions of bishop or dean if such Secretary of the Lord-Lieutenant SHALL INFORM HIM IN WRITING THAT HE IS CONSIDERED BY HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT TO BE, FOR SOME REASON OF A CIVIL NATURE, A PERSON IMPROPER FOR SUCH OFFICE!

" Honest and conscientious Catholics, who understand how matters are managed at the Castle, what say you to that? Mr. Canning's veto bill was nothing to it! But I anticipate.

" It is then provided that this notice, which is to disqualify any priest from being a bishop or dean in the Catholic Church, must be—what think you? *Why, under the hand, and the seal too, of the Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant!* Wonderful mark of condescension!

" But lest this precious document should be lost or mislaid, and lest there should be any difficulty in prosecuting a conscientious Catholic bishop or dean, the seventeenth section provides that such certificate of disapprobation shall be enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, and that an attested copy of it shall be evidence against any Catholic clergyman upon any prosecution under this act!

" The eighteenth section follows up the persecution to its climax, and makes it an indictable offence to exercise ANY PART of the functions of a dean or bishop, without having on his nomination signified the same to the Castle, or after he has been disapproved of by the Secretary. Now, even on an idle accusation for such an offence, any Catholic priest may be dragged from his flock; thrown into a jail for six or eight months, although guiltless; and if convicted by an Orange jury, he is to be liable to punishment. The extent of that punishment is not defined as yet. It may be hanging; it may be reduced to transportation; it may be only whipping; it cannot be less than fine and imprisonment. Punished, however, he must be. The punishment is already certain. The quantity alone is doubtful.



“Such, my beloved countrymen, is Mr. Plunket's bill. It is an impudent veto. I will not call it less. It is an audacious attempt to place all the Catholic clergy in Ireland under the worst species of ministerial control, and also to leave them at the mercy of every malignant Orange informer. In the province of Ulster the Catholic clergy would be annihilated by this bill, and, as far as I am concerned, I would infinitely rather perish with disgrace on a scaffold than assent to such a law.

“Heretofore the idea of a government appointment was confined to bishops. We owe it altogether to Mr. Plunket that the notion is extended to deans. The minuteness of his dislike to the Catholic Church has induced him to go beyond every former attempt; and he will soon be disconcerted if he cannot extend severity and punishment to the most humble orders of our clergy.

“You have now, my countrymen, the bill before you. It gives directly and in plain terms the installation of your deans and bishops to the Castle. The way in which the authority of the Castle is exercised is familiar to us all. It is parcelled out amongst the ministerial members for each county; and as the revenue officers and stamp distributors are now nominated by those members, so in future, under this law, the Catholic deans and bishops, in each county, would become part of their *patronage* and *emolument*. Those persons are familiarly known at the Castle and in the country by the appellation of ‘county patrons.’

“What course should a priest, under that system, pursue in order to be made a dean or bishop? He must consult the interest and court the patronage of the *patron* of his county—that is, of the chief supporter of the minister amongst the county members. At present, learning, piety, and zeal, are the ingredients which facilitate the promotion of a bishop in our Church. What will the ‘county patron’ care for the learning of a Catholic priest? Our county patrons are, in general, blessed be God! men as destitute of learning as can well be imagined. They are, in general, incapable of appreciating its value in any person. They would hate and despise it in a Catholic priest. Learning would certainly be no recommendation to them.

“The piety of a Catholic priest would serve him in still less stead with the county patron. In the first place, all the present county patrons have sworn—have solemnly and repeatedly sworn—that the exercises of that piety are impious and idolatrous. In the next place, the piety of a Catholic priest may be highly offensive to the ‘patron.’ It may offend his minions or his friends, if the patron has any bigots amongst his friends—and what county patron has not?—and how many of the patrons are bigots themselves? In every such case the piety of a Catholic priest will make enemies for him, in the person and about the person of the county patron, and insure his exclusion from all promotion in his Church.

“But if piety be dangerous to any candidate for promotion, zeal would be quite destructive of all hope. The zealous priest should oppose, in private and in public, as far as he can (without violating charity), the vices of the ‘patron,’ and of his friends. The zealous priest must oppose the great *Education Swindle* of Kildarestreet, which is a favourite to so many bigots. The zealous priest must oppose every other fraudulent scheme of underhand proselytism. He must discountenance and expose the ‘patron’ and his friends in their plans of making every man a kind of founder of a sect, by sending him to pick a religion for himself out of what we deem a corrupt version of so much of the Word of God as has been preserved in writing, to the utter exclusion of that part which has been preserved in our Church by tradition. For each and every of these acts he is certain of being excluded from promotion in his Church.

“If he shall, in his zeal, *disturb* the minion of the mistress of the ‘patron;’ if in his zeal he shall convert a single Protestant, or bring back from error a single stray Catholic; if by his preaching, his prayers, his zealous exertions, he should extend the bounds of Catholicity—of that Catholicity which the patron has sworn to be impious and idolatrous—what possibility is there of his being a dean or a bishop, so long as that patron can exclude him?

“Thus, my countrymen, you see at once this obvious consequence, that under Mr. Plunket's bill, a Catholic clergyman cannot expect promotion by means of the qualities which best entitle him to it. His learning will be useless to him. His piety will be dangerous to him. His zeal, destructive. What qualities, then, will serve him? What qualifications will secure his appointment? The detail is short plain, and simple.

" [Mr. O'Connell has written his letters in the little intervals snatched from the arduous professional avocations of a busy circuit. He has not been able to finish them at two or at six sittings, or to send them to us *otherwise than in portions*. We promised, in the *Herald* of Tuesday, his second letter on the Double Pains and Penalties' Bill, and we were, by the post of yesterday, furnished with so much of it as the reader has just perused. We expected the conclusion by this morning's mail, but, instead of it, we have received the annexed note. The entire we shall certainly be able to give on the next Tuesday.]

" TO THE PROPRIETOR OF THE 'EVENING HERALD.'

" Limerick, 22nd March, 1821.

" MY DEAR SIR—The pressure of professional business has rendered it impossible for me to send you the remainder of my second letter by this post. I regret this circumstance, because I think it of great importance that the Catholics of Ireland should become acquainted with the remainder of the Veto Bill as soon as possible. I am particularly anxious that the various pains, penalties, and punishments to which, if this bill passes, our clergy will be subjected, should be distinctly understood. I also wish that the Catholics should see how admirably contrived the bill is to prevent its lying for one hour as a dead letter, and to make it execute itself.

" For the present I can only pledge myself to demonstrate, in your next publication, that there has not hitherto existed in Ireland any law so horribly cruel to the Catholic clergy as that which Mr. Plunket proposes.

" I am, my dear Sir, your very obedient Servant,

" DANIEL O'CONNELL."

- The bills of Mr. Plunket passed the lower house, but were fortunately defeated in the upper upon the second reading.

A considerable degree of division and angry discussion had arisen among the Catholics, with relation to them, but the majority of the country, headed by the prelates, repudiated them, and hailed their defeat with satisfaction.

Matters that occurred during the debates upon them in parliament, drew from Mr. O'Connell the following letter:—

" TO THE EDITOR OF THE CORK MERCANTILE CHRONICLE.

" SIR—I should pass over in silence the mention lately made in parliament of my name, but that I think it may be injurious to the cause of anti-vetoism, if I did not contradict one assertion which appears to have been made there.

" Mr. Martin of Galway is reported to have said two things of me: first, that I had endeavoured to procure a requisition for a Catholic aggregate meeting in Dublin, *and was unable to obtain more than nine signatures*; secondly, that I have no chance of a place, or, in his own words, not less true than facetious, that if it rained places, not one would be given to me.

" The first of these things Mr. Martin spoke from information, and I beg to inform him that his informant entirely deceived him. There was not the slightest foundation whatsoever for the story. The tale was a pure invention of the person who related it to Mr. Martin, and I presume he will be glad to know how little credit ought in future to be given to the person who misinformed him.

"When I left Dublin there was not the least notion of an aggregate meeting. The resolutions in the committee of the whole house, as proposed by Mr. Plunket, were so vague, general, and unobjectionable, that no aggregate meeting could be held to oppose that veto, which was carefully concealed, until the bills were brought in, and until it was not possible any longer to conceal it. But *at that time* the circuits had gone out. It seemed as if there were a very dexterous management to keep back the veto until after the Catholic lawyers and country gentlemen had left Dublin for the assizes. The consequences which were, I believe, foreseen, have actually taken place, and Dublin, instead of giving, as it formerly did, and as it naturally ought, the tone to the clergy and laity of Ireland, will now receive its own impulse from the clergy and laity of the provinces.

"With regard to the second allegation of Mr. Martin, I admit its force and its truth. I receive it as unmixed praise. If I am not looking for place or office, it furnishes a strong argument to prove that I am honest. In religion I am a sincere Catholic; in politics I am a sincere reformer. I come, indeed, within the class of radicals, and owning myself a radical, I cannot be surprised or displeased to hear it said, either that I am not suited for office, or that office is not suited to me.

"Avowing these principles—looking upon reform as absolutely necessary, and the repeal of the Union as a measure without which Ireland cannot prosper, I am pleased to have obtained the censure of Lord Castlereagh. May I never live to sustain the infiction of his lordship's praise. He says, 'I have not cultivated the peace or tranquillity of Ireland. The species of cultivation in which his lordship has been engaged, and the fruits it has produced are, indeed, apparent. I think that the peace of Ireland would be promoted, and her tranquillity insured by a reformed and a resident parliament. His lordship is of that class of politicians—'*ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*' My plan would be different. I would people our solitudes with a free and happy nation; and the bloodless revolutions on the Continent of Europe prove that my daydream for unhappy Ireland may yet be realized. This hope may the more confidently be entertained, as we neither wish for, nor want any revolution. All that is necessary for us is restoration and reform.

"I am glad to find that those who deem a public meeting to be only 'a farce,' are getting up a protest. That is quite right. We shall now be able to count our vetoists. In Limerick they were, I think, nineteen. One has since deserted. We can easily count them—but could they count us?

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obedient Servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

The divisions which had once more become thus painfully notorious in the Catholic body, prevailed during the spring and summer of 1821. They manifested themselves strikingly in the dispute which occurred respecting the terms of a requisition for a meeting, which took place in July, about the time when it was first known with certainty, that the king would visit Ireland.

Mr. O'Connell drew up the first form of requisition which invited the Catholics to take the occasion of their preparations for the king's visit, to assemble and consider also of the state of their affairs, and what line of conduct it might be their interest to pursue in the then depressed and gloomy state of their prospects.

Lords Fingal, Netterville, Gormanstown, and Killeen, with

Sir John Burke, Mr. Bagot, and other commoners, published a *protest* against

“Connecting in any manner the general question of Catholic affairs, with the object of voting a congratulatory address to his most gracious majesty, on the auspicious event of his visiting this country.”

They accordingly got up another requisition “for the **SOLE** purpose of addressing his majesty.”

Mr. O'Connell, anxious for unanimity, readily yielded his own views, and adopted their requisition.

It was at this time that the old Orange Corporation of Dublin, held out, for the first time, very fair seeming, but what, ere many months elapsed, were proved to be very false colours to the Catholics. The king, driven, as it were, from England, by the execrations of his people, and the cowardice of his own evil conscience, was coming to Ireland heralded by vague and deceitful promises and assurances, put forward to conciliate the Catholic Irish, and ensure him, at any cost, a good reception. The leaders of the Catholics were not blinded either by the treacherous advances of their corporation enemies, or the deceits with which the way was sought to be smoothened for the king's approach. Still they were true to the policy of their lives, and resolved to interpose no check to the popular feeling, and to seem to entertain no doubt of the lavish assurances which were being heaped upon them. Even a direct breach of engagement on the part of the corporation authorities, in a manner seriously affecting Catholic feeling, was allowed but to create a momentary irritation.

There had been a kind of promise given, that the annual insult to the Catholics of bedecking King William's statue, in College-green, with Orange ribbons, &c., should be omitted this year, to favour and forward the conciliatory movement which was said to be taking place. The promise was, however, broken, and the customary insults took place upon the Orange anniversary of the 12th July.

The following report, given by a paper then adverse to Mr.

O'Connell (*The Dublin Evening Post*) will shew that he was not the most eager to allow this incident to have any lasting effect :—

“CATHOLIC MEETING.

“There was yesterday a numerous and highly respectable meeting at D'Arcy's Corn Exchange Tavern.

“Shortly after three o'clock O'CONNOR DON was called to the chair.

“The report of the committee appointed to wait on the lord mayor on Wednesday, and his lordship's letter to Lord Fingal, being read—

“Mr. O'CONNELL addressed the meeting. He said that heretofore much had been done, and that the conduct of the Catholics had been not only pure, but unimpeachable. They had much to forget—they had been greatly injured by insult and taunts ; yet, when an offer was made towards conciliation, they hailed it with shouts and gladness. Mr. Wadden (said Mr. O'Connell), one of our Protestant fellow-Irishmen, our brother Christian, was the person who came and said the olive branch was offered, that it was held out, and the Orange should be kept back. Such was the promise, but scarcely had the air in which that promise was uttered ceased to vibrate, nor was the ink dry upon the letter which conveyed it to Lord Fingal, when those insults were renewed, and the shouts of triumph resounded through Dame-street. I do not (said Mr. O'Connell) condemn the lord mayor as being a party, but I blame him for not preserving the public peace. If he had put constables' staffs into our hands, he would have had a force sufficient to prevent midnight outrage. The lord mayor is the chief magistrate, and therefore, instead of going to wait upon the first magistrate of police, he could have commanded him to his Mansion-house, and could have required his co-operation, and that of every magistrate and officer of the establishment, as well as that of every citizen. We have been told that an application was made to the castle, and from thence to a high legal character. I wonder (continued Mr. O'Connell), if we were to exhibit a wooden horse, with a wreath of green and shamrock about him, whether there would be all this going about ; in considering ourselves insulted, the best way to do is not to leave anything in the power of our enemies. My object (said Mr. O'Connell) in shouting when the proposal was made, was not that I sought emancipation for any particular sect, but that I wished for a repeal of the Union ; it has been said, that it never can be repealed ; but that is a libel against God and man. The Union grew out of our dissensions, and it will cease within twelve months after they shall cease. Mr.

O'Connell then proceeded to state, that Lord Fingal had intended being present, and taking the chair at that meeting, but was prevented by indisposition. He (Mr. O'Connell) therefore proposed, that a committee should be appointed to ascertain what the entire substance was of the communication which had been made to Lord Fingal, and that the meeting should adjourn to Monday.

"MR. MAHON in a few words seconded the motion.

"Mr. SHIEL opposed the motion. For what were the committee to adjourn? Was it with the hope of uniting with the corporation? The late insult offered the Catholics in College-green was too broad and open to admit of such a thing. A promise was held out, a pledge was given; they were both violated, the Catholics had been insulted, and it would be weakness to procrastinate. The meeting should decide at once on what was proper to be done. Let the meeting act as individuals would do in ordinary cases—let them resent the affront at once, rather than revolve it in the mind for ever. The lord mayor had intimated to Lord Fingal at the last meeting, that unanimity was much to be desired, and hoped that its blessings, now attained, would extend to the future. These sentiments were hailed as favourable symptoms, but THE VERY NEXT DAY after their promulgation, the OBNOXIOUS STATUE in College-green WAS COVERED WITH THE SYMBOLS OF FACTION AND OF BLOOD. Why, then, make further concessions to the corporation? Who will insure us that FURTHER INSULT WILL NOT BE OFFERED? The SMALLEST ordinary PRECAUTION would have PREVENTED the decoration of the statue, or removed it. For what were the citizens paying such enormous taxes for the police establishment but that the peace of the city might be kept? For his own part he thought it better to speak out at once, and let the matter be decided. Mr. Shiel concluded by moving the following resolutions:—

"RESOLVED—'That animated as we are by the deepest sense of gratitude and joy at the anticipated visit of our gracious sovereign to this country, and yielding to no class of the community in fidelity and attachment to his royal person, we had received with the utmost cordiality the expression of a wish of the lord mayor and corporation of the city of Dublin, that we should co-operate with them in the celebration of so fortunate an event, and that we entertained a hope that the assurance which was given that all offensive symbols of faction should be laid aside, would not have been violated upon an occasion when all religious differences should be merged in one united feeling of devotion to his majesty.'

"RESOLVED—'That after so distinct an engagement, that all party and offensive ceremonies should be discountenanced, the investing of the statue in College-green, in the colours heretofore employed for the purpose of insult, is a breach of that undertaking which, while it provokes political passions into a violation of the public peace, is more peculiarly calculated at this moment to interrupt the harmony to which we were earnestly anxious to lend our co-operation.'

“MR. JAMES FARRELL said he had called on the lord mayor ; that his lordship declared the decoration of the statue was entirely contrary to his wishes, and that in consequence of these not being complied with, he had since WITHDRAWN HIMSELF ALTOGETHER FROM THE ORANGE SOCIETY.

“MR. LUKE PLUNKET here said, that Alderman Darley had yesterday informed him, that the lord mayor had advanced twenty guineas towards the decorations for the statue, and that there were upwards of 8000 combined Orangemen in Dublin.

“MR. MACDONNELL approved of the resolutions of Mr. Shiel so far as they went. He thought it necessary, however, to go a step farther, and propose that a public dinner take place on the 23rd instant, to which all liberal Protestant and Catholic gentlemen be invited, and that this dinner be wholly unconnected and distinct from that of the Dublin corporation, at Morrisson’s.

“MR. COSTELLOE said, that he was present both at the dressing and undressing of the statue. The mob, on the first occasion, was sober and well-dressed, consisting, for the most part, of shopkeepers. [A gentleman observed, that a Mr. Sutter, and a Mr. Pim, a flour merchant, were amongst the mob, assisting in the operations. It was also said, that Alderman Darley and Sheriff Brady passed during the proceedings, and that there was a groan ‘for Popish Grant.’] On the second occasion, Mr. Costelloe said, the mob was, indeed, most ragged and most infuriated. They were well armed, and many were drunk. There were in the crowd several of the 12th Lancers, and he saw these distinctly draw their swords, brandish them in the air, and vociferate ‘down with the Papists,’ ‘to hell with the Pope,’ ‘to hell with Popish defenders,’ ‘the Pope in a pillory in hell, and the devil pelting O’Connell at him,’ ‘to hell with O’Gorman,’ &c.

“MR. MACARTHY said he had seen the farce of dressing the statue, and the yells of the ruffians were music to his ears, as he hoped their being drunk would bring others to their senses. He clearly saw that the trick intended by getting the Catholics and the Orangemen to appear cordial together, was to show the king that all those reports which have gone abroad concerning this country are ill-founded ; and when the king would see O’Connell (the agitator) and Abraham Bradley King cordial together, he would conclude that it must be unnecessary for Mr. Plunket to be labouring for the repeal of laws which are not injurious.

“MR. HOWLEY was happy to perceive, that his learned friend had yielded to the manly feelings of the meeting, in withdrawing his intention to move an adjournment ; either the lord mayor had or had

not the power to prevent the outrage; if he had, why did he not? I saw, continued Mr. Howley, a novel parade about the damned idol of an expiring party; several ruffians, armed with pistols, surrounded it, as if to tempt the people of this metropolis to acts of violence. When the olive branch is held out to us, if we rush forward to catch the hand that offers it, and are afterwards deceived, who are to blame—the Catholics or those who deceive them?

“MR. O'CONNELL said he could not bring himself to believe that they could not as well decide after due deliberation. He believed Mr. L. Plunket as to the conversation about the robes; but he (Mr. O'Connell) had it from good authority, that the lord mayor had forbidden the robemaker to give out the articles. Another consideration, and what ought to go in extenuation of the lord mayor's conduct was, that he might possibly have no confidence in the military when called out, for numbers of the 12th Lancers were seen to join the mob in their operations on Thursday last.

“MR. SHIEL's resolution was then put and carried.

“A resolution for a *separate dinner* was afterwards moved by MR. MACDONNELL, in which the day was left blank.

“MR. HOWLEY moved, as an amendment, that the words of the resolution be, that a committee be appointed to consider and report on the best mode of celebrating his majesty's coronation.

“The resolution, as amended, was unanimously agreed to, and Mr. O'Brien having been voted into the chair, the thanks of the meeting were unanimously voted to O'Conor Don, and the meeting adjourned to Monday next.”

#### “CATHOLIC MEETING.

“Yesterday there was an adjourned meeting of Catholic gentlemen at D'Arcy's great rooms, Corn Exchange Tavern.

“At half-past three o'clock the EARL OF FINGAL was called to the chair.

“MR. FINN shortly addressed the chair. He thought the late outrage on the public feeling laid the foundation for the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland to join in a petition for the putting down an illegal association. He (Mr. Finn) might well call the Orange associations illegal, when they had been termed so by the bench, and before the parliament of the United Kingdom. He believed the lord mayor was perfectly sincere in his wish for the conciliation. (Hear, hear.) He had heard that an address to the lord lieutenant would be proposed; his opinion, however, was, that nothing should be done in that respect.



There was a prospect of better times ; unfortunately, the Catholics and the corporation could not meet at the present moment. The idea of dining with the lord mayor, he conceived, was totally abandoned. (Cries of 'yes, yes.')

An approach to conciliation had been made, and at no distant period we might be more successful.

"MR. SHIEL said, that under the peculiar circumstances in which the Roman Catholics stood, after the facts which had been disclosed relative to the decoration of the statue in College-green, which had been disclaimed and censured by the lord mayor and magistrates of the city—after the violation of the assurance which had been given by the municipal authorities, that all symbols of party should be discontinued, it was matter for the serious consideration of the meeting, whether measures should not be adopted for the purpose not only of preventing the recurrence of the evil, but in order to put a stop to that system of factious domination from which so much public detriment had already flowed. He was not inclined to lay any blame to the lord mayor or to the magistrates of Dublin ; on the contrary, he believed that this insult had been offered, not only without their approbation, but against their express desire. It had originated from the ferocious spirit of a set of men, leagued by illegal bonds in a barbarous and truculent affiliation. He had a confidence in the good intentions of government at this auspicious moment, and he felt convinced that an appeal for protection and redress would not be addressed to them in vain. [Here Mr. Shiel read an address to the lord lieutenant.]

"LORD FINGAL would merely observe, that the impression upon his mind was, that the lord mayor had been quite sincere in his original offer of conciliation ; and the noble earl still continued to hold the same opinion, notwithstanding the unfortunate and discreditable transactions of the 12th of July.

"MR. O'CONNOR DON stated that he had been inimical to any resolution on that insult ; but on consideration, he thought it could not do an injury, and he felt it was necessary to come to some resolution on the subject.

"MR. O'CONNELL could not concur in the opinion that the address on the subject of the late insult was necessary. There were many parts of that address which might be contradicted as to facts, and the language was not of that nature that would tend to allay the dissensions that had too long subsisted amongst them. The firing round the statue of King William was practised by the Volunteers of Ireland, a body of men to whom they might look back with pride.

"THE EARL OF FINGAL here said, that he recollected when Catholics and Protestants were in the habit of firing round the statue which

had been erected at the very spot where the battle of the Boyne was fought, and that when they afterwards retired together, to celebrate the day, one of their toasts was the Pope's health.

“MR. O'CONNELL resumed.—He should not speak of cups and daggers, although there were many bitter recollections that he might indulge in, was he so inclined; but, instead of looking back for causes of disunion, he preferred looking forward for reasons for conciliation. We forgave insult—(no, no)—I speak not of the present insult; but, I repeat it, we forgave insult when we accepted offers of conciliation. By adopting (said Mr. O'Connell) an address on that outrage, we lose the vantage ground on which we are placed. They say they do every thing in their power to conciliate, and we do nothing; our reply to them is—you, who have been wrong, atone for it. Although I may be called an ‘unhappy man,’ yet I still declare that I hailed with joy, and still hail with joy, the day on which the lord mayor of Dublin (the deputy grand master of Orangemen) made a PEACE OFFERING to the Catholics of Ireland. He confessed, notwithstanding the ridicule to which the admission might expose him, that he was weak enough to wish to see those distinctions, which had been the curse of his country, sunk in the single name of IRISHMAN; and he was credulous enough to think that ‘a consummation so devoutly to be wished’ was by no means impossible. Indeed, he still thought a most important advance had been made by the lord mayor; and he still believed his lordship to have been perfectly sincere. The address proposed went, by implication, to charge the government with connivance. Mr. Shiel has said that the Orange oaths are illegal; but what is Mr. Shiel's remedy?—an address to the Castle. Oh! by all means, present an address to the Castle, and you will find ample redress. The statue will never be dressed again, and you will never be insulted in future. You may be told also, ‘that the courts of law are open to you;’ and, should you look for redress there, perhaps you may get the opinion of the attorney-general as to the illegality of Orange associations; nor need you be much surprised if, like some of the government prints, he should, at the same time, speak of their ‘immense loyalty!’ In my humble judgment, my lord, there is but one hope for Ireland—that hope is unanimity; we owe all our misfortunes to dissension.

“MR. SHIEL, in answer to Mr. O'Connell, said, that although he did not coincide in his reasons, yet, as he had already suggested, he was willing to relinquish his proposition rather than disturb the harmonious temper of the country. He was far from agreeing with Mr. O'Connell in the idea that the government would dismiss such an address with an evasive answer. There was nothing in it calculated to

irritate and inflame. It called for redress for a public grievance upon the persons who had alone the power to grant that redress. However, rather than persevere in any measure which could produce animosity at such a juncture, he should beg leave to suggest a resolution, which would make the sacrifice of our resentments an oblation of homage to the sovereign, and operate as an addition to those testimonies of devotion with which we were anxious to receive him. This was a better mode of expressing an attachment to the royal person, than by a civic feast. The corporation, in their festivities, were only pursuing their vocation. They had, from time immemorial, no other method than by putting their digestive organs into action, to express the deepest sentiment of the heart. But we, thank God, could employ our intellects, as well as our stomachs, in testifying our affection for our sovereign; and we should not be behind them in this regard in the expressions of our fidelity to the royal person. Mr. Shiel concluded by moving the following resolution:—

“RESOLVED—‘That notwithstanding the unprovoked insult which has been offered to the public feeling, by the decoration of the statue in College-green, as a tribute of our homage to his Majesty, we shall avoid, by any remonstrance to government, an interruption of that harmony to which we are anxious to contribute.’

“MR. O’CONNELL seconded the resolution, which, after some further debating, was allowed to pass unanimously.”

The address, which was finally agreed upon to be presented by the Catholics to the King, was as follows:—

“*SIR*—While all other classes of the community are thronging round the throne of your Majesty, with the eager expression of their attachment to your person, upon the auspicious event of your arrival in this country, we, your Majesty’s Roman Catholic subjects, who (whatever may be our civil inferiority) yield to none of our fellow-citizens in devotion to our Sovereign, and fidelity to your illustrious house, have cordially united in that generous emulation.

“We approach your Majesty with sentiments of unaffected gratitude, for the peculiar mark of regard which you have deigned to bestow upon this portion of your dominions. You are hailed with the benedictions of an enthusiastic and undiseemingly people. Accept the homage of our duty, and the finer offering of our love. If the reverence which is due to your royal office is the second sentiment in our hearts, it is only because our affection is the first.

“In other parts of the great empire over which you are appointed to rule, you will behold more gorgeous evidences of wealth, and grandeur, and power; but in none will you ever meet a more exalted and deeply-rooted attachment to your Majesty.

“We shall never forget the happy period of your residence amongst us; and, upon the other hand, whenever the thoughts of our Sovereign, in any interval from those imperial solitudes which occupy your mind, shall return to Ireland, you will, we trust, feel an assurance that you are the master of a faithful people. That while the sister country may afford your Majesty the resources of her riches and of her trade, in our chivalrous poverty, we are ready, as we have always been, with the nobler tribute of our blood. That you will find a soldier in every one of us; and that in the defence of your throne, and of the liberties which it sustains, our lives are at your service.”

The foregoing was not from the pen of Mr. O'Connell ; but we insert it here, as part of the proceedings of the time with regard to which he took so prominent a part.

Neither our space nor subject will allow of any particular notice of the royal visit of 1821, and its attendant circumstances. The deceit as to the King's intentions and disposition towards his Catholic subjects, we have before alluded to ; as also the fact that of the leading Catholics, few were really caught by it, although willing to let it be supposed successful. But there is no doubt at all that the reiteration, while here, of the King's promises and fair assurances had, at last, the effect of causing them to be generally believed ; and we may the less wonder at it when it is ascertained from a passage in the recently published memoirs of Lord Eldon, that the King at one moment *half believed himself that he was sincere*, to the great fright of Lord Eldon and his associates, who thereupon hastened the measures for his departure. On the day of his embarkation, Mr. O'Connell, at the head of a Catholic deputation, presented him with a crown of laurel, which was received with sufficient graciousness. A few days afterwards, came a letter from Lord Sidmouth, expressing, in the King's name, his gratification at all that had occurred during his visit to Ireland—his anxiety to promote her interests, and internal peace among her people ; and his desire that all parties would join him in his endeavours for that purpose.

The Orange party—who had signalized themselves by not refraining from their shibboleth, of "*The Glorious, Pious, and Immortal Memory*," even at the corporation dinner to the King (though, of course, not proposed till after he had left the room)—laughed in their sleeves at this letter. The Catholics took it in earnest, and set about preparing, as the following extracts will show, to meet it in what they deemed a corresponding spirit :— "

#### " MEETING AT THE ROYAL EXCHANGE.

" Yesterday a meeting, convened in consequence of a notice which was published in the newspapers of Thursday evening and Friday morn-

ing, was held at D'Arcy's Great Room, to consider the best way of giving the most extensive circulation to the letter of his Majesty.

"Soon after one o'clock, DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., was called to the chair.

"The Learned Gentleman, on taking the chair, said, that he highly approved of the object of the meeting. Too much publicity could not be given to a document so honourable to the Sovereign; and to the country so gratifying and so hopeful.

"MR. ENEAS MACDONNELL stated, that he, in concurrence with other gentlemen, caused the notice to be inserted. The learned gentleman, after expatiating for a considerable time, and with great eloquence, on the value and importance of his Majesty's gracious communication, moved the following resolutions:—

"RESOLVED—'That the paternal solicitude and benevolence manifested in this most gracious communication of our beloved Sovereign towards all classes and descriptions of his Irish subjects, merits our enthusiastic gratitude and admiration.'

"RESOLVED—'That it is most desirable that this gratifying expression of the royal will should be circulated as speedily as possible throughout the country, as well to inform our fellow-subjects of every degree of the affectionate admonition of our Sovereign, as to diffuse and promote that general concord, which, in the genuine spirit of paternal regard, is declared by our good King to be "No less essential to his Majesty's happiness, than to our own, and which it has been the chief object of his Majesty, during his residence in this country, to cherish and promote."'

"RESOLVED—'That a subscription be raised to carry this object into effect, by printing copies of this important document for circulation, and forwarding them to every part of Ireland.'

"RESOLVED—'That the clergy of every communion, with the nobility, magistrates, and gentry of the country, are respectfully requested to assist in this gratifying occupation, in such manner as is most likely to ensure success; and that we most particularly recommend and request that all the heads of schools, male and female, throughout Ireland, will introduce this letter as a school lesson among their scholars, in order that the youth of the country may be impressed with sentiments of gratitude towards their King, and of good will towards one another.'

"RESOLVED—'That in inviting the aid of the several cities and towns on this occasion, we rely upon that "generosity and warmth of heart" which his Majesty is graciously pleased to say he "well knows to distinguish his faithful people in Ireland;" and we confidently anticipate that they will practically evince their approval of our object, either by forwarding subscriptions to our funds, or establishing local committees for printing and circulating his Majesty's communication.'

"RESOLVED—'That a committee be appointed to collect subscriptions, and to report the best mode of effecting the above object, to an adjourned meeting, to be held at the Royal Exchange on Monday, 10th instant, at four o'clock in the afternoon.'

"The following gentlemen were accordingly named by the meeting:—

"Eneas Macdonnell, Esq., A. Brown, Esq., Counsellor Lannigan, Counsellor Finn, Doctor Callinan, Colonel M'Dermott, Joseph M'Donnell, Esq., Mr. Marnell, Dr. Wright, Mr. J. Brown, Mr. Richardson.'

“ The following letter was read at the meeting :—

“ Sir Edward Lees presents his respects to the chairman at the meeting convened this day for the purpose of affording circulation to the letter addressed by Lord Viscount Sidmouth to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, on the occasion of his Majesty's departure from Ireland; and begs to offer his services, in every possible way, in aid of that most desirable object. Sir Edward Lees begs to add, that he is in possession of the names and residences of nearly 40,000 of the nobility, clergy, and gentry of the kingdom.

“ General Post-Office, Sept. 7th, 1831.”

“ MR. O'CONNELL said, that it was scarcely necessary for him to suggest to the gentlemen present the propriety of proposing a vote of thanks to Sir Edward Lees, for his very polite and patriotic conduct.

“ MR. FINN proposed a vote of thanks accordingly, which was put and carried.”

---

“ LOYAL UNION, OR ROYAL GEORGEAN CLUB.

“ MR. O'CONNELL called the attention of gentlemen to the propriety of endeavouring to perpetuate that spirit of harmony and concord which his Majesty's approach seemed to have created, and which every act and word of the King, during his residence here, had fostered, cherished, and recommended. For the first time, in the history of this unfortunate country, had Irish feelings been respected, and Irish interests consulted; for the first time, had all classes been treated with an equal hand; for the first time, had odious distinctions and party denominations been abolished. The secret of Irish disaffection was now disclosed; and the remedy not only discovered, but applied. Ireland had been, hitherto, too much governed by the spirit of party; and its rulers appeared to consult the interest of the master-few, and to hold in something like contempt the wants and wishes of the several millions—in short, a faction was everything, and a people nothing.

“ Who could wonder that the faction claimed exclusive loyalty, and that the people exhibited, perhaps, too many symptoms of dissatisfaction and disaffection? The King arrived, and the system was at once changed—faction was disregarded, and the people cultivated. The King, fulfilling to a letter his capacity of general parent, hailed all his Irish subjects as his children; and, in return, has obtained our filial affection. With the abolition of party, disaffection has disappeared, and loyalty become universal. We owe the mighty change to the personal wisdom and kindness of the Sovereign; and this practical lesson which he has thus taught will serve to enlighten, and, if necessary, to correct our future governors.

“ Let them but obey and imitate the King, and Ireland, so long the

weakness and the reproach of the British empire, will speedily become its chief pride and most certain support. In looking back to every occurrence that had happened since his Majesty's arrival in Ireland, the friends of the King and the people could not desire to have any thing fall out, otherwise than precisely as it did. The King had done his part nobly—the people had done theirs gratefully; and if there appeared to have been one blot upon the proceedings—if one apparent attempt had been made to disturb the general concord, it only served to make this page of our history brighter, and to give an additional stimulant to conciliation. It would be perceived that he alluded to that ancient symbol of insult brought forward by Alderman Darley; it was foolish conduct on his part, but any body who knew the real character of the worthy alderman could not give it a harsher name. For his part, he was glad that the alderman had received some censure; but he would be heartily sorry if he had been more severely punished. He was also glad that such answer was the spontaneous and unsolicited act of the government, and that those who suffered did not complain.

“ He knew Alderman Darley in private life, and respected him; he was an amiable man in the circle of his family and connexions; he was a worthy man in all the relations of private society; and he was a most attentive, impartial, and exemplary public officer. Under such circumstances, the government did wisely to censure the toast; but they did also most wisely and most kindly to forget the indiscretion, in the contrition and in the merits of the individual. Mr. O'Connell then said, that, in order to perpetuate that loyal union which the King enjoined, he had consulted with several of his Protestant friends in the propriety of forming a club, to be open to gentlemen of all persuasions, and to have for its object the matters recommended in his Majesty's admonition. In concert with these gentlemen, he had prepared the sketch of a plan of such a club, which he would read for the meeting. Its purpose was unanimity amongst Irishmen. Unanimity was so much wanted in this country, that the desire for it absorbed every other feeling.

“ The Irish were poor, wretched, distracted, and disaffected, because they were divided. Their beautiful country, enriched by Providence with every blessing—with a climate fertile and productive, almost to excess—with a coast indented by capacious harbours—blessed by all the conveniences for manufacture, which their noble rivers afforded; placed as they were in the best situation for the eastern and western, the northern and southern commerce of the world—why was it that, whilst their country produced more of the necessaries and comforts of life than any other country, of five times its extent, in the universe—why was it, with all these blessings and advantages, that, in this rich

country, the people were miserably poor? The answer was ready—it was because they were divided amongst themselves.

“ Why was it, that from an independent nation, with a national government, a national legislature, and a national judicial power, Ireland had fallen into the state of a petty province—her nobles and her gentry banished—her legislature extinct—the property of her inhabitants disposed of at a distance of more than three hundred miles from her shores? Where was the poor man to get the means of looking for such remote justice?

“ But he would not dwell upon this melancholy picture. It was not in any human talent to paint it in colours sufficiently vivid to create a resemblance; and his feeble efforts must be abortive but for the painful and distressing experience of every Irishman.

“ There was one point, however, on which they all agreed—and that was, that the remote as well as the proximate and the all-sufficient cause of Irish misery was, the division of the people. That division promised to perpetuate our miseries; our rulers seemed even to cherish the cause of our wretchedness; and if there appeared now and then a statesman like Mr. Grant, to fling a ray across the desert of our bondage, his light only served to make our darkness the more visible; but the King (God bless him) understood our condition, and determined, by removing the cause, to destroy the fatal effects. The King has proclaimed conciliation—harmony—unanimity; his powerful example, his royal injunction, his gracious admonition—too wise to be neglected, too commanding to be disobeyed, has pointed out the means which can and will enable Irishmen to serve their King and restore their country.

“ Party dissension being at an end, we shall have leisure to think of the mode in which Irish interests may be advanced, and Irish strength applied, to consolidate and secure the throne and the empire.

“ He would now beg leave to read a rough sketch of the proposed club, which he hoped and expected, in his necessary absence on circuit, would meet those corrections and that support from powerful individuals, of all parties, which alone could make it efficacious and useful.

“ The object of this club is, to carry into effect the parting admonition and injunction of their affectionate and patriotic sovereign.

“ With this view it is proposed that a society should be established in Dublin, under the above appellation, to be extended to all the great towns in Ireland, as speedily as possible. The members of this society will pledge themselves—

“ 1st.—To preserve unabated and unimpaired the spirit of loyal union amongst all classes of Irishmen.

“ 2ndly.—To avoid and discountenance every cause of irritation.



“ 3rdly—To observe and encourage mutual forbearance and good will.

“ 4thly—To afford the best security for the continuance of that concord amongst Irishmen, which they have the pride to find recognized as being equally essential to his Majesty's happiness as their own.

“ And, 5thly—To perpetuate that affectionate gratitude towards his MAJESTY KING GEORGE THE FOURTH (whom GOD preserve) which now animates every Irish bosom.’

“ This society will consist of a president, vice-president, committee, and members, and will dine together at least six times in the year, clothed in Irish manufacture, and in the colours worn by the citizens of Dublin on the auspicious day of his Majesty's public entry into that city.

“ The meeting adjourned until Monday.”

The following extracts tell their own amusing tale:—

EXTRACT FROM A DAILY LONDON PAPER.

(“ FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.”)

“ Dublin, Sept. 16th, 1821.

“ Counsellor O'Connell is now travelling on circuit, with a fur cap and gold band, which he says is a *present from the King*, who certainly wore such a cap and band on his landing in Ireland.”

To this, quoted in the *Dublin Evening Post*, there came out immediately the following reply, which, it is to be hoped, satisfied the anxious minds of the alarmed anti-Papist party:—

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN EVENING POST.

“ Cork, October 1st, 1821.

“ SIR—As my travelling cap seems destined to make part of history, I may be permitted to request, that you will be so good as to give the most unequivocal contradiction, in my name, to the person, whosoever he be, who has accused me of asserting, ‘ that I got it from the King.’

“ I incline strongly to think, that no earthly consideration would be sufficient to induce me to say so in earnest; and to say so in jest would be a dull joke, indeed—dull, beyond the proverbial insipidity of bar jesting, where there is ‘ *laughter much at little jest.*’

“ I cannot refrain from adding, that I am astonished to find, that even in London, there could exist a newspaper so exquisitely silly as to notice the fur cap.—With which

“ I have the honour to be,

“ Your very obedient, humble Servant,

“ DANIEL O'CONNELL.”

Before the date of the foregoing, the illusion about conciliation was over, the credit being due to the corporation, of the first effective steps to dispel it, by renewing their old Orange orgies within *one month* of the King's departure.

## CHAPTER X.

IN the beginning of the following year, 1822, the Marquis of Wellesley was sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, and his coming hailed with very general satisfaction—both as he was the first Irishman for centuries appointed to the office, and because of his personal character.

A Catholic meeting was held on the 7th of January (1822), at D'Arcy's (*Corn Exchange Rooms*), to consider of an address to be presented to his lordship—

The Earl of FINGAL in the chair.

“ After the requisition, &c., had been read, and the object of the meeting stated by the noble chairman, who expressed his great pleasure and gratification at having been called upon to preside over such a meeting, on so very pleasing an occasion, MR. O'CONNELL, who was loudly cheered, proceeded to open the business of the day.

“ He commenced by observing that he was sure that all present coincided with their noble chairman in what had fallen from him respecting the object for which the present meeting was convened—which it was scarcely necessary for him to repeat, was the gratifying one of addressing an Irish Viceroy. That the most cordial unanimity would prevail in the discharge of so pleasing a duty, he felt convinced. The Marquis of Wellesley was an Irishman, and was always found among the most distinguished of Irishmen in advancing her interest and endeavouring to ameliorate her condition. His eloquence, which was of the most classical and impressive character, was always most readily exercised by him on every question that regarded the welfare of his native country; and on no question with more impressiveness, energy, and effect, than on that which related to the emancipation of his Catholic countrymen; and whenever the day of their restoration to the privileges of the constitution should arrive, they must gratefully remember that the influence of his example, and the splendour of his talents, have mainly contributed to the attainment of that desirable

object. (Applause.) At an earlier period, when the manifestations of favour towards the Catholic people were less strong and frequent than they are at present—at the interesting and eventful period of 1782, when the spirit of liberty was abroad, yet it was not extended generally to the Roman Catholics; and the Marquis of Wellesley was the first person to raise a volunteer corps, in which a principle of exclusion to persons professing that creed was not acted upon, countenanced, and cherished. (Much applause.) After such repeated proofs of a kindly disposition towards us, it was impossible not to feel a lively sense of gratitude towards him; and feeling it, it would be unpardonable not to express it. Such a man would surely not be seen attending festivals, encouraging by his presence toasts that were offensive to any portion of his Majesty's subjects; and he (Mr. O'Connell) felt satisfied that no sentiment would be pledged at any public dinner which the Marquis Wellesley would please to honour by his presence, alluding to the unfortunate dissensions of this country. Since the arrival of the noble marquis in this country, important events had taken place, which presented renewed and augmented claims to their gratitude. Mr. Plunket, the eloquent and powerful advocate of their civil rights *at least*, was at that moment, if not actually, certainly *potentially*, the first officer of the law in Ireland. (This announcement was received with loud acclamations.) This was an appointment at which they had much reason to rejoice, not only because their friend had been advanced, but also because, by that appointment, Mr. Saurin *ceased to be chief governor of Ireland*.

“ Another high legal functionary, he had strong reason to believe, was at that moment also advanced to the first seat on the bench of justice. It may, perhaps, be indelicate to speak at present of this promotion; but he was sure there was no man in the country who would not be proud to see the Solicitor-General (Bushe) dignify and grace the highest station in the department of the law. It did happen that the Solicitor-General was, on some occasions, opposed to individuals of the Catholic body; but whilst he faithfully and efficiently discharged his duty as an officer of the crown, he never leagued with any person, or any party, in a system and determination to oppress his Roman Catholic countrymen. In his conduct on such occasions there was always found united the talents of the orator and the feelings of the gentleman. He never left a sting of angry sentiment behind, to aggravate and embitter the insults that others heap upon them; and it had been even said, in the House of Commons, by the official organ of government, that ‘if the Catholics were to be persecuted, he was not the man to do so.’ Mr. O'Connell went over a variety of other topics, pointedly

marking the many claims which the Marquis Wellesley had upon the gratitude of the Catholics of Ireland. In conclusion, he said he could not regard him otherwise than as a representative, not only of the person, but also of the kindly disposition of our beloved Sovereign; and therefore it was their duty, as well as their pleasure, to testify their respect towards him in the most emphatic manner.

“MR. SHIEL seconded the address, as proposed by Mr. O'Connell. The learned gentleman who preceded him had so eloquently gone over the topics which naturally presented themselves, that it was altogether unnecessary to recapitulate them. There was no sentiment in which he more cordially concurred than in regarding the noble marquis's assumption of the reins of government as a special gift of his Majesty, and it was certain he could not make a more splendid donation. Advantages of considerable importance had already attended the commencement of his administration, and he thought that the country might sanguinely look forward to additional benefits from the immediate connexion of the Marquis Wellesley with this country.

“After some desultory discussion on the topics of the address, an address submitted by Mr. Shiel was finally adopted.

“The address is to be presented this day, at the levee, to his Excellency.

“It was then proposed by MR. O'CONNELL, and seconded by MR. HUGH O'CONNOR, that in order to promote the principle of conciliation enjoined by our Sovereign, there should be a dinner of Protestant and Catholic gentlemen, to celebrate his Majesty's accession to the throne, at D'Arcy's Corn-Exchange Tavern, on January 29th, 1822.

“The following Catholic gentlemen were appointed stewards:—Mr. O'Connell, Mr. W. Murphy, Mr. Hugh O'Conor, Mr. Thos. M'Donnell, Mr. Val. O'Conor, Mr. Joseph Plunkett, Mr. Wolfe, Mr. R. Therry, Mr. Fitzsimons, Mr. J. D. Lynch. A resolution was added, expressive of a desire that an equal number of Protestant gentlemen should co-operate with the above gentlemen in making preparations, and arranging for the intended dinner.

The following was the address:—

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—We, the Roman Catholics of Ireland, impressed with a conviction, common to all classes of the community, that the appointment of your Excellency to the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland, will be productive of the most beneficial national results; and animated by the liveliest sense of the obligations which you have already conferred upon us, offer you our cordial congratulations upon your arrival, as the representative of our Sovereign, in your native land.

"If anything could have increased the gratitude and veneration which we feel for a monarch, of whose enlightened views and beneficent intentions towards this country we have had so many striking proofs, these sentiments would derive new strength from his having delegated as his representative amongst us, a statesman to whose genius the empire is so largely indebted for its security and glory, and whose fame we have long cherished as a portion of our national renown. We recognize in the nomination of your Excellency an additional instance of his Majesty's peculiar solicitude for our welfare. It is impossible not to feel, that in the selection of your Excellency to fill the highest office in the government of this country, his Majesty was not more guided in his choice by a desire that the dignity of the throne should be adequately represented, than by a benevolent anxiety that, through your impartiality and wisdom, his most gracious disposition should be carried into effect.

"It is with extreme regret we have witnessed, in a few counties, a recurrence of those local outrages, which at different times have manifested themselves in this country. We trust that it is unnecessary to assure your Excellency that we shall be always ready, both individually and collectively, to co-operate with government in the maintenance of the law, and from your well-known firmness and moderation, we anticipate the speedy re-establishment of order in every part of Ireland."

"This address was most graciously received by his Excellency. It is not usual to return answers to addresses presented at levees."

A movement was made about this time to get up a "conciliation" dinner, to celebrate the anniversary of the king's accession; but after several preparatory meetings had been held, the intention was abandoned, in consequence of another open display of Orangeism at a corporation dinner.

At a meeting for erecting a statue to Mr. Grattan, held January 22, 1822, at the Royal Exchange, Mr. O'Connell took a prominent part, as he did in originating the idea, subsequently so creditably carried into execution.

The fourth resolution was moved by Mr. O'Connell.

"MR. O'CONNELL said that although Mr. Grattan belonged particularly to Dublin, the subscription should not be confined to any particular part of this country, for he belonged in truth to the entire nation. He gained independence for Ireland, and if she has since lost that independence, she should cherish his memory who gained it for her. He asserted her rights, he procured for her a legislative representation, and she was then a kingdom. The King of Ireland was then George the Third. As the patriot had himself said, in speaking of his country, 'he had watched by her cradle, he had followed her hearse.' But if a period should arrive, as in Greece, where the plain of Marathon has been immortalized, when we might erect a temple to perpetuate the

memory of Ireland, the spirit of Grattan should hover round it, and his name would be the first sound of the resurrection of his country. An unfortunate spirit, however, pervades the land, which tends only to bring ignominy upon the country. No benefit can possibly be produced but by mutual good feeling. Perhaps it would not be right to indulge in what might or what might not have been the fate of the country under other circumstances. In saying this much, he had but just thrown out the feelings of his heart over the grave of Grattan.

"This resolution was seconded by Mr. William Murphy. It passed unanimously."

In the same month, Mr. O'Connell put forth the following address:—

#### "TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

"Hereditary bondsmen, know ye not,  
Who would be free themselves must strike the blow."

"FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN—You can never obtain your liberty without an exertion on your own part. I do not mean to undervalue the efforts of our friends, nor do I underrate the advantages we possess in having one of the great law offices filled by an advocate of Emancipation in the place of its very bitterest enemy. I am also sensible of the benefit we derive from having the executive government of this unfortunate country intrusted to an illustrious supporter of religious liberty.

"These are great advantages. They serve to cheer us amidst that sickness of the heart which arises from hope deferred; and we ought, indeed, to be sick to the heart at the repeated disappointment of our fairest hopes; at the tantalizing and bitter repetition of expectations raised only to be blasted, and prospects of success opened only to close upon us in tenfold darkness. Alas! perhaps the present gleam only shines upon us to make the coldness of future neglect be felt with increased chillness. However, let the result of recent events be what it will, we owe it to ourselves, to our country, and to our religion, to make one effort more to escape from our present unjust degradation.

"In the history of mankind there never was anything more unjust than our servitude. It began by a gross and shameless violation of a solemn treaty. It was increased in the contemptuous security of a faction, strong in British support, and in the moral and physical imbecility of an unarmed and divided people. And now that all the pretences have passed away by which this iniquity might have been palliated, we still continue an oppressed and inferior class in our native soil, aliens and outcasts in the land of our fathers; and why, gracious God! why? Because some old women, or men more silly still, are pleased to draw out the absurd opinion, that an act of public justice would not 'produce any public good,' and that the abolition of bigotry would 'lead to unhappy consequences!'

"If such absurdities are any longer to sway the British councils, then, indeed, rational men may well prophesy approaching confusion. With Ireland convulsed by desperate poverty; with England reeling beneath an overwhelming taxation; with Europe scarcely hiding the half-slumbering flame of revolt, presenting at best but the image of a sleeping volcano—in such a state of affairs there is but one mode of salvation for the British empire, and that is, to enlist under the banners of the throne of social order, and of the constitution, all classes and descriptions of men, whatever may be their colour or their creed, and by giving them ALL one equal interest to preserve and to maintain all that is valuable and good in the purest parts of the noble and long-tried British institutions. Those who wish to be safe must continue to fling from power the bigots and the dotards of society, and must, in the management of public affairs, consult the genius of common sense, and invoke the spirit of Christian charity.

"What course should the Catholics of Ireland pursue under the present circumstances? This is the question which you, my countrymen, have to resolve. It is upon this question that I beg to offer you my humble but honest advice. I do not think I can err in telling you, that the period is arrived when you must make another effort to obtain your constitutional liberty. Indeed, this is a matter upon which I fancy we are all agreed, and the only doubt, as well as the only difficulty, arises from an apprehension lest, in looking for the greatest of all human blessings, civil liberty, we should injure that which is of greater importance than anything that men bestow—the unsullied and ancient religion of Ireland.

"Early in the last year, very many of the Catholics agreed with me in thinking that we ought not again to petition the British parliament, until that body was in a state more likely to sympathize with the wants and wishes of the people. But events have occurred in the last twelve months which have made me, in common with others, change that opinion, and which, whilst we retain all our former principles, induce us to make one exertion more to obtain from the British parliament that liberty which we know to be our right, but which we are ready to receive with all the affectionate gratitude due to the most gratuitous boon.

"The events which should alter our resolution, and induce us once more to petition parliament in its present state, are these:—First, we have seen, in the last year, a bill for the first time actually pass the House of Commons, which bill (without for the present noticing its ecclesiastical provisions) would have procured for us every thing in point of civil rights which we looked for, or desired. Secondly—That bill was read once in the House of Lords, and was ultimately rejected by a majority which could not be considered, under all the circumstances, as very discouraging to our hopes. Thirdly—The Sovereign who was supposed by our enemies to be hostile to our claims, is now believed to be neutral, and is probably favourable. Fourthly—The King's visit to Ireland has exhibited both the monarch and the people in new and favourable lights. The King must have seen that his Catholic subjects, although excluded and degraded in their native land, were as ready to display their unbought allegiance as the most favoured and caressed of the ascendant party. And the people, to whom the King has plainly been much misrepresented, have seen with delight the delicacy, the *tact*, the taste, and the good feeling which marked the entire personal conduct of the King, from the moment he threw himself, with paternal confidence, and without a single soldier, into their arms, to the period when, with an eye suffused with sensibility, and a voice rendered tremulous by emotion, he spoke his parting adieu. Fifthly—The ministerial letter which closed the King's visit, naturally seems to be the harbinger of better feelings and better days. It has already done much. It has introduced a new tone and temper into society. It has mitigated somewhat of the natural impertinence of long-abused power. It has softened and almost extinguished the bitterness which flowed from public contention into private life; and men have met and mingled and cemented friendships who heretofore scowled at each other in secret hostility, or contended with one another in open and acrimonious defiance. On the part of the Catholics, the injunction of that letter has been most cheerfully and readily obeyed. They have not deviated from it in the slightest degree. We may say it, their conduct has been quite exemplary, and they have afforded a strong and striking earnest of what their Protestant brethren may expect from the concession of civil rights. As we have shown such readiness to be reconciled, and to bury in oblivion every injury—and, what is more, every insult—and as we have shown this readiness merely for a few good words, and at the expense of a little civility, have we not a right to credit for the complete and perfect establishment of private and public cordiality, if a solid and substantial act of justice be done us. Will any man believe that when we have been so thankful for a mere courtesy, we should hesitate to cement a lasting attachment in return for the great boon of civil liberty. If we have been grateful for mere civility, what shall we be for substantial favours? Yes, every candid man will admit, that equalization of civil rights would extinguish for ever religious dissension in Ireland, and the wisdom of the king is manifest in the results of his visit and of his paternal advice.

"Under these circumstances, surely the Catholics ought once more to petition parliament. We have reason to expect Emancipation. Conciliation cannot last if the causes of irritation and resentment are to be perpetuated. The king's letter would have been a mockery, and a cruel mockery, if it were not intended to follow it up by removing the sources of heats, jealousies, and animosities. We, therefore, have a right to expect Emancipation. The king's letter has prepared all parties for it. It would not be any

victory or triumph on our part over our Protestant countrymen. It would now be the combined triumph of both Protestants and Catholics over bad passions, bad feelings, reciprocal animosities, and perpetual disquietude.

"Let us, then, my fellow-countrymen, petition once more. We ought now to succeed. But, should we now be defeated, who is it will presume to hope during the present system of parliamentary representation? If we are now defeated, we must patiently abide the 'great march of events,' and wish for that great tide of National Reform, which, we are told, is, though repulsed for a moment, gaining ground with every breaker.

"In these views, I believe, the Catholics are very generally agreed; but there is one subject likely to engross much of our attention, in the event of a bill for our relief being again introduced. I mean the subject of what, in parliament, has been called 'securities,' but what we have generally denominated 'the veto.'

"This is a subject which, I candidly acknowledge, fills my mind with the most serious alarm. Whilst I thought that the people were unanimous on the subject, and the clergy but little divided, I entertained no fears. But feeling it my duty to speak with perfect candour, I am bound to say that the conduct of the Catholics of Dublin, while the last bill was in discussion, strikes me to be excessively discreditable to them. I cannot express the anguish it gives me to make this accusation, because of its undoubted truth. If the matters were doubtful, I should refrain from reproach; but, alas, it must be told, that there was either an apathy or an inconsistency in the conduct of the Catholics of Dublin upon this important topic, which does them no credit, either as men or as Christians, and which must fill every honest Catholic, upon reflection, with astonishment and dismay.

"I sustain my accusation thus: the word veto means a power vested in the servants of the crown, either by direct nomination, or by an unlimited right of exclusion, to appoint Catholic bishops in Ireland. The latter is its more strict meaning.

"The propriety of granting this power to the Crown has been in agitation since the year 1805. It has been sought for sometimes with great anxiety, and at other times with more indifference, by many of those who supported, and by almost all those who opposed our claims. On the other hand, the Catholic people have unanimously, loudly, and warmly reprobated it. They have repeatedly expressed, even in terms of execration, their disapprobation of any barter of religious discipline for civil advantages. The language of our bishops was not less emphatic. They said that this power 'must not only essentially injure, but may eventually subvert the Catholic religion in Ireland.' The language, also, of the resolutions adopted at the aggregate meetings, was not only strong but violent. These meetings have been ridiculed, for taking the style of meetings of the Catholics of Ireland; but, at all events, they were meetings of the Catholics of Dublin, and thus beyond all doubt, the Catholics of Dublin had most solemnly and repeatedly pledged themselves to oppose any vetoistical measures.

"Matters were thus circumstanced, when last year's bill was introduced into the house. The ecclesiastical enactments in that bill gave the most direct and undisguised veto to the crown. There was no concealment—there was no mitigation. No priest could be a dean or bishop in Ireland, until his name had been transmitted to the secretary at the Castle; nor if that secretary expressed his disapprobation of him. Such disapprobation was made final and conclusive. There was to be no trial, no investigation; in short, it was the veto in terms, and in a more simple, powerful, and offensive form than had ever been imagined at any former period.

"Well, what was the conduct of the Catholics of Dublin at that crisis? We have seen how deeply pledged they were against the veto. With regard to the clergy, I shall say nothing; I am not sufficiently master of the details of their meeting; and of that meeting I think it most respectful and safe to be silent; but I acknowledge that a sigh burst from my bosom when I recollect the approbation they published of some of the oaths in the ecclesiastical bill.

"But I return to the conduct of the laity. We have, I repeat it, seen how deeply they were pledged against the veto. What was their conduct? I know some very worthy men who are angry if it is insinuated that they are not strong anti-vetoists; but I ask these gentlemen what was their conduct at that time? Did they meet to instruct Mr. Plunket and the parliament of their sentiments? Did they exclaim against this tremendous innovation on Catholic discipline expressly contained in the ecclesiastical clauses. No; they were silent—they were acquiescent. If they had changed their minds, they ought to have met and manfully stated that change. If they had not changed their minds, was not their acquiescence inexcusable, and in every point of view criminal?



"There was, it is true, one meeting: a meeting got together by some persons who had manliness enough not to put their names to the advertisement; a meeting brought together with such perfect fair play and universal notice, that the anonymous advertisement calling it actually appeared in the morning, and the meeting itself took place early in the afternoon of the same day!

"This anonymous, and I must say, indecent proceeding, was quite an anomaly in Catholic affairs. The excuse was that time pressed, and that it was necessary to have their resolutions in London on the day then fixed for the second reading of the bill in the House of Lords. This flimsy excuse is valuable, because it shows the real intentions of those who arranged that meeting.

"The resolutions which passed at such meeting, were not, it is said, approbatory of the veto, and I acknowledge that it was not approved of in express terms. The want of such express terms was used to delude some honest and well-meaning persons to sanction that meeting. But was not its very silence a direct approbation. Was it not, at least, a plain and distinct acquiescence in the fatal measure of the veto. Indeed the vetoists boasted of this meeting, with justice, as their first triumph; and the very excuse for its rapid formation proved that its promoters knew that its vote would convey something more intelligible to the House of Lords than mere barren praise of the individuals who advocated the bill in parliament. It was accordingly received as an approval of the bill in its worst shape, by all the peers to whom the resolutions were transmitted. The thing could not be misunderstood by any indifferent person.

"Thus, by dexterity, and a species of side-wind, the Catholics of Dublin are at this moment committed to an approval of that measure, which they often so unanimously and so loudly condemned; and that which I still do fondly believe no man could have audacity enough openly to propose, has been effected by management and trick, which I must say deserve anything but applause.

"Catholic fellow-countrymen, excuse me for this plain speaking. I suppress all feelings of anger towards the persons engaged in the machinery of that meeting. I will not name one of them—and I would consent to bury the recollection of that transaction in perpetual oblivion; but that, alas! it may, and, I think, must, in some degree, influence the great question which must arise upon the preservation of the independence and purity of the Catholic Church in Ireland, both of which I am, in my conscience, convinced, would be lost if the bill of last year had passed into a law.

"With these impressions, I thought it my duty, before the parliament could again meet, to make an effort to obviate the mischief of the vetoistical bill. The grounds upon which a veto has been required were stated to be apprehensions, that as the nomination of our bishops rested with the pope, who is, of necessity, a foreigner, he might, either by mistake, or at the instance of foreign, and perhaps of hostile powers, appoint to Catholic sees in Ireland persons inimical to the king or constitution. It must be admitted that there is something theoretically plausible, if not forcible, in this objection. It is one which may strike and convince a fair and candid man; especially if he was not minutely acquainted with the Catholic priesthood of Ireland. Those who know that priesthood best, entertain no fear on the subject.

"But as this argument existed; as these fears prevailed, or were said to prevail in parliament, it was right to meet them. We answered the objection, by referring to the laws against sedition and treason, which were sufficient to coerce our bishops, as well as our laity. We appealed to the oaths of allegiance which our bishops most cheerfully took; and, finally, we appealed to the experience of a century of unblemished loyalty on the part of our clergy, although it was a century of degradation, insult, contumely, and even of persecution; we asked with confidence, were they not loyal, even when you persecuted them? Is it in human nature that they should be less so if they have your protection and countenance?

"I must say that if we were treated with the deference and respect we deserve, the answers to these two questions would have decided the subject. But the misfortune is that even our friends are apt to treat us with something of a contemptuous superiority which can be justified only by the miserable jealousies and dissensions which prevail amongst ourselves. Passing this over, I have only to add that the objection continued, notwithstanding our reply; and it has become a kind of fixed principle with some of our advocates, that emancipation must be accompanied with some securities against foreign influence in the appointment of our bishops.

"It struck my mind that some plan might be devised, which, whilst it left the Ca-

tholic Church of Ireland free from, and uncontaminated by, courtly control, might at the same time totally destroy the force of an argument in favour of the veto, to be derived from the apprehension of foreign influence; with this view, I consulted some of the Catholic clergy, and as the result, I drew up the plan which will be found marked No. 1, and at the end of the letter.

"I then waited on Mr. Plunket, to submit to him my ideas on this subject. He received me with great kindness, and with the most perfect attention. He discoursed with me the matter, calmly and coolly, with a good feeling, and of course with good sense, as a statesman, and friend to religious liberty. I cannot speak too highly of the temper and disposition which Mr. Plunket evinced at all the interviews which I had with him. He has convinced me that he is desirous of carrying our emancipation, making as little sacrifices to English prejudices as he possibly can. I wish to be the more distinct in expressing this opinion of Mr. Plunket's candour, that it may serve as a refutation of the sentiments which I formerly entertained and published on this topic.

"A communication has been opened between Mr. Plunket and the Catholic bishops. He is ready, I believe, to receive their sentiments with deference; and, I am sure, he will respect their conscientious scruples, on the details of the ecclesiastical clauses in a future emancipation bill. I am also warranted in saying that Mr. Plunket must be convinced that there is every disposition on the part of the Catholics, clergy as well as laity, to seek for emancipation in the most conciliatory manner; to soften, and, if possible, to subdue, every prejudice; and to resist only such measures as may either injure, or have a tendency to injure, their religion. He perceives that the objections to 'the veto' have nothing of faction or bigotry in them—that they are purely conscientious—and, that it would be impossible to frame any statute, calculated to produce tranquillity in Ireland, if that measure were accompanied by 'the veto.'

"The progress which has been made in the discussion is just this: '*First, the unlimited negative is found to be quite impracticable, and given up, and a limited and defined right of rejection is alone sought for.* Whether or not it can be conceded, is another question—no more is at present required. This will be more distinctly seen by a reference to the subjoined paper, marked No. 2, which contains, in Mr. Plunket's own language, the only objections he made to my plan, No. 1. I have the original in Mr. Plunket's own hand-writing. Secondly, the nature and precise extent of such limited power of rejection, as well as the question of *whether it can be practicable at all, without a violation of Catholic principles*, are still in discussion; and that discussion has assumed a shape which induces me to hope for a favourable result. Thirdly, Mr. Plunket has readily consented to introduce a provision into the new Emancipation Bill, in order to secure the property in Catholic chapels and chapel houses; and for the establishment of Catholic charities to the same extent to which the chapels and charities of the various classes of dissenters in England are now protected by law. He has been good enough to allow me to suggest the form in which a clause to the above effect should be submitted to the House of Commons. This is an object of great importance. Fourthly, the exemplary conduct of the Catholic clergy, without any exception whatsoever, in all the disturbed districts—their extreme utility in checking and mitigating, where they could not possibly control, the infatuated spirit of domestic insurrection, are recognized and admitted. I believe it is distinctly felt, that the Catholic clergy could not possibly render the eminent services they now do to the government, if they were to lose any part of their influence over the people; and which influence vetoistical arrangements would have a direct tendency to weaken, if not totally to extinguish; if the clergy were selected by the state, they would lose all their political influence; so that in point of fact, it is, I believe, felt and understood, that the government, by possessing a vetoistical power, would be likely to lose an efficient control over the people; while they would gain nothing that could compensate them for the increased discontent which the veto would certainly excite. I fear it would, at this moment, produce effects of a most disastrous character.

"Under those circumstances, it is for the Catholics of Ireland to consider whether they ought not immediately petition. In my humble opinion they ought; and they ought also to consider whether some combined consultation may not take place between the clergy of all classes and the laity, to ascertain what may be done in the shape of domestic nomination to satisfy English prejudices, and do away all possible apprehension of foreign influence amongst our clergy.

"It is time that this question was set at rest. It is time that, if we can make with perfect safety any concession to smooth the road to Emancipation, we should do so—not

at the dictates of chance or passion, but as the solemn result of consultation and deliberate arrangement. If, on the other hand, it shall appear that no fragment of that sacred edifice, which our ancestors have left us as a most precious inheritance, can be touched with safety, why then, let us one and all resolve, in the name of God! not to accept of any civil rights at the expense of any danger whatsoever to our religion. While matters remain in their present state, great danger arises, lest by a sudden and ill-arranged relief bill, Emancipation may take place in a manner calculated to disgust everybody, and please no one. It would be unfortunate, indeed, that a bill intended to produce permanent tranquillity should be an immediate provocative of fresh and new discontent, and it would be miserable policy to superinduce the frenzy of a religious contest upon the cruel policy of the servile war which now rages in so many of our districts.

"There seems to me but one way to prevent much mischief, but one way to arrange rationally the course fit to be pursued. It consists in making some such selection of individuals as that which constituted the Catholic Board; it might, and I think ought, to be limited to this particular purpose. I do not suggest the establishment of such a Board as may afford our enemies an occasion of accusing us of forming a debating club. But there is a great national question pressing itself directly upon our attention. There may, possibly, be amongst us men who would barter some of *their religion* (or, perhaps, I should say, some of *our religion*) for a chance of civil rights. If there be any such, they are the most dangerous of our enemies. Whether there be or not, it is certain that our question cannot come before parliament, without involving discussions and clauses upon the subject of 'securities.' It would be idle to expect that it should not be so; and it would be criminal not to be prepared for such discussion, and for such clauses. If a Catholic Board were formed, there would be no danger of the present attorney-general's distorting the Convention Act to prevent their meeting. There is also no danger of the introduction of extraneous or irritating topics. No more publicity would be necessary for their proceedings than just enough to prevent their acting in contradiction to the public judgment or public feeling. The king's letter has brought the Catholic gentry to a temper, calculated in a high degree to combine the most respectful moderation with proper firmness. I would pledge my existence that not one single irritating expression would be heard, nor any course pursued, but that which would increase and cement cordiality and good feeling, and tend to promote the views and intentions expressed in the king's letter.

"Without some such Board, the Catholic cause in Ireland cannot be discreetly or safely conducted in its present stages.

"Should any plan of this kind be adopted, the struggle for our liberties may easily be brought to a close in the most amicable manner. Things cannot remain as they are. The recent census in Ireland, however imperfectly taken, gives an actual return of names to the amount of within a few thousands of SEVEN MILLIONS. It is probably half a million below the mark. But take it at seven millions. It will not be disputed but that the Catholics are five millions and a half of that number—that is at the least *full one-third* of the entire population of the empire. *There may be one, but are there two instances in the world, of sober folly that could dream of our remaining as we are? No! I repeat it, things cannot remain as they are.* It is quite too late to think of going back. To re-enact a penal law would be to

"Cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war."

To go forward *well*, we should go forward *with unanimity*—unanimity not amongst the Catholics alone, but unanimity amongst the Protestants and Catholics. Every reasonable prejudice which may exist amongst the Protestants, either of England or Ireland, should be treated with courtesy, discussed with good temper, and satisfied by anything short of a sacrifice of any part of our religion. I know that many Protestants in Ireland are ready to meet us in perfect sincerity of these sentiments, and with a perfect reciprocity of good feeling. It is not the interest of the English nation, much less of the government, to increase exasperation in Ireland. On the contrary, it is their duty—and it is, I am convinced, the inclination—of the representative of the king in Ireland, and of the king himself, to produce tranquillity and harmony by these constitutional methods, which alone deserve to succeed. If the Catholics be not wasting to themselves, they may procure their civil rights, and preserve unimpaired the doctrine and the discipline of their ancient Church.

"A proper petition, and a discreet and rational Board or committee, are essentially neces-

sary to enable us to steer through the remaining difficulties in the way of Emancipation. It is only by some organ of this kind that the mutual desire to make Emancipation satisfactory to all parties can be carried into effect. Without such an organ as this, distrust and jealousy will be perpetual in our own body, and no determination will have weight or importance enough to guide the public sentiment, or to obtain the public confidence. We might easily cashier it at once if it deviated from its intended objects. Whilst it pursued those objects with prudence, caution, fidelity, and perfect good temper, it would not only be of great utility in forwarding the claims of the Catholics, but it might be easily turned, by the government, to the great objects of restoring tranquillity throughout Ireland.

"In fine, fellow-countrymen, our emancipation is probably within our grasp; by prudent measures, we may now secure it. By our own misconduct, we may lose the present opportunity. There are no men so dangerous to our liberties as those who are ready to give too great a price for them. The siffpancy with which some few exposed their anxiety to purchase civil rights at the expense of religion, has created alarm, disgust, and jealousy among the Catholics at large. It has prevented a combination of exertion; it has paralyzed our best efforts; and if these persons will not now submit to the universal sentiment of the Catholic people, and join in preventing a hasty legislation touching our ecclesiastical affairs, they will assuredly retard, and may prevent that emancipation of which they themselves are so desirous.

"I conclude by conjuring you, my fellow-countrymen, to seek for your civil rights only in such a way that, whether you obtain them or not, you may preserve from every injury the doctrine and the discipline of the Catholic Church in Ireland.

"I have the honour to be,

"Fellow-countrymen,

"Your faithful humble Servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

---

"No. I.

*"Proposed Plan for the Domestic Nomination of the Catholic Prelates in Ireland, including land, full Security to the Government against the Appointment of any disaffected or disloyal Person.*

"First.—That by virtue of an agreement with his Holiness the Pope, the succession of the Irish Catholic prelates be provided for by purely domestic nomination or election, and that no person shall be eligible to a Catholic see in Ireland but a natural born subject of the Crown of Great Britain, who shall have taken the oath of allegiance in one of the superior courts in Dublin, and shall have discharged the duties of a clergyman for at least five years in Ireland. And that the electors to each see be not only ecclesiastics and subjects bound by the same oath, but also the most respectable by their rank and character—that is to say, either the Roman Catholic bishops of the province in which the vacant see is situated, or the dean and chapter of the vacant diocese; and if the latter, that every diocese be provided with its dean and chapter, composed of at least twenty-four of the most virtuous and the most learned of the clergy.

"Secondly.—That a see being vacant, the electors shall be called together—if bishops, by their metropolitan or senior suffragan, or if canons, by their dean. That previous to any other proceeding for nominating to the see, the head elector, whether metropolitan or senior suffragan, or dean, shall take a solemn oath in presence of the assembly, that he will not give his vote for any person who has not been known to him by the most satisfactory proofs to be strictly loyal and peaceable in his principles and conduct, and that the same oath be then administered by him to all the electors, and be taken by each of them as an indisputable qualification for exercising the right of suffrage.

"Thirdly.—That the person elected shall not be consecrated unless due notice of his appointment be officially transmitted by the president of the electors to the seat of government, and two months be allowed for investigating his character; and that if, within that space of time, the government should assign, in distinct and specific terms, a charge of disloyalty or disaffection against him, that the charge be referred to the examination and decision of the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, with full liberty to hear the an-

swers of the accused, and require proofs on the part of government. That it be incumbent on this tribunal, if the innocence of the accused be fully established, to have him consecrated as soon as canonical institution can be received. But if the accusation be not fully and satisfactorily disproved, then that the archbishops do forthwith issue an order to the electors to proceed to a new nomination; and that similar proceedings do follow every subsequent election, until a person shall be elected, against whom no objection on the part of government shall be established, as aforesaid.

"That every Catholic bishop in Ireland shall, within the space of six months after his election, or, if the present bishops, shall within six months after the passing of an emancipation bill, take and subscribe an oath in one of the superior courts in Dublin, to this effect:—That he will not correspond with any pope, prince, prelate, or potentate, or any other person, out of the British dominions, upon any political subject whatever; and that if any pope, prince, prelate, or potentate, or any other person whatever, shall write to him, or directly or indirectly communicate with him on political topics, he will with all convenient speed transmit under his hand to government a true copy of so much of every such bull, rescript, mandate, letter, writing, or communication whatsoever, as may relate to political affairs, in anywise, directly or indirectly, being or having a tendency to be injurious to the rights of the crown or the government, or to the civil or temporal interests of any part of his Majesty's subjects.

"No. II.

"*Mr. Plunket's Observations on the proposed Plan.*

"Instead of a specific charge to be established by specific proof, and to be repeated indefinitely, would it not be more advisable that the objection should be general: that the person nominated is considered as not well affected to the state, and let the party objected to be thereupon put aside. To avoid the objection that this right might be exercised so as to amount to a nomination, there might be a limit to the number of times, and then the next person nominated by the proper electors to be liable to no further question.

"This would avoid the possibility of a person filling a see, after being charged by the government with disaffection, which would be doubly injurious—first, as affixing some stigma to a dignified functionary; and, secondly, as almost necessarily creating in his mind a feeling of hostility.

"The requiring a strict proof of a definitive charge of disloyalty would, I apprehend, render the power of objecting altogether ineffectual.

"On the part of the proposal respecting the intercourse, nothing occurs save as to the passage underlined in the proposal, which would, as it appears, have the effect of authorizing the holding a correspondence on subjects affecting the whole frame of government and affairs of the state, provided the party corresponding were of opinion that the proposed measures were not injurious."

We now come to a scene, the record of which will give some idea of the troubles through which Mr. O'Connell had to pass, and in which he did not allow the provocations he received, to divert him from following up his idea of his duty to Ireland:—

"Yesterday (Wednesday, February 13th, 1822), an Aggregate Meeting of the Catholics of Ireland, was held at Denmark-street Chapel, pursuant to public advertisement.

"At half-past one o'clock, SIR THOMAS ESMONDE was called to the Chair.

"MR. O'GORMAN stated the object of the meeting. He said, they had met for the purpose of considering the propriety of petitioning the

legislature for a repeal of these laws which still aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland.

“O'CONNOR DON moved that the petition which had been just read, should be adopted as the petition of the Catholics of Ireland.

“This motion was seconded by E. MOORE, Esq., and having been put from the Chair, passed unanimously.

“MR. N. MAHON then moved that the first resolution, which had been agreed to by the sub-committee, should be read.

“MR. O'GORMAN read the resolution, which was as follows :—

“RESOLVED—‘That we deem it essential to our honour and interests, that as speedy a discussion as possible, in the present session, may be obtained on the merits of our petition.’

“MR. MAHON moved that this resolution should be adopted by the general meeting.

“J. E. DILLON, Esq., seconded the motion.

“MR. HUGH O'CONNOR stated, that having heard that resolution read on the preceding night, he came to the present meeting with a feeling of reluctance—

“MR. O'CONNELL—‘Before Mr. O'CONNOR speaks to the resolution which has been moved and seconded, it is right, in point of order, that it should be put from the Chair. Mr. O'CONNOR will then have an opportunity of speaking to the question.’

“The question was then put from the Chair, after which

“MR. O'CONNOR resumed—‘Mr. Chairman, I have said, that having heard the resolution read on the preceding night, that I came to the meeting with a feeling of reluctance. I am as anxious, sir, for the honour and the interests of the Catholic body as any individual in this assembly, but I conceive the present moment to be critical ; and anxious as we may be for the attainment of our object, we ought not to discard prudence. We have a good cause ; and nothing but a want of moderation, or, rather, impatience (if that word is liked better), can render it a bad one. In the late debate in parliament, when the House of Commons was devising means for the suppression of the outrages which have lately taken place in Ireland, it was with infinite regret I perceived that a minister of the crown advised that there should not be any attempt, for the present, to discuss the Catholic claims. Why this allusion should be made to the Catholics at such a moment, I cannot well conceive : the Catholics are no way connected with the late outrages that have unhappily taken place (hear, hear). The observation, however, has been made, if the newspapers report correctly, by the minister, who is also our distinguished friend. However much I regret this oc-

currence, I do think that we should not act imprudently in consequence of it. I think the word 'speedy' in the petition, and also in the resolution which has been just read, not decorous or well-advised. I would, therefore, move, as an amendment—

“That the petition of the Catholics of Ireland be committed to the care of the Right Hon. the Earl of Donoughmore, and the Right Hon. William Conyngham Plunket, with a respectful request that they will present it for discussion to both houses of parliament, at such period in the present session as they may conceive most beneficial for Catholic interests.”

“MR. O'CONNOR resumed—‘I recollect having waited on Mr. Plunket, about a year and a half ago, when that gentleman was first entrusted with the care of our petition, I was one of a deputation that had been appointed for the purpose. When we inquired of Mr. Plunket at what time the petition would be presented, he said that he would have to consult the friends of the measure, and that it should be laid before the house at the moment most favourable to the attainment of their object. The resolution which I have now proposed, is in unison with the sentiments of that most distinguished supporter of Catholic claims, of the value of whose advocacy we are all so fully sensible.

“JAMES EDWARD DEVEREUX, Esq. seconded Mr. O'Connor's amendment. The only difference between it and the original resolution was, whether they should press the immediate discussion of their petition, or leave it to their advocates to select the time they should conceive most beneficial for Catholic interests, limited, however, to the present session.

“O'CONNOR DON had heard with regret of the disturbances in the country; he knew the Roman Catholics to be as ready to put down disturbances as any others of his majesty's subjects could be. He conceived the present the most proper time for petitioning. No man would be inclined to give Lord Londonderry more credit for what he had done than himself; but they were not to be kept back by any talk of prudence. He conceived that it was for our honour and interests that our question should be speedily brought before parliament; but we do not dictate the time to our advocates; we only express our own opinions.

“MR. HOWLEY, in a long speech, supported the amendment.

“MR. EDWARD MOORE supported the original resolution.

“Considerable confusion prevailed, amid which MR. O'CONNELL arose, and spoke as follows:—

“MR. O'CONNELL—‘I never rose to address a Catholic meeting with more pleasure than I feel on the present occasion. Our conduct has been such, that we have deserved to be emancipated, and we will be emancipated (hear, hear), if we do not, by any idle bickering among ourselves, retard the progress of our cause. I will point out to these

gentlemen the course to be pursued, by which we will be most likely to attain the object we have in view. But first, let me congratulate my Catholic fellow-countrymen on the progress that we have already made; and I trust that I am guilty of no impiety, when, in the temple of my God, I thank that God for the unanimity we have evinced this day, in adopting that petition. With respect to that petition, it called for a speedy discussion on the merits of our claims——'

"MR. NICHOLAS MAHON here called Mr. O'Connell to order. The petition had been passed, and should not now be made the subject of discussion.

"MR. O'CONNELL—"I am not out of order. I assert that *that* petition requires the meeting to pass my resolution.'

"MR. JAMES O'GORMAN—"I call Mr. O'Connell to order; we are not now discussing the merits of the petition.'

"MR. O'CONNELL—"I call on the meeting to call for a speedy discussion on our petition.'

"[Here much confusion and noise ensued, which was allayed by the Chairman stating that Mr. O'Connell said that he was speaking to the resolution and the amendment, and that he conceived he had a right to be heard.]

"MR. O'CONNELL resumed—"This petition speaks of our gratitude for the concessions already made to us, without encroaching on our religious tenets or institutions. Is there any one amongst us that is sorry they did not encroach upon our religious tenets or institutions? Where is the man who regrets it? Oh! I should like to see his face. Our religion is at this day nearly the same as that of Henry VIII. was. When we can be unanimous amongst ourselves, I cannot see why we should put our reason and judgment into the pockets of any two individuals, even though these individuals should be the Earl of Donoughmore and Mr. Plunket. I now offer to the gentlemen—shall I say on the other side?—no, I will not; I will say the gentleman who press the amendment; I offer to them to put my resolution previous to the amendment; take the sense of the meeting first on that, and I will, myself, agree to the amendment, which can be afterwards put as a separate resolution (no, no). Who is now looking for a division? I ask you first to decide on Mr. Mahon's resolution (no, no). If it be a bad one, you can reject it, without getting rid of it by the side-wind of an amendment. You have heard the name of Lord Londonderry, or Castlereagh, introduced; he has been termed our dignified friend.'

"MR. O'CONNOR—"The words I used were "distinguished friend."

"MR. O'CONNELL—"I beg the gentleman's pardon; when I have occasion to speak again of Lord Londonderry, it shall be, for the re-



mainder of the day, as our "distinguished friend," though I do not admit that he is my friend.'

"A person in the crowd—'Do you come here to abuse members of parliament?'

"MR. O'CONNELL—'The Marquis of Londonderry is not my friend. Mr. Lawless, of Belfast, the conductor of the "Irishman," has asserted that I am on the point of accepting a bribe from government; that I am about to receive a silk gown from them: the created universe would not induce me to accept a favour under the administration of Lord Londonderry.' (Loud interruption, and murmurs of disapprobation, together with cries of "question, question.")

"MR. HUGH O'CONNOR conceived that Mr. O'Connell was taking up the time of the meeting very unnecessarily. (Several groans.)

"MR. O'CONNELL—'Mr. O'Connor spoke of Lord Londonderry; it is strange if I must not. I have served three apprenticeships to my profession; I have been for the space of twenty-one years a barrister; it is seventeen years since I first took a part in Catholic affairs; my child was then young—he has since grown up to be a man, and I am naturally anxious for the attainment of our object. We are told that we should not press the discussion on our petition, at the present moment, in consequences of the disturbances in the country; and a few weeks, it is said, will put an end to those disturbances; but what has occasioned them? Is it not poverty and misery? And what is to make the wretched peasantry rich in the course of three weeks? We may expect to find them purchasing houses in Mountjoy and Merrion-squares; but how are they to acquire the means? Oh! I suppose by the lottery—they have as good a chance of becoming rich that way, as any other that I know of. The counties of Tipperary, Clare, and Limerick have been proclaimed; and it is yet supposed that all the disturbances that have lately agitated the country shall cease in the course of three weeks. They may, however, continue for seven years; and it may be urged as an argument against our claims next year, that a tithe-proctor was killed in one place, and a "notice" of Captain Rock's seen in another. If our "distinguished friend" did not mean an imputation, when he alluded to the disturbed state of Ireland, it would be said by our enemies that he did; and they would not be backward in saying that we understood him, and that we did not press our claims, fearing that our turbulence would be discovered. Thus would an imputation be fastened on the honour of the Catholic people. We cannot conceive anything more foolish or disgraceful, than the scenes of blood and outrage that have taken place in the south of Ireland; it is a trial of mere brutal force against everything that is intellectual. Fellow-countrymen, you have in

me one unpurchaseable friend—a man whom empires would not buy—a man who, during his own life, had at heart only your good, and who would sacrifice a thousand lives to do you service. It is then such a man, fellow-countrymen, who entreats of you not to participate in any treasonable projects against the state. (Prodigious applause.) Let no man say we thought Lord Londonderry was borne out in the imputation, if it was one; we challenge him to the proof, if any can be adduced; we say the imputation is a foul, foul one, and we shake it off “as dew-drops from the lion's mane.” I can't afford to pay the compliment of my rights to the convenience of a minister; let those who enjoy their all under ministerial influence, look down from their stations, and amuse themselves with spitting upon the slaves—the Irish people. They may still keep me in thralldom, but I am resolved that their slumbers shall be disturbed by the clanking of my chains. Our “distinguished friends” may turn their backs on us, but when we look to the state of Europe, should six millions of people be afraid of using the language of common sense. Look to Russia, sending a force of 200,000 men against Constantinople, and thus breaking up the holy alliance. Look to Greece, struggling for freedom; look to Spain; look to Portugal. In those countries we see the inquisition and the tithe system abolished. Look to France——'

“MR. O'CONNOR—‘Does Mr. O'Connell mean to occupy the time of this meeting with such ridiculous nonsense?’ (Applause.)

“MR. O'CONNELL—‘Whether it be ridiculous or sensible, I am determined I will not be prevented from going on. (Loud laughing, which continued for some time.) Can they look for foreign support against our claims? What might have ensued in Ireland, if the Catholic clergy had remained neuter?’

“MR. DEVEREUX called Mr. O'Connell to order.

“MR. O'CONNELL—‘A weekly publication in this city has already dared to cast an imputation on the Catholic clergy. Another paper, which affects to be our friend, has charged them with want of exertion. We have arrived at a time when an imputation, or what may be considered as such by others, has been thrown out in parliament against the Catholics of Ireland. Our going forward with our petition, fully and properly, meets that imputation. It has been said that we did not talk of honour in any of our former petitions; but I hold in my hand the resolutions passed at a Catholic meeting, in the year 1813, two of which I shall read. The Catholics then declared that they would not accept of any concession inconsistent with their honour.’ [Here Mr. O'Connell read from a printed pamphlet.]

“MR. HOWLEY repeated that the word honour had never been similarly used.

“MR. O’CONNELL—‘The present is a peculiarly favourable time for the discussion of our petition; now that the guilty are about to be punished, it is right that the meritorious should be rewarded. Those who govern wisely, reward as well as punish. We have lived nearly seven hundred years under English government, and if this is the result, the fault is not attributable to us; we have not governed ourselves.’

“CAPTAIN FOTRELL, amid much confusion, made some remarks on Mr. O’Connell’s speech, but was forced to sit down by cries of ‘question.’

“[Here MR. HUGH O’CONNOR, MR. HOWLEY, and others, declared they would withdraw the amendment, and permit Mr. O’Connell’s resolution to pass, upon the understanding that Mr. O’Connell would not oppose it as a separate resolution. Mr. O’Connell assented.]

“MR. MAHON’S resolution (the original one) was then put and carried, amidst loud cries of ‘no, no.’

“MR. O’CONNOR’S amendment was then put as a separate resolution, and carried.

“It was then moved by JAMES EDWARD DEVEREUX, Esq., and seconded by O’CONNOR DON—

“‘That a Committee of eleven be appointed to prepare a petition or address to his Majesty, from the Roman Catholics of Ireland, praying that he would be graciously pleased to recommend to parliament a Repeal of the Penal Laws still affecting that portion of his Majesty’s subjects.’

“The following gentlemen were then named on the Committee:—

“‘Sir Thomas Esmonde, Chairman; James O’Gorman, Esq., O’Connor Don, Daniel O’Connell, Esq., Hugh O’Connor, Esq., James Edward Devereux, Esq., John Howley, Esq., Nicholas Mahon, Esq., Edward Moore, Esq., Lord Killeen, Thomas Fitzgerald, Esq.’

“After some other routine business, the meeting adjourned, *sine die*.

“MR. O’CONNELL’S allusion to the charge against him by Mr. Lawless, produced a letter from that gentleman a few days after; a disclaimer of any intention to make such a charge.”

#### “NATIONAL TESTIMONIAL TO GEORGE THE FOURTH.

“SUBSCRIBERS’ MEETING—APRIL 25.

“Mr. O’CONNELL rose and stated that he had listened with considerable attention to the observations and opinions of the several gentlemen who preceded him. Some were of opinion that a pyramid, some

that an arch, some that a statue, and many that a bridge was the most eligible mode of testifying public gratitude on the auspicious occasion of the king's visit. As to a pyramid, he felt that, from the specimens which had been already given in that department of architecture, an additional obelisk would not meet with very general public satisfaction. Nelson's Pillar and the Wellington Testimonial were lamentable failures; and it was deeply to be regretted that these erections had not been more worthy of the occasions which they were intended to commemorate. He believed, therefore, that a pyramid would by no means please or satisfy the public. As to an arch at the end of Sackville-street, he regarded it as equally objectionable; it would only spoil the appearance of a beautiful street, already too much lumbered with a pile that was by no means ornamental. After a short time it would be disregarded, and become, like a market-cross, a place for sticking bills on. As to a statue, he for one, did not approve of it. There were already many statues in the city, and more were about to be erected; besides, they could not get a suitable site in which to place it. It would not be admitted into the squares; and he knew no other spot would be worthy of it. Under these circumstances, he was strongly disposed in favour of the suggestion of the bridge. It would combine utility with ornament—and be the more gratifying to his Majesty, as adopted in conformity to the expressed wish of his Majesty. Lord Manners communicated it at a general meeting; and he remembered to have heard the noble lord state that his Majesty did not mean by this suggestion to interfere with the free choice of the subscribers. The delicacy of the communication was an additional reason to recommend the preference of a bridge. Besides, it would afford an agreeable approach to the Park, and save families the necessity of passing through Barrack-street—an unpleasant, and often extremely offensive way. This would make the Park a place of general recreation to the citizens, and thus assimilate it to Hyde Park, in London. It would, besides, unite both parts of the city in some degree, and be emblematic of his Majesty's desire to unite all parties in this country. He could not but express his regret, that his Majesty's anxiety had not *experienced a corresponding anxiety in some quarters*. After forcibly urging other reasons, why a preference should be given to a bridge, the learned gentleman concluded by moving that the erection of a bridge over the Liffey, opposite the entrance to his Majesty's Park, the Phoenix, be strongly recommended by the subscribers, amongst the plans referred to them, as an object worthy to commemorate his Majesty's visit to this country."

At a meeting which took place in the Rotunda Buildings,

upon Tuesday, the 7th May, in this year, the first idea of the present National Board of Education in Ireland seems to have been shadowed out. It will be seen from Mr. O'Connell's remarks, which we give as we found them, in an evidently much abbreviated form, that, friendly as he was then (as now) to the general spread of education, and anxious to put in motion all good means for that purpose, he did not contemplate any of the overweening liberality of the education-mongers of our day, but an education carefully watched over, as it ought to be, by the clergy.

“MR. O'CONNELL proposed the fourth resolution. He spoke at some length, and with great eloquence. He declared that the Catholic clergy were most anxious for the establishment of schools in all parts of Ireland; but they wished to see them founded on one principle only—the principle of fair play—the principle of diffusing education as widely as possible, but leaving every one's conscience uninfluenced. They would teach children of *all* persuasions, but would not interfere with the religious tenets of *any*. It was upon this principle the Kildare-street Society professed to set out. They had, however, abandoned it; and, therefore, the National Society became necessary.

“Mr. O'Connell proceeded to show that education, without a shade of religious distinction, was afforded to the poor by the National Society, to the extent of its means, and he referred to the letters of the Catholic clergy, lately published in the papers, to prove,

“First—That the clergy were anxious to promote the education of the poor.

“Secondly—That the Kildare-street Society does *not* educate the poor.

“Thirdly—That it is impossible it ever can educate the poor; for the Catholic clergy never will consent to the use of the Scriptures without note or comment, as the school book; and without this the Kildare-street Society will not give education.

“MR. O'CONNELL concluded with expressing his conviction that, as the legislature certainly wished to educate the poor of Ireland, they would not refuse to grant to the National Society, which, he contended, it was now evident could alone effect that object.

\* \* \* \* \*

“Moved by MR. O'CONNELL, and seconded by DOCTOR BLAKE (5)—‘That the following petition be presented to parliament, and that the secretaries be directed to write to

THOMAS S. RICK, Esq., requesting him to present our petition to parliament, and to write to the Irish members of parliament, requesting them to support the same."

The petition referred to was as follows :—

"To the Right Honourable and Honourable the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the United Kingdom, in Parliament assembled.

"The Petition of the undersigned Vice-Presidents and Committee of the Irish National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor.

"We, the Vice-Presidents and Committee of the Irish National Society for promoting the Education of the Poor, beg leave respectfully to represent to your Right Honourable House, that although large sums have been annually voted by Parliament for the general purposes of education, those sums have not been made available for the education of the Roman Catholic poor, who are the most numerous of that class of society, and who stand most in need of legislative assistance.

"Your Petitioners further respectfully state their conviction that no beneficial aid can be rendered to the poor by way of education in Ireland, if it be regulated in a manner adverse to the religious opinions, or calculated to excite the apprehensions or distrust of the parents or pastors of the children.

"Your Petitioners further state, that the system of Education which they have adopted is unanimously and alone sanctioned by the concurrence and co-operation of the Catholic prelates and pastors of Ireland.

"Your Petitioners earnestly and respectfully implore such legislative assistance in aid of their object as may seem good to the wisdom of your Right Honourable House.

"And your Petitioners will ever pray."

#### "IRISH NATIONAL SOCIETY.

##### "VICE-PRESIDENTS.

Lord Clonscurry.  
Lord Gormanstown.  
Most Rev. Doctor Troy.  
Most Rev. Doctor O'Kelly.

Right Rev. Doctor Doyle.  
Lord Killisen.  
The Earl of Fingal.  
Most Rev. Doctor Curtis.

Most Rev. Doctor Murray.  
Right Rev. Doctor Marone.  
Sir Thos. Remondé, Bart.

##### "COMMITTEE.

Alderman M'Kenny.  
Sir Charles Morgan.  
Very Rev. Doctor Blake.  
Colonel Nelly.  
Rev. Doctor Lube.  
Rev. Doctor D'Arcy.  
John Phelps, jun., Esq.  
Lewis Ferrin, Esq.  
Rev. Mr. Flanagan.  
William H. Curran, Esq.  
John O'Brien, Esq.

Joseph Huband, Esq.  
James J. Cullanan, Esq.  
Robert Cassidy, Esq.  
Doctor Cullanan.  
Rev. Mr. Hewson.  
John Burns.  
Very Rev. Dr. Hamill.  
Cornelius M'Laughlin, Esq.  
Nicholas Mahon, Esq.  
Archd. H. Rowan, Esq.  
Michael Sweetman, Esq.

James Charles Baron, Esq.  
Daniel O'Connell, Esq.  
Thomas Dillon, Esq.  
Francis Mac Donnell, Esq.  
Edward Moore, Esq.  
T. Mac Donnell, Esq.  
Anthony O'Brien, Esq.  
John Power, Esq.  
P. Costello, Esq.  
P. J. Hart, Esq.  
Bernard Mullins, Esq."

Very different such a Board of Presidency would have been from that proposed by the Infidel Colleges' Act of last year!

That amid all the minor business of his life, engrossing and multifarious as they were, Mr. O'Connell still steadily kept his eye far a-head, to the glorious and all-transcending object which he is now exclusively labouring for—the regeneration of Ireland by the Repeal of the Union—will be again recognized from the expressions in the following short speech of his, at a meeting held

at the Mansion House, in Dawson-street, on Thursday, the 16th of May, "on behalf," as the advertisement stated it, "of the distressed labouring poor of the South and West of Ireland." The distress alluded to was the great famine of the year 1822.

"MR. O'CONNELL begged leave to offer a few observations, before the resolution for the committee was put from the chair. He rejoiced at seeing the present meeting: perhaps he might have wished to see it convened before; but as it had been stated that there were reasons for not calling it at an earlier day, he was disposed to believe that those reasons (although he did not hear them) were satisfactory. It was, however, in no small degree mortifying to national vanity, that they should have heard of subscriptions for the relief of the distressed peasantry of Ireland, in London, Liverpool, and other places, not only before a meeting was convened, but before they were told an official account had reached Dublin of the extent of the distress. However, as the meeting did now take place, their first and only object should be the relief of their suffering fellow-countrymen. As to the appointment of a committee, it would be desirable that it should be postponed until to-morrow. For his part, he had no reluctance to attend the meeting—his presence there evinced that he had not. There were, however, he knew, many most respectable merchants, principally Catholic, who would gladly attend at the Exchange, but were not equally disposed to attend at the Mansion House. Indeed (said Mr. O'Connell), as to myself, I should feel proud on the occasion, as I received an invitation to come here—an invitation which it is not usual for me to receive. (Laughter.) The feelings of others, he thought, should in some degree be deferred to. The subscription would not be diminished, and would in all probability be increased, by insuring the cordial co-operation of all. There should be no rivalry in the present case, except a generous rivalry and emulation to excel each other in cheerfully contributing to the relief of their suffering fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) The duties which the committees had to discharge required that it should be formed on a broad and extensive basis. They had to regulate the subscriptions, to correspond with various other committees, and he hoped, also, to inquire into the cause of the present distress; for, without such inquiry, the peasantry might continue one half of the year in insurrection, and the other half in starvation. His friend, Mr. Leader, had eloquently enumerated many of the causes. It was now vain, however, he feared, to speak of absenteeism. The period for that was now gone by. *When the government of this country, with its peers and commoners, was trans-*

*ported to another country, it was idle to speak of absentees; for the great proprietors were obliged by law to be absent from their native land. (Hear, hear.)*

“Mr. O'Connell remarked on various other topics connected with the present distress, and concluded by renewing his expressions of joy at beholding the present meeting, and respectfully recommending that the appointment of a committee should be postponed until the following day—not because there were not persons present competent to form a committee, but because the cordial co-operation of all, on such an occasion, should be sedulously cultivated.”

To alleviate that distress, extraordinary exertions were made in England, and a munificent subscription made in various parts of that country. The highest credit, praise, and thanks, were of course due, and were freely given, to our English neighbours for their bountiful charity on this disastrous occasion; but it was then remarked, as it has so often been since, how much better, and more generous, it would be to restore to Ireland the means of promoting her own prosperity, and herself guarding her children against want, which she possessed under her own parliament, rather than subject her to the humiliation of receiving alms.

In the year in which we write (the year 1846), we have nearly the same state of affairs as in 1822, with the difference, that the government did wisely and timely step in this year, and do what the government of the former period threw upon the benevolence of private individuals to do—namely, to supply food to the starving millions of Ireland, and prevent the depopulation of the land by the cruel death of starvation.

For doing this, for so promptly and efficaciously stepping in to remove or lighten the terrible effects of the calamity with which it has pleased Providence, for its own inscrutable purposes, to visit this afflicted land, Sir Robert Peel, and his colleagues in office, have received deserved commendation: and those who have recently succeeded them in the administration of affairs are showing a most laudable anxiety to carry out the plans of relief they found so actively and successfully at work.

But the same remark applies in the present with even more



cogency than in the former instance cited, to these eleemosynary benefactions. Her rights, not alms; *justice*, not charity; the power to use and develop her own resources, and herself take care of her people;—these are the demands of Ireland, and these must be accorded.

Misery annually recurring, or rather perennially existing, varied only by occasional years of entire destitution and starvation. This is a state of things that, for the credit of England herself, must be put an end to. It is the strongest, the most irrefutable proof that her legislative control of our interests and affairs is disastrous. No one imagined calamity that the prejudiced and paid advocates of the Union can bring even *their* audacity to predicate, as likely to result from a restored system of separate legislation for Ireland—of exclusive management of Irish matters by Irishmen—can appal the fancy more than the actually existing and uninterruptedly recurring *facts* of famine and misery which we every year witness, now depress, sicken, and rend the inmost heart.

All that is sound and consistent with common sense in the dogmas of political economists, forbids the idea that even the most willing and powerful government of the widest and richest empire in the world, can take upon itself, from year to year, the task of supplying food to a nation. One or *two* years, as in the present case—for, alas! there is but too strong a likelihood that the calamity which has been with such difficulty, and by such extraordinary exertions, met this spring and summer, will be upon us again immediately—such a thing may be done; but in the very fact of the necessity itself is the strongest argument for an immediate and entire review of the circumstances under which the country has been brought to such a pass; and an immediate and entire change of the legislative policy, that has proved itself powerless to avert the calamity; and obnoxious to the imputation of having occasioned it.

The permanent, or even the frequent supplying of food by the government, would take the latter from their proper functions

of simply watching over and guarding from interruptions the enterprizes and efforts of private capital and industry ; and convert them into traders, interfering with and deranging the very operations whose perfect liberty it is one of their most stringent duties to recognize and maintain.

We are aware that we are enunciating only *truisms*, as the matter of our foregoing remarks will be styled by those who have examined the great social problems. But the pleasant facility with which the interferences alluded to at first appear to accomplish their object, is apt to lead men's judgment astray, especially where the relief of misery is concerned ; and that which was, and could only be, successful as an expedient to meet a sudden, extreme case, is hastily and blindly assumed to have a permanent applicability and efficaciousness, which would be found miserably wanting on the first trial.

An incident which occurred during the famine of the year 1822, was startlingly illustrative of the wretched anomaly which marked (and still marks) the condition of the Irish people.

A vessel from an English port, freighted with meal, the charitable contribution of an English relief committee, towards checking the starvation that was raging in the districts bordering the Shannon, met, on her passage up that river to her destination, several other vessels, bearing away from those very districts the agricultural produce—the *human food* that had been there raised, and that then was being *exported* to England ; and there can be no doubt but that incidents of a precisely similar nature occurred at other ports in the distressed parts of the country.

Why was not the home-grown food retained in at least sufficient quantity to save its producers from the pangs of starvation ? Why ? Because of the Union.

The Union has sevenfold increased absenteeism. The rents of Ireland, to an amount of nearly seven millions, are spent out of that country. The food is sent away to procure the money to pay those rents ; and when the money is procured, away it goes too, into the absent landlord's pocket. Thus Ireland

loses both the food of her people, and the money-value of it.

How would the abrogation of the Act of Union alter this disastrous and monstrous state of things? By reason (amongst other consequences of that abrogation) of the inducement thereby given, and *the necessity* thereby occasioned, to the rich proprietors to come back and spend the rents at home. The business of the legislation of Ireland would be of far too much relevancy to them to allow of neglect; and the increased importance and weight of public transactions there, would have wide effects in stimulating not only all the ordinary occupations of society, but also its pleasures and attractions.

Before the Union, absenteeism existed, but (at least during the period 1782–1800) in a very minor degree. At that time, great lords and rich commoners might more safely desert their duties towards the people, than could be the case were the Irish parliament restored now. At that time the Irish parliament was, of course, unreformed, and, in short, in the hands of the borough-mongers. The absentees had their nominees in the lower House to look after their interests, and prevent any interference they might deem injurious or troublesome.

The case would be different now. The wildest anti-Repealer does not for a moment imagine that the parliament we seek to restore is the old narrow-based, borough-mongering—in short, *packed* parliament. Reform should have sway here as in England. Every one should have *constituents*—no more representation of a few old walls, as at Old Leighlin; or of a few bigoted burgesses, themselves the serfs of the nearest large landholder, as in so many other cases. And the reformed representation would be based upon an extended franchise, thereby insuring that the opinions and wants of the people should be spoken out and attended to. What safety, then, could the obnoxious absentee have, if by his criminal neglect of his social duties in this country he drew upon himself public obloquy? Should he not have to expect at least a weighty tax; if not an enforced sale of his Irish

property to those who *would* reside and discharge the duties in question? Would it not be intimately of his interest to be over here in Ireland, watching the legislation, and bringing what influences he could command to bear upon it, and render its course more favourable?

And in the recess of Parliament, he yet would not be discharged from all necessity of a similar nature. Parliamentary reform he would find to have left him no other means of controlling the votes in his neighbourhood, save by conciliating the voters' affections. No more sweeping and reckless—no more murderous exterminations of tenantry—no more grudging and stinted employment of labour even in the most necessary repairs and requirements of his country residence—no more pinching and shabby economy here, in order to fling away thousands in another country. He should court, by fair and honest means, the opinion of his district; conciliate the affections of his poorer neighbours; and by showing an interest in their welfare, induce them to conceive an interest in his.

If the pursuit of health, or other strong inducements, still led him to visit other countries, it would not be until he had devoted sufficient time personally to his social duties here, and had taken measures to secure that his temporary absence should not have injurious effect upon those whom his residence had benefited.

The restored circulation of money in Ireland would have its effect in creating a home market for Irish produce; and, unless the country were afflicted by a sudden and supernatural infliction of sterility, we should no longer be doomed to witness the recurring famines and the perennial want which we are at present powerless to prevent, and without the charitable assistance of England, or the intervention of the imperial government, unable even to mitigate.

The best and truest charity is that which tends to put its object in a position to depend thenceforward upon self-exertion. If that be true in its application to the case of the poor labourer

that begs at your door for employment, it is, if possible, more eminently and stringently true in its application to the case of the people of Ireland. Considerations of *restitution and atonement* should mix up with those of charity, in dealing with their case. England has forcibly deprived them of that which is the keystone of the prosperity of a country—a home-parliament, acquainted with home affairs and interests, and able to devote its time exclusively to them. The keystone gone, the rest of the arch has come tumbling down in hideous ruin. The rich proprietary had no inducement to remain in a provincialized country, when tempted by the metropolitan gaieties and splendours of the seat of imperial legislation. Their rents, as we have seen, went with them; and the decrease in the circulation of money, and decrease of rich consumers, made our home market too weak to sustain our struggling manufactures against the competition of English capitalists.

What custom remained for manufactures being thus laid hold of by England, the moneys paid for them became, of course, an addition to the pecuniary drain. With the impoverishment of the country, her foreign trade naturally fell away; and for what foreign goods there yet remained any Irish consumption, we have had to look to England also; and thus again the drain was increased, in this case in a twofold manner—first, by the profits of the carrying trade, and again by the amount of the duties on such goods; these duties being paid in England, and credited to the English revenues return, and repaid to the English merchant in the price paid by the Irish consumer.

When all was distress around, the Irish landowner did not, of course, escape. His own improvidence is a favourite theme with English writers; but provident or improvident, the landowner, in a country running to bankruptcy, must suffer with the rest. The loans on mortgage which have so deeply encumbered estates in our four provinces, were made in England, or through English sources; and the heavy annual interest has thus become an additional item of money drain.

As the blood to the human body, so is the money of a country to the body politic. Exhaustion of blood weakens and destroys the one; exhaustion of money the other. True it is that Ireland is not entirely robbed of her money—that sums collectively of considerable amount, are in the Irish funds and savings banks, and other such investments of limited profit; but these are the unhealthy deposits of a deranged and impeded circulation—of a circulation deranged by diminution of a needful sustenance, and an abstraction of at least a large portion of the vital fluid itself.

The first and most obvious remedy is, to stop the drains. Do so by looking to their source. Restore the rich proprietors to their country, by giving her a parliament, which will require the personal attendance of many, and the vigilance of all; at once from six to seven millions of the drains in question cease to go from us—a sum, be it recollected, very considerably exceeding the amount of the public revenue in Ireland. So much capital restored will revivify and compensate enterprize, manufacturing and commercial; the home market of Ireland will flourish; and the increasing wealth of the country will have its influence on every class and every interest throughout the community, restoring all to that prosperity which it is so evidently in the designs of Almighty Providence that poor Ireland shall enjoy.

England would have eminently her advantage, too, were the Union repealed, and Irish prosperity thus restored—an advantage all-surpassing in the renewed and for-ever-secured friendship, fast alliance, and undeviating support of the re-invigorated and regenerated Irish nation; but an immediate, directly tangible, and most practical advantage in *the increased ability of Ireland to share the burdens of the empire*. Her revenue is small now; not because of great inferiority of taxation—for her taxation is higher than as three to four in comparison with that of England—but because of the *poverty of her consumers* of taxed articles. With the increase of their means, their consumption of such articles would, of course, increase; and thus, within not many months of the stoppage of the drains of Ireland by Repeal,

England would be rewarded by a large increase, without any new taxation, to the funds out of which the public expenditure is defrayed.

So long a digression needs excuse; and we have it twofold. First, in the importance to us, at all times, of the considerations with which we have been dealing. Secondly, in their added importance and relevancy at this time, from the necessity which there is to make preparation in our own minds for the discussion which is now inevitable,\* at an early period of the next session, upon the Union in its effects upon Ireland, and the expediency and necessity of repealing it. To stimulate thought upon this subject, and thereby do something towards urging forward that preparation, was our second and *main* object in so long delaying from our more proper subject.

In returning to the latter, the first matter we take up comes well in after the preceding reflections, as it involves the name of one who has rendered signal service to Ireland, in the exposition of the details of the evils inflicted upon her by the Union, and in the refutation of the paid pamphleteers and other hirelings that have been employed from time to time to put forward strings of specious fallacies in opposition to Repeal, and point their miserable attacks and calumnies against the advocates of that great measure of justice and of right.

The gentleman in question is Michael Staunton, one of the aldermen of Dublin, and many years proprietor of the *Register*, a journal having the strongest claims on the people for its early, consistent, and powerful advocacy of popular rights and the national cause.

Mr. Staunton, then a very young man, in the outset of the career in which he has since acquired so deserved a reputation, was arraigned in the King's Bench, on the 25th of May, for an alleged libel on Thomas Wallace, Esq., Q.C., in an article which

\* Mr. O'Connell having given notice of his intention to move for a committee on the Union, a motion which, carried or not, will, of course, occasion a most interesting discussion.

had appeared in the *Register* some time before. The following is the report of Mr. O'Connell's speech :—

“ MR. O'CONNELL then arose on behalf of Mr. Staunton. Amongst the peculiarities of the present case there was one which astonished him—the prosecutor did not appear.

“ For the first time, he believed, in the history of the jurisprudence of this country, the prosecutor in a private prosecution did not come forward to state and prove the grounds of his complaint. In the present instance it was the more to be wondered at, as the prosecutor was within hearing, or at least within the hall. It would not be difficult to discern why his friends deemed it prudent not to examine him. In advising him not to show himself in the witness's box, they proved themselves as discreet as they are learned. They knew that he should admit the truth of the statements contained in these publications ; and this admission it was not their object or interest to procure.

“ This was a disadvantage to the defendant, which, in the history of the persecutions of the press, was unparalleled. He hoped, however, although his non-appearance had all the merit of novelty, it would not have the advantage of success. His absence from the witness's box, he (Mr. O'C.) would place in the front of his defence, and more earnestly call the attention of the jury to it, as a bad precedent was always imitated with the readiest alacrity, and speedily passed into a law.

“ The prosecutor and his client were strongly contrasted on the present occasion. The prosecutor was a barrister, and a king's counsel of high and respectable station in his profession. He had raised himself to rank, to fortune, and to fame, with as little support from patronage as any man in any profession, and without any aid but what he drew from the resources of a vigorous mind and industrious habits. The artificer of his own fortune, he was a proud living example of the result produced by a combination of superior talent and honourable exertion. This testimony he readily bore to the character of the prosecutor, and he was satisfied he could do so without infringing in the slightest degree on the interests of his client. ”

“ The defendant, on the contrary, was unknown to them. He was the son of a gentleman who gave what he only could give his son—a good education ; and whose only legacy to him was an unprovided mother and an unportioned sister : a legacy which he did not renounce, but which he accepted and cherished with the most devoted attachment. The verdict of the jury was to determine whether he was to be now torn



from those relations—to be sent into a dungeon, for having expressed his opinions in the exercise of his duty as an editor of a newspaper, upon a subject of public interest, at a time that the whole press of the country was leagued with Mr. Wallace in hunting down an individual whose conduct was about to become the subject of legal investigation.

“ He defied the jury to discover one assignable motive of malice to the conduct of the defendant, either in endeavouring to prevent the due administration of justice, to provoke breaches of the law, to vilify the character of Mr. Wallace, or infringe on the privileges of the bar, which constituted the several charges in the counts of the indictment.

“ As to motives of malice in the defendant, there was nothing, he believed, imputable to his client. On the contrary, his friendly disposition to Mr. Wallace, had been made manifest before. When that gentleman was candidate for Drogheda, Mr. Staunton, on that and other occasions, inserted paragraphs, complimentary of Mr. Wallace, in *The Freeman's Journal*, of which he was at that time the editor. He had, many years ago, risen by his talents to the sole editorship of *The Freeman's Journal*, which he held, enjoying a salary of near £500 a-year, until he undertook the publication of *The Weekly Register*, with the view of advancing himself in the world. In *The Freeman's Journal*, and in his own paper, he had always given Mr. Wallace the warmest support as a public man; thus showing, that so far from having any feeling of malice or ill-will towards Mr. Wallace, he always entertained for him the most favourable sentiments.

“ And here (said Mr. O'C.) give me leave respectfully to say, that from being unaccustomed to trials of this nature in this country, you are, to a certain extent, I might almost say, unfit to try this case. If I was addressing a jury of Englishmen, where cases of this nature are better understood, they would call on me to prove the truth of the statements contained in the publication; and if proved to be true, they would acquit my client.

“ As to the charge of these publications impeding public justice, they could only prevent it in either of two ways: either in prejudicing the minds of the jury, and thereby preventing conviction; or by prejudicing the bench, in order to prevent punishment. The case on which this prejudice was supposed to take place was the assault on Mr. Wallace; and he asked the jury if, after the strong evidence which had been given of that assault, could they hesitate to convict Mr. M'Namara, although they had read a hundred such publications? He was confident they could not. Idle as it was to talk of prejudicing the minds of the jury, it was doubly so to suppose it could sway the bench, whom the ha-

bitual exercise of a dispassionate judgment had raised far above such-influence.

“The privileges of the bar formed another topic of consideration. Unquestionably, they were proud and valuable privileges; but their value should make persons discreet and circumspect in the use of them. It could not be denied that they had on many occasions been exercised to an unwarrantable extent. They were intended for the protection not only of the members of the bar, but also for the due attainment of justice; they had been, however, frequently perverted to the purpose of trampling down justice with the individual. The abuse of them now was less frequent, and the reason was, because the bench was every day improving. The bar did not require protection from the subject, but the subject required protection from the bar.

“Their verdict would, in a measure, decide what limit was to be placed to a barrister, in the statement and animadversions, by the manner in which they would deal with a person who had only remarked upon the introduction of a third person into a statement of a leading counsel—that person a respectable female, unconnected altogether with the case, and yet visited with the severest epithets. It had been proved that at the trial of *Caila v. M'Namara*, a great deal of intemperance had been shown, and shown at the time of taking a bill of exceptions, when there might be supposed to be least occasion for it.

“As to the vilification of the character of Mr. Wallace, there was nothing in the publication which could even warrant such an imputation. On the contrary, one of the publications stated him to be ‘a man of talent and spirit.’ The statements in these publications were the assertion of facts which were not disproved, and some editorial observations mitigatory of the conduct of Mr. R. M'Namara. Here Mr. O'Connell read several paragraphs from *The Freeman's Journal, Patriot, Dublin Journal, &c.*, which animadverted in severe terms on the conduct of Mr. R. M'Namara; and Mr. O'Connell asked if, whilst the whole press of Dublin was teeming with vituperation on the conduct of that unfortunate gentleman, it was not admissible to offer something in mitigation? He (Mr. O'C.) would be satisfied to rest the case of his client on the constitutional principle, that every man should be accounted innocent until proved to be guilty. And whilst every other paper was wrongfully prejudicing the public on the side of guilt, even before accusation, his client alone appeared on the side of mercy, and maintained the propriety of not condemning Mr. M'Namara before trial.

“Mr. O'Connell dwelt on this point with much force and eloquence. He could wish to have seen this matter amicably adjusted before it came

into court. At one time he hoped that an adjustment would take place, but as it was on the eve of settlement there came a question of costs. He regretted that Mr. Wallace was advised to stoop to the consideration of them, which, if unadvised, he was sure he would not do. His client could not pay costs. The payment of them would be his ruin. After adverting to a variety of other exculpatory topics, Mr. O'Connell conjured the jury to pause before they plunged a young gentleman in gaol, for the blameless exercise of his duty as a proprietor of the public press—to hesitate before they tore this last remnant from the freedom of discussion—the right of remarking *truly* on the conduct of public men, and on public transactions. If the press was to be despoiled of this privilege, it ceased to be a moral benefit, and would become a mischievous machine, at the beck and influence of every person who was rich and powerful enough to control it.

“A burst of applause from a crowded court followed the delivery of this speech.”

Mr. Staunton was, notwithstanding, convicted, and suffered an imprisonment in Kilmainham. But *conviction* and condemnation, merited or unmerited, was sure to be a Catholic's fate before a city of Dublin jury, chosen and packed as they were, and still often are, by the foulest means and practices of the Orange sheriffs.

We hasten on to a letter of Mr. O'Connell's, on the subject of the annual Orange demonstrations in Dublin:—

“TO HIS EXCELLENCY MARQUIS WELLESLEY, &c. &c. &c.

“Marion-square, July 11th, 1822.

“MR LORD—To-morrow will finally decide the character of your administration. The oppressed and neglected Catholics of Ireland had fondly hoped, that they might have obtained from a *friend*, placed in the exalted situation which your excellency occupies, a recommendation in favour of their claims. You took an early opportunity to crush that hope for ever. In your reply to the address of the Catholics of the county Clare, you told the Irish people that you came here to ‘*administer the laws, not to alter them.*’

“My lord, but a few weeks elapsed, when you deemed it expedient to recommend the insurrection act, and the act to suspend the *habeas corpus*. That the latter was not wanting, is now admitted by everybody; and that any necessity is a justification of the former, remains, in my humble judgment, to be proved.

“It still remains for your excellency to *administer the laws*. Hitherto the Catholics have felt no advantages from your excellency's administration. The system by which we are governed—the cold system of exclusion and distrust—is precisely the same as that of the most rigid of your predecessors. One principal actor, to be sure, has been withdrawn from the scene, and we may deem the alteration a compliment; but I am yet to learn what benefit we are to derive from it; and I appeal to your lordship, whether the change to which I allude has not been amply compensated for to the exclusionists, by the removal of the mildest, kindest, and best public man Ireland has ever yet seen—Mr. Grant.

"Your excellency came to *administer the laws*. My lord, I most respectfully, but, at the same time, most firmly call upon you to *administer them*. The exhibition intended (it is said) for to-morrow, is plainly a violation of the law. It is an open and public excitement to a breach of the peace; it is a direct provocation to tumult; it obstructs the public streets, by collecting on the one side an insulting, and on the other, an irritated concourse of persons. It is, my lord, for these, and other obvious reasons, a manifest violation of the law.

"I pledge myself to prove, before any court, or to any impartial jury, that the usual annual exhibition on the 12th of July is illegal.

"I make this pledge under no small risk. I have certainly as large, probably a larger professional income than any man in a stuff gown ever had at the Irish bar—an income depending mainly upon the public notion that I understand something of my profession. I could not afford to forfeit that public confidence; and yet I freely consent to forfeit it all, unless I am able to demonstrate to any judicial tribunal, *that the annual exhibitions of the 12th of July are illegal*.

"Having given this pledge, I again respectfully call upon your excellency to vindicate the exalted character you have heretofore acquired, to do justice to the high name you bear, and to fulfil the duties of the exalted station which you occupy.

"As you cannot *alter*, I again respectfully, dutifully, but firmly, call upon you to *administer the law*, and to suppress an illegal and insulting nuisance.

"My lord, you do not, cannot want, the means of suppressing this nuisance. One word from you will be abundantly sufficient to do it. The expensive police of Dublin is at your disposal. With one word you can remove every one of them, from the chief magistrate in the chief office to the lowest retainer in the patrol department.

"The corporation has, to be sure, the power to nominate to many of those situations, but that influence, which, alas! is deemed necessary over higher assemblies, is preserved in perfect purity over the corporation by your Excellency's undoubted right to dismiss the nominees of the corporation, at your pleasure, from those lucrative situations in the police.

"You do not, my lord, want the power to administer the law. To say nothing of the military force at your disposal, you can command, and it is within the limits (and would it were within the practice) of our constitution to command them, all the liberal Protestants, constituting a most numerous and respectable body; and the entire Catholic population of Dublin, as special constables, to keep the peace, and prevent a violation of the law.

"You have, my lord, ample power, and God forbid it should ever be said, that you wanted the inclination to administer the laws *impartially* towards all classes of his Majesty's subjects.

"I say nothing of his most gracious Majesty's parting admonition; I say nothing of the disinterested and affectionate loyalty which the Catholics showed to their sovereign, on his visit to Ireland; and I scorn to boast of the active part so humble an individual as myself took upon that important occasion. My lord, the Catholics forgot injuries, and what is infinitely more difficult, forgave insults, to effect a reconciliation with their Protestant fellow-subjects; and in no one instance have the Catholics, since the King's visit, violated, *in deed, or even in word*, the spirit of that amicable concord which they then sought, and believed they had attained. I now defy the most active of our calumniators to point out any one single act, or even any one single word, by which the Catholics have violated that concord.

"But, alas! how speedily, how completely, how entirely has it been violated upon the other side. On the other side, those men who were loudest in proclaiming *sentiments* of amity, what has been their conduct since? But I will not dwell upon this painful subject; I will only say, that the Catholics deserve and require protection from insult and injury. Will you, my lord, refuse them that protection?

"To-morrow decides the character of your excellency's administration in Ireland. That your conduct then and always may at length justify the wishes of your admirers, and the fallen expectation of this fallen country, is the anxious desire of,

"My Lord, your Excellency's most obedient,

"Most respectful, humble Servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

The degree of attention which the Marquis of Wellesley paid to this earnest remonstrance of Mr. O'Connell, on the part of the insulted Catholic people of Ireland, can be gathered from the following account of the proceedings in Dublin on July the 12th, 1822, taken from the *Freeman's Journal* of the succeeding day.

“ORANGE DISPLAY.

“The statue (King William) in College-green, was dressed yesterday, the 12th July, in the usual manner. The ceremony was performed by a few mean-looking persons, about four o'clock in the morning, in the presence of several POLICEMEN, who made no attempt to prevent it.

“Two soldiers were observed in College-green about the same time. The persons most active on the occasion were a Mr. Brownlow, who got on the pedestal, a Mr. Forbes, a merchant's clerk, and a Mr. Hudson. A country attorney, name unknown, was also present. When they had completed their foolish and mischievous work, they proceeded in a body to the public house (Daly's) in Werburgh-street, where they held their grand lodge. On their way they amused themselves by shouting and huzzaing, and alarming the peaceable citizens by striking the doors and window shutters as they passed along the streets. There were a few spectators in the street when the trappings were put up.

“During the whole of the day the assemblage of persons continued to increase hour after hour. At nine o'clock in the evening the crowd became very thick and dense; many of the indignant spectators could no longer endure the insult. Some persons from the crowd accordingly mounted the pedestal, with an intention of undressing the statue. The horse patrol and police prevented them, dispersed, and, as we have been assured by an eye-witness, subsequently charged the people. We could learn that they even used their swords and sticks without ceremony or caution. Shortly afterwards the *favoured band* approached their idol, and without the slightest interruption, were permitted not only to undress the statue, but to annoy the respectable neighbourhood with the most boisterous yells and imprecations. No carriage or vehicle of any description was permitted to pass, without the drivers taking off their hats to the god of Orange idolatry. A melancholy occurrence took place in consequence of the clamour thus kept up. It

unfortunately happened that a car of Mr. Casey's was passing, and before the carman could comply with the requisition of making his obeisance to King William, the horse ran off, frightened by the clamour which assailed it. The car came in contact with another car belonging to Mr. Darcy Burne, and shocking to relate, the shaft of Mr. Casey's car pierced the breast of Mr. Burne's horse, a fine animal, which immediately fell prostrate in the street!! It has been taken to Mr. Watt's, but we regret to hear its death is expected. The carman of Mr. Casey was, we understand, flung from his seat; his head fractured, and otherwise severely bruised. Providentially neither the family of Mr. Casey nor Mr. Burne was in either car. But both families might have been in them; the mother of ten children, the father on whom ten children depended for bread, might have been in either of these cars, and in them would probably have met a sudden and fearful death; and yet, there are persons who assert, that the dressing of the statue of King William is a *harmless exhibition*.

"At the moment we are writing these lines, (two o'clock, A. M.,) small, but noisy groups of Orangemen were standing in the streets, and disturbing the peace by their shouts and exclamations.

"We narrate these occurrences with unaffected sorrow. The reflections they naturally suggest we must postpone until our next."

During the summer of this year, Mr. O'Connell, at one of the assize towns of his circuit (the Munster circuit), being as usual in great request among the solicitors of the multitude of unfortunate creatures, whom the misery of the country, and the oppressions of bad laws and worse administrators of them, had driven into the commission of offences of various degrees and descriptions, was offered a retainer from the solicitor of a man accused of having plundered some plantations belonging to a rich proprietor of the neighbourhood. The evidence against his client was expected to be of the clearest kind—being that of no less than three servants of the injured party—the gamekeeper, the butler, and a labourer, who had all three assisted in capturing the offender, in the very act of committing the depredation.

In the face of such evidence it appeared to Mr. O'Connell impossible to do anything towards saving the man from punishment, however severe the latter might be, and disproportioned

to the degree of criminality to be attached to such an act of a poverty-stricken wretch. Severity of the most relentless nature was the sad characteristic of the administration of justice in those times, and Mr. O'Connell was not likely to have refused his exertions towards giving the offender some chance of escape, did a chance appear to him at all possible. But as we have said, he was so thoroughly convinced of the utter futility of rendering the man any service, that his first motion was to refuse undertaking the defence, and he accordingly sent back the retaining fee, advising that it should be applied in some more useful way than in engaging counsel, who could not give value for it.

He was sitting in court the morning after his refusal, attending to his other business, when he was suddenly accosted in a very sharp tone by the solicitor for the accused, who demanded to know whether it was the fact that he declined the cause. Being answered that it was, and the simple reason being stated, that matters looked so entirely hopeless, as to render the feeing of counsel nothing better than a mere waste of the prisoner's money, the solicitor, in still greater anger than before, declared that Mr. O'Connell had no right to refuse in the case, and that he would insist upon his accepting the fee and undertaking it.

“‘Oh,’ said Mr. O'Connell, ‘there is not the slightest necessity for your putting yourself into a passion about the matter. If you will insist on my receiving these fees, notwithstanding that I tell you I cannot give you value for them, have it your own way. I am quite satisfied since you are, and I *will* take the matter up.’”

He did so accordingly, and the case being presently gone into, counsel for the prosecution contented himself with a short statement of facts, and mentioned his having in court three witnesses, whom he would immediately produce, who had all been at the capture of the man in the very act of robbing the plantations.

“‘Get two of them out of court, Mr. O'Connell, while one is under examination,’ whispered the solicitor.

“‘No, no,’ was Mr. O'Connell's reply—‘they shall all remain in—it is our only chance, as you will see.’”

The first of the three witnesses that appeared on the table was the butler. He was evidently full of his story, and very particularly anxious to attribute the chief part of the credit to himself. Mr. O'Connell marked his victim at once, encouraged him, on cross-examination, to tell his tale with all the pomposity and circumstantiality he was inclined to; and then, by a few pointed questions, involved him in such a mass of inconsistencies and contradictions, as utterly to invalidate his testimony.

When, at length, he allowed him to escape in confusion from the table, the second witness—the labourer—was called up, and here the wisdom of not insisting on having the witnesses out of court, became at once apparent. The second witness had, of course, heard the evidence of the first, and although not quite pleased at the lion's share of the merits in the capture, which the worthy butler had sought to arrogate to himself, had yet too much interest in the success of the prosecution not to endeavour to support him. Accordingly, instead of confining himself to the plain, simple narration of the event as it actually occurred, he turned all his attention to seeking to explain away, or reconcile the inconsistencies of his predecessor, and, of course, only succeeded in making the matter worse, when he became to be cross-examined. He left the table in a state of greater *botheration* than even the butler.

The third witness—the gamekeeper—not at all frightened by the discomfiture of the others, now appeared, and his plight was speedily even worse than theirs. He, too, having heard all the preceding evidence, &c., laboured to do away with its inconsistencies, a task the more difficult, as they had so multiplied under the second cross-examination. Mr. O'Connell upset him most



completely, and, at length, by skilful badgering and tormenting, brought him to such a state, that the following colloquy passed between them :—

“ ‘ Now, will you answer me one question more, and then, perhaps, I’ll have done with you.’ ”

“ ‘ Oh, if it’s only one question more and you’ll let me go then, I’ll answer it *any way you like* !’ ”

“ ‘ Very well now, remember you said so. Now, by virtue of your oath, *isn’t the prisoner innocent* ?’ ”

“ ‘ By *virtue of my oath he is* !’ ”

It is needless to say the man was acquitted, and Mr. O’Connell left the court in high amusement at having so unexpectedly earned the fee, which he had at first so scrupled to accept. ‘

His skill in conducting a defence was tested in a more meritorious and a graver case, much about the same time, on the same circuit. He was engaged on behalf of a man accused on the testimony only of a young boy, of having been a principal in a savage agrarian murder which had occurred a few weeks previously. The evidence of the boy was clearly and distinctly given, and for some time Mr. O’Connell was unable to elucidate anything that appeared to hold out a hope for his client. At last the too great readiness of the boy gave an advantage. He had stated that he identified the prisoner by a mark upon one of his cheeks. That there was such a mark needed only a look at the man to establish. But Mr. O’Connell, without allowing his object to be seen, drew the boy out on the subject, until he specified the *right* cheek as that on which the mark was, and got him two or three times over to repeat the specification, after, in each interval, distracting his attention by asking questions on some indifferent matters. The mark proved to be on the *left* cheek, and this discrepancy, pressed in the speech to evidence of the counsel for the prisoner, saved the prisoner’s life.

Justice was not defeated thereby, the accused being really

innocent, which was fully established a short time afterwards, when the real murderer was arrested, and his identification completed by a similar mark being found *on his right cheek*. It was then seen that the boy had been misled by a general similarity of appearance, coupled with the strange circumstance of both men bearing such marks, though on different cheeks. The mistake as to "*right*" and "*left*," was accounted for by the position in which witness and prisoner relatively stood—the left cheek of the latter being, of course, opposite to the right of the former, and the marks thus appearing to correspond.

The niceties on which men's lives turn, in criminal trials, were never clearer illustrated than on the occasion in question. Had Mr. O'Connell not caught at this point, but trusted to the defence set up, viz., an alibi, to be proved by a Protestant clergyman, who had actually had the man employed at a distance from the scene of the murder, all the day on which the latter was committed, an innocent man would have assuredly been made a victim. The witness mentioned *entirely broke down*, through his anxiety to conceal the nature of the business at which he had kept the man engaged on that day—the not very creditable occupation of making "*poteen*," i. e. illicit whiskey.

The first political speech that Mr. O'Connell made in the winter of 1822, was at a Catholic charity dinner for the Orphan School at Clondalkin, on Wednesday, the 13th of November, Lord Cloncurry in the chair. Like landmarks throughout his career, are such ever-recurring allusions as are contained in this short speech, to the one great object of his life.

"MR. O'CONNELL, in returning thanks for his health, commenced by saying, that he was accustomed to public speaking, and could not, at least, plead want of practice as an excuse for want of perfection. (Laughter.) He felt most proud of the opinion which his noble friend had pronounced upon him. He did not aspire to greater honour, or to a higher ambition, than that he was *honestly* disposed to serve Ireland. When it might please the All-wise Disposer of events to call him

from this life, he would be happy if it were inscribed on his grave that he was '*an honest Irishman,*' and that his noble friend was the person who wrote that epitaph for him. (Applause.)

"He delighted in every opportunity of meeting an assembly of his countrymen, and he delighted the more on the present occasion, as some time had elapsed since he could have enjoyed that gratification. He lamented the apathy which prevailed on public topics here, but was glad to notice an effort made for a great public good, and in a quarter in which, he would own, he did not expect it. To Alderman Nugent, as an Irishman, he felt unaffectedly grateful for his meritorious exertions in endeavouring to effect a **REPEAL OF THE UNION.**

"'Twas true he differed, most widely differed from that gentleman in politics, *but he would forgive any man his injuries towards himself, or his general political line of conduct, provided he redeemed them by a sincere and substantial service towards his country.*

"In England and Scotland great efforts were making for the amelioration of the country. In Scotland, her delegates from her several counties were convened to consult for her interests and future prospects. In England, the great county of York, and several other counties, with their nobles and landed proprietors, had come forward and proclaimed their sentiments; but Ireland was sunk in slumber and despair. *He deplored most sincerely the fate of the unfortunate victims whose folly and whose crimes had driven them for ever from their native land.* As far as his influence could extend, he wrote and exhorted his countrymen to desist from *secret confederacies and private associations.* *The bond of such conspiracies was guilt; the men who entered them consigned themselves to any man, whom interest might instigate into treachery against them.* A twelvemonth ago he was aware that the '*Michael Coffeys*' were abroad, and he then, as now, strenuously and publicly besought the humbler classes to abandon all illegal meetings. His admonition was disregarded, but he would again and again renew it. These associations he regarded as the reaction of Orangeism, and he was persuaded there would not be peace or prosperity for the country, until the Catholic and Protestant united in putting down disaffection in whatever guise, or under whatever banner it reared its unseemly front.

"Mr. O'Connell enlarged upon a variety of other topics, into which our limits do not permit us to follow him, and concluded a most eloquent and animated address, by pronouncing a handsome eulogy on his Grace the Duke of Leinster, and proposing the health of His Grace."

The legal, peaceable principles of his agitation, too, are here again enunciated and proclaimed, as on hundreds of occasions before and since.

The allusion to Alderman Nugent, in the short speech we have just given, was drawn out by a reference to a then recent meeting of the Guild of Merchants, when a committee of their body were appointed, with the present member for the county Meath, Henry Grattan, Esq., and his brother James Grattan, Esq., at their head, to prepare a petition for the "REPEAL OF THE UNION."

The following are a few brief extracts from the petition drawn up by this committee, and adopted by the Protestant Guild of Merchants, or as they described themselves in their due legal title :—

"The Masters, Warden, and Brethren of the Corporation of Merchants, or Guild of the Holy Trinity, Dublin."

After dilating generally on the miseries caused to Ireland by the Union, the petition complained of—

"The constant recurrence (since the Union) to coercive measures, to violent acts of parliament, and to the suspensions of the constitution now grown familiar to the Statute Book. . . . The rejection of all motions for inquiry into the evils under which the country suffered—the want of development of the general resources of Ireland, &c., &c. . . . We could also shew (it went on to say) how we have endured fever in one year, and famine in another, and often both in one, and all patiently; how we were laden with taxes until their excessive accumulation proved our only relief, and our best friend; how the great progress which Ireland once was making, was stopped by the Union, and all her improvements as a nation checked."

It protested against a repeal of the *habeas corpus*, against insurrection bills, &c., &c., and against a "constable bill" of that year, "containing the monstrous principle of governing this

country by a stipendiary magistracy, and an armed police—alarming and unconstitutional substitutes for a resident gentry.

It concluded by an exhortation to the House of Commons, to take into consideration the propriety of repealing the act of Union—"a measure which, carried by such illegal, such unconstitutional means—by the sale, notorious as it was, of all our sacred, our judicial, our political institutions—never could prosper, but must end in calamity, and recoil upon the authors of so much evil;" and the exhortation was enforced by reminding the house, that "the pressure of business upon you is too great, the inconvenience to Irish members to attend is too great, the wants of seven millions of people were too great."

There were in this petition grievous faults of style and arrangement, and a want of sustained force of expression; but the substance, coming from an *Orange* Guild of the city of Dublin, was sound and good, and proved how national feeling will sometimes break through the strongest barriers of miserable party prejudice and interest.

A question of a good deal of interest relative to bar practice was involved in the matter, which drew the following letter, published in the *Freeman's Journal* of Saturday, the 1st of December, 1822:—

"TO THE PROPRIETOR OF THE FREEMAN'S JOURNAL.

"Marion-square, 6th December, 1822.

"SIR—There is a statement in your paper of this day, of an occurrence in the Court of King's Bench yesterday, during the trial of the cause of *Crowe v. Fleming*, which is singularly inaccurate. I request you will publish the following accurate detail of the facts:—

"I was counsel for Mr. Crowe at the trial of the first cause, instituted by him in the Court of Exchequer, and tried at Ennis in the Summer Assizes, 1819. He was unsuccessful, and the cause was at an end.

"He afterwards filed a bill against Mr. Fleming in the Court of Chancery. In that cause I was not counsel for either party; Mr. Crowe had a right to leave me out, and he very properly exercised that right.

"He next instituted *this* suit in the Court of King's Bench, and issue had been for some time joined in it before either party applied to me. Mr. Hickman, the defendant's attorney, was the first to do so. He offered me a retainer. I at first declined to receive it, saying, that as I had been counsel for the plaintiff in the former cause, I was unwilling to be counsel against him in this. Mr. Hickman asked whether I was retained in this cause? I said not. He insisted upon it, as the defendant's right, that I should accept of his retainer, and that I could not consistently with professional propriety refuse.

I told him I would consider of it for a day or two, and that if ultimately I was of opinion that I was bound to take the defendant's retainer, I would take it as if given on that day.

"In the interval the plaintiff's attorney left some papers in the cause at my house. I told him what had taken place between Mr. Hickman and me. He immediately laid claim to the plaintiff's prior right to my services. I told him I could not admit that right. He asked whether I would refer the point to any other counsel. I said I would readily, to any one whom he should name. He named Mr. Edward Pennefather, and I said it was not possible to make a better choice.

"Accordingly, in a few days, the plaintiff's attorney called on me, and we went together to Mr. Pennefather's house. The facts were stated to Mr. Pennefather by the plaintiff's attorney, and upon that statement he decided that I was bound to accept the defendant's retainer.

"In that decision, of course, I acquiesced. I could not be wrong in submitting to it, but I must say, that I am convinced it was a perfectly right decision. The plaintiff himself does not think that he is bound to employ the counsel he had at the trial at Ennis, and in point of fact, there are two of those counsel whom he has not employed now; and who are not engaged at either side. The condition of the clients would be grievous, if they were under any obligation to employ in every cause, all the counsel they employ in any one suit respecting the same property.

"Your report of this morning makes me say, that I was *leading* counsel at the former trial. I was not leading counsel. Another gentleman was, and the plaintiff has not employed him in the present cause. You also make me say, that it was I who named *the arbitrator*. You perceive now it was not I; it was the plaintiff's attorney who named him. I pass over other inaccuracies.

"Your report will probably be copied into other newspapers. Those who copy it, if they affect fair play, will also copy this letter. I confess I scarcely expect so much candour.

"I am Sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

#### MEETING IN THE ROYAL EXCHANGE,

20TH DECEMBER, 1822.

#### OUTRAGE AT THE THEATRE.

In December, 1822, occurred an event that has a place in the Annals of Dublin as the "*bottle throwing*" conspiracy. On Saturday, the 14th of that month, the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Wellesley, attended the theatre in state, and was warmly received by the audience, with the exception of a party of Orangemen, chiefly of the lower class, whose ire he had provoked by no great *practical* exhibition of impartiality in his government; but rather by a less than usual active favouritism towards the old ascendancy party. From groans and hisses the malcontents proceeded to open violence—and a quart bottle, and shortly afterwards a large piece of wood, part of a watchman's rattle, were flung, happily without effect, at the viceregal party.

Among other public demonstrations on this occurrence, was a meeting at the Royal Exchange, of persons of all parties—held on Friday, the 20th December; the Lord Mayor (Fleming) in the chair.

After several speeches, Mr. O'Connell having been repeatedly called upon, came forward, and, after the cheers with which he was received had subsided, spoke nearly to the following effect:—

“ My Lord Mayor and Gentlemen—It would be very great affectation in me not to come forward at the call of my fellow-citizens, to express my thankfulness for the kindness with which I have been greeted, and to offer my humble sentiments on the present occasion.

“ And permit me, in the first instance, my lord, to express the delight which I feel in addressing your lordship as the chief magistrate of this city. Your career of office since the commencement, has been one of which every well-disposed man in the community must approve. It has been marked by an impartial administration of the law—by a meritorious obedience to the directions of the supreme magistrate of the country—and by creditable exertions to regulate the conduct, and stimulate to the execution of their duty, the officers and magistrates of subordinate station.

“ As to the event which has occurred, and which we have assembled to deprecate, I am satisfied that only one feeling of indignation, of sorrow, and of shame, can pervade the mind of every man in the country. It was an outrage without parallel in any former instance of wanton, unprovoked insult. If the accused be innocent, their acquittal will clear their characters from the foulness of the imputed guilt; if guilty, impartial justice will avenge the laws which they have outraged. To that law I am anxious they should be submitted; and sure I am, that whether innocent or guilty, I may be pardoned the vanity I take in my profession, in the assurance I give, that they will be dealt with fairly, uprightly, and impartially. With that distinguished ornament of the bar and of Ireland, Charles Bushe, presiding in the Court of King's Bench, aided by Mr. Justice Jebb, by that admirable Englishman, Mr. Justice Burton, and by that excellent gentleman, Mr. Justice Vandeleur—there is not a country in Europe where justice is more purely administered, than in the King's Bench in Ireland. (Applause.)

“ Whatever, therefore, may be the punishment, it would be the award of justice. On this topic, or on any other, my lord, I am not

disposed to use irritating language, and, if I were so disposed, the presiding presence of your lordship would restrain me from the use of it. I am not even disposed to animadvert with harshness upon the events which have, either remotely or immediately, preceded this last unparalleled atrocity. These events it would be better, perhaps, to forget; and, taking this atrocity for an example of the baneful and dangerous excesses of illegal associations of every description, we should all unite and join in the universal inculcation of the salutary lesson, that loyalty, to be genuine, should be rational; and that loyalty is not the peculiar prerogative of one sect or another, but is the legitimate and appropriate characteristic of all his majesty's subjects, of every class, every rank, every denomination. (Applause.)

“Much polemics had been abroad in the world at the present day, and learned disputations had lately occupied the attention, and no doubt edified the piety of the public; but that religion is alone worthy the character of Christianity, which does not exasperate or divide, but which unites every man, and all men, in the bonds of brotherly love, reciprocal kindness, and mutual benevolence.

“If Ireland, with the richest soil, maintained the poorest people, if her prosperity had been marred, if her riches had been drained and squandered in foreign dissipation, it was because her children, instead of combining in effectual co-operation to consider how best that soil might be cultivated, how best that prosperity might be advanced, and how best her wealth may be distributed for the nation's weal, abused their time, and abandoned their duties in attacking each other, and running a dishonourable rivalry in their endeavours to tear their country into pitiful and tattered fragments. (Much and continued cheering.)

“It was true, that great misery, as Mr. Leader had eloquently depicted, existed in the South of Ireland. And it was true also, that crime had been abundant there. The Irish peasantry, in the insanity of their poverty and wretchedness, had taken up arms. In the dark hour of midnight, they prowled to the perpetration of horrible excesses. Of those I am not, God forbid I should be, in the most distant degree the apologist; however, it should be remembered, that their wants and their wretchedness were extreme; it should not be forgotten, not as a justification, but as some trivial mitigation, that the weight of misery pressed upon them so heavily as to provoke them, in some degree, to burst these bonds of order which, under any circumstances, it was their bounden duty to observe and revere.

“But was it ever known of an Irish peasant, that in the midst of gaiety, of luxury, and of merriment, he became a murderer? Was it ever known of him, that in the moment of joy and gratulation, sur-







rounded, too, by our beautiful countrywomen, whose presence it was the chivalrous pride of an Irishman to respect; was it ever heard that he degraded his name, his nature, and his humanity, into the character of an ignominious traitor, and a base assassin? (Cries of 'no, no,' and continued cheering.) And who was the object of this outrage? The man who was the delegate not only of the king's power in this country, but the delegate also of his benevolence, and the representative of his affection for Ireland. (Cheers.)

"I am myself a reformer, I always avow my opinions on the subject of reform. I differ, respectfully differ, from the Marquis of Wellesley, from the sentiments which at the early part of his active and glorious public life he expressed upon that subject; yet, his distinguished services on that occasion could not preserve him from the outrage of those who affect all the loyalty of the land, and make that loyalty to consist, perhaps very properly, in an opposition to reform. I pass over his glorious administration in India, where he introduced the blessings of British law, and where the wisdom of his government displayed itself in the increased civilization of the people, and the augmented glory, strength, and power of the British empire. But that one of his eminent services on which I dwell with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction, is, his conduct as representative of his sovereign in Spain. He was the person who had sown that seed which had risen to a magnificent tree, which, in the maturity of its growth, overshadowed the odious and abominable inquisition, and under the shade of whose spreading branches the forlorn liberties of mankind found security and shelter.

"At the time when the armies of France threatened desolation to Spain, the Marquis of Wellesley was at Cadiz, and then cheered the royal party there. 'Cultivate,' said he, 'the affection of the people. Instil into their minds the blessings of good and equal government, and in the combined energies of an approving people you will find the best bulwark for your throne, and the best security to your dominions.' This is the advice he then gave, and the wisdom of this advice, it is believed, is now felt and adopted.

"It has been said, and I trust it is true, that his illustrious brother, the Duke of Wellington, has added another ray to the star of his fame, by refusing to join the Holy Alliance in the invasion of peaceful and neutral states. May the admonition of the Marquis of Wellesley be the monitor of his decision!

"In the same language the Noble Marquis will now address his Majesty and the British Parliament. He will point out the misery that mischievous faction has entailed upon the country, and assure England, as he assured Spain, that the best security to the throne and consti-

tion is ever found in the united energies of a united people. And whenever the liberties of Spain are consummated, and Ireland made prosperous in the union of her children, the gratitude of the admiring world must surround the man, the wisdom of whose counsels essentially aided the one, and the fearless energy of whose impartial administration achieved the other. (Continued cheering for several minutes.)

"It is our duty, my lord, to co-operate in the achievement of this goodly work. Let the Protestant join the Catholic in discountenancing the green badge of Ribbonism, and the Catholic, in turn, unite with the Protestant in abolishing the ribbon emblematic of Orangeism; for in the abandonment of every symbol of faction, and in the annihilation of every illegal association in Ireland, the peace and prosperity of Ireland can only find a commencement and a basis. These, my lords and gentlemen, are the sentiments which this occasion, and the presence of this respectable and thronged assembly inspire in my mind.

"I am grateful for the attention with which I have been received—grateful, too, for the cheers which have greeted me—not for any idle vanity I take in them, but because they convince me that the sentiments I have uttered, find their echo in the approbation of all who hear me, and, still more, because I recognize in them the united and concordant sentiments of my Protestant and Catholic fellow-countrymen. I trust the union of this day may be perpetual. I fondly hope so, as it is only from the perpetuity of such an union we can ever expect to please the King, to make the people happy, or the nation great.

"The learned gentleman sat down amidst the loud and general cheering of the meeting."

An address was brought forward by the committee; and for the first time, but not the last, Daniel O'Connell and the Orange-men's *pet*, the late Sir Abraham Bradley King, were brought into friendly contact.

"Moved by DANIEL O'CONNELL, Esq., and seconded by SIR A. B. KING, Bart.,

"7. RESOLVED—'That the address now reported by the committee be adopted as the address of the meeting, and that the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor be requested to present the same, in the most prompt and respectful manner, to his Excellency.'

"8. RESOLVED—'That the Lord Mayor do now quit the Chair, and that his Grace the DUKE of LEXINGTON do take the same.'"

The offenders in this "conspiracy," two carpenters named Handwich, and a shoemaker named Graham, were capitally com-

mitted; but a Dublin grand jury, of "*the right sort*," ignored the bills.

Early in the summer of the year, the summary of whose *public* events, connected with Mr. O'Connell, we are now concluding, he sent his family to the South of France, for the benefit of Mrs. O'Connell's health. They embarked at Dublin for Bordeaux, and thence proceeded to the town of Pau, in the department of the Basses Pyrenees, to await his coming.

In the month of August, he was enabled to leave Ireland to join them, and, proceeding by Dover and Calais, first visited his relative, General Count O'Connell, in Paris. During his journey thence through France, to the southward, a trifling incident occurred, which afforded him much amusement.

One of his fellow-passengers in the Diligence was a French sea-captain, whether of the naval or the merchant service did not appear. He was a fine, well-looking man, of prepossessing appearance and manner, until, after being in the vehicle some time, he found out that he was in company with what he supposed an *Englishman*; at once his whole demeanour changed—very possibly with the recollection of some injuries sustained at sea from English cruisers—and he commenced, and kept up, a continued fire of abuse and denunciations of the English, and everything belonging to them.

From time to time he paused, as if to see what effect his violence might have on the *Englishman*, as he conceived Mr. O'Connell to be. Provoked at the uninterrupted equanimity of the latter, and at, perhaps, seeing something like a smile upon his face, he renewed his philippics with greater virulence than before, but with no greater effect upon him whom they were intended to irritate. At length, losing all patience, he turned directly to Mr. O'Connell, and giving vent to a still more violent and roughly-worded *anti-Anglican* diatribe than before, he asked him—

"Do you hear me, monsieur?—do you understand me?"

"Perfectly," was the quiet reply.

“Eh bien—comment, donc—have you nothing to say to me after that? Do you not resent my attack on your—country and your countrymen?”

“I have no cause to resent anything you have said. On the contrary, I think much of it is richly deserved. Besides, you have *not* attacked *my* country, nor *my* countrymen.”

“Comment! Monsieur est Anglais—n'est ce pas?”

“Non, monsieur, je suis Irlandais, à votre service; et n'ai nullement raison de me fâcher, mais bien le contraire.”

It still required a little explanation before the excited Frenchman could entirely comprehend the extent of his mistake; but the moment he did so, his demonstrations of hostility were changed to those of the greatest delight, and anxiety to be friendly; and, during the rest of the time they were travelling together, nothing could exceed his politeness and anxiety to shew his *Irish* companion every attention in his power.

The latter part of his journey Mr. O'Connell had to post, and had to encounter a less agreeable incident than that just related. Having, through a misconception of his orders, been taken along the route to Bayonne, instead of that to Pau, and not ascertaining the error until just at the close of a most exhausting day, during which he had been keeping himself up with anticipations of immediately seeing his family, he learned, in answer to an inquiry as to the exact distance yet between him and Pau, that he was at the second or third last stage from Bayonne, and nearly forty leagues, by *cross* roads, from his real destination. The miserable night travelling to get back into the right road, and the long, long day of weariness that followed, are amongst his most disagreeable recollections.

After a few weeks' sojourn at Pau, he brought his family to Tours, where he left them to spend the winter, and returned to his public and legal duties in Ireland. His son Morgan, who had now been two years returned from South America, accompanied him as far as Paris, and there parted him, to join the Austrian army, as a cadet in a light dragoon regiment.

## CHAPTER XI.

## THEATRE RIOTS.

COUNTY DUBLIN, 8TH JANUARY, 1823.

THE outrage in the Dublin Theatre, committed against the Marquis of Wellesley, gave rise to a multitude of meetings besides that we have already noticed, at all of which addresses were agreed to, and forwarded to the Lord Lieutenant. The county of Dublin met at Kilmainham, on Wednesday, the 18th of January, 1823—the High Sheriff in the Chair.

To one of the resolutions—which went to attribute the outrage in question to a “*conspiracy*”—the High Sheriff a little demurred, as not being, in his opinion, a question within the object of the meeting. A gentleman present expressed his concurrence in the Sheriff’s view of the matter, and suggested further, that the men were yet untried, who stood charged with the outrage, and their case might be prejudiced.

“MR. O’CONNELL had listened with respectful attention to the objection which the High Sheriff had made to putting the resolution from the chair, and had also listened to the very respectable young gentleman (Mr. Hamilton, jun.), who had very properly stated his additional ground of objection and opposition to the resolution. He hoped, however, that if he were fortunate enough to remove the objections of Mr. Hamilton and the High Sheriff, he would have the honour of their concurrence with him as to the propriety of the motion being put.

“The Sheriff’s objection was, that the proposed resolution did not come within the limits of the requisition under which the meeting had been convened. He should respectfully submit, however, that the resolution was not only a part, but a *necessary* and an *essential* part of the proceedings of the day, as implied in the requisition.

“They had met to address his Excellency—upon what occasion?

Upon his escape from an attempt at assassination ; and from a conspiracy, of which the interchange of signals—the aggregation of a knot of persons in one part of the theatre—their riotous deportment—the heavy missiles hurled—and their inflammatory printed placards, gave irresistible attestation. It was, therefore, impossible—plainly impossible—to separate that resolution from the object of the requisition.

“ Besides, he would respectfully remind the Sheriff that his constitutional duty was to put the resolution, although he might not accord to the sentiment it conveyed. He (the High Sheriff) would not be held, and was not, accountable for the resolutions that might be passed at that meeting. The responsibility of these resolutions devolved upon the gentlemen who proposed and seconded them, and upon the meeting in general.

“ With regard to the objection made by Mr. Hamilton, that the resolution prejudged the case of the accused persons, he felt that if it involved an undue anticipation of justice, he would be the last person to say one word in favour of it. To prejudge a case, two circumstances were necessary. First, that it should anticipate an event which was about to occur ; and, secondly, that it should refer to persons who were concerned in that event. No name or person was introduced into the resolution, and therefore it did not possess that qualification of prejudging a case. As to that portion of it which stated the outrage to be an ‘ attempt at assassination,’ it surely did not prejudge any case ; as, by the admission of Mr. Hamilton himself, the capital charge was withdrawn ; and, therefore, the question of assassination would not be discussed or entertained in any trial that might take place on the subject of the outrage. (Much applause.) But as they knew the outrage to be literally an attempt at assassination, they had a right to assert their opinion, belief, and knowledge. He (Mr. O’Connell) had himself heard the Marquis of Wellesley say, ‘ Let the hand of the assassin strike now !’ He had used the term of assassination, and he asked the meeting, could they, in truth and justice, do less than assert it also ?

“ The Sheriff expressed himself satisfied with the reasons adduced by Mr. O’Connell, as to the propriety of putting the resolution, and it was accordingly put and carried.

“ MR. BURNES, king’s counsel, next offered himself to the meeting ; and, after a very animated speech, concluded by moving three resolutions, the first of which was, ‘ to trace the late outrage to a desperate and disappointed faction ; and to call for the interposition of the strong arm of the law to defeat its machinations, and thereby prevent the recurrence of so odious and disgraceful an atrocity.’



“The REV. TIGHE GREGORY strongly protested against the general inculcation of the Orange body, by the terms of Mr. Burne’s resolution.

“The High Sheriff supported him.

“MR. O’CONNELL was convinced the High Sheriff would do what he thought was right. He was glad to find those persons who had once been suspected of disloyalty, now ready to exert every nerve in proclaiming to the world their conviction that a friend filled the throne, and that a generous and merciful monarch was their legitimate prince ! He dwelt on the necessity of putting the resolution, and solemnly declared that if any resolution, expressive of the folly of Ribbonism—of its madness and absurdity, had been under consideration—(and to these Ribbonmen he would say, ‘You are not Roman Catholics if you belong to a society collected together for the purposes of anarchy’)—if such a resolution were before the meeting, he would be bound to sign it ; and he himself would borrow, if possible, a voice of thunder, to drown a Ribbonman, that should be heard from the Giant’s Causeway to Cape Clear. He thought the same necessity existed for expressing abhorrence at the illegal society he now alluded to. If the High Sheriff refused, such an act would be throwing his shield over those whom the meeting wished to condemn. He was convinced he was utterly incapable of countenancing any party whatever.”

A warm discussion took place on this point, but at last the High Sheriff yielded with regard to it also ; and Mr. Burne’s resolution was put and carried unanimously.

A committee was then appointed to draw up an address to his Excellency—Mr. Hamilton, sen. ; Mr. O’Connell ; Mr. White, M.P., county Dublin ; Lord Cloncurry ; Mr. Burne, K.C. ; Mr. Evans ; and Mr. O’Neill. Retiring for a short while, they speedily returned with the address, which was read by Lord Cloncurry.

“MR. O’CONNELL then expressed his pleasure at Mr. Hamilton’s having nominated him upon the committee, where the utmost unanimity had prevailed. He had chanced to be the only Catholic on it, and was happy to bear his testimony, that there had not been a gentleman on it whose liberality had not exceeded his own.

“He was also very happy, indeed, to remark the unanimity of the meeting. From one quarter only, and in one instance, had there been

observed any difference of opinion on the necessity of a strong and determined expression of public abhorrence of the late flagrant and vile outrage. The gentleman by whom that difference of opinion had been expressed, was in error (said Mr. O'Connell), and I feel happy in correcting him. He talked of the principles that placed the king upon his throne—the principles that placed him there were those of civil and religious liberty. (Cheering.)

“I would tell the reverend divine that his Majesty the King sits on the proudest and greatest throne in Europe, because a revolution had hurled a bigot from his seat, to make room for the present line of sovereigns. (Loud huzzas, which interrupted the learned gentleman for several moments.) The bigot who had been deprived of majesty, lost it, because he had dared to endeavour to enslave his people—to fetter them in the vilest bonds, and coerce the consciences of his subjects: (Cheers.) The magnanimous people flung the great despot from his exalted station. They drove him from his throne, and placed King William on it, upon principles which I most heartily applaud. (Loud and reiterated bravos, the assembly waving their hats.) And these are real Jacobins who, adopting the principles of the justly-dethroned King James, would vainly attempt to trench on civil and religious liberty.

“Sir, I would be among the first who, in honest sincerity, would drink the glorious memory of King William, if it was not the custom in Ireland to affix ideas coupled with insults to ‘memories.’

“I hope, sir, that this wretched country is about to look on a new day. With a climate like ours, shores indented by spacious harbours, every fleet that leaves our green island might be made the conveyances of such plenty, the product of our fertile soil, as would be sufficient to feed half the world. But, sir, we are otherwise employed. Instead of availing themselves of the great blessings bestowed by a bountiful Providence, Irishmen are busy in the pursuit of ‘discord,’ under the name of ‘religion’ and unmindful of the sacred instructions of their God, who said, ‘Be known as my disciples, if you love one another.’ I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the reverend gentleman will excuse *my preaching*. (Huzzas.) I trust he will excuse my transient usurpation of his calling. He has said he was no barrister; I am no clergyman. I have preached unanimity, however, and I would say to him—‘Go thou and do likewise.’ (Cheers.)

“**LORD CLONCUREY** was moved into the second chair, and the meeting separated in good humour, at an observation of his lordship's, relative to his different treatment that day, and on the last day he had been

at a meeting there—the occasion when the then sheriff had him removed by force.”

The time was now at hand when the *real* Catholic Association—the association that in its organization, activity, and efficiency, so very far surpassed all the bodies that had gone before it—whether Catholic Boards, Catholic Committees, or whatever their designation—was to be called into existence.

Little did the government imagine what an engine was about to be set at work. Catholic agitation seemed to them, at that moment, to be sunk below contempt. The divisions of the veto; the continued disappointments of hope; in particular, the utter annihilation of the sanguine, and apparently most assured hope, the King's visit and fair speeches had excited; the impunity, absolute and unbroken, which was given to the wildest Orange excesses; had the most depressing and deadening influence upon the spirits of the Catholics; and few—very few, indeed—anticipated the extraordinary *moral resurrection* that was now about to take place.

The first public symptom of what was coming was a meeting not regularly convened, nor by any means well attended, at Dempsey's rooms in Sackville-street, upon Friday, the 25th April.

At this meeting, Mr. O'Connell thus shadowed out the great project upon which he had resolved to enter :—

“MR. O'CONNELL rose to second the motion of Mr. O'Connor. He observed that much had been said in former times about the heat and intemperance of Catholic 'leaders,' as they were called; but sure he was that no intemperance could have placed Catholic affairs in a more melancholy condition than that to which they were reduced at present. (Hear, hear.)

“If the Catholics looked back for years, he would confidently say, they would find that they had not the guilt even of a mistake to answer

for. They were, in fact, accused of no misconduct. If their names were mentioned in parliament, it was for the purpose of bestowing some approbation upon them. Yet what was the reward of their conduct? A state of things more degrading, if not more hopeless, than anything that has yet been witnessed in Ireland. (Loud cries of hear, hear.)

“Under these circumstances, two or three measures appeared to him expedient, or indeed indispensable. First, some persons must take the trouble of managing the affairs of the Catholics. The people owe it to the country and to themselves, that if their cause retrogrades, it shall not be, at least, through utter and shameful negligence. They do not deserve, and they should not allow, the blame to rest for one moment upon themselves. (Cheers.) The Orangemen are sufficiently active: no man could accuse them of allowing opportunities to pass unused; they were ever found ready, not only to use them, but to abuse them to the uttermost, whenever it was in their power. They have their ‘admirable organization,’ as it has been called, their presses here and in London, their lodges, their enormous revenues drawn through pensions and places from the pockets of the people; and they have the undisguised sanction and encouragement of nine-tenths—no, but ninety-nine hundredths—of the persons filling the most prominent departments connected with the government of the country. (Loud cheers.)

“In this state of things it would certainly seem strange if there was no body of confidential persons to whom the people of Ireland could look, even for counsel—none to whom they could turn in their distresses and maddening sufferings, and crave sympathy and what aid there might be means of giving. It was dangerous to leave the people without some body of recognized friends of theirs, to whom they could at least give vent to their complaints. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. O’Connell) would, therefore, strongly recommend the formation of such a body of persons. Particular cases need not be referred to, but it would be useless to conceal, that if things went on in this country as they have recently done, Catholic life or property would not, in a little time, be commonly safe, even in the capital itself. (Hear, hear.)

“The learned gentleman next proceeded to point out the necessity of calling an aggregate meeting, as another measure rendered indispensable by the character of the times, and also to show the expediency of a representation to THE KING.

“There was a fourth duty which he considered imperative on the body, and that was, an expression of the ardent and unqualified gratitude with which the entire conduct of Mr. Plunket, since his accession to office, has filled the breasts of the Catholic people. (Loud cheers.)”

Meetings were now *coming thick* ; so, without delaying with commentaries, we hasten to record them, and show how the foundation was laid for the great edifice that was about to be raised in the sacred name of liberty, civil and religious.

On Wednesday, the 30th April, Dempsey's Rooms saw another gathering of the chief Catholics, to arrange as to the resolutions which were to be brought forward at the intended Catholic aggregate meeting.

The following is the brief account of the main part of it, as given in the journals of the day, with the requisition on which the aggregate meeting was summoned.

After SIR EDWARD BELLEW had been moved to the Chair, and had briefly alluded to the business that had brought them together, and Mr. Shiel had also spoken upon the subject, Mr. O'Connell was called upon.

Among a variety of other remarks,

“MR. O'CONNELL observed that he came forward with the utmost deference to tender his advice. It was a time when all who considered they could offer anything of benefit to the common interest, was bound, in conscience and duty, to come forward. As for himself, his first and last recommendation to his afflicted countrymen would be, to take the management of their own affairs, and to proceed in that management with firmness and unanimity. (Cheers.)

“They saw the wretched condition to which their cause had been reduced. No one ought to be surprized at it : there was nothing out of the ordinary course of things in it : it was just that condition to which must be reduced the concerns of any men, or set of men, deluded enough to put their trust in the agency of others. (Hear, hear.)

“As to firmness and unanimity, if ever these qualities were desirable, were necessary in the affairs of an unfortunate people, assuredly this is the time when there is the utmost need of their exhibition and maintenance. The Catholics had opposed to them a faction as weak in intellect certainly as it was despicable in principle ; but despicable as it was, simple contempt of it was not safe. It was formidable, most formidable, not of itself, but inasmuch as it was backed and supported by power. (Hear, hear, hear.) However contemptible the faction was in numerical strength, no one would dispute that it had not only arranged itself

in the most envenomed hostility against everything that could be called liberal in principle, and that was deemed essential to popular right ; but had been hitherto able to sustain itself, though opposed by the sovereign authority itself. (Hear, hear.)

“ He thought it the duty of the aggregate meeting to pass, on behalf of Mr. Plunket, a resolution declaratory of their gratitude and entire confidence, and that it should be couched in as ardent and unqualified terms as the language could afford. (Loud applause.) He looked upon Mr. Plunket as having been made a perfect martyr to his public duty. He was now actually standing the brunt of a persecution, more audacious, more persevering, and more inveterately malignant than any other person, public or private, even in this country of persecution, had ever before to encounter. (Cries of hear, hear.)

“ If Mr. Plunket is suffering, has suffered, or is doomed to remain a lasting object of factious rancour, it is because he has endeavoured to break the chains of his Catholic countrymen. (Hear, hear.) Did he only consent to desert his duty like others, to basely betray the cause he had pledged himself so devotedly to serve, there is no one who would stand higher in the estimation of faction than Mr. Plunket.

“ After inveighing in very animated terms against the conduct of those who described Mr. Plunket as a tyrant, and stating the case in which the late Attorney-General filed an *ex-officio* information after the bills had been ignored (the case of the *bottle-throwers*), he proceeded to remark, that if a lawless press traduced him publicly and privately—he would repeat, that if (as the fact was) Mr. Plunket were now persecuted in all ways, with a savage malignity for which there is no parallel in the history of party in this or any other country, it was because he had not abandoned his duty towards the sacred cause of religious freedom.”

When Mr. O'Connell had concluded, a committee of eleven was appointed to prepare the resolutions and the address. The gentlemen named were: Sir. E. Bellew, Daniel O'Connell, John Howly, *Eneas M'Donnell*, Cornelius Lyne, Hugh O'Connor, A. Strong Hussey, Lawrence Clinch, T. M'Donnell, Purcell O'Gorman, and William Murphy.

## "AGGREGATE MEETING.

"TO N. P. O'GORMAN, ESQ., SECRETARY TO THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

"April, 1823,

"We, the undersigned, request that you will, on the earliest day that may be convenient, call an aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland, in Dublin, to take into consideration, such constitutional measures as ought to be adopted in the present unprejudicated posture of Catholic affairs.

Netterville,  
Killeen.  
Thos. Esmonde, Bart.  
Sir E. Bellew.  
John Burke, Bart.  
Gouville P'french.  
Cornelius Lyons.  
Kean Mahony.  
John Murphy.  
Edward White.  
Michael Corcoran.  
Richard Corballia.  
David Lynch.  
Thomas Fitzgerald.  
William Forda.  
Michael Hughes.  
John Burke.  
Edward Hogan.  
J. P. Nugent.  
Roger Hayes.  
William Murphy.  
John Donohue.  
William Conlan.  
Patrick Oliver Flunket.  
Bryan Cogan.  
Thos. M'Donnell.  
Patrick Seanlan.  
John Fitzpatrick.  
D'Arcy Ayre.  
Thomas Talbot.  
Lawrence Finn.  
Thomas Furlong.  
William Shina.  
S. Young.  
Joseph Flunket.  
James Kesting.  
Robert James Staunton.  
Hugh O'Connor.  
Val. O'Connor.  
H. Power, co. Waterford.  
Patrick Costello.  
J. M'Namara, co. Clare.  
John Howly, jun.  
O'Connor Don.  
Patrick Grehan.  
Michael O'Loghlan.  
John Fox.  
James Corballia.  
Richard O'Gorman.

John Mac Laughlin.  
John Joseph Scalan.  
Pierce Bonayne.  
Daniel Ferrail.  
Michael O'Brien.  
James J. Callanan.  
Anthony Brown.  
Thomas Chamberlaine.  
Christopher M'Donnell.  
Michael Sweetman.  
Edward Leonard.  
Mark Malona.  
Edward Conlan.  
Peter Chamberlaine.  
Robert Walsh.  
Andrew Ennis.  
Patrick Kealy.  
George O'Neill.  
John Ennis.  
Hugh M'Donald.  
John Walsh.  
Hugh O'Loghlan.  
Francis M'Donnell.  
Charles Cavanagh.  
Stephen Woulfe.  
John Power.  
Maurice O'Connell, Darry-  
nayne.  
Daniel O'Connell.  
John O'Connell, Grana, Kil-  
larney.  
Richard Shiel.  
Elias Corbally.  
Michael Roche.  
Jonathan Lynch.  
Henry Lambert.  
J. P. Corballia.  
Ennis M'Donnell.  
Thomas C. Duffy.  
James O'Shaughnessy.  
John Burke.  
Patrick Waldrom.  
Robert Molloy.  
Brian Molloy.  
James Conolly.  
James Troy.  
Henry O'Hara.  
Anthony O'Brien.  
John Thomas Power.

Joseph Dwyer.  
John Byrne.  
John Costigan.  
Luke Dillon.  
John Delany.  
Patrick Donohue.  
John Redmond.  
Thomas Merrin.  
Bartholomew Murphy.  
Lawrence Clinch.  
L. H. Nangle.  
Richard Dunkett.  
Patrick O'Hara.  
James O'Connell, Lakeview,  
Killarney.  
Patrick James Harle.  
Myles Staunton.  
Cornelius Mac Laughlin.  
Nicholas Mahon.  
Christopher Flunket.  
John O'Brien.  
Thomas Mahon.  
Peter Daly.  
William Granger.  
Thomas Roche, Limerick.  
James Esmonde.  
James Sugros.  
Dominie Bonayne.  
James Edmund Byrne.  
Michael Walsh.  
John Corley.  
Patrick O'Donnell.  
James Rosvitz.  
James Charles Bacon.  
Patrick Beahan.  
James Egan.  
Philip Molloy.  
Thomas Dwyer.  
Michael Powell.  
John M'Donnell.  
John Walsh.  
John Malona.  
Francis Brophy.  
W. H. Beghian.  
James Ennis.  
Joseph Denis Mullen.  
John J. Burke, M.D.  
Charles Mac Donnell.  
Maurice King."

"Pursuant to the above requisition, I hereby require a general meeting of the Catholics of Ireland, to be held in Dublin, on Saturday, the 10th day of May next, at the hour of one o'clock in the afternoon, for the purposes in the said requisition mentioned.

"NICHOLAS PURCELL O'GORMAN,

"Harcourt-place, Merrion-square,

"Secretary to the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

"The meeting will take place at Townsend-street Chapel."

According to the terms of this requisition, the Catholics as-

sembled at the place and time indicated—**LORD KILLEEN** in the Chair.

“**MR. O'GORMAN** read a letter he had received from the Earl of Donoughmore, stating that in consequence of the late event respecting the Catholic question in the House of Commons, he thought it more prudent to await the result of the intended aggregate meeting, than present to the House of Lords the petition with which his Catholic countrymen had honoured him.

**SIR E. BELLEW** then reported the address from the committee appointed at the preparatory meeting; and it was read, and unanimously agreed to.

“**MR. HUGH O'CONNOR** having moved the adoption of the following resolution, viz. :—

“**RESOLVED**—‘That the Right Honourable William Conyngham Plunket is entitled to our warmest gratitude and confidence, for the zeal, eloquence, and sincerity with which he has uniformly sustained our cause. That we recognize his just claims to the most faithful support and attachment of the Catholics of Ireland; and look forward with sentiments of exultation to his ultimate and entire triumph over those enemies to public justice and repose, who have arrayed themselves in hostility to that liberal and enlightened policy of which he is so powerful an advocate.’

“**MR. O'CONNELL**, upon seconding this resolution, spoke to the following effect :—

“He would not promise to be brief, for he never felt his mind big with so many topics that should be addressed to his beloved fellow-countrymen, the Catholics of Ireland.

“These topics were so numerous, and of such mighty import, that he knew not where to commence, or when he should have done.

“The Catholics were called upon, by present circumstances, to do something for their country, unless they were content to be abandoned by their friends, or trampled down by the infuriated rancour of a vile faction. We live (said the learned gentleman) in the richest country in the universe, and amongst the poorest people. Admirably situated for a ready intercourse with all parts of the world; our coast everywhere indented with excellent harbours, affording shelter against every wind; its soil fertile to a proverb, producing ten times more than could be consumed by ten times its population—and in that consists the real riches of a country, for money is wealth, only because it enables its possessors to enjoy those natural riches; but in Ireland the superabundant produce was considered as great a curse as its superabundant population.



“ We have a beneficent and gracious Sovereign, who, as far as in him lies, has done every thing for us ; but has been able to effect nothing, because the blighting voice of intolerance and persecution has been raised, to check in its growth every patriotic feeling, every sentiment of liberality, unanimity, and mutual good will.

“ It was said, indeed, that this should be the case with a country possessing every natural capability of being great and happy—a country remarkable for the ready intellect and mental qualifications of her sons, which, improved by the blessings of a sound education, might be rendered so eminently conducive to her prosperity and lasting tranquillity. As a proof of the high nature of these qualifications, he might, he conceived, without any sacrifice of Christian principle, turn the tables upon some portion of the holy hypocrites, and their shameless abettors, who were accustomed to abuse this country. The Lancasterian system of education had been founded in England for educating children up to the age of fourteen years ; it was introduced into Ireland, and it was found that here the children had, by the eighth year, consumed the entire of the system. This was not a solitary instance of the disposition and abilities of Irishmen—they were universal ; and yet it was the fashion amongst a portion of their own countrymen to decry them as intractable, wild, and insensible to the comforts of civilization ; and in this spirit did the learned hypocrites of the Kildare-street Association suppress, in their Report, the fact he had just stated, though they had first agreed upon mentioning it—yet they afterwards struck it out of their printed annual Report.

“ He should deal openly with all parties, and would, therefore, state his authority : it was Mr. Jackson, the secretary of the association, and a respectable barrister.

“ Irishmen never combat to be upon a *level* with, but always *above* their competitors. (Hear, hear.) There was not an army in Europe but was led by Irishmen ; there was not a corner of the world but resounds with their achievements. When Maria Theresa founded a new order of honour and merit, out of the first *fifty* officers who received the decoration, no less than forty-two were Irishmen.

“ And why are they not more generally celebrated in the service of their country ? Let the intolerant, persecuting bigot answer. All they want, Cobbett says, is ‘ a clear stage and fair play.’ (Hear, hear.) But that clear stage they had hitherto been insultingly refused.

“ Did those who so foully and insolently calumniated their fellow-countrymen show, by their conduct, any real anxiety for the improvement of the latter ? What efforts towards such an end had they made that could at all justify them in adopting the tone of censorship ? Were

the misguided peasantry to be admonished, and weaned from their illegal and destructive courses, by the example of the so-called *loyal* writers in the Orange press—ever advocating courses the most violent, wicked, and destructive? Were the people to be educated by these parties out of all bad passions? Were they exhorted to love and respect one another, and to study their own and their country's good? Were these the doctrines inculcated by the education societies, legislating through the means of parliamentary agents? The reverse was, unhappily, the case. A *bribe* was held out to the child to desert his parent, and encourage him to turn into ridicule the minister of his faith, and to profane the name of his redeeming God, by proclaiming religion the watchword to disseminate eternal hate and destruction to his fellow-man, on account of a difference of creed.

“ I ask, what can be assigned as the cause of this monstrous and unnatural inveteracy of bigotry on the one side, and of the spirit of insubordination and wild outrage on the other? The answer is not far, nor hard to find. The cause of this distracted state of our land, and of the dwellers in it, is to be traced and found in the long, long series of misrule and misgovernment by another country. I thank my God, no man can say these circumstances have resulted from the Irish governing themselves! (Hear, hear, hear.)

“ I now turn to a more pleasing topic: none of this mismanagement is attributable to our present Irish government, but the preceding *piebald* administration. As far as the King himself is concerned, no patriot the most ardent could testify a truer anxiety for the alleviation of our misfortunes. (Hear, hear, and loud and continued applause.) He came the first of his race amongst us, in the spirit of peace, and for the promotion of unanimity and concord, as far as his own example could go. It was then I, for once, saw union amongst all classes of Irishmen; and, oh, blessed sight! may I witness it again. (Hear, hear.) Then man was in natural communication with his fellow-man; and Irishmen apparently enjoyed that which their country has so long needed—that which she now so sadly needs—a union of feeling and of sentiment.

“ As there has been talk about the faults of the Irish people, let us fairly investigate who are really to blame for the dissipation of Ireland's hopes.

“ We (the Catholics) met to make arrangements for receiving our King, and we were ignorant of his conciliating intentions towards Irishmen; but from our inherent love and loyalty to the throne, we determined on giving him the warmest and most affectionate reception on his coming amongst us. We were in consultation in Earl-street, when

Mr. Barret Wadden (that respectable gentleman who was lately examined before the House of Commons) was announced as having an important communication to make. He informed us there was a disposition on the part of the corporation and Protestants to unite with their Catholic fellow-citizens in measures for giving his Majesty such reception as would be agreeable to him; and this was actually followed by the arrival of *Lord Mayor King*. It is well known we had never received anything but insult and contempt from a set of men equally selfish and equally stupid, who, to gratify their malignant feelings, decorate their marble idol, to celebrate the defeat of their own countrymen by a Dutch adventurer (laughter and applause); yet in the genuine spirit of conciliation we received the proposals of *even Abraham King*.

“There were some amongst us, to be sure, more prudent than *Mr. Shiel* and *myself*, who accompanied the lord mayor to his meeting; and then *I was Daniel* in the lion’s den. Some Catholic gentlemen held aloof, still doubting the sincerity of corporate bigots, when professing liberality, they wished to see practical proofs of their reformation, and they received them—for the next day but one the *statue was dressed!*

“We remonstrated, and something was promised. Promises are easy; and these were kept with as good faith as all the other engagements of the corporation. *I did not believe their promises at the time, but I saw no use in telling them so. What noise was at this time about conciliation, and the wishes of the King! and who more vociferous in his professions than Orange Abraham? He was then A. B. King, Esq. It is to that assumed liberality, and spirit of conciliation, he owes his baronetcy; though he has the audacity since to avow and boast that his pretended liberality was merely a surtout, which he found more congenial to his principles to throw off immediately after; and, my lord, what faith can even his bigoted associates put in his professions, when he proclaims that his signature and assent to a solemn resolution was a mere farce!*

“Here is the sort of conciliation which the corporation have evinced, and which he, impatient of the unnatural disguise, could not keep twenty-four hours after it was professed. By reason of that hypocritical liberality, and dissembling with the Sovereign, did Mr. King obtain his present title. Has he not thrown off the covering of dissimulation, and proclaimed aloud his apostacy? I said it was to his professions of conciliation that he owes his title; and to prove it, I shall give you my authority.

“ Mr. O'Connell then read the following letter:—

“ ‘ Richmond Park, October 9th, 1821.

“ ‘ MY DEAR SIR—I cannot forbear congratulating you upon the complete accomplishment of his Majesty's gracious intention to confer upon you the dignity of a baronet of the United Kingdom. It was a most fortunate circumstance that at the period of his Majesty's visit to Ireland the high office of lord mayor of Dublin was held by a person of known prudence and discretion, who, by a happy union of moderation and firmness, was enabled, without the surrender or compromise of any principle, to conciliate the confidence and esteem of all parties.

“ ‘ Allow me further to express the great pleasure which I have felt in noticing your actions, and at the late dinner of the sheriffs, your successful endeavours to promote that liberal forbearance and that true benevolence which you have so constantly observed and practised whilst in office.

“ ‘ It is of the greatest importance to Ireland and to the whole empire that such an example should be implicitly followed.

“ ‘ Accept my best wishes for your health and happiness; and believe me to be, with sincere esteem, my dear sir,

“ ‘ Your faithful and obedient Servant,

“ ‘ SIDMOUTH.

“ ‘ To Sir Abraham Bradley King, Bart.’

“ At that period, I defy the tongue of malignity—the most shameless audacity of that compound of stupidity and slanderous villainy (produced from the crazed brain of a reverend fox-hunter, and translated afterwards into better English by his coadjutor), *The Warder*, even to assert that anything was wanting on the part of the Catholics. I defy, too, the scribblers in that paper's creditable ally—that reservoir of baseness and calumny, in which truth never appears but by accident, *The Mail*; I defy their virulence—nay, I would appeal to their *candour*, if of such an attribute they could for a moment be supposed to be possessed, to point out any one occasion—any *one*, in which the Catholics, either in act, in writing, or in speaking, can be truly said to have, in the slightest degree, been accessory to the failure of our gracious Monarch's blessed work of conciliation!

“ And what has been the result of our having so meritoriously conducted ourselves? Need I ask you? Has it not been that our cause is abandoned, and that we have neglected our duty to ourselves? We have lain quiescent, and permitted the daily promulgation of Orange calumny, fearful of infringing the commands of our Sovereign.

“ We saw a portion of the English press (but certainly with powers equalling only the dull stupidity of the bird of night) teem forth monstrous libels, impeaching our loyalty. We saw the stall-fed church dignitary raise against us the voice of sectarian intolerance and bigotry; we saw our religion foully traduced, and ridiculed, and stigmatized; and we were silent, until our enemies were believed: and the Catholics have suffered accordingly.

“ But there is a point beyond which experiment becomes dangerous.

The Catholics are men—are Irishmen, and feel within their burning breasts the force of natural rights, and the injustice of natural oppression. (Hear, hear.) Not merely the oppression of grinding statutes have we endured, but a monstrous attempt to pollute the stream of justice, through the interference of an *attorney-general* and a *judge*. Yes; I hold in my hand the damning proofs of this infamous conspiracy. I hold the copy of a letter which I deposited in the hands of our secretary. This letter was found in the street, and was transmitted to me by a Catholic clergyman, whose name I shall not mention; for who knows but if I did, we should shortly have to send another petition claiming the justice and interposition of the Marquis Wellesley against the unmerciful and illegal decision of a magisterial bench? (Great applause.) I shall not, therefore, subject him to the persecuting powers of sessional bigotry.

“On the 19th of June, 1822, the letter I have alluded to was found in the street; you shall hear it read.

“CAPTAIN WHITE, R.N., here interrupted Mr. O’Connell, and observed, that as the letter was a private one, and not intended originally for the public eye, he conceived it was not candid to read it.

“MR. O’CONNELL replied, that objection would have no weight, for he had published it in the newspapers, and it had been a subject of observation in parliament. (Here there was a general cry of ‘read, read;’ and Mr. O’Connell accordingly complied.)

“The following is a copy of the letter:—

“Dublin Castle, August 9th.

“DEAR NORBURY—I transcribe for you a very sensible part of Lord ——’s letter to me:—“As —— goes our circuit, and as he is personally acquainted with the gentlemen of our county, a hint to him may be of use. He is in the habit of talking individually to them in his chamber, at Phillipstown; and if he were to impress upon them the consequence of the measure—viz., that however they may think otherwise, the Catholics would, in spite of them, elect Catholic members (if such were eligible); that the Catholic members would then have the nomination of the sheriffs, and in many instances perhaps of the judges; and the Protestants would be put in the back ground, as the Catholics were formerly. I think he could bring the effects of the measure home to themselves, and satisfy them that they could scarcely submit to live in the country if it were passed.”

“So far Lord ——; but what he suggests in another part of his letter, “that if Protestant gentlemen, who have votes, and influence, and interest, would give those venal members to understand, that if they will purchase Catholic votes, by betraying their country and its constitution, they shall infallibly lose theirs; it would alter their conduct, though it could neither make them honest or respectable.”

“If you will judiciously administer a little of this medicine to the King’s County, and other members of Parliament that may fall in your way, you will deserve well.

“Many thanks for your letter, and its good intelligence from Maryborough. —— is a most valuable fellow, and of that sort that is much wanted.

“Affectionately and truly yours,

“WILLIAM S——R.”

“What, he would ask, was the suggested attempt on the prejudices

and feelings of the jury, compared to this shameless and secret interference of a law officer in the administration of justice? An accident threw in his way this proof of official malversation; but who could tell how many other and similar letters might have passed, and been acted upon? But in another world there is no statute of limitation against crime; and although there may be impunity here, it may be answered for at the day of general justice!

"The learned gentleman then informed the meeting that he had thought it his duty to communicate that letter to the present *Attorney-General*, requesting that he, in his place, would bring it under the consideration of the House of Commons. But an obvious delicacy prevented the right honourable gentleman's compliance with this request; and, perhaps he was the more to be esteemed for refusing to be an actor in a scene connected with so gross a violation of propriety.

"But the matter was brought before the house by another member. When this occurred, the Catholics, in the pure spirit of conciliation, exerted themselves, and succeeded in inducing their friends in Parliament not to press it. What was the result?—what was their return for so doing? That kindly feeling has been met on the other side by making a jest of the term conciliation—by a violation of the privileges of the press, in calumniating the King's representative, because he dared to be just—because he wished to be honest.

"For so daring, and so wishing, the faction turned their sensitive loyalty against the deputy of the monarch!

"Are they not the genuine and *bona fide* rebels, who have thus scoffed and contemned the advice of their monarch, and the example of his representative; and who seek, in fact, to achieve a triumph over both? Do they not thus show how empty and false was all their parade of loyalty, when neither the personal injunctions nor the delegated authority of his Majesty can obtain their respect?

"This (said the learned gentleman) is the system of which we complain. This is the grinding tyranny we wish to abolish, that we may freely participate in the blessings of the British constitution, and that every man, no matter whatever his creed, should be co-equal in the eyes of the law; that virtue, worth, rank, and talent, such as now fills your chair, may not be excluded by any paltry monopoly of the constitution from enjoying those rights granted to his illustrious ancestors, and withheld from him as a punishment for his conscientious adherence to their mode of faith—that he should not be stripped of those privileges which the law gives to the poorest of his countrymen. A Catholic peer cannot vote for a member of the Commons' House; and yet he is deprived of his rights in the other. Strange and most insult-

ing anomaly ! and yet but one of the many such with which Ireland is afflicted !

“While we were conducting ourselves, as I have stated, in the most faithworthy spirit of conciliation, our enemies, in their different lodges, in their black associations (for it has, strange to say, been lately acknowledged that a *black corps* forms a part of their enlightened and patriotic institution)—in their corporations—in their guild of merchants, that absurd and contemptible club, which has a name only to belie its legal description—that nest of agitators, which has of late forced itself into notice from its intemperance and arrogance, and assumed the privilege of legislators ;—those political corporators, while we endeavoured to conciliate, they persisted to persecute : while our hearts were full of peace and good will to all men, theirs were brimming over with the worst uncharitableness and malignity to their neighbours.

“To turn to considerations less disgusting and sickening, but yet not without pain and disappointment to us, the recent occurrences in parliament ; I do not blame that uncompromising and zealous patriot, Sir Francis Burdett, for the manner in which he has thought fit to deal with regard to our affairs. But though I do not blame him, neither do I approve of his determination upon them. But I am sure he intended honestly, although I may not think that he acted wisely. Would that I could say the same of others ! Would that our weak and divided ministry were equally honest ! For it is entirely impossible that men can be sincere who will compromise a question of this kind. There ought not, there cannot be any difficulty about it. It is right, or it is unjust. Those who think the latter cannot conscientiously coalesce with men wicked enough to promote an act destructive to the constitution. Those who think it right, their course is plain, and ought to be straightforward. They ought not to allow a doubt to lie a moment upon them ; nor to give any advantage to the men who divide with them upon a question of right and justice—of the peace and the tranquillity of Ireland.

“And will you, my countrymen, submit to this bartering of your privileges and liberties ? Will you, like torpid slaves, lie under the lash of the oppressor ? If we are not free, let us, at least, prove ourselves worthy of being so.

“[Here the applause was so general and animated, that several minutes elapsed before order was restored.]

“Shall the interests of *five millions* of men, excluded from the benefits of the constitution, be left to the mere eleemosynary protection of their advocates in parliament, who, however well disposed to shield us from the persecution, insult, and injustice of our oppressors, have neither the

opportunities of becoming acquainted with our daily grievances, nor the time to devote to the particular and peculiar circumstances of our situation.

“ Let it be, then, our care to attend to the management of our local affairs, and by the information we shall possess on Catholic affairs, assist our parliamentary advocates in bringing to the contest useful and important knowledge respecting our disabilities and their effects. When a Catholic association existed, were they not enabled, by addressing the suffering peasantry, to quell three different attempts at insurrection? If the Catholic Association had existed, would they not have been able to warn the unsuspecting peasantry against the villainy of persons who had an actual interest in promoting disaffection; against the wretch who profaned the most sacred ceremonies of the Christian religion, in order to go to Belfast, and be enabled to lay the foundation of becoming an informer, and whom I traced, a year ago, to the occupation of *alternate* informer to the proctor and the Ribbonmen? If the Association had existed, how many of our peasantry would have been saved to their families and homes? Our advice would have been listened to, because it would have been known to be honest, and the country would have been spared from the infringement of the constitution, and the enormous expense of an additional police, with the irritation occasioned by sectarian yeomanry corps, which serve no other purpose than to perpetuate strife, and create a natural desire of revenge in the opposite parties.

“ If the government wanted a yeomanry, let them not select its members for their religion, but their loyalty. Catholics would be always found ready and anxious to enter into the bond of good-fellowship and union with their Protestant countrymen, the great majority of whom, he rejoiced to say, were equally desirous with the Catholics themselves for the extension of the blessings of civil liberty, and equally prepared to leave the corporate bigots to their fate. If no other object were attained by the formation of a Catholic association, the preservation of their present legal rights would surely be of signal importance, as in the case of the *freemen of the city of Dublin*. It was well known that Catholics were eligible for thirty-three years past to become free of the city, and he (Mr. O'Connell) some years ago, endeavoured to prevail upon some Catholic gentlemen to assist him in establishing that right in the person of a man named Cole. He could get no assistance, and he undertook the affair himself. He applied to the Court of King's Bench for a *mandamus* to admit Cole to the freedom of the city. It was granted; but before it could be acted upon, the poor man died. But he (Mr. O'Connell) could assure their honours there were many persons who were equally well entitled to their freedom, and, with the blessing of God,



next term they should have it in defiance of the intrigues of the Orange corporation.

“The learned gentleman in conclusion said : These are the sentiments of an humble, but ardent and faithful Irishman, who, after twenty-three years’ exertions in his country’s cause, finds her worse than when he commenced his labours ; but who, loving new-born freedom with more ardour than lover ever doated upon his mistress, still clings to the hope of seeing his country great, contented, and free ! (Loud and long-continued cheering.)

“SIR THOMAS ESMONDE seconded Mr. O’Connell’s resolution, which was unanimously agreed to.

“MR. SHIEL supported the resolution for the establishment of a Catholic association. He differed with Mr. O’Connell relative to the conduct of Sir Francis Burdett on the occasion referred to ; approving of that conduct, and declaring that he did not think the Catholic cause had suffered by the conduct of that distinguished person and his friends.

“The resolution for the appointment of a

#### CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION

was then put, and carried unanimously.”

A story has appeared in some recent publications touching on events of the popular agitation in Ireland, which we are bound here to notice, in order to correct a mistake. ◆

It has been stated that the first idea of a Catholic Association arose in a conversation between O’Connell and Shiel, at the house of a mutual friend, in the county Wicklow, in the spring of 1823.

The idea, however, had originated long before the rencontre in question, and originated in Mr. O’Connell’s mind. He had been for some time revolving it and maturing it in his thoughts, ere that event ; and the story had its rise from the simple circumstance of his having first mentioned his plan of a popular association at a dinner party at Glencullen, the seat of C. Fitzsimon, Esq., the then residence of the late well-known and respected T. O’Mara, Esq., where Mr. Shiel was also present.

Mr. O’Connell then stated that his plan contemplated two classes of members, the one paying a pound, the other one shil-

ling a year—the working committee of the body to be chosen from the former class.

This, it is needless to say, is the constitution of the existing Repeal Association, and has been that of all the various bodies which have tenanted the Corn Exchange Rooms from 1829 to this day.

Mr. Shiel expressed doubts; he feared the plan would not work, and that the time was not very suitable for such an effort as the getting up a new association. Mr. O'Connell said he considered the time come, and that the plan would work—that, in fact, he would *make it work*.

*He kept his word.*

The first meeting of the “CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION” is thus introduced in the newspaper accounts:—

“Yesterday (Monday, May 12th, 1823), a number of most respectable Catholic gentlemen assembled at Dempsey's, in Sackville-street, for the purpose of forming an association to conduct the Catholic affairs.

“LORD VISCOUNT KILLEEN was called to the Chair.

“SIR E. BULLER and MR. O'REILLY complained of a morning paper having published an incorrect and unauthorized copy of an address agreed to at the aggregate meeting, to be presented to his Majesty.

“MR. O'CONNELL defended the publication. The supposition that there was any irregularity in printing such documents before they were presented to those for whom they were destined, was quite erroneous. The rule applied only to petitions to parliament, because the legislature would not receive *printed* petitions.”

At length the gentlemen who started and supported this capacious *crochet* having talked themselves out, Mr. O'Connell was at last permitted to take his *great* step.

“MR. O'CONNELL proposed that an Association should then be formed of such gentlemen as wished voluntarily to come forward, for the purpose of conducting the affairs of the Irish Catholics, relative to their political disabilities, and the means of having their grievances brought before parliament; and that the qualifications necessary for becoming a member should be the annual subscription of one guinea.

“MR. HUGH O’CONNOR conceived it would be more advantageous that the subscription should be *two guineas*.

“That being, however, objected to, MR. O’CONNOR consented to the original motion, which passed unanimously; and above *fifty* gentlemen subscribed their names, and paid *instantly*.

“Upon the motion of MR. O’CONNELL, it was agreed to hold the future meetings of the Association at Mr. Coyne’s, No. 4, Capel-street.

“It was then resolved that it should be styled—

“THE IRISH CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION.”

After which, an adjournment took place to this day, Tuesday.”

The details of his plan, with regard to associated members, he did not at that time bring forward, seeing the difficulties that met him with even the first and plainest steps. We shall presently have to show under what circumstances of opposition and difficulty he did at last disclose and establish it.

Upon Tuesday, the 13th of May, the newly-organized body re-assembled; meeting this day and thenceforward at Coyne’s, the Catholic bookseller, No. 4, Capel-street—LORD KILLEEN in the Chair.

A committee of regulation was appointed, to report upon Thursday.

A deputation was also appointed to wait upon his Majesty, with the address agreed to at the aggregate meeting. It was arranged to consist of, the Earl of Fingal; Catholic Peers; Sons of Peers; two gentlemen from each county; and as many others as chose to attend.

The adjournment this day was to the following Saturday, when several new members were admitted, and some other minor business transacted.

Tuesday the 20th was the first day that anything of a regular debate occurred. On that day the Association met by a special requisition—JOSEPH M’DONNELL, Esq., in the Chair.

“MR. O’CONNELL rose and stated, that as he was the principal person who procured the requisition for calling this meeting, he thought it incumbent on him to state the object of the requisitionists.

“Previous to the passing of the act providing for the appointment of a Catholic chaplain to the gaol of Newgate, the duty of that office had been performed gratuitously for a century, and there was no complaint of the want of spiritual assistance for the instruction or consolation of the prisoners. In former times the Catholic clergyman visited the gaol with the concurrence of the grand jury, because he had nothing to receive for his trouble; but latterly, when the public were to be at the expense of a Catholic chaplain, none would be tolerated but those who grounded their claim to the appointment from want of capacity, moral character, or a renunciation of the principles of the Catholic religion.

“The first appointment made by the grand jury was that of the late respectable and learned Dr. Murphy, because they knew *he would not serve the office*. The next was that of a Spanish priest, totally unacquainted with the English or Irish languages. After him a madman was nominated. Then Mr. Crotty was appointed—a parish priest residing in Limerick, who, the late Mr. Giffard said, could attend to his duty by coming up in the mail, when a wretched convict required his assistance to prepare for meeting his Maker. Had the grand jury appointed a *blind* man to teach the prisoners to read, or a fiddler for a physician, they would not be more ludicrous than those he had already mentioned.

“Their last appointment evinced an equal anxiety for the religion and morals of the prisoners, by nominating a person named Morrissy, as a reward for his permitting his name to appear to a couple of pamphlets which he never wrote, abusing, in terms peculiarly gross, the Catholic religion.

“But the mischief is not confined to forcing upon the prisoners improper clerical characters, or in the misapplication of the salary intended by government and the public as a reward for the pious exertions of a properly qualified chaplain, but the inmates of Newgate are actually deprived of the services of worthy and correct clergymen, who are either *denied admittance* in the gaol, or quite excluded from the room where divine service is performed. Now for such a monstrous abuse of grand jury functions, the Catholics had no remedy. The Court of King's Bench had been applied to repeatedly, but the judges were of opinion they could not interfere, as the appointment was, by the act of 1811, vested in the term grand jury. The only redress they could expect must come from parliament, and at this moment he (Mr. O'Connell) thought it would be advisable to lay before the legislature a petition from the prisoners of Newgate, who complained of the want of spiritual instruction,\* representing to the House of Commons the gross

misconduct of the grand jury, *and their bigoted and shameless interference to defeat the kind and benevolent intention of the legislature.* This circumstance alone would speak volumes as to the spirit in which the laws, wherever the Catholics are concerned, are administered by the Corporation of Dublin, and their officers, who studiously exclude from term grand juries, *Catholic gentlemen*, though eligible for the last thirty years.

“‘It is,’ said the learned gentleman, ‘a melancholy and sickening reflection, that men filling respectable stations in society, can be so filled with the spirit of bigotry, intolerance, and injustice, as to appropriate the public money to the purpose of encouraging, prolonging, and gratifying malignant party feeling.’

“MR. O’CONNELL concluded by moving—‘That a committee be appointed to prepare separate petitions to parliament, for the prisoners in Newgate and the Sheriff’s Prison, who felt aggrieved by the appointment of the present Catholic chaplain.

“ENEAS M’DONNELL objected to the point of form as to the shortness of notice of the meeting—and also objected that the association was yet not sufficiently organized, to occupy itself with a matter of such deep importance.

“NICHOLAS MAHON supported him.

“MR. O’CONNELL saw no reason why the consideration of the question should be adjourned, when there were so many inducements, and such cause for an immediate application to parliament.

“The present was a moment, when for the first time the attention of the legislature was called to those tangible facts that would enable it to form a judgment of the **ABUSE** and **CORRUPTION** of the Dublin jury system, under which the public money is misapplied, and the Catholic people deprived even of the rights given them by the existing laws. The object of the association was not to force on parliament the annual farce, or more properly, a triennial interlude of a debate on the Catholic claims. Their purpose was with *practical and not abstract* questions—to shame the advocates of an unwise system, and, by exposing its corruption in all its branches, show that it worked badly and impracticably for the country; and he trusted they should have the assistance of men of every religious creed in melting down sectarian acrimony into a community of Irish feeling. There were many grievances under which the poor and unprotected Catholic peasant smarted, that would not admit of waiting for redress until the day of emancipation arrived, and which might be made the subject of separate applications to parliament and the laws.

“Such were the objects of the association, and he thought the particular subject now under their consideration was legitimately within this province.

“The many serious and grinding impositions to which the Catholics were subject, and among others, that of Church-rates—this was a grievance that would come within the objects of the association; for it was not to be expected that the poor and illiterate men would have recourse to traversing a presentment, however well-grounded their objections might be, as in the case of a parish in the county of Westmeath, where £700 was granted for building a church, and, afterwards, £200 levied upon the parish for the same purpose, *and no church yet built*, although *another levy* of £200 is about to be made. He should, therefore, persevere in pressing the original resolution.

“MR. FLANAGAN supported Mr. O'Connell's motion, and observed, that the duty of the association was not only to obtain the rights that were withheld from the Catholics by the penal laws, but to preserve those which they actually possessed.

“Some other gentlemen having supported Mr. O'Connell's motion, it was at last put, and carried with unanimity.

---

“SATURDAY, 24TH MAY.

“SIR EDWARD BELLEW in the Chair.

“MR. SCANLAN reported from the committee of regulation, and read to the meeting so far as the committee had gone in preparing the rules for their proceedings.

“Those of importance were—‘That the association be formed for the purpose of procuring, *by every legal means*, Catholic Emancipation; that the society consist of such individuals as pay the annual subscription of one guinea, and that the association will not exercise nor accept of any delegated authority or quality whatsoever; that no Catholic be permitted as a spectator of the proceedings at the meetings of the association, unless he become a subscriber. That persons of every other religious persuasion shall have permission to be present during the proceedings, but not to vote or speak upon any question, unless he be a subscriber. That every accommodation be afforded to the press..’

“MR. ENEAS M'DONNELL and MR. O'REILLY were of opinion, that Catholics should have the same right of being present as spectators with those of their dissenting brethren.

“MR. O'CONNELL objected to this compliment to Catholics, who

would, he considered, be unworthy of it if they did not take a guinea's worth of interest in the Catholic cause.

"MR. ENEAS M'DONNELL, MR. LANNIGAN, and MR. O'REILLY contended against Protestants having a deliberative voice in the proceedings of their association, from their inability to form a disinterested opinion upon Catholic Emancipation, and the apprehension of persons inimical to their cause, insinuating themselves into the meeting.

"MR. O'CONNELL, in reply, observed, that it was by and from Protestants they were to receive their emancipation, and consequently, no one more capable of discussing and advising the means for obtaining than a Protestant; and as to the intrusion of improper characters, there was little apprehension of Orangemen flocking in with guineas to mar their proceedings.

"MR. N. MAHON supported Mr. O'Connell's view of the question, which, upon being put, was carried by a large majority.

"MR. O'CONNELL gave notice of a motion to consider the propriety of petitioning parliament against the Church-rates, as paid by Catholics."

On the next day of meeting, the following Tuesday, Mr. O'Connell brought forward additional rules. We are particular in giving all these details of arrangement, as the plan and system of the Catholic Association have been that of all the associations since created:—

"That no question should be entertained by the meeting, or amendment put by the chairman, unless the same was stated in writing.

"That no member be allowed to speak twice to any question, unless the mover, who shall have the right of reply.

"That the object of the foregoing resolutions is to prevent, as much as possible, any debate or discussion but what may be absolutely necessary to ascertain the sense of each meeting.

"That the Rules and laws of the Association be posted up in the room, and also be entered in a book to be kept for that purpose."

The first "*no house*" of the new body, occurred on the 31st of May, when at half-past three o'clock, ten members not being present, "*the house adjourned,*" according to one of their recently adopted rules.

This regulation was soon afterwards made use of to thwart Mr. O'Connell, and increase the difficulties in the way of his

plans, for working the cause with the new organization. We shall have to come to this speedily.

On the 8th of June, Mr. O'Connell redeemed his notice relative to the "administration of justice and church-rates."

After some preliminary business, in particular the reading of letters respecting the address to the king, from several of the parties appointed to go with it, craving an extension of time, the business of the day was called on :—

"MR. O'CONNELL then rose. He had given notice of two motions (the administration of justice, and justice in Ireland and the Church-rates), and he was at liberty to give precedence to which he pleased, he should, therefore, move on the administration of justice.

"He congratulated the Catholics upon their unanimity of feeling, and hailed as a good omen for the cause, the establishment of a Catholic association in London; not for the absurd purpose of discussing mere routine matter, but in order to wrestle with their grievances and oppressions boldly and effectually. As their English brethren had imitated them in the formation of the association, so he hoped the Irish would take example by them in adopting any of their regulations which might be thought advantageous; such, for instance, as admitting the Catholic clergymen to become members of the association without payment of a subscription.

"In reference to the subject matter immediately before the association, he would refer to the speech of Mr. Hugh O'Connor, at the late aggregate meeting, to prove its mighty importance. The observations made by that gentleman, and the manner in which they were received by the assembly, afforded incontrovertible evidence of their truth and application. For many years he (Mr. O'Connell) had been complimented by too kind friends, as the most animated speaker of the Catholic body; but even were the fact as they would have persuaded him, in his life he never could have made so energetic a speech as that of Mr. O'Connor's. But why was it energetic? Because its force arose from its truth; because it pourtrayed, faithfully and strongly, the grinding evils with which the Catholics are aggrieved by the existing system of the administration of justice in Ireland; evils which no individual power could control, no judicial authority remedy, however well disposed to do so.

"The course of proceeding best adapted to the interests of the



Catholics, required the serious consideration of the association. Three presented themselves for their adoption.

“First—that of confining themselves to the old practice of an annual petition to parliament, and to the association having its way, but taking such previous measures as might be best calculated to ensure its success.

“Secondly—that of detaching particulars of the most operative grievances from the general and disgusting catalogue, and exposing them to the British empire and the world.

“Thirdly—that of endeavouring to bring the Catholics to act with the reformers of England.

“In fact, he was desirous of testing the Catholics once more, and seeing whether there were any ground for the accusation that seemed to be taken as an admitted and proved charge against them—that the iron had so entered into their souls as to make them averse to any, the most moderate self-exertion, and inclined to submit tamely to their evils, and timidly and basely to allow the Orangemen to trample upon and lord it over them—to revel unchecked and unopposed in all the license of triumphant tyranny, bigotry, persecution, and the demoniac spirit of rapine and outrage!

“Could it be said he used these strong terms without need; it was not a fancied sketch, but a picture of fearful realities; that of which the disgusting outline was so wantonly and so recklessly exhibited at the theatre on Wednesday night last. That place which was generally considered to be the temple of classic entertainment, and of refined and cultivated amusement; the haunt of the graces, and the scene of social enjoyment, was converted into a bear-garden, where the ferocious Orangeman taunted his quiescent Catholic neighbour, by insultingly displaying the insignia of past victory, and anticipated triumph!

“Yes, triumph; for has not their grand master been permitted to triumph over the imperial authority of the Commons of England? has he not been permitted insolently to refuse telling the great legislative assembly of the nation, when they demanded it of him, what was the watch-word by which they hallooed each other on to the work of destruction?

“The most calm and deliberate conviction of his (Mr. O’Connell’s) mind was, that there must be something in their token of recognition *too horrible to be uttered*; and therefore it was, and therefore it could only be, that the legislature was suffered to be degraded—its high privileges to be contemned, and that authority which it has been so zealous to maintain, as to commit its own members for breaches that were but

as pismires to elephants, when compared with the contumacy of the grand Orange martyr, Abraham Bradley King, Baronet and government printer, set at defiance with impunity. That there was some adequate cause for the unheard-of proceeding, it would be idle to doubt. Government knew why they permitted the authority of parliament to sink into utter ridicule; they were not so insensible to public censure as to declare that they had unwittingly fostered a system, whose object is now to root out of the land of their fathers, seven millions of people. (Cheers.)

“What but the protection of that government (that government which Catholics pay and support), could have inspired the confidence to concert a project so insane, yet, so horrible, that *neutrality* is now become a crime, and every Protestant not an Orangeman, must sink his individual interest, and coalesce with the Catholic in extinguishing a faction whose purpose was so monstrous, and whose existence occasioned such misfortunes and misery to Ireland. They could already count some Protestants among the association, and so late as the day before, a highly respectable one, Mr. Prossur, gave him his guinea, in order to become a member.

“It would, he conceived, be the greatest absurdity, were they to continue the holyday farce of annually petitioning for general emancipation; it had become a mockery so repugnant to common sense, that it could not now obtain even that annual discussion which had heretofore paralyzed the exertions of the Catholics, producing no result, save to have their hopes adjourned, and the creation of disunion amongst themselves. In bringing forward the abstract question, particular grievances were lost sight of, their best friends were confounded and confused, and a general misunderstanding was abroad upon the subject of their disabilities. They saw the *Edinburgh Review* repeat over and over, that there are but five-and-twenty offices from which Catholics were excluded. He (Mr. O'Connell) would defy the research of the reviewer to point out five-and-twenty Catholics who enjoyed the places to which it supposed them eligible. By bringing the peculiar grievances immediately under the notice of the legislature, they enlisted those who were particularly afflicted, and secured their exertions.

“Why, for instance, should they hesitate to bring such a subject as that of Church-rates before the house, by a peculiar petition; that shameless imposition, whereby Catholics were called upon to pay for repairs of churches that did not exist, and contribute to the erection of churches which are never built—as in the case of the parish of Westmeath, where, after £2000 had been granted in the first instance, and afterwards several considerable sums levied off the parish, the founda-

tion stone was not yet laid, and they were called on again for another levy of £800! Why should the wretched, naked, persecuted peasant be forced to contribute to this system?

“He was aware that there was a number of Catholics who cherished a lingering expectation that the present government, from the known and general feeling of the House of Commons, would voluntarily come forward and administer the only remedy for the salvation of Ireland. Oh! these honest, unsuspecting, confiding, but miscalculating politicians! Little were they versed in the wily tactics, the perfidious duplicity, the unprincipled dishonesty of professional statesmen, who, however they may apparently differ on matters of policy, are always sure to pull together, when there is a scramble for places and pensions! Could any man who was not the willing dupe of a perverted imagination, deceive himself by hoping for any good from such an administration?

“When he exclaimed against the administration of justice, he should be wanting in sincerity, and, indeed, in common honesty, did he not declare, without dreading an imputation of sycophancy, that Ireland possessed *some* judges who, with a proud satisfaction, he could hold up to the world as bright examples of learning and honesty. There was the *entire* Court of King’s Bench, such as he never expected to have seen in this unfortunate country. There were also some virtuous and learned judges in the other courts; he regretted he could not extend the approbation to all the judges; but that which was the more immediate subject for their consideration, was the construction of juries.

“Over this grievance the judges had no control; there was no remedy; it was a part of that system of Orange sheriffs, with Orange panels in their pockets. When that appalling fact had been heard from sources which could not be doubted, were they not warranted in asserting, that there was no security against the injustice of Orange intolerance—now become triumphant from ministers having given them up the country, in order, as it was alleged, to give no triumph to *either* party!! Did ministers expect to screen their pusillanimity by affecting not to favour Catholics at the expense of offending Orangemen? The pretext was unworthy the character of the statesman who assumed it. Could they affect to delude any man of any party, into a belief that the struggle was not between the government of the Marquis of Wellesley and Mr. Plunket on the one hand, and the Orange party on the other, and that the Catholics were more involved in the late struggle, than any other portion of his majesty’s subjects who were not Orangemen, and who felt an interest in the preservation of the British constitution? In his (Mr. O’Connell’s) opinion, there never was a ministry calculated

to effect such mischief to the empire as the present ; by having amongst them a few persons whose reputation and character secured to them a certain degree of public confidence, they were enabled to effect those insidious disgraceful manœuvres in which they were at last out-generalled and obliged to succumb to the Orangemen under the specious terms of not giving a *triumph to either party* ; and how were they still further humbled, for, after the capitulation, the Orange conquerors boast of their triumph by proclaiming an accession of 20,000 to their number.

“The learned gentleman concluded with assuring the meeting, that among the few chances that remained for their obtaining emancipation, one of the only chances was, to join heartily the reformers (hear, hear) in endeavouring to procure a change in that system, by which the great borough-mongering families were able to influence the returning of members for rotten boroughs, and thus perpetuate that oppression and misrule under which the country had so long groaned.

“He was, however, aware that the Catholics were not yet prepared for that step, and he should for the present move for the appointment of a committee of eleven to petition parliament for the administration of justice in Ireland.

“MR. O'CONNELL then moved, that the petition for the administration of justice in Ireland, should be confided to Mr. Brougham. (Carried unanimously.)

“He then gave notice for an address to the Catholic people of Ireland, warning them against secret societies ; he would willingly take charge of Mr. Lawless' motion, which was for the adoption of a petition to the lord lieutenant, praying his excellency to prevent any Orange display which might cause a reaction of the ribbonmen.”

In reply to an observation of Sir John Burke—

“MR. O'CONNELL observed, that he had not applied any observation to the private character of the chancellor, nor did he speak of him in his judicial capacity.

“He spoke of him in his character as a statesman ; he said he courted the vapid applause of an eating club, where one of the toasts went, by inference, to include the Marquis of Wellesley among the exports of Ireland. It was for his conduct as a statesman that he had arraigned and would arraign him, until he should see the propitious day when he (the chancellor) should himself become an export from Ireland.”

We jump for a moment from politics to law, to return to the former immediately. Such a course is not unsuited to a sketch of Mr. O'Connell's life, the habit of which for so many years it resembles; those years, when almost the only recreation he knew, was by a change from one engrossing occupation to another—from the Four Courts to the Association meeting—from thence to his study, to prepare for the courts again.

“CRIMINAL INFORMATION.

“THE KING *at the Prosecution of* MICHAEL O'CONNOR, Clerk, *v.* JOSEPH TIMOTHY HAYDEN AND WILLIAM GLYNN, *Proprietors of the Public Newspaper called 'The Dublin Evening Mail.'*

“IN THE KING'S BENCH, JUNE 14TH, 1823.

“MR. O'CONNELL (upon the same side as Mr. Gould) submitted to the court, that the subject before them necessarily resolved itself into three branches :

“First, whether the publication was libellous.

“Secondly, Whether the persons libelled be such as are entitled to make their complaint as a public body ; and

“Thirdly, whether the conduct of the professional persons concerned for them, in directing the prosecution, has been irregular, and must be visited upon the aggrieved persons prosecuting.’

\* \* \* \* \*

“The court in deciding the first position, were called upon to determine whether the encouraging of midnight assassination and atrocities of the most appalling nature, and in the worst shapes, were crimes, as it was for the encouragement of such offences that the Catholic clergy were accused in the libel, not under the guise of impartial discussion, but by a direct accusation ; not weighing the probability of the charge, but convicting at once, and calling upon the public vengeance ; for if any man believed the charge, must he not feel exasperated, and would he not be bound to exert himself by all legal means, and procure the punishment of wretches base enough to disgrace their religion and their calling, by the conduct here imputed to them.

“Did not such a charge go to a direct encouragement of the lamented atrocities, by tending to occasion a relaxation of the exertions of the Catholic clergy, when they found their interference and their communication with the peasantry so maligned and misrepresented ; and was he

to be told, that for fear of agitation, the calumniator who works such mischief, should not be prosecuted; that the *priest* was to suffer, and *not his calumniator*.

“The learned counsel, after commenting very forcibly, but temperately, upon the nature and tendency of the libel, went on to argue, whether the Catholic clergy were a body of men entitled to call upon the court for its protection from such calumny.

“That was a question, he said, of mere law, and would be more properly argued when the case was before a jury, or upon arrest of judgment. The Catholic clergy, he argued, were recognized and regulated by acts of parliament; they were liable to certain oaths in their ministerial capacity, binding them to the constitution, as well by gratitude for its provision, as by duty for its protection. The Durham case, he conceived, to be conclusive upon their right of appeal as a public body, for in the rule granted in that case, there was no use of the word *established* clergy of Durham, as relied on by Mr. Johnson. The rule could not apply to the *established clergy alone*, for no term was more indefinite or undefined, than the *established clergy*.

“After arguing at much length upon this point, the learned counsel proceeded to the third—that of the conduct of the prosecutor having dealt unfairly, and disintitling himself to the information. He then read an affidavit stating, that he (Mr. O'Connell) wrote a letter upon the 1st of May to the defendants, informing them that it was intended to take proceedings against them for the publication of the libel upon the Catholic clergy, but that if they *without delay* gave up the author, and acknowledged the proprietorship and publication in one of the southern counties where the paper circulated, and where the circumstances were best known, that the proceedings against them would be relinquished. Upon the 4th of May, Mr. Hayden, one of the defendants, waited upon him (Mr. O'Connell), and prayed time until Mr. Cooper, the author, returned from the country; that it was granted to him, and upon the 7th, Mr. Cooper wrote to Mr. O'Connell, acknowledging his readiness to stand in the place of the proprietors, but refused to acknowledge the publication in Kerry or any of the southern counties, and that through this ingenuity, the time was got over until the 17th of May, when it was too late to file an information, so as to have the trial in the next assizes; and that the author not having complied with the terms of his (Mr. O'Connell's) letter, he was at liberty to proceed as he had first intimated.

“That his object in having the trial in some of the southern counties was, that those Protestant gentlemen to whom the conduct of the clergy was best known, might have an opportunity of proving and deciding

on it. If the defendants had not the gratitude to thank him (Mr. O'Connell) for the liberal and candid communication made to them in the first instance, and the indulgence granted them subsequently, they should, at least, have abstained from charging the prosecutor with unfairness and misconduct, because he would not receive the author in place of the printer, *on his (the author's) own conditions.*"

The transitions we have recently spoken of from politics to law, and law to politics, which so quickly succeeded each other in the everyday current of Mr. O'Connell's existence, are well exemplified at this stage of our sketch, when we have to give a political speech of his upon the same day that he made the law argument which we have last inserted.

It was at a meeting of the association; relative to Church-rates.

**"MR. O'CONNELL** rose to move upon his notice respecting *Church-rates.*

"There was, he said, no grievance which afflicted the peasantry more than the present mode of levying church-rates.

"In the country the hardship of the system was intolerable, and pressed with a severity that made it no longer possible to submit in silence. The plan of assessment was equally arbitrary as inconsistent; as long as the levy was made for occasions which might not come immediately within the statute, but which were all reasonable, there was no complaint on the part of the people; but when the magnitude of the demands rendered compliance no longer possible, and that recourse was had to the remedy of seizing upon the little all of the impoverished peasant, then remonstrance forced itself from the still reluctant complainant.

"Up to the reign of Henry the Eighth, the great burden of repairing and building churches fell upon the clergy, as also the support of the poor from the Church revenues, and so continued until the confiscation of Church property in England. It occurred in a few particular instances in Ireland, that special parliamentary grants were made for the building of churches; but this never occurred but from some peculiar circumstances, such as to suit the alterations of modern residence, or change the site of the church from inconvenience of situation, and this was not on more than five occasions up to George the Second. In Ireland, Church property, at the Reformation, was not confiscated to the

same extent as in England, because the country adhered to the original faith, and the provision for building churches from Church revenues, remained in force.

“ The first date from which Catholics can count the origin of their peculiar hardship in the management of church-rates, was the 12th George I., when they were for the first time rendered ineligible to *vote* at vestry meetings upon the subject of building or repairing churches, and the statute remains in force to this day ; but on this point considerable mistake prevailed, for the intolerants would have it, that by the provision of that act, Catholics were excluded *altogether* from vestries, whereas they were not prevented from delivering their opinions, or taking part in the discussion upon building of churches, but only from voting upon the question ; and that statute of the twenty-fifth of the late king, was further accompanied by the particular grievance, that though they might vote for parish cess, they could not vote for Churchwardens, though they themselves were rendered eligible, and could be compelled to serve the office.

“ In the 3rd George II., how glaringly intolerant, persecuting, and bigoted was the provision rendering Catholic churchwardens personally responsible for the amount of the whole parish cess ; it was found useful, when the parish was composed of poor Catholic parishioners, to single out a Catholic of substance, and make him pay, by privation, too, of himself, for the poverty of his fellow-sufferers. Surely, Catholics were the most unfit people in the world for the office of churchwarden, part of whose duty it was to keep order during the service, and to procure the elements for the sacrament. Now, he (Mr. O'Connell) would remark, that the Catholic churchwarden's attendance at the service of his own religion, might clash with his assisting at that of another, even were there no other impeding cause ; and from the opportunity this law afforded to harass and annoy a respectable Catholic in the country, it was incumbent upon the association to seek its repeal.

“ The peculiar grievance of the statute was, however, more sensibly felt in the strange and numerous *jobs* that were effected under its provisions ; the moment a Catholic rose to object to such proceedings, he was immediately silenced by changing to, or introducing the subject of church repairs, or church building, and told he had no privilege to vote upon such a question.

“ From among the numerous instances of misapplication under this act, he could mention one that had been verified by affidavit before the Chancellor and the Court of King's Bench, and which to this day remains uncontradicted. In the town of Mullingar, it was determined to pull down the old church, and erect a new one ; and it was the gene-



ral calculation, that with the materials of the old, and about *one thousand pounds*, a new one could be built; and, accordingly, in 1813, an assessment was made of ninepence per acre, which produced the sum of £360 in the year 1814; another levy of one shilling and ninepence per acre, which produced the sum of £860, making with the former a total of £1220, which the parishioners thought was quite sufficient for the purpose with the old materials; but no, for in the following year another levy of £300 was made; there was then in hands £1520, and, by way of managing that sum with prudence, instead of building the church by *contract*, they very economically engaged to erect it by the day's work, and appoint an inspector of labourers at the salary of £200 per annum out of the pockets of the parishioners.

“Finding the taxing trade went on so well, in the following year, 1817, another assessment of 1s. 6d. per acre was ordered. From this was received a sum of £740; but still they were not satisfied; for, in 1818, the sum of £740 more was levied. Well, one would have thought that by this time there was no decent pretence for any further levy; but no such thing. In the year 1819, another sum of £740 was levied, and they had then an amount of £3,740. Still rapacity kept pace with the successful levies, and in 1820 a further sum of £1,800 was demanded, being an assessment of 3s. 11d. per acre. The clergyman, it was alleged, lost £400 in speculating on timber; and poor Dibbs, the parish clerk, having the shell of a cabin that stood in the way of the new church, it was found necessary to induce him to submit to its removal by presenting him with £200 in lieu.

“The frequency and amount of those levies became at length so alarming, that a gentleman, having a few acres of land, found himself, in 1820, called upon, in addition to all the former levies, to pay the sum of £10. He refused; and, under the 45th of the late King, he was immediately distrained for his audacity. He was not, however, so passively inclined, and he issued a *replevin*. An application was made to the King's Bench, and afterwards to the Chancellor, to quash the *replevin*. The matter was decided for the traverser by the King's Bench, and the Chancellor refused the application of the minister with costs. Then the party got rid of the grievance, because he was spirited, and in circumstances enabling him to contend with extortion. But how many similar exactions took place every day, and nothing was heard of it, because of the poverty and ignorance of the sufferers. In the county of Louth, there was a case of still more flagrant injustice than the one already mentioned.

“The people of England might well be astonished (and who was there but should be so?) at the enormous offences committed in this ill-fated country; but their astonishment would be still greater, if they

knew all the causes of irritation—and to which he (Mr. O'Connell) rejoiced they were strangers—producing those offences. However, he congratulated the country that a decline of crime had already taken place, within these few weeks, *since the establishment of the Catholic Association*; and he trusted that, in a few weeks more, the *advice and good counsel of the Association, in holding out the expectation that there is yet a chance of constitutional liberty, and that, as heretofore, no flattering voice of consolation had reached the desponding peasantry—they should now learn that there are men resolved to expose their grievances*; to exhibit to the feeling and generous hearts of the British people their long sufferings and accumulated wrongs; and that a paternal and gracious monarch, with a patriotic and benign viceroy, sympathized in their misfortunes, and were anxious to alleviate them.

“Such were the means by which, he trusted, the Association would succeed in subduing outrage, and proving their genuine loyalty to the constitution, and their admiration of the Marquis of Wellesley's government.

“The eloquent gentleman then went into detail of the erroneous remedies that had been applied by the legislature for the suppression of disturbances in this country. He instanced the absurdity and inconsistency, at a time when the national distress was at its height, of affording *additional facilities to landlords to distress their tenantry, as in the Ejectment Act of 1811, enabling him to seize upon the growing crops*;—and when there were several landlords between the occupier and the owner of the estate, who, if they quarrelled among themselves, had no other mode of revenge than oppressing the innocent tenant, by seizing upon him, in order to vex his immediate landlord. Then there was the Police Magistrate's Act, enabling him to *issue his warrant for church-rate and tithe*, and the power of *summary ejectment* for non-payment of rent.

“He cited several other hardships, and observed that the national distress appeared to have had an unnatural and inconsistent effect upon the reasoning faculties of legislators; for as distress increased, their principle was to augment the arbitrary, irritating, and oppressive enactments; and the consequence was such as we had the misfortune to witness.

“Mr. O'Connell moved that a committee of eleven be appointed to prepare a petition to parliament on church-rates.

“This was agreed to.

“MR. SHIEL then brought forward a petition relative to the administration of justice in Ireland, which was read and adopted. After which—

“MR. O'CONNELL took the opportunity of impressing upon the

Catholics of Dublin that their supineness was inexcusable, in neglecting to preserve the rights to which they are by law entitled. By a culpable passiveness, they sacrificed their own and their brethren's privileges to the freedom of the city of Dublin, to which they were eligible for the last thirty years.

“ Some few years since, he (Mr. O'Connell) undertook, at his own expense, to obtain for a man named Cole the civic rights to which he was entitled, as having served his time to a *freeman*, but when he had gone through all the forms, and completely succeeded, the poor man died; and the *Hibernian Journal* announced the event by stating that GOD had miraculously saved the CORPORATION FROM THE CONTAMINATION of a PAPIST!

“ He had, however, since found another Catholic entitled to his freedom; and as he was not in circumstances sufficient to enable him to contend for it, he conceived the Association should come forward and give their assistance. The Catholics should not neglect to enrol their indentures, as doing so saved a considerable expense.

“ Upon the 19th of June, MR. LAWLESS moved, in the Association, for appointment of a committee to prepare a petition to the Lord Lieutenant, praying he would interpose his authority to prevent, on the 12th of July next, public processions of political associations in the country parts of Ireland.

“ MR. O'CONNELL, in seconding the motion, was anxious to have it understood that not the slightest notion prevailed of his Excellency being unmindful of his own duty with regard to what was necessary to be done for preserving the public peace, or that any want of confidence existed in his Excellency's desire or intention to prevent the sanguinary waste of human life which usually follows the illegal processions of Orange societies.

“ If the Marquis Wellesley were the only Lord Lieutenant whom they addressed upon the subject, it was because they had no hope from any other. It was an act of the plainest justice to the Catholics to acquaint the government how Orange irritation was met by Catholic conciliation; how the public peace was endangered, and innocent blood shed by the processions of licentious and infuriated rabble. No disturbance was ever occasioned by the Catholics.

“ Here Mr. O'Connell instanced the readiness of the Catholics to promote peace, by stating that in the north the Ribbonmen were accustomed to have a procession on Patrick's-day, by way of a set-off against other displays; but in consequence of an able and patriotic address from one who exercised his talents with true Irish feeling (Mr. Lawless), calling upon them to forego their procession, they unanimously desisted from

the annual procession on the last celebration of St. Patrick's-day. In return, their enemies are making every exertion to promote the offensive display on the approaching anniversary, not only where they have heretofore existed, but in places yet free from them. He had heard it was intended to have Orange processions in Tipperary, Youghal, and the city of Cork; and he therefore thought it would be quite right to show the Lord Lieutenant that Orangemen would follow no advice nor example for the peace of the country; but could only be controlled by the interference of government."

The meeting of Saturday, the 5th of July, afforded a very fair specimen of the increasing business of the new Association. A number of members spoke on various objects; and Mr. O'Connell, in particular, had to speak three times—the weight of the work, as usual, falling upon his willing shoulders.

MR. O'GORMAN made a long speech, complaining of misrepresentation in parliament of former declarations of his. Several gentlemen spoke to the same subject, after which

"MR. O'CONNELL inquired if the secretary had received any communication from Earl Grey, respecting their petition to the House of Lords on the administration of justice in Ireland. Should his lordship determine on presenting it, he would take care the same objections should not apply to it as were made in the other House; for he would supply abundance of facts to prove the undue administration of justice, as regarded the Catholics.

"There was, he regretted, a great misapprehension as to the petition not having been signed by men of large properties, or of weight and influence; and he could state, for the information of the honourable gentlemen who so remarked upon the petition as was reported in the newspapers, that there were many, very many, men signed that petition, of greater landed property than either of the honourable members, Mr. James Daly and Mr. Richard Martin; and, still more, that they had themselves the sole control over their own estates.

"As to men of other descriptions of property, there were the signatures of some of the most respectable merchants attached to the petition; men worth from £80,000 and upwards, that in Ireland was considered a respectable property. It is true the petition was signed and sent off in so great a hurry that it was not possible to obtain more signatures; but he doubted if there was a petition ever sent from Dublin that, for

the number of signatures, contained a greater proportion of respectability—not even the petitions of the corporation. (Laughter.)

“It was remarkable that the two Galway members, who objected to the petition, are returned by electors two-thirds of whom are Catholics, and several of them members of the Catholic Association. But he (Mr. O’Connell) had since learned, and was informed by several of them, that thirteen of the present members are not likely to have the opportunity of objecting to the Catholic petition after the next election—so indignant do the electors of Galway feel at the conduct of those honourable gentlemen. Indeed, he did not think the Catholics could have more dangerous enemies than those who vote the general question of Emancipation, because it is sure to be of no avail; but when a particular grievance is submitted, they are sure to be found in the ranks of ministers.

“The Catholics could have no worse nor more effectual enemy than the man who, having the patronage of a county in his pocket, and boasting of its influence, coalesced with a ministry like the present, though he might formally fulfil the conditions upon which he was returned, by giving his solitary vote upon an annual mockery of the Emancipation Bill.”

A member inquired what was become of the address to the Lord Lieutenant; upon which

“MR. O’CONNELL stated, that the committee had made no report. As for himself, he said he had changed his mind upon that subject since the resolution of the corporation of Cork had been put forward. This he regarded as an official proceeding, not such as the proclamation of an Orange lodge, imposing upon, ridiculing, and insulting the government by forwarding this Orange proclamation with fictitious signatures, such as the romantic one of *Alfred Howard*. It was certainly the safest mode of keeping the name of the grand officer secret, when he had the grace to be ashamed of his dignity by affixing the signature of a person who did not exist. The committee appointed to prepare the address to his Excellency had determined on the propriety of not doing so, out of respect to the exertions which it was evident the Lord Lieutenant was making, to prevent the insult against which his interposition was intended to be claimed; and they also refrained in order to show their sense of the conciliating disposition evinced by the corporation of Cork.

“Next, MR. O’CONNELL, on the part of the committee appointed to prepare petitions to parliament, on the subject of poor-rates, stated,

that it was the opinion of the committee, that as they were every day obtaining additional information with facts which were almost incredible, they conceived it most prudent to defer the petition until next session, when they were determined not to leave ministers the opportunity of slurring over the grievances of Ireland.

"They would then attack them in detail, and upon such disqualifications as were more immediately felt, and upon which they would offer strong and irresistible evidence. They would petition week after week, as if those who had the power persisted in refusing to remove the fetters, their ears should, at least, be dinned with the clanking of their chains, and the great object of the Catholic association would thereby be attained—that of exposing to the world the present iniquitous and barbarous policy of a vacillating, inefficient ministry.

"The mockery of a Commutation Tithe Bill, wholly impracticable, if not otherwise objectionable, would meet its deserved fate in the House of Lords. No operative measure to do away the grievance of the present tithe system, is likely to pass the legislature this session, and the clergy will have the benefit of the Composition of Tithe Agistment Bill, without having commuted the tithe of potatoes. MR. O'CONNELL here declared he knew no greater evil existing than that, nor did he think the imposition of local taxation was foreign to their purpose, as they found in it a compost of manure that nourished and preserved the existence of that hot-bed of bigotry and persecution, the Dublin corporation; who, protected by Mr. Goulbourn, might now triumphantly glory in having jobbed and squandered so many hundred thousand pounds to keep alive the cry of intolerance and persecution.

"He assured the meeting they would be prepared with materials for next session, that would create for them in the minds of the British people, at least consideration, if not conviction."

The next speech we shall quote had reference to one who, though still prominent on the public scene, has long ago ceased to merit such testimonials as that which follows.

The speech was on a motion (made July the 12th) of thanks to *Henry Brougham*, who then *did* appear to merit the glowing eulogium Mr. O'Connell pronounced upon him, but who now has sunk himself almost below contempt.

"MR. O'CONNELL rose. He did not consider it would be necessary, upon the subject of his motion, to address the meeting at any length.

“The petition complaining of the administration of justice in Ireland, was the first which the Catholics thought advisable not to place in the hands of any but an Irish member, and the result was proved, that the choice on this occasion was as judicious as happy, while the discussion itself, forming a new era in the history of Irish grievances, was also matter for congratulation.

“It afforded an opportunity to the Catholics for the exposure of corruptions and abuses which would astonish even those who stood unawed by conscience, and unsubdued by shame. The Catholics, when preparing this petition, did not think it expedient to enter into a detail of facts which would necessarily provoke the ire of individual feeling, and elicit a premature defence of personal character. There were, besides, many recent cases in which the right of property has not been finally decided, and the decisions of which may be material to the support of their allegations, and if they thought it right to go before the house with their petition, complaining in general terms in the first instance, it was not, he would assure the quibblers, for want of materials of evidence, to prove the frequent and glaring acts of partiality in the administration of justice, where Catholics were concerned, and which were so notorious, that they did not expect any man possessing character or intellect could have the hardihood to deny; but though the Catholics, from thinking too favourably of human nature, may have miscalculated the opposition to their complaints, perhaps their error was a fortunate one, as having caused a challenge which they (the Catholics) most willingly accepted from a confidence in their ability, if not to satisfy, at least to confound their opponents.

“But that was a subject which they should adjourn until next sessions of parliament, when he could promise their pledge should be redeemed.

“To the people of Ireland, the debate itself afforded important instruction, teaching them what they were to expect from the perfidious friendship of members who assume an affected liberality, in which to shroud their mercenary ambition and unworthy projects, until the moment of the minister's necessity, when the liberties and privileges of constituents, the country's rights, and the nation's interests, are bartered for the patronage of a county, or the appointment of some dozen of guagers. (Hear, hear.)

“After the debate was opened by a speech (than which there never was one more powerfully eloquent pronounced in that house), Mr. GOULBOURN, from his official station, undertook to reply (though certainly not *by argument*). He condescended to quote what fell from so humble an individual as himself (Mr. O'Connell), when, in alluding

to the judges, he instanced the honesty and ability of those who preside in the Court of King's Bench. Now, had the right honourable gentleman meant to rely upon that opinion, as contradicting the averments contained in the petition, he showed that he (Mr. Goulbourn) was quite mistaken in its operation, for, in their capacity of petitioners, they did not make any allusion generally to the judges, so neither could a compliment paid to any partial number of them, serve to exculpate the *whole*; and as to what fell from him (Mr. O'Connell) respecting the judges of the King's Bench, he could, with great certainty, declare it was not the incense of flattery, but an expression of honest feeling extorted from him by a conviction of the intrinsic merits of the distinguished individuals. (Hear, hear.)

“But as the right honourable gentleman was merely a hired advocate, whose official duty obliged him to act as protector of abuses in Ireland, even to the plunderers of the corporation (great applause, and continued cheering), he might be excused for trying to make the most of a bad case. Gentlemen might, perhaps, recollect Jeremy Bentham, talking of liberty, described the several authorities in the state as a series of checks upon each other; and as the judge, he says, is a check on the jury, so the Lord Lieutenant is a check on the judges; and as liberty consists of *checks*, so Mr. Goulbourn was sent to be a check over the Lord Lieutenant, fearing his excellency would be too favourable to liberty (laughter, and hear, hear), if not under the control of a gentleman serving his apprenticeship as a statesman, and who was frequently reduced to the dilemma of the barber who cut his finger when shaving a beggar, for which he cursed the poor wretch's thin cheek. (Laughter.) So did Mr. Goulbourn often cut his finger when defending the respectability of an Orange lodge, or the selection of a jury composed of twelve brothers, sworn to root out the *Amalekite* over whose life or property they hold the law's control.

“Mr. Goulbourn, for aught he knew, might be a very honourable gentleman, though placed in one of the most unpleasant situations, and obliged to support and defend every measure of the cabinet to which he was attached. He had the authority of Falstaff for saying, that it was no crime for a man to labour in his vocation. As an advocate, the right honourable gentleman could not have worse clients.

“The Catholic petition was encountered by the qualms of the immaculate Colonel Barry's conscience; they were all aware how he shuddered at any, the least imputation, upon the honesty of juries; how the preserver of *Magna Charta* and patron of Orange grand juries, gave loose to his virtuous indignation at any insinuation against the administrators of justice in Ireland; and then the honesty of his zeal,



and the success of his efforts for the preservation of our constitutional privileges, deserved, as they would be, to be transmitted to admiring posterity ; and those who have heretofore toasted Lord Erskine, and trial by jury, would henceforth vociferate ‘*huzzed*’ for Colonel Barry, and the honesty of jurors! Long life to Colonel Barry, the preserver of justice. (Laughter, and cheers.) And oh! how their admiration for the *lover of juries* must be heightened by the recollection, that in the newspapers of 1798, it is stated, that a gentleman then named *Barry Maxwell* made a proposition to the Irish House of Commons, for the creation of an *ex post facto* law, authorizing THE TRIAL BY COURT MARTIAL of a number of unfortunate men who had been some time in confinement, owing to the difficulty of proving their guilt, but whom he alleged it was necessary to dispose of (hear, hear)—a proposal which even Lord Castlereagh’s government refused to entertain, and protested against!

“How it came to be the same person, who, in the English Commons, was so tenacious of a jury’s rights, he (Mr. O’Connell) could attribute to his improvement from an English education, and, indeed, he could hardly believe that the present Colonel Barry was the apologist of the enormities of the year 1798, and who now raised his voice in support of the juries, though he could well believe him the person who wishes that Catholics should be excluded from juries that were to decide upon Catholic life or property; but that is a mere matter of taste with the gallant colonel, in which he (Mr. O’Connell) differed from him.

“In alluding to the Galway members, Mr. Richard Martin and Mr. Blake, he (Mr. O’Connell) was not a little embarrassed in endeavouring to restrain his indignation within those limits necessary to guard the expression of his feelings.

[“Here a gentleman exclaimed, include Mr. Hutchinson. Mr. O’Connell, in a very earnest tone, replied, ‘indeed I will not, and I shall give you my reason by-and-by.’]

“The learned gentleman then resumed.—Why, he would ask, were the Catholics not long since emancipated? because those whom they return to parliament, under the guise of Catholic friends, proved their most insidious enemies, ever ready to coalesce with the bitterest opponents against any practical or substantial good being extended to them, and took care to parade on the side of liberality, when they knew their services would not be available. Such men were the real enemies of the Catholics, for, like treacherous allies, they elude the precautions that would be adopted against the avowed, but less dishonourable enemies of religious toleration—the Orangemen, and should the Catholic electors of Galway neglect to mark their disapprobation

in the most effectual and decisive manner they would be degraded amongst the meanest of mankind, and unworthy of possessing the privileges of freemen or electors.

“He now felt, he assured the meeting, an indescribable dread in mentioning the name of *Hutchinson*, lest a word escape him that might be construed into any thing like disrespect; a man to whom Ireland and the Catholics owed a debt of gratitude, which they should not feel the less, because of their inability to acquit themselves of it. (Hear, hear, and applause.) At the period of Ireland's suicide, when the family of Mr. Hutchinson assisted in the degradation of their country, he it was who, sacrificing the dearest affections of the heart, which are inseparable from refined feeling, and soften the chagrins of existence, separated himself from those connexions, and stood forward as the eloquent, able, and independent advocate of his country (hear, hear), and has since remained the active and energetic guardian of her few remaining rights.

“Could the Irish peasant forget his exertions on the subject of tithes? and though he has been in a situation in which a minister never thinks a patriot disinterested, has he purchased a country's patronage at the expense of his vote? No, he stands on a pinnacle of virtuous independence, removed at an immeasurable distance above the reproach of dishonour. To him are the Catholics indebted for having secured to them not only the return of two real friends, but the exclusion of an Orange representation. On the subject of this petition, Mr. Hutchinson voted with Mr. Brougham; but he at the same time expressed his opinion of a particular class of persons whom he sought to relieve from the charges made by the petitioners.

“In that opinion he certainly was mistaken. He forgot the case of *Todd Jones*; he also forgot, that when an inhabitant of the city of Cork, not connected with the corporation, had occasion to bring an action, he never had it tried there, but in some neighbouring county, frequently in his (Mr. O'Connell's) county; (‘your own kingdom,’ observed a gentleman in the room.) The honourable gentleman (Mr. Hutchinson) had also forgotten, that it is notorious that a poor man never obtains a verdict against a rich man, in the city of Cork, and that it is the only county in Ireland in which an assassination has been committed for a pecuniary consideration, in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining justice for a poor man.

“Indeed, there was one exception to this general accusation, in which he (Mr. O'Connell) had been himself concerned, and he was resolved to try to shame the jury into a verdict, by telling them if they gave a verdict for his client, they would be the first jury in the city of

Cork that had given a verdict for a poor man, against a rich adversary, and they deserved the distinction, for they found for the poor man. There was not a county in Ireland, even the most Orange of the north, that he would not sooner have a Catholic's case tried in, than the city of Cork; and as to their grand juries, he never yet heard of a resolution proceeding from them in favour of liberty or liberality, while instances are most numerous of the contrary.

“It was by presenting a petition against the Catholics, as foreman of the grand jury, that Mr. Anderson, of Fermoy, got his knightsip from the Duke of Richmond. With the existence of all these facts, he would admit Mr. Hutchinson was mistaken in his opinion of the city of Cork juries, and he would not apologize for the error; but he was bound, from the deepest gratitude, to acknowledge Mr. Hutchinson's many and eminent services, and to express his sincere belief that he was mistaken, and had not shaken his (Mr. O'Connell's) conviction of his pure and ardent patriotism.

“In mentioning the name of *Brougham*, he was affected by feelings of admiration, gratitude, and pleasure. (Hear, hear.) Never was there, perhaps, a happier specimen of splendid and various talents, of a powerful mind, of chastened energy and unaffected greatness of design and arrangement, than in the speech for which they were about to thank its author. In his reply to those who followed, oh, what a triumph! He followed them to their den, and dragged them from their strongest hold. When they affected to talk of the celebrated letter being improperly introduced, from the manner in which it had been obtained, instead, then, of replying by acquainting them of its history as furnished by him (Mr. O'Connell), he fearlessly preferred, not merely to enter, but to carry the war into their own camp, *to ask them how they came by the queen's letters?*

“But oh, that was a different case. No public crime was committed there—no violation of the most sacred principles of social or civilized society. There was no despicable meanness in bribing the queen's domestics to become malignant tale bearers, perfidious and treacherous guardians of her *escrutoire*! Oh, but that occurrence was managed with such excessive delicacy, that it did not deserve to be named at the same time with such baseness, as producing a mischievous, offensive, and unconstitutional letter, found in the street, and relating to improper interference with the grand jury by—a judge.

“The bare mention of even the possibility of a political judge of a certain party being influenced by his prejudices in the administration of justice, would be such a sin in the eyes of Lord Downes and Mr. Saurin (who were both perfect saints in their way), that life itself

would hardly suffice to expiate the offence; but thank heaven, Mr. Plunket spares the press at *both* sides, and much good may it do them, though some portion of it never spares him (Mr. Plunket), nor were they more kind to himself (Mr. O'Connell); but they were perfectly welcome, when they made anything by him, to cut him up in bad rhyme and worse prose, sooner than he should invade the liberty of that powerful preserver of our rights and freedom.

"But he would ask, if ever such a use was made of the press as the publication of a charge lately given from the bench in Carlow? Why, it was a perfect libel on the learned judge, for it was impossible that any such buffoonery could ever have escaped from the lips of a man holding the office of Chief Justice; and if Mr. Saurin should succeed in turning Mr. Plunket out, the press—that is, the independent portion—will be punished for having inserted so gross a libel as that purporting to be Lord Norbury's charge.

"In the speeches of Mr. Brougham upon their petition, there was so much to admire as made it impossible to select any particular passages for eulogy; but what was most worthy comment was the total indifference to personal or professional interests when upon the subject of the judicial authorities; but take him all in all, had they a man in the House of Commons possessing such powerful talents. There was, to be sure, Mr. Peel, remarkable for his figures of poetry, Mr. Canning for his figures of wit, and Mr. Robinson for his figures of calculation; but they were all so many figures of pigmies when compared with the intrepid zeal, capacity, powerful mind, and happy eloquence of Brougham; and sincerely did he (Mr. O'Connell) wish he were endowed with some portion of his abilities, in order to express the gratitude of Irish Catholics for that exertion, the fame of which will travel to the remotest corners of the world; and if their country should have occasion to erect a monument, not to a Wellington, but to perpetuate the resurrection of Ireland from the evils of the Union and the curse of intolerance, oppression, and persecution, the first name written over the altar of Justice should be—

"HENRY BROUGHAM!"

The Association having adjourned from its rising on the day of the motion for thanks to Henry Brougham, until November, Mr. O'Connell, thus released from his chief political engagements, delayed only until those of a legal nature were terminated by the long vacation, to rejoin his family in France.

From Tours, where they had spent the winter, he brought them to Paris, and thence, after several weeks in that city, by Rouen and Havre, to Southampton, for a further sojourn of a few months at the latter.

It is not for the author of this *half-sketch, half-compilation*, overpowered as he is by the multiplicity of matter directly relevant to his theme, to introduce what is of lesser, because of private concernment; yet the remark may be allowed him, that the recollections of travel in the company of Mr. O'Connell are among the most delightful in the minds of his family. Records of the old woes of Ireland; recitations of her most moving ballad poetry; information and illustration the most interesting upon historical events connected with the objects on the line of route;—these (given an additional charm to by the unvarying sunshine of cheerfulness, and the frequent indulgences of playful humour)—

*"Cheered the rough road, and made us wish it long!"*

Late in October he returned to Ireland, accompanied only by the writer, then on his way to the Jesuits' College, at Clongowes—Mr. O'Connell not being one of those Irish Catholics, who are so ashamed of their country that they must needs leave their children in England to be educated.

Before proceeding to his ultimate destination, the writer attended one meeting of the infant Catholic Association, in Capel-street; and, by a chance, did not attend another until the year 1829, when that body had not only passed its maturity, but, having accomplished its great end and object, was approaching its dissolution.

The contrast was striking. The narrow *two-room floor* in Capel-street, yet but half filled; the scanty returns of money, the few communications from the country, and the informal haste with which the business of the day (all, save Mr. O'Connell's usual address) was got through, were exchanged, in 1829, for the much larger arena of the Corn Exchange Rooms, crowded—room, passages, stairs, and all—to suffocation;—Catholic rent

handed in in hundreds ; country letters of the most spirit-stirring tone read in rapid succession ; and these, and other routine businesses, conducted with a gravity, and an observance of forms, that could scarcely be equalled in the bureau of a Secretary of State.

The men themselves (such of them as the vicissitudes of the eventful interval had left in activity) were altered. Captious, uncertain, half-timed in 1823, in 1829 they were bold, self-confident, enthusiastic. Each of them, in that interval, had been taught—

“ — His rights to scan,  
And learned to venerate himself—as *Irishman*.”

*One* only remained unaltered. The tone, the manner of 1823 were, in his case, the tone and manner of 1829—high, cheering, hopeful, and determined, to the fullest degree, but not more so in the latter year than in the former.

In her adversity, he had never doubted of the fortunes of Ireland, and carrying out of the merciful designs of Divine Providence in her regard.

The Association re-assembled for its winter “*session*,” at the rooms in Capel-street, on Saturday, the 1st of November. Mr. O'Connell had all the work to himself.

“MR. O'CONNELL observed, that in consequence of the secretary's absence, the book containing the proceedings of the Association could not be laid before the meeting ; and, therefore, as there was no business nor order of the day to proceed in, he should then give notice of some motions for the next day of meeting, and he would begin with notice of a motion of thanks to the author of the pamphlet ‘*In Vindication of the Catholics of Ireland*.’

“The pamphlet had been attributed to the learned Doctor Doyle, and there was no doubt it emanated from his powerful pen ; but as the author had not thought fit to attach his name to it, the Association would not be authorized to use his name in their vote.

“He (Mr. O'Connell) considered it truly satisfactory that such a work came from such an authority ; for there was not a single principle professed through the whole of the pamphlet that did not meet the con-

currence of every Catholic in Ireland. The 'Essay upon Tithes' was, perhaps, one of the happiest compositions ever read, being in its nature novel, and in its objects useful, in demonstrating the weakness and insufficiency of the title to tithes, as derived from divine right. To the Catholics it was matter of congratulation that, against a principle so pernicious and oppressive in its bearings, and so much opposed to man's natural rights in its practice, the arguments most effective, and calculated to shake its holding, were furnished by a Catholic prelate.

"For seventeen of the eighteen years when, struggling with the British Parliament for their rights, the Catholics dared not raise their voices upon the subject of tithes, until their enemies had furnished them with the opportunity, and then it was shown that, however insupportable a grievance tithes were to the Irish peasantry, the mode of collection rendered them the most fatal enemy to the peace and prosperity of the country. It was the bounden duty of the Association to pledge itself to the principles professed in the pamphlet, and to throw around it the shield of its opinion against any assaults that may be made upon its author, by one of the vilest instruments that ever disgraced the institution of the press.

"If the pamphlet was read in England, it would be of the last importance, as it might induce England, for the security of the British empire, to think of making peace with Ireland, when she is very likely to be at war with the Continent. (Hear, hear.) By the intended vote of thanks, the Association would proclaim their opinion, and their wishes, on the subject of their grievances.

"The next notice he should offer, was for the appointment of a committee for collecting such facts as may be deemed necessary in support of their petition to the House of Lords, upon the administration of justice to Ireland, to be presented by Earl Grey.

"The Irish public (he said) well knew that in their country justice was corrupted to its very source, and that in one province in particular, the administration of justice had been affected by the unfortunate tinge of sectarian and political prejudice, and that even in the very counties so highly lauded by parliament for their good government.

"When the petition was confided to Mr. Brougham, it was not thought necessary to support its allegations by particular facts or instances, or he should have been furnished with them most plentifully; and if they were only to take up the records of the last assizes, they should find abundant matter of complaint in the *Leinster* circuit. But their petition never went to arraign the superior judges. It was true they did not compliment, but neither did they censure any court; indeed, it was quite impossible their complaints could have alluded to the superior

courts ; for whilst there were particular judges exceptionable, the superior courts in general were honest, impartial, and able ; and he most explicitly and unequivocally expressed his respectful admiration of, and confidence in, *all* the judges in the King's Bench.

#### "TITHE COMMUTATION BILL.

"MR. O'CONNELL said his third notice related to a very important subject. It was, that a committee should be appointed to prepare a petition to parliament against the late Tithe Commutation Bill, than which he had no idea of any measure more contemptible or ridiculous.

"One of the best Irishmen living—and, if there was but one such in every county, Ireland would not remain as it is—that talented individual, the Honourable Pierce Butler,\* had written most powerfully upon the gross injustice of fixing the average for the seven years preceding 1821, but though the honourable and learned writer had successfully exposed the false data upon which the bill was founded, yet as he was not a lawyer, he did not detect the important distinctions between the sums *paid*, and that *agreed* to be paid, during the seven years upon which the average is struck ; and every one knew there was some difference (particularly in Ireland) between sums *paid*, and sums *agreed* to be paid. (Hear, hear.) And it was also to be considered that the term of years for ascertaining the average included two or three of the years in which agricultural produce was higher than it had ever been in Ireland before or since ; and then, how was the average to be ascertained, supposing the principle unobjectionable ? Why, by commissioners, who were to average every acre in the parish, and for which they were to receive each thirty shillings per day. By that provision every man of property would be at the mercy of the commissioners ; and for himself, he (Mr. O'Connell) would be glad to have the commissioners his friends, but most certainly would dread their enmity, in having his property subject to their valuation.

"Really, thirty shillings per day to gentlemen, paid for riding through the parish, amusing themselves, and exercising their strange boasted authority, would be so desirable a mode of killing time, that he (Mr. O'Connell) feared the seven years allowed for ascertaining the practicability of the measure would expire before every acre in the parish was valued.

"From the clause, that whatever sum should be awarded was to have precedence of every other engagement or claim, it appeared as if

\* The recently deceased and lamented Colonel Butler, M.P., county Kilkenny.



the anxiety of the framers of this bill was directed principally to the minister's protection and aggrandisement, "he (the minister) being permitted to re-value and obtain the highest price of the day, should he become dissatisfied with the former allowance. It was calculated that by this bill one half of the property of the country would be enjoyed by the clergy, and he (Mr. O'Connell) was one of those who thought they had quite enough already; nor would he quarrel with the person, whoever he might be, that would say the clergymen had *too much* tithes.

#### "EXTENSION OF THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION.

"MR. O'CONNELL next gave notice of a motion for the appointment of a committee to devise measures for the purpose of extending the Catholic Association throughout every county in Ireland, as he conceived the Catholic cause would be benefited by every county coming simultaneously forward next session, with their petitions to Parliament.

"The misery of Ireland has, within these few years particularly, been increasing in proportion to the prosperity of other countries. France, in her finances and trade, was at that moment the most flourishing nation in Europe. Owing to the apathy of the British ministry, she had exterminated liberty on the Continent, and driven her from her last hold; she had secured the most imposing military positions; she commands the coast from Cadiz to Dunkirk, from any port of which she can leave at pleasure, with her countless forces. The British navy, in its proudest days, could not blockade such an extent of coast as France now possesses; and whether her hostility to England was a mark of gratitude or not, was immaterial. (Hear.) But with such facilities and powerful means, and having previously secured the alliance of MARSHAL ROCK, she might, on a landing at Bantry Bay, prove an infinitely more formidable enemy than ministers appeared to think.

"He (Mr. O'Connell) was of opinion that a connexion with England would be beneficial to Ireland; but he wished it to be a fair and just connexion; and he conceived his allegiance to the BRITISH MONARCH obliged him to express his apprehensions and opinions for the safety of the empire, and to caution England against continuing her intolerant opposition to the rights of the Irish nation, thus making for France an ally so near her in the Irish peasantry, who should rather be made a portion of England's strength.

"He thought that when the Catholic Association was extended through Ireland, they might simultaneously send forward a petition to

Parliament every fortnight; for, unhappily, there was no want of subject or matter for such petitions.

" CATHOLIC BURYING GROUND.

" When MR. O'CONNELL was about to hand in his notices, MR. CONROY reminded him of the rights of sepulture; upon which MR. O'CONNELL observed that the subject was certainly one of paramount importance.

" Late occurrences had shown that opportunities were eagerly sought for, and every pretext laid hold of to humble the Catholics, and remind them of their degraded condition. They were not content with oppressing Catholics when living, but they must insult them when dead. He had no doubt of the Catholic's rights, as stated in his published opinion, and which he learned was assailed, in his absence, by some person who withheld his name. It was not his (Mr. O'Connell's) habit to reply to communications addressed to him anonymously, or he would have something to occupy him; but if any barrister, or other person, would contend with him openly, he should be able to support his opinion, and dissipate such objections as had yet been put forward.

" To be sure, he heard it gravely asserted that the church-yard was the clergyman's freehold, and he could do as he pleased with it; and so he (Mr. O'Connell) always understood that a man could make what use he pleased of his own freehold; but he had yet to learn whether a clergyman could plough up the burying-ground, and sow turnips in it: and yet he was told it was his freehold. If he could appropriate the ground to sowing turnips or other vegetables, yet he doubted whether such an occupation would be as productive as *sowing Papists* (laughter); for the *freehold of St. James's*, he was informed, produced the minister near a couple of thousand a-year.

" The Catholics should get rid of such unfeeling and unnatural irritation; and the means by which they could do so would be, to form an association for the purchase of ground, to serve as an asylum where their bones might be deposited with the forms of Christian burial, without fear of insult, and where the Irish Catholics might enjoy the exercise of a religious ceremony of which *they only, of the whole Christian world, were deprived.* (Hear, hear, hear.)

" Catholics should know that the burying-grounds were not consecrated by the Protestants, but by the Catholics; and it is because they were so, that Catholics continue being buried in the present graveyards. Catholic bishops could again consecrate burying-grounds, the revenue of which, instead of being given to enable their enemies to pur-

chase *The Evening Mail*, and insult the Catholics, may be applied to some Catholic charity (great applause); and then the BISHOP OF DUBLIN and the SEXTON OF ST. KEVIN'S may be left to arrange the expulsion of Catholic clergymen from church-yards. He mentioned the BISHOP OF DUBLIN, because it was between him and the SEXTON; but he could not say what portion of the honour each was entitled to. The glorious distinction was not exclusively theirs, however; for the same revolting and unchristian-like interference had extended lately through several parts of the kingdom; and really those who valued the peace and tranquillity of Ireland should be anxious for such an establishment as would preclude the necessity of employing the police, or increasing their numbers.

“It was never so much the practice as at present to call for the interference of the *Peelers*. Whether to distrain or collect tithes, to drive for rent or execute any civil process, the criminal and military authorities must have a share in the proceedings; and if, in addition to these services, they give the Catholics a military escort with their funeral processions, the armed guardians of Ireland must be prodigiously increased, and perhaps on such occasions, having to bury *one*, may cause the death of *many*; and therefore, instead of paying for the privilege of being insulted, the Catholics should endeavour to avoid the opportunities of giving or receiving offence.

“He should, therefore, give notice of a motion for appointing a committee to take measures for the purchase of ground for a Catholic cemetery, and against which there was no statute. There was one against burying in old abbeys; but he believed that was remedied by the act of '93.

“After thanks to the Chairman (says the report) the meeting adjourned; the three months and a-half recess not having given birth to any projects for carrying on the agitation on the part of any other member.”

The following Saturday—the usual day of adjournment—Mr. O'Connell redeemed some of the foregoing notices:—

“CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION—Nov. 8, 1828.

“LAURENCE CLINCH, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

“MR. O'CONNELL opened the business of the day, by observing, that as he had given five notices of motions for that day's discussion, it was his privilege to take them in such order as he pleased; and he

should commence with one upon which he did not anticipate any difference of sentiment in the meeting.

“ The motion was—‘ That the thanks of the Association be returned to the author of the pamphlet in vindication of the Roman Catholics of Ireland’—a work in which its author evinces more talent, more genuine liberality, and more command of his subject, than, perhaps, any other writer who has laboured in the same cause.

“ He fearlessly asserts what Catholics believe to be true, while he treats with decent respect the belief of others ; and in handling with a happy and dignified sarcasm the vulgar and bigoted prejudices that exist against his countrymen, he forcibly and successfully vindicates their principles ! From amongst the numerous, unfounded, and illiberal charges daily issuing from the vile press of their opponents, he has selected such as appeared to have any claim to be considered serious accusations ; and he (Mr. O'Connell) should mention them in the order they appeared in the work itself, for the purpose of showing to the Association how important it was the charges should be collected and replied to.

“ The first charge was, the late miracles or (should he call them) extraordinary cures. If upon that subject there happened a mistake, was it reasonable its consequences should fall upon the Catholic body, or that it should be imputed to them ? The reality of the cure had been admitted on all sides. Mrs. Stuart was most dangerously ill, and in a few moments was restored to perfect health ; that is a fact not doubted. Then as to the manner of cure, Doctor Cheyne and others might call it natural, and also contend that the circumstance of a person who lay at the point of death, and was instantly restored to health, had no connexion with the sacrifice of the Mass ; but was it to be believed, that from any species of credulity such a man as Doctor Murray would be capable of contriving an imposition or publishing a falsehood, and that the lady herself, and the other persons who have attested what they saw, were perjurers. If credit was to be denied to them, he did not know what was to become of human testimony.

“ It had been his duty, from a professional course of many years, to draw matters of fact, as resulting from human evidence ; and more credible testimony than theirs he never saw offered to a public tribunal of justice.

“ Mrs. Stuart had confined herself for life, from religious motives, and could have no object to gain by condemning herself to punishment hereafter. She is a Catholic, and believes in the intercession of her Redeemer, whom she appealed to for the truth of her deposition ; and could they believe she would daily approach the celebration of his sacri-

face with perjury upon her lips? He (Mr. O'Connell) was told that day, in the hall of the Four Courts, by a respectable gentleman, that Mrs. Stuart had been dead for some time past.

“MR. O'GORMAN here observed, that report was generally circulated throughout the country.

“He asked him (Mr. O'Connell) if he believed in the cure? and upon telling him he did, the gentleman went off without hearing him as to his reasons for so believing.

“He had dwelt upon that topic rather long, because he considered it one of importance to Ireland; and though he believed the cure a miraculous one, yet he quarrelled with no one who believed it to be natural. But not so with the intolerant scurrilous fanatics who have reviled and calumniated one of the meekest and least pretending of men—a prelate of a mild and humane disposition, unobtrusive and peaceable habits, whose splendid talents and scholastic acquirements have been ever exercised for the good of his species, and the advancement of Christianity. (Hear, hear.) HE—the scholar of Him from whose example he has learned meekness and humbleness of heart—HE, the metropolitan head of the Catholic Church, has been assailed with a virulence disgraceful to any but the vile Orange press of Dublin. Oh! what a frightful state of society, when persons are found capable of traducing such characters as Doctor Murray, merely because he should sanction, by the authority of his name, what he knew to be true, and what he (Mr. O'Connell) hoped Parliament would appoint a commission to inquire into.

“In the pamphlet of which he (Mr. O'Connell) spoke, how finely pourtrayed was that amiable quality, Christian forbearance; and how mildly opposed to volumes of personal abuse! Doctor Doyle had not replied—he had merely written an apology for the Catholic belief, that the arm of God is not now less powerful than when it created the world, however infidels may coalesce to destroy that belief, by impious ribaldry.

“The next charge against the Catholics, and against which Doctor Doyle had so admirably and effectively vindicated them, is—‘That the Catholic religion is anti-Christian, and is so slavish as to unfit its professors for the enjoyment of freedom;’ and never was a charge more distinctly or happily refuted than by the reply, that that religion cannot be anti-Christian with which Christianity began; nor slavish, which first disseminated freedom, in establishing the British constitution; nor slavish, which established with it free states, before they became monarchical; and monarchical governments, before they became absolute.

“The inestimable disquisition upon tithes he (Mr. O'Connell) could not sufficiently panegyrize. The author had satisfactorily proved that

they were not of divine right, but of human institution (hear) ; and that they are some of the blessings for which Ireland is indebted to English civilization.

“ He has shown that the Irish supported the clergy respectably before the institution of tithes : and he has also established beyond contradiction, that when tithes were instituted, they were appropriated to the purposes of repairing and building churches, and in support of the poor ; and that the innovation pompously, but erroneously, styled the ‘ Reformation,’ took from the poor that benefit, whilst it threw upon them all the expenses of church repairs. (Hear, hear, hear.) The wicked insinuation that Catholic leaders had endeavoured to instigate a rebellion, it was unnecessary for him (Mr. O’Connell) to say how triumphantly he (the author of the pamphlet) had refuted. If the Catholics were a slavish race, and suffering under their bondage, was it rebellion to tell their oppressors they felt the weight of their chains ?

“ Was it, in Ireland, false, unfounded, or wicked, to tell the people they were persecuted, oppressed, and unhappy ?—or was the information new to them ? (Hear, hear.) Are *they* not rather the *promoters* of disturbance *who daily* proclaim their privilege to irritate and insult the population of Ireland, and threaten them with extermination should they seek to emerge from that debasement ? Are *they* not the disturbers of Ireland who seek to perpetuate her grievances ? (Hear, hear, hear.)

“ The Catholics were charged with wishing to oppose the progress of education. It was a peculiarity of the English character, that liberality was an attribute said exclusively to belong to the Protestant religion, and that the Catholic was the reverse. But did those who argued so forget that a Catholic state was the first to proclaim liberty of conscience ? (Hear, hear.) Did they forget Catholic Maryland ? Did they forget that Catholic Hungary first gave emancipation to Protestants, who, though but one-third of the population, enjoy equal privileges, and are free from tithes to the Catholic Church ; whilst at the same time, their ministers are paid by the state in proportion to their flock ? That, as an example, might be praised by Protestants ; but remained unimitated. (Hear, hear.)

“ Do the exclusively liberal Protestants forget that in Catholic France the Protestant clergyman has one-fifth more salary than the Catholic ; for where the Catholic clergyman has about £80, the Protestant has £100, upon the liberal feeling that the latter, being privileged to marry, may have a family ?—and do they forget that in Catholic France Protestants are eligible to fill every public situation ? (Hear, hear.)

“ Do they forget that in Catholic Bavaria, the Protestants were emancipated ? Do they forget that in the history of any Protestant

state, there are no such instances of liberality to be found, and that wherever the Protestants have the upper hand, the Catholics are a persecuted race. Oh, but in Protestant London, they tell you there is liberty of conscience; for there every one has permission to embrace any form of religion he pleases. Why, it is true; but the same privilege exists at Constantinople, in China, and even in Madrid, where, by the supineness and criminal apathy of the English ministry, the Inquisition was re-established. If such were called the liberty of conscience, he considered it the groundwork of fanatic bigotry.

“The Orange press was not sufficiently strong already, but they must have an additional ally in a new newspaper; but certainly one whose weapons were also new, for in it there was a decency of expression, and some references to facts, of which the other Orange papers were entirely destitute. In that paper it was stated that the cause of the Catholics opposing the Kildare-street Association was, because they could not exclude the Scriptures entirely from the schools. Now, that was a gross misrepresentation, for the Catholics never required any such unreasonable concession: all they asked was, that Bibles should not be *forced* upon Catholic children, contrary to the consent of their pastors (hear, hear); and he would then pledge himself to the Kildare-street Association (here he hoped he should be reported correctly, for some papers in Ireland were singularly inaccurate in that respect), that if they did not *FORCE upon Catholic children the Bible without note or comment, and against the consent of the Catholic clergy, he would bring them a phalanx of subscribers and supporters!*

“To every unprejudiced person it must be evident that the tender, uninformed minds of children were ill-calculated for the perusal of a work that frequently caused distraction and delusion in the adult, and which, if given to children to read as task punishments, must, instead of respect, create in them disgust for a work that should never be alluded to but with affectionate reverence and admiration. (Hear, hear, hear.)

“(MR. O’GORMAN here exclaimed, the practice was really impious.)

“Upon every point, Doctor Doyle, in his pamphlet, had ably met and refuted their opponents; and so eagerly was it read, and so high was its character, that (what was very unusual in Ireland) the first edition had met such a sale as not to leave one unsold in the hands of the publisher; and such was the force and overpowering weight of its arguments, that their opponents were reduced, as a last experiment to prevent its circulation or coming before the English eye, to proclaim it not worth reading.

“There was, however, one passage in it which might be an excep-

tion to its general merits—the compliment paid to him (Mr. O'Connell); but if the author seriously intended to compliment him, that was a sufficient recompense for the ridicule of his (Mr. O'Connell's) Orange panegyrist; and he would desire no better character from his country than the approbation of such a man as Doctor Doyle. It might be a good subject for laughter that he had praised the pamphlet, because the pamphlet had praised him; but the pamphlet was as much above his praise as he despised the ridicule of a press that never rose above Billingsgate phraseology but to tell an unvarnished falsehood.

“MR. O'CONNELL, then moved the resolution of thanks to the author of the pamphlet ‘In vindication of the Catholics of Ireland.’

“The motion was then put and carried unanimously.

#### “BURIAL GROUNDS.

“MR. O'CONNELL said, the subject of the *burying ground*, though not next in order, he should bring forward, because the necessity for its adoption was more pressing than the others.

“Since the last day of meeting, he had looked into all the law authorities upon the subject; and he was happy to inform them, that neither by the common, statute, nor ecclesiastical laws were there any obstacles opposed to their having a piece of ground where their remains might be deposited without the eternal recurrence of insult, to which they were at present subject. He did not wish to make it exclusively Catholic; for as the Catholics were desirous not to be separated in this life from their brethren of other persuasions, neither did they wish to be divided from them in their passage from this to another world. It was intended to be open to the deceased of every sect, where perfect freedom of religious rites might console the living, and, according to his (Mr. O'Connell's) creed, assist the dead.

“The knowledge that those rites would be obtained might render death itself less terrible to those who know that even to the grave they are prevented by sectarian intolerance. The fact was very well known and felt, that burial fees were excessively exorbitant. In the case of Mr. D'Arcy, his friends paid no less a sum than *ten pounds* burial fees, for which, indeed, they had the privilege of seeing his remains insulted. The immense revenues arising from that source of emolument, the Catholics might divert from the pockets of their enemies. Those revenues might be applied to the liquidation of the necessary expenses, in the first instance, and the surplus go to the formation of a fund for the support of Catholic and other charities—a consideration which could not fail to be grateful to the benevolent mind and soothe the agonies of



a sick bed. There was no legal obstacle to carrying their object into effect; there was nothing to prevent their having a burying-ground out of the precincts of a town. It was true, there was a statute preventing the opening of a new burying-ground within the city, but that had no relation to particular religious sects. For very obvious reasons it applied to objects of health, and no clergyman could complain of the diminution of his revenues.

“ In the reign of King James I. a clergyman, in a parish in London, brought an action against the friends of a person who died in his (the clergyman’s parish), but was buried in another; when it was decided by the Ecclesiastical Court that the suit should not go on; and the Court of King’s Bench granted a prohibition against the suit. He had reason to know that some very respectable and influential persons interested themselves in the present project, in order to prevent, as much as lay within their power, that constant irritation which it was the object of their enemies to create.

“ One gentleman had waited upon him (Mr. O’Connell), and had offered him *the fee simple of twenty acres of common, near Clondalkin*; and there might to that be attached a chapel, where the dead in that burying-ground would be prayed for; and around the ground might be built a wall, and with the constant watching of a sufficient number of persons, the remains of mortality would be secure from being disturbed for the purposes for which they are at present used; and as the law gives the power, they could find no difficulty in getting sixty or seventy persons to subscribe £50 each, at the highest interest, for the purpose of enclosing the ground, building the chapel, &c.; and that sum it will not be necessary to pay but by instalments, and as they may be wanting; and the revenue of the ground could be handed over as a security. Even as a trading speculation, he conceived there would be no difficulty in obtaining a sufficient number of persons to undertake the speculation, when, if it be true that a single church-yard in Dublin produces £2,000 a-year, and paid by nine-tenths of the inhabitants of Dublin, the establishment, he conceived, would have the effect of diminishing that revenue which was not at present employed as it might be, and a certainty of directing it to meritorious purposes.

“ The origin of churchyard fees (said the learned gentleman) was not a little curious, when it was sought to exclude the Catholics from those privileges established by their ancestors. In Catholic times the canon law guarded against the payment of churchyard fees, and they were considered an imposition; but monasteries having churchyards attached to them, persons when dying directed they should be buried in them, and left money in order to have themselves prayed for; but

at the Reformation the monasteries were abolished, and the fees were continued; and even Doctor Magee was content to receive those monastic dues, handed down by a preposterous reformation, which leaves the taxes, yet takes the value.

“MR. O'CONNELL then moved for the appointment of a committee of five, to adopt measures for carrying into effect the establishing of a general burying ground.

#### “TITHES.

“MR. O'CONNELL gave notice of a motion for preparing a petition to Parliament, praying the enactment of a law to compel the clergy to take their tithe in kind, particularly as related to potatoes, in which the miserable peasantry were considerably harassed and defrauded, the custom having been to leave every tenth ridge, or every tenth spade's length, for the tithe; but by a recent decree of the court at CASHEL, the peasant was obliged, in addition to giving so large a portion of his property, to have the labour of digging them also; and such a grievance was this felt that Mr. CROTTY, whom every body knew, and who Mr. BLACKER so bedaubed with praises for what nobody could sell, was offered ten shillings with each lot, besides the tithe, and to take it in kind, which he refused.”

We should have inserted before, had we observed strict order of dates, an opinion of Mr. O'Connell's respecting the vexed question of Catholic funeral ceremonies in Protestant churchyards, which appeared in the Dublin papers about the end of September. But the opinion has strict relevance to the speech which follows it here:—

#### “RIGHTS OF SEPULTURE.

“An opinion has been obtained from MR. O'CONNELL on this question, which, as it is one of very deep interest, we lose no time in laying before the public:—

“There is no statute law preventing a Catholic priest from praying for a deceased Catholic in a churchyard. The mistake on this subject originated in a misapprehension (frequently a wilful one) of the statute of the 21st and 22nd of the late king, cap. 24, sec. 8. But that section contains no prohibition.

“It is not, in itself, any enactment of a positive or affirmative nature. It operates merely by way of exception, and it simply *deprives* such Catholic priest as may “*officiate at a funeral in church or churchyard*” of the benefits conferred by that act.

“Now, no Catholic priest does at present want the benefit of that act at all. It is, in truth, now a dead letter, remaining, with much similar lumber, on the statute book—

creating no rights, constituting no privations, unless in its enactments, nugatory in its exceptions.

“The next question asked me is, whether the praying for the dead by a Catholic priest at a funeral or in a churchyard, is prohibited by the common law ?

“My answer is, THAT IT IS NOT. The Catholic religion had pre-existence in the common law ; it was adopted into the common law, as part and parcel of that law. So the law continued until what is called the Reformation, in the reign of Henry VIII.

“The Catholic religion being thus part and parcel of the common law, it follows, necessarily, that praying for the dead could not be prohibited either at funerals, in churchyards, or elsewhere. On the contrary, it was at common law part of the duty of the priest, and he was bound to pray for the dead at funerals and in churchyards. And it was reciprocally one of the rights of the King's subjects at common law to have prayers said for the dead, by Catholic priests, at funerals and in churchyards.

“Thus, such prayers not being prohibited, but, on the contrary, being enjoined at common law, and there being no statute to forbid such praying, it follows as a matter of course, that no Catholic priest can be legally prevented from praying for a deceased Catholic at a funeral in a churchyard.

“The next question turns upon the mode of redress, should a Catholic priest be prevented from *thus* officiating. As to that—

“I am of opinion (but with some doubt) that an action would lie at the suit of the executors of the deceased against any person who prevented a Catholic priest from praying in the churchyard, over the body of their testator.

“But as I am unwilling to advise litigation where it may be avoided, I think the best remedy would be found in the peaceful, but determined assertion of the right. Let the friends of the deceased peaceably surround the priest and the body during the service. Let any violence which may arise come from the *preventing* parties, and then the individuals to whom that violence may be used will have a distinct right of action, or may proceed by indictment against the persons who use force.

“In many counties there may be the natural and usual apprehension that the magistrates, *tinged* (to speak moderately) with Orange, may not do strict justice to the Catholics on any occasion of this sort. In every such case, the indictment, as soon as found, should be removed by *certiorari* into the King's Bench, Dublin, where every body is sure of meeting impartial justice.

“If grand juries, acting on a *similar* bad feeling, throw out the bills of indictment, the Court of King's Bench, upon the making out, by affidavit, a proper case for that purpose, will grant a criminal information.

“Thus it will be found that there are abundant means for the Catholics to maintain this their undoubted right. I am decidedly of opinion that it ought to be asserted. The Catholics may as well at once abandon the tombs of their fathers and relatives, as submit to the petty and tyrannical bigotry which now seeks *unjustly and illegally* to deprive them, at moments of the greatest and most bitter sorrow, of the awful but melancholy consolations of their holy religion.

“I therefore repeat my decided opinion, that the Catholics have a right to these prayers, and that such right *should be exerted with determination, but peaceably and without any illegal violence whatever.*

“ ‘ DANIEL O'CONNELL. ’ ”

On Saturday, the 15th of November, the meeting of the Association was (by the reports by the newspapers) more numerously attended, and comprised more of the rank and wealth of the Catholic body, than upon any previous occasion.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15<sup>TH</sup>, 1823.

“ EDMOND POWER, of Gorteen, County Tipperary, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

“ MR. O'CONNELL, in presenting the report from the committee appointed to carry into effect the resolutions respecting the burial

ground, hoped that from the terms of the resolution, it would not be understood that the graveyard was intended to be one for the exclusive use of Catholics; for nothing could be further from their thoughts than a desire to follow the example of those who pursue their rancorous hostility towards Catholics even to the grave.

“ In wishing to preserve the ashes of their relatives and friends from unfeeling indignity and insult, it was not their wish to do so by separating from their Protestant brethren, either in this or the next world. It was their duty as well as interest to promote union, and dissipate irritation amongst Irishmen. It was upon that principle the Catholic Association was founded. It was their object to subvert that principle of perfidious persecution so much at large through all the constituted authorities, from the highest officer to the commonest constable, merely because the Catholics adhere to a religion which they believe to be true.

“ It was the interest and wish of the Catholic Association to abolish, as much as with them lay, all causes of domestic irritation, at a time when England was about to be arrayed against a world of perfect despotism, in which kings were every thing, and the people nothing. It was equally the inclination as the duty of the Catholics of Ireland to support that country which in Europe stands alone a bright exception to the rule of *legitimate* despotism, spite of Toryism and oligarchy, the progenitors of continental tyranny, and of that Machiavelian policy which, in France, prevented them from at once annihilating the remnant of liberty, in order the more effectually to extinguish it by frequent encroachments on the charter said to have been given by the King, as if it were not the people who create the king.

“ The day of retribution had at length arrived to the English Tories. They must now fight for their places and pensions. They must fight for the cotton trade of England, or give up South America to the holy leaguers. To preserve their places, they must preserve English independence; and to effect either, English liberty must vanquish that monster of iniquity, *legitimate* despotism. To preserve their places, the Tory ministry must abandon the characteristic principle of their imbecile policy—injustice to Ireland. England cannot suffer her right arm (Ireland) to remain paralyzed by sectarian persecutions and political degradation. Ireland must not longer continue the point of England's weakness, instead of being a portion of her strength. Instead of turning her bayonets upon—he would not call them a discontented peasantry—but a disgusted and terrified population, England must hold out the hand of fellowship, and purchase, with equal laws and equal rights, that co-operation and that friendship, without which she cannot support

her independence against holy leagues, divine rights, and monarchical despotism.

“The interests and objects of the Catholic Association (however they might be calumniated) were to effect that desirable change, by obtaining the abolition of Catholic grievances, which, if they could not remove in a mass, they might by fragments. He, therefore, would take them in detail, and commence with that one upon which a committee had prepared a report, which he should then have the honour of presenting.

“It was a subject upon which a Catholic of sensibility could hardly trust himself to speak in public; for a man might suffer an injury to himself, but he (Mr. O’Connell) pitied the wretch who could tamely witness the bones of his friend trampled under the hoofs of Orangeism; and he confessed he had no great reverence for the founder of such anti-Christian persecution, however Doctor Magee might value the distinction.

“That learned prelate, when Dean of Cork, was the first who carried the persecution of Catholics to the extremity of insulting them when about to join their kindred earth; but the priest, through whom the insult was to be conveyed, conscious that neither the legislature nor the Protestants would countenance the gratuitous and unfeeling indignity (hear, hear, from Colonel Butler), firmly but temperately refused compliance with the intolerant mandate; and here he (Mr. O’Connell) would not omit repeating an anecdote connected with that occurrence. Doctor Magee upon that occasion went to the churchyard himself, for the purpose of prohibiting the clergyman to officiate; and when there, he saw a poor woman gathering dried leaves that had fallen from the trees. He inquired from her for what purpose she wanted them; and when she informed him they were to sell for manure, he turned her out, and sent his own servant to gather them. There he acted legally; no one could say otherwise, for the churchyard was his freehold, as some lawyers will have it, and he had an undoubted right to the leaves. He was left his right; the leaves were his, but the Catholic corpse was not. He succeeded there, because he ought to do so. He triumphed over the old woman, but shrunk from the people who surrounded the funeral; and while in Cork he no more attempted the insult, but in Dublin he revived it.

“To be sure, he was drinking the waters of Cheltenham when it was attempted in Dublin; and he, therefore, considered himself authorized to deny to the people of England that he had any participation in the outrage; but had he DENIED it in Dublin? He (Mr. O’Connell) wished most sincerely that he could do so. No man would be more ready to

give him credit for it ; and the prelate would thereby redeem himself from an attempt to create more serious discontent amongst the people of Ireland, than any other occurrence since the infamous violation of the treaty of Limerick.

“ The committee had endeavoured to perform the duty committed to them on the subject of a burial ground ; and their first consideration was the law of the case ; and if his legal reputation was of any value to him, he would pledge it, that there was no point of law to prevent their having burying grounds.

“ Having ascertained that necessary preliminary, their next object was, whether they could procure the ground wanted ; and upon inquiry they found many pieces of ground, of three or four acres, in different situations, and within such distances of the city as would answer their purpose. It had been communicated to them that burial grounds in several directions, and in proportion to the population of the district, would be more advantageous than one general burial ground for the city. The committee were of opinion that upon a subject requiring so much information, and in order to carry it fully into effect in the way most advantageous, the committee should have power to add to their number, and also to request the co-operation of Doctor MURRAY.”

The following was their

“ REPORT.

“ Your Committee have endeavoured diligently to attend to the duty committed to them. They have entered zealously into the views of the Association. They have felt it a pleasing duty to assist in calming the public mind, agitated by a species of persecution novel in its nature, and afflicting in its application. They have been desirous to take away this new subject of irritation, which has been unhappily introduced in our times, as if the Catholics were not already sufficiently afflicted, or as if it were not deemed sufficient to oppress and degrade the living, without offering insult and outrage to the dead.

“ We, Catholics, have been deeply anxious to obviate this new source of animosity and resentment. Our first wish has ever been to reconcile our countrymen of all denominations. We wish to live on terms of amity and affection with our Protestant fellow-countrymen. We earnestly desire to be united with them in our lives, and not to be separated from them in death.

“ But there is a different spirit abroad. Men who call themselves ministers of the God of charity, and who receive the good things of this world in great abundance for making that profession, have clothed themselves in the garb of the demon of discord, and have exercised a vicious ingenuity, in order to discover a new method of outraging the feelings of a religious and faithful people. They have gone beyond the letter, or even the spirit of the penal code, and have found out another mode of persecution, which the laws of man cannot sanction, and the laws of charity must condemn.

“ Under these circumstances, we have felt it our duty as faithful subjects, anxious to maintain public peace and private tranquillity, to devise means of avoiding these occasions of irritation or violence. The genius of bigotry has deprived us, in this our native land, of our fair and just share in the administration of municipal and public trusts. We have been and are unjustly deprived of our station as freemen, because of our adherence to the religion of our ancestors ; and now we are obliged to quit the tombs of those ancestors,

and abandon the melancholy consolation of laying our bones with theirs, and relinquish all hope of ever resting in the same spot with them, because of our anxiety to preserve peace, and avoid the occasions of ill-will, of hatred, and of strife.

"Animated by these sentiments, your committee has entered upon the performance of its duties. It is enabled with confidence to state:—

"First.—That there are no legal obstacles to prevent the Catholics from acquiring two or more tracts of land, in the vicinage of Dublin, for the purpose of converting them into burial grounds.

"Secondly.—That there are no practical difficulties in the way of procuring sufficient quantities of land for this purpose.

"Your Committee next beg leave to recommend to the Association, either to continue the present Committee, with augmented numbers, or to appoint a new and enlarged Committee, in order to carry into practical effect the present object.

"We take leave to suggest that the new Committee should be directed to solicit, in the most respectful manner, the co-operation of his Grace the Archbishop, the Most Rev. Doctor MURRAY, and of the Catholic rectors of the several parishes in this city, and to arrange with these reverend personages the best mode of raising the necessary funds, and of appointing proper trustees, and of arranging all the details which will be found necessary to effectuate our purpose with expedition and security.

"As we have reason to be convinced that the necessary funds can easily be procured, we deem it right to suggest, that the Committee should be authorized immediately to advertise for quantities of land, in parcels of not less than two, and not more than three acres; such parcels to be all situate within two miles, in any direction, of the Castle of Dublin.

"And this we respectfully submit as our report.

"DANIEL O'CONNELL, Chairman.

"15th November, 1823."

"MR. O'GORMAN (Secretary) reminded Mr. O'Connell of three notices, saved for him from the last day:—tithes; the extension of the Association; and the appointment of a committee to procure evidence in support of the petition, to be presented by Earl Grey, upon the administration of justice in Ireland.

"MR. CONWAY thought the tithe subject might be put off, as it was to be considered next session of parliament.

"MR. O'CONNELL was of opinion that the reason given by Mr. Conway for not entertaining the question, was only one why they should petition, not against the bill, but *the principle upon which it was founded.*

"The bill was impracticable, and its provisions excessively oppressive. The most galling and serious grievance of the tithe system was, the inability of the peasant to oblige the clergyman to receive his tithe in kind. If there was such a provision, the peasant would escape the fangs of the tithe proctor; but that would not serve the purposes of the rapacious gentry who live by the commotions of discontent of the lower orders.

"That he (Mr. O'Connell) was not exaggerating, he referred to the instance of the well-known Parson Morrit, who was offered, by the peasantry of Skibbereen, his tithe in kind, with ten shillings an acre, which he refused. What he (Mr. O'Connell) had stated, was given in evi-

dence upon oath before a committee of the House of Commons, and was not refuted by any one.

“ Within a few days, a most extraordinary instance of the unaccommodating and heartless spirit with which tithes are exacted from the peasantry, had come to his knowledge personally. He was not then at liberty to mention the name of the gentleman from whom he had received the information; but if it were necessary, he could do so in a few days. He (Mr. O'Connell) had been written to by a gentleman from the country, who stated that a Parson Morgan, of his parish, had received £1,200 per annum, in compensation for a portion of his tithes; and in consequence, he (the writer) had served the parson with a notice to take his tithe in kind (as Mr. Scully had advised). But the parson refused taking the tithe in kind, because being corn, and owing to the state of the weather, it had been stacked, instead of leaving it on the ground, where in a few days it would have been rotted. The writer, in order not to furnish the parson with any excuse, had, when giving him notice, taken care to pull down the stack, and give him his choice; but as the corn had been in stack, the parson refused taking it, and, in consequence, cited the gentleman, who was determined to fight him out, for the benefit of his Catholic tenantry.

“ Yet these are the men who bewail the turbulence, and deprecate the discontents of the Irish peasantry, who, harassed under such paltry pretences, as that the tithes were *saved* for the parson, are occasionally driven to excesses, whose consequences none feel more heavily than themselves.

“ He (Mr. O'Connell) was not sorry the new tithe bill had passed, for it afforded an opportunity to touch upon what was long regarded as a prohibited subject, and an invasion of the Church's rights. They (the Catholics) could now expose to the English nation, and to Europe, the oppressions of those, who, through the medium of the vilest press that ever cursed a country, exclaim against Irish civilization and Catholic agitation. It was not possible to conceive a more fruitful source of litigation and oppression than was the tithe system. The common and the ecclesiastical law, instead of being applied to the preservation of the mutual rights of the parson and the peasant, were transformed into the instruments of oppression against the latter; for by the ecclesiastical law, a notice to the clergyman is necessary to oblige him to take his tithe in kind; but the common law says no notice is necessary; and that species of tithe, in which the peasant is most interested, is left without the protection of any statutable provision.

“ Every clergyman cites him to the ecclesiastical court, where he has very little chance of succeeding; and if proceeded against by civil bill,



he must abide the decision, not certainly of the parson, but frequently of the tithe *owner*. But then the peasant is told, he has his remedy, by—*an appeal to the Court of King's Bench, for a prohibition!!!* Certainly a splendid remedy for a poor peasant! But as HORNE TOOKER once replied to LORD KENYON, when the latter told him, 'there was law in England for the poor as well as the rich'—'so the London Tavern is open, but who will get anything to eat in it without money?'

"It would, however, be well for the peasant to know, that under the 12th of Geo. III., if the clergyman was served with forty-eight hours' notice to draw away his tithe in kind, he could not complain of its being stacked, nor demand payment in lieu; but even that act was found to be unavailable, when its provisions were to be decided upon in the ecclesiastical or civil bill courts, for where three villages had given notice to the same clergyman in one day, the courts decided that was *proof of combination!*

"Lord Eldon once told General Matthew, when that point was brought before the consideration of the house, that it was impossible so great an absurdity could ever have been ruled in a court where rational beings presided: and afterwards the practice had been almost generally discontinued; but to his (Mr. O'C.'s) knowledge, it still partially existed. With such inveterate hostility was the peasant pursued by the preachers of Christianity, that where the cause might be decided by civil bill, at a small expense, it is most generally brought into the ecclesiastical court, where the assistant-barrister is frequently vicar-general. Without any disparagement, he would say of the office of assistant-barrister, admitting generally the integrity and capacity of the gentlemen who preside in these courts, that if a system to promote perjury, and the most dangerous immorality were intended, he doubted if it could so well succeed in that object as by means of this jurisdiction.

"In the trial by jury, a *bonus* is given to witnesses to preserve their character—for an honest man's testimony will be received in opposition to twenty men of bad reputation; but in the assistant-barrister's court, it sometimes happens that the man who swears most has most credit. The conscientious witness will hesitate to go further than his belief, if he is not morally sure; but the perjurer, if not at first up to the necessary point, when questioned by the assistant-barrister, is soon brought just within the requisite length to justify the barrister's decree. If he be an honest barrister, he is either confounded by the swearing of numbers on one side, or is delicate in deciding upon his single opinion, against the oaths of many, upon the testimony of one. But amongst twelve men that difficulty does not exist; for they each keep the other in countenance. Many wise men have thought it would be better that

no tribunal should exist for the recovery of small debts ; and that those who gave such credits incautiously, should lose them, rather than such a facility should be given for abusing the solemn appeal to the God of Truth.

“ Before he concluded upon the subject of tithes, he would mention a new hardship to which the peasant would be liable, if the principle contended for by Parson Morgan were established.

“ When tithes were received in kind, it was considered sufficient the peasant should leave every tenth ridge, or tenth spade, and send notice when about to remove his portion : but if he is to forfeit his right to pay in kind, because he should have previously taken any off the ground before serving notice, then he must daily call upon the clergyman before he has dug his daily portion for the use of his family. The peasant begins to dig his potatoes, for his own use, in July, and continues till November, when he gets them in for the winter.

“ Mr. O'Connell then moved, that on that day week, a Committee should be appointed to prepare a petition to parliament, praying for an act to oblige the clergyman to take his tithe in kind, when in potatoes ; and that the old mode of serving notice, when removing the crop, shall be sufficient.”

“ The HON. COLONEL BUTLER spoke in support of Mr. O'Connell's opinions, and cited some cases of hardship.

“ MR. SCANLAN objected to the taking up of the tithe question by the Association ; as being thus made what might be called a *party* grievance, the co-operation of others aggrieved by it, but differing from them in other matters, could not be obtained.

“ MR. DWYER supported Mr. Scanlan's views ; expressing at the same time his belief that to meddle with the tithe question ‘ would rouse the jealousy of the Protestant mind.’

“ MR. O'CONNELL, in reply to the gentlemen who had spoken against the motion, observed that their objection was rather to its form than substance.

“ No man could be called the friend of the Irish peasantry, who would not seek to mitigate the horrors of the tithe system, which they did not hesitate to censure amongst themselves ; nor should the Catholics be dismayed by intelligence (which did not require the respectable authority of Mr. Dwyer to confirm,) that Orange malignity would be increased by Catholics touching upon the subject of tithes.

“ The Catholics had suffered grievously by their apathy ; but it was an experiment, and the consequence was that bigotry reared its thousand heads, and the genius of sectarian persecution stalked forth at noon-day. The Catholic question retrograded. Grey, Bennett, and

Denman, the champions of reform, joined the ranks of Orangemen in persecuting the Irish Attorney-General, who was abused because he had honestly and fearlessly advocated religious liberty in Ireland.

“The Catholics had no reason to fear the secession of their Protestant friends, because they (the Catholics) grappled boldly with their oppressors—nor had they to dread opposition from England, the parent of freedom, who, when she saw men emulous to prove themselves worthy of being her sons, would cheer them in their course.

“There was not an honest man in the country that would refuse his support to the Association, because they had extended their minds to do good to all, to universal utility, and not confine their efforts to sectarian grievances.”

The opposition was then withdrawn, and the motion passed unanimously.

In pursuance of it, Mr. O'Connell moved for his Committee upon Saturday, the twenty-first of November, being the day of adjournment.

---

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 1823.

COUNSELLOR FITZSIMON IN THE CHAIR.

“MR. O'CONNELL, in rising to move for the appointment of the Committee to prepare the petition to parliament for an act to facilitate the mode of offering tithe in kind, felt great pleasure in being able to state, that no measure of the Catholic Association was likely to give such general satisfaction, as a petition upon the subject of tithes.

“Since he last mentioned the subject, he had learned that the difficulties from the clergyman's refusal of tithe in kind, were not confined to the south of Ireland, but existed also in Leinster; and that Protestant as well as Catholic smarted from the tortures of the tithe system.

“The Rev. Mr. Morgan, of whom he made mention upon the last occasion, was resolved to persevere in his refusal of taking tithe in kind, though no less than thirty persons had left it for him, in all whom he served citations to the Bishop's Court. He (Mr. O'Connell) had his information from a most respectable professional gentleman named Carr, of Wexford, and who had authorized him to make use of his name, and refer to the facts in any petition to parliament. When the thirty persons, cited by Mr. Morgan, attended the court, one of the surrogates, Dr. Elgee, was absent, owing to a recent family affliction—his father

had died a few days before. Of this circumstance the thirty persons were not apprised, and they had brought with them three hundred witnesses. The grief and affliction of Dr. Elgee, every one would give him credit for. He could not (it was said upon the opening of the court) take his seat, and the other surrogate refused to hear a single cause in his brother judge's absence, though Mr. Dogherty, king's counsel and recorder of Waterford, was brought down specially by Mr. Carr, upon a fee of *thirty guineas*.

"Suddenly, it was found that Dr. Elgee's grief had subsided, and that he would sit; and upon his doing so, how did he proceed to business? Why, by calling on a case to which there was no appearance! It was the case of a gentleman, named Frizell, who, from some particular cause, could not appear personally, but by his attorney, who had paid five guineas to a proctor, for permission to use his name. Upon Dr. Elgee's being told who appeared for Mr. Frizell, he inquired had he (the attorney) his proxy (a form of appointing a proctor's proxy), for no attorney will be permitted to practise in a bishop's court, unless he has gone to the expense of qualifying as a proctor. Well, there was no proxy; and the attorney who had paid the five guineas to the proctor would not be heard, and as soon as the doctor had despatched Mr. Frizell and his five guineas, he grew sorrowful again; his grief returned and it was impossible he could hear Mr. Dogherty, the king's counsel, on the part of thirty persons, attended by three hundred witnesses.

"The effect of the doctor's grief having subsided was the dismissal of the counsel at thirty guineas, the attorney at five guineas, and the three hundred and thirty persons who attended at the loss of their time; and the only case he would hear *was the one in which there was no appearance*.

"He (Mr. O'Connell) submitted, could there be anything conceived more cruel than the operation of a machine that moved by such a system.

"Mr. O'Connell then moved the appointment of the Committee, when the following gentlemen were nominated:—

"Messrs. Shiel, Ronayne, Mullen, Clinch, John M'Donnell, Lynch, and Corley, with the mover and seconder."

"MR. SHIEL then brought forward and spoke to a motion for 'a Committee to devise the necessary measures for recovering, through the medium of the existing laws, the Catholics' rights to admission into Protestant corporations.'

"COUNSELLOR RONAYNE (the late Dominick Ronayne, M. P., for Clonmel), seconded the motion.

“MR. O’CONNELL, before the question was put in the negative, begged to observe, that it was now thirty years since Catholics became entitled to the freedom of the city, and yet there was no instance of a Catholic having that privilege from the corporation.

“He could with confidence assure the Catholics there was no legal obstacle to their possessing and exercising that right; but whenever he had mentioned it, he found the most disgraceful apathy prevail, and sometimes the objection started that is now occasionally urged, namely to confine themselves to seeking for general emancipation by the hack-nied mode of an annual petition.

“He at one time called a meeting of respectable Catholic merchants and others at a place, not that where the Catholics were used to assemble. They all appeared sensible of the importance of the object, talked a great deal, but *did nothing*—and at length he (Mr. O’C.) disgusted at such inertness, set about and discovered a Catholic named Cole, who was qualified to claim his freedom. He (Mr. O’C.) commenced legal proceedings, and Mr. Costello, as an attorney, lent his assistance; whilst he (Mr. O’C.) was seconded at the bar by Mr. Woulfe. He (Mr. O’C.) paid the expenses; and just as they had attained their point in the King’s Bench, poor Cole died, and upon that occasion, Sir Harcourt Lees announced in his paper, that *Providence had specially interfered to preserve the Corporation from the contamination of Popery*, by the admission of a Catholic amongst them.

“It was not like the recent miracles by which persons were restored from infirmity to health; but in this it was a transference from health to death. This was one of Sir Harcourt Lees’s miracles; a transformation not at all unlikely to result from Orange contact. Such miracles are of frequent occurrence in the North of Ireland.

“There were, however, at present five individuals who were qualified for claiming their freedom, which was of great practical utility to the Catholic cause; and he trusted the question would not be permitted to sleep through the criminal indifference of some, and the inefficient support of others; who, by their occasional co-operation and long abstraction from Catholic affairs, practically combine with the enemy; and who, though they may not have any great portion of talent, yet by keeping it neutral, take from the support of the Catholics, and consequently aid the opposition to their endeavours for Emancipation.

“After a speech from Mr. HUGH CONNOR, Mr. Shiel’s motion was put from the Chair, and unanimously passed.

“Messrs. Mullen, Ford, David Lynch, and Counsellors Hayes and M’Laughlin, were, by him, appointed as the Committee.

“MR. O'CONNELL then stated that he should, upon the next day of meeting, move—‘That the association do *meet daily*, for one fortnight, in the month of January next, for the despatch of business, previously to the next session of parliament.’”

---

SATURDAY, 29TH NOVEMBER, 1828.

O'CONNOR DON IN THE CHAIR.

“THE SECRETARY announced that the Right Rev. Dr. Murray had been pleased to accede to the request of the Churchyard Committee, for his patronage, advice, and co-operation.

“THE routine business being gone through—

“MR. O'CONNELL stated, that the Committee appointed to devise measures for asserting the Catholics' right of freedom into corporations, had already discovered upwards of a hundred Catholics entitled to their freedom; and it was intended, if the corporation offered any litigious opposition to their admittance, to try a few cases, in all of which the corporations, if defeated, will have to pay the costs, and thereby goad them in the tenderest point.

“Perhaps it was not a little curious, that one of the persons found entitled to the freedom was a namesake of his (Mr. O'C.'s) own, but that he wanted the Milesian distinction of ‘O.’ However, as he (Mr. O'C.) was one of the leaders of the clan, he would present him with the ‘O,’ upon his being made free of the city (laughter).

“MR. O'CONNELL then moved for the appointment of a Committee to collect and furnish the facts necessary to support the petition to be presented to the House of Lords, by Earl Grey, on the administration of justice in Ireland. Mr. O'Connell observed, that when a similar petition had been presented in the House of Commons, the enemies of Ireland manfully encountered it by such general pleading as that no facts were stated in support of the allegations. Terrific as the exposures in the petition were, to high authorities, it would have been easy for the Association to have completed their effect by a statement of facts, had they thought it expedient so to do. Indeed, it was thought to be so perfectly notorious and well known, at least to the Irish members, that in one province of Ireland, no Catholic had a chance of obtaining justice when opposed to an Orangeman, as made it unnecessary on the part of the Association to do more than allude generally to magisterial delinquency, without punishing a second time those already convicted; or by dragging those forward who had escaped; and thereby harrowing up individual feelings, and throw around them the shield of partizan pro-

tection ; and they thought it a sufficient confirmation of their charges that the corruption of justice, by factious interference, and the foul spirit of party passions, had been denounced from the bench ; and in one instance by a judge of assize, not professing an over great affection for Catholics.

“ While in their petition they studiously excluded any allusion to the superior courts, they thought it sufficient to refer to the known prevalence of a system of magisterial corruption and oppression.

“ Here the learned gentleman instanced the late Leinster Circuit, as affording abundant proofs of the iniquitous administration of justice, and congratulated the county that at length juries were found who dared to be honest, and with whose verdicts the judges (with one exception) had honestly, faithfully, and fearlessly concurred. That those guilty magistrates had been dragged to the bar of public justice was owing to the voluntary exertions of some Catholic attorneys, who, at great personal sacrifices, undertook the good work. The learned gentleman also stated, that when their petition on the administration of justice should be next presented to parliament, the abettors of corruption would be confounded by a well-authenticated fact, that in one instance lately, a sub-sheriff of a county stated the price to be given for an acquiescing jury.

“ He then adverted to the corruption of courts of inferior jurisdiction, of corporations, manor courts, courts of conscience, &c., where conscience remains at the doors, but never goes in ; and he hoped the magistrates of Cork, who were honest, would not be displeased when he stated that there never was such a perversion of justice as in their local courts and alderman's wards, where law was administered in small doses and bad compounds. It was also well known that in many instances the verdicts of juries were regulated by the complement of whiskey agreed, or expected to be given to them previous to their names being entered on the panel.

“ As to chairmen of counties, and assistant-barristers, he did not mean to speak disrespectfully of, but still less did he mean to praise them. There were many of them most respectable in private life ; but he hardly knew an instance of their having risen to their seats until it was found they never could rise if left to themselves. There was (continued Mr. O'C.) a period when the Irish bar shone as the brightest meteor in the firmament of national independence. As professional men, they must of course be occasionally on the wrong side, but formerly they gave the tone and spirit to public feeling, because they gloried in the avowal of patriotism, and dared to be honest ; but though lately, the power of the bench had neutralized the good feeling of the bar, there was a portion of it (happily for Ireland) that could not be purchased. Many

were the instances of men of learning and talent, whose professional career has been impeded owing to their liberality of politics. There was one instance known to all, where a respected, admired, and able man had been made to feel the force of judicial hostility—not because he had taken an active part on the side of patriotism, but because he stood neutral. When he (Mr. O'C.), assailed by the power of the crown, threw himself upon the generosity of the bar, he found no kindred response—no professional sympathy—no cheering voice, nor helping hand; no, he found them like a nest of vipers, but that they did not hiss, because they dared not.

“Mr. O'Connell concluded by expressing his opinion, as that of every Catholic he had spoken to on the subject, that no Catholic can safely go to trial on life or property in Dublin, where the opposite party has any connexion with the corporation, or corporation's friends.

“He also commented on the late revision of the magistracy, particularly in the county of Cork, where one gentleman of large property, and who never interfered in politics, was deprived of the commission of the peace, merely because he lived in the neighbourhood of a magistrate who was desirous of reigning alone in magisterial sovereignty. Mr. O'Connell then moved for the appointment of a Committee to collect such facts as may be useful in support of the petition to be presented by Earl Grey.

“MR. HUGH O'CONNOR suggested, that in any petition to be presented to parliament upon Catholic grievances, it should not be omitted to dwell particularly upon the hardship to Catholic commercial men, of being excluded from any participation in the management of the Bank of Ireland. He supported the proposition in a speech of some length, and was seconded by NICHOLAS MAHON.

“MR. O'CONNELL was of opinion that Catholics *were* eligible to be Bank Directors. \*

“But he conceived the reason the Catholics had not heretofore exerted themselves in support of their rights, was from an impression that they were not so, and that they, therefore, did not care to create enemies, when they thought they could not succeed.

“The impression was entirely a mistake, in his opinion; and he for one would spare no effort to prove it so. Men should help themselves, and not stand waiting for what would *never* come—the voluntary concessions of those interested in keeping matters as they were. Those who enjoyed the monopoly would never surrender it, till the iron arm of the law should absolutely wrest it from them.

“He would advise a specific application to the legislature in the next session, for the passing of a law declaratory of the Catholic's privilege



to become Bank Directors. The Catholics need not expect that the Directors will ever voluntarily act otherwise than as a worthy mayor of Limerick once did, who, when there were two parties in the corporation, and he was billeting soldiers, took care not to billet any upon his own party; and when accused of the injustice, he declared he had acted with the *greatest impartiality*, for he billeted *as many soldiers' families as he could—upon the Papists!*

“MR. O'CONNOR was then advised to refer the subject to a committee, which he accordingly consented to do.

“The Chairman (O'CONNOR DOW), before leaving the Chair, begged to offer a few words to the consideration of the meeting.

“There was nothing he had heard that day of which he disapproved, but perhaps their objects would be as well attained by the publication of *resolutions*, instead of furnishing their enemies with matter for animadversion, by their *speeches!*

“He instanced the Catholic Convention in 1793, when the Most Rev. Doctor Troy so often presided; and the Catholic clergy united with the body of the people in their labours for Emancipation. He regretted he did not see the clergy now coming forward in like manner; and he thought the interests of the Catholics would be better promoted by *parish meetings*, where the people could take a more general share in the management of their cause, and where they could be assisted by the discretion, intelligence, and advice of their clergy.

“He merely threw out these suggestions for the consideration of those better qualified to judge of their bearing than he himself.

“MR. O'CONNELL observed that there was no disunion of sentiment between the clergy and the people.

“The clergy were members of the Association, as a matter of right, and without payment. As to the convention of Catholics in 1793, just alluded to, if the Catholics had then succeeded, it was because the convention was a delegated body, who, if they had not the legislative, had the national sanction. Their proceedings had a moral force, and their measures were guided with an energy and an effect that forced from an alarmed ministry those rights which the Catholics at present enjoy.

“After this the meeting adjourned.”

Upon the 2nd of December, Mr. O'Connell had to attend a meeting of the Dublin Library Society, where, on the occasion of a motion for expelling the *Dublin Evening Mail* newspaper, for some articles passing the license of a public jour-

nal, he had occasion to make some touching allusions to the great sorrow of his life.

“MR. O'CONNELL said that however the Society might differ upon politics; however strong their inclination to polemics; yet there were principles with which he hoped they all concurred, as men—as Christians.

“It was contrary to all the laws of war, civilized or savage, to poison water from which an enemy might drink; and he put it to them, whether that which a savage Indian would not tolerate, should be permitted by the Dublin Library Society?—whether they would sanction in political warfare the introduction of the poisoned arrows of malicious slander and personal calumny? Could they not differ upon politics or religion?—could they not argue upon the merits of Whig and Tory, without defaming the unoffending wife, or injuring the innocent child? Could they not discuss those matters with the dignity belonging to freemen, and not with the rancour of desperate villainy? The learned gentleman still felt proud, that however successful a few factious journals had been in Ireland in attaining the *style demoniacal*, yet the honour of originality belonged to their neighbours, the Scotch, as exemplified in *Blackwood's Magazine*, which the Dublin Library Society had had the virtue and manliness to expel, not because of its politics, but for a departure from legitimate argument, and the adoption of virulence and calumny.

“The London *John Bull* was the offspring of *Blackwood's Magazine*, and from thence it spread to Dublin—to the journal of Sir Harcourt Lees, who resembled a bottle of soda-water, lively and brisk without spirit. The contagion of Scotch malignity spread its pestiferous infection to Dublin, where the *Mail*, under its baneful influence, breathed envenomed censure upon the characters of a class of men who devote their lives, and often meet their death, in the sublimest walks of charity. Would the Society, by continuing the *Mail*, verify the appellation of the members, who were described by it as apes and monkeys?—or would they, by discarding it, show the vain imbecile that their appetites were not yet so depraved, nor their stomachs so diseased, as to relish the carrion and garbage with which the *Mail* fed them?

“He looked upon the members of the Society as gentlemen—he hoped they were Christians—and he trusted they would not sanction an opinion that the god of discord and the spirit of slander were the objects of their private devotions. If the Orangemen thought well of their own cause, surely they did not require the aid of such a creature as the *Mail*. To be sure, it might be a recommendation that it abused

him (Mr. O'Connell), and that in the last number it accused him of want of courage. But WOULD TO GOD the *Mail* had more cause to taunt him with that failing! Would to heaven that in escaping with his own life he had not given a too sad but convincing proof that he did not want courage!

“He would now give up the pleasures of his life and liberty, could the sacrifice expiate that fatal act of self-defence. [Here Mr. O'Connell became so much affected, as to be incapable of utterance for some time, during which the applause was more fervent and general than we ever recollect to have witnessed in any assembly. Several gentlemen, his political opponents, were among the most warm applauders.”]

---

## “CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION.

“SATURDAY, 27TH DECEMBER.

### “TITHE BILL.

“MR. O'CONNELL rose to move, upon his notice for the preparing of a petition to parliament for the repeal of the Tithe Commutation Bill.

“That measure, he said, had been generally complained of throughout the country, and the more it was understood, the more it was likely to meet public disfavour. It was not because there was any want of mischievous provisions in the original tithe system, but because the remedy prescribed was found worse than the disease.

“That very respectable gentleman, Mr. Lidwell—than whom there was no individual better qualified to form an opinion upon the merits of the bill—had with much force and effect demonstrated the evil tendency of the measure; but though dissatisfied with it, he was not content without also making known the hardships of the tithe system, which reminded him of the familiar story of the soldier who was dissatisfied with the drummer, when flogging him, whether he hit him high or low.

“It was not his (Mr. O'Connell's) wish to lay blame where it was not deserved, but it was hardly possible to cite a stronger proof of incompetency for office than was furnished by the Tithe Commutation Bill, and which was the offspring of Mr. Goulburn's legislative function. Mr. Goulburn was, he believed, an amiable man in private life, but he was of opinion that his upper story was excessively ill-furnished. Indeed, it followed that a man who came to this country for the purpose of perpetuating Catholic exclusion, must necessarily be devoid of those qualities requisite for a legislator or statesman.

“ Mr. O'Connell then proceeded to review the several sections of the bill.

“ The twenty-first section of the act provided that if the commissioners thought fit, they might direct a survey of the parish ; or if they thought fit, they might not do so ; or if there was an old survey of the parish, they might make use of it. The absurdity of such a provision was evident to a man of the meanest capacity : it was no more than if the legislature declared that men might use their own eyes, or spectacles ; and provided that, should they have an old pair, they might or might not use them, just as they choose. But such was generally the case with acts of parliament, particularly those originating with the government ; and the difficulty of understanding them was always occasioned by the extreme quantity of verbiage with which they were encumbered, and increased by the legal prohibition against punctuation in records, though every man's experience must convince him, that where a long sentence occurs, in that way, it is impossible to affix a definite meaning.

“ This, however, was called the wisdom of our English ancestors, to which modern legislators pertinaciously adhere, instead of adopting a single, distinct proposition, expressed in such terms as every man could understand, and as was practised by every other nation in the world. Of this we have a perfect example in the celebrated ‘ Code Napoleon,’ it being perfectly intelligible even to those of the most moderate capacity, though they might not agree in the principle. But our anxiety appeared to be, that no man should attempt to explain or understand an act of parliament but a lawyer ; and when it chanced to be intelligible, lawyers were found to enshroud it in mystery and doubt.

“ Those were trivial hardships in the Tithe Commutation Bill, compared to the substantial grievances that he should point out.

“ It was bad enough that, under the old tithe system, the clergy were in possession of *two millions* of green acres, and that such an anomaly should exist as the richest Church with the poorest people, who contribute to its support for the accommodation of the few. He (Mr. O'Connell) was anxious that any legislative measure upon the subject of tithes should have for its object the diminishing, and not increasing, the burthens upon the people. He should like to see the Church sufficiently but reasonably provided for, as might be effected by allowing to archbishops the same salary as chief-justices, namely, *five thousand five hundred pounds* per annum ; to bishops, the salary of judges, *four thousand* per annum ; and inferior clergy, *four hundred* per annum—being the same salary as assistant-barristers and chairmen of counties, who give much more labour for what they receive than do the clergy. His wish would

be to see ample provision made for all, instead of the pauperism of many, and the overgrown wealth of a few—such as the Archbishop of Armagh, having from fifteen to twenty thousand per annum. The late primate, a Scotchman, was but from eight to twelve years in his primacy, and yet he managed to carry to England *three hundred thousand pounds*!

“Now, if this was an age of political economy, and that the English were the wise and thinking people they were represented, he could satisfy them, from example and fact, how they might have been saved enormous sums, paid for the performance of duties which bear no proportion to the salaries. Doctor Troy, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, performed the duties of his office for *thirty years* for no more than *eight hundred per annum*; yet he maintained his dignity full as respectably, and did five times the work of the prelate, took quite as good care of his Church, made as many converts, and lost as few proselytes as the primate. He died not worth a penny, and still his duty was as well performed as that of him who left hundreds of thousands; but this monstrous extortion had only existed because the people hesitated to speak of it as men—as rational freemen.

“Mr. O’Connell then went on to show that the effect, if not the object, of the Tithe Commutation Bill, was to increase them by *fifths*; for by the sixteenth section it was provided that the average should be nothing less than that of the seven years 1814 to 1821—thus including the years 1814 and 1815, when Napoleon was upon the throne, and up to 1819, when the Bank Restriction Act was first modified—that act which created so great a nominal value on agricultural produce. The average, also, was to be regulated, not by what was even paid in those years, but by what was promised; so that, if it be thus regulated, taking the difference of prices into account, the tithe would be doubled. Instead of the tithe being, as by the old mode, payable once a year, it is, by the new bill, transformed into a *tithe rent*, payable in May and November, full six months before the tithe could be productive to the farmer; whereas, by the old mode, the parson accepted of a tithe-note, payable in twelve months after harvest; so that, by the new bill, the farmer should pay his tithe eighteen months sooner than by present practice.

“According to the old mode, the tithe was considered to interfere too much with the rent; but by the thirty-eighth section of the new act, the tithe was recoverable before rent, and had the priority of all executions;—so that it was not extraordinary that the people in general should feel dissatisfied with that high flogging. By the fortieth section, if an assessment was not made, then the tithe was to be levied according to the church-rates; and could any exaction or vexation be more cruel

than the increase of *church-rates* upon the Irish peasantry? The valuation is provided to be made by commissioners, one on the part of the parish, and the other on that of the parson; but should they not agree, they are authorized to call in an umpire, and, if they cannot agree upon the choice of one, to what court or judge are they to appeal? Why, to Mr. Goulburn—to the Secretary at the Castle!—so that if it should happen that a secretary had a desire to serve the parson, the commissioner for the church has only to propose some enormous tithe, to which the other commissioner cannot assent, and then the affair is determined by the Secretary!

“By the thirty-first section the parish is prevented from canvassing the assessment, when once signed by the commissioners or umpire, if ever so fraudulent, unless that within fourteen days they appeal—not to any court of law, but to the Lord Lieutenant; and the whole expense of preparing the evidence in support of their appeal is to be levied off the parish. The commissioners are also to receive thirty shillings per day each; but in order to understand the spirit of delusion in which the act is drawn up, it was necessary to look to the thirtieth section, where the Lord Lieutenant is empowered to refer the appeal to the next judge of assize, to make such order upon it as he (the Lord Lieutenant) was authorized to make, either by confirming, abating, or annulling it.

“Now he (Mr. O'Connell) did not mean to say that the inconsistencies of the act were intentional, but it was rather remarkable that a power was given to the judge to annul, commensurate with that given to the Lord Lieutenant, who, it will be seen by the twenty-ninth section, has no power at all for annulling, and consequently neither can the judge. Was the error design or mistake? It was too horrible to suppose the former; and if by the latter, is it not cruel to have the fate of the country dependent upon men who can commit such blunders? That is not all. Every man knows the advantage of a short mode of pleading. At present the parson is liable to the same mode of pleading as all others of his Majesty's subjects; but by the bill that form is done away with, and in the case of replevin for goods seized for tithe, the parson has merely to plead, without any further explanation than that he seized them by force and virtue of the statute made and provided in that case. Heretofore the clergyman recovered costs, but in the present case he is entitled to *double costs*, let the case be ever so fair upon the part of the farmer; and if the clergyman is wrong, he merely pays the *common costs*; so that, if he is right, even in sixpence of his claim, he receives double costs, and that was styled *commutation*; but it was rather of the rights than the burdens of the people, who, if they acted as they should, would leave Mr. Goulburn, the tithe, clergy, and government to the enjoyment

of the bill, and seek to breathe an atmosphere untainted by tithe exactions or religious persecution.

“ To him (Mr. O’Connell) the absurdities and oppressive provisions of the Tithe Bill appeared to have been introduced for the purpose of reconciling the country to the tithe system, by demonstrating that there was still something worse than even that plundering law ; and he conceived the evils of the late bill were sufficiently manifest to induce them to petition for its total repeal, instead of amendments ; for the greatest evils in legislation have arisen from attempts to cure defects in acts of parliament. The Tithe Commutation Bill had, however, been of important service ; for its enactment had deprived the advocates of the divine right to tithes—of the only argument upon which they relied. They had established that interference with that species of church property was not sacrilege ; and from the present state of society there was reason to hope that the British people would no longer be deterred by such unmeaning cant from seeking that reform in church revenues as would leave the clergy leisure to attend to their missions—make them cease to be politicians, and become divines.

“ Mr. O’Connell concluded by observing that the Tithe Bill had also violated the conditions made as the wages of corruption, paid for the vile votes of those who trafficked upon the independence of their country, and assisted to effect the odious Union. It disregarded the provisions of the Tithe Agistment Bill, and in every instance had done away with whatever was favourable to this country in that infamous measure ; that swindling act, that had no legal power to operate ; that was void from its formation ; and that was sanctioned by those who assumed a privilege never intended by their constituents or the constitution—an act of legislative fraud and oppression, that, as Mr. Saurin observed, made it ‘ A QUESTION OF PRUDENCE, NOT OF CONSCIENCE, WHEN IT SHOULD BE REPEALED.’

“ Mr. O’Connell then moved that a petition be presented to parliament, praying the entire repeal of the Tithe Commutation Bill.”

A Protestant gentleman (a Mr. Kelly) here addressed the meeting upon the same subject, and was received with the greatest attention.

“ MR. O’CONNELL rose to avail himself of his privilege of reply, and after a high eulogium upon the sentiments of the last speaker, and congratulating the Association upon the presence of a gentleman of his ability and liberality, he assured the gentleman that it was not his intention to censure the Protestant clergy generally ; for he (Mr. O’Con-

nell) had amongst them several worthy, liberal, kind hearted, and learned friends, for whom he entertained a sincere affection, and he had also several relations Protestant clergymen, whose conduct and principles he knew and respected too highly to include them in general censure.

“When he (Mr. O'Connell) expressed his disapprobation of any Protestant clergyman, he alluded to those whose conduct was known to the public, and by whom they would not be mistaken. With respect to the petition, the gentleman was mistaken if he supposed the Association composed of citizens only. They were prevented by legislative enactments from assuming a delegated character; but the Association consisted of most respectable gentlemen from every county in the kingdom, who all suffered from the Tithe Bill; and though many citizens were present, yet, like himself, they were tithe payers. As the Association was formed for the management of Catholic affairs, he conceived tithes a peculiar Catholic grievance, and therefore could not think of withdrawing the motion.”

It was accordingly put from the chair, and passed without further remark.

Mr. O'Connell subsequently gave notice, that he would move an aggregate meeting to be held on the 2nd of February, in the ensuing year, 1824, not to petition for emancipation; for it was useless to continue that mockery, but to submit such petitions upon grievances in detail, as the committee of the association might agree upon.

The following letter, which will explain itself, was written by him next day:—

“Merrion-square, December 26th, 1823.

“MY DEAR SIR—I perceive by the public papers, that the gentlemen of the county and town of Galway intend to celebrate the arrival at age of the young Earl of Clanrickard by a public dinner.

“I regret extremely that my necessary absence with my family in England, precludes the possibility of my attending to evince my respect for those that give that dinner, and my cordial sympathy on the objects of it. There are associations connected with the noble house of Clanrickarde, which must be dear to every heart that throbs with affection for the long-suffering people of this wretched land; and there are views of a more domestic nature belonging to the inhabitants of the county and town of Galway, which are not less pure in mere patriotism, nor less independent in mere motives to connect us all with the present youthful prop of that illustrious house.

“I say *we* all, because I do myself the honour of considering myself a Galway man by adoption, and indeed, I am truly proud of being able to associate myself, even in absence, with the feelings of your county and town, where nothing is wanting to place you in



the first rank of independence, but a generous and combined effort of the worth, property, and talent which abound amongst you.

"Should any occasion occur during the day devoted to this truly festive object, to obtrude upon the meeting the sentiments of so humble an individual as myself, I will be happy to have them announced, because they evince my gratitude in the only way I can evince a gratitude, which, in solemn truth, is too big for utterance.

"Should, as it is probable, the day pass off without any occasion to notice so insignificant a person as me, I shall, at least, be glad that you should have this proof of my sensitiveness to whatever justly interests your countrymen, and to avail myself of this opportunity to assure you, that

"I am very respectfully,

"Your faithful and obedient servant,

"DANIEL O'CONNELL.

"To Mr. Fowle."

The object of the compliment here alluded to has as yet little redeemed the hopes then entertained of him. Nor has his over-eagerness in advocacy of the defeated Coercion Bill of this session given much reason to renew them.

## CHAPTER XII.

AFTER this Mr. O'Connell proceeded to England to bring home his family, and thus was not present at the three first meetings of the Catholic Association, in the year 1824.

Upon Saturday, the 24th of January, however, he re-appeared in that body, to resume his portion—the *lion's share*—of the agitation.

## “CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION—24TH JAN. 1824.

“COUNSELLOR FITZSIMON, IN THE CHAIR.

“MR. KIRWAN rose to propose a motion of which he had given the proper notice. It was to the following effect, viz. : that letters should be written to all the Roman Catholic peers, sons of peers, baronets, &c., &c., requesting of them to become members of the Catholic Association.

“MR. KIRWAN spoke at considerable length to this motion, and when he had sat down—

“MR. O'CONNELL moved as an amendment, that a committee of nine should be appointed to devise the best mode of enlarging the association.

“He (Mr. O'Connell) did not approve of the mode suggested, of writing letters. The answers should be read, and it would give an opportunity to any gentleman who might differ in opinion with them, to say anything disparaging he pleased, either to gratify peculiar whim or prejudice, or perhaps neither, but merely in submission to the opinion of some interested friend, anxious to create allies to the *Warder* and *Antidote*; and these last would, no doubt, turn their assistance to account, and use those answers to the disadvantage of the Catholic Association, and many persons would be prevented from expressing their approbation of the association, not wishing to have their families and friends traduced by the vituperated press. He (Mr. O'Connell) differed from Mr. Kirwan in his opinion, as to the attendance of members of respectability. He remembered that during the existence of the Catholic Board, when it comprised 800 members, there was not a better, nor generally so good an attendance as appear at the meetings of the association; and though he (Mr. O'Connell) had the experience of

a score years in Catholic affairs, he had no recollection of more numerous attendances. The association had certainly taken no pains to extend itself, and for which it deserved censure, as it was his opinion that every parish should be visited, and inquiries made as to who would become members; or better modes might be adopted, but certainly none so injudicious or mischievous as rising dissensions amongst themselves, and consequent exposure and misrepresentation. There were difficult times before them. Tory and Orange malignity was industriously exciting in England prejudice in the doubtful, and active hostility in those who, though averse to Catholic claims, were heretofore satisfied with leaving them to the management of more *ultra* opponents; and it behoved the Catholics in defence of their interests to be watchful, and not intentionally supply their enemies with weapons of offence. The Catholics should promote that union amongst themselves, which they had been endeavouring so long and so ineffectually to establish amongst their countrymen generally: but there was now something wanting amongst the Catholics, equally as requisite as union of sentiment; they should not cease to keep up a necessary fund for proceeding with such measures as might be found expedient for the attainment of their emancipation; and every Catholic in Ireland should be called upon to contribute a monthly sum from *one penny* up to *two shillings*, the utmost to which any person should be expected to subscribe; and by a general effort of that kind, the people of England would see that Catholic millions felt a deep interest in the cause, and not confined, as is supposed, to those styled 'agitators,' though in point of law, the association cannot represent the people, yet, as they represent the public voice, because able to guide public opinion, they would (had they such a fund as was proposed) easily detect those itinerant fomenters of discontent, who are at present distributed through the country by the enemies of Ireland, seeking to entrap the unwary, simple, credulous, starving peasant, into some conspiracy or secret association, as did the Catholic Board, under Lord Whitworth, when they succeeded in bringing the case so home to several individuals, that many members of the Board went to the castle, and the information and evidence were so powerfully convincing, that Mr. Saurin was obliged to order the persons to be arrested and sent to Newgate; but from whence they were allowed to depart without any further inquiry, or bringing them before the tribunals; and being at large, were at liberty to renew their work of blood, and pounce like vultures upon the persecuted peasantry, who easily became a prey to their treacherous villainy. With a fund at the command of the Catholic Association, the value of which had already been felt, as in proportion to its influence, the disturbances through the

country had ceased to be extensive. If the committee were appointed, all those matters for the extension of the association could be considered, and Mr. Kirwan would have the opportunity of pushing his own views.

"MR. SHIEL supported Mr. O'Connell's view of the case, and Mr. Kirwan was induced to give way and accede.

"MR. O'CONNELL rose to propose a motion of which he had given notice. It was that an aggregate meeting should be held on the 13th of February. The notice he had given, was a resolution to hold an aggregate meeting on the 2nd of February, but he should beg leave to substitute the 13th of February, the day after term, for the day originally named. First, he had to satisfy them that there ought to be a Catholic aggregate meeting; and secondly, as to the change of day. The necessity for holding an aggregate meeting, he conceived, was too obvious to require much consideration. They had passed several petitions; those petitions were but the petitions of individuals; then they require the sanction of the public voice. The Catholic question had at different periods various success in parliament. Three times it passed the House of Commons, and at one time it was within one of having passed the House of Lords. The conduct of Sir Francis Burdett, on a late occasion, was actuated, as his conduct ever has been, by a hatred of treachery and trick.

"He took a manly and open line of conduct, but though proper at the time, its consequences were, perhaps, injurious.

"The Catholic question should be kept before the public; the Orange newspapers might, of course, continue to fling their filth on them, so much was to be had in the market of corruption, that even carrion bore a high price. He believed, however, that at least nine-tenths of the conductors of the Orange press were, in point of law, and even in belief, as much a Catholic as he was himself. Some persons, he understood, had intimated that it would be advisable to select another advocate in the House of Commons, to entrust their cause to: he hoped that their petition would never be taken from Mr. Plunkett, as long as that highly-talented advocate choose to accept it. (Hear, hear.)

"It had been suggested by Mr. Charles Butler, an English Catholic, that a petition for the repeal of the act which enforces the degrading oath which Protestants take, should be presented, and that the Catholics might be heard by counsel at the bar of the house.

"MR. KIRWAN here observed, that no Irish advocate would be heard at the bar of the house.

"MR. O'CONNELL replied, that no such prohibition existed; previous to the Union, no English advocate would be heard at the bar of

the Irish house, nor Irish at the bar of the English house ; but since the Union, as the parliament consisted of the representatives of the United Kingdoms, that objection did not now exist.

“MR. KIRWAN believed, that Mr. Whitestone, the Irish barrister, was refused the liberty of pleading a case before the English parliament ; but that the Scotch advocates were entitled to the privilege.

“MR. O’CONNELL and MR. SHIEL assured Mr. Kirwan he was mistaken ; Mr. Whitestone was not refused, and the Irish advocates founded their claim on the same pretensions as the Scotch—that of the Union.

“MR. O’CONNELL resumed.—The repeal of the Abjuration Oath would remove all the disqualifications under which the Catholics suffer, and the only question was, whether the rules of the house were against such mode of proceeding ; but that difficulty was removed by the opinion of the first living authority, Lord Colchester, to whom Mr. Butler applied upon the subject ; and though Lord Colchester was averse to the Catholic claims, yet he did not hesitate to pronounce that they were entitled to be heard by their counsel at the bar of the house.

“The proceeding was not without precedent ; the Abjuration Oath was established in direct violation of the treaty of Limerick, which covenanted that no test oaths should be administered but those in force in the reign of Charles II. ; and Sir Toby Butler and Sir Stephen Rice (both barristers) were heard at the bar of the house against those oaths.

“As he (Mr. O’Connell) never did any thing but what he was defamed and abused for, he expected that in the present instance it would be said, as had been by some of their *friends* (like the *Carlow Post*), that a lawyer was never honest in his political advice (laughter), and that, therefore, he (Mr. O’Connell) was recommending himself ; but he was eighteen years a politician, and had not *yet* received a bribe, save that from the Catholic people, which he should ever hold dear to his heart, and he would not be so presumptuous as to suggest himself as the advocate ; but if the people appointed him, it would not be a money gain, but a very considerable pecuniary sacrifice, and one he would be most happy to make. (Hear, hear.)

“It had been said that this proceeding had been determined upon by some of their parliamentary friends, but he assured the association, that none of those parliamentary gentlemen most interested in their cause, ever took upon themselves the responsibility of *deciding* upon any course for the adoption of the Catholics, but when consulted, they always gave their opinion and advice ; and he again assured the as-

sociation, that the recommendation of such a mode of proceeding had not originated with any member of parliament, but had the sanction of many whose opinions deserved the greatest respect.

“He would, previous to the intended aggregate meeting of the 13th proximo, have an opportunity of consulting persons upon whose discretion and high intelligence he felt he could entirely rely, and the Catholics generally would have an opportunity of considering the measure against the day in question.

“They would thus be enabled to decide entirely for themselves, as there was no wish to shift the responsibility of their proceedings upon any persons but themselves.

“MR. O'CONNELL then moved—‘That an aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland be called for an early day in February.’

“Seconded by MR. CLINCH, and carried.”

The time was now come when Mr. O'Connell thought advisable to bring forward his long meditated plan of small subscriptions. Among those to whom he had yet mentioned it, were few to encourage, and several to condemn it as a trifling, and certainly unsuccessful experiment. So wild and chimerical did it appear, that pains were actually taken to prevent his having an opportunity of bringing it before the association.

There was a rule of the association, that if ten members of the body were not in attendance by half-past three o'clock (the hour of meeting being three P. M.), an adjournment should inevitably take place.

It will create wonder in the minds of some of our readers, and a smile in others, to read, that with every exertion he could possibly make, Mr. O'Connell *failed* on several successive days, to obtain the required quorum, small as that was. *Promises* of attendance he *did* get, in much more than sufficient number; but promises not kept, or redeemed half-an-hour too late.

Four, five, or six might be in the room when the fatal half hour would arrive; and punctually at that moment, Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman, the then secretary, would hold up his watch, which he had taken care to leave out for the preceding ten minutes, and say—

“Gentlemen, it is half-past three o'clock, and ten members

not present, we must adjourn !” And adjourn they accordingly did.

At last, upon Wednesday, the 4th of February, 1824, the spell was broken. At twenty-three minutes past three, on that afternoon, there were but seven persons present, including Mr. O’Connell himself, and the *inexorable* Purcell ! the latter, as usual, watch in hand, not in the least moved by the anxiety so plainly depicted in Mr. O’Connell’s face. Another minute, and Mr. O’Connell could remain in the room no longer. He ran down towards Coyne’s shop, down stairs, in the faint hope of finding somebody. On the stairs the *eighth* man passed him going up. In the shop itself were fortunately two young Maynooth priests, making some purchases. The rules of the association admitting all clergymen as honorary members, without special motion, he eagerly addressed and implored them to come up but for one moment, and help to make the required quorum. At first they refused, there being a good deal of hesitation generally on the part of the clergy to put themselves at all forward in politics ; and these young men in particular, having all the timidity of their secluded education about them. But there was no withstanding him, partly by still more earnest solicitations, and partly by actual *pushing*, he got them towards the staircase, and upon it, and finally into the meeting-room, exactly a second or two before the half-hour, and so stopped Mr. O’Gorman’s mouth.

The required number being thus made up, the chair was taken (by William Coppinger, Esq., of Cork), the business entered upon, and Mr. O’Connell was enabled to unfold his plan.

The two poor priests, who had so reluctantly, and almost unconsciously done such good duty, shrunk away timidly a few moments afterwards ; but as there was no “ *counting of the house*” in the association’s code of laws, their presence was no longer necessary.

The following was Mr. O'Connell's speech, according to the best report that we can find.

“MR. O'CONNELL rose to report from the committee appointed to consider the best means of increasing the funds of the association and its members.

“The first duty of the committee was to consider the legality of the measure. The association were resolved, from principle, duty, and inclination, not to involve the interests or safety of the Catholic body by any illegal course; and they defied the Orange press to point out, through their whole proceedings, a single illegal act, or a solitary measure tending to a breach of the law. If any thing of the kind could be shown, he assured the meeting he would be one of the first to recommend an alteration of their course.

“In considering whether the association was legally constituted, it would be necessary to refer to the 60th Geo. III. c. 6, one of those statutes commonly called the ‘Six Acts’—acts which pressed very heavily upon what we familiarly term ‘English liberty.’ Four of these acts were permanent, the other two were temporary. One of these was to expire upon the 24th of December next; but it was worded in such a manner as that it might be continued for another year, at the pleasure of the minister. For, according to this curious and clumsy mode of legislation, if the session of parliament were then going on, the act would be in force for another year.

“The sixteenth section of this act specifically stated, that it did not apply to meetings held in a private room. The association, therefore, could not be possibly brought under it—not being assembled, or intended to be assembled at any time in the open air—but within doors, and in a room. The fourth of the present King, chapter 87, was enacted under the pretence of preventing Orange meetings; but it had had no other effect than that of destroying the freemasons, and perfecting a system for the increase of Orangemen. This he should prove by some very curious documents, which he intended to deposit with the secretary, after reading them at the aggregate meeting, and in which would appear the proceedings of the Orange committee of 1821, for devising the best means of increasing the Orange fraternity. At the head of the committee was Master Ellis, a member of the legislature, whose enactments he thus sought to frustrate; and next in dignity was Alderman Darley, the chief magistrate of police, whose duties, if fulfilled, would be to prevent, and not encourage what appeared to him (Mr. O'Connell) a breach of the law; and in order to sanctify the measure,



Sir Harcourt Lees, a baronet and a minister of the Gospel, was the third in authority.

“The act last mentioned had not put down Orangeism, much less could it put down the Catholic Association, which was not bound by any test, recognized by no sign or symbol, and which did not hold its meetings clandestinely, but openly and publicly. The association might, therefore, defy the malice and persecution of those who sought for its abolition.

“Upon the subject of increasing the funds of the association, he was desirous of being perfectly understood, although he expected to be abused for the proposition he should submit to the meeting. He could not lay claim to originality in the project, for it had appeared in a letter from Lord Kenmare, in the year 1786, addressed to Dr. Moylan, and published during the time the celebrated Arthur O’Leary’s powerful Essays occasioned such a sensation. Lord Kenmare, however, justly beloved by his tenantry, was loaded with public censure for his conduct upon the Catholic question. It was painful, indeed, and bitterly to be regretted, that this should be the case; but it was inevitable under the circumstances.

“Having expressed his sorrowful disapprobation of the Earl of Kenmare’s conduct, Mr. O’Connell said, that it would indeed be unjust, and most reprehensible upon his part, were he for a moment to hesitate to express his entire and decided conviction, that although his lordship was unfortunately mistaken in the *means*, yet his *intention* was thoroughly pure and honourable, and his conduct really directed, as he thought in the right way, towards the attainment of Catholic emancipation.

“With regard to the plan he had alluded to, the following were Lord Kenmare’s words:—

“‘There are,’ said his lordship, ‘two thousand five hundred Catholic parishes in the kingdom. Let us only make a rent of one pound sterling a year, upon each parish, and that accumulating and forming a permanent fund, will be a powerful ally in the contest for emancipation.’

“But his (Mr. O’Connell’s) plan was still more comprehensive, and he did not hesitate to say, that it would, with very little exertion, produce *one hundred and twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and thirty-seven pounds, ten shillings*. He liked to give them down to the very *shillings of it*, and had there been pence, he would give them the pence too. (Laugh, and cheers.) Suppose, however, that the product was less than one-half that sum. Say it would be *fifty thousand pounds*, although one penny per month from each Catholic in Ireland ought surely to yield a sum considerably above that amount.

“Indeed there could be no doubt of it, that fifty thousand pounds was a sum far below what the general contribution he had named would amount to, estimating the population by the last census. That census was known to have been very imperfect. In the county of Mayo alone, during the year of the scarcity, the numbers relieved exceeded by thirty thousand the stated population of the county, as returned in the last census. It would follow then, of necessity, that if the census of the other counties was deficient in proportion, the population of the entire of Ireland was far above eight millions.

“Taking it at that number, he (Mr. O'Connell) claimed seven of those eight millions as Catholics. Their ratio of increase had been ascertained. In the year 1731, there were in Dublin 8823 Protestant families, and 4119 Catholics. In the year 1810, the Rev. Mr. Whitelaw, a Protestant clergyman states, in his census of Dublin, that the Catholics were as six to one; thus there was upwards of six, probably *seven* millions, or even upwards, of Catholics in the country. The sum proposed to be raised was £50,000; and if the Catholics of Ireland were to pay but one penny a month, if but *one* million of them, instead of the *seven* millions were to pay it—being, as it would of course be, only one-shilling expense to each individual, the money could be had easily. That the facility existed was obvious, since the Orangemen had already charged them with having *actually levied* the money. He wished the fellows had been right for once. (A laugh, and cheers.)

“About the year 1812, he (Mr. O'Connell) had himself proposed, and had set on foot a temporary subscription, and in three parishes alone, he had collected seventy-nine pounds, which had gone into the funds of the Catholic Board. The collection would then have been continued under a regular organization, but that miserable disputes arose between what were called the Catholic aristocracy, and the Catholic democracy, and upset every thing. No such result should occur now. He would carefully superintend and work out most perseveringly every detail of his plan, and would not abandon it but with life. He was thoroughly and entirely convinced not only of its practicability, but of its certain efficaciousness for its purposes.

“Before he should enter more minutely into any of those details, it would be necessary that he should state the object for which the funds were required, and the manner in which they were to be applied. Nothing could be more natural than that men should require to know for what they were to pay, and nothing more proper than they should have that stated fully and distinctly, before being called upon.

“There were, then, five distinct, definite, and decided objects in view.

He would take them one by one. The first of these objects was, the collecting and conveying to parliament the petitions of every county in Ireland, not only on the subject of Catholic emancipation, but upon that of every other grievance, of whatever kind, which pressed upon the country; also there was the purpose of retaining what he believed to be quite indispensable to a proper care of their business—a parliamentary agent in London, at a salary of four or five hundred pounds a year, to attend to the proceedings in parliament having reference to the Catholics, and take such steps there as might be advisable. For this duty he should take leave to mention Mr. James Roche. He did not know a gentleman more qualified in every respect to fill a situation of so much importance, and so necessary as this was. He did not exaggerate its importance, nor its clear advisableness. -The foreign dependencies of Great Britain had each their own self-chosen parliamentary agent in London, watching the parliamentary and other transactions there; and why should Ireland not have hers? There would, of course, be various expenses attending the petitions of which he had spoken, and also attending the bringing to town evidence to support their statements. He would set apart £500 a year to meet these items.

“The second object that he proposed they should have in view, would be to encourage, and by effective support to enable the liberal press, both of London and Dublin, to contend with the Orange press, which is paid to revile every thing liberal. The *Patriot* and the *Correspondent* were, to be sure, *honest*, after a fashion; they abused everybody that spoke against the government, and supported every government and every ministry that chose to pay them for doing so. They got their pudding, and they tried to deserve it.

“But among those public prostitutes, there was what might be called the volunteer part of the Orange press, cherished indirectly by government, and avowedly by the established clergy. He meant the *Antidote*, the *Warder*, and the *Mail*. The *Mail*, that was too fashionable to be thought to belong to its own religion. There was also to be another paper which had put forth a comical piece of impertinence, by way of prospectus, and which he supposed he might class amongst them. These publications never yet breathed a word in favour of liberty, and are strangers alike to kindness, liberality, generosity, or good feeling of any sort.

“He (Mr. O’Connell) was, with them, a scoundrel, not because they hated him, but because they thought abuse of him was grateful to their employers.

“In fact, the Orange press was a perfect picture of Orange principles; in no one instance was there to be found a sentence that bespoke

a spirit of nationality, a sense of the value of liberty, or a desire for unanimity and good fellowship amongst Irishmen. No! it nourished faction, and spread discord and deadly hatred between men who should live as brothers. It fattened upon that which a sound constitution or an honest mind would fling from it with loathing and disgust, fearing to be poisoned by its rancorous vileness. It was a singular fact, that these wretched publications were exclusively conducted by renegades.

“He would not, however, confine his view to the press of Dublin. They had more formidable enemies at the press of London. The papers most in circulation were divided into shares, and in many instances held by those whose personal politics were strongly opposed to the principles advocated by the paper from which they derived a considerable revenue. A fact connected with that subject was so curious and so apposite, that he could not refrain from mentioning it. The late Mr. Ricardo, so resolutely opposed to ministers in his political career, was a very extensive shareholder of the *Courier*, of which there were twenty-four shares, and which derived its support from abusing himself amongst others who, certainly, however, were not benefited by the abuse as he was. The *Times* was another mercantile speculation, and money—money was the object. It abused and supported the Catholics alternately, just as a purpose was to be answered by it. The *Morning Chronicle* had long and effectually supported the Catholics, but it had now become a more trading concern, after having passed from the hands of him who never would have condescended to drag it through the mire with which its pages are now daily sullied. No: he (the late Mr. Perry) was too stanch a whig, and too high-minded a man for conduct like this. The present editor of the *Chronicle* is a sour Scotch sectarian; one of those who, without believing implicitly in Christianity, assume its principles, in order to hate and persecute more effectually. Now a few pounds sterling might have a great effect upon a sour Scotch sectarian, if not swayed by the same generosity that induced some of his countrymen in Edinburgh to subscribe a few half guineas, in order to educate the Irish people. For the press, then, he would allow £15,000, and for the first head of expense he had said £5000, making in all £20,000.

“The Orange faction have become active. They are on the alert. They have locked the Marquis of Wellesley to their chariot wheels, and dragged him to their Orange club feasts, without his making one stipulation that the sentiment of offence, the personal application of which was understood, and which no one having a respect for Catholic feeling could sanction, should not be given: and scarcely was his back turned, when, as if to shew that their silence in his presence was not from any

deference to his wishes, but the effect of a forced etiquette, the toast was given, for drinking of which he dismissed one of his own officers. Hitherto Orange strength was concealed, because it was of a mixed quality, and hid beneath the shield of government; but at present it despises protection or disguise, and openly opposes government, which it had taken captive. But who would say the captivity was not voluntary upon the part of the government?

“The marquis had acquired a high character in India, and like many who had amassed wealth in that clime, he feared that he had returned to Ireland but to enjoy his ease in expending it in his native country.

“Throughout the country the people stood in need of legal protection. This idea might be sneered at as coming from him, but it was really frightful to think of the oppressions which it was in the power of a magistrate, tinged with Orange principles, to inflict upon the people. With a view to meet this, he would apportion £15,000 a year towards procuring legal protection for the Catholics against Orange oppression. He had now disposed of £35,000 a year, and trusted the objects he had detailed were such as would meet the entire approval of the Catholic body.

“He had next to turn their attention to the subject of the education of the poor. It had been said by the Orange press, and by the saints of the association in Kildare-street, that the Roman Catholic clergymen were inimical to the education of the poor. Nothing could be more false. The hypocritical saints had, however, become agitators, it appeared, and had taken on themselves to arraign peers in parliament.

“Let any one compare the crowd of busy bright faces coming out of a Catholic school, with the silent few coming from one of the Society's schools, where the scholars are furnished with the Charter School Catechism. It would be necessary also that the Catholic children should be provided with books untainted by any doctrine opposed to their own faith. The government were much and grievously in fault to continue the system of subsidizing with thousands of the public money, the parties who were employed in teaching the Charter School children little else, but to hate with inveteracy their neighbours of a different religion. For the use of the Catholic schools, and for the purchase of books, he would allow £5000. The fifth purpose for which the fund should be applied, he would now explain. He had received a letter from the Right Rev. Dr. England, Roman Catholic Bishop of Charleston (than whom a more pious divine, a better Christian, or more learned prelate was not to be found), stating that Catholic priests were much wanting in America, particularly Irish ones, and as the resources for educating the Catholic clergy were scanty, and totally inadequate, he would pro-

pose a grant for that purpose. It was notorious, that notwithstanding the thousands granted by parliament to charter schools and the Kildare-street Society, the Catholic College of Maynooth received but an annual grant of £8000. The French government were now very anxious to educate as many Irish priests as possible, not indeed for any hostile purpose, but from a desire to retain the funds left by Irish families, his (Mr. O'Connell's) own amongst the rest, for the education of Catholic priests, and for which funds the English government neglected to apply, when they might have done so effectually, and were urged to it by the Irish Catholic prelates. There were many objections which should influence a paternal government solicitous for the peace and welfare of the kingdom, against having the Catholic clergy educated in France, and induce them to make a sufficient allowance to the Catholic college, for the purpose of assisting in the education of Catholic clergy at home. Our government seemed insensible to these considerations, and therefore he would allot a sum of £5,000 for the purpose he had stated. There would then remain of the £50,000, £5,000, and that sum should be held over to accumulate, and be applied to the building, and for building chapels, taking farms in the several parishes, and erecting a house upon each for the Catholic clergymen, &c., &c.

“He had now stated the objects for which he sought to raise the money, and he had but to recall to their minds the means by which he proposed it should be got. If only one million out of the seven millions subscribed but a single penny a month only, they would have more than sufficient for their purpose. They could enter the several parishes in a book, and call it the ‘Emancipation Rent,’ or the ‘Slave Rent.’ A circular letter should also be prepared, stating that they would not take more than two shillings per month from any individual, and expecting only one penny a month for each. Thousands of orphans were supported in Dublin by one penny per week. The first year he thought they would get, at the least, one million of shillings, and it was a million to one, but they would get double that number next.

“The great difficulty would be, not to get the money, but to collect it. He was himself, in general, as busy as most men, but he would engage to collect his parish. They could not fail but from the voluntary abandonment of their plan, and he for one would, as he said before, and now repeated, never abandon it but with his life.

“The first Protestant to whom he had mentioned the plan, offered him his money upon the instant. It was in his study that very morning, and the subscription was pressed upon him. He (Mr. O'Connell) had, of course, not consented to receive it yet, as the plan had not been as yet adopted by the association; but he felt, that although the cour-

tesy was small, the kindness which prompted it was great, and he drew a good omen for the future from it. He felt assured that more than half the Protestants in the kingdom would subscribe, when the legitimacy and fitness of their object should be seen by them. Their carrying this plan vigorously into effect, would show to the government how anxious the Catholics of Ireland were for emancipation, and by acting thus in unison, they would win their way on the public mind. If they had money enough, they need not fear being efficiently represented in parliament. Though the law said no seat in parliament could be purchased, yet it was contrived to dispose, by some means or other, of seats, for *friendship's* sake; and the Nabob of Arcot, it was well known, had had at one time the property of five borough seats in the house, and what was practicable to him, was so to others. Catholics might also obtain an influence, should it seem proper to attempt doing so in the indirect modes which others used so frequently, and which would continue until nomination boroughs should finally be got rid of.

“The two objects for which he had given notice of a committee, were so distinct, that he now considered it necessary to move for the appointment of a separate committee for each purpose.”

The motions were agreed to unanimously.

On the 14th of February, Mr. O'Connell reported from the committee appointed to consider the best means of increasing the funds of the association.

“He had at a former meeting, stated in detail the plan of subscriptions, of which the association had been pleased to express approval. His observations during that statement, had occasioned a great accumulation of abuse, directed against himself, but abuse for which he had been, and always was quite prepared, and careless about.

“Having put his hand into the hornet's nest, he could not expect but that attempts would be made to sting him.

“His (Mr. O'Connell's) observations upon the *London Morning Chronicle* were founded upon inferences drawn from facts, such facts as, that the *Morning Chronicle* had heaped the most rancorous and monstrous abuse upon the Catholic religion; had attempted to confirm and strengthen the prejudices of the English people against the Catholic claims; had libelled and calumniated the religion of five-sixths of the people of Europe, the religion of Alfred, of Edward, of Sir Thomas More, and Fenelon; had audaciously styled the Catholic religion as one that can only be professed by knaves or fools. Could there be a

more offensive imputation, though obviously groundless? for he (Mr. O'Connell) would ask, what was the inducement, that as *knaves* they should adhere to a religion, for which in this life they were made to suffer rigorous persecution and deprivation of the rights of free-born men, and that as *fools* they should forfeit their temporal advantages, at the risk of damnation hereafter.

“Those charges of immorality, brought against the Catholic religion by one differing in faith not only from it, but the religion of the state, and advanced with such acrimony, justified, in his (Mr. O'Connell's) opinion, the appropriate appellation of ‘sour sectarian’ bestowed on the person from whom they had proceeded. The *Morning Chronicle*, since it had become a mere mercantile speculation in the hands of the present proprietors, had ceased altogether to give any thing like fair play to the Catholics.

“In this opinion he was not singular. (Hear, hear.) He had received a letter upon the subject, a part of which he would read. The letter was received from Preston, from a member of a society formed in that town, called ‘The Catholic Defence Society,’ associated for the purpose of refuting, through the press, the numerous calumnies so industriously propagated against the Catholic religion. The letter stated that in the town of Preston there were many Catholics, all of whom lived upon the most friendly terms with their Protestant neighbours, who subscribed liberally to the support of some Catholic charities. The letter then proceeded to state, that there were several Catholics of rank in the neighbourhood; and the writer regretted the apathy that seemed to exist amongst them, and that it was only the working and middling classes that felt particularly anxious on the subject of Catholic grievances. The society approved of the plan suggested by him (Mr. O'Connell) for increasing the funds of the association. They were about to adopt it in Preston, and had every hope of its success. ‘The *Morning Chronicle*,’ continues the writer, ‘has well deserved the censures of the Catholic body. The press, by a judicious and vigorous exercise of its powers, could remove the accumulated prejudices of centuries against the Catholics, and convince the credulous that they have been imposed upon by ignorance and malicious bigotry; but the *Morning Chronicle*, since its change of proprietors, has taken an opposite course, and its efforts appear directed to strengthen and perpetuate the ancient, though now fading prejudices of the English Protestants against Catholic emancipation.’

MR. O'CONNELL then proceeded to read the report of the finance committee; after which he moved that it should lie on the table, in





order to be submitted to the consideration of the association on Wednesday next.

“The report recommended the several allocations proposed by Mr. O’Connell, when he submitted the plan to the association, viz:—

For parliamentary expenses . . . . .	£5,000
For the services of the press . . . . .	15,000
For law proceedings, in preserving the legal privileges of the Catholics, and prosecuting Orange aggressors . . . . .	15,000
For the purpose of education for the Catholic poor . . . . .	5,000
For educating Catholic priests for the service of America . . . . .	5,000
	<hr/>
	£45,000

“The surplus sum of five thousand pounds should be suffered to accumulate, in order to repair and build Catholic chapels and schools, to procure accommodation for the Catholic clergy, and facilitate their efforts in every way towards improving their parishes, to meet contingencies, &c.

“The report also recommended the appointment of treasurers and trustees, with whom the subscriptions should be lodged; and that he (Mr. O’Connell) should be appointed secretary for correspondence with the several parishes in Ireland, upon the subject of subscriptions, and Mr. James Sugrue his assistant secretary; and that no grant of money should be paid out of the fund, without having been first considered by the finance committee, and duly sanctioned by the association.

“The subscription to be called ‘the Monthly Catholic Rent,’ for which no greater sum should be expected than *one farthing* per week, nor higher expected than sixpence per week, to be paid by the several Catholics of the different parishes, whose names should be entered in the subscription books, and an account of them weekly transmitted to the association.

“Mr. O’Connell added, that the members of the association would not be required to subscribe, in addition to their annual payment of one guinea. They would be required to allocate their guinea to the subscriptions of some parish; that to which they individually belonged, or any other they might choose to fix upon.

“He (Mr. O’Connell) entertained not the slightest doubt of the plan succeeding, where the individual sacrifice would be so trifling, and the advantages to be obtained so important. The collection would be the only difficulty—but that obstacle, it was hoped, would be overcome by the arrangements of the committee.

“Mr. O’Connell then proceeded to detail the purposes to which the subscription should be applied, namely, to enable the association to lay

before the parliament an authenticated and detailed history of all the Catholic grievances ; to bring before the legal tribunals cases of Orange outrage and magisterial oppression ; to maintain and preserve those legal privileges to which the Catholics have been entitled for the last two-and-thirty years, but of which they have enjoyed very few indeed ; and finally, to inspire the Catholic peasantry with a confidence in the protection of the laws, by showing him, and making him practically know that an institution had arisen, whose object was, that no village despot, no magisterial tyrant, nor sectarian bigot, shall be longer permitted to make the law subservient to the purposes of persecution and oppression, instead of to the administration of justice, and the preservation of the peace.

“The mere certainty that such a body existed, would render this assistance unnecessary, their enemies speedily becoming aware, that they could not any longer offend with impunity.

“MR. FITZSIMON seconded the motion, and it passed as usual.

“MR. PLUNKET objected to the allocation of Irish Catholic rent to the education of priests for America.

“MR. KIRWAN defended the conduct of the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, without approving of the late politics of that paper.

“MR. CONWAY deprecated abuse of the press.

“MR. O'GORMAN protested against impunity to calumny, in the press.

“MR. SHEIL apprehended the conductors of the London press had made a mistake respecting Mr. O'Connell's proposed allocation of money to newspapers.

“MR. O'CONNELL reiterated the opinions he had before avowed, respecting the editor and proprietor of the *Morning Chronicle*.

“After which, and some unimportant business being gone through, the meeting adjourned.”

The attacks upon Mr. O'Connell for his new, and yet scarcely developed plan of the *small subscriptions* to the “Catholic rent,” were by no means confined to the Orange press. A great number amongst the Catholics scouted the idea as childish and ridiculous. Boys will catch up, and reflect the opinions of men, and the writer well recollects that he himself was for some time much jeered at by several of his schoolfellows, for his father's “*penny-a-month plan for liberating Ireland.*”

“ WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH, 1824.

“ FREDERICK WILLIAM CONWAY, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

“ MR. O’GORMAN read a report from the burial committee, stating that several advantageous offers of sites had been made to them, none, of course, being accepted until the arrangements should be forward for raising and supplying the necessary funds.

“ The report of the committee for devising the best means to increase the funds of the association, having been read—

“ MR. NICHOLAS MAHON objected to its being adopted—accusing it of indiscretion and rashness. He proposed its postponement until after the aggregate meeting.

“ Various opinions having been expressed on this subject, Mr. O’CONNELL, who came in during the discussion, said, that from the length of the report, and the variety of its topics, he thought it very proper to postpone the consideration of the report, but wished to move the adoption of the resolution for setting the subscription on foot.

“ MR. N. MAHON could have no objection to that course, as there was nothing objectionable in the resolution.

“ MR. O’CONNELL, in reply to the observation, that the report contained angry expressions, assured the meeting that it was drawn up ‘more in sorrow than in anger,’ for never was there so unfavourable a prospect for the Catholic cause as at the present moment. Never was there so slight a pretence for resisting their claims, and never so formidable a combination to oppose them. Mr. O’Connell then moved several resolutions, which originally formed part of the report.

“ The following is the substance of those agreed to :—

“ That a plan of subscription be adopted, to be called “ *The Monthly Emancipation Rent.*”

“ That a secretary and assistant-secretary be appointed to collect the subscriptions.

“ That the secretary do immediately open an account, and enter the amount of money, paid by each parish.

“ That collectors for each parish be appointed to receive subscriptions, and that no greater number than twelve, nor less than three, be appointed for each parish.

“ That a monthly report be laid before the association of the amount and progress of subscription in each parish.

“ That the names of the subscribers be published, unless such as wish to be unknown.

“ That the amount of subscriptions, debtor and creditor, be published annually.

“ That all subscriptions received by the secretary, be immediately paid over to the treasurer.

“ That a committee of twenty-one be appointed to manage the subscriptions, to be called a committee of accounts.

“That no money be paid without having been first recommended by the committee, and afterwards sanctioned by the association.

“That the amount of subscription be one penny per month from each person, and not to exceed two shillings.

“That the subscription of one guinea to the association, be deemed a part of the contribution.

“That Mr. O'Connell be appointed secretary, and Mr. James Sugrue, assistant-secretary, for collecting subscriptions.’

“A discussion then took place as to the necessity of adjourning the aggregate meeting to some future day, in consequence of the resolutions and petitions intended to be submitted to the meeting not being ready.

“After which the association adjourned.

Upon the 21st February, their next meeting—

“MR. O'CONNELL stated, that some of the London papers had said that Mr. Sheil accused him of entertaining the opinions of Tom Paine! Of course this was unfounded. Mr. Sheil never did so.

“As to himself, he could not—although the miserable calumny was scarce worth his while—bring *himself* to forego the opportunity of once for all giving the most public denial to this malignant and most contemptible insinuation.

“He declared that no man had, or could possibly have, a more thorough and entire conviction of the divine truths of Christianity, and the abominable falsehood of Paine's impious doctrines!

“It was quite well known to him who was the author of the illiberal observations upon him in the British press. He knew the connexion with the Marquis Wellesley, the connexion with the British Stamp Office, through which the paragraph came. He knew the individual who, for writing a pamphlet in favour of Lord Melville, gained the situation he now holds; and it was from a point of Christian forbearance, that he refrained from mentioning his name, and observing upon him as he merited.

“That individual had been able to discover that he (Mr. O'Connell) was devoid of talent. That important discovery however, came, fortunately for him (Mr. O'Connell), *a little* too late. It reminded him of a gentleman, who, after he was made a judge, congratulated himself, that the government had not discovered, until after his elevation, that he was *no lawyer*.

“So, as to himself, the discovery was not made until he had attained that station in his profession which rendered that discovery of no avail. (Laughter and cheers.)

“MR. O’CONNELL next moved upon his notice, for changing the hour when the association should adjourn from want of a sufficient number of members present to authorize the chair being taken.

“He then proposed the following resolution, which was agreed to :—

“That in future the chair be taken at any time between the hours of three and five o’clock, as soon as ten members be present.”

“MR. O’CONNELL again rose and said, that though various homicides had been committed during the last year by the Orangemen, no trial of the perpetrators had taken place ; the effect of which had been, that Orangemen considered they might shed Catholic blood with impunity, and the Catholics thought them protected from punishment.

“The late atrocious outrage in the North, where Orangemen deliberately took their stations upon the road, in order to shoot Catholics, was brought home to the parties, by the vigilance and honesty of a magistrate, Mr. Hamilton. A coroner’s jury had declared it wilful murder ; and yet it may happen, that if the parties are not properly prosecuted, they may be acquitted by an Orange jury, and the Orange body may thank them, and declare them deserving of a reward.

“When the crown undertook any prosecution of Orangemen in the North, the proceeding never had the cordial co-operation of the Catholics. It was believed that a principal officer who conducted these proceedings, was a dignitary of the Orange institution ; and when it was known that that body had their private signals, and that the members of it were individually influenced by some obligation, that the authority of the House of Commons could not wring from a dependent of the government (Sir A. B. King), was it unreasonable that the Catholics should have little confidence in proceedings conducted under the auspices of one of their chiefs ?

“He did not mean to say but that the gentleman alluded to discharged his duty fairly and honestly ; but he was in such a situation as made it difficult not to lean to the party accused. He did not make the assertion slightly, or without foundation, as it was grounded upon documentary evidence, which he should take care to have with him in proper order and arrangement to furnish to the aggregate meeting, and deposit with the secretary. There was the sanguinary affair at Maghera, where Campbell was shot, and at which his sister, who was to have been married in a few days, was present ; but the sight of her brother being slaughtered, had such an effect upon her that she instantly became deranged, and has continued so. Here was the brother

slain, the sister a maniac, and yet the ruffian perpetrators remain unpunished, while the Orangemen are calling out to the government for persecution against the unfortunate Catholics, hallooed on by the *Warder* and the *Antidote*, both of which, they boast, are supported by the contributions of Protestant clergy, while the Orange lodges are sedulous in supplying arms to those of their brethren who are unable to purchase them. Under such circumstances, it was of consequence to have the plan of subscription already approved of by the association, established as quickly as possible, in order to supply a fund for the conducting of those prosecutions, in the first instance. For that purpose it would be desirable to have the report, accompanying the plan of subscription, published, that it might get into every one's hand, and thereby promote the collection. In publishing the report he did not intend that it should be considered as adopted by the Catholic association, but that the Catholics might have an opportunity of considering it. There were a few verbal alterations which he considered necessary, and they should be made. The term, limited intellect, as applied to Mr. Goulburn, had been objected to; but he (Mr. O'Connell) could not suppose the observation would be considered, as applied to Mr. Goulburn, in a mere personal sense; it was used in allusion to his capabilities as a statesman. It was one of the cruelest consequences of Catholic degradation, that men speculated upon their advancement in office or enjoying the favour of government, by opposing Catholic claims; and so it was with Mr. Goulburn, who, when in the office of Colonial Secretary, had stood up in the House of Commons, when the Catholic Relief Bill was there under discussion, to object to its provisions extending to the colonies of Great Britain, as if there were no such authority as a colonial legislature or a prerogative of dispensation in the king, to each of which such a provision must be subjected.

“Though Mr. Secretary Goulburn betrayed upon that occasion his utter want of legislative and official information, yet he manifested hostility to the Catholics; and that was quite sufficient to obtain for him the favour of ministers. The secretaryship for Ireland followed; and if he persevere, he may soon become a prime minister of England—talent not being now considered a necessary qualification for that office.

“But Mr. Goulburn has, perhaps, rebutted the charge of limited intellect, in not only sustaining the Orangemen, but falling in love with the Dublin corporation, thereby evincing his discrimination in patronizing a body that has never done anything for the citizens of Dublin, but form processions for the amusement of schoolboys—raise the price of coals by excessive extortions and fees—increase the price of provisions

by their market exactions and tolls—levy unauthorized contributions upon the people ;—In fine, an association for the encouragement of anti-national feeling—a cumbrous, expensive, unmanageable machine, that he defied any person to shew had ever effected any practical good for the citizens of Dublin, or the country generally.

“MR. KIRWAN, in a short speech, seconded Mr. O’Connell’s motion for printing the report, but objected strongly to several passages. Several other gentlemen spoke for and against.

“MR. O’CONNELL defended the report. It was surely a strong argument in its favour, that after having been scrutinized with such criticism as to discover verbal improprieties, they were not able to produce any specific objections to its principles. How could the merits of the document be considered, unless it were first made public? The objection reminded him of a club in London, called ‘the Odd Fellows,’ in which, after a long debate as to the appointment of a treasurer, the secretary reminded them that before they appointed a *treasurer*, they should first have a *treasury*. The objection was so forcible, and betrayed so much common sense, that the Odd Fellows all gathered around the secretary, and gave him a good drubbing for being an *odd* fellow amongst them, as he was the only one that had common sense ; now, if Mr. O’Gorman was amongst the *Odd Fellows*, he would be quite at home. (Laughter and cheers.)

“MR. O’GORMAN—‘I am pretty much so now.

“The chairman was about putting the question, when Mr. N. MAHON entered the room, and upon learning the subject matter of debate, implored Mr. O’Connell, that in mercy to the Catholic people, he would not press a measure that might involve the Catholics of Ireland. The whole tenor of the report, in his opinion, was conceived in terms highly indiscreet. The allusions to the heir apparent were improper and injudicious.

“MR. O’CONNELL replied. Who, he asked, would devote their time and attention to the association, if their measures were to be thwarted by such childish opposition? Had the association yet effected one political good? It was time they should commence. There was now the opportunity, and it should not be lost through neglecting the means ; if they had subscriptions, they could apply them advantageously ; if they had them not, it would be owing to their not informing the people of the necessities and the benefits of such a fund. This was the object in publishing the report, without waiting for its adoption. With respect to the mention of the Duke of York, did not the Orangemen boast, that his royal highness was the declared and avowed opponent of the Catholic people? Were the Catholics to be like



woodcocks, hiding their heads in bushes, thinking that when their heads were covered, they could not be seen? What would they gain by disguising the truth? or were they likely to retard their emancipation by speaking out boldly and candidly? The reverse was his opinion, for the royal personage would then see how sorely and keenly the Irish people felt his supposed hostility to their cause. The prize was too valuable; he would not risk losing the brightest ornament in the British diadem. He could not afford to lose the loyal attachment of seven millions of Irish subjects, by alienating their affections, which they were ready to pledge him if he but followed the genuine principles of liberal policy professed by our revered monarch. He should recollect that one Duke of York lost England by attempting to coerce the religious feelings of the people, by his bigotry and illiberality. The feelings of the Irish were no less sensitive, and the example might extend beyond the channel. People would not be deluded by his royal highness attending a charity dinner. Such an occurrence could not be supposed to operate as an effectual antidote—the poison of the Orange boast of his avowed hostility to Catholic Ireland. There was nothing to be obtained by affecting an unworthy, cringing posture, when the principles of public liberty were trampled under foot by Continental despots, upheld by British ministers. If the Catholics should not obtain emancipation, surely it would be a gratification that their oppressors should not enjoy their dominion unalloyed by apprehensions.

“MR. STEPHEN COPPINGER thought that adopting the resolutions relative to the subscriptions was useless, if they were not followed by the report, professing and demonstrating the purposes for which it was intended. Were the report printed, he had little doubt the subscription would immediately follow.

“MR. A. BROWNE thought the meeting was taken by surprise. There was no notice of the motion given.

“MR. N. MAHON was yet to learn that emancipation would be obtained by idle words and empty threats. It was idle to talk of discussing the report when it had effected the mischief.

“Upon a division, there appeared in favour of the printing, twenty-one. Against it four.

“MR. O'GORMAN said these were sufficient for a majority, but the half of those who voted had not paid their subscription for the present year.

“After thanks to the chairman, the meeting adjourned.”

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH.

“MR. O’CONNELL brought forward the resolutions to be moved at the aggregate meeting :—

“1st. RESOLVED—‘Thanks to Nicholas Purcell O’Gorman, secretary.

“2nd. RESOLVED—‘That it is with great grief, bitter disappointment, and much indignation we contemplate the continuance of the most unjust and oppressive code of laws, by the emaciating cruelty of which we still remain an inferior and excluded class in our native land.

“3rd. RESOLVED—‘That the penal code was enacted without any necessary or justifiable motive whatsoever, and simply because the framers of it had the power and mercenary malignity to pass the same into law; and that it was so enacted in direct and open violation of a solemn and recorded treaty, and manifest derogation of the rights of liberty of conscience.

“4th. RESOLVED—‘That the Irish parliament has frequently and publicly recognized the constant allegiance and fidelity of the Catholic people of Ireland, notwithstanding the continued infliction of the penal code; and such allegiance and fidelity have been solemnly put on record with the recital of various statutes enacted by our parliament.

“5th. RESOLVED—‘That during the reign of our late most gracious sovereign King George III., many laws were passed beneficial to the Catholics; but no redress whatsoever has been hitherto extended to us during the reign of our present respected monarch, notwithstanding the public exhibition of his most gracious sentiments in our favour—sentiments which we ought to, and do cherish with the greater veneration and gratitude, inasmuch as they are at variance with the avowed hostile opinions of the heir presumptive to the British throne.

“6th. RESOLVED—‘That our Irish Protestant brethren, having become sensible of the injustice of the penal code, and of the grievous wrong done to us, and great injury inflicted on themselves, thereby passed several statutes for our relief—statutes which were the more precious to us, as they recognized that sacred principle for which we contend, namely, that of liberty of conscience.

“7th. RESOLVED—‘That no statute was passed purporting to be for our relief, since the enactment of the baneful measure of the Union; neither was any concession made to us since that unhappy event, save and except one law, which, without appearing to effect any thing, has, by its indirect and consequential operation, opened the highest grades in the army and navy to the Catholics. An act, however, not passed until long after the conclusion of the war, during which war Irish and British Catholics were excluded from military rank, whilst German Catholics, aliens to the land, and strangers to our laws, were allowed to exercise, and did actually exercise, military commands in the very heart of England.

“8th. RESOLVED—‘That we are thoroughly convinced, that had not the fatal measure of the Union taken place, the Protestants of Ireland, by their and our representations in parliament, would have long since conceded to us that equalization of civil rights, which is usually styled emancipation, and we have thus to suffer the poignant affliction of attributing the continuance of our unjust sufferings to the heartless indifference and interested intolerance of some individuals belonging to an unfriendly legislature.

“9th. RESOLVED—‘That although our prospect of success is at present uncheering and gloomy, we still owe it to ourselves, our children, and our country, to bring before the British parliament and the world the injustice which is done us; and whilst we disclaim being parties to any annual farce or *ministerial mockery*, we will still persevere in pressing our claims, because the public discussion of those claims, however fruitless in other respects, demonstrates the futility of the pretences upon which we are resisted, the total want of rational argument to oppose our rights, as well as the strength and justice of our cause, and the unquestionable merits of the Catholics of the British empire.

"10th. RESOLVED—That we will persevere in appealing to the British legislature, to the civilized world, and to our God, against the iniquitous oppression under which we labour. That we will again bring before the public the melancholy contrast between our merits and our sufferings, our rights and our grievances, and defy the strictest scrutiny to produce any justifiable cause whatsoever for the continuance of our national degradation.

"11th. RESOLVED—"That we earnestly recommend all the Catholics of Ireland to contribute towards forming a fund for Catholic purposes, convinced, as we are, that there is no rational prospect for Emancipation, unless the Catholic Association shall be enabled to adopt more vigorous and effectual measures than have been heretofore pursued by the Catholic people.

"12th. RESOLVED—"That we highly approve of the mode of raising subscriptions by monthly sums of one penny from each individual, and we strongly recommend that no greater annual contribution be received from any person than ten shillings each, per month.

"And we earnestly recommend to the inhabitants of every parish in Ireland, to meet as soon as possible, in a public manner, and to appoint individuals to collect such monthly subscriptions, and to transmit the same to the Catholic Association."

"With a thirteenth resolution, calling for public meetings generally.

"The aggregate meeting so long announced and prepared for, took place upon Friday, February the 27th, in Old Townsend-street Chapel.

"SIR THOMAS ESMONDE was called to the Chair.

"CHRISTOPHER FITZSIMON, Esq., moved the resolution of thanks to Nicholas Purcell O'Gorman, Esq.

"MR. O'GORMAN returned thanks.

"STEPHEN COPPINGER, Esq., moved the second resolution, the HON. MR. FRENCH, the third, and MR. CONWAY then read the petition proposed to be adopted, which was ordered to be referred to the Catholic Association for further consideration, and for the purpose of being forwarded to parliament."

Some discussion here arose on an amendment proposed by the Honourable Mr. French, to omit from the petition all topics and remarks not strictly connected with the single question of Catholic Emancipation.

The amendment, however, not being seconded, fell to the ground; and Mr. Conway's resolution, adopting the petition with such amendments as the Catholic Association should consider proper to be made, was put from the Chair, and passed without further opposition.

"MR. O'CONNELL here rose, amidst the most enthusiastic cheering. For many minutes he was unable to proceed, in consequence of the deafening shouts that proceeded from every corner of the chapel. Silence

being at length obtained, he said that he craved with a peculiar triumph that the attempt to overturn the honest labours of the committee appointed to prepare the petition just read, had met with such a decided repulse; and it was with no ordinary regret he had witnessed that one of a family who had done much for the Catholic cause, and a gentleman whose character he highly esteemed, and whose respectability and general good sense he could bear attestation to, had determined on pressing a motion so contrary to the general sense of the large and respectable meeting by which he was surrounded, and so contrary, he would say, to the interests and feelings of the country at large. (Applause.) Here it was highly important they should take their stand; and he would again repeat his old and favourite motto—

"Hereditary badness, have ye not,  
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow."

Yes, at once he freely declared, to whatever side he turned him, there was no hope of legal and constitutional redress, notwithstanding their painful and laborious exertion. (Hear.) It was, therefore, important that the Catholics should calculate what use they should make of the resources on which they can draw. This was necessary, as it was only by inquiring into their affairs they could fortify themselves with prudent determination.

"Emancipation, then, he thought, might be attained by two means: First, by external means, in which he included the suppression of war, and the effect of foreign policy upon domestic legislation; secondly, by internal wisdom, or a just application and disposition of the resources of those undiscovered mines; which were latent in the body of our country.

"As to external means, they should be repudiated and rejected, as the last extreme of painful and inevitable necessity, although they were frequently taken advantage of to forge the fetters of the Catholic people of Ireland. The Duke of Marlborough's external victories had been taken advantage of in the enactment of the penal code. In the strength and plenitude of power, England, during the reign of Queen Anne, had enacted a great portion of that frightful and horrible code, violating that religious toleration on which the Revolution had been founded—which Revolution it was that changed the dynasty of the Stuarts, and placed the predecessors of the present family on the throne of these realms. (Applause.) And if England, in the security of triumph, and in the insouciance of haughty dominion, had put her foot upon their necks, there was a time, too (and it might occur again), when she held out the hand of fellowship and friendship—when she 'kept the sword of promise to the

ear,' and wooed them into a convenient and profitable alliance. (Loud applause.)

"In the experimental despotism which England fastened on Ireland, her mighty appetite for slavery was not gorged; and because our unfortunate country was proximate, and polite in the endurance of the burden so mercilessly imposed, it was inferred that slavery could be safely extended far and wide, and an attempt was therefore made on the American colonies. Despotism, in fact, was an all-craving and voracious animal: 'increase of appetite did grow on what it fed;' until endurance became at length too vile; and the Americans—the Great God of Heaven bless them for it! (laughter and applause)—shook off the thralldom which a parliament, representing an inglorious and ignominious funding system, had sought to impose. (Cheers.) Oh, it was a noble sight, to see them in open battle, contending for their liberties! The recollection of the circumstance cheered and invigorated him in his progress: it gave him an elasticity, which all the fatigues of the day could not depress. (Cheers.)

" 'The friends they tried were by their side—  
The foes they dared, before them.'

Wives animated their husbands to the combat; they bid them contend for their children, for the dear pledges of their mutual love—(hear, hear)—mothers enjoined their sons to remember those who bore them—the younger sex bid their lovers earn their favours in a 'well foughten field,' and to return arrayed in glory. They did so—God of Heaven for ever bless them! he said again. (Loud cheering, mingled with laughter.) Thanks to the valour and patriotism of Washington, a name dear to every lover of liberty, the Americans achieved their independence, and Providence spared the instrument to witness it. (Loud applause.)

"The independence of America was the first blush of dawn to the Catholic, after a long and dreary night of degradation. Seventy years had they been in a land of bondage; but like the chosen people, Providence had watched over, and the progress of events had liberated them, and redeemed them for the service of their country. The same Providence existed now, and why should they despair? (Cheers.)

"In 1778, Holland assumed a threatening aspect, and some wise friend—(a laugh)—whispered into the ear of England, 'Search the rich resources of the Irish heart; give to their arms a stimulus to exertion; delude them with promises if you will, but convert their power into your strength and render them subservient to your purposes.' England took the advice: the meteor flag was unfurled; the Danish, Spanish, and Dutch fleets peopled a wide waste of waters; but what of Ireland? Oh,

although long neglected, she was faithful in the day of need : fifty thousand seamen were produced in a month—the Volunteers organized—a federate independence was created—and the Catholic cause was debated. But, lo ! peace came, and gratitude vanished ; and justice was not abroad ; and obligations remained unrequited ; and the Catholics were forgotten.

“Forgotten? No! Acts were passed against them. (Loud and long-continued applause.)

“Yes, strange as it might seem, the act taking from them the power to vote at vestries was passed at this very time ; so that if the rectors agreed to build a church, the poor Catholics could not ask, ‘Who is to go into it?’ (Much laughter.) Or, if taking cold, he required repairs, they could not order him fifty shillings to buy glass windows! (Laughter.) Next came the French Revolution. That Revolution produced some good, but it was not without alloy : it was mingled with much impiety. Liberty and religion were first separated. The experiment was a bad one. It had much of French levity in it, and a deal of what was much worse. The people of France should have remembered that Liberty is the first instinct of a generous religion. (Immense applause.)

“This position he would not concede to any saint or Bible-distributor. (Great applause.) The French, in folly, set religion at nought : they profaned the sanctuary, and they suffered for it. And if they are now settling into quiet, it is because they are settling into religion. (Applause.)

“But he was trespassing on the time of the meeting—(no, no)—and in some measure wandering. (Cries of ‘Go on.’) Well, he liked the subject, and would go on a little longer. He was saying the French Revolution produced much good. So it did. Dumourier gained the battle of Jemappe—the French crossed the Pyrenees—General Biron was in Italy—England looked benignantly on Ireland—it served her interest, it was her policy to do so, and she passed another act in favour of the Irish Catholics. (Applause.) The Irish were made more thirsty for liberty by the drop that fell on their parched lips. (Applause.)

“There was not one who heard him who did not mourn in affection, in dress, or in heart, for some relative or friend who fell in the field of battle. (Hear.) His own heart strings were torn asunder by the loss of a beloved brother, the companion of his youth, and the offspring of the same loins. A kinsman of his, too, died at the storming of St. Sebastian. Three times did he mount the breach, and he fell at last, covered with wounds and with glory. (Applause.) He was as gay and as lovely a youth as ever shed his blood in defence of his country, and a fair withal as ever trod on the green sward of Erin. (Much applause.)

He could not choose but name him. It was Lieutenant John O'Connell of the forty-third regiment. And what did the relatives of these brave men gain by this?—what the Catholics of Ireland? Why, the Marquis of Douro was made Duke of Wellington!

“The victories of Wellington might be compared to those of Marlborough. Both had perpetuated despotism at home and abroad. Civil liberty was now extinct on the Continent. From the fair and classic shores of Naples to the Tanis and the Volga was one wide stretch of illimitable despotism. In Naples, where the King ‘swore, and swore, and swore again,’ he returned against his oath, and put to death those who spared him. Piedmont was under the hoofs of the despots. In Portugal, liberty was extinct. In Germany, no breath of public spirit was heard—their chards had become corporations to ‘crib and cabin’ the intellect of man. Brutal force controlled, for the present, the eternal empire of mind.

“In France, the cause of liberty found some advocates, but they were few: the enemies of the rights of man were the more numerous; but, nevertheless, France enjoyed much practical liberty, and her peasantry were happy and well-fed.

“In England, Toryism was triumphant. The forges were all employed; the funds were high and healthy; the cry of war had been abandoned; the navy was flourishing, and actively engaged; the army was numerous, well fed, and well paid; the Duke of York, their declared and open enemy, and who headed the Orange faction, was the Commander-in-Chief; Mr. Canning was in office, secured by a motley cabinet, who opposed each other openly, but who covertly befriended themselves to the detriment of the country; Mr. Peel, their avowed enemy, was firm in his place; Lord Liverpool still opposed them. Was it, therefore, at all wonderful that the Catholics were despised, and their cause abandoned?

“In Ireland, they had been blamed for being agitators. He (Mr. O'Connell) thanked his God for being one. Whatever little they had gained, they had gained by agitation, while they uniformly lost by moderation. The last word was repeated so often, that he was completely sick of it. He wondered some gentleman did not teach a parrot to repeat it. (A laugh.) If we gained nothing by moderation, it cost us something. Our religion was reviled, and we thanked the revilers; they spit in our faces, and we paid 'em for it. (Laughter and applause.) This reminded him of Shylock, in ‘The Merchant of Venice’—

“Fair Sir, you spat on me on Wednesday last;  
On such a day you called me dog;  
And for these courtesies I'll lend you so much monies.”

“The King came, and from the Catholics he reaped a rich harvest of gratitude. Anger and bigotry clothed their frightful forms in the garb of peace and conciliation, and became for a time allies to the throne. The feelings of the Catholics were, and he was not ashamed to say it, a little exaggerated by the natural ardour of the national temperament; by their innate sense of gratitude, and by the sentiments of duty and respect, which warmed into enthusiastic love. The king had dismissed the whiskered and feathered tribe, the reds and the blues, who delighted in clothing themselves in all sorts of muffs and tippetts. (Much laughter.) He won the Irish, and he was received with one acclaiming shout from Dingle-o’-Cooch to the Giant’s Causeway.

“That most paltry of all paltry things, the Corporation of the City of Dublin, swallowed this as they would have a bitter pill. (Loud laughter.) It was a very long time since he had taken physic, but he had some slight recollection of the taste of a pill from his boyish days. (Laughter.) The cat, however, drew up its nails within its paw, and we met the velvet. (Laughter.) We pledged as men and gentlemen, and we kept our words. The Orangemen accuse us of not keeping faith with heretics, but they have kept no faith with us, from the treaty of Limerick to the dinner at the Mansion-house. (Loud applause.) They never made a treaty with us that they did not violate, when it was their interest or pleasure to do so. (Hear.) The vile press of London might taunt him for his observations to-day; but he would tell that press, that at the last time of which he was speaking, he bent his knee to his Sovereign, in all the ardour of duty, allegiance, and love—that knee which he bent only to his God beside. (Cheers.)

“However, as he was saying, the Orangemen got alarmed—consultations were held—deputies came up to town, to preserve the Orange system. A representation was thereby established, and each county and city appointed some kind friend to act in behalf of the fraternity. (Loud and general applause.)

[“Mr. O’Connell here called for a large package of books, letters, and papers, which, he said, an honest fellow in the North (and God bless him for it!)—(laughter)—transmitted to him. (Here there were many cries of ‘Read, read.’)]

“He would, with the leave of the meeting, proceed to read, but he would first exhibit to them the signs and seals of the dignitaries of Donegal. This document should be framed and glazed forthwith, and suspended from the walls of the Catholic Association. (Hear, and laughter.) The county of Donegal was not regularly organized till 1813.

[“Here Mr. B. COYLE stated that it was organized in 1796.”]



“Mr. O'Connell resumed. It was a very Catholic county, and although there might have been scattered Orangemen resident in it, still he had reason to think there was no organized Lodge till the period he had mentioned.

“The learned gentleman now proceeded to read the regulations for admission, as assigned by the notorious Jack Giffard. Those who wished to be of the brotherhood should enter naked and hoodwinked. (Immense laughter.) This part of the business was denominated the Royal Arch Mark. They were next made acquainted with the dialogue, which was represented by Giffard to be long, simple, and beautiful. (Laughter.)

“Mr. O'Connell next read a letter, signed ‘John Payne,’ of the Cambridge militia, who was admitted to Lodge 1,287. This person stated that the forms were indecent and absurd, and that he had suffered considerable injury and abuse, and many things degrading to a good and loyal man, in becoming an Orangeman. It was worthy of remark that these Orange Lodges met on the first Tuesday, in every assizes. If there was a bit of an acre of ground between a Protestant and a bloody Papist, or if there was an Orange murder, to be sure these honest Orangemen would not say a word about the matter to those of the fraternity summoned on juries. No, no; it would be indelicate to suppose such a thing. (Applause.) It was further to be observed, that Captain Nesbitt, after being one year in office, had resigned the grand-mastership of this Lodge to Sir James Galbraith, the crown solicitor for the county. Therefore, the stream of justice was sure to flow unpolluted. (Cheering.) Oh (he said again), God bless the honest fellow who sent him these books! He was sure he was much obliged to him. (Hear.) It was in the recollection of many who heard him, that these self-same gentry had petitioned the House of Commons against the respectable Jesuit establishment in Ireland.

“The Jesuits were a body, the most enlightened in every age since their original formation. The tuition of the youth of Europe had been committed to them, and they had acquitted themselves nobly. There was no subject of science or elegant literature which they had not touched, and they certainly improved and adorned every subject on which they had written. At a time when bigotry was the epidemic of the age in England, efforts were certainly made by subornation of perjury to malign and traduce the character of this society; but the clear and steady light of history—‘*temporum testis, lux veritatis*’—had pronounced a judgment not less severe than merited on these attempts.

“These were the men who were accused by the Orangemen of the North with darkening the intellect of the rising generation; but the

eagle-eyed penetration of Henry Brougham had discovered that the petition of the enlighteners, '*par excellence*' abounded in glaring mis-spellings and breaches of concord. (Laughter.)

"In one of the letters in his possession, the treasurer, in applying for subscriptions, wrote as follows:—'As several members *is is* arrear.' The high numbering of the lodges reminded him of a templar in London, a friend of his, who, having purchased two pair of silk stockings, had them numbered 47 and 48. (Laughter.)

"After all the boasting, however, about organization and funds, it was discovered that lodge 10,547 only paid 5s.; that lodge 1,499 paid only 5s. also; while 344 advanced only 2s. 6d., and 1,190 nothing at all. (Laughter.) In all they could muster but the sum of 12s. 6d. for one year, of these lodges, which he contended were falsely represented with regard to the number and respectability of their members. He next produced an entry on the book, 'deploring that the political hemisphere had been gloomily clouded by the removal, to a better world, of that great and good man and brother, John Giffard, Esq.' (Great laughter and applause).

"If J. Giffard died, the spirit of the dog survived; but what was next? Why, a document proving the illiberality of their enemies. It was in the shape of a resolution:—

"RESOLVED—'That any Orangeman, who ever has, or may hereafter, sign any petition in favour of the Roman Catholics, and for their emancipation, be expelled from all Orange Lodges, and his name posted.'

"The individuals who passed that resolution had lately appointed a Committee of twenty-one Orange gentlemen, to manage their affairs in the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland. They were—

"Thomas Ellis, Esq., M.P.; Frederick Darley, Esq. and Alderman; Sir H. Lees, Clergyman and Baronet; Thomas Verner, Esq., Francis Dejoncourt, Esq., Captain Wiley, Charles Todd, Esq., George Hill, Esq., J. Walsh, Esq., N. Barrington, Esq., J. Forbes, Esq., L. H. Mangan, Esq., J. Pim, Esq.'

"'All Esquires,' said Mr. O'Connell.

"Joseph Mullen, Esq., (no Denis in it) (a laugh); Wm. Hall, Esq., G. Bentley, Esq., A. O'Neill, Esq., T. G. Byrne, Esq., George Feazon, Esq., George Atkinson, Esq.'

(Great laughter, when this list was ended.)

"Here came a letter, written at Donegal, when the king was in Dublin, addressed to the then Grand Secretary; the object of it was to know if the Orange system was not about being discontinued, owing to the conciliatory proceedings of that period. The answer to that was from Theophilus Norton, Esq., Grand Secretary; he expressed his amazement as to what could have given rise to such a rumour, but said

that owing to the bustle in Dublin, the Grand Lodge could not meet, and added that Colonel Blacker had been elected Deputy Grand Master, in the room of Sir A. B. King, Bart., and that the system was as flourishing as ever.

“The next document read, was dated 9th July, 1822, and addressed to the Donegal Lodge, by John Burke Fitzsimons, Esq., their representative; it was a postscript of a letter, and ran thus:—

“P.S.—Our statue in College-green, I am delighted to say, is painting for the 12th.’

(Great merriment.)

“In the following November, the next paper was written, and was a suggestion from the Grand Lodge of Donegal, that any further concessions to Papists would only produce further demands ‘on our liberty,’ and they might call for the removal of the statue, and an abandonment of our *principals*, &c. (laughter)—that being so obnoxious to Catholics—they might ask to abolish ‘days and times’—‘days and times,’ repeated Mr. O’Connell, why that would be working a greater miracle than any yet wrought. (Great laughter.) This was signed ‘J. B. Fitzsimons,’ and dated Sandymount.

“The next was a letter from Mr. Fitzsimons, also dated Sandymount, 17th September, 1822:—

“DEAR SIR—The Grand Lodge are averse to abandoning the old custom of dressing the statue—Lord O’Neill in the Chair—present, three Vernons, Messrs. Sneyd, Ellis, and Darley. God send we have done right in differing with Government: I hope it will not lead to bad consequences; but no discussion had ever been more fairly or knowingly conducted.

“‘J. B. F.’

“Another document, dated Wiley’s Rooms, North Earl-street—Colonel Blacker in the Chair—it was agreed to form a new association, called the ‘Loyal Orange Association.’

“Another document called for a return of masters and representatives from the country. [Here, Mr. O’Connell said, was a proof of illegality.] That document, claiming such return, was dated ‘Post-office, Dublin,’ and signed ‘William M’Culloch, Deputy Grand Secretary.’

“This, he said, convicted the Orangemen out of their own lips, who now called themselves legally constituted. Mr. J. B. F. wrote another letter, declaring he had received no money, and recommending another application to Mr. Ellis, (secrecy), and the adoption of the King’s parting admonition, as their best guide. (A laugh). It complained ‘that no party was ever more *maligned* or *misrepresented* than the Orangemen of Ireland; and he hoped that their unjust persecution was at an end.’ He expressed his hope in Anglo-Saxon language, ‘that they

would prove the advice of their friends,' and ended with, 'send to me when at a loss *for to act*, as your representative.' It concluded as if (added Mr. O'C.) with love to yourself (laughter)—not literally, but in meaning, for it ended with, 'I beg my best regards to yourself.—Yours, J. B. FITZSIMONS.' (Great shouts of laughter.)

"The next credential was a blank certificate, from the No. 334, at 2s. 8d. per year. The blank might be filled up with the name of Daniel O'Connell. (Great merriment.) The paper was signed O'Neill. Another began—

" 'Glorious, Pious, and Immortal Memory; we appoint our well-beloved brother of the Purple Order, W. Mackintosh, Esq., and his successors for ever, is permitted to hold a lodge, &c.

" 'Given under our Great Seal.

" 'O'NEILL.' "

"It would require a peer to spell the writing. He deprecated the fact of one of the name of O'Neill, for whose protection the red arm of Ulster had often been raised, being placed as the head of Orangemen. He added, that Orangemen were wholesale calumniators, and affected a strength they possessed not; Government, if it knew that, would despise them; and so would the people of Ireland, if they were not unarmed. (Great applause.) Mr. O'Connell rebutted the assertion, that Roman Catholic priests had interfered in the late county of Dublin election, and read a letter signed 'James Langrishe.' Dean Langrishe.

"The following is the substance of Dean Langrishe's letter to Mr. Bartholomew Senior:—

" 'SENIOR—As you are a staunch Protestant, and an honest man, I suppose you can have no difficulty in voting for Sir Compton Domville. Do not, by any means, fail in attending at the hustings, and be as early as possible. I believe your son has got a vote also; pray fetch him with you.

" 'J. H. LANGRISHE.'

"This, he said, had threatened a person named Bartholomew, a staunch Protestant, with exclusion from his office of parish clerk, if he did not vote for Sir Compton Domville, for whom forty-nine clergymen of the Established Church had voted. If there were honesty in England, he declared emancipation would have been granted long ago; and there would be honesty in England again, as soon as they were in danger. Should they wait until the Orange press had created a ferment? No; they should exhibit a legal and unanimous combination. While Orangemen were working in the dark, for their ultimate object—blood and murder—Catholics could not endure being trampled on, much less could they suffer the graves of their parents to be trodden on irreverently. Was it to be suffered that they should continue to inflame the land—to

commit murder?—should not the Catholics be prepared for their defence? (Cheers.) Petitions to the legislature should be prepared every week. (Cheers.) The best exertions of the Catholics had been frustrated, owing to the want of pecuniary means; a general subscription should be made—he only asked one farthing per week, one penny per month. (Cries of 'You shall have it.') He alluded here to the examinations in the House of Commons, relative to the inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Sheriff Thorpe, and said that the Orange secret could not be wrung from Sir A. B. King, for fear that the illegality of the Orange system should be made manifest. He next appealed to the patriotism of the fair sex, and alluded to the siege of Limerick, where the women threw themselves into the breach, and checked the assailants. King William saw that, and slunk away; he took the city the next year; but he obtained possession on the faith of treaties, which he afterwards violated. How otherwise than by a violation of a pledge could he have conquered Limerick, protected as it then was by the heroine bravery of its defenders. (Cheers.) If his (Mr. O'Connell's) plan succeeded, it would redeem the Catholic cause, put down Orangemen, and show that genuine loyalty consisted in making the throne secure, and that the Constitution would be best preserved by affording liberty of conscience and equal rights to every individual in the empire.

“(When Mr. O'Connell concluded, the cheers and huzzas that followed continued for a few minutes.)

“The fourth resolution was moved by R. O'FARRELL, Esq.

“The fifth resolution was moved by MR. BARRON.

“MR. CONWAY moved the sixth resolution.

“MR. SHEIL moved the seventh resolution.

“MR. PALLAS moved the next resolution, which was seconded by MR. LYNCH, of Clogher House.

“MR. SHEIL addressed the meeting at considerable length, and the resolutions being then put and adopted, the proceedings terminated.

"CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION—SATURDAY, FEB. 28.

"DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

"COLLECTION OF THE RENT.

"Upon the motion of MR. CONWAY, it was resolved that the proceedings of the Aggregate Meeting, on Friday, should be inserted once in the *Morning Chronicle* and *Courier*, London newspapers, and twice in such Dublin papers as the Secretary should think fit.

"MR. O'CONNELL stated that he had received £2 from a Catholic clergyman in England, on account of 'the Catholic rent,' and he (Mr O'Connell) then gave notice that on next Saturday he should move the measures he taken for consulting each parish in Dublin, upon the best mode of collecting 'the Catholic rent.'

"He had received an offer from Mr. O'Mara, of Lower Ormond, to collect the rent of two parishes in that neighbourhood, and the parish priest had also promised to lend his assistance.

"MR. O'GORMAN was pleased at finding the clergy disposed to assist in the collection. Heretofore they had been adverse to interfering in political proceedings.

"MR. O'CONNELL said, it was well known amongst the Catholics, that several orphan charities were supported in Dublin by the collection of weekly subscriptions. *Forty-eight* of those collectors had offered their services for Dublin, under the superintendence of the clergy, but it was not intended to give the clergy any more trouble than that they should become the patrons, or act as checks upon the collectors, and see that the amounts were paid with punctuality.

"The first step should be that of consulting the several parishes of Dublin, and having the mode of collection determined upon before they commenced in the country. From the many communications made to him, he was enabled to say that an intense anxiety existed at present in Dublin, for the subscriptions being commenced. The people were convinced of the necessity for a general contribution, in order to provide legal protection against the atrocities of the Orangemen."

Upon the 3rd of March

"MR. O'CONNELL read to the meeting a letter that he had received from Waterford, dated 1st March, and signed 'John Fitzpatrick,' informing him that eighty moral and well-conducted tradesmen of that city had formed themselves into an association, to be called 'The All-

Saints' Society,' for co-operating with the Catholic Association in forwarding such legal and constitutional measures as were likely to obtain emancipation, and for the purpose of managing and arranging the subject of the Catholic rent.

"The letter also enclosed a series of resolutions upon the subject of Catholic grievances, and a vote of thanks to the Association. Mr. O'Connell also stated that twenty-four members of the Charitable Confraternity, for the support of orphan-houses in Dublin, had proposed to assist in the collection of the Dublin subscriptions. In fact, nothing could be more promising nor more cheering than the spirit which was beginning to be evinced in various quarters on this subject; and all that would be wanting would be steady perseverance in the good work.

"It was not intended that the clergy should have any trouble with the collection, further than that they should be satisfied with the persons appointed as collectors, all of whom should have their approbation. Dishonest persons might otherwise avail themselves of the occasion to assume the privilege of collecting for their own pockets, as had been the case in the North of Ireland, where a person professed himself as appointed by him (Mr. O'Connell) to collect subscriptions.

"The success of the subscriptions depended upon the legal and constitutional means used for their collection and application. The government and the magistracy should know every step of their proceedings, and the subscription lists should be posted upon the chapel door.

"The Catholic Association would be informed of every local grievance that occurred in every part of Ireland, through the same channel. There was not one oppressive or illegal act that they would not learn in all its details, without any cost to the aggrieved person, and his case should either be brought before the legislature or the courts of law.

"The plan of subscription would also enable them to have a pretty accurate amount of the Catholic population, and enable them the better to expose the injustice of Catholic degradation. For instance, in a town in Roscommon, the births of last year were, one hundred and seventy-nine Catholic children, and two Protestant. Now, it was rather severe that those hundred and seventy-nine children should be made hewers of wood and drawers of water to the two more favoured infants. As soon as the English people see that so many millions of Irishmen are determined not to cease their exertions until admitted within the pale of the constitution, they will oblige the ministry to sacrifice to justice and the safety of the empire, what they can easiest spare—a passion for bigotry.

"Mr. O'Connell then gave notice of a motion for 'authorizing the

secretary for subscriptions, to take the earliest opportunity of ascertaining the names, numbers, warrants, &c., of the parties making collections in various parts of the country.

“He also gave notice of a motion respecting the Kildare-street Society.”

Upon the 8th of March, he redeemed the latter notice.

#### “KILDARE-STREET ASSOCIATION.

“MR. O’CONNELL rose to move upon his notice respecting the Kildare-street Association.

“It appeared there was now a petition before parliament for an increased grant to this association, and it was cruel that the funds of this association should be diverted from their original purpose, and applied towards shameless jobs. He (Mr. O’Connell) was himself a subscriber for many years without attending the meetings, because they put forward a notice, that the object of the institution was to facilitate education amongst the poor, without interfering with the religious tenets of any. His attention was at last called to their proceedings by the best of Irishmen, and one far beyond his eulogium. Lord Cloncurry informed him that in his neighbourhood the institution was perfectly useless, the association having refused relief to any school in which the Bible was not received as a school-book, without note or comment. In consequence of this, at the next meeting of the society, his Grace the Duke of Leinster, Lord Cloncurry, and the late Randal M’Donnell, and he (Mr. O’Connell) attended, and stated, that the Catholic clergy would not consent to have the Scriptures degraded into a school-book, particularly without note or comment. They observed that the Catholic clergy might be wrong in that resolution, but it rested on a principle from which they could not swerve. In this statement he was met by the Committee, positively denying that such was the practice of the Catholic clergy, and they contended they knew the doctrines of his religion better than he did himself.

“In support of their assertion they read several letters, each from some Rev. Mr. blank, of blank parish, and blank place, those being the characteristics of authenticity which distinguish all the correspondence read at their annual meetings, when the name of Joseph Devonshire Jackson, to whom the letters are addressed, is the only one announced to the public.

“By the testimony of those anonymous witnesses, there was an immense majority against him.



“At the next annual meeting, having previously taken the liberty to address the two Catholic bishops of Dublin (Doctors Troy and Murray), and having received from them a letter, stating, ‘that they did not conceive the Scriptures proper *school* books; and that their practice was to have the Scriptures accompanied by note and comment, and that they could not deviate from that rule,’ it was proposed by Lord Cloncurry, seconded by Mr. Curran, that a committee should be appointed to inquire and report, whether their mode of proceeding was the best adapted to carry into effect the principle of their institution, and to give an equal facility for education to persons of all religions.

“But the majority of the society, from a conviction of having carried on proceedings they dared not avow, resisted the appointment of a committee of inquiry, and thereby convicted themselves of that want of candour of which he had often accused them. Yet those were the men to teach morality to the Irish peasantry, who themselves violate its first principles—nay, they even resolved that the regulation respecting the use of the Scriptures in school, should not be repealed without a particular resolution of the association.

“Those general meetings were the most oddly composed imaginable. There were High Churchmen, such as Rev. Mr. Daly, county Wicklow; there were several ‘New-lights’ of several denominations, some Quakers, and several of those half Quakers, who are neither Protestant nor Quaker, but have a smack of both; not agreeing exactly in the Scriptures, that they may continue to wrangle upon them. He should never forget the fanatic yell with which his motion for investigation was received—particularly from a host of Quakers.

“It was somewhat singular that he shortly afterwards experienced a defeat, with a similar-toned *hiss*, at the Dublin Library, when he attempted to have excluded from its shelves an impious work against Christianity, styled *Ecce Homo!* It had been irregularly, and, of course, improperly introduced; he had endeavoured to get rid of it; the shameless writers in the Orange press accused him of having contended for its reception! It was most likely one of themselves who had put it on the shelves.

“He had no doubt the Kildare-street proselytizing schools had considerably increased through the labours of a gentleman, whom he (Mr. O’Connell) much regretted had greatly exerted himself to forward the views of the promoters of the society in question. The schools had, unfortunately, increased to a considerable extent, owing to a misconception in several Catholic quarters. The society had, in these places, got the name of liberality; because of casual relaxations of their rule, with

regard to the reading of the sacred scriptures, without note or comment. He had heard that there were somewhere about forty instances in which this had occurred; and he prayed the association and the country to remark what manner of men these were, who managed this Kildare-street Society, and assumed, or rather presumed to meddle with the education of the entire youth of Ireland. First, they make a rule which they profess to be essential, to be indispensable, and in fact, the foundation of their whole system; and then, when an object is to be gained, they do not hesitate to abandon what they affected to consider so necessary, and to violate what they appeared to hold as of such sacred importance.

“Perhaps, however, they considered duplicity a necessary part of the system for educating the Irish, and so practised it before they preached.

“He had been misunderstood upon a former occasion by some of the newspapers, when he charged the Kildare-street Society with incorrectness in their accounts. He did not charge them with not bringing forward, in their balance-sheet, the *money* in hand; but he had charged them, and did so still, with having omitted the stock of books and paper, from one year to the other. He did so upon the best authority in the world.

“The Kildare-place Society had thought proper to proceed against Mr. Boswell, a respectable paper-stainer, who had become security for a store-keeper, who, they alleged, was deficient in the quantity of books and paper. He (Mr. O’Connell) had been counsel for Mr. Boswell. The Kildare-place Society had totally failed in the prosecution, because they had not the slightest evidence in the world as to the quantity of paper, or books, which they had had under the care of the accused store-keeper. They contrived most industriously to keep the trial out of all the newspapers, although there were reporters present.

“What admirable tutors in vulgar arithmetic! What admirable instructors for the Irish peasantry! Were they better qualified, in a moral point of view, divided as they were amongst themselves, by various religious opinions, and agreeing in nothing but the spirit of proselytism, not caring what the children were, so as they ceased to be Catholics. It was very probable that the saints in parliament would throw their shield of protection around their fellow-labourers in Kildare-street, but the petition would have the effect of administering that material portion of education—wholesome correction.

“It would expose their practices to the parliament and the people; and if the parliament were intent upon giving the public money really for the education of the Irish poor, instead of making it the means of

proselytism, they would agree to the prayer of the petition. They would appoint a committee to inquire whether the mode of education pursued by the Kildare-street Association is that best adapted to the wants and circumstances of the Irish peasantry.

“To be sure, they might be met by the hacknied calumny, that the Catholic clergy were desirous of keeping the people ignorant of the Scriptures, but there never was a baser or more absurd assertion.

“The Catholic clergy wisely see what the Kildare-street Association themselves exhibit—a couple dozen religions seated around their table. They wished to prevent children’s uninformed minds from being confounded and embarrassed with what they cannot understand. They wish to avoid laying the foundation for future Johanna Southcotes, Jumpers, and Seekers, and other “New Lights.” They had no desire to render the Scriptures obnoxious to the rising generation by their being made *task* books. They had no desire to withhold the Scriptures from adults, or those capable of understanding their mysterious truths. But they had no wish to create doubts and difficulties by the use of the Scriptures, without note or comment; and it should be recollected that to the veneration and care with which the Catholic clergy have preserved the Scriptures, the Protestants are indebted for having them in their original purity.

“The Catholic clergy have not only preserved the written, but the *unwritten* law of God—practised and professed by the Protestants of this day.

“The learned gentleman then moved the appointment of a committee to prepare a petition to parliament upon this subject. Carried.”

Before proceeding to the Association to make the foregoing speech, Mr. O’Connell had had to deliver two or three others, at a “meeting of the citizens and householders of Dublin, pursuant to a requisition to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, for the purpose of taking into consideration the measures most expedient to be adopted, in order to prevent the infliction of the burthens now sought to be imposed upon the citizens of Dublin, in consequence of the corporation having, by public notice, announced their intention of applying to parliament, in this session, for power to impose tolls and customs upon goods coming into and going out of said city.”

Such were the terms of the announcement. The abbreviated

account we give of the meeting will show the reckless shamelessness of the old corporators, and also the varied nature of the struggles—varied in all save *difficulty*—which Mr. O'Connell was continually engaged in.

“The Lord Mayor took the Chair, and the first proceeding was to read the intended petition of the Corporation.

“MR. ARABIN moved :—

“RESOLVED—‘That we understand that the Corporation of the City of Dublin have petitioned parliament for the establishment of tolls and customs in the said city.’

“ALDERMAN ARCHER thought the resolution should *not* embrace any *inuendo*. The Corporation did not wish to *tax* the citizens, *but to relieve them!* (A laugh.)

“MR. O'CONNELL said, that if the resolution proposed did not state what was the fact, let the gentleman bring forward one that he considered did. Let them state the truth at once. If they were not seeking to establish tolls, let them bring forward a resolution to this effect :—

“RESOLVED—‘That the Corporation are *not* seeking to establish tolls.’

“He would prove to their satisfaction, or rather dissatisfaction, that that was not what, as private gentlemen, they could assert.

“They stated that, from time immemorial, they were accustomed to receive tolls. That was unfounded in fact. Let them try the question of right. If they did not like the King's Bench, let them bring it into the Common Pleas. The tolls must be local. If they removed them beyond the boundaries of the city, they might extend them to the county of Dublin. Those who resided one inch beyond the toll-gate were freed of toll ; but this effort of the Corporation, if successful, would have the effect of making them liable to toll who were not so before.

“The crown could not grant to any corporation the power of levying any toll without a *quid pro quo*. The king could not grant a toll by charter without the *proviso* that the corporation would give value to the citizens of Dublin. He would ask, did the Corporation repair the streets, or mend the quays, or build bridges, or pay the metal main tax ? (No, no, no.) He (Mr. O'Connell) paid the Paving Board nine or ten pounds a-year, for which he had not got any equivalent from the Corporation. The city treasurer was well able, but he was not willing, to pay that—no blame to him.

“He (Mr. O'Connell) paid the Anna Liffey cess without a murmur ; he got fair value for it. If a bridge was to be built, a prison to be erected, or a contract to be entered into for milk, butter, and potatoes

for any prison, the citizens were called on to pay according to the grand jury presentments; and the Corporation was not permitted to interfere further than in the appointment of the man who was to receive the money. Whenever they did interfere, they give little or no value for the taxes. They still received monies which in Catholic times had been applied to Catholic uses, but which uses had of course long ago ceased; such as the providing that mass should be regularly said for the trainbands.

“The Corporation held out no prospect that they would give value for these new tolls; and the greatest proof that could be given of their own conviction that they had no right to levy them, was their admitting that an act of parliament was necessary, in order to establish their present claim.

“Let the Corporation deal candidly with them. What was now sought was nothing more nor less than an extension of the tolls in points to which they had not laid claim before. They (the citizens) denied the right of the Corporation altogether. Let them go into the courts of law, as they did before with Mr. Pilsworth. Let them go outside the Exchange, and assert their right; let them stop a car, and a replevin would be entered against them in half an hour, and the question would be tried the next term. They had an able and an intelligent law officer in the Recorder; let them, therefore, try the question of right in the courts of law, and not petition parliament on the subject.

“MR. ELLIS, M.P., Dublin, said, that there ought to be an adjournment for the present. (Loud cries of ‘No, no.’)

“What was looked for now was a private bill, between the first and second reading of which, in parliament, not less than three weeks should necessarily intervene. Would it not be better, then, to wait until they should have the bill itself before them, which he would engage they should have with the utmost promptitude, and thus be enabled to see what its provisions really were, rather than to oppose it in entire ignorance of it. (‘No, no.’)

“He went on to assert that Mr. O’Connell was mistaken in supposing the question of tolls had never been tried. It had, and there had never been a decision against the Corporation.

“MR. O’CONNELL denied that he had asserted that no legal proceedings whatever had occurred with regard to the Corporation’s right to levy tolls. This, however, he would assert, that the Corporation had been *non-suited*.

“With respect to the case of Reilly, he was fighting the Corporation, who were backed with £5,000 a-year out of the tolls. The case was brought into the county of Wicklow, and because it did not proceed, they

succeeded. Poor Reilly, who had not courage enough to put an 'O' to his name, had not money to proceed, and this was the triumph of the Corporation!

"He should be glad to know the name of the salesmaster that was al-luded to. (Here the name of Colclough was mentioned.) He did not know whether this Mr. Colclough was a freeman or not, but he seemed in a great hurry to pay the costs; and those were the cases that were relied on for establishing the right of the Corporation to toll! He would remind them of the action, '*Pilsworth v. Archer.*' Alderman Archer was able to defend that case by his private fortune, but he had also the treasury of the Corporation at his back. Mr. Pilsworth, however, was not to be deterred; he was resolved to leave the world better than he found it. An order of judgment for the plaintiff was entered. There Alderman Archer was obliged to pay the *costs and damages.*

"The learned gentleman (Mr. Ellis) said, that if the tolls were illegal he would oppose them. He (Mr. O'Connell) should like to see him oppose the Corporation. (Great laughter.) He was of no party! Oh, not he! (Continued laughter.) He was *your representative*, forsooth! (Laughter.)

"See how the Corporation conduct this affair. First, they say they have a *right* to tolls; and modestly ask leave to increase them. Then they say they have *not* a right to tolls; and require to be relieved from the £2,000 a-year demanded by the Paving Board. He admitted that that claim of £200 a-year by the Paving Board was a grievance, and as a freeholder, he was ready to join in a petition against it. What a country would not Ireland be, if they, corporators and citizens, Protestants and Catholics, would but join, would but unite, one and all, for the redress of their common grievances!

"The people were as anxious as the corporators could be for British connexion—for one king—one constitution—that constitution which existed in such safety and vigour before, when Ireland had her own parliament. Had she that parliament now, there never would have been occasion for the species of charity-sermon which Mr. Ellis had preached upon the poverty of the country. (Cheers.)

"After some further opposition, the Lord Mayor advised that Mr. Arabin's resolution should be let pass without a division.

"NICHOLAS MAHON moved a resolution, deprecating in strong terms the conduct of the Corporation in making their pretended claims to tolls and customs.

"ALDERMAN HARTY strongly opposed it, referring to the prosperity of Dublin, when tolls were levied before the Union.

"MR. O'CONNELL said that, as counsel for the Corporation—(a

laugh)—he would say that it was a hardship that £2,000 should be demanded of them for what they did not receive, and were not entitled to.

“Alderman Harty said that the country was prosperous before the Union. Why, then they had upwards of two hundred resident noblemen in Dublin, besides six or seven and twenty bishops—(laughter)—who went regularly to the levees in coaches and six, and kept livery servants, who lived like gentlemen of fortune. Luxury then bore a high price.

[“The Lord Mayor here observed that the learned gentleman was wandering into extraneous matter.”]

“MR. O'CONNELL resumed—If Alderman Harty was allowed to argue in support of tolls on the ground of the state of Ireland before the Union, when there were two hundred and fifty resident nobility in the city, it was competent for him to show that the Union had taken away their resources.

“It was said that the Irish parliament was corrupt; but there were eighty, and from that to ninety-six, constantly voting in the oppositions, and that was a greater number, in proportion, than in the British House of Commons.

“The Corporation never called on the poverty of the people to pay tolls, because they paid them when they were rich and flourishing. They all recollected the numberless riots they occasioned. The police were often sent out to the toll-gates, and returned bleeding and crying to Alderman Archer. If the tolls were again brought forward, and an attempt was made to levy them, was it not very probable that some one would whisper to ‘the boys’—‘When an attempt was made before to levy tolls, you beat the Corporation. They then gave them up. Why should you not beat them again?’ (Cheers.)

“ALDERMAN ARCHER suggested an adjournment as the best means of *conciliation*.

“MR. KIRWAN ridiculed the proposition, and called the Corporation ‘the worst curse with which the city of Dublin was disgraced.’

“The Lord Mayor and Mr. J. B. FITZSIMONS defended the Corporation.

“MR. MAHON’S resolution was put, and carried, as were some other resolutions, and the meeting broke up.”

It will be seen, that whatever might be the business of the hour—however engrossing the immediate object on which he was engaged—Mr. O'Connell’s mind constantly and eagerly reverted to

the great business and object of his life—the “ Repeal of the Union.”

And evidencing it thus in public, his family and friends knew how unremittingly his thoughts were occupied in private with the prospect of Ireland’s regeneration, and how well he was entitled to address her in the lines so frequently used by him in his speeches—

“ Still shalt thou be my midnight dream,  
Thy glories still my waking theme !  
And every thought and wish of mine,  
Unconquered Erin, shall be thine !”



## APPENDIX.

---

### “REPORT OF THE REV. RICHARD HAYES,

DELEGATE OF THE IRISH CATHOLICS TO ROME,

PRESENTED TO THE CATHOLIC BOARD, SATURDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 1817.

“ON the 16th September, 1815, the nonstrance of the Irish Catholics was confided to me. Reaching Rome on the 25th of October, I lost no time in waiting on Cardinal Litta, and disclosing my mission. His eminence honoured me with assurances of support—denied that the Genoese letter conceded the Veto—and gave me a copy to send to Ireland. I found at once that my mission had to meet the implacable resistance of Cardinal Gonsalvi, secretary of state. He much complained at my not having selected him for my communication. I did not conceive myself warranted to submit, contrary to all practice, our religious concerns to the political cabinet.

“On the 9th of November, I had my first audience of his holiness, who received me and my documents in the most gracious manner. I had the satisfaction of removing some erroneous impressions, and hearing his declaration that he had never granted the Veto to the British Crown.

“The influence of his minister was, however, too visible—his holiness expressing a desire that I should place the papers in the hands of Cardinal Gonsalvi; but he accompanied the request with the warmest assurances of his personal care, and a promise to refer them to a congregation of cardinals.

“For some time I was engaged in arrangements, and was also much occupied in removing the effect of the extravagant misrepresentations of the vetoistical faction, aided by the public press, which was under the control of my opponents.

“Cardinal Litta's official deputation to the Austrian Emperor at

Milan, increased my difficulties. Scarcely was he gone when the secretary evaded the promised reference. However, after many efforts, I prevailed on two of the most venerable cardinals—Pietro and Somaglier—to interpose with the holy father, who was not aware of the evasion of his orders, and subsequently obtained another interview. I found his mind had been practised upon; and I had to put into his hands a strong protest against the arts and the whole conduct of his minister.

“ I expostulated with the latter; and, after much discussion, succeeded in inducing him to admit the injustice of the representation he had allowed to be made to the Pope, that the majority in number and respectability was, in Ireland, favourable to the Veto. I laid before him the plan of ‘ domestic nomination,’ of which he affected to approve, but evaded, by every means, the giving it any aid.

“ On the 9th of January, 1816, I obtained another audience of the Pope, for nearly an hour, during which I urged every argument against this obnoxious innovation. His holiness seemed much alarmed for the state of the Irish Catholics, and expressed an apprehension that they would be subjected to new persecutions, if he did not yield, in some measure, to the desires of the British government upon this head.

“ I told his holiness that the *Irish Catholics were no strangers to persecution; and that I was authorized to declare that they would prefer the re-enactment of the whole penal code to any injurious innovation upon that religious system for which they and their forefathers had, during three centuries, made such unprecedented sacrifices!*

“ I added, in reply to the anxious solicitude of his holiness—‘ We dread not persecution, holy father; but we dread your holiness’s sanction of a measure which we must resist; as we would be thereby deprived of those sympathies of the holy see, which have ever consoled us under the fierce trials we have endured for our attachment to the centre of unity.’ I informed his holiness that were he to allow the gratification of the British cabinet to be preferred to a compliance with the prayers of his faithful children in Ireland, I should find it difficult to persuade my constituents, on my return, that their religious interests were not made secondary to the political objects of the Roman court. I reminded him, that he had, in 1805, through Monsignor Coppola, then secretary of Propaganda, in his letter to the Right Rev. Doctor Milner, distinctly reprobated such a measure as is now proposed; and in which letter is quoted the declaration of Pope Benedict XIV. to the Bishop of Breslau, expressing an insuperable objection to the interference of any anti-Catholic prince or power in the nomination of a Catholic prelate. His holiness, on reading this letter, was much moved; and I retired, re-

newing my expressions of confidence in the paternal care of the holy see.

“ Two days after I had obtained this third audience, I waited on the cardinal secretary, who, to my great surprise, evinced considerable desire to see the affair concluded, by the enactment of domestic nomination. I found, however, ere long, that these professions of anxiety were equally — on this, as on every other occasion; and that so far from aiding me by his co-operation, he continued, as before, the ardent promoter of every measure prejudicial to me and my mission.

“ The Cardinal Prefect, Litta, having returned to Rome in February, I immediately waited on his eminence, and informed him of all that had occurred since his departure. Having urged him to execute his former intentions, he replied that he could do nothing further in the business, until it should be known how the prelates of Ireland had received the amended answer, which had been forwarded to them by the cardinal secretary of state.

“ The illness of Cardinal Litta, at this period, which continued for two months, interrupted my negotiations with his eminence, and I turned my attention to those officers of Propaganda from whom the rescript signed ‘Quarantotti’ had emanated, well knowing their influence, and the opportunities they enjoy for its exercise. I was now satisfied that the measure of domestic nomination was the only one which could substantially prevent the Veto; for it was manifest that if the appointment of our prelates was to rest in Rome, that the cardinal secretary would place it at the disposal of the British minister. I therefore urged that measure, and succeeded in inducing those officers to be as friendly to it as they had before been to the obnoxious innovation. I found his holiness and the sacred congregation willing to accede, as they disclaimed any views of patronage on their part, and expressed a desire for a settlement of the matter in the most satisfactory way.

“ On the 7th of March I had a fourth audience of the holy father, with a view to submit to his perusal an earnest and very able communication, upon the subject of the veto, which I had received, a few days before, from the illustrious Bishop of Cloyne and Ross, the Right Rev. Doctor Coppinger. I renewed my entreaties for an adjustment of the question, and his holiness was pleased to order me to bring the letter of the venerable prelate to Cardinal Litta, with whom he promised to confer upon its contents.

“ The Cardinal Prefect having been restored to health, and the resolutions of the synod of Kilkenny having arrived at Rome, towards the end of May, I again pressed on Propaganda the measure of domestic

nomination ; and I found that an intimation had been given to the Irish prelates, that the sacred congregation had no objection to the principle, and would establish the measure, provided a mode was proposed that should meet general approval. I felt much gratified at this determination, as our affairs were thus imperceptibly taken out of the hands of the political secretary, and had returned to their proper tribunal, where they remained until the period of my arrest. I therefore avoided any further intercourse with the minister of the Roman court, and confided my negotiations to the holy see through the legitimate medium of the Propaganda.

“ The anxious caution of the Cardinal Prefect gave rise to many interruptions in the progress of domestic nomination ; but the arrival of Sir John Cox Hippenley’s report, of June, this year, created a general alarm, and induced his eminence to resolve on an immediate decision. Many modes of domestic nomination had been proposed, as well in Rome as from Ireland. At length his eminence seemed to approve of one, which I had, at his request, submitted ; but he commanded and countermanded its being taken into consideration several times ; so that the entire summer of 1816 passed away in interviews and correspondence with the prefect and other members of the sacred congregation, on this subject, which was now become the primary object of attention in Rome as in Ireland. The details of this negotiation will necessarily constitute a principal portion of my future narrative. Suffice it here to say, that I laboured constantly and earnestly to collect and promote the views of my constituents on the subject.

“ Nothing decisive having been done, and observing the approach of the annual October vacation, and of the solemnities of November, Christmas, &c., I resolved on returning to Ireland, at least for the winter, in the hope of finding such an unanimity amongst the prelates and clergy, on the mode of establishing this indispensable measure, as might ensure success in the future discussions. I communicated my intentions to Cardinal Litta, who delivered me a letter, dated 5th of October (since published), declaring that the letter from Genoa, in favour of ministerial control, was not mandatory, condemning the pretensions set forth in Sir John Cox Hippenley’s report, and admitting the principle of domestic nomination. His eminence at the same time promised to obtain, in the first general congress of November, a decree for the mode which had been submitted.

“ On the 8th of October, I repaired to Castle-Gandolfo, the country residence of his holiness, where I was admitted to my fifth and last audience. I repeated my former prayers, that he would graciously

please to attend to the desires of his faithful children in Ireland, and having placed in his hands an address expressive of their attachment and veneration, I obtained, on their behalf, the apostolic benediction.

“ My intention of departure being generally known, I received from all friendly quarters entreaties to desist from a perseverance therein, as it would probably occur, that the measure of domestic nomination would be put to rest if I were to depart, particularly during the winter season, when much danger of a prejudicial influence was to be apprehended, from the influx of British travellers. I yielded to these apprehensions, which, after the vacations, I soon found to be too fatally realized; and I had the satisfaction to learn, that my stay was approved of by a vote of the aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland, held in this city on the 17th of December.

“ In January, 1817, I renewed my correspondence with Cardinal Litta, and addressed to his eminence a long letter, re-arguing the subject of domestic nomination, and urging its discussion in the congress, which had been promised to take place three months before. His eminence again commanded and countermanded the consideration of the question; but at length, after some earnest expostulation by friends of the measure, he ordered the plan which I had drawn up to be prepared for immediate discussion. The summary of this plan, as amended by his eminence, was—That the parish priests, including the members of chapters, should elect three candidates; that the metropolitan and suffragans should unite their sentiments with respect to the qualifications of each; and that the sacred congregation should institute on the joint testimony. That, with regard to coadjutors, the incumbent prelate should propose the candidate to his parish priest and canons, who should declare their assent or dissent by a plurality of votes; that the metropolitan and suffragans should transmit their opinions of him to the holy see; and the sacred congregation institute accordingly.

“ The publication of a letter which I had addressed to a member of this Board increased, if possible, the hostility of the vetoistical party against me, as it exposed the arts and misrepresentations of the Roman minister and his adherents. The most active of my enemies was the Baron Ompteda, Hanoverian ambassador—distinguished only for his servility and intrigue, and who presumed to take a prominent station in the affair. I was, however, informed of his unworthy designs, and succeeded in counteracting them for several weeks.

“ Regardless of the calumnies which were circulated now with increased industry, in proportion as the period for adjusting the measure approached, I directed my attention to make arrangements previous to the general congress, which was finally fixed for Monday, the 19th of

May. The plan of domestic nomination had been printed by Propaganda three weeks before, and distributed among the cardinals who were to attend. I hold a correct copy of this plan, and propose to include it in my future narrative. Several reasons in favour of domestic nomination are adduced in the *penenza*, or printed case, laid before their eminences, who unanimously approved of it, including the aged Cardinal Quarantotti, whose prominent zeal I would deem it injustice to overlook, as I found his eminence a most earnest supporter, and apparently anxious to compensate thereby for the mischievous rescript with which, in an inconsiderate moment, under the influence of the grossest misrepresentation, he suffered his venerable name to be associated.

“The divisions in the Catholic Association gave new life to the vetoists. However, all the cardinals voted for the decree, except Cardinal Fontana; and he prevailed on Cardinal Litta to postpone it. Thus was lost domestic nomination, though the pending appointments in Ireland had been decided on its principle.

“The triumphant vetoists laboured for my expulsion. Two months were gone since my letter in the Irish papers had been known, and the sensation in Rome on the subject had died away. However, as I seemed abandoned by the Dublin Association, it was thought a favourable opportunity to drive me from Rome; and I was accordingly ordered to leave that city in twenty-four hours, and the states in three days. I remonstrated in vain. Fever then attacked me; yet my persecutors did not desist. They broke into my bed-room, placed guards over my person, and continued them to the day of my deportation—a period of eight weeks.

“On the 16th of July, I was conveyed, by a military escort, to the frontiers of the Roman states; and having remained some days at Florence to recruit my health, reached home finally on the 24th September.”

---

#### LETTERS FROM MORGAN O'CONNELL, ESQ.,

CORNET OF HUSSARS IN THE SOUTH AMERICAN LEGION, UNDER GENERAL D'EVEREUX,\*  
TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ.

#### “SOUTH AMERICA.

[The following is an extract of a letter from the son of Mr. O'Connell, who, accompanied General D'Evereux to South America. We believe it is the most authentic account that has reached Europe from this quarter. The friends of General D'Evereux, amongst whom we ranked ourselves, in evil report and in good report, will be glad to hear,

\* At the early age of fifteen.

that up to the 13th of August he was well. For the particulars we refer to a youth's letter, upon which no suspicion can rest.]

"Head Quarters, Barranquilla, Monday, August 13, 1820.

"MY DEAR FATHER—Mr. Burke, a most particular friend of the general's, having told me that he will have an opportunity of sending letters to-morrow to Jamaica, I embrace the opportunity to send you a few lines, giving an account of our voyage and arrival here. After a few days' tedious passage from Jamaica, we anchored in the Bay of Savanilla, and none but the general was allowed to land, accompanied by two aides-de-camp. Your humble servant was one of those; but the general not being able to procure horses enough for us, I was left behind. As soon as the general saw Admiral Brion, he solicited permission for all of us to land, which the admiral granted, and sent down a large Bongo, or boat, for us to come up from Savanilla to Barranquilla, 22 miles distant. The Bongo came down, but the crew never mentioned a word of the message; they loaded her from several vessels with different articles, went up the river, and we never knew she was for us until she was gone. The passage up the river always occupies from twenty-four to thirty hours for large boats, in consequence of the strength of the current running down. As soon as the general saw we were not come, another large boat was despatched; and after lying at Savanilla for a week, we came up here, after twenty-four hours' passage. On our arrival here, the officers and soldiers were billeted on the inhabitants, and supplied with excellent rations—of beef, 3lbs. each; of bread, a good loaf; and rice, candles, &c. I, being on the general's staff, stop at the same house with him. The admiral behaves very well to the general; and, indeed, we are all treated here with the greatest respect.

"It seems that Montillo has refused to give up the command of the army to the general; in consequence of which the general has despatched Hall and Bennett to the President, to lay the matter before him. The general regrets greatly my not being up here in time, else he would have sent me to the President instead of Bennet. Bolivar is at present within ten days' journey of this.

"I rode yesterday, with Mr. Burke, to Soledad, about seven miles off, where 400 Creoles are stationed. I was presented to Admiral Brion and to Madame —, a superannuated old duchess. You will be surprised to hear, and no doubt rejoiced, that I have got Thady O'Sullivan as servant, who came out with Palmer, of the Lancers. My dear father, I will write again to you before I leave this.

"MORGAN O'CONNELL.

"The messenger who goes with this is just going off, so I must

finish abruptly. Mr. O'Mullen, Maurice O'Connell, &c., &c., are all well. We are to attack St. Martha in a few days."

[The same gentleman writes from Kingston, Jamaica, under date July 17, stating, that the Viceroy of Carthagena had arrived there, accompanied by six officers and four friars; that General D'Evereux took with him about 160 Irish troops, and 100 Creoles; which, added to 150 on board Brion's fleet, and 300 at Angostura, will constitute a force of 500 Irish, and 100 Creoles; that the army under the President's special command is 12,000 strong, which is intended for an attack on Caraccas, in conjunction with the divisions of Generals Paez and Urdaneta.]

" Head Quarters, Margarita.

" Government House, Wednesday, June 14.

" MY DEAR FATHER—Here we are at last, in the sandy oven of Margarita, where we arrived about six o'clock on Wednesday evening last, and where we were received with every demonstration of joy and satisfaction. On our arrival here, Colonel Hall and Major Bennett went ashore; but in a short time the latter returned along with Colonel Low, A.D.C. to the President, and Colonel Richards, deputed to wait on the general to the constituted authorities. They hailed the general with all the respect due to his rank as lieutenant-general of the armies of the republic, to which high rank he was promoted, as one of the first acts of the President, on his triumphal entry from Angostura into Santa Fe. The general, after perusing his despatches from the supreme chief, went on shore the next morning, all the forts and armed vessels in the bay of Juan de Griego having saluted him with thirteen guns each. In the course of the evening, some of the officers who had been left behind sick by Aylmer, but who go on at present with us, came on board.

" O'Kelly's nephew is here. The officers said that the legion mustered about a thousand men before leaving this, but only about eight hundred went, the rest being either in a bad state of health, or having misconducted themselves. Young Sexton, Maurice O'Connell's friend, fought a duel coming out, but was not wounded. There are at present in the stores here and at Angostura, eighteen thousand stand of arms, &c., all provided by the general.

" I never enjoyed better health in my life. This place is not near so hot as I have heard it reported.

" Mr. O'Mullen has just bid me tell you, that you had better send your letters to me through Colonel Kenny, who will send them on along



with the general's, and we will direct ours through the same channel. The general is named by Bolivar in his despatches as the senior lieutenant-general in his service, and he has the government of the island during our stay. He and his staff, of which I am a member, dine every day, at the expense of the government. Bolivar sent a beautiful white charger for his use; it is at present at Rio de la Hache; it was taken from a Spanish general, was all through the campaign, and originally cost five hundred guineas. The legion, at the taking of Rio de la Hache, lost not a man, the town having surrendered without firing a shot. The time the legion were here they got regular rations and pay. Everything is going on well on the main. One of the expressions of the supreme chief in his despatches to the general was, that the Irish legion had contributed greatly to the liberation of new Grenada. A Buenos Ayres privateer came in this morning, with news that Artigas was carrying all before him—that a royalist general had joined him, and that the whole country had declared against the Portuguese. . . . I had scarcely finished my letter of yesterday, when an order from the general came, saying that as he dined with General Arismendi, he desired I should come ashore in full uniform, where I should find a horse ready to bring me to him. Having done accordingly, I rode from the landing with Colonel Lowe's young son, a fine boy, not eight years old, who has been all through the campaign with his father—can ride any horse, attends parade every day, and performs his sword exercise in half the time a regular trooper would do it. As we rode hard, we soon arrived, and were met by Arismendi, General D'Evereux, Colonels Low and Hall, and Major Bennett.

“General D'Evereux presented me, saying who I was, what you had done for the cause, &c. Arismendi answered in Spanish, that he felt truly happy in seeing the son of such a man joining the cause, and would do me every service in his power, which is very great, he being second in command to Bolivar. I was then presented to Arismendi's lady and sister, and Mrs. English, a nice little woman, very handsome and gay, and I think very like —.

“After my presentation, Admiral Clementi, who is also General, came in with a large number of officers and others, and we sat down to dinner—Arismendi at the foot, and his wife at the head. He is a small, active, thin man, with large black moustaches, and very like the picture you have of Bolivar, only a little wrinkled. I never saw such a dinner. We began with turtle soup; then fowls, fish, yams, bananas, game, &c., and the largest turkey I ever beheld, as large as a sirloin of beef! all sorts of spiced and forced meats, and a dessert of fruits, half of the names of which I don't recollect. Immediately after, Arismendi stood

up and said—' Brindesi, fill your glasses,' and then gave the President's health, three times three; and we all sat down with cries of ' Vive la Colombia, vive la Patri !' Then ' Admiral Brion,' ' General D'Evereux,' &c. The next toast, ' Daniel O'Connell,' was given by Colonel Low, a fine fellow and an Irishman. He proposed you as the most enlightened, the most independent, and the most patriotic man, not only in Great Britain, but in all Europe. This was drank with the most enthusiastic acclamations, and Colonel Low's son, standing on his chair, shouted, ' Viva el Counsellor O'Connell !'

" Several other toasts followed. The last was also from Colonel Low's little son; who quite spontaneously getting up on his chair, gave—' May the first man that deserts his colours have a sword through his body !' His father assured us he had not said a word of it to him. The little fellow also said to our general, in Spanish—' General, there are ten thousand enemies in front; lead on your men, draw your sword, and remember the cause !' He is a little Irishman.

" After dinner, Arismendi, taking me by the hand, said, that as my father had evinced such feeling for the cause of Columbia, if any thing happened to D'Evereux, he (Arismendi) would consider me as his own son, and provide for me as such.

" About half-past eleven o'clock we mounted our horses, in number about eighteen, and cantered off, headed by Mrs. English, who kept us at a good pace.

" We saw Don Gomez this morning, and breakfasted with him. He looks for all the world like a sergeant-major of horse; but is, I understand, very brave and determined.

" Your affectionate Son,

" MORGAN O'CONNELL."

" Friday, June 16.

" We dined last night with Don Gomez, the Governor. He is a man of no education; but has rendered himself famous for the number of Spaniards killed with his own hand. It was he who challenged Morillo to single combat, in order to decide the fate of South America. Morillo declined, else by this time we should have had a different story.

" After dinner we drank nothing but champagne, and that not in glasses, but tumblers; and I assure you we did great justice to it. After the usual toasts the general gave your health; drank with the greatest acclamation. We then had a band of music, and several Spanish patriotic songs, of which the airs were beautiful, particularly one called ' Por la Patria viver o morir !' On breaking up, we were all invited to a ball by General Clementi, for this night. . . . .

About eight o'clock we entered the ball room. We were greatly entertained with the ridiculous stiff and awkward manœuvring of the dancers. I did not waltz; but there was one English country dance, in which I shone forth. I never saw so many ugly faces of both sexes in any ball-room before in my life. . . . Maurice went to dance a fandango; he got through it miserably, and tore a lady's gown with his spur. In short, we had great fun; and if we have more to-day, I shall let you know of it. . . .

" June 17.

. . . . " We dined last night with Arismendi. We had the standing toast, 'The wisdom of the President, who had appreciated the noble character of General D'Evereux, and attached him to the service of the republic;' other usual toasts also—such as you, Arismendi, &c. &c. . . . My dear father, I hope the next time you hear from me, that I will be on the Spanish main—on the theatre of, I hope and trust in God, our future glory; and I also tell you to rely on it, that I will never do any thing to disgrace the name I bear, either as a soldier or a gentleman.

" I remain, my dear Father,

" Your affectionate Son,

" MORGAN O'CONNELL,

" Cornet Hussar Guards, Staff of the Irish Legion."

---

" EDINBURGH.

" DINNER TO MR. O'CONNELL.

" SEPTEMBER 21ST, 1835.

(From *Times*, 25th September, 1835.)

" The Chairman ( ) then gave—

" 'Mrs. O'Connell and the Roof Tree of Darrynane.' "

" MR. O'CONNELL, in expressing his gratitude for the toast they had just drunk, said that it gave rise to emotions which were not translatable into language. They were, indeed, too domestic to intrude on the company. He would, however, say, that Mrs. O'Connell was the choice of his youth, the comfort of his life, and his solace in all his troubles and trials. No man could struggle well for his country whose nest was not warm at home—(cheers)—and it was quite certain there was no honey

in the cup of life, if not administered by the hands of those we love. (Renewed cheers.) For his own part, he owed much (perhaps the entire) of his public character to Mrs. O'Connell. When, in consequence of the chills of disappointment, and the disgusts at the treacheries which every public man, in a long course of life, is apt to meet with, he felt himself driven almost to give up politics, and betake himself again to that profession in which he had been so successful, he yielded to her earnest solicitations to the contrary, and he always found himself more loved at home for continuing the struggle for his native land. (Immense cheering.)"

## BRIEF SKETCH OF THE O'CONNELLS OF KERRY,

FROM THE CROMWELLIAN CONFISCATION TO THE PRESENT TIME.

ACCORDING to the most consistent accounts we can discover, the ancient and illustrious House of O'Connell of Kerry derives its origin from the same source whence descended the royal lines of Scottish Kings.

Their common ancestor was Conaire the Second, Monarch of Ireland at the commencement of the third century, through Cairbrie Riada—called Reuda by Venerable Bede—a Prince of West Munster, and son of that monarch by his marriage with the daughter of Conn of the Hundred Battles, his predecessor on the imperial throne of Erin.

At the epoch of the Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland in the twelfth century, the O'Connells were possessed of the midland district of the present county of Kerry, now called the Barony of Magonihy, their chief residence being then, and long afterwards, at Aghadoe, a town of some magnitude at that early period of our annals.

From this territory, it would seem, they were gradually evicted by the M'Carthy's, who were themselves forced westwards by pressure of the Fitzgeralds, Cogans, and De Barrys, and they finally settled down in comparative tranquillity in Iveragh, whence they appear to have displaced the O'Sheas, and of which they were found, by Sir William Petty, to have been but recently the principal proprietors, when he commenced the Down Survey, during the Protectorship.

Leaving their previous history to antiquarians, we will content ourselves with a brief sketch of their fortunes from that remarkable era down to the present time.

At the period from which we start, they formed but one and the

same family, but have since diverged into distinct branches, which follow in their order of seniority :—

The O'Connells of Brentree, county Clare, now extinct.

The O'Connells of Tralee, now the eldest line.

The O'Connells of Ennis, a branch of the foregoing.

The O'Connells of Darrynane, the most important branch.

The O'Connells of Ballybrack, a branch of the Darrynane family.

The O'Connells of Ballinablown; and

The O'Connells of Riverstown, county Kerry, or of Tarmans, New South Wales.

MAURICE O'CONNELL, OF CAHERBARNAGH.

\* HEAD, OR CHIEF, OF THE SEPT OF O'CONNELL OF KERRY, 1641, 1656.

(Temp. Cromwell.)

Maurice O'Connell, of Caherbarnagh, was chief of his sept in the war of 1641, but by his great age was prevented from taking part at either side. He was elder son of Rickard, the preceding chief, and his wife, Julia, daughter of Teige M'Owen M'Carthy, of Drishane, in the county Cork, and was the *stipes*, or common ancestor, of the seven branches just enumerated. He had two brothers, John O'Connell, of Ashtown, county Dublin, who died without issue, and Rickard, Bishop of Kerry, who was martyred by the Cromwellians, about the year 1652, at Ardfer.

In the "Book of Forfeitures and Distributions," lodged in the Record Office, Custom-House, Dublin, Maurice O'Connell, of Caherbarnagh, is set down as late proprietor of the eighteen estates which follow, and which he forfeited, and as actual proprietor of the estate marked 19, which never then, or since, went out of the possession of his family.

*Estates of Maurice O'Connell, of Caherbarnagh.*

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| 1. Clohanehanachane.     | 12. <i>Ffearglin</i> , alias Puffin Island. |
| 2. Keanburrin.           | 13. Ballinahaw (in part.)                   |
| 3. Garra West.           | 14. Kinagh (in part.)                       |
| 4. Crooma.               | 15. <i>Flaneboy</i> (in part.)              |
| 5. Ballinagloragh.       | 16. Killeearagh (in part.)                  |
| 6. Ballinahann.          | 17. Rathkesne (in part.)                    |
| 7. Killonogha.           | 18. Aghgort (in part), and,                 |
| 8. Caherbarnagh.         | 19. <i>Barkenagh</i> , called Innish-       |
| 9. Murisk.               | Ishmulty, and Drumlabort,                   |
| 10. Spankane.            | which never were forfeited.                 |
| 11. <i>Iniets</i> , and, |   |

## THE DARRYNANE FAMILY.

To render more clear the genealogy of this, the most illustrious branch of the O'Connells, it will be necessary to revert once more to the chieftain in Cromwell's time.

Maurice, of Caherbárnagh, who was father of Bartholomew, left two sons : Maurice, ancestor of the extinct house of Brentree ; and Geoffrey, second, who follows.

Geoffrey, the second son, had two sons : Maurice, ancestor of the Tralee family already mentioned ; and Daniel, ancestor of the Darrynane family.

John, of Darrynane, was his eldest son and heir, who had Maurice, second son, ancestor of the Ballybrack family ; and Daniel, who follows, his son and heir.

Daniel, of Darrynane, son of the foregoing John, left three sons : Maurice, the eldest, who died *s. p.* ; Morgan, who follows ; and Daniel, Count O'Connell, Major-General in the French, and Lieutenant-Colonel in the British, service.

Morgan O'Connell, of Carhan, was the second son of the aforesaid Daniel, and father of

Daniel O'Connell, M.P., the Liberator of Ireland. His brothers are : John, of Grena, and James, of Lakeview ; and his sons, by his marriage with his cousin in the fourth degree, Mary, second sister of Captain O'Connell, of Tralee, head of the sept :—

Maurice O'Connell, M. P.

Morgan O'Connell.

John O'Connell, M.P.

Daniel O'Connell, jun., M.P.

His daughters are :—

Ellen, married to C. Fitzsimon, Esq.

Kate, to Charles O'Connell, Esq.

Betsey, to N. J. French, Esq.

The Liberator retains in his possession an unforfeited portion of the estates of his ancestors—a concealment in the penal times—of which another part has not yet departed from the Tralee branch of the family. It is believed to be the very same property saved by Maurice of Caherbárnagh, even from the Cromwellian depredators. Its preservation is accounted for by the fact of its having been mortgaged for the support of the "King's Guards"—the O'Connell troop of horse—during the siege

of Ross Castle, and held by the mortgagee till the troubles were over, when it was restored by him to the family.

Of this branch and their connexion, no less than eighteen members were officers of the Irish Brigade at one period of the last century. One of them, Count Daniel O'Connell, rose to the highest distinction in the French service, and received his title as a reward from Louis XVI., who declined his offer to batter the city of Paris at the commencement of the Revolution, which act of decision would, in all probability, have effectually suppressed it, and for the achievement of which the Count possessed the means as well as the energy, being then in the actual command of fourteen thousand men, in the environs of the capital. At the period of the revolution of July, 1830, he was on the point of being created a Marshal of France, by Charles the Tenth, whose life he had saved in 1792. The expulsion of Charles the Tenth, and his own refusal to transfer his allegiance to Louis Philippe, shut the career of further honours to him.

At the period of the emigration in 1792, when he was transferred to the British service, he was offered a *bribe* by the Duke of York, on condition of changing his religion, which he spurned with disdain, in the very presence of the august proselytizer. The bribe offered was the royal patronage, and the highest promotion attainable in the army.

The *Ballybrack, or Tarmans Branch*, descends from a younger son of John O'Connell, of Darrynane. Of this family was the late Baron O'Connell, Chamberlain to the Emperor, Francis of Austria, and uncle to Captain Maurice, of Ballybrack, and Geoffrey, of Cork.